

**Submission to the InternetNZ Organisational Review Change Proposal Public  
Consultation**

**Paul Szyndler**

Tēnā koutou katoa

Thank you to the InternetNZ Council for the opportunity to provide input and feedback on current proposals for the organisational restructure of InternetNZ. Your openness and consultative approach, particularly with regard to significant and potentially contentious changes, is refreshing.

I offer my regrettably brief commentary in a personal capacity. However, I note my previous professional experience includes nearly nine years with .au Domain Administration Ltd (aUDA) and approximately eight years with the Australian Department of Communications and its various previous incarnations. I have dealt extensively with InternetNZ on bi-lateral projects (such as the Australia and NZ Internet Awards) and in multi-lateral fora including ICANN, the ITU and the IGF.

As such, I hope I qualify as a stakeholder when offering my particular international perspectives on InternetNZ's achievements and future. Please also note that, for the sake of brevity and clarity, I may refer to Jordan Carter, Jay Daley and Debbie Monahan in personal terms, as I have dealt with them extensively, however my intention is to comment about the roles they occupy as CE of Internet NZ, CE at NZRS Ltd and Domain Name Commissioner, respectively.

As an overall observation, I want to applaud the Council for taking a visionary approach: “we are doing well, but we could do better”. Having the opportunity to look forward from a position of stability and strength is a credit to existing governance models and the people that have made .nz what it is today.

However, I respectfully warn against the impulse to facilitate “change for change’s sake”. It does not always result in progress.

From an outsider’s perspective, there is little in the Council’s public consultation document that compels me to believe that such seismic changes to InternetNZ’s corporate structure are warranted.

I have always perceived the structural separation of functions (“independence”) within InternetNZ as a strength, not a weakness that needs to be “streamlined”. Of course, I cannot comment upon claimed internal inefficiencies and duplication. However, from my various interactions with Jordan, Jay and Debbie, I have observed them to be clear and expert thought-leaders in a range of international fora.

Instead of delegating responsibilities to various subordinates, each of these Executives have brought detailed and particular knowledge to complicated and often difficult international deliberations. Jordan played a leading role in the transition of policy oversight of ICANN from the US Government to the “Empowered Community”. Jay’s strengths in technical and security-related matters have proven invaluable. Similarly, Debbie has provided tremendous insight and leadership on issues relating to policy development and oversight. That they did so from a C-level perspective only added to the value of their input.

I invite the InternetNZ Council to adhere to the mantra stated in the Review Change Proposal: “We need to be less inward and more outward facing”. From the outside, I can confirm the utility of the current model. I know what the InternetNZ CE does. I know what the NZRS CE does. I know what the DNC does. I could approach each on specific matters without confusion or uncertainty.

I argue that establishing a “face” for InternetNZ (as mentioned in the Proposal) is the exact antithesis of what the .nz community is seeking or needs. An overarching CEO will, by necessity, have little time and resources to cover the gamut of issues that need to be addressed. She or he will, literally, just become a “face” for .nz. Nothing more.

I invite the Council to consider if this is really the future direction they desire. Will this deliver the expected clarity and consistency that “members expect”? Further,

is an incremental structural refinement worth the potential loss of 66% of senior executive resources?

Professionally, I have often promoted .au as punching above its weight and displaying industry best practice but I must admit that, in actuality, New Zealand has often led the way. That is very hard for an Australian to admit, but a loss I am willing to wear if it continues to benefit the stakeholders of .nz.

Thank you for considering my input.