| **Results** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Number of records in this query:** | 67 |
| **Total records in survey:** | 67 |
| **Percentage of total:** | 100.00% |

Top of Form



Bottom of Form

| **Field summary for 611** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **In order to improve the WHOIS service capabilities, we need for data to be extensible** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Strongly Disagree (1) | 5 | 7.46% |  |
| Mostly Disagree (2) | 6 | 8.96% |  |
| Don't have an opinion either way (3) | 8 | 11.94% |  |
| Mostly Agree (4) | 20 | 29.85% |  |
| Strongly Agree (5) | 20 | 29.85% |  |
| Question does not matter (6) | 2 | 2.99% |  |
| Comments | 10 | 14.93% |  |
| No answer | 6 | 8.96% |  |
| **'Other' Responses** I'm very concerned with data mining and privacy. Extensions and standardization may make it easier to mine the Whois.  There should be a common standard that can be adopted by all name registries. Since ccTLDs have different requirements than gTLDs, the standard should be extensible with a minimal set of required fields. WHOIS needs are essentially the same now as they were 15 years ago EPP has a fixed data set. As long as people adhere to the EPP standard, the data set of the whois can also be fixed. And XML could be hard to do. That is why JSON is better if search is allowed it will introduce many other issues. legit registrants will enter false info, for example, and bad actors will have each domain with different info extensible data about any EPP object will cover many legal platform mostly in case of CC TLD's extensibility help us make multiple queries which are easily recoverable from storage. Various legal systems require a variable set of information which needs to be provided at "impress" alike services. Such legal requirements change quicker than any programmer can adopt any software. Extensibility of the WHOIS service is essential to handle registry data that includes additional types of objects and additional attributes. Existing service is fine - too much dataprotection issues in different legislations | | |  |
|  | | | |

| **Field summary for 612** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **In order to improve WHOIS capabilities, we need for the required data elements to be changeable over time.** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Strongly Disagree (1) | 6 | 8.96% |  |
| Mostly Disagree (2) | 5 | 7.46% |  |
| Don't have an opinion either way (3) | 13 | 19.40% |  |
| Mostly Agree (4) | 19 | 28.36% |  |
| Strongly Agree (5) | 17 | 25.37% |  |
| Question does not matter (6) | 2 | 2.99% |  |
| Comments | 9 | 13.43% |  |
| No answer | 5 | 7.46% |  |
| **'Other' Responses** People change, whois will need to change Registration data may change over time, as points of contact are introduced or withdrawn (eg fax numbers). A historical example might be DS records which are a recent addition to registration data. No evidence of this over the past decade Another service to keep maintaining. As long as the purpose is really really useful. unfortunately if allowed, data elements will only be added, never removed. who uses fax numbers nowadays anyway? Bt backwards compatibilty is thorny so that name server and contact should be updated and correct in whois response  Various legal systems require a variable set of information which needs to be provided at "impress" alike services. Due to geographical differences the requirements vary. Using the thin WHOIS approach the required information can be collected and enforced locally. We agree that there's an advantage in being able to change which elements are required.  Transitioning a required element to optional is reasonable, but collecting a new element or requiring an element that was previously optional will be difficult to coordinate even with broad agreement. Exisiting documentation should work | | |  |
|  | | | |

| **Field summary for 613** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A formal definition of WHOIS Data is needed** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Strongly Disagree (1) | 7 | 10.45% |  |
| Mostly Disagree (2) | 3 | 4.48% |  |
| Don't have an opinion either way (3) | 2 | 2.99% |  |
| Mostly Agree (4) | 20 | 29.85% |  |
| Strongly Agree (5) | 30 | 44.78% |  |
| Question does not matter (6) | 0 | 0.00% |  |
| No answer | 5 | 7.46% |  |
|  | | | |

| **Field summary for 614** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A formal modeling language such as XML should be used to create a data model for WHOIS** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Strongly Disagree (1) | 7 | 10.45% |  |
| Mostly Disagree (2) | 3 | 4.48% |  |
| Don't have an opinion either way (3) | 11 | 16.42% |  |
| Mostly Agree (4) | 16 | 23.88% |  |
| Strongly Agree (5) | 22 | 32.84% |  |
| Question does not matter (6) | 3 | 4.48% |  |
| No answer | 5 | 7.46% |  |
|  | | | |

| **Field summary for 615** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Work on such a model should be done by ICANN** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Strongly Disagree (1) | 21 | 31.34% |  |
| Mostly Disagree (2) | 2 | 2.99% |  |
| Don't have an opinion either way (3) | 14 | 20.90% |  |
| Mostly Agree (4) | 12 | 17.91% |  |
| Strongly Agree (5) | 11 | 16.42% |  |
| Question does not matter (6) | 3 | 4.48% |  |
| No answer | 4 | 5.97% |  |
|  | | | |

| **Field summary for 616** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Work on such a model should include the IETF** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Strongly Disagree (1) | 5 | 7.46% |  |
| Mostly Disagree (2) | 1 | 1.49% |  |
| Don't have an opinion either way (3) | 4 | 5.97% |  |
| Mostly Agree (4) | 17 | 25.37% |  |
| Strongly Agree (5) | 31 | 46.27% |  |
| Question does not matter (6) | 3 | 4.48% |  |
| No answer | 6 | 8.96% |  |
|  | | | |

| **Field summary for 617** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **WHOIS data collection techniques should insure that data is entered in a defined format** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Strongly Disagree (1) | 7 | 10.45% |  |
| Mostly Disagree (2) | 2 | 2.99% |  |
| Dont have an opinion either way (3) | 3 | 4.48% |  |
| Mostly Agree (4) | 19 | 28.36% |  |
| Strongly Agree (5) | 31 | 46.27% |  |
| Question does not matter (6) | 1 | 1.49% |  |
| No answer | 4 | 5.97% |  |
|  | | | |

| **Field summary for 618** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **WHOIS data collection techniques should allow for some fields to be made mandatory, mandatory fields are decided by Policy decision** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Strongly Disagree (1) | 7 | 10.45% |  |
| Mostly Disagree (2) | 4 | 5.97% |  |
| Don't have an opinion either way (3) | 2 | 2.99% |  |
| Mostly Agree (4) | 22 | 32.84% |  |
| Strongly Agree (5) | 28 | 41.79% |  |
| Question does not matter (6) | 0 | 0.00% |  |
| No answer | 4 | 5.97% |  |
|  | | | |

| **Field summary for 619** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **WHOIS data collection techniques should require that all fields be made mandatory** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Strongly Disagree (1) | 30 | 44.78% |  |
| Mostly Disagree (2) | 12 | 17.91% |  |
| Don't have an opinion either way (3) | 3 | 4.48% |  |
| Mostly Agree (4) | 11 | 16.42% |  |
| Strongly Agree (5) | 8 | 11.94% |  |
| Question does not matter (6) | 1 | 1.49% |  |
| No answer | 2 | 2.99% |  |
|  | | | |