

Proposed DRS default transfer process

We are proposing that in undefended DRS cases, the complainant should have the right to a transfer of the domain name registration on payment of a fee of £200 (plus VAT).
Please read our consultation paper for full details of this proposed default transfer process and then answer the questions below.

This document contains respondents between 108 and 108 inclusive.

1. What do you think about our proposal for a default transfer process?

- I agree with the proposal
- I don't mind one way or the other
- I disagree with the proposal

2. Please give your reasons for why you feel this way about the proposal

After the prior community response, I'm disappointed that this was not withdrawn, given a fundamental rethink, and subsequent better presentation.

The problem the proposal is intended to solve is what we do with the fraction of uncontested cases where, it is presumed the merit is with complainant. The fraction in question has been somewhat muddied by the proposal's presentation - and third party analysis has called into question the statistics and magnitude of this issue.

However - a more fundamental flaw than the erroneous statistical presentation in the proposal is the implicit assumption that a respondent 'no-show' in argument terms equates to merit being with the complainant.

This assumption is within the design requirements of the process - and has consequently been built into the process. It assumes in the case of a non-response that the non-responder is in the wrong. There will be a significant proportion where this is not the case. This process is consequently open to abuse, by multiple predators keen to acquire domains, against the rights of current holders, for their own gain.

Due to, now two, presentations on the default proposal yielding widespread negative comment, the proposal appears a 'wounded beast' in the eyes of the community, and beyond in the media. Adoption of it will adversely affect confidence in the Registry.

There is no shame in withdrawing the proposal for now - considering the true magnitude of the non-responder problem, and considering less damaging measures to address - if deemed necessary in light of the former work. A non-misleading presentation of the true magnitude of the problem is fundamental to this process, as is a clear presentation of the functional safeguards necessary (a flowchart is sorely missed as is criteria as to when an expert might be expected to intervene). This presentation must have the confidence of the community, and build a consensus, currently lacking, that the merit of a default mechanism outweighs its potential abuses.

Personally, given the potential abuses of this schema, I would like to see a much greater element of Expert involvement, and assessment of each case. This will lead to a greater cost for the default mechanism, but this is necessary to protect rights within the .co.uk namespace, and confidence in the Registry in discharging its responsibilities to name-holders.

3. Please give us your contact details

Name

Dr Nick Flowers

Company Name

Netwise Networks Ltd

Email address