From:
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2015 9:19 PM
To: DFSRegs
Subject: DFS Comment

Formstack Submission for form DFS Comment

Submitted at 11/20/15 9:19 PM

Name: Henry Harrison

Address: 9 Garrison Ln
Southborough, MA 01772

Email:

Comment: As a player of all varieties of fantasy sports, I welcome regulation. I agree that government oversight is desirable in order to ensure transparency and fairness. This is a more sensible approach than then outright ban being sought by some others.

Many of the regulations are sensible and I will welcome them. However, I have several concerns about the specific proposed regulations.

34.06.3: No Proxy Servers. While it makes sense to prevent players from circumventing other rules by using proxy servers, a blanket ban is unreasonable. Many people use proxy servers as their primary means of internet access, for completely legitimate reasons. For example, when using public internet (e.g., at a coffeeshop), use of a proxy server can keep your transmission secure from hackers. In this sense, proxy servers can actually increase security. Perhaps a better rule would be to allow only proxy servers that verify that their users are in the same state as the server. This would prevent proxy servers from being used to get around geographic restrictions while still allowing them to be used for security purposes.

3.06.5. Simultaneous Log-ins. In our digital age, simultaneous log-ins should not be considered suspicious. I am routinely logged on many devices. For example, I may enter lineups from my laptop, but then check results from my phone, without bothering to log out in-between. The possibility of being penalized, or assumed to be a cheater, for using multiple devices is distressing.

34.12. Fairness of DFS Contents. While I agree that DFS should be fair, and regulations put in place to prevent abuse, I fear that some of these regulations take the goal of fairness to the level of Harrison Bergeron.

34.12.1. No Game Play by Employees and Others Affiliated with a DFSO. In light of recent events, some restriction of this type is evidently required. However, I fear no thought is being given to the consequence. Imagine a DFS player who sees problems with existing DFSOs and believes she can build a better, fairer, more fun platform. If she truly loves DFS (as she must, if she wants to create a DFSO), she may be reluctant to enter the market if it means she could never again be a DFS player. As a result, this type of restriction could cement the market share of the existing DFSOs and stifle competition. If proprietary data is properly protected, then I believe other employees and contractors who don't have data access should be able to continue playing.

34.12.6. Games that Exclude Highly-Experienced Players. My concern with this rule is personal. By

your definition, I am a highly experience player. My favorite games are the 25-cent tournament offered by DraftKings. I believe that due to the variability of DFS results playing the lowest possible buy-in is the safest play. 25-cent games are far better than $1 games that most sites have as the lowest. However, they are not that popular. I worry that the cheap games will be made to exclude experienced players. This will be to the detriment of players like me, who are experienced but do not have a large bankroll, and may be forced to play higher buy-ins than they are comfortable with.

34.12.8. Prohibition of Scripts. This issue especially concerns me. Unfortunately, expert scripts are difficult to detect. Currently, there are some scripts made publicly available, e.g. by RotoGrinders. If scripts are banned, players with the most technical skills and resources will still be able to use them, but "regular" players like me will not be able to. An alternative is to make sure that the same interactions with the DFSO are available to everyone. For example, the DFSOs should allow users to upload lineups as text files instead of having to click on all their buttons and deal with the potential slow website interactions. If I need to change some lineups because a player is out, being able to make automatic changes to a number of lineups is desirable. If I am forced to do so "by hand", with many clicks, then my success at DFS will be determined in part by the speed of my computer and internet access. It will also prevent me from preparing contingency plans ahead of time. Successful DFS players will be required to monitor their lineups closely before they lock. People subject to distractions, such as parents of young children, may be discouraged from playing because they know they are not likely to get a chance to fix their lineups if they are not allowed to script the processes involved. The only solution is to require these scripts to be publicly available and advertised.

34.12.9. Rules on When DFS Contests Lock. Why disallow late swap? Yes, it is possible that late swap gives an advantage to certain DFS players. But as long as no one is being misled about what is allowed, why ban the practice? Late swap is controversial in the DFS community, and the best solution is to allow everyone to enter the type of game they prefer---late swap or not.

34.12.11. Restrictions on Number of Entries by Contest. This makes some sense. However, I don't think blanket restrictions are desirable. For example, imagine a specific contest type that pitted one player against another, and each creates 20 different lineups? This sounds like a fun game type to me, and not unfair in any way. Maybe a better rule would place limits only on the majority of games offered by a DFSO, with exceptions clearly labeled.

In general, I would offer a few closing statements. First, it is not inherently a problem that different DFS players have different chances of winning. After all, there is an element of skill involved. People have different levels of education and have different preferences with respect to risk taking. These will result in different outcomes. If a game of equal outcome is desired, the players should roll dice against each other.

More importantly, the best solution to a problem of privileged access to data or privileged use of scripts or other advantages that these regulations are meant to address, may not be to remove the privilege entirely. A better solution may be to grant the same privileges to everyone. Some of the data that you are concerned about, maybe it could be posted publicly (not data at the individual levels, obviously) instead of restricted.Easier interaction with DFSO websites should be made available to everyone, whether via scripts or site APIs or other services. This would democratize access.

To reiterate, I welcome regulation. Those aimed at advertising or problem gambling are particularly needed, in my opinion. While I also believe that regulations should be made to enforce fairness, I believe that DFS games are already fair. If we listen to everyone who has a complaint on the internet, and remove every aspect of DFS that someone has complained about, there will be nothing left.

In sum, there are many aspects of DFS that could be abused. Rather than ban the corresponding part of the game (that is used legitimately, but potentially abused), make it illegal to abuse them. In finance, we could ban business executives from ever owning stocks. Instead, we ban insider

trading--acting on private knowledge for personal benefit. In DFS, we could ban late swaps. Instead, we should ban abuse of late swaps. Transparency is key. Instead of banning mass-entry, ban mass-entry that is not disclosed.

I hope you take a critical eye to these regulations and do not make a regulation for every single complaint that exists against DFSOs. You will not be able to keep up.