

Lock States

1. Introduction

The PAB discussed an Executive paper on Lock States (Annex 1) in July 2007. The discussion at that meeting is recorded as:

“The PAB received the paper. Lock State is the ability to lock a record so that only one party can change it (either the registrar or registrant). It was noted that there was no locking at present. One member noted that current gTLD lock states offer registrant safety - but there was no ability for this within the UK namespace.

The PAB felt further discussion was merited which took account of the two different types of lock - locks that mirror functionality already available in other TLDs and other types of lock that would be appropriate for .uk. Some members felt there was a need for a sub-committee to evaluate the wider considerations. Eleanor Bradley offered a more detailed discussion paper and to create a 'best-fit' solution together with draft policy statements for the PAB's consideration in September.

Jarrold Robinson agreed to email his points to Eleanor to further the debate.”

The Executive has prepared an overview of Lock States used by gTLDs (Annex 2). However, it has not prepared a more detailed discussion paper as it needs guidance from the PAB to identify whether there are specific policy concerns that would suggest that registrars and/or registrants should be able to set lock states to prevent others making changes to a registration.

The earlier discussion agreed to establish a sub-committee on Lock States. There has been no further action.

2. Discussion

The PAB is invited to:

a) Consider whether there are particular circumstances when having a Lock State would be desirable. In particular:

- i) Are there specific cases where a registrar should be able to prevent a registrant from making changes?
- ii) Are there specific cases where a registrant should be able to prevent a registrar from making changes?
- iii) In either case, are specific safeguards needed to protect from abuse?

b) Decide whether it wishes to establish a sub-committee to evaluate policy concerns. As a first step, a new sub-committee could use the July 2007 paper to identify the issues that it wished to look at in more detail and to commission additional studies of current operational practice.