

me.uk Rules – A PAB Consultation - Responses

Author: Peter Gradwell
Version: 0.01
Date: Monday, 17th February 2003

A. Purpose of this document

This document summarizes the responses to the me.uk consultation. Whilst the me.uk consultation had not finished when this document was prepared, we are able to give an indication of the type & level response for the April PAB meeting.

At the time of writing, only eight responses have been received. This is disappointing, particularly as over one thousand emails were written on the issue of me.uk when it has previously been discussed on the nom-steer mailing list.

B. Summary

In summary, respondents seem agreed that the domain name should be chartered for the use of private individuals, but that all variants of names should be permitted. They feel that enforcement should be performed at the dispute stage and that a rules dispute procedure would be of benefit.

D. Consultation and relevant stakeholders

Q D.1 Do respondents agree that the identification of stakeholder groups is accurate and complete?

Q D.2 Do respondents agree that the subcommittee's intended consultation process is sufficient, or should the PAB recommend a different process?

In the majority, respondents felt that the identified stake holders was ok and that the intended consultation process was sufficient, however one respondent suggested that

“The "natural persons" group is often not well represented and in this case (an SLD for "natural persons") they are significantly affected. I acknowledge the PAB's difficulties in this respect and would merely suggest that it avoids making statistical inferences on these submissions as they will be disproportionately industry based.”

E. Charter – Use of “Private Individuals”

Q E.1 Do respondents agree that the me.uk name space should be chartered for “the use of private individuals”?

Most respondents felt strongly that me.uk name space should be chartered for “the use of private individuals” although one respondent suggested that it should be left “open”, as per the current state.

F. Definition of “for the use of private individuals”

Q F.1 Do respondents believe that the definition should concentrate on the nature of the registrant, the nature of the use, or both? How should such a definition be framed?

Respondents felt that this was a tricky, but important question. The majority feeling was that a combination of both was preferred, but that it would be nearly impossible to define rules for “nature of use”.

It was suggested that, in terms of “test of registrations” it was sufficient to determine the nature of the registrant, however, given that it is felt that the domain should only be for the “use of private individuals” the nature of use should be considered during any dispute phase.

G. Registrations on behalf of “private individuals”

Q G.1 Do respondents believe that “on behalf of” or “with the permission of” registrations be allowed?

Respondents felt that registrations on behalf of private individuals presented too big a loophole in that they allowed companies to make arbitrary registrations. In the case of celebrities with management companies it was felt that the registrant should still be the celebrity, but perhaps at their agent’s address.

H. Protection of use by “private individuals”

Q H.1 What mechanism (if any) should Nominet UK use to enforce use of the me.uk SLD by private individuals?

Firstly, respondents felt that the proposed “rules dispute procedure” would be a key enforcement mechanism. One respondent noted that whilst cost was perceived as an issue for DRS in me.uk, it was not perceived as an issue for co.uk (where individuals may also file disputes).

One respondent suggested that there should be basic automated rules on application to detect, for instance, closeness to registrant name, and 'illegal' things in the registrant name (eg if 'Fredblogs.me.uk' is registered by 'International Business Machines Ltd', then it shouldn't be hard for a script to flag that 'Ltd' is unlikely to be someone's surname and the rest of the registrant name is totally unlike the domain name). Domains that fail the automatic tests could then be vetted manually.

I. Matching of domain name with registrants name.

Q I.1 To what extent should a correspondence between the registrant’s name and the registered name be enforced or advantage the registrant to a greater extent than provided for under the ‘normal’ (non-me.uk) DRS?

Q I.2 If correspondence is important, how should it be defined? How close a correspondence should Nominet look for? Should nicknames etc. be permitted?

Respondents felt that in principle domain names should be relatively correspondent with the registrant’s name, but that this should be managed at dispute time, rather than application time.

Respondents also felt that nicknames and “non name words” (e.g. puzzled.me.uk) should be permitted, as the use of aliases and pseudonyms is very popular on the Internet.

Respondents noted that there might be problems with using “closeness” as a measure. For example if you have a 'sambrown.me.uk', someone whose birth certificate says their name is 'Sam Brown' should have any more right than someone whose birth certificate says 'Samuel (or Samantha) Brown'. In this case the First Come First Served principle would apply. Equally, it was felt that that 'Samuel Brown' should have more right than 'Joe Bloggs' to the 'sambrown.me.uk' domain.

J. Transitional provisions.

Q J.1 What should happen to “legacy names”, i.e. those that are made either in breach of the new rules, or more likely to be successfully challenged should the changes apply immediately?

a) *On notice, the changes should apply;*

- b) *On renewal, the changes should apply; or*
- c) *Such names should become “golden names” and the old rules (and DRS procedure) would apply indefinitely.*

The majority of respondents felt that changes should apply at the point of renewal, however two respondents suggested that existing names should be allowed to remain.