

## CoM Feedback from PAB meeting 30

At its meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> February, the CoM considered the PAB resolutions and responds as documented below.

### 5. *DRS consultation and review*

**Resolution:** The PAB considered the paper presented by the CoM, and *recommended* that the CoM should put it out for consultation. The PAB further recommended that Nominet's Data Protection Policies should be applied consistently including publication of DRS judgments, and that the issue of defamation in DRS judgments should be considered by the Council of Management.

*Approved unanimously.*

**CoM response:** The document will be put out for consideration. Emily Taylor was asked to bear in mind the PAB's concerns.

### 6. *Review of Registrant Terms and Conditions*

**Resolution:** The PAB considered the paper presented by the CoM, and *recommended* that the CoM should put it out for consultation subject to the following amendments:

1. The PAB *recommends* that the CoM should reconsider its proposals under Section 2.2 of the paper marked "should the registrant cease to exist", and instead the CoM should allow legal successors of registrants who have died or otherwise ceased to exist, within the period of registration, to execute a valid transfer form in respect of a domain name, together with the appropriate fee; further, that Nominet will not otherwise deal with such successors unless and until such a valid transfer form has been executed and the appropriate fee paid;

**CoM response:** Accepted

2. The PAB *recommends*, with respect to Section 2.3 of the paper, that the only criterion to make a name "correct" under the terms in the current document should be that it is both good for contact, and that it is not deceptive; further that the term "correct" should not be used as it is misleading; and

**CoM response:** Accepted in principle. Specific wording to be considered. Added inclusion of "contractual certainty" as an objective.

3. The PAB **recommends** that the CoM should address the issue of revocation of security codes in its consultation, and the possibly incorrect assumption that it is always Nominet that issues the security code;

*Approved unanimously.*

**CoM response: General principle accepted. Some further study needed.**

#### **7. Automaton date restrictions**

**Resolution:** The PAB considered the paper presented by the CoM, and **recommended** that it should be implemented subject to the following amendments:

1. Under Section 3.2, “seven days” should be changed to “three days”; and

**CoM response: Accepted**

2. Under Section 3.1, the new field should become mandatory on an aggressive timescale without further reference to the PAB.

**CoM response: Accepted**

*Approved unanimously.*

#### **8. Matters arising from nom-steer and pab-suggest**

**Resolution:** The PAB **noted** that there should be no restriction on individual PAB members revealing how they voted, and **resolved** that should PAB members wish their individual vote to be recorded in the minutes, they should be able to demand this; however, the PAB **resolved** that it would not as a matter of course minute the manner in which each PAB member voted.

**CoM response: Noted**

*Approved unanimously.*