

Consultation on auDA's purpose

Submission type	Email submission
------------------------	------------------

From	Will Hackett
-------------	--------------

Dear auDA Board,

I am writing in response to the consultation on auDA's revised purpose statement, opened on 21 April 2026.

I am the registrant of two .au domain names and currently the subject of an active auDA complaints case (Case 00156103). I am making this submission in good faith, offering my current experience as a real-world case study. I believe it speaks directly—and rather urgently—to the questions the Board has put to the community.

1. Does auDA's revised purpose statement use accessible and memorable language?

Yes. "Connecting Australians to an open internet with trust and confidence" is plain-language, easy to recall, and undeniably catchy. It is a clear marketing improvement over previous iterations.

2. Does auDA's revised purpose statement clearly and simply articulate what auDA does, for whom and to what end?

This is where I would respectfully encourage the Board to look closely. A purpose statement should be a faithful description of operational reality, not a utopian aspiration disconnected from it. The phrase "trust and confidence" is doing a lot of heavy lifting here, and I genuinely do not believe registrants experiencing auDA's current administrative processes would recognize those words.

If a purpose statement is meant to reflect how auDA actually operates in 2026, a more accurate slogan might be:

"auDA: Checking absolutely nothing proactively, but aggressively weaponizing bureaucracy the moment you try to update your own records."

I offer that with a smile, but it is grounded in my current experience as a registrant trying to voluntarily comply with your continuing eligibility rules. When I recently attempted to update a registered entity from a Trust to a Pty Ltd—a change the Australian Business



Register publicly recorded 23 months ago, which auDA's monitoring completely missed—I was not met with "trust and confidence." Instead, I was routed through a process that:

- Treats corrections as cancellations: Routine database updates are processed as full cancellations and re-registrations, with a toll attached and no refund for unused terms.
- Demands invasive paperwork for public facts: Your compliance team requested my family's private, confidential Trust Deed to prove a structural change that can be verified on the public ABR website in roughly ten seconds.
- Operates with zero proactive oversight: There appears to be no systemic monitoring of the federal registers that underpin your eligibility requirements. You rely on the honor system, but penalize registrants who act honorably to keep their records accurate.
- Hides behind anonymity: When this absurdity is pointed out, registrants are met with unsigned, copy-pasted boilerplate emails from an anonymous "Compliance Team" that refuses to engage with the substance of the complaint.

If a registrant in my position is the worked example of what auDA actually does, "trust and confidence" is not the phrase that describes it.

3. Is auDA's revised purpose statement a clear improvement on its previous purpose statement? If not, why not?

In its language, yes. In substance, the improvement depends entirely on whether it is paired with actual operational reform. A catchy, memorable statement that perfectly highlights the glaring gap between your aspirations and your practices isn't an improvement—it is simply a more efficient way of communicating that gap to the public.

I would encourage the Board, in considering submissions to this consultation, to ask the following operational questions:

- Does auDA's complete lack of proactive compliance monitoring meet the standard implied by the Licensing Rules?
- Is treating a mechanical database update as a paid cancellation consistent with building registrants' "trust and confidence"?



- Is an anonymous, copy-paste complaints handling experience consistent with your own Conduct Complaints Policy?

A purpose statement is only as credible as the operations powering it. Right now, there is a significant disconnect, and member submissions are the appropriate place to surface it.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute.

Kind regards,

Will