

I'd very much like to see Nominet given the opportunity to use its expertise beyond the current limited scope, to benefit both members and the wider internet community, however I find it difficult to choose between the specific options given in the consultation. Like Sam Kington and Paul Smith suggest in their respective responses, I believe that the language of option 3 is such that it is too lax in what it allows, while option 2 is a little too restrictive. Specifically (all from option 3):

* 3.5 and 3.10 seem to allow the provision of services (database and consultancy, respectively) to any external body at all, without any limitation to it being in relation to Nominet's purposes. In my opinion, such services should only be offered where they are directly related to the existing expertise of Nominet, and in furtherance of Nominet's aims as described in the Objects.

* 3.6 allows the undertaking or funding of R&D into "any area of knowledge, technical development [...] or human endeavour". While laudable, Oxford already has two universities, and Nominet's efforts and monies would be better spent limiting themselves to those aspects of the above directly associated with the Company's other aims and purposes.

* 3.11 similarly appears to have no limitation on its scope. I've no objection to Nominet promoting (etc) best practices, et al, in fields where it already well placed to be such an authority, however don't see how it could be respected as such outside its area of expertise, or indeed what benefit this would bring the members of the community it was set up to serve.

* 3.12 also worries me, especially given the summary of this clause elsewhere in the document. Even making charitable donations (i.e. donations to charities) may be problematic if the charities chosen (or indeed those refused) are in any way controversial. The clause goes further than this, however, seemingly allowing donations (etc) to *any* group or body, again without limitation in purpose. This should *at least* be limited to doing so in the furtherance of the aims of the objects, and likely to bring wide benefit to the community.

In Summary, given the choice only between the verbatim options given, I would choose option 2 (albeit with the intention to further widen the scope to cover the majority of option 3 which I agree with), although I'd much prefer something closer to 3 with the changes identified above made.

Thanks

Darren Edmundson