

# Second Level Domains Policy Review Submission

**From:** Richard Shearer  
**Received:** 10 November 2003

**1.**

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

A: Generally yes.

If sufficient representation was made to remove a 2LD, then some framework should be provided to discuss that - opposite of new 2LD...

**2.**

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

A: yes

comments: Probably .school and .ac

**3.**

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

A: No, dont think so, even though some have small no.s of domains registered, there is technically nothing really wrong with that.

**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: It should be considered, but the process may not need to be developed until a case for its use came up.

**4.**

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

A: I think current criteria is ok.

**5.**

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

A: about right

comments:

**6.**

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

A: Should meet costs of considering the application.

**7.**

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

A: InternetNZ, or other applicable party.

Why? well maybe the police would have a problem with rapist.nz

**8.**

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

A: Not really, but the issue would need to be part of any application. If moderated, there would need to be justifiable reason as to why moderated.

If moderated, proposal would need to include how moderation would function, and who would administer etc.

**9.**

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

A: inadequate

comments: Its probably inadequate, but not through lack of opportunity, more through lack of publicity, understanding etc.

**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: Probably appropriate. I guess to some extent, this is up to the community of interest. Ie the .geek.nz community were able to galvanise themselves into action, which supported their application.

**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: This is now the way we operate. It is not an option to go backwards.

**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: None, as this should not even be considered due to obvious problems and complexity.

**13.**

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

A: see above 12.

**14.**

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

A: see above 12.

**15.**

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

A: see above 12.

**16.**

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

A: No.