

Draft Policy Advisory Body Report

This report will be tabled for approval at Meeting 59

**Fifty-eighth meeting of the Policy Advisory Body
Victoria Park Plaza, 239 Vauxhall Bridge Road, London
10 September 2008
Meeting 58**

Those present:

Andrew Bennett	Elected Member
Simon Bezzant	Elected Member
Gordon Dick	Nominet Board
Earl of Erroll	Appointed Member – apComms Group (part)
David Evans	Appointed Member – Information Commissioner’s Office (part)
Clive Feather	Elected Member
Mark Healey	Elected Member
Nora Nanayakkara	Elected Member
Eric Ramage (Chair)	Appointed Member – ITMA
Jarrod Robinson	Elected Member
Geoff Smith	Appointed Member – BERR (part)
Rob Taylor	Elected Member
Michael Toth	Elected Member

From Nominet by invitation of the PAB:

Martin Boyle, Senior Policy Advisor
Gill Crowther, Director of HR
Laura Hutchison, Policy Executive

PAB September Meeting – Report

1. Welcome and apologies

Apologies were received from Ulrika Diallo and William Brocklehurst

2. Declaration of Interests

The Chair reminded PAB members of the importance of completing their declaration of Interest form.

Item 7e) Michael Toth and Mark Healey declared an interest in the two-letter domains item.

3. Approval of the July meeting report

Simon Bezzant objected to the approval of the July meeting report but declined to identify the basis of his objection. He agreed to discuss the matter privately with the Chair outside of the room. On returning to the room the Chair proposed that the meeting report should be approved as it stood. No PAB member raised any objections and the report was therefore approved.

4. Matters arising

There was a verbal update on the WHOIS for Tags and insurance cover, as the only items not covered elsewhere on the agenda.

Simon Bezant asked if the insurance policy included health and safety cover against accidental injury to PAB members. Another PAB member commented that it was individual PAB members to assess their own risk and arrange their own cover if they felt it was appropriate.

5. Board response to PAB resolutions

Response number 2 had asked that a statement concerning the Byron report be posted as a policy statement on the Nominet website. The Chair confirmed that the request was addressed to the executive, not to the PAB.

6. Nominet Strategy (Executive paper)

The Chair asked the PAB to note the content of this paper and to keep it in mind during future policy discussions.

7. Policy Issues

a. Phishing: preparation for a Phishing workshop (Executive paper)

The Chair outlined the workshop proposal and highlighted that the proposed date is 12 November, which is the date of the next PAB meeting. The PAB meeting will take place at APACS with the workshop following in the afternoon.

The workshop is intended to be the first step in a continuing dialogue on this issue.

b. Industry Standards: scoping discussion (Executive paper)

The paper was introduced and the link to trust in the Internet and expectations for effective industry self-regulation was highlighted.

Geoff Smith emphasised the interest and expectation of stakeholders on the way the Internet industry regulates and conducts itself. This is a legitimate expectation and he fully supported this paper.

Following a query from a PAB member, it was confirmed that the Good Practice Terms of the registrar agreement are enforced and registrars have been suspended for non-compliance. It was requested that any details of specific case of registrars not complying with the Good Practice Terms should be passed to the Executive so they can be investigated.

The Chair asked the group for examples of problems between registrants and the domain names system. It was suggested that registrars should be required to provide a complaints procedure. There was some discussion around the possibility of providing an independent dispute resolution service like the ISPA service.

At the request of the Chair, Gordon will produce a paper with input from Simon, Geoff and Jarrod.

c. Lock States (Report from the sub-group)

As Chair of the sub-committee group Jarrod introduced the paper. The PAB agreed the following recommendations.

- Nominet should have a registry lock to be used in line with the domain name terms and conditions as necessary. A registrar should be notified when this is used on a domain name on their tag.
- There should be the function within Registrants Online to allow a registrant to set a lock to prevent the automatic transfer or cancellation (surrender) of their domain name(s) regardless of whether a registrar is subscribed to the lock-state service.
- A registrar should be able choose to allow their registrants access to an extended lock state service via Registrants Online. This should be done in a manner that enhances the registrar channel, for example via a co-branded system (unique to each tag) that allows a registrant to set various locks on their domain name(s) including the function to lock a domain to a particular tag. This service would include the following features:
 - The default of this service would be for all registrars to be opted in and then they can choose to opt out if they wish.
 - When a domain name is moved from an opted-in tag to an opted-out tag through Registrants Online, then the registrant will get a warning that the new registrar doesn't allow them to set lock states. If the registrant chooses to complete the tag change then all lock state settings will default to being unlocked.
 - When transferring between two opted-in tags then all details currently locked on a domain name will remain locked.
- A registrar should be able to view the locks that are in place on a domain name on their tag and should be notified of any changes.
- A registrar should have the ability to turn on a registrant lock on behalf of their customer but not to turn it off again.
- The tags subscribed to the lock-state service should be regarded as public data and the information made available to all.

There was some discussion about the possibility of providing a "renewal" lock so that a registrant could safeguard against their domain name being lost if their registrar didn't renew it. This will be discussed by the sub-committee in more detail with a view to making a further recommendation to the Board.

d. Registrar Parking Pages: good practice (discussion paper: Nora Nanayakkara)

Nora explained that the paper discusses best practice guidelines associated with registrar parking pages. There was a lot of discussion about this paper during which the following points were made:

- The group agreed that it wasn't practical or appropriate for Nominet to ban or discourage parking pages. It was felt that Nominet should encourage best practice rather than actually setting guidelines.
- There was a consensus that it was important that registrants were made aware prior to purchase if their domain name was going to be used for a parking page.

The PAB recommended that Nominet should make registrars aware that they should be following the existing registrar good Practice terms and specifically draw their attention to the risks that a registrant could face if their domain name is associated with a parking page.

It was also suggested that it would be worthwhile including this as a topic for discussion at a future registrar conference.

e. Two-letter domains (Executive scoping paper)

There was some discussion over confidentially issues over a briefing note that had been circulated regarding a complaint about the existing policy on two-letter domains, as it had not been circulated in accordance with the PAB code of conduct. Clive, Michael, Rob and Mark asked for it to be noted that they did not agree to the confidentiality request.

The Chair will convene a sub-committee to discuss this issue. Andrew, Simon Gordon, Clive, Mark, Nora, Rob and Michael all confirmed that they would like to be involved. As the meeting was running over, the appointed members were not present for this discussion and may be interested in attending the sub-committee.

8. PAB internals

a) PAB methods of work (Chair paper)

This item was deferred to the November meeting due to lack of time.

b) Ideas for PAB team building (Executive presentation)

The PAB welcomed Gil Crowther to the meeting. Gill outlined proposals for a PAB team building day. The PAB discussed the idea and the following suggestions were made:

- The venue is important
- An activity (such as a tour of Parliament) would be a good way to break up the day
- All who are willing to attend should be included

The PAB secretariat will follow up by email to draw up a list of participants.

c) Nom steer forum: discussion on moderation and etiquette

Gordon introduced the paper and asked the group if the forum requirements outlined were acceptable. There was some discussion and the PAB broadly agreed that the aim of the nom-steer forum is to provide a method that members can use to communicate effectively with Nominet and the PAB.

Following a query from a PAB member, it was confirmed that the forum would have email functionality.

The group went on to discuss the outlined ideal vision of forum users. However, there was some discussion around this question and the group were not able to come to an agreement on these points as some members felt they were too idealistic.

It was suggested that this topic would be a good subject to re-visit after the PAB team-building event has taken place.

As the PAB were not able to reach agreement at the meeting Gordon will reflect on the best way to take the paper forward.

9. Matters arising from nom-steer and pab-suggest

There were no matters arising from nom-steer or pab-suggest.

10. AOB

Board representation: The suggestion of inviting an additional Board member to the meeting was raised. It was highlighted that at the previous meeting the PAB had agreed:

“The PAB agreed that the involvement of members of the Executive (Directors or senior managers) could be useful for the discussion of particular issues and invited the Chair to consider when this was appropriate for the discussion of specific agenda items.”

It was pointed out that the Board had been very clear that it was happy with its decision to only send one representative to the PAB and it was therefore not appropriate for the PAB to invite an additional Board representative.

DRS experts' contract: Simon Bezant asked why the DRS experts' contract wasn't published on the website. Martin agreed to look into this and report back at the next meeting.

11. Date of next meeting - 12 November

The next meeting will take place on 12 November at APACS and the workshop on Phishing will take place there that afternoon.