

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 52 and 52 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

This rule was always a nonsense.

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

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

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

Please give comments

In addition, .com.co.uk is highly likely to be
a) confused with the hateful .uk.com
b) used by spammers (eg paypal.com.co.uk)
so it's best no-one has it.

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

Please give comments

Most of these were registered in .uk domains before they were gTLDs - in practise there is only [gtld].net.uk left

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

Please give comments

Great possibility for confusion. If they were to be released, I'd like some extra rules attached forbidding resale of subdomains (to avoid .uk.com situation)

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

Comments

If not, I'd like some extra rules attached forbidding resale of subdomains.

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

Please give comments

If the same approach is not taken, the releases should be in different years.

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?

2009

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

Please give comments

Some two-letter company names are so widely used that they appear in dictionaries. A dictionary should be selected and used as the first point of reference. Then sealed bid for any other domains.

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

Please give comments, particularly in relation to the starting price for any Dutch auction.

I believe the starting price should be £50, but for a 10-year period - so there is no premium, just an expression of commitment.

However, if the standard period must be used, the starting price should be £10 - a small premium.

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

Paul Gregory

Company name/Organisation name

Grosvenor Media