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# How to use this submission template

### Instructions

This template contains a full summary of the questions in the Options Report. You may wish to respond to one, many, or all of them.

For ease of navigation we have included the headings and options from the full Report. A plain text summary of questions without the table formatting is attached on page 26.

You are welcome to use the template, or make a submission through other means.

We are interested in any views you have. If you are able to support your views with evidence, we are keen to see this too. This might include facts, figures, research, or examples.

For the purposes of your submission on this paper, you should include your name (or your organisation’s name) and your contact details.

You can make your submission by:

* Email to dotnzreview@internetnz.net.nz
* Post to PO Box 11-881, Manners Street, Wellington 6142, New Zealand

Submissions are due by **Friday 14 August**.

### Participate online

We will be releasing bite-size content on InternetNZ’s social media channels and the InternetNZ website. And you will also be able to provide your feedback there.

The Panel will also be hosting webinars where you can come and discuss your thoughts on the Report. To find out more and register your interest, visit <https://internetnz.nz/nz-have-your-say>.

### Use of information

The information provided in submissions will be used to inform the Advisory Panel’s recommendations to InternetNZ on changes to the .nz policies. The Panel or InternetNZ may contact you directly to clarify anything in your submission.

The Privacy Act 1993 establishes certain principles with respect to our collection, use and disclosure of information about individuals. Any personal information you supply to the Panel and InternetNZ in the course of making a submission will only be used by the Panel or InternetNZ in their consideration of what changes should be made to the .nz policies.

InternetNZ has an open policy making process and typically publishes all submissions to encourage open conversation. Individual names and contact details will not be published. If you would like to include confidential information in your submission, please contact dotnzreview@internetnz.net.nz to discuss what arrangements InternetNZ might implement if we were to agree to receive the confidential information.

### Permission to reproduce

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

##

### Your details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Ben Bradshaw |
| Email address |  |
| Contact phone number |  |

Yes ☐ I understand and agree that my submission will be made public on the InternetNZ website

Yes ☐ I understand that my contact details will be redacted from the public version of this submission

No, thank you ☐ I would like to speak to my submission with the Panel

## Guiding Principles

### Summary of proposed changes to the guiding principles for .nz

The Panel intends to recommend that the guiding principles for .nz be:

* .**nz should be secure, trusted and safe:** .nz infrastructure should be dependable and secure and .nz be a domain space people trust and feel safe using.
* **.nz should be open and accessible:** The .nz domain should be an inclusive space where everybody can observe, participate, innovate and enjoy online benefits.
* **.nz should be safe-guarded and operated for the benefit of New Zealanders:** The .nz domain space should be safe-guarded and operated for the benefit of New Zealanders, reflecting and being responsive to our diverse social, cultural and ethnic environment.
* **.nz should support te reo Māori and participation in .nz by Māori**: The .nz domain space should contribute to the protection and use of te reo Māori and facilitate participation in the .nz domain space by Māori.
* **.nz should enable New Zealand to grow and develop:** The .nz domain space should help people, businesses and organisations connect, create, innovate and grow.

The Panel intends to recommend that the .nz policies contain the following operational guidelines:

* **First come, first served:** A domain name will be registered on a ‘first come, first served’ basis if it is unregistered and available for registration.
* **Restrictions on use should be minimised**: The ccTLD manager should keep restrictions on the way domain names can be used to the minimum necessary to enable the .nz domain to be trusted and safe.
* **Structural separation:** Regulatory, registry, and registrar functions are structurally separated.
* **Clear chain of relationships:** Registrants have agreements with their registrar, and all registrars with the registry and with DNCL. Where appropriate the DNCL can intervene in these relationships consistent with this policy, the .nz policies and associated agreements and contracts.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. | Do you consider that the .nz guiding principles should be visionary, holistic, inclusive and instructive rather than operational? Why / why not? What else should they be? |
|  | I don’t see any issue with having a mix of both, no need to throw away good exinsting principles just to bring in new ones. |
| 2. | Do you think the .nz policies should be rewritten and simplified? Why / why not? If yes, how? |
|  | Consolidating dispirate sets of policies has value, as does some simplified language choices. It would be a lower priority to my mind though. |
| 3. | Do you think there should be a new ‘secure, trusted and safe’ principle? Why / why not? Do you have any comments on the proposed formulation of the new principle?  |
|  | Yes, I support the addition of this principle. This should not be interpreted as support for removing ‘no concern for use’. |
| 4. | What would be the main benefits and disadvantages of moving from a ‘no concern for use’ approach to a ‘secure, trusted and safe’ approach?  |
|  | I don’t understand the wording of this question. I don’t believe adding things like DNSSEC and registrant privacy in any way conflict with ‘no concern for use’.I am not in favour of removing ‘no concern for use’ because I do not believe DNCL are best positioned when they maintain neutrality and have an arbiter in such matters. They can also act as a check and balance on any order to restrict a domain name.There are times when it is best for the NZ public to restrict access to a domain name quickly, especially after a terrorist incident. Organisations like the OFLC can declare items to be restricted and as part of that I would prefer them to be able to identify and restrict comains, not DNCL. After the Christchurch Mosque attacks the shooters ‘manifesto’ began circulating online and it was not just through domain names in the .nz space, it was through social media and file sharing tools as well. Removing content from web involves more than DNS controls.“They should also be able to trust that people they engage with online are who they say they are.”I don’t believe DNS is part of the trust and identity verification process any customers or Nzers use to verify onlin identity, nor is it likely to be so.  |
| 5. | Do you think there should be a new ‘open and accessible’ principle? Why / why not? Do you have any comments on the proposed formulation of the new principle? |
|  | The principles detailed in this section are things I agree with.In terms of principle wording I do not know that innovate is needed as a word, because it describes only one kind of potential use and the principle is to be open and accessible for any use. |
| 6. | Do you think there should be a new ‘New Zealand benefit’ principle? Why / why not? Do you have any comments on the proposed formulation of the new principle? |
|  | Yes. I think this is well written as-is. |
| 7. | Do you think there should be a new principle on te reo Māori and Māori participation in .nz? Why / why not? Do you have any comments on the proposed formulation of the new principle? |
|  | Yes. |
| 8. | Do you think there should be a new guiding principle on enabling New Zealand to grow and develop? Why / why not? Do you have any comments on the proposed formulation of the new principle? |
|  | - |
| 9. | Do you think there should be two types of principles (guiding principles and operational guidelines) to help manage the .nz domain? Why / why not? |
|  | - |
| 10. | Do you agree that the ‘rule of law’ principle should not be retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not? |
|  | - |
| 11. | Do you think the ‘first come first served’ principle should be modified and retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not? |
|  | I would like to see first come first served stay as-is. As noted by Jay in the second panel discussion, first come first served does not mean that there can’t be restricted domain names, but that these restrictions are not pre-emptively applied.Any word filter system will cause unexpected restrictions. One funny example is always Pen Island. A human appeal process is necessary. |
| 12. | Do you think the ‘registrants’ rights come first principle should be modified and retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not? |
|  | - |
| 13. | Do you agree that the ‘low barriers to entry’ principle should be removed? Why / why not? |
|  | Removing limits on pricing could allow for increased pricing for new development but it could also allow for straight old increased pricing.I do not know how diverse the true number of DNS registrars is and of this might be a competition issue. |
| 14. | Do you agree that the ‘no concern for use’ principle should be modified and retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not? |
|  | I made comments earlier around no concern for use. I would support a system which would allow trusted agencies OFLC, NZ Police, CERT NZ etc. to report domains and those could be blocked case by case, but in my rapid reading I am not sure if that requires a policy change to implement.I would also support a public reporting mechanism of the number of domains blocked per month (by requestor) so we could have some accountability. |
| 15. | Do you agree that the ‘structural separation’ principle should be retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not? |
|  | - |
| 16. | Do you agree that the ‘clear chain of relationships’ principle should be retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not? |
|  | - |
| 17. | Should the Panel consider any other principles? |
|  | - |
| 18. | Is there anything else the Panel should bear in mind when making recommendations on the principles or operational guidelines for the .nz policies?  |
|  | - |

## Accessibility and openness of .nz domains

### The .nz policies are written only in English

* Option A: the current situation
* Option B: Make the policies available in te reo Māori as well as English
* Option C: Make the policies available in te reo Māori and take other accessibility measures like adding other languages over time according to how widely used they are

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 19. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  | - |
| 20. | Which option do you prefer? Why? |
|  | - |

### Lack of availability of characters other than English and te reo Māori alphabets in .nz domain names

* Option A: the current situation
* Option B: support additional characters as demand arises
* Option C: support all characters for most widely used New Zealand languages

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 21. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  | - |
| 22. | Which option do you prefer? Why? |
|  | I would support Option A or B. Option C adds a new range of security concerns and could impact trust in the .nz space if people are seen to be registering lookalike domain names to run phishing attacks. |

### No geographical limits on registrants

* Option A: The current situation
* Option B: Educate .nz users that .nz domain names can be held from anywhere around the world
* Option C: Impose a local presence requirement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 22. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  |  |
| 23. | Which option do you prefer? Why? |
|  | Option B.It is important for NZers to know that anyone can register a .nz and use it. It has never been a guarantee of a NZ presence and will never be.Option C is technically and humanly unworkable. Anyone with a goal to operate in NZ will be able to find someone in NZ to register the domain and then operate it. |

## Security and trust

### Domain and website content abuse

* Option A: The current situation
* Option B: ‘No concern for use’
* Option C: Suspension of a domain name on advice by a trusted notifier
* Option D: Implement an ‘acceptable use’ policy

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 25. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  |  |
| 26. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why?  |
|  | Option C. As noted above I support a trusted notifier relationship while keeping InternetNZ and DNCL out of the decision making process for domain restrictions, allowing them to stay impartial.As also noted above, a reporting framework to see how many domains each trusted notifier has restricted would help build trust and allow potential abuse of the system to be identified and queried by the public. |

### The interim emergency circumstances clause

* Option A: Allow the interim policy to lapse
* Option B: Make the interim policy permanent as it is currently phrased
* Option C: Modify the interim policy and make it permanent

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 27. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not?  |
|  |  |
| 28. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why?  |
|  | Given that I would prefer a trusted notifier framework to be available in the future I would not seek to make this a permanent policy.I am not sure how long it would take to stand up a reporting framework but until that time 6 monthly renewals by the council wouldn’t be so bad if seen as needed. |

### Domain name registration abuse

* Option A: Current situation
* Option B: Introduce data validation for all domain name registrations

#### Option C: Introduce data verification for high risk domain name registrations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 29. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  |  |
| 30. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why?  |
|  | I have used outdated details in domain registrations for years with no consequence because I do not want my personal address published online for easy access by anyone with access to a WHIOS lookup tool.I use a valid email address so I can be contacted in cases of a dispute.If DNCL want to encourage people like myself to give correct personal information I would strongly urge them to make most registration details private, with the eception of contact email address/phone number and set up a system which would allow limited access to this information for abuse reports which tracks access. |

### Grace periods and domain tasting

* Option A: The current situation
* Option B: Removal of grace periods
* Option C: Adopt different policies towards new registration and renewal grace periods

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 31. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  | - |
| 32. | Which option do you prefer? Why?  |
|  | “There is no evidence that grace periods are being abused by malicious registrants in the .nz space.”Given that statement why change? |

### Misleading, deceptive, and offensive domain names

* Option A: The current situation
* Option B: Introduce a ‘reserved and restricted names’ policy

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 33. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  | Option C: Introduce a series of names which trigger a review after registration |
| 34. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why?  |
|  | As noted in my answer to 11. There will always be innocuous combinations of characters that fall foul of filtering systems, like Pen Island.Retaining first come first served with a flag for domains that might be an issue to the DNCL would strike a balance. Given DNS can take 24-72 hours to propogate there is lead in time to review. |

### Ensuring security best practice across the .nz domain name system

* Option A: The current situation: Registry has no levers to monitor or improve registrar security
* Option B: Require all registrars to adhere to minimum security standards
* Option C: Incentivise or mandate security features or practices

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 35. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  |  |
| 36. | Which option do you prefer? Why?  |
|  | Option B. Slow and steady improvement is desirable. |

### Technology specific approach

* Option A: The current situation
* Option B: A ‘technology neutral’ approach to policy drafting replaces the current prescriptive approach

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 37. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  |  |
| 38. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why?  |
|  | Option A. When dealing with technical requirements it is important to specify in some detail what the requirements are. DNSSEC is a set of requirements, not a “product” as stated in the report. |

## Conflicted domain names

### Self-conflicted names continue to be unresolved

* Option A: The current situation - the Registry continues to allow self
* Option B: Provide a deadline for the registrant to resolve the conflict themselves to avoid release of domain names.

### Other conflicted names continue to be unresolved

* Option A: The current situation
* Option B: Provide a deadline for all registrants to come to an agreement
* Option C: InternetNZ develops a criteria for prioritising registrants’ right to a .nz name

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 39. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  |  |
| 40. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why?  |
|  | Self-Conflicted: Option A. If a user has declined to register the self-conflicted domain name, possibly to save money, then any change will look like DNCL attempting to get more money from the registrant which does not fit with the goal of making it more accessible.Other conflicted: Option A. I have a conflicted domain where a company has the .co.nz and I have the .net.nz. I think this is a fair arrangement, if both of us want it then neither of us will have it. If it had been available when launched I would have made an attempt to get it, but as the other registrant is a company they could probably out-bid me with no benefit for themselves except domain coverage.You don’t change a .co.nz to a .nz when all your infrastructure is already set up, you redirect the domain to your current primary domain and move on with paying $20-30/year as the cost of being online. Companies in NZ have registered .xxx domains with their company name just to protect their image.I would prefer the options are presented in a way that focusses on the benefit to the registrants rather than the goal of getting more .nz domains registered and therefore more revenue. The idea that “Growth in use of .nz domain names [is] facilitated” by changing the status quo ignores that there would be no new registrants, just more domains per registrant. |

## Enhancing privacy across the .nz domain name system

### Level of registrant data collected and stored

* Option A: The current situation
* Option B: Introduce different registrant profiles, requiring different levels of contact data to be collected for each.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 41. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  |  |
| 42. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why?  |
|  | I prefer Option B because in principle providers should only require as much information as they need to offer their service to their users, however the implementation of this would be more difficult and I would prefer focus to go on the IRPO. |

### Registrant data is made public by default

* Option A: Current situation
* Option B: The IRPO is opt out, i.e, individual registrants have the option activated by default
* Option C: All registrant contact details are withheld from query services for all individuals not in trade (no option to opt out or in)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 43. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  |  |
| 44. | Which option do you prefer? Why?  |
|  | Option B.I am in favour of not publicly listing the personal details of individuals by default. In the last few years we have seen the rise of personal information being online and while there is value for a few in having this information public there is value in not having it public for others.I do not believe that many users who register a domain in NZ are aware that some of the PII ends up in a public register. They register with a username and password and provide the details to a website. They can only see those details by logging in and the assumption the data is only on the website is reasonable based on their other experiences.With the rise of doxxing and online bullying, DNS is one information source that can be used to identify individuals. As soon as IRPO was available for myself I activated it and I will continue to use and where I cannot use it I have provided old details or allowed my details to become outdated to avoid anyone who does not like what I posted online to get my cell phone number. |
| 45. | Under the IRPO, which contact details do you think should be withheld from WHOIS? |
|  | Physical addresses and phone numbersI am comfortable with the requirement for an email address to be displayed and I also think yearly emails to ensure the email is monitored would be a great thing for the DNCL to look at. |

### Implementation of the IRPO and access to registrant information when required

* Option A: The current situation
* Option B: Streamline the process described in clause 22 of the *Operations and Procedures* policy and make it more user friendly for requests to access ‘Withheld Data’
* Option C: The creation of a form that allows people to communicate with a registrant without requiring the registrant’s email address

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 46. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  |  |
| 47. | Which option do you prefer? Why?  |
|  | Both Option B and C. Option C is likely to be a good first point of contact for legitimate queries and Option B can follow. I would prefer both options to require a user to login so that contact requests can be audited. If Option C ends up being abused then domains could be restricted to just Option B. |

## The .nz domain space and Māori

### Engaging with Māori in the policy-making process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 48. | Do you agree that following the Panel’s work, InternetNZ should take reasonable steps to engage with Māori when amending the .nz policies? Why / why not? |
|  | Yes! |

### Building strong capability within InternetNZ to engage with Māori

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 49. | Do you agree InternetNZ should ensure it has adequate capability to facilitate engagement with Māori? Why / why not? |
|  | Yes |

### Engaging with Māori on the issues that the Panel has identified

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 50. | Are there any other .nz-related issues affecting Māori that you think should be considered? |
|  | I am not qualified to talk to this point, but I have not ignored it.  |

## Opportunities to enhance .nz growth and improve market operation

## The current flat wholesale fee structure limits innovation

* Option A: Flat wholesale fee, no rebates or incentives (Current situation)
* Option B: Enable variable wholesale pricing to Registrars
* Option C: Allow Registry to offer rebates to the registrant via the wholesale fee

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 51. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  | The remaining questions have not been answered due to time constraints. Thank you for considering my response. |
| 52. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why?  |
|  |  |

## The scope of incentives to enhance market operation

* Option A: Do not incentivise registrars or registrants (the current situation)
* Option B: Allow registrar incentives to drive specific initiatives
* Option C: Require any incentive payment criteria to be designed to promote .nz policy goals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 53. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  |  |
| 54. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why?  |
|  |  |

### Empowering registrants could improve market performance

* Option A: Current situation
* Option B: InternetNZ works with registrars to establish a statement of registrant rights which the DNC monitors and registrars are accountable for by annual monitoring

#### Option C: DNCL publishes expanded objective market information to better inform registrant choice eg. market share and renewal rates

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 55. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  |  |
| 56. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why?  |
|  |  |

### Improving the regulation of Resellers could enhance market operation

* Option A: The current situation
* Option B: Establish a two-tier registrar system which incorporates resellers
* Option C: Reduce the $3,000+GST registrar establishment fee for existing resellers as part of the proposed two-tier registrar system

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 57. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  |  |
| 58. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why?  |
|  |  |

## The Registry’s role in market activity

* Option A: No requirement on scope of registrar offering. Registry may not sell/market directly to customers (The current situation)
* Option B: The Registry defines minimum service/feature set all registrars must provide. The Registry may not sell/market directly to registrants. The Registry incentivises registrars to provide services it provides under agreed rules
* Option C: No requirement on scope of registrar offering. The Registry may sell/market directly to registrants under strict controls.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 59. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  |  |
| 60. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why?  |
|  |  |

### Improving Registrar monitoring may enhance market operation

* Option A: The current situation
* Option B: Establish a Registrar Service Level Agreement System to enhance market operation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 61. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  |  |
| 62. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why?  |
|  |  |

### Greater industry data collection and publication could improve growth opportunities

* Option A: The current situation
* Option B: The Registry collects and communicates market information including customer segments, activity/utilisation and product use for industry to better understand and develop the .nz market

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 63. | Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned? |
|  |  |
| 64. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why?  |
|  |  |

### Second level (2LD) market opportunities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 65. | Do you agree with our assessment of the issue? Why / why not? |
|  |  |
| 66. | Is there a role for additional second level domain names (moderated or not) within the .nz domain? If so, what domains in which area? |
|  |  |

## Other comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 67. | Any other comments you would like to make.  |
|  |  |

# Appendix A. Summary of questions

## Guiding principles

### Purpose of the guiding principles

1. Do you consider that the .nz guiding principles should be visionary, holistic, inclusive and instructive rather than operational? Why / why not? What else should they be?

### Rewriting and simplifying the policy framework

1. Do you think the .nz policies should be rewritten and simplified? Why / why not? If yes, how?

### Secure, trusted and safe

1. Do you think there should be a new ‘secure, trusted and safe’ principle? Why / why not? Do you have any comments on the proposed formulation of the new principle?
2. What would be the main benefits and disadvantages of moving from a ‘no concern for use’ principle approach to a ‘secure, trusted and safe’ principle approach?

### Open and accessible

1. Do you think there should be a new ‘open and accessible’ principle? Why / why not? Do you have any comments on the proposed formulation of the new principle?

### For the benefit of all New Zealanders

1. Do you think there should be a new ‘New Zealand benefit’ principle? Why / why not? Do you have any comments on the proposed formulation of the new principle?

### Te reo Māori and Māori participation in .nz

1. Do you think there should be a new principle on te reo Māori and Māori participation in .nz? Why / why not? Do you have any comments on the proposed formulation of the new principle?

### Enabling New Zealand to grow and develop

1. Do you think there should be a new guiding principle on enabling New Zealand to grow and develop? Why / why not? Do you have any comments on the proposed formulation of the new principle?

### Transferring existing principles into operational guidelines

1. Do you think there should be two types of principles (guiding principles and operational guidelines to help manage the .nz domain? Why / why not?

### Rule of law

1. Do you agree that the ‘rule of law’ principle should not be retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not?

### First come first served

1. Do you think the ‘first come first served’ principle should be modified and retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not?

### Registrant rights come first

1. Do you agree that the ‘registrants’ rights come first’ principle should be removed? Why / why not?

### Low barriers to entry

1. Do you agree that the ‘low barriers to entry’ principle should be removed? Why / why not?

### No concern for use

1. Do you agree that the ‘no concern for use’ principle should be modified and retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not?

### Structural separation

1. Do you agree that the ‘structural separation’ principle should be retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not?

### Clear chain of relationships

1. Do you agree that the ‘clear chain of relationships’ principle should be retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not?

### Summary of principles

1. Should the Panel consider any other principles?
2. Is there anything else the Panel should bear in mind when making recommendations on the principles or operational guidelines for the .nz policies?

## Accessibility and openness of .nz domains

### The .nz policies are written only in English

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?

### Lack of availability of characters other than English and reo Māori alphabets in .nz domain names

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?

### No geographical limits on registrants

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?

## Security and trust

### Domain and website content abuse

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which of these options do you prefer? Why?

### The interim emergency circumstances clause

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?

### Domain name registration abuse

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which of these options do you prefer? Why?

### Grace periods and domain tasting

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?

### Misleading, deceptive, and offensive domain names

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which of these options do you prefer? Why?

### Ensuring security best practice across the .nz domain name system

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?

### Technology specific approach

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?

## Conflicted domain names

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which of these options do you prefer? Why?

## Enhancing privacy across the .nz domain name system

### Level of registrant data collected and stored

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?

### Registrant data is made public by default

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?
3. Under the IRPO, which contact details do you think should be withheld from WHOIS?

### Implementation of the IRPO and access to registrant information when required

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?

## The .nz domain space and Māori

### Engaging with Māori in the policy-making process

1. Should there be a requirement to take reasonable steps to engage with Māori when amending the .nz policies? Why / why not?

### Building strong capability within InternetNZ to engage with Māori

1. Should InternetNZ ensure it has adequate capability to facilitate engagement with Māori? Why / why not?

### Engaging with Māori on the issues that the Panel has identified

1. Are there any other .nz-related issues affecting Māori that you think should be considered?

## Opportunities to enhance .nz growth and improve market operation

### The current flat wholesale fee structure limits innovation

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?

### Other Registrar incentives could enhance market operation

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?

### Empowering registrants could improve market performance

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?

### Improving the regulation of Resellers could enhance market operation

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?

### The Registry’s role in market activity

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?

### Improving Registrar monitoring may enhance market operation

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?

### Greater industry data collection and publication could improve growth opportunities

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the options? Why / why not? Are there viable options that we have not mentioned?
2. Which option do you prefer? Why?

### Second level (2LD) market opportunities

1. Do you agree with our assessment of the issue? Why / why not?
2. Is there a role for additional second level domain names (moderated or not) within the .nz domain? If so, what domains in which area?