

WHOIS Technical Survey Requirements – Public Comments Review Tool
20 August 2012

	Comment	Who / Where	WG Response	Recommended Action
Section 1 - Profile				
1.	Should we add a section about the Survey Taker’s expectation of WHOIS use? (for example, Law Enforcement expects to use WHOIS information to find bad actors and defend against online abuse)	Thomas Rickert / Webinar	SM: Isn’t this already covered MY: Agreed	None
2.	Question 1 : \"status\" refers to status with ICANN I assumed. Because I am also a \"business user\" of whois in the sense that I own a business and occasionally will use whois for business-related reasons. There is the option to multiple check which militate against this interpretation somewhat.	Unknown / Survey Tool	DB: Use of status is confusing SM: Best describes your use of whois	Change Q1 to “Which of the following terms best describes your use of WHOIS
3.	The answers to the questions on ccTLDs and gTLDs contain an option without a label. The choice of answers should include \"None\" for both.	Unknown / Survey Tool	SP: Remove question 4 and the logic SP: Logic also applies to Q7; remove logic	Remove Q4 & Logic so that Q5 & Q6 show up without logic Remove Q7 logic, but keep question. Add NA – “Not applicable” to options presented.
4.	WHOIS interface and quality of information needs to be and should be improved for ease of use and accuracy and availability of information	Unknown / Survey Tool	Opinion on WHOIS and out of scope for survey change	None
5.	For the question \"Which of these best describes the most beneficial use of WHOIS to you or your organization?\", besides determining if a domain is available, we primarily use Whois in automated tools used for managing domain names for ourselves and our clients - specifically to determine when domains we are managing for them with various registrars are expected to expire and whether any similar names they have identified for us to watch have gone into a redemption or pending delete status.	Unknown / Survey Tool	SP: Add option - Ability to monitor domain portfolio MY: isn’t this already covered? SP: Not managing domain name portfolio MY: Monitor groups of domains for expiration SM: to manage a domain portfolio for self or others MY: portfolio loaded term “group of domains vs portfolio”	Q10 - Add option – of “Other” Add option – To monitor and manage groups of domains for self or on behalf of others.
6.	I access the WHOIS information both via a web interface and direct server queries, depending on the context. However, the survey allows to only select one.	Unknown / Survey Tool	SM: Q9 “should be option of both”	Q9 - Add option – “Both”

	Comment	Who / Where	WG Response	Recommended Action
7.	Adding an '\other\' box might be a good idea on this question: '\Which of these best describes the most beneficial use of WHOIS to you or your organization?\' For example, Verisign uses Whois to manage Registrar Transfer Disputes. An '\other\' box might be helpful for the last question in this section. (Chuck Gomes)	Chuck Gomes / Survey Tool	SM: Discussed in previous comment	Refer to comment 5 for action
8.	I would like to see a free public service provided for whois lookups. The service should be accessible via various methods such as website, DNS lookup, etc.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Opinion on WHOIS and out of scope for survey change	None
9.	1. region just supplies a list of countries; that is a mismatch. 2. # of domains questions have a blank radio button and one that is No Answer; s/b just one that says \"None\" or \"0\" 3. Think it would be useful for web interfaces to find out whether the person answering the survey uses the whois from 1) registrar 2) registry 3) general commercial source that aggregates all domains 4) Internic.net (ICANN source)[perhaps other choices?]	Unknown / Survey Tool	SM: confusion of region/location SM: About q5 &6 refer to previous SM: More detail on Q9 MY: Not sure this applied to technical aspects of WHOIS, perhaps out of scope DB: Troubling. Would like to go back to person to ask for more detail. MY: Take action on #1 & #2 – worried about this scope creep of how you use whois, who operates, possible policy creep. DB: Agrees. Wonder the person who posted comment, only interested in specific nic, vs direct query. SM: Http to port 43 – users may not know details	Q3 - Remove the word “region” from question #3 Remove blank radio button from Q6 Q10 - Add additional information to question “Website interfaces includes an interface to Registry, Registrar or 3 rd party sources”

	Comment	Who / Where	WG Response	Recommended Action
			<p>MY: add functionality question, do you feel a whois service be capable of hosting multiple TLDs vs a single TLD.</p> <p>DB: Direct query, add an option or 3rd party service. Suggest a direct server interface to Rr or Ry or 3rd Party</p> <p>SM: unpacking a bit more on how to answer</p>	
10.	<p>The operator of a service pointed to by an A record in a zone file is often not the domain owner. When there were 200 domains, needing to contact the admin/tech about an issue was important. Now there are 200 million domains and 20 billion end users, public who is is ONLY used by spammers and scammers to blast out mass emails or target individuals.</p> <p>Its long past time to retire whols to the graveyard as it serves no useful purpose.</p>	Unknown / Survey Tool	Opinion on WHOIS and out of scope for survey change	None
11.	Registration of domains response is for personal domains. There should be a section for number of registrations if a registrar or registry.	Unknown / Survey Tool	<p>MY: Not sure what it means</p> <p>SM: If you're a Ry, how should you answer #6? Or not applicable</p> <p>Add clarification line – the registration of these domains is for your own personal use</p>	<p>Q7 - Add clarification statement:</p> <p>"The scope of domain registrations for this question is for your own use."</p>
12.	How I really found the survey? Twitter post that pointed to icann.org comments deadline.	Unknown / Survey Tool	<p>SP: Interesting to know how much impact of twitter</p> <p>SM: List twitter or other or social media?</p>	<p>Add option</p> <p>"Social Media – (Facebook, Twitter, etc)"</p>
13.	Tracing spam via whois has seldom been useful - US spammers can easily hide behind disposable corporations, so even non-	Unknown / Survey Tool	Opinion on WHOIS and out of scope for survey change	None

	Comment	Who / Where	WG Response	Recommended Action
	bogus contact information is a dead end. Whois is much more useful for identifying ISPs and legitimate users, who have an interest in working contact information. Also, most individuals I know use privacy services, specifically to avoid spam and harassment pointed at their registered whois contacts, while most corporations use some-generic-admin-email@theirdomain.com, which may or may not ever be answered.			
Section 2 - Provision of a publicly accessible and machine parsable list of domain names				
14.	the first option seems to repeat the question	Unknown / Survey Tool	SM: Referring to question 16 SM: Last option is a little garbled	Q16 - Remove the first option – “Do you have a direct need for this list of WHOIS Servers” Change last option – “Yes, we would use this list for the reason stated in the comment box”
15.	First item can be dropped.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Refer to comment 14:	None
16.	The possible answers are non-exhaustive. What’s wrong with the existing referral mechanism? Also, the idea of having some sort of list outside the DNS seems, frankly, insane.	Unknown / Survey Tool	SM: May go to Q17, but perhaps Q16. Think commenter is stating list of answers is not exhaustive.	Q16 - Add another option - “No, we would not use this list for the reason stated in the comment box”
17.	For the purpose of survey review/critique, the first “answer” option should be removed--“Do you have a direct need for this list of Whois servers?” Survey question is broken - has “Do you have a direct need for this list of Whois servers?” as a response. I usually use web-based whois services, but as the registry/registrar community has diversified, they’ve become much less reliable and I often have to hunt down the correct registrar to get information (typically using that registrar’s web interface, when it’s not broken, which it often is.) Having the list directly accessible would make it much easier to get reliable results.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Refer to comments 14 & 16 for action	None
18.	The “TLD.whois-servers.net” subdomain CNAMEs could be used for port 43 lookups while the “WHOIS.nic.TLD” naming	Unknown / Survey Tool	Implementation suggestion, but out of scope/not relevant to survey	None

	Comment	Who / Where	WG Response	Recommended Action
	convention could be used for port 80 web-based lookups.		tool	
19.	The whois templates of each whois server should be the same. It is okay to disclose data, but the template should always be the same. Especially if you are running your own whois server because of thin-registries.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Opinion on WHOIS and out of scope for survey change	None
20.	These questions are for technical users.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Acknowledged DB: It does relate to what we had with webinars or Prague. Flag sections based on skill sets. Organizational issue for survey.	Come back to this one at end of comments. Perhaps flag sections of survey by skill set, as multiple persons within an organization may be required to fill out sections of survey. Jump button to skip a section or, "I've had enough" and abandoned the survey. Deliberately skipped a section because it is too technical. Created separate document outlining sections by skill set. Will be reviewed by WG at 20 Aug session
Section 3 - Definition of a Standard Query Structure				
21.	For \"Select the following benefits of query standardization. Pick one or more\" there probably should be a \"none of the above\" and/or \"other\" box. (Chuck Gomes)	Chuck Gomes / Survey Tool	30 July Q20 – All in agreement	Q20 Add space between benefits and of on the question Add additional option “Other”
22.	These questions are probably suitable for all users.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Refer to comment line 20	None
23.	It seems the Qs 3&4 could be condensed to one which would rank the 4 answers provided Ask last question right after the first one or just use it to replace the first one. (Basically the same question.)	Unknown / Survey Tool	30 july – not sure if we can combine. Wanted to separate out IDN. Q21. Perhaps expand on Q21 and remove Q22? Could be Q21 & Q22 Suggestion to keep it as is. WG	Q21, reword question: Q21 - Of those selected in Q20, please select the single most important of the elements according to you:

	Comment	Who / Where	WG Response	Recommended Action
			Q23 to Q19 – No change.	
24.	Who is is not a directory service and should not be used for \"search\" - what possible valid reason could there be for being able to find all domains and/or registrants with a specific town other than data mining to send them junk, or to know where to do the most damage by dropping a bomb?	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted, but not related to the Survey	None
25.	searchable RDDS is a large burden for a big registry. We only support it as an \"extra credit\" requirement for the new gTLD process. Given a choice we would like to scrap it completely.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as an opinion, but not related to Survey	None
Section 4 - Definition of a standard data structure for WHOIS responses				
26.	Please support JSON, in addition to XML	Unknown / Survey Tool	Q32 – Contains XML. There are other option, pre-defined text, list structures. Create anything you want. Difficult topic on IETF. Should it only be open ended? Suggest a data structure. Q33 after No option, allows users to enter other structure options.	None
27.	These questions are mostly for technical users. The 2nd one could also be asked of general users.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Refer comment 20 for action	None
28.	Its is arguably more important that the data is human readable than machine parse-able. We admire some of the work around making the data available in xml but using an XSLT to format for humans.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related. Referring to Q32 Not worry about specifying readability	None
29.	Localizing based on the IP address of the client is a terrible idea - use a client-provided flag if you\'re going to do it at all. My neighbors speak Spanish and Chinese, and may not like having	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	Q29 – Add more detail to “flag” in question use

	Comment	Who / Where	WG Response	Recommended Action
	their IP identify them as English speakers. My company\'s worldwide, and user queries might come through a firewall in the US, Europe, Japan, or Singapore, and showing up on the Belgian firewall does not mean a response in Flemish is useful.		Browser to WHOIS service works, but not from terminal session. Application sends flag. Not thinking to change question.	Locality settings on a web browser or language of browser itself.
Section 5 - Definition of a set of standardized error messages and standard handling of error conditions				
30.	Please suggest examples of such standardized error messages All those look fine, plus you\'re going to get responses saying to go ask some other server, and it\'s good to structure those so the client can handle them automatically.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Standardized redirects. Not sure if those are error messages. Reference to Q35. We would have to make question more generic. Proposed but not performed: Q35 – modify question: Do you support the use of standardized error messages & standardized operational messages as output from the WHOIS System? Q36 – split in to Q36a & Q36b, Q36b new sub question: “Please suggest examples of such standardized operational messages” Some confusion between range of error message types. Perhaps leave it as it.	None
31.	These questions seem to be for technical users.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Refer back to comment 20 for action.	None
32.	1. I have noticed a whole lot of typos, especially missing spaces between words.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Covered in public comment and will review final version.	None

	Comment	Who / Where	WG Response	Recommended Action
	2. on YES/No question, something that looks like a condition with possible options is confusing.		Confused by comment. Covered in Typos.	
33.	Typo on question \"Please suggest sucherror conditions within the WHOIS System\" .. missnig a space between \"such\" and \"error\".	Unknown / Survey Tool	Acknowledged	Add space in Q38 between such and error
Section 6 - Submitting WHOIS queries for domain names				
34.	wildcard search is nice... even nicer for marketing purpose or intellectual property rogues.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None
35.	These questions are for general users.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Refer back to comment 20 for action.	None
36.	As a representative of a constituency, I would rather answer on behalf of not just myself and my needs. The wording of the questions on this page are specific to me and my personal needs, which I think may be too narrow.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Survey not gauged to identify users. Adjust profile. Not needed. Personalization should be removed from questions.	Remove personalization from questions 42 – 45 Q42 Is there a need to include/exclude Q43 Is there a need to search by wildcard Q44 is There a need to search in native language.
37.	Look up of anything other than domain should be explicitly banned	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None
38.	There\'s no excuse for not handling Unicode - it\'s not the 20th century any more. Unfortunately, searching in Punycode is also necessary.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None
Section 7 - Adoption of a structured data model for WHOIS data				
39.	So much technical beating around the bush that is ultimately dependant on your preference rfegarding the details of either a thick whois or a thin whois.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None
40.	It there was any way to decide a common policy across gTLDs and ccTLDs on mandatory fields, then yes I would support that.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None
41.	Items 1, 4, 5 & 6 are for technical users, Item 1 may also be for general users if \'extensible\' is defined. Items 2, 3, 7, 8, & 9 are probably good for all.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Refer back to comment 20 for action.	Check to see if Extensible is defined on live survey.

	Comment	Who / Where	WG Response	Recommended Action
			Extensible should be defined. Tech - Q46, 49, 50, 51 General - Q47, 48, 52, 53, 54	
42.	I don't understand a number of these questions, so I didn't answer them.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None
43.	Forcing mandatory fields WILL lead to registrars entering false information.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related. Q53, 54 address that	None
44.	If you make fields mandatory, people will just use fake data. Privacy protection for whois data is important, and it'll be done inconsistently by third party workarounds if you don't support it natively.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None
Section 8 - Extending the currently defined set of registration data elements				
45.	WHOwas information should be restricted to a limited population, with legitimate needs, like LEAs. This would require a policy and a technical mechanism for identifying who makes a query.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related. Policy related. Whowas, authentication and tiered access are covered in survey	None
46.	These items are for general users.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Refer back to comment 20 for action.	None
47.	Typo at "It should be possible to collect contact information using a local address format for WHOIS" ... "format for" needs a space	Unknown / Survey Tool	Acknowledge	Q57 – Typo, space required foreseeable whois Q59 – Typo, space required
48.	Social media contacts are ONLY of use to spammers. Previous history needs to be kept but there are privacy issues that need to be addressed.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	Consider this
49.	Historical info may be available on a subscription (cost) model only	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None
Section 9 - Internationalized Registration Data Requirements				
50.	These items are probably okay for all users if the following	Unknown /	Acknowledged	Check to see if U-Label, A-Label,

	Comment	Who / Where	WG Response	Recommended Action
	terms are defined: U-Label, A-Label, US ASCII.	Survey Tool		US ASCII are defined on live survey.
Section 10 - Defining an authentication framework for WHOIS				
51.	Should this elevated access right to be granted to automatic computer systems, or people carrying out a task?	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related. Policy related and not technical requirement.	None
52.	Needs a \"None\" option to stay consistent with the \"no\" option of top question in R-8.1	Unknown / Survey Tool	Q74 should include none option	Q74, add a \"None\" option
53.	The \"elevated access\" question should allow more than one answer	Unknown / Survey Tool	Q72 or Q74 72 to allow multiple	Change Q72 to more than one selection possible. \" Change text to \"Please select all that apply\"
54.	Several groups could be granted elevated access. So, it is not either LEA or judiciary or registrar. This can be all of them, as long as there is a clearance process to evaluate them.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Acknowledged. Refer to row 53 for adjustment	None
55.	Note that the 5th choice of the first question is missing something at the beginning. (Chuck Gomes)	Chuck Gomes / Survey Tool	Agreed.	Add \"Yes\" to 5 th option of Q72
56.	These except for the last one are probably best for general users although VPN may need to be defined for them. The last one is probably best asked of technical users.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Refer back to comment 20 for action.	Confirm if VPN is defined in live survey.
57.	Some of these questions seemed to not allow for the maximal case of constraint.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Confusion on comment; Cant clarify since no ID	None
58.	These questions are all poorly formed. They don't distinguish policy, operation, and protocol questions adequately.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related. We categorized best way possible	None
59.	Typos at \"Describe your preferred approach for being authenticated/verifiedwhile engaging yourelevated access rights, if you have one\" - add spaces between words \"verifiedwhile\" and \"yourelevated\"	Unknown / Survey Tool		
60.	If you ate intendin g on keeping this antiquated junk, then registrars and registries need access to the data and everyone else should get blocked	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None
Section 11 - Implementing an authorization framework				
61.	Where do you see granulated access to RDDS on a 1 to 5 scale	Unknown /	Scales are defined in the questions.	None

	Comment	Who / Where	WG Response	Recommended Action
	<p>of importance?</p> <p>This question needs refinement such as \"where 1 means granulated access is not *desirable* (*important* is too ambiguous, i.e. it could be 'important' to *not* have granulated access implemented or to *have* it, in which case, an answer such as \"granulated access is important at a level of 5\" is very misleading).</p>	Survey Tool		
62.	These are probably ok for all users.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Refer back to comment 20 for action.	None
63.	What is granulated access? It should be defined. (Chuck Gomes)	Chuck Gomes / Survey Tool	Think we added a definition. Confirmed Granulated Access is not defined	Implement Definition
64.	My expectation is that the WEIRDS WG can come up with clear and mandatory implementation guidelines for the authentication framework, that goes beyond simply recommending the use of HTTP authentication.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None
65.	I should not empathize enough that granular access to data is, together with IDN support, the one reason why WHOIS needs a fundamental rethinking and re-engineering. Hence, this is not optional.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None
66.	Being able to protect privacy is key.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None
67.	This question needs refinement such as \"where 1 means granulated access is not *desirable* (*important* is too ambiguous, i.e. it could be 'important' to *not* have granulated access implemented or to *have* it, in which case, an answer such as \"granulated access is important at a level of 5\" is very misleading).	Unknown / Survey Tool	Important to have it or not to have it. Define which direction to go.	Migrate throughout survey, “1 being most important , 5 being least important” appended to each question and not after the available options.
68.	If there's any sort of special access to data available, governments around the world are going to want it for censorship or worse purposes, under the name of \"lawful access\".	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None

Section 12 - Defining a framework and baseline set of metrics

	Comment	Who / Where	WG Response	Recommended Action
69.	<p>Does the collection or use of any of these elements raise privacy or confidentiality concerns? If so, please comment:</p> <p>The \"other\" category could include, for example\", information related to payment, which would be useful for LEAs.</p>	Unknown / Survey Tool	Referring to Q84	<p>Double check on Option selection of Yes and expanded comment section.</p> <p>Modify Q84 to state If YES, please comment.</p>
70.	<p>To whom should access to audit data be available?</p> <p>The question is unclear. do you mean who should be auditing? It should allow more than one answer. As a registrar I would want to audit my data, but I assume ICANN might want to audit it as well. LEA might want access subject to a court order</p>	Unknown / Survey Tool	<p>Q86 Change select only one should be changed. Auditing is more policy related. Who are the stakeholders who would audit data.</p> <p>Discussion about who should be auditing the data.</p> <p>WG were going to modify question But realized it was policy related.</p>	<p>Q86 DELETE</p> <p>Q87 – add space to what additional in question.</p>
71.	<p>To whom should access to audit data be available?</p> <p>This radio button list is a mistake. The answer depends on the data.</p>	Unknown / Survey Tool	Refer to Row 70 for action	None
72.	<p>To whom should access to audit data be available?</p> <p>This should be a multiple-answer question. Technical information about the query such as client/web/3rd-party-web/etc. is useful for whois server implementation and capacity planning. But governments should have no access to the queries beyond what the public has, and the registrant should have access to any data that anybody else collects about their domain (and even that has risks.)</p>	Unknown / Survey Tool	<p>WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.</p> <p>Refer to Row 70 for action</p>	None
Section 13 - All new TLDs should operate a thick WHOIS				
73.	<p>Such a small section. Doesn't include much about thin whois option. Not any discussion about what is thick. If there are privacy concerns, etc, etc, etc. Really somewhat disappointing.</p>	Unknown / Survey Tool	<p>WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.</p> <p>Thick WHOIS been around for a long time. Title is loaded</p>	Change title of Section – “New TLDs operating a Thick WHOIS”

	Comment	Who / Where	WG Response	Recommended Action
74.	\ "What is a reasonable timeframe for a legacy registry to move from thin to thick RDDS?\ " \ "never\ " should be an option, of course, otherwise, this just feels disingenuous, an attempt to ignore that this is the main point of contention, on which the whole previous technical beating around the bush is really depending. Sad and frustrating. Delegitimizing. And many things again.	Unknown / Survey Tool	No problem adding a never option	Add "Never" as list of options.
75.	I think the first question has a typo - I don't see why registrars would be involved in this so maybe it should be about registries?	Unknown / Survey Tool	Q89 Rr have to upload whois data to Rys if they are to convert. Change registrars/registries	Q89 change "registrars" to "Registrars/Registries"
Section 14 - WHOWAS				
76.	None			None
Section 15 - Registrars and registries				
77.	Column 3 Title header contains broken text.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Agreed	Remove broken text from Q107 in column 3 text.
78.	Whatever method it should be additional data and not disrupt current data points	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None
79.	The survey will take a long time to complete and users should be warned of that. Some questions need to be answered by technical experts, some by policy people and some by legal experts but it may be unlikely that all questions can be accurately answered by any one individual. There are several ways to deal with this: 1) Every item could have an '\N/A\' or '\Not my area of expertise\' option; 2) the survey could be divided into sections to be completed by different people; organizations could be encouraged to respond to the survey using a team of people having the full expertise needed. Respondents should be asked to state whether they are responding in their individual capacity or representing their organization and the survey should be modified to accommodate that.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG had discussion. Modify each section on skill of expertise. Legal, policy, technical. Survey tool does have ability to login and logout. Wilson	None
80.	Last comments here. Submit button below. You also have the	Unknown /	Seek clarification, review PDF	None

	Comment	Who / Where	WG Response	Recommended Action
	power to	Survey Tool		
81.	The above are probably okay for all users.	Unknown / Survey Tool	Refer back to comment 20 for action.	None
82.	Registrar and Registry contact details are already public, there is no need or useful purpose to add any of this to who is outout	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None
83.	Abuse contacts are unfortunately mostly black holes, but they\'re still useful on occasion. They\'re obviously the wrong address to use for technical problems (that\'s what the technical contact is for), and intellectual property or ownership complaints should be directed to the administrative contact.	Unknown / Survey Tool	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None
General				
84.	Should questions about Privacy & Proxy services be included in the survey?	Pascal Bekono / Webinar	Not within Scope.	None
85.	Should questions about WHOIS Accuracy be included in the survey?	Thomas Rickert / Webinar	WG Noted as opinion, but not survey related.	None
86.	Make it clear to users that if they do not understand a question to select the “no answer” option – or – Create an OPT Out option for the questions	Chuck Gomes / Webinar	Not sure “no” is an issue. Do we want to have an opt out button in corner of question. Point for whether they are right skill. Not my area of expertise. Not sure of option to include here. Improve instruction at beginning of survey.	Update instructions at beginning of survey that users are not allowed to answer all questions if they do not have skill.
87.	Divide survey up based on survey take type	Chuck Gomes / Webinar	Noted, but WG will adjust section based on skill set.	None
88.	Will the survey be made available in other languages?	Yaovi / Webinar	We don’t have a budget, Not advised based on previous WHOIS surveys.	None
89.	The survey is long. I fear we lose the attention of the	Steve Sheng	Encourage people in instruction to	Update instructions that an

	Comment	Who / Where	WG Response	Recommended Action
	respondents. You may consider shorten it, and/or also incentives for people completing the survey. For example, you may consider asking each stakeholder group to submit one response, instead of responses from individual members. This way, you get to hear a representative voice of that stakeholder group, a stakeholder group also have the incentive to ask the questions diligently. This will make your analysis much easier.		represent a group. Question 1 of survey	individual or representative can complete survey.
90.	Some of the questions goes into implementation details, e.g. Schema language, authentication methods, IMHO, the survey should about setting requirements, (I.e. Whether X feature is desirable), instead of implementation details (whether X way to implement Y feature is desirable?)	Steve Sheng	Questions were guided by staff report and these elements were discussed there.	None