

From: [REDACTED]
To: [LRreview](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - .au Licensing Rules Review – feedback from an applicant for a contested .au direct name
Date: Thursday, 29 January 2026 1:26:40 PM

Dear Policy Advisory Panel,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback as part of the .au Licensing Rules Review. I am responding as an applicant for a contested .au direct domain name.

I have been the registrant of [REDACTED].net.au since **4 January 2014**. At the time of registering that domain, I considered but did not proceed with registering [REDACTED].com.au. Shortly afterwards, [REDACTED].com.au was registered by a third party, who later contacted me several times seeking to monetise the domain through resale. I did not pursue the offers.

Based on publicly observable registration history, [REDACTED].com.au appears to have been held for a few 2 year registration periods, subsequently allowed to expire, and later re-registered through an expired-domain or aftermarket process. The domain is now held by an entity that appears to specialise in acquiring and holding expired domain names. To my knowledge, the domain has not been used for an active service or presence that demonstrates an independent connection to the domain string.

When auDA opened expressions of interest for .au direct domain names, I applied for [REDACTED].au. I understand that the current registrant of [REDACTED].com.au has also applied, resulting in the domain being classified as contested.

My feedback relates to how contention for .au direct names is resolved under the Licensing Rules, particularly where competing applications involve materially different forms of connection to the domain name.

The .au domain space has historically been intended to support a trusted, accessible namespace that reflects genuine connections to Australian identity, businesses, and individuals. In my understanding, the Licensing Rules require registrants to demonstrate a meaningful and ongoing connection to a domain name, whether through their personal name, business name, trademark, or other eligibility criteria.

In my case, the domain string “[REDACTED]” corresponds directly to my personal initials, and I am an active ABN holder with a longstanding and legitimate connection to that identifier. By contrast, the competing application appears to rely primarily on prior registration of a closely related domain name obtained through the aftermarket or expired-domain process, without a separate demonstrated connection to the domain string itself.

I respectfully suggest that the Panel consider whether the current contention-resolution mechanisms sufficiently distinguish between:

- applicants with a demonstrable, bona fide, and enduring connection to a domain name; and
- applicants whose connection arises primarily through speculative registration, domain monetisation, or the acquisition and holding of existing registrations.

More broadly, I am concerned that allowing speculative or monetisation-driven registrations to compete on equal footing may undermine the integrity and intended

purpose of the .au namespace. Such practices can create barriers to entry for legitimate users, distort the availability of domain names, and erode trust in the namespace as a public resource rather than a marketplace for profit.

I believe that refining the Licensing Rules to more clearly prioritise genuine connection, public interest, and fair access would strengthen confidence in the .au namespace and ensure it continues to reflect community expectations over time.

Thank you for considering my feedback. I appreciate the opportunity to contribute to the review process and would be pleased to provide further information if helpful.

Best regards,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

Please keep my name and contact details private. I request that you redact these details from public publication.