



POLICY ADVISORY BODY REPORT

Westbury Mayfair Hotel

09 May 2007

MEETING 50

Those present:

Ulrika Almen	Appointed Member – Federation of Small Businesses
Andrew Bennett	Elected Member
William Brocklehurst	Appointed Member - CBI
James Conaghan	Elected Member
Gordon Dick	Nominet Board
David Evans	Appointed Member - Information Commissioners Office
Clive Feather	Elected Member
Subhi Hashwa	Elected Member
Mark Healey	Elected Member
Alex Kells	Elected Member
Eric Ramage	Appointed Member – ITMA (Chair)
Jarrold Robinson	Elected Member
Michael Toth	Elected Member

From Nominet by invitation of the PAB:

Marianne Robottom, Policy Executive

Industry expert by invitation of the PAB:

Simon Swords, IT Committee, Federation of Small Businesses

1. **Welcome and Apologies**

Eric Ramage welcomed Simon Swords of the Federation of Small Businesses (who joined for item 5 only), William Brocklehurst who attended for the CBI and the four new elected members of the PAB, Andrew Bennett, Mark Healey, Jarrod Robinson, Michael Toth.

An apology was received from Emily Taylor, Executive.

2. **Approval of the March PAB Meeting Report**

The March meeting report was approved.

3. **Matters arising**

The PAB received the paper.

A PAB member pointed out that the first item on the Agenda for this meeting should be the election of the Chair, and selection of organisations from which to draw appointed members should also be addressed at this meeting. The Chair apologised for this apparent oversight, and asked if any member wished to stand for election as Chair, and since no one did, the meeting agreed that the current Chair should continue to serve. The issue of selection of organisations from which to draw appointed members would be dealt with under Any Other Business.

4. **Board response to PAB resolutions Meeting 49**

The PAB received the paper and noted the Board's response to the resolutions.

5. **Phishing (Presentation by Simon Swords, FSB)**

Eric Ramage introduced Simon Swords who presented data from a survey recently carried out by the FSB among their membership. 5,428 responses were received. 12% of those who had responded reported that they had been caught by a phishing scam. 55% of those who had been caught had reported the scam, 44% had not. Of those who had not, 56% stated the reason they did not report it was lack of knowledge about who to report it to. Simon added that some of those who had been caught feared getting caught again, due to the sophisticated methods of the scammers.

From the responses, Simon extrapolated that there was a need for a centralised and consistent reporting point for all scams. Simon suggested to the PAB that Nominet may be able to act as a point of co-ordination, ensuring that any reports of scams were directed to the right people for appropriate and timely remedial action.

Simon is happy to make his presentation available to PAB members, upon request. Please contact the PAB secretariat for a copy.

The following points emerged in the discussions:

- When you have a phishing email originating in Russia, involving primarily a .com or other registry, by a criminal gang based overseas, is Nominet the right body to act?
- Members noted the existence of other more suitable bodies who could take action, such as the Computer Crime Unit or the Internet Crime Forum.
- Though it is not in Nominet's remit, there is an element of corporate social responsibility with this issue and Nominet should develop a policy.
- It is clear people are looking for co-ordination and co-operation to fight the problem.
- Nominet should not be involved in take-down actions but could act as a point of co-ordination across its extended member network or offer a reporting hotline.
- Nominet could encourage ISPs to take action/responsibility but there would be cost implications for ISPs to do this.
- It may be appropriate for Nominet to find out what help ISPs would like.
- Large ISPs have contact with the Computer Crime Unit but small businesses and other stakeholders do not and often do not know where to go.
- Smaller businesses would benefit from an education programme. However, as one PAB member noted, there is plenty of educational material out there already but the problem was how to get people to read it.

The Chairman summarised the debate by stating that it appeared Nominet should have a policy on Phishing for the .uk namespace and invited the Executive to formulate policy proposals for the PAB to consider.

6. **DRS**

The PAB received the paper and looks forward to the report on the consultation responses and initial proposals by the end of May.

7. **IGF update**

Marianne Robottom gave up an update on Emily Taylor's continuing activities with the Internet Governance Forum Advisory Group and announced the details of the Nominet Best Practice Challenge. Full details will be published on the Nominet web site after the parliamentary launch in June.

8. Domaining, dropcatching and the secondary market

The PAB considered the questions posed at the end of the Executive paper. A PAB member asked what level of name ownership was classed as Domaining: 100 names, 1,000 names, 10,000? Another member questioned whether Nominet should be regulating or even forming policy on how domain names are used, effectively making decisions on the business models of its members.

Discussion focused on the need to understand what the precise issues or problems were. 30 million hits on the DAC – is that really a problem if people are paying for it? If it is a problem, lower the limit or charge more. If someone is abusing the system, fix the abuse.

One member felt that this was an operational issue and should be passed to the Director of IT to sort out.

Some members believed that domaining and dropcatching could be covered by existing policy in other areas: DAC, DRS and wait list (for dropcatching).

The FSB and the CBI will look into the possibilities of surveying their memberships on the issue.

The PAB had also received an offer by Sedo to provide a presentation.

The Chairman stated that he did not want to shut down the discussion but felt it would benefit from more structure and more detail. He requested that Nominet provide stats on the problem, including the percentage of domain names picked up immediately when dropped. He invited James Conaghan to supply a paper and invited comments from all PAB members detailing what they believed the problems to be.

9. PAB schedule

The PAB resolved to trial afternoon meetings for the next two meetings: 11 July and 12 September. It was agreed meetings would run from 2 – 5 pm with lunch available beforehand. The PAB asked Nominet to research less expensive venues for future PAB meetings with venues at or near Kings Cross station a first choice, and Victoria Station a second.

10. PAB election

The Chairman repeated his welcome to the four new members to the PAB.

11. Matters arising

The PAB asked Nominet to check whether the new members had been added to pab-suggest.

12. Any Other Business

The selection of 'appointed member' organisations was discussed. Members felt the PAB would benefit from having a representative from a consumer organisation. The Chairman said that a number of organisations had been approached in the past but agreed that Nominet should be asked to put together a list of potential names for further consideration.

13. Date of next meeting

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday 11 July at 2pm at a venue to be confirmed.

Clive Feather gave his apologies in advance for his absence.