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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](mailto: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 Individual names and contact details will not be published.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](mailto: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 | David Farrar |
| Email address |  |
| Contact phone number |  |

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

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

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? |
|  | Possibly but not necessarily. You need to be careful with setting them too holistic. A guiding principle of “secure, trusted and safe” could be used to justify almost anything at all. No one wants to be against safety but safety can be used to justify arbitrary cancellation of domains that someone believes makes them feel unsafe.  A guiding principle should be specific enough that people understand what the implications of adopting it mean, and be debatable in terms of pros and cons of including it. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2. | Do you think the .nz policies should be rewritten and simplified? Why / why not? If yes, how? |
|  | This is almost a trick question. No one wants to argue against simplified policies. But there is an implicit assertion that the policies are not clear enough at present. You can simplify policies by having 15 different policies each with its own subject area (so you just find the one you need) or by having just one policy that has everything included (which means all in one place). You really need to decide on the substance on the policies and then decide how best to present them. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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? |
|  | I am wary of this principle because of where it may lead. You could use such a principle to mandate mandatory use of DNSSEC or to implement a censorship regime that deletes domains that make people feel unsafe. I think trusted is good but secure and safe can mean vastly different things to different people.  Also is there any evidence base on how .nz is currently seen? Off memory it has had very low rates of phishing and other malicious forms of activity. Is there a problem to be solved by adopting this principle? |
| 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? |
|  | The disadvantage is once you start judging domain names off the use registrants make of them, you end up with an ever increasing censorship regime. In .uk the vast majority of domains deleted are around copyright complaints. You also greatly increase the legal risk to InternetNZ by taking on a subjective role in deciding whether use is of concern. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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? |
|  | Agree with principle. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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? |
|  | I see this principle as merely an extension of RFC 1591 which mandates a ccTLD should serve the Local Internet Community. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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? |
|  | I support entirely the principle around te reo Maori. I have some reservations around the participation principle. Not because I am opposed to such participation, which would be absurd. But because it is unclear what would and would not satisfy such a principle. You could argue allowing Maori to join InternetNZ is enough, or you could argue that to meet this principle there must be a parallel Maori body to InternetNZ that has veto over .nz policies. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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? |
|  | I like this 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? |
|  | I am unpersuaded that a hierarchy of principles is useful. If we want .nz to be simple we should have just one set of principles. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 10. | Do you agree that the ‘rule of law’ principle should not be retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not? |
|  | I disagree. Just because it is required is not the same as seeing value in emphasizing it. Having such a principle has helped guide InternetNZ into withstanding requests to ignore the rule of law and act upon accusations of wrong doing. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 11. | Do you think the ‘first come first served’ principle should be modified and retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not? |
|  | I do not support nodifying it to allow for certain names to be banned as domain names. I chaired the Policy Committee in the early 2000s which rescinded the policy banning seven obscene words from being registered. There were numerous reasons for doing so I would be happy to elaborate in detail on, but one is that such bans are simple to get around. Instead of fuck.nz some registers ck.nz and delegates fu.ck.nz. Likewise if you banned DPFisawanker.nz someone could register anker.nz and delegates DPFisaw.anker.nz |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 12. | Do you think the ‘registrants’ rights come first principle should be modified and retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not? |
|  | I think the registrants rights principle is important, while seeing the current wording is imperfect. The rationale behind it was to ensure policies did not allow registrars to trap registrants by refusing to transfer domains etc. Personally I always saw this principle as being more about guiding policies to be in the “public interest”. So happy for it to be formulated better. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 13. | Do you agree that the ‘low barriers to entry’ principle should be removed? Why / why not? |
|  | I do not understand the assertion that having low barriers to entry may impede having a more secure trusted and safe .nz. To respond more fully to this, I need to understand the evidence behind the assertion. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 14. | Do you agree that the ‘no concern for use’ principle should be modified and retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not? |
|  | I am strongly against the modification to allow DNCL to decide if the use of a domain name is harmful, based upon assertion by certain agencies.  If the status quo is not seen as acceptable, then my preferred changes in order are:   1. Law change to allow District Court Judges to issue a takedown or suspension notice of a domain name upon written application. 2. Law change to allow agencies mandated by Parliament to instruct DNCL/Internet to remove domain names. This means those agencies are the decision makers, not INZ/DNCL, and they bear the liability and reputational risk of wrong decisions. 3. A policy allowing INZ/DNCL to suspend a domain from the zone file for a short period of time (say max 72 hours) is they judge not doing so would cause overwhelming and irreversible harm. That would give an agency enough time to them follow the rule of law and apply for a longer or permanent suspension from a Judge   Again the experience of a “concern for use” regime in .uk is we would expect such a regime here to have around 1,200 domains taken down every year and 89.9% of them would be related to intellectual property complaints |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 15. | Do you agree that the ‘structural separation’ principle should be retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not? |
|  | Yes |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16. | Do you agree that the ‘clear chain of relationships’ principle should be retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not? |
|  | **Yes** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 17. | Should the Panel consider any other principles? |
|  | Not had time to consider sorry. |
| 18. | Is there anything else the Panel should bear in mind when making recommendations on the principles or operational guidelines for the .nz policies? |
|  | KISS |

## 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? |
|  | I support Option C but need to be clear about which version is the primary version, and which is a translation. Translations are rarely exact and we need clarity. |
| 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? |
|  | Agree |
| 22. | Which option do you prefer? Why? |
|  | I believe market research should be done to determine potential demand for an expansion, before decisions are made. Is this a solution looking for a problem or are there significant numbers wanting further IDNs. I tend to support more characters being available, so long as non-malicious use will be significantly greater than malicious use. |

### 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? |
|  | Agree |
| 23. | Which option do you prefer? Why? |
|  | Option C would be a very bad idea. It would go against a clear trend globally of fewer restrictions and it would mean either the cancellation of thousands of domains or grandfathering of them which would then undermine any benefits.  Also it would add cost and complexity registrations. |

## 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? |
|  | See earlier comments on my preferences which is that InternetNZ/DNCl should not be judging acceptable use. This should either be left to Judges or Parliament should legislate to give certain agencies the power to instruct a deletion or suspension. But InternetNZ should not be taking on all the liability and risk and reputational issues on behalf of agencies. |

### 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? |
|  | I think such a power should exist but only for a short period of time such as 72 hours to give agencies time to go through a judicial process. |

### 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? |
|  |  |

### 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? |
|  |  |

### 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? |
|  |  |
| 34. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why? |
|  | See earlier comments on why this was done away with 19 years ago. |

### 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? |
|  |  |

### 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? |
|  |  |

## 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? |
|  | I support the submission by DNCL on the issue |

## 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? |
|  |  |

### 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? |
|  |  |
| 45. | 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

* 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? |
|  |  |

## 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? |
|  |  |

### 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? |
|  |  |

### 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? |
|  |  |

## 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? |
|  |  |
| 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?