

Designers Institute of
New Zealand Inc

Submission on Issues Paper
(Review of the
Copyright Act 1994)
April 2019

**The
Designers
Institute.**

This submission is filed by the Designers Institute of New Zealand Inc, in response to the Issues Paper released in November 2018 by the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment entitled "Review of the Copyright Act 1994".

The Designers Institute of New Zealand does not claim confidentiality or privacy over any content of this submission, and consents to the submission being posted on the Ministry's website.

For email correspondence relating to this submission, the Designers Institute of New Zealand can be contacted at service@clendons.co.nz.

About DINZ

The Designers Institute of New Zealand Incorporated (DINZ) is a longstanding national society that represents numerous design fields of practice, including:

- Graphic Design (visual communication);
- Interactive Design (including motion graphics);
- Spatial Design (built environment);
- Industrial Design (product design, consumer and capital goods);
- Design in business;
- Service Design (creating optimal user/customer service experiences); and
- Design Education (the teaching profession).

DINZ was formed in 1991 by the merger of two prior design associations: the New Zealand Society of Industrial Designers (formed in 1960) and the New Zealand Association of Interior Designers (formed in 1968). DINZ and its predecessors have therefore been the leading design organisation in New Zealand for nearly 60 years.

At the date of this submission, DINZ has 1,062 members (see attached schedule for a list of members).

DINZ encourages the development of professional skills in its membership and by bringing together all different design disciplines under a common proposition: that excellent design brings tangible benefits to its users and the community. Other aims are to improve standards of professional service, increase demand for design excellence and generally increase the profile of design.

DINZ is recognised as the official voice of design and designers in New Zealand. On behalf of its members it lobbies Government and has input into proposed changes to legislation affecting designers.

DINZ maintains its integrity of Professional Members by only admitting them after a thorough examination by their peers. Training sessions, seminars and events, and ongoing DINZ communications keep members informed about issues affecting design practice.

One of DINZ's objectives is for professional designers to be valued and rewarded for the contribution they make to the economic, cultural and social growth of New Zealand. DINZ is a strategic partner with the New Zealand Trade and Enterprise Better by Design programme. DINZ also partners with the Department of Internal Affairs and ATEED.

DINZ is a founding member of DesignCo, a joint venture between DINZ, AUT, Massey and Victoria Universities, Otago Polytechnic, New Zealand Trade and Enterprise (Better by Design), Auckland Co-design Lab and Callaghan Innovation. Together with other funding partners, DesignCo commissioned a detailed study and report by PwC published in July 2017 entitled *A Study Highlighting the Benefits and Contribution of Design to the Economy of New Zealand*.

Amongst other ground-breaking findings, the PwC study found:

1. There is a strong correlation between national prosperity, economic growth and a thriving design sector.
2. International evidence confirms that design leads to more competitive firms making and selling higher value products and services;
3. New Zealand has a highly skilled, creative, knowledge intensive design sector adding an estimated \$10.1b to New Zealand's gross domestic product (GDP), 4.2% of total GDP, and 4.4% of New Zealand's total employment.
4. If design were treated as an individual industry, its contribution to the New Zealand economy would be larger than agriculture and on a par with retail trade (\$10.6b), and food, beverage and tobacco product manufacturing.

A full copy of the 119-page PwC study report can be found at <http://designco.org.nz/value-of-design/the-value-of-design-to-new-zealand/>.

DINZ is also part of Taki Makaurau Design Alliance (TMDA). TMDA is a representative committee of leading design organisations and institutions (including professional and tertiary institutions) for the promotion of excellence in design and the built environment within Auckland. TMDA is the voice of Auckland's design sector at the Tripartite Economic Alliance, known as the GALA Design Alliance, an agreement between Auckland, Guangzhou and Los Angeles. GALA seek to share knowledge and design experience to benefit the sustainable development of all three cities.

For more background on DINZ, please refer to our website, www.dinz.org.nz.

Submission

The primary purpose of the copyright law review submission process is to get information and evidence of **problems with the Copyright Act 1994** (Issue Paper, para 36).

In February 2019, DINZ surveyed all 1,062 members on their experiences under current copyright laws. Key feedback included:

- 76% of respondents have experienced situations where their design has been copied or used for commercial purposes without the designer's consent.
- When asked *what changes would you make to the Copyright Law?*, 70% of respondents expressly sought the repeal or substantial revision to the Commissioning Rule (s21). No respondents supported the Commissioning Rule in its current form.

Submission 1 . Repeal the Commissioning Rule (Issue Paper, Question 8)

Background: 2006 – 2008 review of commissioning rule by Ministry for Economic Development

In 2006-2007, the Ministry for Economic Development (as it was then) undertook two comprehensive rounds of public consultation, specifically relating to proposed changes to copyright laws. The Commissioning Rule (s21(3), Copyright Act 1994) was a primary focus of that process.

After analysing numerous submissions following the first round of public consultation in 2006, the Ministry published its initial findings and its preferred approach. In particular, the Ministry determined that its preferred approach was to repeal section 21(3) of the Copyright Act 1994.

The Ministry issued a Second Paper (*The Commissioning Rule and the Copyright Act 1994: Second Paper*) recording this preferred approach, and reporting on the evidence collected by the Ministry that supported the repeal of s21(3), including (amongst other things) that:

- The Commissioning Rule allows for uncontrolled exploitation of works by commercial entities (paragraph 15).
- *Many creators submitted that often a bargaining inequity exists between commercial entities and individual creators, which is enhanced by the commissioning rule. This is because from the outset copyright ownership does not belong to the creator thus placing the often weaker party at an even greater disadvantage in terms of negotiating to remain the copyright owner. This is especially the case with regards to commercial commissions.* (paragraph 17).
- Not all creators have written contracts and/or possess knowledge of the Copyright Act and the Commissioning Rule (paragraph 29).
- The Commissioning Rule differs from copyright laws in other jurisdictions, making it difficult for New Zealand creators to compete internationally (paragraph 76).

The Ministry's second paper recorded:

38. *The Ministry's preliminary view, therefore, is to repeal the commissioning rule and protect consumers' privacy interests by providing the private commissioner with:*
- (a) *the ability to make personal and non-commercial uses of the commissioned work, and*
 - (b) *the right to restrain/object to uses of the work by others.*

Following the second round of consultation in 2007, a Bill (proposed legislation) was developed in 2008 by the government that would give creators default ownership of commissioned works (rather than the person who commissioned the work). This work was never implemented because of a change of government in 2008.

Same problems identified in 2008 (and others) continue to exist today

Each of the problems with the Commissioning Rule that were identified by the Ministry in 2006 . 2008 (and others) continue. The reasons for the Ministry's proposed repeal of the Commissioning Rule identified by the Ministry following extensive consultation in 2006 . 2008 remain equally valid today.

Problems with the Commissioning Rule (s21(3)) include:

Problem 1: The Commissioning Rule promotes **unfair exploitation of design works** by commissioning parties. A design created for a limited or specific use may, without further compensation or even consultation with the designer, be used for other purposes not reflected in the terms of engagement.

DINZ members have provided various examples of works which were created for a limited purpose (and were charged limited fees accordingly) but were then used nationally/internationally without the designer's consent and knowledge. The Commissioning Rule enables this unjust outcome.

The default conferring of copyright ownership upon a commissioner is not required to provide a sufficient return on the investment of the commissioner. The work itself, as well as a licensed right to use the work, is sufficient return. While clients are often involved in the initial stages of the design process and do provide limited input, it is the designers who develop and evolve the concept and impart creativity. It is common for entire designs to be solely (i.e. 100%) the output of the designer's vision and creativity.

Problem 2: The Commissioning Rule creates a perverse engagement dynamic which gives the commissioner an **unfair and unjustified advantage when bargaining** with the designer.

The bargaining dynamics at the time of the commissioning engagement are similar for designers as they are for other creative suppliers. Many designers are sole practitioners or operating in small businesses and face a bargaining imbalance at the time of an engagement.

A bargaining power imbalance often exists between parties in a design engagement context, in favour of the commercial client . particularly where the design services required are reasonably homogenous and there are multiple alternative suppliers. Although this bargaining imbalance is not a result of the Commissioning Rule, the Rule in practice **exacerbates** the imbalance between a commercial entity and an individual creator.

The Commissioning Rule does not determine bargaining power. Rather, the Commissioning Rule is one of several factors that may influence a party's bargaining power. Other factors include relative financial positions of the parties, whether one party is more impatient/eager

than the other to reach agreement, which party has more information about the transaction and whether either party has other options.

Having acknowledged that there is generally a bargaining imbalance weighing against the creator, it is axiomatic that:

- The creator should enjoy the protection of the default statutory position unless they contract out; and
- The commissioning client is in a better position to negotiate a position other than the default.

DINZ submits that the Commissioning Rule may (and in practice does) significantly contribute to giving the commissioner an unfair and unjustified advantage when bargaining with the creator.

Example: Tendering

Given the competitive nature on the supply side of the design industry, clients will often ask several designers to tender/pitch work by providing concepts, drafts, proposals, etc. Similarly, given the competitive supply side, artists/creatives often provide initial concepts for very low fees as a ~~loss leader~~, seeking to secure subsequent work on the project. In both situations, negative outcomes can occur because concepts provided for nominal compensation are then exploited or taken to cheaper designers, artists, etc.

If copyright remained (by default) with the designer, then these unfair business practices would not be legally permitted.

Problem 3: The Commissioning Rule creates a **positive disincentive for creativity** on a national scale.

The national importance of the design sector in New Zealand has now been highlighted by the 2017 DesignCo PwC report (described above).

By denying the designer ownership of their own creative endeavours, designers are discouraged from creating any work of significance. Furthermore, the unfairness of the Commissioning Rule encourages talented creatives (including designers) to move overseas to a country where their moral and material rights are both respected and protected by copyright laws.

Problem 4: The Commissioning Rule is **poorly understood, inconsistently applied** to creative works, and is at odds with professional designer understanding (and public understanding) of copyright laws.

As recognised in the Ministry's Second Paper in 2007:

The commissioning rule only applies to a defined list of works. Literary works (other than computer programs), dramatic and musical works, such as a film script or dance, and certain artistic works, such as collages, are not included. The majority of submitters criticised the inconsistent application of the rule and considered that all creators, irrespective of the type of work, should be treated equally. [80]

Several submitters indicated that the incomplete application of the commissioning rule creates confusion, particularly where no contract is used to clarify the position of ownership, or where a person creates several works and different default ownership rules apply. A few examples include: where a person is illustrating and writing a book, or where a person creates a computer program as well as the instructing text, or where a composer uses notated music as well as music in score form. Additionally, a multimedia work as a compilation would not be covered by the commissioning rule, however, its underlying computer program would be. In each situation different default ownership rules apply. Submitters further argued that the commissioning rule provides an impractical and ineffective guide in relation to products containing works where different default ownership rules apply.” [81]

The Ministry recognised that the Commissioning Rule was a *contributing cause of confusion* but found that the general *lack of knowledge of the law is the main factor in its misinterpretation.* [82] Either way, the Commissioning Rule was causing (and continues to cause) confusing and unexpected legal outcomes for those involved in design.

Problem 5: The Commissioning Rule allows a designer’s work to be used before, and regardless of whether, payment is received

In the February 2019 survey of DINZ members, 62% of respondents confirmed that they were not aware that the Commissioning Rule meant that the client owned the copyright in any commissioned work the designer created, even if the client had not paid the designer’s fee.

This is a constant and serious problem for designers in New Zealand, most of whom mistakenly believe that they retain copyright (at least until paid, and sometimes beyond that unless agreed otherwise with the client).

The Commissioning Rule allows a designer’s work to be used before payment is even received. This results in situations where designers are never compensated for their efforts while their work continues to be exploited by commercial entities.

The Commissioning Rule does not provide protection for designers and their creative work, and commonly leads to unfair legal and commercial outcomes.

Problem 6: The Commissioning Rule stops designers from using their own intellectual property, thereby jeopardising their ability to trade productively in the design industry

As mentioned above (Problem 4), the Commissioning Rule is poorly understood (if at all) by designers and others. This can (and often does) lead designers to providing design works with the expectation that they retain ownership of copyright, only to later discover that the client is relying on the Commissioning Rule (rightly or wrongly) to claim ownership of the copyright in the works.

In addition, an issue that relates specifically to designers is that of derivative or evolving works. A designer’s works are likely to use or draw upon the prior design work or style of the designer. Indeed, the designer is often engaged by a client because of the style/reputation of their prior works. Designers are likely to re-use aspects of current design in future

designs (consciously or even subconsciously). If a designer (inadvertently or otherwise) loses copyright in works, this can create significant difficulties and disputes in the event that future derivations of the design are created for subsequent clients.

Problem 7: The inclusion of the Commissioning Rule in New Zealand copyright law is **out of line with international convention, breaches the Berne Convention**, and leads to **perverse outcomes in cross-border situations**.

The Ministry's November 2018 Issue Paper records:

Many dealings with copyright works occur across borders, so copyright rules should not be considered in isolation from our key trading partners. [18]

DINZ submits that the inclusion of the Commissioning Rule in the Copyright Act is out of line with international convention and the copyright laws of New Zealand's major trading partners. This severely disadvantages New Zealand designers trying to compete in an international market.

All of New Zealand's major trading partners (including USA, UK, Canada, Australia) have already repealed the Commissioning Rule. Unless New Zealand follows suit, its designers will continue to lose ground internationally. This may (as noted above) result in designers leaving New Zealand for those countries where their material and moral rights are protected by default.

In a commercial dispute concerning copyright (*John Radford v Hallenstein Bros Limited*, CIV 2006-404-004881 . discussed at paragraphs 404 . 408, 2018 Issues Paper), the High Court (Justice Keane) observed that:

Where possible our statute law must be given meaning consistent with our international obligations; it being presumed that Parliament does not intend to legislate to the contrary ... Where New Zealand has subscribed to a multilateral treaty, which other countries have also subscribed to and implemented, it is desirable that the treaty be interpreted and applied uniformly.+[paras 13 and 14]

Commissioning Rule breaches the Berne Convention

The leading international convention relating to copyright is the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, to which New Zealand became a party in 1947. Articles 9(1) and (2) of the Berne Convention (mentioned at paragraphs 93-94 of the 2018 Issues Paper) provide:

- (1) *Authors of literary and artistic works protected by this Convention shall have the exclusive right of authorizing the reproduction of these works, in any manner or form.*
- (2) *It shall be a matter for the legislation in the countries of the Union to permit the reproduction of such works in certain special cases, provided that such reproduction does not conflict with a **normal exploitation of the work** and it **does not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the author.**(emphasis added)*

The Commissioning Rule automatically transfers copyright to the commissioner allowing them to make unlimited reproductions of the designer's work for a period which lasts until 50

years after the designer's death. This clearly **does conflict** with a normal exploitation of the work and **unreasonably prejudices** the legitimate interests of the designer.

DINZ therefore submits that the Commissioning Rule unreasonably prejudices the legitimate interests of designers, and therefore conflicts with article 9(2).

The Commissioning Rule also leads to:

- Inconsistency with New Zealand's major trading partners; and
- Conflict between the laws of differing jurisdictions, making it difficult to enforce New Zealand copyright ownership in foreign countries.

Inconsistency with Major Trading Partners/Conflict of Laws

The fact that our major trading partners (the biggest being Australia) have repealed the commissioning rules can cause undesirable outcomes for all parties concerned.

For example, where a commissioned work arises in New Zealand between a New Zealand artist and a New Zealand client, the client will be able to enforce the copyright as owner in New Zealand pursuant to s 21(3) but not in Australia.

This was demonstrated in an Australian decision, *Enzed Holdings Ltd. v Wynthea Pty Ltd*ⁱ. In that case, the plaintiff commissioner (a New Zealand company) attempted to enforce its ownership of copyright in Australia. The Court refused to consider the New Zealand commissioning rule, instead following the position in Australian law, and holding that the plaintiff was **not** the copyright owner.

The Australian Court decided that, to ensure consistency with the Berne Conventionⁱⁱ, the Australian Courts were obliged to extend the protection of Australian law to foreign creators.

This is a clear example of how differing copyright laws between New Zealand and its major trading partners can lead to perverse outcomes.

Conclusion – Question 8

In conclusion, DINZ submits that section 21(3) of the Copyright Act 1994 should be repealed so that the author of any commissioned work is the first owner of copyright.

DINZ supports the position reached by the Ministry in 2006-2008 i.e:

Repeal the commissioning rule (s21(3)) and protect consumers' privacy interests by providing a private (i.e. non-commercial) commissioner with:

- (a) the ability to make personal and non-commercial uses of the commissioned work, and*
- (b) the right to restrain/object to uses of the work by others.*



Submission 2 . Enforcement of Copyright (Questions 66, 76, 79 and 85)

Question 66 of the Issue Paper is:

What are the problems (or advantages) with the way the Copyright Tribunal operates? Why do you think so few applications are being made to the Copyright Tribunal? What changes (if any) to the way the Copyright Tribunal regime should be considered?

Question 76 is:

How difficult is it for copyright owners to establish before the courts that copyright exists in a work and they are the copyright owners? What changes (if any) should be considered to help copyright owners take legal action to enforce their copyright?

Question 79 is:

Does the cost of enforcement have an impact on copyright owners' enforcement decisions? Please be specific about how decisions are affected and the impact of those decisions. What changes (if any) should be considered?

Question 85 is:

What are the problems (or advantages) with the existing measures copyright owners have to address online infringements? What changes (if any) should be considered?

All of these questions (including the under-utilisation of the Copyright Tribunal, which underpins question 66) are relevant to a central issue, of high importance to designers and their clients alike, that issue being:

How can the owner of a copyrighted work efficiently prosecute an infringement of that work?

The answer: under current laws and legal institutions, it is **not possible** for a copyright owner to efficiently prosecute an infringement of that work.

DINZ seeks two outcomes from the current copyright law review to greatly assist its members (and others) to protect their copyrighted works:

1. An efficient method of enforcing copyrights (and resolving copyright disputes); and
2. Minimum (or increased statutory) damages for breach of copyright.

1. An Efficient Method of Enforcing Copyrights (and resolving Copyright disputes)

Currently, neither the Disputes Tribunal nor that Copyright Tribunal have jurisdiction to assist in resolving a dispute regarding copyright ownership or unauthorised use. This means that District/High Court proceedings are the only available method for pursuing legal disputes for breach of copyright etc.

Coupled with the usually limited amount of compensatory damages arising in many copyright disputes (see next item), designers are prejudiced by the lack of a realistic and efficient forum to enforce their copyrights.

Options to remedy this problem may be:

- (a) Extend the jurisdiction of the Copyright Tribunal, so that the Tribunal can hear and determine any copyright dispute (under a minimum value threshold of say, \$200,000 in damages). Legal representation should remain optional to reduce costs and ensure access to an efficient decision-making process, and legal costs should not be awarded to successful parties by the Tribunal in such cases; or
- (b) Expand the jurisdiction of the Disputes Tribunal, to enable the Tribunal to hear and determine copyright disputes.

2. Minimum damages for breach of copyright:

It is important for the Ministry to recognise that:

- (a) Many New Zealand designers/creatives are small businesses or sole practitioners, and do not have the resources to spend tens of thousands of dollars in legal fees;
- (b) Often a breach of copyright claim might entitle a designer to limited relief for breach (say, between \$3,000 - \$10,000 of compensatory damages, to reflect their usual fixed-term licensing fee or similar loss of profits for the work infringed); and
- (c) The vast majority of copyright infringements experienced by DINZ members (as reported by those members) would involve deliberate misuse of copyrighted works for which compensatory damages would be below \$20,000.

Coupled with the lack of an efficient process/forum for enforcing copyright (see item (i) above), it is **not economically viable to bring legal enforcement proceedings**.

There are some notable examples of this. For example, in the case of *G-Star Raw v Jeanswest*, the defendants (*Jeanswest*) were found to have committed *flagrant infringement in that this was blatant copying [of a jean design] by Jeanswest+* (February 2015, Court of Appeal, para 125)

Jeanswest also refused to provide key evidence until shortly before the High Court trial, and made persistent denials of liability . but refused to call the key employees that would substantiate those denials.

After a High Court hearing that spanned eight days (the Courtroom fees and setting down fees alone would now amount to \$25,600, with substantial solicitor and barristers legal fees in addition), the High Court found infringement but awarded damages to reflect the fact that *Jeanswest* only sold (it claimed) 63 pairs of the infringing jeans . the net profits of which were \$325 in totalⁱⁱⁱ. *G-Star* was therefore only awarded \$325 in compensation by the High Court.

G-Star appealed, and the Court of Appeal imposed an additional \$50,000 in punitive (i.e. non-compensatory damages) against *Jeanswest*^{iv}.

Media commentaries can be found on both the High Court (<http://www.stuff.co.nz/business/industries/9289902/Jeanswest-NZ-fined-for-copyright-breach>) and Court of Appeal decisions (<https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/better-business/66302907/null>).

Options to address this problem may include:

- (a) Expanding the current provisions of the Copyright Act (s121(2)) that enable the Court to award non-compensatory damages, so that a successful copyright claimant is (at least) made whole by a combination of damages and cost awards; and/or
- (b) Adopting a non-compensatory damages award system for copyright infringement (similar to the statutory damages regime in the US) to alleviate this problem.

Related Issues

DINZ also disputes two related comments made in the 2018 Issue Paper:

The first disputed comment is at paragraph 488:

The most significant barrier for copyright owners taking legal action is the cost. Legal action in the courts is expensive and copyright owners often limit their enforcement actions to large-scale or commercial infringements. The cost can also provide a strong incentive for a copyright owner and an alleged infringer to settle infringement claims without resorting to the courts.

Whilst DINZ agrees that costs are the most significant enforcement barrier for copyright owners, DINZ disagrees that *the cost can also provide a strong incentive for a copyright owner and an alleged infringer to settle infringement claims without resorting to the courts.*

The awareness and appreciation of copyright owners' rights amongst commercial entities in New Zealand is relatively low, especially compared to overseas jurisdictions. In many infringement cases, the infringing party is both ignorant of copyright laws and dismissive of the copyright owner's legal rights. Because of the limited compensatory damages in most infringement cases, it is uneconomic for the copyright owner to initiate legal proceedings.

In that (common) context, there is only limited pressure that can be exerted by the copyright owner, and there is **little (if any) incentive on the infringing party to settle the infringement claim.**

The second disputed comment is at paragraph 489:

Although small-scale or occasional infringements may not have a significant damaging impact on the copyright owner, the collective impact of multiple infringements of this nature can be significant.

This fails to recognise the nature of the creative sector (and particularly, the design sector) in New Zealand. The majority of designers and other creatives work in small (SME) businesses, and in many cases, are sole practitioners. Copyright infringements that may be viewed by the Ministry as *small-scale or occasional infringements* in a macro-economic sense are in fact incredibly significant for a small creative business.

For example, if a design work created by a small design studio was misappropriated by a large domestic or multi-national business, and the design studio's usual fee for use of that specific work would have been (say) \$6,000 for a license permitting the unauthorised use for 12 months, that may represent most of the monthly trading profit for the design studio. There is no economic way of pursuing the infringing party, which will predictably deny the offending (even if the offending is blatant and without any colour of right). There is effectively no way for the design studio to enforce its copyright. The impact on the design business is significant.

DINZ provides (through its honorary solicitors) free legal consultations for DINZ members, a benefit that has been offered to (and used by) members for more than a decade. That experience enables DINZ to confirm that the scenario above reflects the real-life experience of many SME design businesses in New Zealand, when faced with a copyright infringement.

Summary

For the above reasons, DINZ considers that copyright laws should be amended to enable:

1. An efficient method of enforcing copyrights (and resolving copyright disputes); and
2. Minimum (or increased statutory) damages for breach of copyright.

End of Document

ⁱ (1984) 4 F.C.R. 450.

ⁱⁱ *Enzed*, at 458

ⁱⁱⁱ For a copy of the High Court judgment, see <http://www.iplawyer.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/G-Star-v-Jeanswest-High-Court.pdf>

^{iv} For a copy of the Court of Appeal judgment, see [https://www.shortlandchambers.co.nz/backend/uploads/Jeanswest%20Corporation%20\(New%20Zealand\)%20Ltd%20v%20G-Star%20Raw%20C.V.%20\[2015\]%20NZCA%2014.pdf](https://www.shortlandchambers.co.nz/backend/uploads/Jeanswest%20Corporation%20(New%20Zealand)%20Ltd%20v%20G-Star%20Raw%20C.V.%20[2015]%20NZCA%2014.pdf)

Aaron Edwards FDINZ
Aaron McKirdy
Aaron McLean
Aaron Simmonds
Aaron Turk
Abbie Whangapirita
Abby Burns
Abby Farrow
Abi Wills
Adam Jenkinson
Adam Moody PDINZ
Adam Walker
Ahlia Mangin
Aida Khangholi
Alain Brideson
Alaine Ingle PDINZ
Alan Deare
Alan Sanders LifeDINZ
Alan Wolfgramm
Alasdair Whye LifeDINZ
Alby Yap
Alec Bathgate PDINZ
Alexander Wastney PDINZ
Alexandra Young
Alex Bartley Catt
Alex Buckman
Alex Fulton
Alex Mcleod
Aleysha Pangari
Alf Walker PDINZ
Alice Andersen
Alice Dalton
Alice Lines
Alicia Grimes
Alicja Podemska
Ali Daniell
Alison Stankovich
Alistair McCready
Allison Robinson
Alphero
Alt Group
Amanda Evans
Amanda Flynn
Amanda Hookham-Kraft PDINZ
Amanda Kissling
Amanda Neill PDINZ
Amy Douglas
Amy Hur
Amy Tasker
Amy Yalland
Ana Davis
Anais Guennoc
Andrea Fehsenfeld
Andrea Marshall
Andrea Robertson
Andrea Stevens
Andrew Carbery
Andrew Davies
Andrew Denton
Andrew Douglas
Andrew McRoberts
Andrew Patterson PDINZ
Andrew Treder
Andrew Tu'inukuafe FDINZ
Andrew Wallace
Andrew Withell PDINZ
Andy Florkowski PDINZ
Andy Grigor
Andy Marchant PDINZ
Angela Amerigo
Angela Coote
Angeline Tulilo-Siilata
Angie Wang
Anke Nienhaus
Annabel Pretty PDINZ
Annabel Wennekes
Anna Cuthbert PDINZ
Anna Dick
Anna Hart
Anna Manson
Anna Myers PDINZ
Anna Parbury
Anna Welsh PDINZ
Anna Wilkinson
Anne Shanks LifeDINZ
Ann Foster
Annie Dow PDINZ
Annie McCulloch
Annie van der Wal
Ann-Louise Hyde
Ann-Marie Appleton
Anoushka Dekker
Anton Agnew
Antonia De Rotaecche PDINZ
Antonia Walmsley
Antony Walton
Anushka Harrison
Ara Institute of Canterbury
Arch MacDonnell FDINZ
Arlene Baird
Ashleigh Lambert
Ashley Thomas
Associate Professor Sven Mehzoud
Auckland Insurance
Auckland University of Technology
Autex
Azza Ho
Back9 Creative
Backhouse
Bahareh Shahri
Barnaby Ward
Barrie Connor
Barry Condon
Batol Rezaie
Belfiore Bologna
Bella Akroyd PDINZ
Ben Corban FDINZ
Ben Fahy
Ben Hutter
Benjamin Parkinson
Ben Jarrett
Ben Reid PDINZ
Bernard Makoare
Beth McIvor Peters
Better by Design
Bettina Winkler
Bevan Tonks PDINZ
Beverley Groves LIFEDINZ
Bhavesh Bhuthadia
BJ Ball Papers
Blair McKolskey
Blythe Rees-Jones FDINZ
Bobby Hung
Box Design Ltd
Brendan Jarvis
Brendan Jarvis
Brendon David Nott
Brenna Ward
Bret Gower
Brett Band
Brett King
Brian Anderson
Brian Griffiths
Brian Richards PDINZ
Brian Slade
Bridget Taylor
Bruce Russell
Bruce Wilson
Bruce Woods
Buster Caldwell
Caitlin Bartlett
Caitlin Rassie
Callaghan Innovation
Callum Butcher
Cameron Sanders
Cameron Shields
Campbell Yule
Carin Wilson FDINZ
Carla Jordaen
Carl Dixon
Carl Moselen
Carlos Constable
Carole Andrews PDINZ
Carolina Short
Caroline Dewe
Caroline Konarkowska
Caroline McCaw
Caroline Powley PDINZ
Caroline Terpstra
Carolyn Applegath
Carolyn Armstrong
Carrie Dressler
Catalyst Consulting Limited
Catherine Hugo
Cathy Veninga CEO FDINZ
Cato Partners NZ Limited
Catriona Knapp
Celia Visser PDINZ
Central Innovation
Chantal Gaiqui
Charles Vaughan
Charlie Nott PDINZ
Charlie Ward
Charlotte Smith
Chelsea Pratt
Che Tamahori FDINZ
Chin-En Keith Soo
Chris Aplin
Chris Barneu

Chris Bentley
Chris Flack PDINZ
Chris Hay
Chris Hill
Chris Jones PDINZ
Chris Kerr
Chris Kim
Chris Smith
Chris Stevens PDINZ
Chris Thomson
Christian Fabricius
Christian Royce Costuna
Christopher Metcalfe PDINZ
Chris Watson
Chrometoaster Limited
Claire Timpany
Clare Kitching
Clark Bardsley
Clark Pritchard PDINZ
Clem Devine PDINZ
Clendons Barristers & Solicitors
Cliff Gibson FDINZ
Colenso BBDO
Colin Depree
Colin Downing
Colin Wood
Conan Fee
Conor O'Brien
Courtney Lawry
Craig Brown
Craig McColl PDINZ
Craig Mulholland
Craig Turvey PDINZ
Cris de Groot
Curtis White
Daisy Tafuna'I
Daisy Zou
Damian Alexander
Damian McMillan
Dan Hamilton
Dani Cunningham
Daniela Markova
Daniel Grinter
Daniel Kempka
Danielle Barclay
Danielle Robinson
Daniel Reilly
Daniel To
Daniel Varcoe
Daniel Zhu
Danny Rowlandson
Dan Wilkinson
Danya Ball
Darryl Best PDINZ
Darryl Fausett
Darryl McClay
Dave Black
Dave Clark FDINZ
Dave Gick
Dave McDonald
Dave Turnbull
David Angus
David Bourke

David Bruce Silvester
David Burroughs
David Cassells
David Craggs PDINZ
David Creighton-Pester
David Evans PDINZ
David Geard
David Lovegrove FDINZ
David MacPherson
David Morgan PDINZ
David Muir FDINZ
David Plaistowe
David Sauvage FDINZ
David Scott PDINZ
David Sinfield
David Sweatman PDINZ
David Trubridge FDINZ
David Wingate FDINZ
Davina Harper
Davinia Sutton
Dayna Northwood
Daz Jensen
DBJ Furniture Ltd.
Dean Christopher Hawken
Dean Krietcher
Dean Murray
Dean Poole FDINZ
Dean Sharpe PDINZ
Dean Steward
Debbie Kitson
Debbie Omond
Debbie Quy
Debbie Ryan-Sheridan
Demelza Round
Dennis Chippindale
Dennis Clotworthy PDINZ
Dennis Winter
Department of Internal Affairs
Derek Manson PDINZ
Designworks
Desna Jury FDINZ
Devi Lecchi PDINZ
Diane Burney
Diane Sumner PDINZ
Diego Getar
Dion Christie
Dock St Group
Donna Aitken
Donna Hoyle PDINZ
Donna Maxwell PDINZ
Donna McCort
Donna Robertson
Donna White PDINZ
Dorothy Davies PDINZ
Douglas Maclean PDINZ
Dow Design Limited
Dr Alan Young
Dr. Amabel Hunting
Drew Douglas Blair PDINZ
Dr. Sue Hedges
Dulux
Duncan Firth
Duncan Joiner LifeDINZ

Earl Tutty
ECC Ltd
Ed Burak PDINZ
Edd Coomber PDINZ
Edward Freeman
Edwin Hooper
Edwin Surtida
Elaina Hamilton
Elaine Conway LifeDINZ
Elaine Roberts LifeDINZ
Element 17 Ltd
Elianna Mark
Elias Marechal
Elizabeth Torres
Ellen Ip
Ellie Gorter
Ellise Judd
Emily Drysdale
Emily Gorman
Emma Bradley
Emma Butterfield
Emma Elliott
Emma Fox Derwin
Emma Jepson
Emma Kaniuk PDINZ
Emma Lowe
Emmanuel Turner
Evajean Paikea
Evandah Steadman
Farshid Sarmast
Felicia Wan
Felicity Stevens
Felton Industries Limited
Fiona Wilson
Fisher & Paykel Appliances
Flora Muriel-Nogoy PDINZ
Folio
Foti Kalogiannidis
Fraser Gardyne FDINZ
Fraser Gillies PDINZ
Gareth Huston PDINZ
Gareth Lauchlan PDINZ
Garrick Wood
Garry Emery
Gary Backhouse
Gary Patterson
Gaye Adsett PDINZ
Gemma McKinlay
Geoff Courtman
Geoff Hargreaves LifeDINZ
Geoffrey Clarke
Geoff Watt
George Frost
Gideon Keith PDINZ
Glen Honeybone
Gracious Living
Graeme Kyle
Graeme Thorne
Grahame Alan Boyd
Grahame Burgess
Grant Alexander FDINZ
Grant Blazey
Gregg Bennett

Grenville Main FDINZ
Gretl Lukas PDINZ
Gus Leen
Guy Hohmann
Guy Richards PDINZ
Guy Trowbridge
Guy Whateley PDINZ
Hadley Vaughan
Hamish Clark
Hamish Stevenson
Hannah Brodie PDINZ
Hannah Morris
Hannah Souter
Harriet Pilkington
Harry Rowntree PDINZ
Hayden Raw
Haydn Jack
Hayley White
Heather Mason
Heather Ogden-Handa
Heath Lowe PDINZ
Helen Clegg
Helen Darroch PDINZ
Helene Hunt
Helen Milner
Helen Schamroth LifeDINZ
Heloise Amaral
Henry Crothers
Henry Steiner
Holly Russell
homestyle
Hyunsoo Song
Ian Anderson PDINZ
Iceberg
Idealog
Insight Creative Limited
Isabella Stockdale-Williamson
Italian Stone
Iva Parapunova
Jackie Mills
Jaclyn Hon
Jacob Dawson
Jacquette Barrington
Jae Park
Jake Clayton
James Carnie
James Duthie
James Felipe
James Fisher
James MacFarlane
James McNab PDINZ
Jamie Booth PDINZ
Jamie Mayne
Jamie McLellan PDINZ
Jane Brown
Janelle Rodrigues PDINZ
Jane Pierard
Jane Pilkington
Janine Pugh
Janson Chau FDINZ
Jaron Ansley
Jarred Bishop PDINZ
Jasmax

Jason Bonham PDINZ
Jason Juno
Jason Lee
Jason Ong
Jayde Williams
Jayne Belcher
Jeanette Trewin
Jeannie Burnside
Jeffery Joseph Bartlett
Jeff Fearon PDINZ
Jeffrey Gordon
Jef Wong PDINZ
Jen Cheyne PDINZ
Jenie Congerton
Jennie Dunlop FDINZ
Jenny Fearnley
Jenny Green FDINZ
Jen Pack PDINZ
Jeremy Andrew
Jeremy Brooker
Jeremy May
Jeremy Smyth
Jeremy Sweetman
Jerry Li
Jesse Keith
Jessica Blair
Jessica Marie Barr
Jess Lowe
Jevan Dickinson
Jewel Yan
Jim Griffin FDINZ
Jimmy Simmons
Jim Pharaoh PDINZ
Jim Scully PDINZ
Jodine Bell
John Dinsdale
John Hughes LifeDINZ
John O'Sullivan
John Oxborough
John Shepherd PDINZ
Johnson McKay
John Tatu
Jonathan Custance FDINZ
Jonathan Davies
Jonathan Killick
Jonathan Mountfort
Jonathan Sagar PDINZ
Jonathan Smith
Jonathan Templeman
Jon Chapman-Smith
Jonti Griffin
Jonty Valentine
Jo Perkins
Jordan Foster
Jordan Keene
Jordyn Baldwin
Joseph Makisi
Joseph McKay
Josh Wong
Jos Kokx PDINZ
Josua Logito
Judi Hilary Bagust PDINZ
Jules Pakenham

Julia Brown
Julia Holman
Julie Ashby
Julie Emmerson
Julie Rees
Juliet Arnott
Juliette Wanty
Justin Crook
Justin Roderique
Kairangi Buchanan
Karel Wohlnick PDINZ
Karen Delehanty
Karen Fergusson PDINZ
Karl Kane
Karl Wixon FDINZ
Karyn Hopper
Kate Alexander FDINZ
Kate Mabin
Kate Morrison
Kate Pilot
Kate Price
Kate Voice
Katherine Vercoe
Katie Rebaïro
Kay Barr
Kay Tasma
Keely Allen
Keely O'Shannessy
Keith Guyan PDINZ
Keith Strode-Penny
Kelly Keach
Kelvin Soh PDINZ
Kennady Virak
Kent Parker PDINZ
Kerenza Smith FDINZ
Keri Ann Cunliffe
Kerry Ann McComish
Kevin Chote
Kimberly Gan
Kim Chambers
Kim Clarke
Kimina Styche
Kim Meek PDINZ
Kim Munro
Kiril Kirilov
Kirsty Mackenzie
KKDC New Zealand Ltd
Knight Associates
KPMG
Kris Lane
Kris Sowersby
Kristin Mischler
Kurk Brady
Kurt McEwen
Kylie Adam
Kylie Willett
Lana Wigley
Lance McGregor
Laura Cibilich
Laura Hill
Laura Lochhead
Lauren Gibbs
Lauren Hickling

Lauren Palmer
Lavinia Sures Kumar
Lee-Anne Flockton
Leela McElroy
Lee Whiterod
Lee Young
Lena J Doull
Len Lew
Leonie von Sturmer PDINZ
Leonie Whyte
Leon Tan
Leon White
Leslie Tergas PDINZ
Les Mills
Les Mills Jnr
Liam Ooi
Liana Young
Libby Beattie
Lili Lovell-Wood
Linda Drew
Lindsay Mackie
Lionel Taylor
Lisa Cruse
Lisa Hegh
Lisa Jukelevics
Lisa Plato
Lis Burt
Lizelle Smit
Liz Johns
Lizzi Whaley
Lorraine Christie
Louise Kellerman
Louise McKenzie-Smith
Lucan Donovan
Lucas Wotawa
Luciana Borges
Ludo Campbell-Reid
Luke McConnell
Luke Scott
Luke Sharpe
Lyn Garrett
Lynn Peck
Lyzadie Renault
Machiko Niimi
Madelene Strong PDINZ
Madison Ford
Maia Visnovsky
Maia Whittet
Malcolm Taylor PDINZ
Mal Corboy PDINZ
Marcel Herbke
Marcjon Nimmo
Marc Simpson
Marcus Robertson
Margaret McGregor
Margo Barton
Maria Goretti Oliver
Marianne Calvello
Marie Bowes
Marilyn Carter-Smith PDINZ
Mark Adams LifeDINZ
Mark Alexander Kessner
Mark Apperley

Mark Benseman PDINZ
Mark Cain
Mark Elmore PDINZ
Mark Gascoigne PDINZ
Mark Gordon Brown PDINZ
Mark Haydon
Mark McEntyre
Mark Parris
Marlene Hudson
Marsha Valenta
Martin Jackson
Martin Joyce PDINZ
Martin Kean
Martin O'Sullivan PDINZ
Martin Sawbridge PDINZ
Mary Davy PDINZ
Massey University - College of Creative Arts
Matt Eales
Matt Grantham PDINZ
Matt Grueters
Matthew Arnold FDINZ
Matthew Buchanan FDINZ
Matthew Galloway
Matthew Smith
Matt Holmes
Matt James
Matt Johnston
Matt Lazenby
Matt McKendry
Matt Pickering
Matt Townsend
Maurice Askew LifeDINZ
Megan Au
Megan Keats
Meg Brasell-Jones
Meg Rowntree
Meisha Kimber
Melanie Kassian PDINZ
Melanie Marshall
Mel Arnold
Melissa Bornholdt
Meridian Energy
Methven
Micaela Wynne
Michaela Ashford
Michael Crampin PDINZ
Michael Cullen
Michael Denton
Michael Fisher PDINZ
Michael Freeman PDINZ
Michael Leng
Michael Mertz PDINZ
Michael Revill PDINZ
Michael Smythe LifeDINZ
Michael Wingham
Michala Kodish
Michelle Backhouse
Michelle Hopkirk PDINZ
Mijntje Lepoutre
Mike Amundsen
Mike Davison
Mike Hindmarsh

Mike Jensen FDINZ
Mike Oxborough
Mike Sanders
Mike Steiner PDINZ
Mike Templeton
Mike Thorburn
Mike Tisdall PDINZ
Mike Williams PDINZ
MILK
Milly Scott
Mitchell Hughes FDINZ
Murray Pilcher FDINZ
Musonda John Katongo
Nadia Suzanne Sakey
Nadine Rathjens
Nanda Rammers
Nanette Cameron
Naomi Rushmer
Natalie Corbett
Natalie Parke
Natalie Sievers
Natasa Sova Bozic
Natasha Baumgartner
Natasha Simeonidis
Nathan Chambers
Nathan Goldsworthy
Nathan Varga
Nathan Walker
Neerali Parbhu
Neil McLachlan PDINZ
Neil Pardington PDINZ
Neville Parker FDINZ
Ngataiharuru Taepa
Nicholas Burrowes
Nicholas Vanderschantz
Nicholas Yardley
Nicki Brady
Nick Kapica
Nick Lew
Nick McFarlane
Nick Riley
Nick Worthington
Nico Dubois
Nicola Cumming PDINZ
Nicola Custance PDINZ
Nicola Harrison PDINZ
Nicola Manning PDINZ
Nicole Austin
Nicole Wilson
Nigel James
Nik Clifford PDINZ
Nikki Apse
Nikki Wilson
Nik Senior
Noel Blackwell PDINZ
Noel Brown FDINZ
Noor El-Matary
NV Interactive
Oliver Backhouse
Oliver Haydon
Oliver McDermott PDINZ
Oliver Ward
Olivia Collinson

Olivia Harper PDINZ
Olivia Murray
Omar Shahab
Ornela Priotti
Oryza Clark
Otago Polytechnic
Pablo Eynon
Pacific Environments NZ Limited
Pamela Hall
Pam Ford
Paola Trapani
Patricia Lai
Pat Watkins
Paula Comber
Paula Marcondes
Paul Baker
Paul Belchambers PDINZ
Paul Heywood
Pauline Ray
Paul Izzard PDINZ
Paul James
Paul Shadbolt
Paul Walkinton
Paul White PDINZ
Paul Wilkinson PDINZ
Paul Wood
Paul Woodruffe
Pearl Kathanna
Peeti Lamwilai
Pep Zuijderwijk PDINZ
Pete Montgomery
Peter Bromhead LifeDINZ
Peter Gilderdale PDINZ
Peter Haythornthwaite FDINZ
Peter Howman
Peter Murray
Peter Roband FDINZ
Peter Tasker LifeDINZ
Phil Dunstan-Brown
Philip Heath PDINZ
Philip Horner
Philip Vodanovich
Phillip Judd
Phillippa Ryder
Phil Robinson
Phil Shaw PDINZ
Phil Smith
Phil Thompson
Phil Treweek
Phoebe Ellis PDINZ
Pieter Dreyer PDINZ
Piri Arnold Tukere PDINZ
Pitch Studio
Plato Design Agency
PLN Group
Portfolio Recruitment
Professor Brian Lucid
Professor Claire Robinson
Professor Guy Littlefair
Professor Julianna Preston
Professor Thomas Mical
Prof Terry Cunniffe
Prof Tony Parker FDINZ
Prof Zagorski
Prudence Lane PDINZ
Prue Fenwick
Rachael Lovelace
Rachel Doughty PDINZ
Rachele Simmons-Taling
Rachel Foye
Rachel Martin
Rachel McPherson-Parker
Raelene Bailey
Raewyn Foote
Raimana Jones
Rainer Leisky
Ray Labone FDINZ
Ray Pryor LifeDINZ
Ray Thorburn LifeDINZ
Rebecca Au
Rebecca Bailey
Rebecca Burton
Rebecca Millington
Rebecca Ransley
Rebecca Steedman
Rebecca Wyborn
Rebekah Harman
Rees Morley
Rei Konza PDINZ
Remy Smit
Renee Norman
Reuben Reid
Reuben Woods PDINZ
Rezharco Doria
Ria Gleeson
Richard Craig
Richard Foy
Richard Francis
Richard Furze FDINZ
Richard Heath
Richard Naish
Richard Roach
Richards Partners
Richard Te One PDINZ
Richard Unsworth PDINZ
Richie Hartness
Rob Bolus
Rob Cox LifeDINZ
Robert Ellis LifeDINZ
Robert Macfarlane PDINZ
Robert Whitaker
Robin Beckett
Rob Lovelock
Robyn La Roche PDINZ
Rochelle Foster
Rodney Inteman PDINZ
Roger Billington
Roger Wall
Ron Kumar
Rosemary Hume
Ross Bell PDINZ
Ross Bryon LifeDINZ
Roz Hamilton
Rufus Knight PDINZ
Rupert Enberg
Russell Haines
Ryan Marx PDINZ
Sacha Ghisleni
Salia Wang
Sally Thompson
Sam Allan PDINZ
Sam Cunnane
Sam Houghton FDINZ
Samuel Southwell PDINZ
Samuel Whitburn
Sandra Grummitt LifeDINZ
Santi Fungtamman
Sara Denise Narciso
Sarah Backler
Sarah Bryant
Sarah Carne
Sarah Eaton
Sarah Gardner
Sarah Gebbie
Sarah Gladwell PDINZ
Sarah Kirk
Sarah Langford PDINZ
Sarah Maxey FDINZ
Sarah Melrose
Sara Murdoch PDINZ
Sara Romano
Sara Walker
Scott Compton
Scott Fitzsimons
Sean McGarry FDINZ
Serena Smalley
Shahriar Asdollah-Zadeh
Shane Inder
Shannon Lenihan
Sharmila Jeram
Sharneel Chandra
Sharon Cross LifeDINZ
Sharon Darrah
Shaun Boyd
Shaun Craill PDINZ
Sherilyn De Klerk
Shirley Chin PDINZ
Shona Macleod
Shontelle Crosswell
Simon Blincoe
Simon Coley PDINZ
Simone Stephens PDINZ
Simone van der Plas PDINZ
Simon James
Simon Laing
Simon Murray
Simon Richmond
Siobhan Nolan
Sommer Cook
Sonya Cotter PDINZ
Sophia Cameron
Space Studio
Special Group Limited
Stacey Senior James
Stack Interiors
Stan Mauger LifeDINZ
Stefan Geelen
Stefan Kerekere
Stephanie Nathan

Stephanie Zwerink
Stephen Boxall
Stephen Cashmore PDINZ
Stephen Fraser
Stephen James PDINZ
Stephen McCarthy PDINZ
Stephen Reay
Stephenson & Turner NZ Ltd
Steve Cochran
Steven Giannoulis
Steven Korner
Steve Rosling
Steve Toomath
Steve Tullett
Strategy Design & Advertising
Stuart Smith
Sue Davies
Sue Gallagher
Sue James
Sue Kanji
Sue Naylor PDINZ
Sue Strobel PDINZ
Susan Timberlake
Suzanne Miller
Suzy Falconer
Sven Baker FDINZ
Sylvia Sandford PDINZ
Tabitha Lau
Talia Indyk
Tamsyn Black
Tania McDougall
Tanmay Desai
Tessa Pawson
Theo Zentgraf
Thomas Lawlor
Thomas Woods
Tikirau Hathaway
Tim Brown
Tim Christie
Tim Donaldson
Tim Garman
Tim Gomez FDINZ
Tim Hogarth
Tim Hooson FDINZ
Tim Huber
Tim Kelleher DINZ
Tim O'Neill
Timothy Allan FDINZ
Tim Papps
Tim Parkin
Tim Powell
Tim Sumner
Tim Webber PDINZ
Tobias Danielmeier
Tobin Smith
Toby Curnow FDINZ
Tomas Garcia Ferrari
Tom Charles William Hargreaves
Tom Davies
Tonga Robertson
Toni Brandso PDINZ
Tony Borland Lye
Tony Profitt PDINZ
Tony Winter LifeDINZ
Toulouse Group
Tracey Ellin
Tricia Dunlop PDINZ
Tristram Sparks
Troy Darrow
Tui Short
Tyrone O'Halloran
Tyrone Ohia PDINZ
UCOL
Unispace Limited
Unitec New Zealand
Universal College of Learning (UCOL)
University of Canterbury School of
Product Design
University of Waikato
Valentina Machina PDINZ
Vanessa Byrnes
Vanessa McNaught
Vanessa Taylor
Vee Kessner FDINZ
Vic Smith
Victoria Campbell
Victoria Wilkes PDINZ
VidaSpace
Vien McArthur
Vimlesh Naidu
Vivian Oskam
Vivienne Cardno
Vivienne Radcliffe
Voice
Walter Kooznetzoff PDINZ
Warren and Mahoney Architects
Warren Burton PDINZ
Wayne Pick
Wayne Shih
Welby Ings
Wendy Elers PDINZ
Wendy Goode PDINZ
Wendy Nannestad
Will Cook
Will Grant PDINZ
William Bardebes
Wim de Bruin
Wingate Architects Ltd
Winifred Rutherford PDINZ
Wintec - Waikato Institute of Technol-
ogy
Xuanyang Sun
Yardley and Foster Architecture Ltd
Yellow6
Yolande Dickinson-Smith
Yukako Matsuda
Yuran Qin
Zac Goodsir
Zachary Moller
Zak Dittmer
Zoe Ikin PDINZ