Creating the appropriate Term:
Deceptive Brand Tread Notice
Deceptive Brand Encroachment Notice
Fake Squat Notice
More???

*** Slamming will be referenced within this document until the appropriate term has been defined and agreed.

5.5 Slamming

5.5.1 Issue / Definition
“Slamming” is a deceptive practice by where an existing registrant obtains and may act on a notice to register a domain name of like string in another TLD. It is separate from but related to fake renewal notices due to the deceptive tactics. However, the rogue sales and marketing practices focus on new registrations versus existing registered domains, and suggested costs of registration are typically exponential greater than current market rate. Both Fake Renewal Notices and Slamming appear to be primarily spawn from resellers, but detailed research is required for accurate analysis.

5.5.2 Background
What is the ICANN issue?

- New Domain Registration issue (deceptive/fraudulent practices on the part of a registrar/reseller)
  - Pretending to receive a legitimate request from a new client with intent to register a domain and trademark the name within the respective jurisdiction.
  - A notice is sent to the current registrant of a domain name (typically within .com, .org, .net, or all) stating the intent of the above customer and that the registrant has a limited time to protect the brand in the said country where the threat of the trademark is requested.
  - No formal data exists as to the extent of deception and monies paid to this regard, but the prevalence of the scam is widely recognized. Informal review of this issue does indicate that the deceptive practices occur mostly within ccTLDs, but this does not omit the issue from occurring in gTLDs.

- WHOIS abuse issue (deceptive/fraudulent practices on the part of a non-registrar/non-reseller)
What is ICANN’s role?

- If the perpetrator is a registrar or reseller, ICANN policy applies through the RAA.
- If the perpetrator is not a registrar/reseller, ICANN’s role still applies, but it falls into the realm of WHOIS abuse.
- What within the Chain of Agreements should be explored?

**Is this within ICANN’s Scope?**

- Because the deceptive tactics take place prior to Registration, ICANN scope is questioned.
- However, in the instances where a consumer is deceived and commits to the defensive registrations, scope should fall within the ICANN policy realm.
- The GNSO Scope Test (Draft):
  - Which TLD does the Slam occur? G, CC, (gTLD = Pass)
  - Does the Slam involve Contracted Parties? Ry, Rr, Reseller (Yes = Pass)
  - Did the Slam result in a Registration? (Yes = Pass)
  - Does the Slam involve a Trademark or Brand? (Yes = UDRP, No = Confusing Prevailing Right)
  - Other test attributes?
- Side Question - What policies and agreements are bound to the .CO rollout? Following RPMs.

**What actions can Law Enforcement take?**

- Does the extent of this issue warrant Law Enforcement attention?
- Is the cost/risk per incident great enough?
- Jurisdiction issues

An example of a slamming notice can be found on the RAP Mailing Archive, please see document at: [http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-rap-dt/msg00621.html](http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-rap-dt/msg00621.html)

**5.5.3 Recommendation Options**
Recommendation 1:

The RAPWG recommends nothing and remain in the status quo.

The WG feels this issue falls outside the scope of ICANN policy development and enforcement.

Recommendation 2:

The RAPWG recommends the GNSO pass this issue over to the CCNSO for research, investigation and develop policy about this issue potential remedial action.

The WG realizes that this issue appears to predominately exist within Country-Code top level domains and thus out of scope for the GNSO. The GNSO is to follow protocol for inter-Supporting Organization transfer of issue requests.

Recommendation 3:

The RAPWG recommends the GNSO monitor for this abuse in the Generic space and designate a team (ICANN Staff) to conduct research and create education for awareness.

The WG believes this issue warrants formal definition but understands the lack of credible data to substantiate it does not warrant a PDP. However, the issue does appear to be wide spread enough and the deceptive tactics used provide an indication that harms do exist and any policy making body should understand the scope and breath prior to any further decisions. Equally important, the team responsible for the research should be tasked with creating a disseminating education and awareness of this issue.

Recommendation 4:

The RAPWG recommends the initiation of a Policy Development Process by requesting an Issues Report to investigate “Slamming” in conjunction with fake renewal notices.

The WG agrees that this issue.