| **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 831(1)** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What elements of WHOIS access should be available for audit? [rank on a 1-3 scale: should not collect, somewhat interesting, should collect] [Requester IP address]** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| should not collect (1) | 14 | 20.90% |  |
| somewhat interesting (2) | 9 | 13.43% |  |
| should collect (3) | 34 | 50.75% |  |
| No answer | 10 | 14.93% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/ce589af2a96649bbac0e3d12744553c3.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 831(2)** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What elements of WHOIS access should be available for audit? [rank on a 1-3 scale: should not collect, somewhat interesting, should collect] [Method of access (web, 3d party web service, port 43, bulk, other)]** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| should not collect (1) | 9 | 13.43% |  |
| somewhat interesting (2) | 14 | 20.90% |  |
| should collect (3) | 31 | 46.27% |  |
| No answer | 13 | 19.40% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/6d3b6c1efca12333a37f91b4754d142b.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 831(3)** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What elements of WHOIS access should be available for audit? [rank on a 1-3 scale: should not collect, somewhat interesting, should collect] [Requesting user-agent]** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| should not collect (1) | 10 | 14.93% |  |
| somewhat interesting (2) | 20 | 29.85% |  |
| should collect (3) | 22 | 32.84% |  |
| No answer | 15 | 22.39% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/3f822d12e006e2769427a4ac7d707cbd.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 831(4)** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What elements of WHOIS access should be available for audit? [rank on a 1-3 scale: should not collect, somewhat interesting, should collect] [Name of requester]** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| should not collect (1) | 24 | 35.82% |  |
| somewhat interesting (2) | 10 | 14.93% |  |
| should collect (3) | 20 | 29.85% |  |
| No answer | 13 | 19.40% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/99e87966a920691d14e6e3feef43d286.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 831(5)** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What elements of WHOIS access should be available for audit? [rank on a 1-3 scale: should not collect, somewhat interesting, should collect] [Domain name requested]** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| should not collect (1) | 9 | 13.43% |  |
| somewhat interesting (2) | 7 | 10.45% |  |
| should collect (3) | 41 | 61.19% |  |
| No answer | 10 | 14.93% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/bf39d8643f9840976a5f5e197db63478.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 831(6)** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What elements of WHOIS access should be available for audit? [rank on a 1-3 scale: should not collect, somewhat interesting, should collect] [Date and time]** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| should not collect (1) | 4 | 5.97% |  |
| somewhat interesting (2) | 6 | 8.96% |  |
| should collect (3) | 46 | 68.66% |  |
| No answer | 11 | 16.42% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/c4376094570fb0dc09c1f6c139a665cc.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 831(7)** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What elements of WHOIS access should be available for audit? [rank on a 1-3 scale: should not collect, somewhat interesting, should collect] [Response]** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| should not collect (1) | 8 | 11.94% |  |
| somewhat interesting (2) | 10 | 14.93% |  |
| should collect (3) | 35 | 52.24% |  |
| No answer | 14 | 20.90% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/4d67ddca260be8a53ac15c054eec167f.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 831(8)** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What elements of WHOIS access should be available for audit? [rank on a 1-3 scale: should not collect, somewhat interesting, should collect] [Other]** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| should not collect (1) | 4 | 5.97% |  |
| somewhat interesting (2) | 6 | 8.96% |  |
| should collect (3) | 6 | 8.96% |  |
| No answer | 51 | 76.12% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/6675361d965a69b81982906b1441826f.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 832** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Does the collection or use of any of these elements raise privacy or confidentiality concerns?** | | | |
| **Answer** | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Yes (Y) | 33 | 49.25% |  |
| No (N) | 18 | 26.87% |  |
| No answer | 16 | 23.88% |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/1fbcc00e2cceca906eb622c15297124d.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 833** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **If YES, Please comment** | | | |
|  | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Answer | 27 | 81.82% |  |
| No answer | 6 | 18.18% |  |
| **Responses** Collecting Requestor information could reveal the domain registrant is a target and, if they could learn this information, could send them into hiding to evade legal action. GIven a WHOIS system with appropriate safeguards (not currently the case) those making a query should also have their identities protected, as should registrants. Data security issues I have much less trouble with collecting information about requesters than with requesters collecting information about registrants.  IP address and name are personally identifiable information. Access to this information would need to be regulated by privacy law in many jurisdictions I envision a two-tier system, anonymous access and authenticated access. I would resist the idea of collecting personally-identifying information for anonymous access. IP addresses are personal data in some jurisdictions, but their collection is legitimate to help analyse usage and protect other personal data. Collection should be limited and data retained only for short periods. Peoples names are PII, other info may be there's alway privacy concerns when collecting large amounts of data from the public. any time personal information is gathered, that information falls into privacy compliance depending on the country and/or region. However, the need to caputer audit information is greatly needed Name of requester Who is (what entity) is requesting the information and why (for what purpose)? It is personally identifying information and therefore subject to all the same restrictions Personally identifiable information should be treated with the highest standard of privacy protection, such as EU data directive. Obviously, this auditing data should only be made available to those entitities with elevated access rights  WHOIS output for public use, should only contain limited data. For Registry/Registrar and law enforcement purposes, it should contain all data in order for each party to be able to perform their duties. Public access should not display full data because marketers/spammers will simply use that data.  to some, IP addresses are PII. can be managed with privacy-sensitive data-sharing framework.  IP address Name of the requester Name is PII, IP sometimes is name and IP addresses does rise the privacy question. more importantly the domain requested will impact business choices for the stake holders. Collecting domain names might disturb the checks before registering a trademark. Fraudulent use of the (leaked) collected data can cause headache to the future trademark owner. Collecting IP addresses, client information and queried names raise interests of politics and marketing. spam, stalking,... For the security of the system,it is always appropriate we know whoever is using the system or using the WHOIS service.  Name of requester raises privacy or confidentiality concerns ip address Several of these elements appear to fall within the definition of 'personally identifiable information ' (PII) or 'personal data' (PI) as defined in relevant data protecition laws and any use or collection of elements constituting PII or PI beyond the collection and use necessary to provide the service raises potential privacy and/or confidentiality concerns. It should be only used to improve performance  Requester IP-Address Name of requester Aside from improving site performance (if this was web based) there is no reason to collect user information. | | |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/87a891c503deaf7526ffc162d0987fd7.png | | | |

| **Field summary for 835** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **If you have additional use cases for auditing of WHOIS access, what additional auditable metrics would be useful? (For example, rate of access, number of requests/requester, number of requests/domain, most frequent requesters)** | | | |
|  | **Count** | **Percentage** |  |
| Answer | 17 | 25.37% |  |
| No answer | 50 | 74.63% |  |
| **Responses** Might prove helpful for both Law Enforcement and for internal abuse mitigation mechanisms for the providers of the WHOIS service. I believe simply that any information should be made public One possibility would be to collect the level of access (anonymous up through the various levels of authenticated access).  rate of access is the first line of defence, but other patterns (such as sequential access - aaa.com, aab.com, etc) - could help to identify abuse.  godaddy makes you jump through hoops to adequately access their whois for domain transfer purposes. some other registrars don't really follow the ICANN radar IP whitelisting and such. DNS timing, reverse DNS lookup, Find nearby IP's, HTTP header data, etc. Response: found/not found Error: rate limit/bad request/no request those plus: domain names for which that requestor is the registrant, number of spam emails sent to honeypot email address returned to that requestor, # of "false whois" reports requestor sent to ICANN Most frequent requestors. That would show you how/what it may be using the WHOIS data for. data collection and retention should be at the operator's discretion and not a protocol issue number of requests rate of access most frequent requestors Technical performance parameters should be collected: query rate, response latency etc. Audit logs would be useful in determining any potential patterns or claims of abuse. Number of requests/requester, number of requests/domain and most frequent requesters. The core requirement is to stop machine marketing. The rest is just details.  any other UDRP actions against owner for similar sites? - nice, but understand why you cannot.... However, just need access for contact purposes!! Rates of access + impact on future operations (ex: dropping domain names & registration anew) | | |  |
| https://limesurvey.icann.org/tmp/2283aef38e2086cf217868ee2e42aa9e.png | | | |