



Report to Policy Review Panel

Implementation of Direct Registration and

Reform of Existing Policies

Outcomes of Consultative Activity and Focus Groups

March 2019

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
Wider Engagement Activity	5
Domain Investor Focus Group Agreed Outcomes Statement	5
Registrar Focus Group Agreed Outcomes Statement.....	6
Corporates, Small Business, Government and Education Focus Group Agreed Outcomes Statement .	6
INTRODUCTION	7
METHODOLOGY	8
Stage 1: Planning and Preparation.....	8
Stage 2: Engagement Implementation	8
INDEPENDENCE OF THE PROCESS	9
DETAILED FINDINGS	10
IMPLEMENTATION OF DIRECT REGISTRATION	10
1. Priority Allocation Period	10
2. Conflict Resolution Process.....	10
3. Cut off Date	11
4. Contestable Levels	11
5. The Draft Policy.....	12
REFORM OF EXISTING POLICIES	14
6. Eligibility and Allocation: the Australian presence requirement	14
7. Resale and Warehousing.....	14
8. Close and Substantial Connection and Domain Monetisation	15
9. Grandfathering.....	16
10. Licence Transfer and Licence Suspensions and Cancellations	16
11. Prohibition on Misspellings and Reserved Names.....	16
APPENDIX	18
Stakeholder Engagement.....	18
Focus Group Participants	19
Focus Group Invitees	21

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Legend: **Support** **Reject** **No Consensus** **Further work or alternative policy**

Direct Registration	Domain Investors	Registrars	Business, Education & Govt
Priority Allocation Period to all second level in .au	Support	Support	Support
Priority Allocation Period of six months	Support	Support	Support
Conflict Resolution Process: Lock-down process	Support	Support	Support
Conflict Resolution Process: No harm from lock-down process	Support	Support	Support
Conflict Resolution Process: Lock-down period of 6-12 months	Support	Support	Support
Conflict Resolution Process Indefinite	Reject	Support	Support
Cut off Date: 4 February 2018	Support	No Consensus	Support
Contestable Level: Exclude fifth level*	Support	Reject	No Consensus
Contestable Level: Exclude fourth level not in .au registry*	Support	Reject	No Consensus
Draft Policy: Clear and understandable	Support	Support	Support
Draft Policy: Of benefit to you	Support	Support	No Consensus

Reform of Existing Policies	Domain Investors	Registrars	Bus, Education & Govt
Australian presence test	Support	Support	Support
Australian connection requirement	Support	Support	Support
Trademark registration or application match	Support	Support	Support
Strengthen resale & warehouse prohibition rule	Reject	Support	Support

Reform of Existing Policies	Domain Investors	Registrars	Bus, Education & Govt
Introduction of list of factors indicating a domain name has been registered primarily for warehousing or sale	Reject	Support	Support
Close & substantial connection rule	No Consensus	Support	Support
Replace Domain Monetisation test with narrower test	No Consensus	Support	Support
Domain Monetisation as close and substantial connection	No Consensus	Support	Support
Grandfather when licence is renewed, rather than immediately	Support	Support	Support
Alternative grandfathering method	Support	Reject	Reject
New licence holders to retain benefit of remaining licence at time of transfer	Support	Further work or alternative policy	Support
Clarify definition of law enforcement agency	Support	Support	Support
Introduce suspension	Support	Support	Support
Suspension capped at one month	Support	Support	Support
Misspelling list retained	Support	Support	Support
Details of misspelling list published	Support	Support	Support
Processes for prohibited misspellings list	Support	Support	Support
Publish reserved names list	Support	Support	Support
Reserved names list expanded	Support	Support	Support
Agency to inform auDA	Support	Support	Support

Legend: **Support** **Reject** **No Consensus** **Further work or alternative policy**

Wider Engagement Activity

While larger corporates, their peak bodies and small business peak bodies supported direct registration when presented with the material, there was no prior awareness of the proposal.

These groups recognised and understood the benefits as helping to build on Australia's competitive strengths and developing world leading digital businesses engaging globally through a "brand Australia" prism.

We note in particular the advice of the Business Council of Australia in its submission to the Federal Government's National Digital Economy Strategy Consultation in which it advises that "digital innovation is essential to future economic growth and national competitiveness. Public debate on these issues should continue despite trepidation in the community around fundamental change. Collaboration between government and business is the key to managing the risks. Attempting to hold back technological progress only denies consumers the benefits of digital innovation".

This view is echoed by CEDA in their submission to the Federal Government titled "Connecting people to progress: securing future economic development".

As a corollary to this, Squad Consulting has received 200 surveys from an International Women's Day Breakfast held in Geelong this month which showed overwhelming support for Direct Registration.

Significantly Squad Consulting was able to secure commitments from large corporates and peak industry bodies involved in the one-on-ones along with Focus Group participants in October and again in February of their willingness to collaborate and maintain ongoing involvement in the event of the Board agreeing to a wider public consultation phase.

Domain Investor Focus Group Agreed Outcomes Statement

Domain Investors agreed that during the Priority Allocation Period for Direct Registration, first rights must go to .com.au domain holders. The Priority Allocation Period should be for at least six months. Once .com.au domain holders have been exhausted, there should be a rolling priority period for other domain name space holders.

The introduction of Direct Registration must be accompanied by an extensive media and communications campaign.

The group agreed to a Conflict Resolution Process for a defined period of up to 12 months (six months at the earliest) and if there is no agreement, that should trigger an arbitration process.

On the subject of eligibility and allocation, Domain Investors believe that the Australian presence requirement was not sufficient. They argued that a registrant identifier needed to be included such as an ABN/ACN.

They do not support resale and warehousing provisions being tightened because that diminished the re-sale value of domain names on the secondary market. Domain Investors argued that it's vital to protect the commercial viability and commercial focus of the Australian domain space.

Domain Investors also did not support the changes to monetisation (even once they were explained) however they did support the notion of no time limits to the grandfathering provisions.

Their strong recommendation was that eligibility for registration in .au should be set a high benchmark. Domain Investors concurred that .au has the potential to become a preeminent space, second only to .com.au and therefore trust in the space is a critical issue.

Registrar Focus Group Agreed Outcomes Statement

Registrars supported the Policy Review Panel's recommendations around the priority allocation period being six months. They recommended that there should be a way to revoke the registration of domain names.

Registrars agreed that a communications and media campaign to sit alongside the introduction of Direct Registration was critical.

They agreed to an indefinite lock down period as part of the conflict resolution process and a process for review within a few years. They also supported a cut off date for priority allocation albeit there was no agreement as to when the cut off date should be.

The group agreed that there needs to be an exceptional circumstances caveat to protect historic domain names and recommended that there needs to be a mechanism to deal with predatory behaviours and domain squatting efficiently and effectively.

On the matter of contestable levels Registrars recommended that if there is a conflict, they should go through the same process as everyone else.

In terms of the reform of existing policies, Registrars agreed with the recommendations of the Policy Review Panel albeit there was some discussion about how the Australian presence test could be validated. They agreed with the policy review panel around the need to strengthen resale provisions and recommended further strengthening trademark and intellectual property provisions.

Registrars agreed that the warehousing rules were problematic and given the links to monetisation, it would be best if these policy changes were implemented after the introduction of Direct Registration.

Registrars had no comment on grandfathering provisions or close and substantial connection. They noted that licence conditions and transfers recommendations would require a software change. They agreed with the Panel's recommendations on licence suspensions and cancellations.

Corporates, Small Business, Government and Education Focus Group Agreed Outcomes Statement

The Focus Group agreed to almost all the recommendations contained in the Policy Review Panel's public consultation paper.

The group recommended that consideration should be given to a dispute resolution mechanism to deal with bad faith or improper use of tokens for resolving conflicts between multiple parties with matching names at the third level (e.g. example.com.au and example.net.au) that wish to register at the second level (e.g. example.au).

They were supportive of contestable levels (with the exception of the education sector who have provided a written submission to elaborate on their concerns). They were also keen to understand the implications of extending the Reserved Names List to State and Territory levels.

The group was evenly split on the benefits or otherwise of Direct Registration with legal counsel reiterating concern voiced in a previous focus group in October around brand protection.

INTRODUCTION

In December 2018, auDA engaged 3 Tiers Advisory (3TA) in partnership with Squad Consulting to deliver extensive and rigorous stakeholder and community engagement services.

The imperatives of this phase of Stakeholder Engagement were as follows:

- implement the Communications and Advocacy Strategy as agreed to by the Board as it relates to Direct Registration and Reform of Existing Policies including a narrative explaining the rationale for direct registration and the suite of policies that sit alongside it;
- engage and contract manage a financial/economic impact assessment inclusive of a decision matrix;
- work with relevant parties to obtain data and any other information required for the economic impact assessment;
- commission customer sentiment research on behalf of the Policy Review Panel;
- complete a stakeholder engagement matrix;
- commence a targeted engagement phase allowing road testing and refinement of key materials;
- convene broad based focus groups prior to the Board meeting scheduled for March 2019; and
- prepare a final report on the above for the Board's consideration in March 2019.

This report relates to the stakeholder engagement undertaken primarily by Squad Consulting and the conclusions of the Focus Group discussions which were facilitated by Phil Martin from 3 Tiers Advisory.

Direct Registration of domain names at the second level to all Australians, if implemented, will impact the community on many levels, from professional Domain Investors to those who own a small business and beyond.

Consequently, the Policy Review Panel (PRP) and auDA require real and meaningful feedback from the Australian community to ensure the proposed implementation model for Direct Registration and related reform of existing policies, should it proceed, is fair, positively received and any unintended consequences are understood and preferably ameliorated.

METHODOLOGY

Squad Consulting in association with 3 Tiers Advisory approached the facilitation of the stakeholder and engagement work as follows:

Stage 1: Planning and Preparation

Inception meeting: met with key auDA and PRP personnel to deep dive into the current context, confirm the tasks, discuss resource/delivery requirements/timelines and any parameters for the development of the engagement plan.

A key component of this time was dedicated to understanding key stakeholders, focus group participants and their current positions.

Relevant background materials were provided to ensure incorporation into the engagement planning phase.

Background desktop review: Reviewed existing background documents and desktop analysis of relevant information relating to the overall project.

Documentation was prepared to ensure the information was presented in a way that was easily digested by the focus groups.

Co-designed and prepared the focus group plan: Squad Consulting worked with key personnel and stakeholders to codesign the focus group plan. This included speaking individually with some stakeholders prior to the workshops commencing to gain an understanding of the issues from their perspective and to ensure alignment of the engagement process with the needs of the group.

Squad Consulting prepared material that articulated the key engagement questions, the negotiables and non-negotiables, identified categories of people to be engaged and what, where and how engagement takes place (the key engagement activities).

Stage 2: Engagement Implementation

Squad Consulting undertook a parallel stakeholder engagement activity in conjunction with the Focus Groups.

Three focus groups were established with key participants identified in the inception meeting and throughout the planning.

The focus groups were:

- Domain Investors
- Registrars
- Corporates, small business, government and education sector.

A full list of participants and invitees is included in the Appendix.

It should be noted that all participants listed received the Policy Review Panel's Information Paper and Public Consultation Paper.

Importantly in this phase Squad Consulting set the focus group expectations in pre-reading/pre-work to ensure participants had a clear understanding of how the day will progress and the inputs required.

Squad Consulting and 3 Tiers Advisory worked with the focus groups to ensure everyone had clarity about the level of influence that the group held in taking part in this process and everyone fully understood what is negotiable and not negotiable (what is in and out of scope).

Each focus group allowed for careful consideration of the issues: an in-depth conversation where the pros and cons of a range of options were discussed and the group worked towards agreed recommendations.

3 Tiers Advisory facilitated workshops in a way that allowed building of cooperative working relationships between stakeholders and identified elements they can agree on or at least 'live with'. Consensus for the purpose of the workshops was defined as 75 per cent of participants agree.

It was clearly articulated to each group that while it may be difficult to reach agreement on some of the issues, the aim was to arrive at a position that most participants could 'live with.'

INDEPENDENCE OF THE PROCESS

3 Tiers Advisory stated upfront to each Focus Group that the facilitator's role was not to convince or argue for a particular point of view. Rather this process was based around the independence of the facilitator.

This was crucial to the success of the focus groups.

Squad Consulting take this opportunity to thank the PRP for their support during this project. Particular gratitude goes to the Chair, John Swinson. We acknowledge and thank Ian Halson for his support during the Domain Investors Focus Group and Dr Bruce Tonkin for his technical counsel in all Focus Groups.

DETAILED FINDINGS:

IMPLEMENTATION OF DIRECT REGISTRATION

1. Priority Allocation Period

Participants across the focus groups concurred with the recommendations in the Public Consultation Paper that a priority allocation period of six months was appropriate.

Every participant across Focus Groups also spoke in favour of a significant marketing, PR and media campaign to educate the broader community about Direct Registration. It was generally agreed that the campaign would need to be segmented for particular audiences. By way of example, Registrars noted that they would require their own communications campaign for their client base.

The Domain Investor Focus Group was made up from a more diverse base to the previous focus group held in October 2018. Nonetheless, they held similar views to the previous group regarding this issue with a strong view that domain name holders in the .com.au space must be given preference and have first rights in the .au space, echoing the sentiment that .com.au is king.

The proposal from the Domain Investor Group was essentially a series of priority allocation periods commencing with .com.au allowed to register in the .au domain space first followed by .net.au and so on.

As a corollary to this, the Corporate and Registrar Focus Group supported the notion of protections for brand and trademark owners. One participant summed up the issue as follows:

‘With .nz a number of Registrants who had trademark claims dropped the ball and what happened post that was that they were registered by squatters. So, provided that in that instance there’s a way to revoke a domain name then six months is probably okay.’

2. Conflict Resolution Process

There was agreement across the Focus Groups that the conflict resolution process, as articulated in the Implementation Plan, is fair and understood. The Registrars and Business Focus Groups agreed to the concept of an indefinite lock down but that it should include a periodic check, conducted by auDA, to ensure a token holder remains interested in registering a name corresponding to the token in .au.

The Domain Investor Group supported the notion of a lockdown but that it should be limited to a period of 6-12 months after which there should be a mechanism that triggers a process allowing for a check of the token holders’ ongoing interest in registering a name corresponding to the token in .au and an arbitration/resolution method seeking to resolve the rights of a potential registrant to the token. Failure to resolve the rights to a token would result in a further extension of the lockdown.

3. Cut off Date

Participants across Focus Groups agreed to the concept of a cut off date. There was no agreement however between (or within some) groups on what that date should be.

Registrars agreed that a cut off date is required but they did not concur as a group on what that date should be. The Business Focus Group agreed to the recommendations in the Implementation Plan i.e. 4 February 2018 as the cut off date. The Domain Investor Group, on the other hand, supported the notion of a cut off date closer to the launch date.

The view of the Domain Investor Group was consistently around the need to protect .com.au with a participant summing up the view of the group as follows:

“I overwhelmingly agree that .com.au is clearly the most popular and recognised current level. But that is not the case now because of the cut off date because it causes a conflict. It means you are favouring the time period over the prevalence and strength of .com.au”

Another participant suggested that if .com.au is carved out anyway then it’s possible to keep the 4 February cut off date for the other domain name spaces recognising again that .com.au is the higher benchmark.

A participant from the Registrar Focus Group put a different slant on the issue by explaining that there has been a push over the last few years within Government to minimise the number of Government websites. A cut off date will cause them difficulty and potential disadvantage as they would have taken steps earlier to register and protect some ‘key words’ associated with Government websites. Another participant from this group recommended that there needs to be an exceptional circumstances caveat that protects historic domain names.

The Business Focus Group, however, referred to this exact issue in explaining the need for a cut off date as being 4 February 2018 and therefore agreeing with the recommendation of the Policy Review Panel. A participant from a large corporate noted:

“We would be concerned if it is pushed out any further because we have seen activity in some of our primary domain names where we have seen a few instances of registration activity. So, we definitely don’t want it to go beyond 4 February 2018.”

4. Contestable Levels

The Focus Groups supported the recommendations contained in the Implementation Plan particularly as it relates to the fifth level.

However, the education sector noted that 75 per cent of their domain space are registrations at the fifth level.

Education Services Australia, in their written submission, recommend that domains registered at the fifth level should not be excluded from the Priority Allocation process and the policy pretexts which underpin it on the grounds that excluding them is contrary to the principle of no hierarchy of rights in the .au space.

“It remains unclear to us why fifth level domain names are being excluded and we believe all domain licences stored in the central.au registry should be eligible to participate in the priority allocation period in the interests of treating all Registrars fairly.”

Education Services Australia argue that government departments should be given the opportunity to register in the central register. They contend that it is only legacy and historic issues which have precluded this to this point given that no one foresaw the introduction of direct registration.

It should be noted that Squad Consulting received a request from the Tasmanian Government’s Department of Premier and Cabinet to provide a late submission. We shall endeavour to incorporate any comments in our presentation to the auDA Board meeting on 18 March 2019.

5. The Draft Policy

The wording of the Draft Implementation Plan and associated policy was understood by Focus Group participants.

A participant representing a large corporate has recommended inclusion at 9.9 in the Policy to address bad faith or improper use of the tokens suggesting the inclusion of a mechanism that stops misuse of tokens.

It is our observation that this round of consultation was not as emotionally charged as the previous round. That sentiment is true across all groups.

One of the participants noted:

“Corporate Australia is interested in .au. but they won’t change their presence in favour of .au. they will just register it defensively.”

This view is consistent with the one-on-one meetings held by Squad Consulting. While larger corporates, their peak bodies and small business peak bodies supported direct registration when presented with the material, there was no prior awareness of the proposal.

These groups recognised and understood the benefits as helping to build on Australia’s competitive strengths and developing world leading digital businesses engaging globally through a “brand Australia” prism.

We note in particular the advice of the Business Council of Australia in its submission to the Federal Government's National Digital Economy Strategy Consultation in which it advises:

“Digital innovation is essential to future economic growth and national competitiveness. Public debate on these issues should continue despite trepidation in the community around fundamental change.

Collaboration between government and business is the key to managing the risks. Attempting to hold back technological progress only denies consumers the benefits of digital innovation”.

This view is echoed by CEDA in their submission to the Federal Government titled “Connecting people to progress: securing future economic development”.

Significantly Squad Consulting was able to secure commitments from large corporates and peak industry bodies involved in the one-on-ones along with Focus Group participants in October and again in February of their willingness to collaborate and maintain ongoing involvement in the event of the Board agreeing to a wider public consultation phase.

REFORM OF EXISTING POLICIES

6. Eligibility and Allocation: the Australian presence requirement

It should be noted that previous Focus Groups have called on the Policy Review Panel to release a suite of policies particularly around close and substantial connection and monetisation in order for participants to form a view around Direct Registration.

Focus Group participants were uneasy about the recommendation for an Australian presence test. Participants felt that it was not sufficient for the Australian presence requirement test to sit only at the individual level, rather it needed to include some level of registrant verification such as currently done within .com.au.

The following quote from participants explains the positions across the Focus Groups.

“There needs to be an entity registered in Australia – organisation, company. I don’t think an everyday student should be able to go out and register a domain with no entity behind it.” - Domain Investor.

The Business Focus Group recommended that the paper needs to clearly articulate that the Australian presence requirement is not replacing the current rules for registrant validation as this would minimise confusion in the wider community.

7. Resale and Warehousing

The Registrar and Business Focus Groups’ views on this issue were similar but diametrically opposed to Domain Investors.

Registrars argued that the rules should be strengthened particularly around trademark and IP. This view was shared by the Business Focus Group.

Support for the warehousing provisions however was soft across these groups. In part that was due to concern about how the warehousing rules would be implemented given the subjective nature of the judgement. Focus group participants recommended that there needs to be some metrics built around this given the difficulty inherent in trying to establish intent.

One participant explained:

“What does warehousing mean? In theory all of my customers who have domain names for defensive purposes, you can point the warehousing finger at them because they are not using them. And they are doing it to simply defend. So, what is the measure for when it is applied and how will someone take recourse against it.”

The Domain Investor Group was strident in their opposition to these reforms. The group submitted that this whole section should be removed.

“Resale and warehousing provisions should be removed entirely. For decades now the system has facilitated, whether through intention or not, commercial trade of domain names and has created a market of secondary trade and it has been easy to comply with the rules through the loose meeting of requirements.”

A similar argument was raised in a written submission by a Domain Investor who argued that the current rules and their administration have not deterred warehousing and resale.

The submitter argued as follows:

“Premium aftermarket sales of generic Australian domain names held by Domain Investors have been highly beneficial to the ‘trust’ and ‘value’ of the Australian ccTLD domain name system. In fact some of our aftermarket sales have been recognised around the world. In other words, the Australian domain name system is working fine with the current rules in this regard.”

8. Close and Substantial Connection and Domain Monetisation

Registrars and Business Focus Group participants supported the Panel’s recommended changes to close and substantial connection rules. However, it was also felt generally that specific change to Domain Monetisation and the ongoing relevance of the close and substantial connection rule is not explained well in the paper.

Domain Investors supported the intent of the Panel’s recommendations as they relate to Domain Monetisation but argued that further work needs to be done by the Panel to ensure the viability of existing commercial enterprises.

Squad Consulting received written submissions from Domain Investors who opposed the Domain Monetisation and Close and Substantial Connection recommendations contained in the Policy Review Panel paper.

The argument put simply was as follows:

“Domain Investors and entrepreneurs and businesses up until this point have obeyed the rules. The rules cannot simply be pulled out from under them that have existed since 2006 and 2012 without compensation. That would be unjust and unfair...”

9. Grandfathering

Domain Investors recommended that grandfathering provisions should be implemented with provisions being left in place forever.

The argument can be summarised as follows:

“Grandfather forever. It is difficult to change the rules. If you’ve allowed people to invest on the basis that they are adhering to the rules then you change the rules, so they lose out, well then we end up in the same situation as Victorian taxi licences and Uber.”

Conversely Registrars and the Business Focus Groups were supportive of the grandfathering provisions as articulated by the Policy Review Panel.

10. Licence Transfer and Licence Suspensions and Cancellations

The Business and Domain Investor Focus groups were supportive of the recommendations in the Policy Review Panel’s paper regarding these elements. Domain Investors strongly supported the concept of licence suspensions and contended that one month may not be sufficient to rectify issues. The Business Focus Group recommended that auDA should be the body to decide whether suspension or cancellation of a licence is appropriate based on the severity and complexity of the complaint.

The Registrar Group were supportive of the recommendations regarding licence cancellation but were unable to reach agreement as a group on Licence Transfers. It was noted that the recommendations contained in the paper would require a software change in order to be implemented. It was also noted that while transferring the balance of a licence fee is not a ‘deal breaker’ for Registrars, it would be very popular from a customer perspective.

11. Prohibition on Misspellings and Reserved Names

Focus group participants were supportive retaining and strengthening the monitoring processes around misspellings.

Similarly, there was universal agreement around publication of the Reserved Names List.

Groups agreed that State and Territory Governments should be responsible for providing advice about reserved names to auDA.

The Australian Government’s Digital Transformation Agency (DTA) recommended that the misspelling policy needs to be tightened to prevent the use of suffixes within domain names e.g. atogov.au or monashedu.au.

On the subject of the Reserved Names List, Education Services Australia submit that the Reserved List should be expanded to include generic education and training terms. The concern is that the education sector could be targeted by rogue providers seeking to appear authoritative for example sciencetraining.au or training.au. Education Services Australia recommend to auDA that there needs

to be robust policy documentation and strong enforcement mechanisms in place to avoid undermining the edu.au domain.

Several participants across Focus Groups recommended that the Panel reconsider the use of the public interest test in the Reserved List on the basis that the test is an effective mechanism to protect terms that may not be protected under legislation. The example of primeminister.au was cited in this context.

APPENDIX

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Telstra – Corporate Affairs
- City of Melbourne - Chief Information Officer
- City of Melbourne - Head of Marketing
- Australian Hotels Association of Victoria, CEO
- Business Council of Australia – Head of Policy
- Victorian Chamber of Commerce – Head of Policy
- Medibank – Media and Marketing
- Jetstar – Media Manager
- Fergusson Plaire – Owner
- Salvation Army

Focus Group Participants:

Domain Investors:

- Anthony Wymond - Founder, Ignite Online
- Greg Roebuck - Founder, carsales.com.au
- Andrew Ranger – Founder, Skymorials
- Ian Halson - Lemonstone
- Luke Smorgon - Transpire

Registrars:

- Kris Cutmore – Education Services Australia
- John Kane - Afilias
- Luke Richards – Mark Monitor/Clarivate
- Greta Adamo- Afilias Australia
- Patrick Donaldson – Afilias Australia
- Chris Erett – Australian Government’s Digital Transformation Agency
- Cameron Muir - Hostopia
- Sara Bockey – GoDaddy
- Tommy Ho – GoDaddy
- Nikki Scholes – NetFleet

Large Corporates, Small Business, Government, Education:

- Jess McKinnon - RACQ
- Samantha Krajina – Dialog Information Technology
- Rachel Elliott – Education Services Australia
- Tim Guy – Legal Counsel, Realestate.com.au
- Jason Whitely – Department of Premier and Cabinet
- Mark Costello
- Leanne Towerzey – Griffith University

Written Submissions:

- Vinesh Chora, Domain Investor
- Robert Kaay, Domain Investor
- Ned O'Meara, Domain Investor and former Demand Class Director, auDA
- Scott Long, formerly Constitutional Reform Committee, auDA
- Louise Sandberg, CEO Broker.com.au
- Robert Ardill
- Alan Gladman
- Robert Jak, Department of Premier and Cabinet, Tasmania
- Mark Andrews, DNS software engineer, Internet Systems Consortium
- Education Services Australia
- Paddy O'Sullivan, CEO Australian Hotels Association Victoria
- Sanjay Parekh, SEO specialist Open Universities
- Mark Andrews

Focus Group Invitees:

(Public Consultation and Policy Paper provided to the following people)

Domain Investor

- Jeff Marr (formerly OMG, Boomerang & BookMaker.com.au)
- Greg Brown Acheeva Business Solutions
- Robert Kaay, Domain Investor and blogger
- Sam Herszberg, Domain Investor
- Bobby Khanna Domain Manager, Digital Marketing Consultant
- Chris Norris, Domain Boutique
- Ian Halson, Policy Review Panel and Domain Investor
- Ed Keay-Smith, Owner and Founder Online Impact
- Dr Brian Ballsun – Stanton, Solutions Architect, Macquarie University
- Greg Roebuck, Founder, Carsales
- Anthony Wymond, Founder and Creative Director, Ignite Online
- Michael Norris, Newsandsport
- Andrew Ranger, Founder and Managing Director Skymorials
- Luke Smorgon, CEO Transpire.

Registrars

- Sara Bockey, GoDaddy
- Tommy Ho, GoDaddy
- Patrick Donaldson, Afilias Australia
- John Kane, Afilias
- Chris Erett, Australian Government's Digital Transformation Agency
- Cameron Muir, Hostopia
- Nikki Scholes, Operations Manager NetFleet
- Luke Richards, Clarivate
- Jenny McCloy, Education Services Australia
- Kris Cutmore, Education Services Australia
- Brett Fenton, ARQ Group
- Gavin Gibson, Dreamscape Networks
- Daniel Foenander, Chief Customer Officer, VentralP Australia
- Angelo Giuffrida, CEO, VentralP Australia
- David Warmuz, Trellian

- Liz Sonenberg, University of Melbourne
- Johnathan Horne, CEO, Terrific.com.au Pty Ltd
- Amin Manzoori, Head of New Business APAC, Corporation Service Company (Aust) Pty Ltd
- David Shaw, International Domain Registrations Manager, Safe Names
- James Braunegg, Managing Director, Micron 21
- Keith Fenwick, Operations Manager, Rebel
- Kevin Clark iiNet
- Louise Lentino, Operations Manager Instra
- Marco Hoffman, Head of Domain Services InterNetX
- Prudence Malinki, Domain Name Specialist, Mark Monitor
- Robert Rolls, Head of Online Business Domain Central Australia Pty Ltd
- Saurabh Pande, Head of Abuse Mitigation and Compliance, Public Domain Registry Pty Ltd
- Simone Theboom, Product Management, Tucows (Australia) Pty Ltd trading as OpenSRS
- John Whittle, Monash
- Colin Fairweather, Chief Information Officer, City of Melbourne
- Jo Whyte, Marketing Manager, City of Melbourne

Corporate, Small Business, Government, Education

- Tully Smith, Corporate Affairs, Telstra
- Tim Guy, Legal Counsel, Realestate.com.au (REA Group)
- Phil Mahoney, Media Manager, Realestate.com.au (REA Group)
- Kellie Cordner, Chief Marketing Officer, carsales.com.au
- Sarah McCartney, Corporate Communications Manager, SEEK
- Naomi Dawson, Senior Legal Counsel, PEXA
- Robert Coorey, Corporate Relations, Archistar
- Carly Richardson, Senior Corporate Counsel, Ladbrokes.
- Wayne Baskin, Deputy CEO, Booktopia
- Simon Page, CIP, JB Hi-Fi
- Faye Ilhan, Dan Murphy's
- Brett Proposch, GM IT, Officeworks
- Gavin Stroud, Commercial Manager, Australia Post
- Tom Whelan, Woolworths
- Mark Drasutis, IAG Insurance
- Kevin Millroy, Chief Technical Officer, Vodafone
- Vishy Narayanan, Partner Chief Digital Officer, PWC

- Michael Laxton, Chief Marketing Officer, Fairfax
- Jessica McKinnon, Legal Counsel, RACQ
- John Simeone, Head of Business and Government Sales, QANTAS
- Steve Conolly, VP IT Solutions and Services, Siemens
- Julian Delany, Managing Director NEWS DNA
- Mia Greeves, External Affairs Manager, Medibank
- Tim Blizzard, Architecture and Compliance Manager, MEGT Australia
- Ross Gerring, Director Business Development, Itomic
- Samantha Krajina, Senior Consultant, Dialog
- Emma Jane McCarrrol, Education Services Australia
- Rachel Elliott, Education Services Australia
- Greg Hardiman, Business Manager, Independent Schools
- Tony Attridge, the College of Health and Fitness
- Nick Evans, IT Manager, Murdoch Children's Research Institute
- Fiona Hollier, CEO Resolution Institute
- Louise Howard, Director IT, Griffith University
- James Gauci, Director ICT, St Mary's College
- Liz Hoffman, CEO, Wesnet.com.au
- Peter Moran, Principal, Peer Legal
- Michael Peters, Research Fellow, Sydney School of Business
- Michael Hoblos, Head of Academic and Compliance, Pivotal
- Dane Marcus, IT Operations Manager, Ascham School
- Sally Foreman, Senior Trademark Counsel, Davies Collison Cave
- Paul Bellinger, Director, Real Estate Home Loans
- Marty Drill, Luminary.com
- Peter Tonoli, Electronic Frontiers Australia
- Steve de Mamiel, the Mongrel Method
- Jane Drake-Brockman, Australian Services Roundtable
- Lyndsey Jackson, Internet Australia
- Professor Jon Whittle, Dean Faculty of Information Technology, Monash University.
- Professor Liz Sonenberg, Pro Vice Chancellor Digital Data, University of Melbourne
- William Confalonieri, Chief Digital Officer, Deakin
- Mark Stone, CEO, Victorian Chamber of Commerce and Industry
- Matthew Kandelaars, Property Council of Australia

- Virginia Birrell, Australian China Business Council
- Simon Pryor, Business Council of Australia
- Paddy O'Sullivan, CEO, Australian Hotels Association Victoria
- Steve Plarre, CEO Ferguson Plarre
- Michelle Lopes, Tourism Manager, Tennis Australia