Licensing Rules Review 2025

Policy Advisory Panel Final Report

August 2026

Acknowledgment of Country

The Policy Advisory Panel (**the Panel**) acknowledges the Traditional Owners of Country throughout Australia and their continuing connection to land, waters and community. We pay our respects to their Cultures, Country and Elders past and present.

About us

The Panel was established by the auDA Board on 10 September 2025 to examine issues relating to the effective and fair operation of the *.au Domain Administration Rules: Licensing* (.au Licensing Rules). The role of the Panel, as provided in the Terms of Reference, includes to:

- Demonstrate a genuine multi-stakeholder approach in its consultations with the public and key stakeholders,
- Provide regular updates to the auDA Board on the progress of the review, and
- Provide the auDA Board with a review report setting out recommendations for change supported by information, evidence and/or submissions obtained during the review process.

For more information, visit the Panel's webpage.

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary

This final report presents the findings of the Policy Advisory Panel's review of the .au Domain Administration Rules: Licensing (.au Licensing Rules). The auDA Board established the Panel on 10 September 2025 to examine whether the .au Licensing Rules continue to operate effectively and fairly and provide the greatest benefit for the Australian community.

The review considered allocation rules for com.au and net.au, Domain Name Monetisation, contested .au direct names, fraudulent and bad faith registrations and Reserved Names, complaints arising from auDA audits, and alignment with common generic top-level domain practices. The Panel also considered additional issues raised during consultation, including scams, registrant communications, the position of retiring business owners and privacy in WHOIS data.

The Panel undertook consultation from September 2025 to July 2026 through virtual town halls, in-person events in Canberra, Sydney, Brisbane and Melbourne, an information session at the Australian Internet Governance Forum, meetings with stakeholders and written submissions. Participants included registrars, businesses, government, consumer representatives, auDA members and members of the public. Feedback showed broad support for maintaining trust and confidence in .au, while views diverged on several issues involving commercial use and allocation of domain names. On Domain Name Monetisation, the Panel heard support for retaining the current approach because it provides registrants with greater choice and supports legitimate secondary-market activity, advertising and domain investment. Concerns focused on pay-per-click pages, confusing advertising links and the risk that monetised sites may undermine consumer confidence. On balance, the Panel supports retaining the absence of a specific prohibition on monetisation in com.au, net.au and .au direct, while noting that auDA should continue to monitor the effects of AI-generated content and advertising.

The Panel reached a different majority view on the use of monetisation to satisfy the allocation rules for com.au and net.au. These namespaces are valued for the connection between a domain name and the registrant or its business. The majority considered that allowing a monetised website alone to establish that connection may disproportionately benefit domain investors and weaken trust in the allocation framework. A minority of Panel members supported retaining the current rule because of the choice and secondary-market availability it provides, in addition to the other points set out in their minority position statement.

For contested .au direct names, the Panel did not identify a fairer alternative to the existing process. Each applicant already holds a corresponding .au domain name, has entered the contest under known rules and has no inherently superior claim. The Panel therefore supports continuation of the current negotiation-based arrangements, under which the number of contested names is expected to decline over time.

The Panel found strong support for maintaining a Reserved Names framework on public policy grounds, but differing views on whether the list itself should be published. It supports removing the publication requirement and instead publishing the criteria used to reserve names, together with aggregate information about reservations, reversals and processing times. This approach is intended to improve transparency without exposing information that could assist misuse.

The Panel also supports changes to the complaints framework so that complaints may address auDA audit processes, a broader range of interested persons may seek review, and applicants have seven days rather than 48 hours to seek internal review. It further supports aligning selected .au domain lifecycle rules with common industry practice by allowing renewal at any time during a licence term, extending the cooling-off period to five days, applying a consistent 30-day redemption period and increasing the pending deletion period from one day to five days.

On scams, the Panel supports retaining the current approach while auDA works with the National Anti-Scam Centre (NASC) to refine processes and publish guidance and outcome information. It also proposes clearer and more frequent registrar communications about suspension, cancellation and expiry; a flexible compliance approach for registrants who cease trading and need to move from com.au to a more appropriate namespace; and clearer information about using role-based WHOIS contact details to limit publication of personal information. Given the pace of technological and market change, the Panel encourages auDA to review the Licensing Rules again in approximately three years.

Panel Recommendations

All recommendations were adopted by the Panel on a consensus basis apart from Recommendation 2 where four members voted in support of the majority position to remove subparagraph f, two Panel members voted to support the status quo and one Panel member abstained from a vote.

RECOMMENDATION 1: No change to the current approach that allows domain monetisation in the com.au, net.au and .au direct namespace.
RECOMMENDATION 2: The Panel recommends deleting subparagraph (f) from section 2.4.4 (2) of the .au Licensing Rules. Noting that a minority of the Panel opposed that position and instead supported the option to maintain the status quo.
RECOMMENDATION 3. The Panel recommends continuation of the current process for the contested .au direct name allocation process.
RECOMMENDATION 4.1. Remove the requirement under Rule 2.6.7 of the .au Licensing Rules for auDA to publish the reserved list. **RECOMMENDATION 4.2. auDA should publish the criteria based on which it decides to put a domain name in a reserved list, and release aggregate metrics, such as number of Reserved Names, number of reversals that are being or have been reviewed, and average time taken from detection to reservation over periods of time.**
RECOMMENDATION 5.1. The Panel recommends that the complaints process in Part 3 of the .au Licensing Rules be amended to include audits performed by auDA. **RECOMMENDATION 5.2. The Panel recommends that the scope of the 'affected person' is broadened appropriate to Rules 3.6.1 and 3.8.1 of the .au Licensing Rules such that they can demonstrate an interest in the domain name adequately.** **Recommendation 5.3. The Panel recommends increasing the time given to a person to file an application under Rule 3.6.3 of the .au Licensing Rules to 7 days from the current 48 hours.**
RECOMMENDATION 6: The Panel recommends amending the following rules regarding the domain lifecycle: **a) Remove the 90-days renewal window within Rule 2.14.1 of the .au Licensing Rules and allow registrant to renew domain licences anytime during the lifetime of the domain until the expiration of the licence;** **b) Increase the cooling-off period from 3 days to 5 days in relation to Rule 2.15.4 of the .au Licensing Rules;**

c) Amend the redemption periods and apply a consistent deletion period with 30 days redemption period (to standardise along the lines of international best practices); and **d) increase the pending/hold period from 1 day to 5 days (time between the redemption and purging of the domain name).**
RECOMMENDATION 7: The Panel recommends that the current approach to scams under the .au Licensing Rules be retained, and further, auDA should work with the National Anti-Scam Centre to continually refine the approach to dealing with scams in the .au and publish processing guidance, scam referrals and outcomes. **Acknowledging the fast-moving nature of scams particularly with the rapid development of AI technology, the Panel further recommends that this issue be included in the terms of reference for the next review of the .au Licensing Rules in three years' time.**
RECOMMENDATION 8: The Panel recommends that the .au Licensing Rules should incorporate clear information about a registrar's obligation to contact a registrant in the case of suspension, cancellation or expiry of a domain name and there should be an uplift in the frequency and method of contact like sending multiple notices in plain language.
RECOMMENDATION 9: The Panel Recommends adoption of flexibility within the compliance posture to facilitate a registrant transition to another appropriate namespace once they have ended their commercial operations and they no longer meet the com.au eligibility. **The Panel also recommends that auDA distributes advisory/educational documents on how registrants can approach transitions in simple language.**
Recommendation 10: The Panel recommends that the .au Licensing Rules be amended to include information, along the lines of section 2.8.1 of the Registrar Rules, about how registrants can use role-based descriptions in the WHOIS to limit publication of personal information.

2. Introduction

2.1 Background and Objectives

The external Policy Advisory Panel was convened by auDA on 10 September 2025 to examine issues relating to the effective and fair operation of the .au Licensing Rules.

Under its Terms of Reference, the Panel was tasked with demonstrating a genuine multi-stakeholder approach in its consultations with the public and key stakeholders, providing regular updates to the auDA Board throughout the review, and delivering a final report setting out recommendations supported by information, evidence and submissions received during the review process.

The review was undertaken to ensure the .au Licensing Rules continue to provide the greatest benefit to the Australian community by remaining relevant and effective over time. It also sought to support the multistakeholder model of internet governance through an inclusive, consensus-based, transparent and accountable review process, including consideration of the process for resolving contested .au direct domain names.

2.2 auDA Terms of Endorsement

auDA is endorsed by the Australian Government to administer the .au domain for the benefit of all Australians. The Australian Government's Terms of Endorsement (Terms of Endorsement) establish auDA's core functions to:

- ensure the stable, secure and reliable operation of the .au domain as part of Australia's critical infrastructure;
- administer a transparent, accountable and efficient licensing regime for .au domain names through multi-stakeholder processes; and
- advocate for and participate in multistakeholder internet governance processes domestically, regionally and internationally.

In addition to its Government endorsement, auDA operates under a sponsorship agreement with the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), the international body responsible for coordinating the internet's naming and numbering systems.

2.3 Stakeholder Engagement

The Panel was committed to a transparent, responsive and accountable multi-stakeholder approach throughout the review. Public consultation and stakeholder engagement sought to ensure all relevant stakeholder groups had the opportunity to contribute, raise awareness of the review, and inform the Panel's recommendations. Further details of the Panel's consultation activities can be found in **Appendix A**.

The Panel engaged with stakeholders through public town hall events, in-person consultation sessions, virtual workshops, meetings with registrars and other stakeholder groups, and written submissions. A list of submissions can be found in **Appendix B.** It also considered consistency with international multi-stakeholders engagement guidelines, such as the NETmundial +10 Multistakeholder Statement (São Paulo Multistakeholder Guidelines).

2.4 Transparency and Accountability

The review commenced with public consultation on the draft Terms of Reference, allowing the community to help shape the issues considered by the Panel. Panel members were appointed following a public expression of interest process, while information about the review was made available through dedicated webpages, member communications, social media and consultation events. Holders of contested .au direct domain names were also contacted directly and invited to participate in a targeted survey.

The review was conducted in accordance with the policy development principles in auDA's corporate policy *Process for the Development and Review of auDA Published Policies*, which emphasise evidence-based decision-making, effective consultation, proportionate policy outcomes and ensuring policies continue to deliver the greatest benefit to the Australian community.

The Panel's agendas and meeting minutes are published on the Panel's webpage. auDA provided secretariat, communications and administrative support, including consultation logistics, webpage hosting and subject matter expertise as required. Notwithstanding this support, the Panel acted independently of auDA throughout the review.

3. Overview of the Licensing Rules

The .au Licensing Rules were made by auDA, as administrator of the .au domain, through multi-stakeholder processes and in accordance with its obligations under the Terms of Endorsement. The current version commenced on 12 April 2021.

The .au Licensing Rules form part of the terms and conditions of the licence agreement between a registrant and registrar. Registrants and registrars must comply with them, and the .au Licensing Rules also set out relevant obligations relating to auDA's administration of the .au domain.

The objects of the .au Licensing Rules are to ensure a licensing system that:

- is transparent, responsive, accountable, accessible and efficient;
- improves the utility of the .au ccTLD for all Australians;
- promotes consumer protection, fair trading and competition;
- maintains the integrity, stability, utility and public confidence in the .au ccTLD;
- expresses licence terms and conditions objectively;
- provides clear, predictable and reliable complaint processes; and
- preserves the fundamental principles of No Proprietary Rights in a Domain Name, First Come, First Served, and No Hierarchy of Rights.

4. Review Methodology

4.1 How the Review was Conducted

The Panel used qualitative and quantitative sources to inform its review.

Qualitative data included public consultation outputs, written submissions and publicly available research on previous and current domain name registration practices. Consultation involved in-person and online engagement with stakeholders using workshops and semi-structured interviews. Further details are provided in Section 5.

Quantitative analysis drew on auDA's internal data regarding the performance of the .au ccTLD across namespaces, including com.au, .au direct and gov.au.

4.2 Data Sources

In addition to public consultation, the Panel considered:

- the Contested .au Direct Domain Names Applicants Feedback 2025 Summary Report;
- auDA's 2024–25 Annual Report;
- auDA's 2025–26 Quarterly Reports; and
- specific data requested from auDA to support the Panel's consideration of particular issues, including complaints data.

4.3 Consultation Feedback

A list of submissions is provided at **Appendix B**.

Further information about the consultation process, including an overview of the Panel's online and in-person consultations, is available on the Panel's webpage. The consultation events were supported by ThinkPlace, an external consultation design and facilitation business.

5. Consultation Findings

5.1 Summary of Feedback

5.1.1 Domain Name Monetisation

Submissions reflected mixed views on Domain Name Monetisation and whether it should be permitted, restricted or prohibited. Some stakeholders considered monetised sites to facilitate Domain Name Licence transfers for monetary gain rather than genuine commerce through that domain name.

Concerns were raised that the current rules undermined confidence and trust in the domain name system by concentrating the financial benefit of registration among a small number of sophisticated actors. This was also seen as locking small business owners out of a domain name that most closely reflected their activities unless they paid a potentially significant premium to facilitate a transfer.

Domain investors pointed to their investment in acquiring, holding and marketing Domain Name Licences and argued that changing the current .au Licensing Rules would undermine the certainty reasonably expected from their continuation.

5.1.2 Allocation Rules

Current allocation rules were seen by some stakeholders as complex and misaligned with the intent of linking use of a Domain Name Licence to the registrant's business. Support for strengthening the com.au allocation rules focused on preventing monetised or pay-per-click sites from being used to achieve allocation, with participants seeking simpler rules that would lift trust and confidence in the namespace. It is important to note that public feedback was valuable and provided roughly equal support of and opposition to the Panel majority's recommendation.

A majority of the Panel supported removing sub-clause (f) of Rule 2.4.4(2), which was viewed either as a legitimate source of flexibility or as a self-fulfilling loophole enabling monetisation. The majority considered it a less onerous allocation pathway than sub-clauses (a) to (e), which require verifiable documentation and a clearer connection between the registrant and the domain name.

The use of artificial intelligence has also lowered the barrier to establishing a pay-per-click or monetised website for the purpose of achieving allocation. The majority considered that greater reliance on sub-clauses (a) to (e) would provide a consumer protection uplift and better support integrity, transparency, trust and confidence in the com.au and net.au namespaces.

5.1.3 Contested Names

Some participants considered the current process unfair and capable of improvement, while others regarded it as well-established and saw no need for change.

Concerns were raised about government entities contesting .au direct names because of their relative economic power. Conversely, public sector parties may maintain a contested name to protect the public interest, particularly against scams involving names associated with government agencies, such as ato.au.

5.1.4 Fraud and Reserved Names

The Panel received calls both to remove the requirement to publish the Reserved Names list and to make the list more widely available. Both positions were underpinned by an acknowledgment that trust and confidence in the domain name system is enhanced by ensuring certain names are not available for registration, particularly given the role of AI technologies in online scams and the prevalence of bad actors.

5.1.5 Complaint Process

The consultation identified a lack of clarity about which parties have standing under the complaint mechanisms in the Rules. In particular, the description of a 'person affected by a decision' was seen to be applied inconsistently between auDA's internal review process and the external review path offered by the Licence Review Panel.

There was support for a clearer and broader definition that reflects auDA's current pro-consumer approach, rather than narrowing existing practice. Stakeholders also raised that Part 3 does not adequately cover complaints and reviews arising from auDA audit activity.

5.1.6 .au Domain Name Licence Lifecycle

There was strong support for aligning renewal, cooling-off, deletion and redemption periods with common international practice, including the .com lifecycle. No material objections to this reform were identified.

5.1.7 Other Matters Raised

Stakeholders also raised matters beyond the issues listed in the Terms of Reference, including protection of privacy on .au domains, prevention of internet-facilitated fraud, registrar communications, and the treatment of a com.au Domain Name Licence when a registrant retires. The Panel considered these matters sufficiently material to address in this report.

5.2 Areas of Consensus

Allocation rules, and to a lesser extent the contested .au direct process, were widely viewed as overly complex. Participants sought simpler rules that are easier to explain and understand, together with clear criteria, consistent processes, transparent market signals and timely decision-making.

There was also broad recognition that policy changes must be carefully designed to avoid legal risk, disruption and loss of confidence. Strong support was expressed for aligning the .au Domain Name Licence lifecycle with common international practice.

Stakeholders supported amending Part 3 to expressly cover complaints and reviews arising from auDA audit activity and clarifying the meaning of an 'affected person' so that the .au Licensing Rules reflect a clearer and more consistent pro-consumer approach.

On fraud and Reserved Names, stakeholders agreed that protections should be maintained to support trust and confidence in .au. On balance, there was greater support for removing the requirement to publish the Reserved Names list, a position also supported by the National Anti-Scam Centre (NASC).

5.3 Areas of Divergence

Views remained divided on whether Domain Name Monetisation should be permitted, restricted or prohibited. While there was broad agreement that transferring Domain Name Licences should not be prohibited, there was less consensus on rules that facilitate obtaining a licence primarily for resale.

There was also no clear consensus on the future allocation approach. Some participants considered the current rules sufficient, while others sought stricter or more flexible requirements. A recurring concern was that pay-per-click sites could undermine trust and confidence by acting as a potentially misleading veil for the underlying purpose of advertising a Domain Name Licence for resale.

Views also differed on resolving contested .au direct names. Some participants considered the current process unfair and capable of improvement, while others regarded it as well-embedded and cautioned against changes that could be disruptive.

5.4 Stakeholder Group Insights

Individual small businesses largely viewed monetisation as harmful to more ‘legitimate’ Domain Name Licensing and of limited community value. They generally supported reducing its scope through the allocation rules and strongly supported aligning the .au domain lifecycle with international practice. Equally there were many small businesses who supported monetisation and did not consider any issue with it.

Business representative groups and larger commercial stakeholders generally preferred fewer rules and less complexity.

Domain name registrars considered allocation rules and the contested .au direct process overly complex and insufficiently user-friendly. They supported simpler rules that are easier to explain and understand.

Community and consumer participants emphasised that reforms should not weaken the integrity of or trust in .au.

Government and regulators, including NASC, highlighted how scammers misuse Domain Name Licences and the DNS and supported stronger consideration of scam prevention.

Industry experts supported alignment of the Domain Name Licence lifecycle with international practice and identified a related issue concerning how registrars notify registrants that a domain name will be cancelled or is expiring.

6. Analysis of Issues

During public consultation, three issues attracted the highest levels of engagement: monetisation of com.au, net.au and .au direct domain names; allocation rules for com.au and net.au domain names; and the process for allocating contested .au direct domain names.

These remained the most discussed issues throughout consultation. The Panel allocated significant time to understanding, interrogating and reviewing them, and the following sections reflect that deeper consideration.

6.1 Monetisation of Domain Names

Current Practice

Under the .au Licensing Rules, Domain Name Monetisation means registering a Domain Name Licence for the sole purpose of selling, leasing or holding it to generate revenue. It includes warehousing and registering a licence solely for transfer to another person.

Rule 2.4.13 prohibits Domain Name Monetisation in all namespaces except com.au, net.au and .au direct. Examples include affiliate websites, pay-per-click websites and domain parking.

Submissions and Public Engagements

The Panel noted strong and diverging views on Domain Name Monetisation (monetisation) in the com.au and net.au namespaces. Some participants considered that investors benefit at the expense of businesses seeking a domain name closely connected to their activities.

Supporters argued that monetisation is a legitimate and established commercial activity, supports advertising and referral-based business models, and suggested that it contributes to a mature secondary market. Others supported retaining monetisation subject to stronger action against fraud, bad faith or registrations with no genuine commercial connection. Concerns were also raised about the consequences of removing monetisation entirely.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Panel

The Terms of Reference identify monetisation in com.au and net.au as an issue for review. Although monetisation is also permitted in .au direct, it was not raised as an issue during consultation. The Panel's consideration therefore focused on the com.au and net.au namespaces.

The Panel note that monetisation is of significant public interest and considered similar practices in other ccTLD and gTLD jurisdictions. Monetisation has existed since the early development of the internet and is common in namespaces including .com and many other ccTLDs. This secondary market includes expired domain names acquired by investors and licences offered for sale by existing registrants.

There is no definitive way to identify how many registrants hold domain names for monetisation. For this review, the Panel used holdings of more than 50 domain names by one person or entity as a proxy for potential investor holdings, while acknowledging that some registrants hold more than 50 names for reasons such as brand protection.

auDA data shows that 3,386 registrants hold more than 50 Domain Name Licences across com.au, net.au and .au direct, out of 1,702,174 registrants in those namespaces. Together, those registrants hold 582,895 domain names.

The secondary market provides financial benefits, including advertising revenue and increased commercial value, which flow primarily to the registrant of the monetised licence. While the Panel received feedback that monetisation benefits the Australian community, this was not supported by compelling data or evidence. On its face, monetisation appears to disproportionately benefit domain name investors and those able to purchase desirable names at a premium. Small business owners and their representatives also argued that investors were less entitled to a name than businesses seeking a close match for their commercial activities.

The Panel considered removing or restricting monetisation, as well as maintaining the status quo. The impact of prohibiting monetisation is difficult to measure, and there would be practical difficulties in unwinding a secondary market that is long established and consistent with international practice.

The Panel also noted that operating domain names to generate income is now a common business practice. Given the commercial nature of com.au, it was not convinced that a blanket prohibition on registering a Domain Name Licence for future transfer or income generation would be effective, and would effectively run contrary to an open market driven economy.

On balance, the Panel considers that the current approach should not be substantially changed. There is insufficient evidence that monetising a website inherently undermines trust and confidence in the com.au, net.au or .au direct namespaces.

RECOMMENDATION 1: No change to the current approach that allows domain monetisation in the com.au, net.au and .au direct namespace.

6.2 Allocation rules for com.au and net.au namespaces

Current Practice

To acquire a licence in the com.au and net.au namespaces, an applicant must be a commercial entity with an Australian presence and meet the allocation requirements in Rule 2.4.4 of the .au Licensing Rules.

Subparagraph (f) reads as follows:

(f) a Match or Synonym of the name of:

i. a Service that the Person provides;
ii. Goods that the Person sells (whether retail or wholesale);
iii. an event that the Person registers or sponsors;
iv. an activity that the Person facilitates, teaches or trains;
v. premises which the Person operates

This part of the .au Licensing Rules was previously known as the 'close and substantial connection' test which had been in place since the early days of the .com.au domain extension, it was consolidated into the licensing policies in about 2017. The deletion of this clause effectively limits a registrant to registering a domain name that matches its name, business name or trade mark.

These requirements establish the connection between the domain name and the registrant or its business, such as a match with a business name, trade mark, service, goods, event, activity or premises.

A registrant may meet the requirements by providing a service whose name matches or is a synonym of the domain name. As the definition of service includes providing information or referrals, many domain investors use a pay-per-click website to meet the allocation rules.

Submissions and Stakeholder Engagement Feedback

Submissions reflected diverse views. Domain registrars and investors generally supported retaining the current allocation criteria, or allowing any commercial entity with an Australian presence to register any available name in com.au and net.au.

In contrast, small and medium businesses and members of the public described subparagraph (f) of Rule 2.4.4(2) as either a source of flexibility or a self-fulfilling loophole enabling monetisation. They supported a stricter interpretation of the allocation rules and removal of subparagraph (f). Other stakeholders proposed a middle path: retain the broader allocation framework but prevent pay-per-click or monetised sites from using subparagraph (f) to establish allocation.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Panel

A majority of Panel members considered that the current allocation rules create two distinct pathways. Registrants relying on sub-paragraphs (a) to (e) must provide documentary evidence of a connection to the domain name, while those relying on subparagraph (f) can establish a referral service with minimal administrative barriers. This duality was seen as unfair to small businesses, sole traders, start-ups and entrepreneurs competing with investors able to register multiple names for resale or defensive purposes.

Although allocation rules are now uncommon among larger global ccTLDs, many submissions valued the trust and confidence they support in com.au and net.au. The Panel was not persuaded that removing the allocation rules altogether would benefit the Australian community, as this could increase speculation, raise the cost of desirable names and reduce confidence in the namespaces.

The consumer harm identified in submissions was most acute where monetisation was used to achieve allocation. Advances in artificial intelligence have also made it easier to create pay-per-click websites for this purpose. Unlike eligibility criteria that can be checked against government databases, compliance with allocation requirements relies on a registrant warranty, and feedback suggested those warranties are not always honoured.

The Panel considered whether stricter definitions or disclosure requirements for pay-per-click sites could address these concerns, but such measures would require substantial content-vetting and compliance resources. It also recognised that trading Domain Name Licences is consistent with a market economy and international practice, and that the principle of No Hierarchy of Rights prevents one category of applicant from receiving priority over another.

On balance, the majority considered that removing subparagraph (f) would place applicants on a more consistent allocation footing while retaining the objective and verifiable pathways in sub-paragraphs (a) to (e). Clearer and more transparent allocation rules would support trust and confidence in com.au and net.au for the benefit of the Australian community.

RECOMMENDATION 2: The Panel recommends deleting subparagraph (f) from section 2.4.4 (2) of the .au Licensing Rules. Note a Minority of the Panel did not support this recommendation and instead supported the retention of the status quo on the basis of its reasoning below.

Minority View

The Minority of the Panel being Erhan Karabardak and Niluka Welungoda (the **Minority**) opposed the recommendation of the majority. Anthony Peake abstained from voting on this recommendation however he has subsequently expressed support for the Minority view.

The Minority are deeply concerned at the recommendation to delete subparagraph (f) from section 2.4.4(2) and will cause significant negative consequences. Furthermore, this recommendation is at odds with not only international practice but also a departure from over 25 years of .au domain name policy.

Paragraph (f) of this section of the policy has been relied upon by Australian registrants including for instance:

- Schools registering a domain name for their annual fete;
- Charities registering a domain name for a fundraising campaign; and
- Sporting clubs registering a domain name for an oval, pitch or other venue;
- Businesses registering a domain name for a product or service they offer or a venue they operate.

This provision provided reasonableness and flexibility for registrants who did not fit within the business name and trade mark regime.

Submissions made to the Panel pointed out many good examples of domains that could no longer be held by registrants in the absence of a matching business name or trade mark; these include live.com.au operated by Microsoft for email purposes. The difficulty with many domains, particularly ones that are generic, is that registering a business name or trade mark is not possible due to the generic and descriptive nature of the word such as live, shoes or tyres.

The Minority make the following points:

1. The majority of the Panel has not provided any cogent evidence of any harm caused by the operation of subparagraph (f) which has essentially operated since the early days of the .com.au domain name space. In the absence of any harm there is no justification in disturbing the current policy;
2. Subparagraph (f) is not solely relied upon by speculative registrants. It also provides a legitimate allocation pathway for businesses and other organisations such as charities and schools that have a genuine connection to a domain name but may not neatly satisfy the remaining eligibility criteria. The deletion of subparagraph (f) will in the Minority's view cause significant disruption and cost not only for business but also schools and charities (potentially 1 million registrants)– during the Minority's research it was identified that Australians would face significant costs due to a change. According to one submission received by the Panel, being an estimate of around $30,000,000 increased annual cost to Australians. The Panel has not conducted is own costings. Furthermore, the change if implemented will require substantially increased manual eligibility assessments and compliance activity from registrars and auDA, with a corresponding increase in the number of eligibility disputes;
3. The recommendation does not address the impact on existing registrants who currently rely on subparagraph (f) to maintain their licence, nor whether any transition or grandfathering arrangements would apply;
4. The recommendation does not fully consider real world business scenarios. Businesses evolve over time, and subparagraph (f) provides flexibility where a registrant continues to have a legitimate connection to a domain despite changes to its business structure, branding or naming. Removing this may create unnecessary compliance issues for legitimate businesses without necessarily preventing abuse – for instance if a business

forgot to renew a business name then in the absence of subparagraph (f) it would be in breach of policy and risk losing the domain and potentially their business;

5. Evidence from submissions made to the Panel show that many investors and monetisation businesses who are Australian employers will be adversely affected by the proposed recommendation;
6. The Panel's recommendation to permit monetisation (which is the correct position) is inconsistent with the recommendation to delete subparagraph (f);
7. The proposed recommendation is not consistent with international domain name practice including New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Singapore and other OECD countries;
8. Deleting subparagraph (f) would not achieve its purpose: it simply relocates the cost. The Panel's own data shows domain investing is concentrated in a small, sophisticated group of 3,386 registrants who each hold more than 50 domains. For them, a matching business name, trust or entity is a trivial, one-off cost of doing business. The rule instead falls hardest on the far larger population of small businesses whose domain doesn't match their registered name. These registrants have no reason to be tracking domain policy, and many of them, in the Minority's experience, already struggle to keep pace with far simpler ongoing obligations such as maintaining an active ABN. That is not a contradiction: the same workaround that barely inconveniences a few thousand professionals is a genuine burden for a much larger group who don't know it exists;
9. No quantified assessment of the cost or impact of this recommendation on small businesses has been undertaken or published by the Panel, including the number of registrants who rely on subparagraph (f), the compliance cost of transitioning away from it, or the effect on registry and registrar revenue. A recommendation of this scale should not proceed without that evidence base first being gathered at a minimum;
10. **Having made the above observations, the Minority strongly opposes the Panel's recommendation to delete subparagraph (f) and instead supports option 1 being the maintenance of the status quo.**

6.3 Contested .au direct Domain Names

Current Practice

In September 2022, auDA launched the .au direct namespace. Existing registrants could apply for the .au direct name matching their third-level domain name. Where more than one eligible party applied for the same name, it became contested and remains unavailable until all but one applicant withdraws.

Priority applications must be renewed annually, including revalidation of the applicant's eligibility to hold the matching domain name. Approximately 3,000 .au direct names remain contested. The process is governed by the .au Domain Administration Rules: .au Direct Priority Implementation, which must be reviewed at regular intervals.

Contested Names Survey

In 2025, auDA surveyed contested-name holders. A summary report of the contested-name holder survey feedback is available on the Panel's webpage. The most supported options were allocation to the applicant with the earliest matching registration, continuation of the current process, and an auction between the contesting parties.

Submissions and Stakeholder Engagements

Stakeholders remained divided. Some supported allocation to the applicant with the earliest matching registration, while others argued this could favour investors or produce arbitrary outcomes because earlier policy releases affected when particular names became available.

Other proposals included mediation or time-limited negotiation followed by an objective allocation rule. Auctions attracted strong opposition because larger businesses and investors could outbid small businesses or individuals. A further group supported the status quo, allowing parties to negotiate without an imposed deadline.

Review and Recommendation by the Panel

The Panel acknowledged the strong views of parties unable to reach a mutual resolution. It considered international precedent, including InternetNZ's decision to end mediation and negotiation for conflicted names and maintain them as blocked until only one applicant remains.

The Australian system differs because priority applications are managed separately from the related domain names and applicants must continue to meet .au eligibility and allocation rules. Maintaining the current approach would therefore allow parties to continue negotiating rather than permanently blocking the names.

The Panel also considered the previous auDA Policy Review Panel's assessment of alternative methods, many of which were found to be unfair, impractical or otherwise unsuitable. It did not identify a sufficient case for changing the current process. Each party already holds a domain name and has paid to remain in the contest under clearly stated rules; changing those rules now could itself be unfair.

The Panel could not identify any class of applicant as more deserving than another, and giving preference on that basis could interfere with the principle of No Hierarchy of Rights. It therefore supports maintaining the current contested-name process.

RECOMMENDATION 3. The Panel recommends continuation of the current process for the contested .au direct name allocation process.

6.4 Fraudulent and bad faith registrations and Reserved Names

Current Practice

Under the .au Licensing Rules, auDA may prevent registration of a domain name by placing it on the Reserved Names list. The Rules require auDA to publish the list, but it is not currently published because doing so could provide bad actors with information about names commonly targeted for scams, fraud or copycat registrations.

Submissions and Stakeholder Engagements

Submissions supporting removal of the publication requirement argued that publishing the list may create risks to the operational security, integrity and utility of .au. Facilitated discussions produced more mixed views, reflecting a tension between operational security and transparency.

Stakeholders proposed maintaining transparency by publishing the criteria, decision-making process and timeframes for reserving names, together with aggregate information such as the number of Reserved Names, reversals and average time from detection to reservation.

Recommendation by the Panel

The Panel considered that submissions and consultation feedback support removing the requirement to publish the Reserved Names list. Instead, auDA should publish the criteria used to place domain names on the list and regularly release aggregate metrics about Reserved Names, reversals and processing times.

RECOMMENDATION 4.1. Remove the requirement under Rule 2.6.7 of the .au Licensing Rules for auDA to publish the reserved list.

RECOMMENDATION 4.2. auDA should publish the criteria based on which it decides to put a domain name in a reserved list, and release aggregate metrics, such as number of Reserved Names, number of reversals that are being or have been reviewed, and average time taken from detection to reservation over periods of time.

6.5 Complaints process for domain name audits

Current Practice

This section considers two issues relating to procedural fairness in the complaint handling process under Part 3 of the .au Licensing Rules: complaints arising from auDA audits, and who is a person affected by a decision for the purpose of internal and external review.

Complaint Process for Audits

Under Rule 2.16, auDA audits domain names to ensure compliance with the .au Licensing Rules and maintain the stability, integrity and reliability of the Domain Name System. Part 3 does not expressly provide for complaints arising from an auDA audit, although auDA accepts such complaints in practice and manages them through the existing complaint provisions.

Submissions and Stakeholder Engagements

Most submissions supported expressly including audit activity within the complaint process. Although this issue attracted less engagement than other matters, stakeholders emphasised procedural fairness, transparency and the importance of ensuring parties affected by auDA compliance activity have a clear avenue for complaint.

Recommendation by the Panel

The Panel supports auDA's existing practice of accepting complaints arising from audits. As audits are an integral part of auDA's compliance activities, formally including them in Part 3 would improve accountability and trust in the audit process, protect registrants' rights and support the effectiveness of the audit framework.

Therefore the Panel recommends that the complaints process in Part 3 of the .au Licensing Rules include audits performed by auDA.

Complaint Escalation and Standing

A person affected by an auDA decision may seek internal review under Rule 3.6.1 and external review by the Licence Review Panel under Rule 3.8.1. auDA has interpreted these provisions broadly, including where a third party seeking the disputed domain name has applied for review. In two Licence Review Panel decisions, the panellist questioned whether the applicant was affected by the decision but did not disturb auDA's acceptance of their standing.

Submissions and Stakeholder Engagements

Most submissions supported a broader and clearer test so that legitimate interested parties are not excluded. This was seen as supporting a pro-consumer approach and improving the integrity and transparency of decision-making. Other submissions cautioned that overly broad standing could create a secondary acquisition channel, delay decisions or increase the burden on the review system.

Recommendation by the Panel

The Panel considers that auDA's current broader interpretation of an affected person should be better reflected in the Rules. The test should allow a person to demonstrate an adequate interest in the domain name while maintaining an effective and proportionate review process.

The Panel also considered the 48-hour period under Rule 3.6.3 for applying for review of a decision to cancel a Domain Name Licence. It considered this period too short for many applicants and supports increasing it to seven days.

RECOMMENDATION 5.1. The Panel recommends that the complaints process in Part 3 of the .au Licensing Rules be amended to include audits performed by auDA.

RECOMMENDATION 5.2. The Panel recommends that the scope of the 'affected person' is broadened appropriate to Rules 3.6.1 and 3.8.1 of the .au Licensing Rules such that they can demonstrate an interest in the domain name adequately.

Recommendation 5.3. The Panel recommends increasing the time given to a person to file an application under Rule 3.6.3 of the .au Licensing Rules to 7 days from the current 48 hours.

6.6 Alignment of selected rules in .au with equivalent rules in generic top-level domains (gTLDs) (such as .com)

Current Practice

The .au Licensing Rules contain domain lifecycle processes that differ from those commonly used in generic top-level domains, including renewal, cooling-off, redemption and pending deletion periods. The table below sets out the four differences considered by the Panel.

.au lifecycle	gTLD Style Lifecycle	Explaining the issue and what is the impact
90 days renewal window (refer Rule 2.14.1).	No server Renew Prohibited hold	Currently, a registrant with a .au Domain Name Licence cannot renew their licence more than 90 days before renewal date, to help address the issue of unsolicited renewal notices being sent to registrants at any time of a domain name lifecycle. If the 90 days window is removed, the registrant could renew whenever they want, provided within the maximum period of the licence (that is, 5 years).
3 days cooling off period (added grace period) (refer Rules 1.4: Definitions and 2.15.4)	5 days cooling off period (added grace period)	Increase the cooling off period for domain name registration (the period in which a new domain name can be cancelled with no fee) from current 3 days to 5 days. Note that the registrar agreement (clause 18.2(f)) now limits the ability for registrars to receive refunds to 10% of the volume of

.au lifecycle	gTLD Style Lifecycle	Explaining the issue and what is the impact
		names registered during the month, which limits the ability of registrants to register high volumes of domain names to test for network traffic during the cooling off period.
Client Delete (3 days) and policy delete (14 days) redemption periods *	Standard Delete with 30 days redemption period	Currently there are different redemption periods that apply to a domain name that has been cancelled. Apply one consistent timeframe to all deletions. Registrant can redeem domain name in this period subject to meeting the .au licensing rules at the time of redemption.
1 day pending purge Hold Period (time between redemption period and purging) *	5 days Pending Delete Period	After redemption period ends, there is a one-day redemption hold period where ethe domain name is published in a drop list, before the name is purged from the registry. A 5-day period allows more time for the public to see what names will be purged from the registry on the daily drop list. This hold period only applies to expiring domain names, not deleted domain names.

The domain purge rules are not currently contained in the .au Licensing Rules. They were set out in the Domain Renewal, Expiry and Deletion Policy, which expired on 11 April 2026. The Panel considered that this information should be incorporated into the .au Licensing Rules.

Submissions and Stakeholder Engagements

Submissions supported aligning the four lifecycle rules with common international practice to improve registrant protection and reduce ambiguity. Small businesses and their representatives highlighted the disproportionate consequences of missed renewal notices, particularly for seasonal businesses and registrants that rely on third parties to manage their domain names.

Discussion and Recommendation by the Panel

The Panel considers that alignment would benefit registrars operating across Australian and international namespaces by reducing different business processes. Registrants would also benefit from longer and more consistent periods to renew, reconsider, recover or act on a Domain Name Licence.

Increasing the cooling-off, redemption and pending deletion periods supports consumer protection and responds to stakeholder concerns about losing domain names because of short or unfamiliar timeframes. The Panel also considers that the pending deletion phase should be expressly referenced and explained in the .au Licensing Rules.

The Panel therefore recommends amending the four lifecycle rules to align with common international practice.

RECOMMENDATION 6: The Panel recommends amending the following rules regarding the domain lifecycle:

a) **Remove the 90-days renewal window within Rule 2.14.1 of the .au Licensing Rules and allow registrant to renew domain licences anytime during the lifetime of the domain until the expiration of the licence;**

b) **Increase the cooling-off period from 3 days to 5 days in relation to Rule 2.15.4 of the .au Licensing Rules;**

c) **Amend the redemption periods and apply a consistent deletion period with 30 days redemption period (to standardise along the lines of international best practices); and**

d) **increase the pending/hold period from 1 day to 5 days (time between the redemption and purging of the domain name).**

6.7 Additional issues

During consultation, stakeholders raised several issues beyond the specific matters listed in the Terms of Reference. The Panel considered the following issues sufficiently material to address.

6.7.1 Including scams within the scope of the .au Licensing Rules

The Issue

NASC and other stakeholders highlighted the increasing misuse of domain names in scams, including expired names and Australian Business Numbers. They argued that deceptive sites may technically comply with the .au Licensing Rules and that faster, more proactive action is needed.

Current Position

The .au Licensing Rules prohibit use of a Domain Name Licence to facilitate illegal, unlawful or fraudulent conduct and allow auDA to suspend or cancel a licence in the public interest, including following a request from an enforcement or intelligence body.

Discussion and Recommendation

NASC proposed making scams a distinct prohibited use under the .au Licensing Rules, or expressly including them within the definition of DNS Abuse. The Panel accepts the seriousness of scam harm and the need for auDA to contribute to whole-of-system prevention. However, determining whether conduct is a scam may require assessment of content, evidence and law beyond a registry's technical role.

The Panel did not support expanding the internationally recognised definition of DNS Abuse, which is limited to predominantly technical threats such as botnets, malware, pharming, phishing and related spam. It considers that regulators, courts and enforcement bodies should remain responsible for determining scam conduct, while auDA continues to work with NASC to refine referral and response processes.

RECOMMENDATION 7: The Panel recommends that the current approach to scams under the .au Licensing Rules be retained, and further, auDA should work with NASC to continually refine the approach to dealing with scams in the .au and publish processing guidance, scam referrals and outcomes.

Acknowledging the fast-moving nature of scams particularly with the rapid development of AI technology, the Panel further recommends that this issue be included in the terms of reference for the next review of the .au Licensing Rules in three years' time.

6.7.2 Adequate communication to registrants regarding renewals or cancellation of domain name licenses

The Issue and Current Position

Stakeholders reported losing domain names after renewal or cancellation notices were missed, including where notices were sent only to a contractor or service provider. Although registrants must keep their contact details current and the Registrar Rules require notice before expiry, the Licensing Rules do not clearly state registrar notification obligations for expiry, suspension or cancellation.

Proposed Approach and Recommendation

The Panel considers that the source of these complaints should be addressed through clear obligations in the Licensing Rules. Registrars should use available account and registration contact details, provide multiple notices in plain language and, where appropriate, use more than one contact method. Registrants should also be regularly prompted to maintain accurate contact details.

RECOMMENDATION 8: The Panel recommends that the .au Licensing Rules should incorporate clear information about a registrar's obligation to contact a registrant in the case of suspension, cancellation or expiry of a domain name and there should be an uplift in the frequency and method of contact like sending multiple notices in plain language.

6.7.3 Exemption from eligibility rules to retain com.au after retirement

The Issue and Current Practice

Some long-term registrants who retire or cease trading wish to retain a com.au name as part of their digital identity or business history. However, the Licensing Rules require a registrant to continue meeting the eligibility criteria for the duration and renewal of the licence, including remaining a commercial entity.

Proposed Approach and Recommendation

The Panel recognises the value attached to a long-held domain name but also the trusted commercial purpose of com.au. The Panel must strike the balance between the needs of individual licensees and the objectives of the .au Licensing Rules which is to promote and protect the integrity, trust and confidence in the .au domain.

The Panel notes the unique role of the com.au (and net.au) namespaces within .au. Many of the Panel's conversations with stakeholders and the public have centred around the identity of com.au as a trusted commercial space in Australia, with specific reference to the rules that underpin that trust. In fact, multiple submissions suggested tightening the rules in the com.au namespace because of both its importance to commercial entities and a desire to avoid risk and improve cybersecurity within the namespace.

Rather than creating a non-commercial exception, it considers that auDA should use its compliance posture to help affected registrants transition to another namespace for which they remain eligible.

RECOMMENDATION 9: The Panel Recommends adoption of flexibility within the compliance posture to facilitate a registrant transition to another appropriate namespace once they have ended their commercial operations and they no longer meet the com.au eligibility. The Panel also recommends that auDA distributes advisory/educational documents on how registrants can approach transitions in simple language.

6.7.4 Improving privacy in the WHOIS database

Current Practice and Stakeholder Views

The public WHOIS service allows users to identify and contact a domain name registrant. Stakeholders expressed differing views between protecting personal information from misuse and ensuring sufficient transparency and accountability.

Recommendation by the Panel

The Panel considers that WHOIS must balance registrant privacy with the need to identify the entity responsible for a Domain Name Licence. Existing protections include suppression where information is also suppressed on the Australian Business Register.

The .au Domain Administration Rules: Registrar (Registrar Rules) section 2.8.1 states that registrars must inform a person applying for a Domain Name Licence of the option to use role-based descriptions for the registrant, administration and technical contact names. For example, rather than including the name of an individual, the registrant contact could be CEO, and the registrant contact email address could be ceo@forexample.com.au. While the personal details are not published, they are provided to the registrar and auDA, which makes them available, for example, for law enforcement activity.

The Panel considers that explaining this option in the Licensing Rules would help limit publication of personal information while preserving a means for the public and law enforcement to identify and contact the registrant.

Recommendation 10: The Panel recommends that the .au Licensing Rules be amended to include information, along the lines of section 2.8.1 of the Registrar Rules, about how registrants can use role-based descriptions in the WHOIS to limit publication of personal information.

7. Statement of Compliance with the Terms of Reference

The Panel has undertaken this review in accordance with the Terms of Reference, which require the Panel to undertake a review of the .au Licensing Rules to ensure they continue to provide the greatest benefit for the Australian community.

The Panel has had reference to:

1. The relevant principles and procedures set out in the auDA corporate policy Process for the Development and Review of auDA Published Policies (Policy Development Policy).
2. The importance of maintaining trust in the .au and confidence in its integrity, security and resilience.
3. Promotion of competition, fair trading and consumer protection to facilitate equitable access to .au domain names.
4. The role and responsibilities of auDA as articulated in the Terms of Endorsement and the Agreement with ICANN.

In accordance with the Policy Development Policy, which sets out the policy review process for a Policy Advisory Panel, the Panel has:

- Been appointed following a public expression of interest process
- Developed and published a stakeholder engagement plan
- Been guided by the eight principles of policy development
- Met regularly and published its meeting agenda and minutes on the Panel webpage
- Consulted widely with the Australian community, holding six online town hall events and six in person events
- Used consultations with the public and stakeholders to identify feasible options for achieving policy objectives
- Received written submissions via an online consultation process and published them on the Panel webpage
- Adopted a consensus approach to developing policy recommendations
- Drafted a report which sets out the draft recommendations of the Panel and the rationale for accepting or not accepting some stakeholder input.

The Panel provided opportunities to the public to comment on the Panel's draft report to the auDA Board.

APPENDIX A: Consultation

Key dates

- **September 2025** – auDA Board approval for the Panel to carry out the review under the Terms of Reference.
- **23 September 2025** – the Panel Chair attended the monthly online registrar briefing held by auDA.
- **24 September 2025** – lunchtime session open to the public at the Australian Internet Governance Forum in Adelaide.
- **14 November 2025** – presentation on the review at the auDA Registrar Summit.
- **24 November 2025** – Issues Paper released and public consultation commenced.
- **27 November 2025** – introductory public town hall webinar.
- **11 December 2025** – virtual town hall to explore some of the key issues identified as part of the Review to date.
- **29 January 2026** – information about review sent via email to extensive list of .au stakeholders, including auDA members, government, business, education, industry and community stakeholders.
- **25 February - 25 March 2026** – in-person consultation events in Canberra, Sydney, Brisbane and Melbourne

	• **2 -3 March 2026** – two online virtual town hall events • **31 March 2026 –** consultation on the issues paper closed. • **4 June 2026 –** public consultation on the draft report commenced. • **17-18 June 2026** – two virtual town hall events • **6 – 7 July 2026** – in-person consultation in Melbourne and Sydney • **10 July 2026** – consultation on the draft report closed.
	**Methodology** • Written submissions invited to inform the issues paper, respond to the issues paper, and in response to the preliminary recommendations report. • Public online sessions • In-person workshop events in four major centres • One-on-one meetings with key stakeholders
	**Number of participants** 127 attendees at our in-person consultation events in Canberra, Sydney, Brisbane and Melbourne (issues paper consultation) and Melbourne and Sydney (draft report consultation), including representatives from: o Registrars o Government o Employer and Small Business peak bodies o Consumer advocates o .auDA Members

	• 205 participants at our webinar and virtual town hall events in November and December 2025, and March and June 2026.
	**Submissions received** A total of 78 written submissions were received throughout the process. Submitters were given the option of not having their submissions published. In addition to the submissions listed below, six submissions were reviewed by the Panel and not published. Written submissions are listed at Appendix B and can be accessed via links to phase 1 and phase 2 consultations on the Panel's webpage.

APPENDIX B: List of submissions received

Submissions for publication received for the issues paper consultation (phase 1) – 32 submissions:

Author	Sector
3V Pty Limited	Small and medium business
Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Business association/representative
Anonymous 1	
Anonymous 2	
Anonymous 3	
Anonymous 4	
Anonymous 5	
Anonymous 6	
Anonymous 7	
Anonymous 8	

Author	**Sector**
Anonymous 9	
Anonymous 10	
Braidsdale	General Public
Conseek Pty Limited	Small and medium business
Container Homes Pty Limited	Small and medium business.
Cooper D'Andilly	General Public
Fleet Locksmiths	Small and medium business
Geoff	General Public
Heidi Richards	Legal sector
Ian Halson x 2	General Public
James Mills	General Public
John Papadimitriou	Small and medium business
Law Society of South Australia	Law Association

Author	**Sector**
Locksmith Nominees Pty Limited	Small and medium business
Master Locksmiths Association of Australasia	Trade association
Michael Parnell and others	General Public
National Anti-Scam Centre	Government sector
Nexus Polytech Pty Limited	Small and medium business
Sedrick	General Public
Steven de Vroom	General Public
Steven Haigh	General Public

Submissions for publication received for the draft report consultation (phase 2) – 40 submissions

Author	**Sector**
3V Pty Ltd	Small and medium business

Andrew Davies	General Public
Anonymous 1	
Anonymous 2	
Anonymous 3	
Master Locksmiths Association of Australia	Trade association
Bryan Chetcuti	General Public
Bryce Sheehan	General Public
Chris Protheroe	Domain investor
Cliff Bregman (Brandzilla)	Domain investor
Cooper D'Andilly	General Public
Damien Gardner	General Public
Daniel Underhill	General Public

Ed Groenscheij	Domain investor
Ed Keay-Smith	Domain investor
Education Services Australia	Government/registrar
Filipo Fascella	General Public
Grayson O'Connor	Small and medium business
Henry	General Public
Hunter Johnson	General Public
Ian Quick	Domain investor
Department of Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development, Communications, Sport and the Arts	Government
James Perkins (Clove Internet)	Domain registrar
Joel Roberts	General Public

Karl Williams	General Public
Mark Tull	Domain reseller
First Nations Digital Inclusion Advisory Group	Government
Nexus Polytech	Small and medium business
Nick Pratley	Domain investor
Robert Kaay	Domain investor
Roland Bleyer	Domain investor
Scott Nailon	General Public
ICA member	Domain investor
Shaun McGowan	General Public
Shaw Targeted SEO services	Domain investor
Synergy Wholesale Accreditations	Registrar

Synergy	Registrar
Steve White	Legal Sector
Tomislav Gajic	Domain investor
Internet Commerce Association	Internet Association