

## 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 110 and 110 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**

Limitation should be that one design can not be copied over other networks. (ie co.uk or org.uk.)

**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**

With some graphic style and as above.

**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**

Cannot see how it can be controlled.

**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

**Please give comments**

Becomes difficult to decypher for normal user.

**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

**What process should we use for releasing domains?**

**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

**Please give comments**

It is the only fair and just way.

**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?**

1996

**Please give comments**

Why should older rights holders be disenfranchised?

**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

First come - first served.

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.

Market forces should dictate from zero.

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

Roger Blackall

Company name/Organisation name

Watchman Security Services