The domain name policy for co.no and whether the current use of the domain is in breach of the domain name policy for .no.

The upcoming lawsuit about the co.no domain will among other things decide if there in real terms has been an illegal transfer of co.no and whether the current use of the domain is in breach of the domain name policy for .no.

The Privacy & Identity Lab: a new Dutch expertise centre
Radboud University, TNO, Tilburg University and SIDN are to work together to find better solutions for the protection of online privacy and electronic identities. The four bodies are setting up an expertise centre – the Privacy & Identity Lab

NASK Partners Satisfaction Survey
50 Partners took part in the research, from which 38 were from Poland and 12 from countries abroad. Evaluation of cooperation with NASK, as of yet, turned out to be very positive, with about 38% respondents claiming that the cooperation is very good, 28% that it’s good and 28% rather good and only 6% had no opinion about the subject.

RNIDS at the 19th TELFOR Conference
As one of the most prestigious regional annual gatherings of experts in the field of telecommunications and IT, TELFOR has grown into a forum, within which all relevant matters regarding telecommunications are discussed, Internet being among them.

Nominet to create .judiciary.uk
Nominet has approved a request from the judiciary.uk, asked Canadians what they perceive as challenges and opportunities facing the development of the Internet in Canada.

CZ.NIC allows public to test for IPv6 readiness
CZ.NIC, as part of its educational activities is running a project in the coming IPv6 Laboratory in which everyone will be able to test the operation of their network devices, web applications and other services currently on the new IPv6 protocol.

Technical Center of Internet deployed DNSSEC protocol in domain .SU
On 18 October Technical Center of Internet signed domain zone .SU with DNSSEC key.

The new terms and conditions of domain names registration in domains .RU and .РФ
The main objective of the new Terms and Conditions of domain names registration in domains .RU and .РФ was unification of the current Terms and Conditions of domain names registration in domain zones .RU and .РФ.

Multi-year registration available from 1 May 2012
From May 2012, the wholesale fee (for Nominet members) for a one-year registration will be £3.50 (+VAT), two years will stay the same at £5 (+VAT), with each additional year costing £2.50 (+VAT).

The Nomint Board has approved a request to allow the judiciary its own closed second level domain (SLD), judiciary.uk.

DomainWire Stat Report
(Spring 2011 edition)

Centr Reports
63rd RIPE meeting Report, Vienna
31 Oct - 4 Nov 2011 (PDF)

DNS Easy 2011 Report
18 October 2011 (PDF)

42nd ICANN meeting Report, Dakar, 23-28 October 2011 (PDF)
Does the Registry have a Registrar Accreditation, certification, or similar process

17 of the 23 respondents (74%) stated that they provide some sort of Registrar accreditation or certification process.

Who conducts the qualification of Registrars

19 out of 22 (86%) of the respondents stated that they conduct the qualification of Registrars themselves.

The cost of becoming an Accredited Registrar

Below are selected responses to the question of what it costs for a Registrar to become accredited. Responses were spread evenly across different values. (All values are in EUR)

CENTR Statistics

Source: CENTR domain counter (as well as manual checks on Member websites) and hosterstats.com for gTLDs
Note: CENTR domain count and CENTR growth refer to all CENTR Full ccTLD members

DOMAIN COUNTER:

59,543,703
October 2011
Full Member ccTLDs only

This count represents a growth of 0.88% from the previous month. The largest contribution to this growth in absolute value was .uk and in percentage terms the highest growth was .re

The total count is expected to hit 60 million by the end of November 2011
Much-needed modernization of the Whois protocol on its way

Lack of standardization is a problem
At the most basic level, Whois is a very straightforward protocol. You pose a query to TCP port 43, and generally receive a somewhat longer answer (resolve). Nowadays, most people do not really use the protocol that was originally intended, instead a website is used that helps users convey this query using port 43. Whois is not standardized beyond this. For example, the protocol does not include a specification of the character registry that is to be deployed (such as us-ascii, ISO-8859-1 or UTF-8), the information to be included or how it is to be presented. Naturally, this poses a problem for Whois users. Of course, queries are made in the same way under all Whois services, although the resolves vary widely, which essentially completely prevents automation.

Regulated by law
Swedish legislation concerning national top-level domains in Sweden governs how we manage Whois to a certain degree. Because of the stipulations in the Swedish Personal Data Act (PUL), we specifically allocate somewhat greater protection to personal data, meaning that we do not provide data on private individuals to just anyone, but instead require the registrant to take an active position in the matter. This means that we require that certain criteria be met in our registry in order to publish information. Additionally, the information is not provided through our public Whois service at port 43, but instead is accessible only via our website, iis.se, protected by CAPTCHA to prevent the information from being retrieved by someone who could retrieve the entire registry through programmatic means. By law, all domains registered by companies must be presented online free of charge.

The development of the Whois
However, what I actually want to write about in this post is the trend in the Whois protocol. Since Whois is so poorly standardized, many people have long wanted to address the problem. And domain names are no longer the only type of object adaptable to the Whois template. An attempt was made many years ago at IETF (The Internet Engineering Task Force) to produce a new protocol as a replacement for Whois, which was favourable in many ways. It was XML based, according to a template that everyone was meant to be able to use to present the content of the resolve in a programmatic manner. IETF’s CRISP task force produced the IRIS protocol, which, in addition to XML, was based on the BEEP transport instead of HTTP. BEEP was IETF’s way of avoiding the use of an HTTP construction, which many at IETF disliked at the time. The major problem was that no one spent any real time implementing any of this. The protocol simply became one of many RFCs at IETF that never resulted in any major success.

Renewed efforts
Renewed efforts are now in progress to make a fresh start at IETF. Several RIPv (those who administrate IP addresses, RIPE, ARIN and so forth) have independently begun building experimental services for Whois lookups of IP networks. These new services are based on REST, using JSON or XML. REST is the HTTP-based protocol used to build APIs for web services. And this is the protocol that everyone wanting to build modern services on the Internet today use to publish APIs that anyone can use. Essentially all programming languages offer compatibility with these APIs, unlike BEEP and IRIS. REST makes it easier for those who want to create new services.

REST particularly facilitates matters for those who want to create new online services. And at the latest IETF in November, a BoF (Birds of a Feather) was held on the matter. A BOF is a meeting where participants can discuss whether there is sufficient interest and motivation to initiate a new IETF task force. The current working name is WHOIS-based Extensible Internet Registration Data Service (WEIRDS).

ICANN could regulate the development
ICANN is also interested in renewing and improving the Whois protocol, particularly for the new top-level domains, since IDN domains must also be managed, which many new top-level domains will implement in their entirety from the root. Of course, the implementation of a new Whois protocol is something that ICANN could require new top-level domains, as well as from all ICANN accredited registrars. By doing so, they could regulate their way to the development of a protocol. So the question is, how popular will this be among the old registries that handle domains? My impression is that registries are highly conservative and weary of implementing new protocols. However, essentially everyone currently offers a Whois service on their website, so a practical approach to covertly initiating the use of the protocol is to begin deploying it for proprietary internal communications between the database, the registry and the website. It is particularly important for .SE to monitor and participate in this effort.

Article from Patrik Wallström
Project Manager for the Health Check and DNSSEC at .SE Registry