

## **PAB sub-committee meeting**

### **Domain Name re-registration**

Attendees:

Andrew Bennett  
Gordon Dick (Chair)  
Clive Feather  
Mark Healey  
Michael Toth

Emily Taylor

Apologies: Eric Ramage, James Conaghan

GD reviewed progress to date.

In the last PAB meeting there was general agreement that:

- a) the PAB is uncomfortable with the discrepancy between registrants' perception and reality on cancelled domain names.
- b) the PAB believed that there should be a level playing field for registrars on this issue.
- c) the PAB believed that there should be a level playing field for registrants on this issue.

In an e-mail circulated to the sub-committee members before the meeting, GD had posed the following questions, which were used as a framework for the discussions.

- 1. What are the concerns/issues for registrants and potential registrants?**
- 2. What are the concerns/issues for registrars?**
- 3. What are the concerns/issues for Nominet?**

Each point was discussed in detail. The sub-committee then formulated general policy principles, and suggested some operational mechanisms which could be considered by Nominet.

### **Policy Principles**

1. The system should be fair, and should not incentivise people to share resources/act in concert
2. There should be low barriers to entry for all registrars so they can truly compete for cancelled names
3. One party should not be able to unfairly disadvantage another
4. The system should aim to prevent excessive use of resources on tech/complaints systems at Nominet
5. An even distribution of registrants should be able to obtain cancelled domains
6. The ability to dropcatch should not prevent a registrar's ability to do other normal tasks

7. Should your ability to dropcatch depend on the number of names on your tag?  
The larger registrars are being disadvantaged because they need their access to do other things.
8. Cost neutrality
9. Mechanism should be understandable to the average registrant.
10. There should be disincentives for hammering Nominet's technical systems.

It was noted that the first step forward could be to consider small operational changes within the current frameworks that may go some way towards achieving the policy principles above.

In the circumstances that a larger review is required to achieve these policy principles, it is suggested that some options to be considered for operational implementation include:

**Status quo**

Tweaking the status quo (ie abuse limits); randomisation - Adjusting the randomisation process (30 day period rather than 1 day, random decay model)

**Change contract on DAC**, so that you can only use it on public website.

**Waitlists** – first come, first served slot, or finite number, or infinite slots

**Auctions** – eg 10<sup>th</sup> bid

**Blind auction**

**Blind auction - lowest unique bid above the registration price wins.**

**Not dropping them at all.**

**Holding names for a longer period.**

**Lottery** – for each name; go into lottery to get a choice of name; number of entries according to size of registrar; one per registrant (cheating?)

**Some form of sunrise vs beauty contest** (Nominet picks the best registrant) or .me.uk style sunrise.

**Nominet could list all suspended names.**

**Drop them all at once** at start of day.

**Transfer it to a third party to auction**

**The earlier you do a DAC look up after it drops, the more DAC look ups that costs you.**  
The earlier it drops, the more you pay for it. Want to discourage the early hammering that means only a few people get in. People should be thinking about when and how they hammering the DAC. The subcommittee members were comfortable with the principle of discouragement.