

> Benefits of changing the current rules  
> It has been suggested that the rules are "too strict" and don't really define what an "ISP" is.

The current rules define network provider effectively.

> It may be perceived as unfair that one industry has its own SLD.

Because it is limited to network providers specifically for infrastructure use, rather than ISPs or even network providers to use as they want, it is not the same as a domain for the industry.

> Function of a domain name:

> 1 What do you believe is a function of a domain name?

Usually to provide people with an easy to remember alternative to IP addresses.

> Perception of the ".net.uk" SLD:

> 2 Would you class yourself as working in, or being part of the ISP/network provider industry?

No.

> 3 Do you associate ".net.uk" with an ISP/network provider-type company?

Yes.

> 4 On a scale of 1 to 5, do you believe that the "average Internet user" associates ".net.uk" with an ISP/network provider? (1 = No association, 5 = Strong association)

3

> 5 (a) How far do you see .net.uk as a duplicate for .co.uk, .net or other TLDs/SLDs?

net.uk is unique as a useful home for hostnames of network infrastructure in the UK.

> (b) Would this be different if anyone could register a .net.uk domain?

Yes, another open domain is pointless when every type of registrant is covered by co.uk/org.uk/me.uk and could cause confusion.

> Definitions of an ISP/Network Provider:  
> 6 How would you attempt to define an "Internet Service Provider (ISP)" and what would you say are typical characteristics of an ISP? Are these objective criteria which are easy to verify automatically?

Offering, to the public, services related to the Internet Protocol. No.

> 7 How would you attempt to define a "Network Provider" and what would you say are typical characteristics of a Network Provider? Are these objective criteria which are easy to verify automatically?

An operator of Internet Protocol routing hardware and AS, with significant IP connectivity to the public Internet.

> 8 Do you believe there are sufficient differences which can be clearly defined between an ISP and Network Provider?

Yes.

> If you believe the domain should be restricted to some definition, should this be inclusive of both an ISP and Network Provider, or one of them?

It should be restricted to just network providers. The current rules, and restriction to network providers in line with RFC1591, is very clear and effective.

> Options  
> 9 What general option do you favour, and why?  
> a. Close .net.uk completely to new registrations.  
> b. Restrict .net.uk for some definition of ISP/network operator with strict eligibility criteria.  
> c. Open .net.uk with a charter to indicate its suggested use for ISPs/network operators but without a restriction enforcing such a recommendation.  
> d. Open .net.uk with no specific charter (everyone is encouraged to register)  
> e. Another option. (please explain)

e - no change. The current rules are clear and have been effective at restricting the domain to network providers, as intended.

There are significant disadvantages to each of the other proposed changes, until there is clear evidence that a change is necessary and safe, Nominet should always favour the status quo.

> 10 If you believe there should be a restriction of some kind, how  
> should this be structured?  
> (see previous page for some ideas)

The current rules are fine.

> 11 If there is a restriction on the registrant, do you believe that  
> the rules for ".net.uk" should require some kind of presence in the UK?

Yes.

> 12 If registration of ".net.uk" domains is restricted to a specific  
> type of organisation, should  
> its use (e.g. subdomains, e-mail addresses, etc.) also be restricted  
> [for names registered  
> under such rules]?

Yes.

> 13 If the .net.uk SLD is opened up for registration with no or very  
> limited controls, would  
> the benefits of more registrations be defeated by any problems such as  
> more defensive/  
> duplicate registrations?

Number of registrations is not a good measure of benefits of a domain or  
charter. More registrations in any one SLD should not be a goal of Nominet,  
but rather use of whichever .uk domain is appropriate.

Opening net.uk would cause confusion and I am strongly opposed to creating  
yet another  
open domain as the existing open domains (co/org/me.uk) cover all  
registrants. The experience of opening the .net gTLD has shown that there  
was very little benefit, other than increasing revenue for Network  
Solutions by forcing significant numbers of defensive registrations, while  
it caused dilution of the value of duplicated .com domains, and confusion  
for users and owners of domains where .com and .net are owned by different  
organisations.

In addition, opening the restricted net.uk domain is such a significant  
change that it is effectively a new domain, as such I believe that not  
using the new SLD procedure, and in particular ignoring the General  
Principles, is not just unwise but could also open Nominet to significant  
liability.

Mark Shaw