

Have your say!

Please give us your feedback on these proposals by answering the following questions:

What domains should we release?

This document contains respondents between 56 and 56 inclusive.

Do you agree that two letter domain names should be released for registration in co.uk, org.uk, net.uk and me.uk as recommended by the PAB?

- Yes
- No

Please give comments

It will just open up a can of worms with IP lawyers having a field day. The number of 2 letter combinations is limited and the number of applications will far exceed the domain names available. Nominet does not need the money and should keep the lid firmly closed on these potential domain names.

Do you agree that one character domain names should be released for registration in co.uk, org.uk, net.uk and me.uk as recommended by the PAB?

- Yes
- No

Please give comments

see above times whatever

Do you agree that existing country codes under ISO 3166-1 such as fr, de, es, us etc be released for registration in co.uk, org.uk, net.uk and me.uk as recommended by the PAB?

- Yes
- No

Please give comments

Why? What is the point? It will only confuse people.

We outlined the technical reasons why com.co.uk, org.co.uk and net.co.uk should not be released. Do you agree with these exceptions?

- Yes
- No

Do you agree that existing generic top level domains (e.g. biz, info) should be released for registration in co.uk, org.uk, net.uk and me.uk as recommended by the PAB?

- Yes
- No

Do you agree that existing .uk second level domains (e.g. co, org, ac, me, ltd) should also be released for registration in co.uk, org.uk, net.uk and me.uk?

- Yes
- No

Do you agree that “uk” should continue to be reserved from registration in co.uk, org.uk, net.uk and me.uk as recommended by the PAB?

- Yes
- No

We propose to take the same approach for two letter, one character and the other previously unreleased domains (e.g. pro.co.uk). Do you agree with this proposal?

- Yes
- No

The PAB recommended a two stage release process: a first round for holders of registered trademarks, and a second round for names not taken by rights holders, open to holders of unregistered rights. Do you agree with this recommendation?

- Yes
- No

The PAB recommended a cut off date for qualifying rights for IP rights holders. They suggested 1996 and 2002 as possible dates. What do you think would be a suitable cut off date?

2002

We propose that initially commercial organisations should have priority in.co.uk and charities and not for profit organisations should have priority in org.uk. Do you agree with this approach?

- Yes
- No

We propose to hold a sealed bid auction for domain names where rights holders are competing, and for domain names not taken up by rights holders. Do you think there is a fairer way to allocate the first registration of these domain names?

- Yes
- No

We propose to hold a Dutch auction for the general release (“landrush”) of domains not taken up by rights holders. Do you think there is a fairer way to allocate the first registration of these domain names?

- Yes
- No

We plan to run this whole exercise on a cost recovery basis, and any surplus funds generated from auctions would be donated to Nominet Trust, a charitable organisation established by Nominet with the objects including the education, relief of financial hardship and protection of children in the area of the Internet and information technology. Do you agree with this approach?

Yes

No

12. Please give us your contact details

Name

Hazel Pegg

Company name/Organisation name

Glastonbury Online