* 1. **Slamming**
     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, rogue sales & marketing practices focus on new registrations versus existing ones and often at exponential rates beyond real market condition. Both Fake Renewal Notices and Slamming may also come mainly from resellers.

* + 1. **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 money lost, but the prevalence of the scam is widely known.
* WHOIS abuse issue (deceptive/fraudulent practices on the part of a non-registrar/non-reseller)
  + Obtaining contact information through questionable means or in violation of RAA section 3.3.6.4.

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.

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>

* + 1. **Recommendations**

**Recommendation:**

***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 must define the consensus position on this issue, as it was developed after the initial report, but prior to the final report.*