

STATUS REPORT on PAB & CoM ISSUES & ACTIONS

Aug03/1

The PAB recommended that when a successful DRS challenge is made against a registration, the expert should have the option that the domain name should be put in a state where it is registered neither to the complainant nor to the original registrant, and its use be blocked until expiry of the original registration, as if the domain name had been suspended, or for such longer period as the expert shall specify.

25 September 2003 Board meeting:

The board was concerned that the ... recommendation would effectively be creating a new type of registration. Issues arise about who should pay for such a 'blocked' registration and how abuse might be avoided. ... The board discussed some alternatives and concluded that the issue should be included in the planned review of the DRS as a whole.

Status: Issue discussed at experts' meeting in October 2003 and as the proposal strictly related to the .me.uk SLD, it was in the papers for the .me.uk Review Consultation, which ran concurrently with the DRS review. The consultation closed on 19th July and a paper will be presented to the October board meeting.

Oct03/1

Automaton Template Changes

The PAB resolved to accept the interface changes described in Section 3.1 of the paper (headed 'Tidying contact details').

Executive team requested to implement.

Status: Not yet implemented, as this is an interim step needed before we implement EPP that has not yet been put into production.

Feb04/1

DRS consultation and review

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.

Status: The DRS review was put out for consultation. and the PAB's concerns were noted. Final outcome is in a paper to the October PAB.

Feb04/2

Review of Registrant Terms and Conditions

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;*
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*
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;*

Status: Consultation completed. . Final outcome is in a paper to October PAB.

Apr04/4

The PAB resolved to recommend to the Council of Management that it investigate anti-abuse mechanisms (including but not limited to implementation of only a subset of DNSSEC) to minimise the impact of enumeration of zonefiles using DNSSEC should the current proposals for the DNSSEC protocol remain unchanged.

Status: Proposals have been made to the IETF Working group and others. Discussions continue.

Apr04/5

The PAB resolved to ask the Council of Management to provide a status report on its Governance Review.

Status: It is summarized in a paper for the October PAB.

Apr04/6

The PAB, noting that it did not believe there are currently general problems in the enforcement of the tag-holder agreement, resolved to ask the Council of Management whether or not making the tag-holder agreement more specific would aid its enforcement.

Status: The Board agreed that making the tag-holder agreement more specific would aid its enforcement. This item is built into the review of the tag-holder agreement. Verbal status report will be provided at October PAB meeting.

Apr04/7

The PAB resolved to recommend that the Council of Management clarify the procedure for making complaints about a tag-holder’s alleged non-compliance with the tag-holder agreement, and also to ensure that tag-holders’ obligations under the agreement are successfully communicated to tag-holders.

This resolution covers two items:

1. The procedure for making complaints about a tag-holder's alleged non-compliance with the tag-holder agreement.

Status: Built into the review of the tag-holder agreement. Verbal status report will be provided at October PAB meeting.

2. Ensure that tag-holders' obligations under the agreement are successfully communicated to tag-holders.

Status: Ongoing through specific projects (e.g. Ts&Cs project, logo project) and communications programme.

Apr04/8

*and **resolved** to request that the Council of Management expedite the redrafting of the me.uk rules and the associated consultation process.*

Status: The .me.uk consultation has now completed. . A paper is planned for the October board meeting.

Aug04/5

*The PAB further **resolved** to recommend to Council of Management that it should take further legal advice in terms of the detailed framing of the policy [that where data about a registration, in excess of that available by inspection of WHOIS and/or PRSS, is passed by Nominet to a third party, Nominet should...].*

Status: Pending.