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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 Individual names and contact details will not be published.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 | Michele Neylon |
| 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? |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 2. | Do you think the .nz policies should be rewritten and simplified? Why / why not? If yes, how? |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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? |
|  |  |
| 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 internet has matured and now the concerns for many are around security and safety. That this is reflected in a ccTLD’s approach makes sense. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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? |
|  | It’s in line with generally accepted concepts of inclusiveness and freedom to innovate. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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? |
|  | The .nz namespace is clearly linked to New Zealand and reinforcing what was already inferred makes sense. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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? |
|  | The .nz ccTLD should serve all the peoples of New Zealand, so it makes sense. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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? |
|  | Yes as it reinforces the importance of digital |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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? |
|  | I’m not sure it needs to be explicitly included, though obviously I don’t see any reason why you wouldn’t include it. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 11. | Do you think the ‘first come first served’ principle should be modified and retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not? |
|  | First come first served is a core principle for how domains work. Removing it would be dangerous. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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? |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 14. | Do you agree that the ‘no concern for use’ principle should be modified and retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not? |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 15. | Do you agree that the ‘structural separation’ principle should be retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not? |
|  | The 3 R model is the one that is used internationally and avoids conflicts. A registry and its policy and administrative functions can focus on high level issues like those outlined in this review. Let registrars and other commercial entities deal with selling the domains and monetizing it. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 16. | Do you agree that the ‘clear chain of relationships’ principle should be retained as an operational guideline? Why / why not? |
|  | Yes – see answer to 15 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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? |
|  | Yes |
| 20. | Which option do you prefer? Why? |
|  | B, though this could cause issues if there are differences of interpretation between the two versions of the texts. In some countries where there are two languages the text in one language is considered to definitive when there is a conflict. |

### 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? |
|  | B makes the most sense. Adding support for other IDN tables only makes sense if there is demand to do so.  A – this is limiting and ignores demand  C – this would lead to unnecessary cost with little benefit. We considered this during the addition of IDNs in the .ie namespace and decided to keep the focus on our national language only initially. The uptake has been very low, so had we pushed for more languages the investment would have been wasted. |

### 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? |
|  | Yes |
| 23. | Which option do you prefer? Why? |
|  | B – one of the attractions of NZ is that it is open and inclusive. Educating New Zealanders about how it is open can only be beneficial  C – is a terrible idea. The only way that could possibly work would be to introduce a specific third level namespace with restrictions, as the horse has long bolted. Also most ccTLDs either have removed or are removing geo restrictions. NZ should not be going backwards. |

## 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? |
|  | Seems fine |
| 26. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why? |
|  | Some combination of C and D. You cannot ignore how domains are used as this goes against the concept of it being a trusted and secure online space. A laissez faire policy might seem attractive, but in reality it simply does not work. However there need to be clear lines around what kind of issues the registry will act on and which ones are out of scope. So the devil is in the details. Issues of security and stability or other issues such as child abuse, imminent physical harm etc., could be in scope, but it’s not up to the registry to act as the content or trademark police. |

### 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? |
|  | Option A, however if this is coupled with the adoption of an acceptable use policy it essentially gives you a variation on option B which is probably a sane approach |

### 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? |
|  | Yes |
| 30. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why? |
|  | A as it causes the least friction. An expansion of how the registry monitors the zone might help identify risks, but it shouldn’t be the norm to add a burden or obstacle to registration.  B – bad idea and would cause more problems than it resolves  C – what is “high risk”? How is that defined? Several ccTLDs have tried to use various variations on this and it causes more problems than it solves while also giving a false sense of security. An exception to this would be domains identified as being algorithmically generated for use in botnets etc., however this would probably be covered in other parts of the policies. |

### 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? |
|  | If the concern is around “tasting” then consider a percentage based limit to the add grace period. For example if this was set at 10% of the registrar’s new adds per month then the registrar (and registrants) would still be able to deal with various issues such as human error or credit card fraud, but this would limit the number of AGP deletes and thus avoid mass tasting. |
| 32. | Which option do you prefer? Why? |
|  | Modification of A as per answer above |

### 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? |
|  | A variation on B might be saner. I have huge issues with any registry adopting a policy that refers to something so subjective as “offensive”. Offensive names are highly subjective and should be avoided. However having a reserved / restricted policy can make sense if adopted carefully. |
| 34. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why? |
|  | See response above |

### 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? |
|  | Yes |
| 36. | Which option do you prefer? Why? |
|  | Some combination of B and C would make sense. It is reasonable that registrars are technically capable of operating securely. However the baseline of this would need to be set. Adding incentives for other security features etc., makes it more attractive for registrars to adopt. |

### 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? |
|  | No. A more nuanced approach should work |
| 38. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why? |
|  | A more nuanced approach in how the policy is drafted which would allow for specific technology to be referenced but that would not preclude newer technologies. |

## 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? |
|  | B – this should have been handled better when the policy was changed to allow for the registrations. It now just needs to be cleaned up. |

## 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? |
|  | A however that is linked to the publication of the data. If publication of the data remains “as is” then Option B makes more sense. |

### 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? |
|  | B or C as long as there’s an opt in for publication. The phrasing of B is confusing – it sounds like it means data is published, yet it then contradicts itself. Essentially unless the registrant is a “legal person” the contact information should be redacted by default. |
| 45. | Under the IRPO, which contact details do you think should be withheld from WHOIS? |
|  | First off why are you still referring to “whois”? Whois as a protocol is on the way out and being replaced by RDAP.  As for which data elements should be redacted the answer would depend on whether the registrant is a natural person or a legal person, but any data element that contains PII should not be available to be mined. There should also be a difference between the port 43 service and the web based “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? |
|  | No – see answer below. |
| 47. | Which option do you prefer? Why? |
|  | A combination of B and C. I can see situations where releasing the data is important for LEA or others, however this is not a binary choice. Allowing for a “contact” option should also be possible. |

## 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? |
|  |  |

## 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? |
|  | Not really no. You’re over simplifying the options and in so doing making them more complicated. The registry should be able to offer incentives and rebates to registrars and to test different commercial methods of marketing the namespace. The three options outlined aren’t flexible enough to allow for that. What would make more sense would be to clearly state that all registrars are given equal access to marketing programs etc., as long as they are able to meet the criteria of the various promotions.  A flat wholesale fee is a good baseline. Do not conflate that with offering incentives to grow market share in particular verticals and segments. You can do that without removing the flat pricing. |
| 52. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why? |
|  | None of them as outlined above. |

## 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? |
|  | Free market principles should apply, so I’m not really sure that the way this is being pigeon holed really works. |
| 54. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why? |
|  | A is a terrible option. B and C might be a move in the right direction, but they’re restrictive. |

### 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? |
|  | I don’t understand why B and C are being treated separately. |
| 56. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why? |
|  | B and C together seem to make sense |

### 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? |
|  | No. The framing of “reseller” is far too broad. Have a look at how it’s been done elsewhere. Also a clearer framing of the actual problem that needs to be solved would be helpful. Is there actual data?  Reviewing the costs for becoming accredited is probably a good idea. However there should be a reasonable barrier to entry in line with the ethos of .nz being stable and secure.  Other registries have offered the option for the reseller field to be optional and for the registrar to set this in the whois or RDAP output (both Nominet and EURid support this)  Expanding contractual relations to include resellers would cause problems as you’d be competing against your own channel. |
| 58. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why? |
|  | See response above. |

## 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? |
|  | Yes |
| 60. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why? |
|  | Option A ie. the status quo.  While it might be a good idea about setting certain requirements on registrars eg. They need to provide customer service etc., expanding that to specify which services they offer is problematic. However if you look at offering incentives via marketing promotions then you can probably get to the same place. |

### 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? |
|  | Yes |
| 62. | Which of these options do you prefer? Why? |
|  | Some form of SLA might be appropriate, however the ICANN model is for registries not registrars, so I’m not sure why it’s being cited as an example of anything. |

### 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? |
|  | Most other registries are using data to inform their decisions as well as to assist the channel to market. So option B makes sense. |

### Second level (2LD) market opportunities

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 65. | Do you agree with our assessment of the issue? Why / why not? |
|  | Yes |
| 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? |
|  | Not unless there is actual demand. |

## 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?