

Second Level Domains Policy Review Submission

From: Aotearoa Maori Internet Organisation

Received: 24 October 2003

1.

Q: Are the twelve second level domains still appropriate for their communities of interest?

A: .ac and .school could be merged into .ac .

.cri should be merged into .govt .

2.

Q: Should any of the open 2LDs be moderated? (.ac, .co, .gen, .geek, .maori, .net, .org, .school)

A: no

comments: In the case of .maori.nz: our executive (former NZMIS executive members) were responsible for the writing of the .maori.nz proposal. We widely consulted with the community of interest who asked for an unmoderated domain. Although there has been wide spread "cyber squatting" the consultation we have done to date still suggests that .maori.nz should remain un moderated.

3.

Q: Is there any need for the rationalisation of the current 2LDs?

A: no. In the case of .iwi.nz it has only recently been promoted and the policy revised. The original policy only made a small handful of organisations eligible. The new policy and the work of the .iwi.nz moderator has meant that potentially hundreds of organisations/groups are now eligible for .iwi.nz .

It would be premature to change the current 2ld .iwi.nz . No doubt it will also be seen as racist and contradictory in terms of te reo Maori.

3.1

Q: If so, what process should be used for the removal or closing of existing 2LDs?:

A:

3.2

Q: Should any such process be included in the 2LD policy?:

A:

4.

Q: What criteria (types of criteria and specific examples) should be applied to the creation of new 2LDs?

A:

5.

Q: Is the current process for creating new 2LDs too simple, too complex or about right?

A: too complex

comments: The time frame is too long and percentage of votes needed is too low.

We propose that once an application has completed a public vote (a majority of at least 80%) the domain should be created.

6.

Q: How much, if anything, should an application for the creation of a new 2LD cost?

A: We would consider that a cost recovery basis was appropriate.

7.

Q: Who, if anyone, should be able to block the creation of new 2LDs? If so, why and how?

A: The community of Interest.

8.

Q: Should there be different criteria or processes for the creation of moderated as opposed to open Second Level Domains?

A: yes. A moderated domain should only have consultation with the community of interest. If the COI agree then the 2ld should be created.

9.

Q: Is the level of public input in the process adequate; excessive; or inadequate?

A: excessive

comments: Surely the public vote is sufficient.

10.

Q: Are the methods currently used to seek public input (submissions; discussion period; straw poll) the best available, or would you suggest other/additional methods?

A: More media coverage including non IT media to ensure all Internet users have a chance to participate in the process.

11.

Q: Do you think direct public registrations should be accepted at the second level?

A: no

11.1

Q: Why? What are the advantages or disadvantages of such an approach?

A: Too much of a financial change to justify.

12.

Q: If direct registrations are allowed at the second level, what kinds of transition arrangements would need to be put in place for existing third level registrants?

A:

13.

Q: What is the best way to deal with any conflicts between existing third level registrants if the second level is opened?

A:

14.

Q: Should registration fees be different (higher/lower) for Second Level domain registrations if they are opened directly to the public?

A:

15.

Q: Are there other options around the future of the Second Level that the working group should consider?

A:

16.

Q: Are there any other issues you think the Working Group needs to consider in the course of the review?

A: