

Ross Wm. Rader

From: "HJW" <webmaster@buildable.com>
To: <icann-delete@total.confusion.net>
Sent: Friday, October 19, 2001 1:44 AM
Subject: [icann-delete] a "better mousetrap"? Why?

Since the registrars participating in the practice of capturing deleting names are not violating any terms of the agreement, I do not see why they should be labeled as "Violators".

Since the registry has implemented the "batch pool", activity there should in no way interfere with the "normal" pools that registrars use to conduct "normal" business, so certainly those registrars using the "batch" pool are not "Violating" anything at this point - they are using the resources allotted for that specific purpose.

Like it or not, it IS the speculators that are driving this market, so Chuck's comments are accurate from what I see. From what I see, the registry was certainly not prepared for this but has now made a solution that at least keeps it from impacting the "normal" RPP connection pools. I believe that this IS a step in the right direction. While the registry seems to have been "caught short" on resources as a whole, would it not be possible to expand those resources further? One thought is that VGRS could charge a slightly higher registry fee for ONLY those names registered through the "batch" process pool. This would keep that activity from impacting the "normal" pools AND help to offset the cost of the extra resources that the registry is providing across the whole spectrum with only the users of the batch pool supplementing the cost. I do not believe that registrars participating in the batch pool would have a problem with a SMALL increase in the registry fees for names registered strictly through that pool, but that is something that should be asked of them since I am not a registrar. This would allow for as much expansion of the batch pool as necessary to allow all registrars the opportunity to use those resources as well, while satisfying the registry with some offset of the costs to upgrade the resources. It should also be noted that there are also infinite scenarios available to modify this existing format to lessen the "DOS attack" style activities even in this pool and still keep it fair and competitive while providing equal opportunity to all. Any registrar could choose thier own business model to provide this service to the public. No monopoly would exist in this area.

If the resources to allow registrars to service the "speculator" market are removed, believe me the speculators will only hammer the front ends of all registrars themselves to go after the deleting names. If the "batch deletes" are discontinued and random deletes are implemented, this scenario will be a constant activity - is that really the right path? I believe this has been covered previously and the likely results of such actions would be more resource intensive. While I believe that every name should go through the "5 day purge" cycle before it deletes, it also seems reasonable that they should all be put into that cycle during the 45 day grace period. Any registrar holding a name past the 45 day grace period forfeits the \$6 registry fee at this point but still needs to delete the name because it is not technically registered to a registrant at that point and that name needs to be returned to the pool as soon as possible to allow a "real" registration to occur. Any activities by the registrar other than deleting the name at this point- like trying to auction the name (this goes for names still in the 45 day grace period as well) - would most likely be a violation of the agreement anyway, so why even allow the name to go past the 45 day grace period knowing that the \$6 will be forfeited?

This scenario takes the agravation of the "Speculators" away from those who do not want to service them and allows those that do the resouces to accomplish that without impacting regular registrar activities in the least.

here are some thoughts...

Why build a "Paralell Registry" when with the above system all deleting names could just be dumped into the "batch" pool?

Want the 1 connection has equal chance idea? only allow 1 connection per registrar into that pool! (although this seems a bit silly to me, since all registrars would have equal access anyway no matter how many connections were allowed) There also could be limitations to requests/second and such to limit activity here.

Want nothing to do with "Speculators" or any impacton on normal registrar business? This does it.

The interesting thing is that all of this infastructure is already in place but it seems everyone is focused on "fixing" something with some sort of radical change. The current first come first served model of registrations is preserved by this model also, any other system would alter that in some way.

Do I have to write this as a "Word Document" for it to be considered as an option?

Harold Whiting

At 06:11 PM 10/18/2001 -0400, you wrote:

>At 5:40 PM -0400 10/18/01, Gomes, Chuck wrote:

>>I am not convinced that the registrars who are "abusing" the system are
>>actually violating any terms of the agreement. They may be doing something
>>that many of us dislike. Many people are opposed to speculation. But I
>>don't think the agreements disallow it. The problem is that the original
>>system was not designed to handle such activity efficiently.

>

>So, if registrars are operating within the terms of their agreement
>with the registry, what's the problem with the registry upgrading its
>systems to accommodate that activity? A design flaw by the registry
>is something that the registry should be paying to correct, not the
>registrars.

>

>Jordyn

Harold Whiting
webmaster@buildable.com
805.886.4164