



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Stuart M. Brown (SBN 170028)
PRESTON GATES & ELLIS LLP
222 SW Columbia Street
Suite 1400
Portland, OR 97201-6632
Telephone: (503) 228-3200
Facsimile: (503) 248-9085
Email: sbrown@prestongates.com

Kathleen O. Peterson (SBN 124791)
Aaron M. McKown (SBN 208781)
PRESTON GATES & ELLIS LLP
1900 Main Street, Suite 600
Irvine, CA 92614
Telephone: (949) 253-0900
Facsimile: (949) 253-0902
Email: aaronm@prestongates.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
AT LOS ANGELES

JFW
(MAN)

DOTSTER, INC., a Washington corporation, GO DADDY SOFTWARE, INC., an Arizona corporation, and eNOM, INC., a Washington corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS, a California nonprofit corporation

Defendant.

Civil Case No. 03-5045

DECLARATION OF CLINT PAGE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

1
2 I, Clint Page, declare and state as follows:

3
4 I am president of Plaintiff Dotster, Inc. ("Dotster"). I make this declaration of
5 my own knowledge, and after a review of documents maintained by Dotster in the
6 normal course of business. If called as a witness I could testify to each of the
7 following facts:

8 1. Every computer connected to the Internet is identified by a unique
9 numeric code, known as an Internet Protocol address, or IP address. IP addresses can
10 contain up to 12 digits, and can be difficult to easily remember. For that reason,
11 Internet-connected computers can also be located by a domain name, an alphanumeric
12 phrase which is tied to a specific IP address ("Domains").

13 2. The U.S. Department of Commerce ("DOC") delegated the technical
14 management of the domain name system ("DNS") to the Internet Corporation for
15 Assigned Names and Numbers, a California nonprofit corporation ("Defendant"), in a
16 Memorandum of Understanding/Joint Project Agreement with U.S. Department of
17 Commerce dated 25 November 1998 (the "MOU"). A copy of the MOU is attached
18 hereto as Exhibit A, and is incorporated herein by reference. Defendant was tasked
19 with operating the DNS based on the principles of promoting stability, competition,
20 bottom-up coordination, representation, and in a manner that would develop robust
21 competition. The MOU has been amended and extended multiple times, with the
22 most recent being Amendment 5 to the Defendant/DOC MOU, which is dated
23 September 19, 2002.

24 3. Defendant has been specifically tasked with coordinating the assignment
25 of Domains, IP address numbers, and protocol parameter and port numbers, which
26 must be globally unique for the Internet to function.

1 4. Defendant has delegated certain of its functions relating to the
2 assignment of Domains by contracting with third party registries, each of which is
3 responsible for managing a top level domain ("TLDs") (such as .COM, .ORG, or
4 .BIZ). Specifically, on May 25, 2001, Defendant and VeriSign Global Registry
5 Services, a division of VeriSign, Inc. (the "Registry"), entered into two Registry
6 Agreements under which the Registry was delegated to operate the .COM and .NET
7 TLDs (the "Registry Agreements"). A copy of the .COM Registry Agreement is
8 attached hereto as Exhibit B, and a copy of the .NET Registry Agreement is attached
9 hereto as Exhibit C, both are incorporated hereon by reference. The appendices to
10 Exhibits B and C, other than Appendix G, are not included, as they are technical in
11 nature and not relevant to this matter. VeriSign, Inc.'s wholly owned subsidiary,
12 Network Solutions, Inc., is a Registrar.

13 5. The Registry and Defendant both individually contract with third parties,
14 or Domain registrars ("Registrars"), who have a relationship with businesses or
15 individuals who register and use the Domains ("Domain Registrants").

16 6. To become a Registrar, a business must apply for accreditation with
17 Defendant, submit certain supporting documents pertaining to commercial general
18 liability insurance coverage and proof of adequate working capital, pay a non-
19 refundable application fee, and sign a Registrar Accreditation Agreement
20 ("Accreditation Agreement"). The Accreditation Agreement governs the relationship
21 between a Registrar and Defendant.

22 7. As part of becoming an Defendant-accredited Registrar, and in addition
23 to the steps required in Paragraph 6, the prospective Registrar must also determine
24 which TLDs it will offer to register. For example, a Registrar may offer to register the
25 .COM, .NET, .INFO and .ORG TLDs for potential Domain Registrants. The
26 determination of which names to offer is a business decision, and requires a

1 prospective Registrar to pass compatibility testing for each Registry and to execute
2 certain appendices to the Accreditation Agreement. For example, to register .COM
3 and .NET Domains, a Registrar must contract with the Registry, and sign an Appendix
4 to the Accreditation Agreement.

5 8. To register Domains, the Registry operates and maintains one shared,
6 central registry in which competing Defendant-accredited Registrars register .COM
7 and .NET Domains. There are currently 168 Defendant-accredited Registrars that are
8 permitted to register Domains. Of those 168 Defendant-accredited Registrars, 135 of
9 those Registrars are accredited by the Registry to register .COM and .NET Domains.
10 There are certain Registrars that do not register the .COM and .NET Domains.
11 However, the .COM Domains are generally considered to be the most popular
12 Domains.

13 9. Registrars compete against one another to register and host Domain
14 Registrants' Domains. The Domain registration arena has become increasingly
15 competitive in recent years. Each Registrar that registers .COM or .NET Domains can
16 only do so through the Registry, which receives \$6 for each such Domain registration.

17 10. Registrars compete not only to register new, never-before registered
18 Domains, approximately 45 Registrars also compete to re-register Domains that are
19 expiring or otherwise being deleted by the Registry.

20 11. When a Domain Registrant fails to renew his or her Domain, the
21 Registrar with whom the Domain was originally registered has up to 45 days from the
22 date the registration expires to send a "delete command" to the Registry.

23 12. After the delete command has been sent to the Registry, the Registry then
24 places the Domain on a 30-day redemption grace period ("Redemption Period").
25 During the Redemption Period, the Domain Registrant can either decide to renew the
26

1 Domain by filling out a form to retain ownership of the Domain and complete a
2 renewal or to take no action and allow the Domain to be deleted, as described below.

3 13. If a Domain Registrant takes no action to renew the Domain and intends
4 to allow the Domain to expire, once the Redemption Period ends, the Domain enters a
5 "Pending Delete" status. When the Domain enters the Pending Delete status, the
6 Domain is placed on a pending delete report, which is updated daily by the Registry
7 for Registrars to download, should they wish to do so. The pending delete report is
8 the complete list of all .COM and .NET Domains that are scheduled to be deleted on a
9 particular day. The Pending Delete status lasts for five days. At the end of the five
10 days, the Domain is deleted in a batch delete process, which takes place at 11 am PST
11 and usually lasts for less than one hour (the "Batch Delete"). There are typically
12 approximately 25,000 Domains deleted daily in the Batch Delete. As stated in
13 Paragraph 10, there are approximately 45 active, highly competitive Registrars using
14 their connections to the Registry to obtain such Domains during Batch Deletes.

15 14. Due to the fierce competition between Registrars, the Registry has set up
16 specialized equipment the Registrars use for the purpose of registering Domains that
17 are being deleted. Such equipment is generally referred to as the "Batch Pool." The
18 Batch Pool provides equal access for all Registrars attempting to register the Domains
19 that are being deleted.

20 15. During a Batch Delete, each competing Registrar sends a command from
21 their computers to the Registry computers attempting to register wanted Domains in
22 the Batch Pool. The first competing Registrar to have their command accepted for the
23 wanted Domain registers the Domain for its customer. A desirable Domain that is
24 deleted during a Batch Delete will generally be re-registered within a few milliseconds
25 of it being deleted by the Registry.
26

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

16. Potential Domain Registrants can choose from many different models offered by Registrars to obtain Domains during a Batch Delete, including, among other models, fixed price, first-come-first-serve, auction models, or contacting a Domain reseller.

17. Currently, each Registrar that attempts to obtain Domains during the Batch Delete sets its own pricing and has its own recommendations as to which is the best model for potential Domain Registrants. Potential Domain Registrants can register Domains deleted during the Batch Delete process from as low as \$8.75 to as high as thousands of dollars.

18. Dotster is a Defendant-accredited Registrar. As part of the requirement for becoming an Defendant-accredited registrar, Dotster entered into the Accreditation Agreement with Defendant, which is dated effective May 17, 2001. The Accreditation Agreement governs the relationship between Dotster and Defendant. Dotster is also active in the registration of expiring Domains. A copy of Dotster's Accreditation Agreement is attached as Exhibit D, and is incorporated herein by this reference.

19. Dotster markets the technology and processes that Dotster has developed to register expiring Domains that are being deleted in a Batch Delete to potential Domain Registrants under the name "NameWinner." NameWinner does not operate on a first-come first-served model; instead, it operates on an auction model, which allows all interested potential Domain Registrants to place a bid on a Domain that is about to expire.

20. NameWinner requires a potential Domain Registrants to make a minimum starting bid of \$8.75 on a particular Domain, and then allows others to bid back and forth. Bidding ends for a Domain approximately one hour before the Domain is scheduled to be deleted in a Batch Delete. A potential Domain Registrants pays

1 Dotster only if NameWinner is able to successfully register the requested Domain; the
2 potential Domain Registrants pays nothing if he or she does not get the Domain
3 requested.

4 21. On an annual basis, Dotster pays registrar accreditation fees to Defendant
5 in accordance with the Accreditation Agreement and Defendant's then-current
6 policies. Since Dotster became and accredited Registrar, it has paid in excess of
7 \$75,000 in accreditation fees.

8 22. In late 2001, the Registry proposed a change to Defendant's policies,
9 which would allow it to offer a new service that is commonly referred to as a Wait
10 Listing Service or WLS.

11 23. The proposed WLS would allow a potential Registrant who wishes to
12 register a Domain that is already registered can pay a fee for the opportunity to
13 register that Domain if and when the current registration expires. Under the WLS, a
14 Domain that is being deleted by the Registry would be checked to determine if a WLS
15 subscription had been purchased for that Domain. If a WLS subscription has been
16 purchased, the Domain would be generally registered to the WLS subscription holder.
17 The Registry would administer the WLS program, and it initially proposed that it
18 would receive \$40 for each WLS subscription, plus the standard \$6 registration fee,
19 should the WLS subscription result in the Domain being registered by the WLS
20 subscription holder. The WLS subscription fee is now proposed to be \$24 for each
21 WLS subscription.

22 24. The Registry's unique position as the entity with exclusive control over
23 the registration of the .COM and .NET TLDs will allow it to operate WLS. A
24 Registrar such as any of the Plaintiffs would not be able to implement a universal
25 system such as WLS.
26

1 25. As the WLS would be a new fee or charge implemented by the Registry,
2 the Registry requested to Defendant that Appendix G to the .COM and .NET Registry
3 Agreements be amended. Appendix G specifies the maximum price that the Registry
4 may charge for "Registry Services." Registry Services are defined in the Registry
5 Agreement as those services that are "provided as an integral part of the operation of
6 the Registry TLD."

7 26. According to Defendant's ~~General Counsel in a letter to~~ Defendant's
8 Board of Directors ("Board") dated April 17, 2002, which has been publicly posted on
9 Defendant's Internet website, "Registry Services" are those that a registry operator is
10 enabled to provide on a sole-source basis by virtue of its appointment as such by
11 Defendant, rather than services that are provided on a freely competitive basis. The
12 proposed WLS is a registry service because, unlike the wait-listing services provided
13 competitively by registrars, it is implemented by bypassing the normal return of
14 deleted names to the available pool and by instead assigning them to the registrar and
15 customer holding the reservation." A copy of the General Counsel's letter is attached
16 as Exhibit E and is incorporated herein by this reference.

17 27. In deciding to whether to permit the implementation of WLS, Defendant
18 established a task force (the "Task Force") of the Domain Name Supporting
19 Organization (which is similar to a "committee" within Defendant) and Defendant's
20 Board requested that the Task Force prepare a report and recommendations on
21 whether to implement WLS. The Task Force initially recommended that the Board
22 deny the WLS proposal, however, it was then persuaded to include in its report certain
23 conditions should the WLS proposal actually be implemented.

24 28. On August 23, 2002, Defendant's Board adopted a resolution authorizing
25 Defendant's President and General Counsel to negotiate with the Registry for the
26

1 establishment of WLS, despite stiff opposition to the WLS articulated by the Task
2 Force and other Internet stakeholders.

3 29. On September 9, 2002, pursuant to Section 4.3.2 of the Accreditation
4 Agreement, Plaintiff Dotster submitted a request for review under the Defendant's
5 Independent Review Policy requesting an independent review of Defendants' actions
6 and disputing the presence of a Consensus as required by the Accreditation
7 Agreement. In contravention of Defendant's ~~then-current~~ Bylaws, Defendant has not,
8 and to Plaintiffs' knowledge has not, established the required Independent Review
9 Panel.

10 30. On September 12, 2002, pursuant to the requirements of the
11 Accreditation Agreement, Dotster submitted a Reconsideration Request and formal
12 request for review under Defendant's Independent Review Policy, asking Defendant
13 to reconsider its August 23 decision.

14 31. On May 20, 2003, Defendant issued a Recommendation on Dotster's
15 request, recommending that Defendant's Board take no action on the request. On
16 June 2, 2003, Defendant's Board adopted the Recommendation issued on May 20, and
17 again authorized negotiations between itself and the Registry toward the establishment
18 of WLS.

19 32. On June 2, 2003, Defendant's Board adopted the Recommendation
20 issued on May 20, and again authorized negotiations between itself and the Registry
21 toward the establishment of WLS. Upon information and belief, those negotiations
22 continue. The Registry has announced that it will begin implementation of the WLS
23 on October 11, 2003, however a "soft launch" is planned to occur prior to October 11.

24 33. Implementation of the proposed WLS will effectively destroy the
25 NameWinner and other competing businesses in the expiring Domain market because
26 WLS creates a single, first-come, first-served model that preempts the competitive

1 Batch Delete process that currently exists. If WLS is implemented, instead of simply
2 deleting the name from the Registry as part of the Batch Delete process, the Registry
3 will first check to determine whether a WLS subscription has been purchased for the
4 Domain.

5 34. If a WLS subscription has been purchased for a Domain, the Domain will
6 generally be automatically registered to the purchaser of the WLS subscription. If no
7 WLS subscription has been purchased, the Batch Delete process will then take place.

8 35. The WLS subscription is currently scheduled to cost \$24 annually, and is
9 non-refundable, even if the Domain is not deleted. Potential Domain Registrants will
10 have to pay for the WLS subscription, but are not guaranteed to get anything for the
11 fee. If the WLS subscription does result in a Domain being registered, there will be an
12 additional \$6 wholesale cost from the Registry for the Domain registration.

13 36. Implementation of the WLS will essentially end the current business
14 model Dotster has created with its NameWinner product (and all of those business
15 models created by its competitors). There will no longer be deleting Domains of
16 value for potential Domain Registrants to bid on, as valuable Domains will likely have
17 WLS subscriptions placed on them.

18 37. The innovation, creativity, and resources that have been devoted to a
19 maturing, increasingly competitive deleted Domain market will be destroyed by a
20 standardized, sole-source product offered by the Registry. Today, potential Domain
21 Registrants have a choice for registering deleted Domains. If the proposed WLS is
22 implemented, the only choice will be WLS.

23 38. I have read the Complaint and it is accurate and complete.
24
25
26

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

39. The estimated value of the business that Dotster will lose (on an annual basis) if WLS is implemented substantially exceeds \$100,000.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on July 14, 2003 at Kelso, Washington.

Clint Page
Clint Page