

Registration Abuse Policies Working Group

Final Report

Submitted 29 May 2010

STATUS OF THIS DOCUMENT

This is the Final Report of the Registration Abuse Policies Working Group (RAPWG), prepared by ICANN staff for submission to the GNSO Council on 29 May 2010 following public comments on the Initial Report of 12 February 2010.

1. Table of Contents

1. TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
3. BACKGROUND, PROCESS, AND NEXT STEPS	16
4. DISCUSSION OF CHARTER AND SCOPE QUESTIONS	19
5. POTENTIAL REGISTRATION ABUSES EXPLORED	26
6. MALICIOUS USE OF DOMAIN NAMES	50
7. WHOIS ACCESS	71
8. UNIFORMITY OF CONTRACTS	81
9. META-ISSUES	97
10. INITIAL REPORT PUBLIC COMMENT FORUM	103
11. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, & NEXT STEPS	114
ANNEX I – WORKING GROUP CHARTER	122
ANNEX II - THE WORKING GROUP	125

2. Executive Summary

2.1 Background

- On 25 September 2008, the GNSO Council adopted a motion requesting an issues report on registration abuse provisions in registry-registrar agreements. The issues report was submitted to the GNSO Council on 29 October 2008 and provides an overview of existing provisions in registry-registrar agreements relating to abuse and includes a number of recommended next steps. In December 2009, the GNSO Council agreed to charter a Working Group to investigate the open issues identified in Registration Abuse Policies report, before deciding on whether or not to initiate a Policy Development Process (PDP).
- A Registration Abuse Policies Working Group (RAPWG) was chartered in February 2009.
- The GNSO Council committed to not making a decision on whether or not to initiate a PDP on registration abuse policies until the RAPWG has presented its findings.
- Even though the RAPWG is not a Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group, in the interest of transparency and participation it decided to follow the practice of PDP Working Groups by producing an Initial Report for community comment before finalizing the report and its recommendations for submission to the GNSO Council. The RAPWG reviewed the comments received and issued this Final Report following the closing of the public comment period.

2.2 Abuse Definition & Registration vs. Use

- The RAPWG developed a consensus definition of abuse, which served as a basis to further explore the scope and definition of registration abuse. This definition reads:

Abuse is an action that:

- a. Causes actual and substantial harm, or is a material predicate of such harm, and*
- b. Is illegal or illegitimate, or is otherwise considered contrary to the intention and design of a stated legitimate purpose, if such purpose is disclosed.*

Notes and qualifications are found in the Abuse Definition section of this report, below.

- Members of the RAPWG devoted significant discussion to the differences between *registration issues* and *use issues* and how they may intersect. The RAPWG found that the

distinctions can provide logical boundaries for policy-making, as the Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) and Registry Agreements may enable the Generic Names Supporting Organisation (GNSO) to develop consensus policies on the topic of registration abuse. The RAPWG agreed that understanding and differentiating between domain *registration* abuses and domain *use* abuses is essential in the ICANN policy context, and a failure to do so can lead to confusion.

- *Registration issues* are related to the core domain name-related activities performed by registrars and registries. These generally include (but are not limited) to the allocation of registered names; the maintenance of and access to registration (WHOIS) information; the transfer, deletion, and reallocation of domain names; and similar areas discussed in more detail below. These are generally within the scope of GNSO policy-making. Many of these are specifically listed in registration agreements as being subject to Consensus Policies, and the extant Consensus Policies have to do with these kinds of topics.
- In contrast, domain name *use issues* concern what a registrant *does* with his or her domain name after the domain is created—the purpose the registrant puts the domain to, and/or the services that the registrant operates on it. These use issues are often independent of or do not involve any registration issues. This report discusses how domain name use is an area in which ICANN’s and the GNSO’s policy-making authority is more limited.
- The RAPWG attempted to understand abuses by categorizing them based on domain life cycle—such as pre-domain-creation, domain-creation, and post-domain-creation abuses. However, the RAPWG noted that abuses may occur at various points in a domain name’s life cycle, and that life cycle categorizations are not always applicable or useful when considering whether a given abuse is in-scope for policy-making. The RAPWG found that in order to determine whether an abuse is in policy-making scope, it is important to identify and understand the registration and use issues involved. To facilitate its deliberations, the RAPWG developed a list of proposed abuses and approached each proposed abuse on its list by determining what registration issue exists (if any), and considering if or how it has any inherent relation to a domain name or registration process.

2.3 Potential Registration Abuses Explored

- As instructed by the RAPWG Charter, which asked to create “an illustrative categorization of known abuses” and perform research “in order to understand what problems may exist in relation to registration abuse and their scope, and to fully appreciate the current practices of contracted parties”, the RAPWG developed a list of proposed abuses for further examination. In each case, the RAPWG considered the activity by applying the RAPWG’s definition of abuse, and by discussing what scope and policy issues existed, especially whether registration issues were fundamentally involved. In some cases the RAPWG confirmed that abuse exists, and in some cases found that abuse does not exist or is out of scope for policy-making.
- Chapter 5 of this report discusses in further detail each proposed abuse, including issue, definition, background and recommendations. The following practices are covered in Chapter 5:
 - Cybersquatting
 - Front-running
 - Gripe sites
 - Deceptive and/or offensive domain names
 - Fake renewal notices
 - Name spinning
 - Pay-per-click
 - Traffic diversion
 - False affiliation
 - Cross-TLD Registration Scam
 - Domain kiting / tasting

2.4 Malicious Use of Domain Names

- In addition to the specific abuses described in chapter 5, the RAPWG discussed some broader categories and issues such as the malicious use of domain names (Chapter 6). The RAPWG was asked by the GNSO Council to examine issues surrounding illicit uses of domain names as an outgrowth of the learning done in the Fast-Flux Working Group (FFWG).

- The WG discussed how these problems relate to the scope of the Working Group’s activities as well as GNSO policy-making. In general, the RAPWG found that malicious uses of domain names have limited but notable intersections with registration issues.
- The RAPWG acknowledges that e-crime is an important issue of the ICANN community. The Internet community frequently voices concern to ICANN about malicious conduct and, in particular, the extent to which criminals take advantage of domain registration and name resolution services. Various parties—including companies, consumers, governments, and law enforcement—are asking ICANN and its contracted parties to monitor malicious conduct and, when appropriate, take reasonable steps to detect, block, and mitigate such conduct. The question is what ICANN can reasonably do within its mission and policy-making boundaries. Accordingly, Chapter 6 explores the related mission and policy questions, including issues such as intent, risk and indemnification; the Expedited Registry Security Request (ERSR); and some examples of malicious use such as spam, phishing, malware, and the use of stolen credentials.

2.5 Whois Access

- The RAPWG found that the basic accessibility of WHOIS has an inherent relationship to domain registration process abuses, and is a key issue related to the malicious use of domain names. It appears that WHOIS data is not always accessible on a guaranteed or enforceable basis, is not always provided by registrars in a reliable, consistent, or predictable fashion, and that users sometimes receive different WHOIS results depending on where or how they perform the lookup. There may also be issues with the enforcement of existing obligations. These issues interfere with registration processes, registrant decision-making, and with the ability of parties across the Internet to solve a variety of problems. Further details can be found in Chapter 7.

2.6 Uniformity of Contracts

- Three specific charter objectives of the RAPWG were to:
 - Understand if registration abuses are occurring that might be curtailed or better addressed if consistent registration abuse policies were established,

- Determine if and how {registration} abuse is dealt with in those registries {and registrars} that do not have any specific {policies} in place, and
- Identify how these registration abuse provisions are {...} implemented in practice or deemed effective in addressing registration abuse.
- The RAPWG formed a sub-team to determine the current state environment of ICANN-related contracts and agreements, and then discussed the findings in the larger RAPWG. These are described in further detail in Chapter 8.

2.7 Meta-Issues

- The RAPWG identified “meta-issues” related to its work, and to tracking abuse issues. These meta-issues have a number of attributes in common:
 - They are being discussed in various Working Groups and Advisory Groups simultaneously.
 - Their scope spans a number of ICANN policies
 - Previous groups have discussed these issues without satisfactory resolution
 - They are worthy of substantive discussion and action, but might not lend themselves to resolution through current policy processes
- The two meta issues discussed in Chapter 9 are:
 - Uniformity of reporting – The RAPWG has identified the need for more uniformity in the mechanisms to initiate, track, and analyze policy-violation issues.
 - Collection and dissemination of best practices - The RAPWG has identified the need for and benefit of creating and disseminating “best practices” related to aspects of domain name registration and management, for the appropriate members of the ICANN community. Best practices should also be kept current and relevant. The question is how ICANN can support such efforts in a structured way.

2.8 Recommendations

- On the basis of its deliberations as outlined in this report, the RAPWG is putting forward the following recommendations for the GNSO Council’s consideration.
- **The following table is a summary only, and does not include full recommendation text. Readers should refer to the body of the Report to read each Recommendation in full.**

<u>CYBERSQUATTING</u>		
<p><u>Recommendation #1</u></p> <p><i><u>Please see pages 26-33 for the full recommendation.</u></i></p>	<p>The RAPWG recommends the initiation of a Policy Development Process by requesting an Issues Report to investigate the current state of the UDRP, and consider balanced revisions to address cybersquatting if appropriate. This effort should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the UDRP has addressed the problem of cybersquatting to date, and any insufficiencies/inequalities associated with the process. • Whether the definition of cybersquatting inherent within the existing UDRP language needs to be reviewed or updated. 	<p><u>Unanimous consensus</u></p>
<p><u>Recommendation # 2</u></p> <p><u>View A</u></p>	<p>The RAPWG recommends the initiation of a Policy Development Process by requesting an Issues Report to investigate the appropriateness and effectiveness of how any Rights Protection Mechanisms that are developed elsewhere in the community (e.g. the New gTLD program) can be applied to the problem of cybersquatting in the current gTLD space.</p>	<p><u>Supported by 7 members of the RAPWG</u></p>

<p><u>View B</u></p> <p><i>Please see pages 26-33 for the full recommendations.</i></p>	<p>The initiation of such a process is premature; the effectiveness and consequences of the Rights Protection Mechanisms proposed for the new TLDs is unknown. Discussion of RPMs should continue via the New TLD program. Experience with them should be gained before considering their appropriate relation (if any) to the existing TLD space.</p>	<p><u>Supported by 7 members of the RAPWG</u></p>
--	--	--

<u>FRONT RUNNING</u>		
<p><u>Recommendation #1</u></p> <p><i>Please see pages 34-37 for the full recommendation.</i></p>	<p>It is unclear to what extent front-running happens, and the RAPWG does not recommend policy development at this time. The RAPWG suggests that the Council monitor the issue and consider next steps if conditions warrant.</p>	<p><u>Unanimous consensus</u></p>

<u>GRIPE SITES; DECEPTIVE and/or OFFENSIVE DOMAIN NAMES</u>		
<p><u>Recommendation #1</u></p>	<p>Make no recommendation. The majority of RAPWG members expressed that gripe site and offensive domain names that use trademarks should be addressed in the context of cybersquatting and the UDRP for purposes of establishing consistent registration abuse policies in this area, and that creating special procedures for special classes of domains, such as offensive domain names, may present problems.</p>	<p><u>Rough Consensus</u></p>

<p><u>Alternate view</u></p> <p><i>Please see pages 37-42 for the full recommendation.</i></p>	<p>The URDP should be revisited to determine what substantive policy changes, if any, would be necessary to address any inconsistencies relating to decisions on “gripe” names and to provide for fast track substantive and procedural mechanisms in the event of the registration of deceptive domain names that mislead adults or children to objectionable sites.</p>	<p><u>Supported by 4 members of the RAPWG</u></p>
<p><u>Recommendation #2</u></p> <p><u>View A</u></p> <p><u>View B</u></p> <p><i>Please see pages 37-42 for the full recommendation.</i></p>	<p>Turn down a proposed recommendation that registries develop best practices to restrict the registration of offensive strings.</p> <p>Registries should consider developing internal best practice policies that would restrict the registration of offensive strings in order to mitigate the potential harm to consumers and children.</p>	<p><u>Strong support</u></p> <p><u>Significant Opposition</u></p>

<u>FAKE RENEWAL NOTICES</u>		
<p><u>Recommendation #1</u></p> <p><i>Please see pages 42-43 for the full recommendation.</i></p>	<p>The RAPWG recommends that the GNSO refer this issue to ICANN’s Contractual Compliance department for possible enforcement action, including investigation of misuse of WHOIS data</p>	<p><u>Unanimous Consensus</u></p>
<p><u>Recommendation #2</u></p>	<p>The following recommendation is conditional.</p> <p>The WG would like to learn the ICANN Compliance Department’s opinions regarding Recommendation #1 above, and the WG will</p>	<p><u>Unanimous consensus</u></p>

<p><i>Please see pages 42-43 XX for the full recommendation.</i></p>	<p>further discuss Recommendation 2 looking forward to the WG’s Final Report.</p> <p>The RAPWG recommends the initiation of a Policy Development Process by requesting an Issues Report to investigate fake renewal notices.</p>	
--	--	--

<u>CROSS-TLD REGISTRATION SCAM</u>		
<p><u>Recommendation #1</u></p> <p><i>Please see pages 43-45 for the full recommendation.</i></p>	<p>The RAPWG recommends the GNSO monitor for Cross-TLD registration scam abuse in the gTLD space and co-ordinate research with the community to determine the nature and extent of the problem. The WG believes this issue warrants review but notes there is not enough data at this time to warrant an Issues Report or PDP.</p>	<p><u>Unanimous consensus</u></p>

<u>DOMAIN KITING / TASTING</u>		
<p><u>Recommendation #1</u></p> <p><u>Alternate view</u> <i>Please see pages 48-49 for the full recommendation.</i></p>	<p>It is unclear to what extent domain kiting happens, and the RAPWG does not recommend policy development at this time. The RAPWG suggests that the Council monitor the issue (in conjunction with ongoing reviews of domain-tasting), and consider next steps if conditions warrant.</p> <p>The RAPWG recommends policy development regarding domain kiting / tasting with input from the appropriate parties</p>	<p><u>Rough consensus</u></p> <p><u>Supported by one member of the WG</u></p>

MALICIOUS USE OF DOMAIN NAMES		
<u>Recommendation #1</u>	<p>The RAPWG recommends the creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the illicit use of domain names. This effort should be supported by ICANN resources, and should be created via a community process such as a working or advisory group while also taking the need for security and trust into consideration. The effort should consider (but not be limited to) these subjects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Practices for identifying stolen credentials• Practices for identifying and investigating common forms of malicious use (such as malware and phishing)• Creating anti-abuse terms of service for inclusion in Registrar-Registrant agreements, and for use by TLD operators.• Identifying compromised/hacked domains versus domain registered by abusers• Practices for suspending domain names• Account access security management• Security resources of use or interest to registrars and registries	<u>Unanimous consensus</u>

<p><u>Additional view</u></p> <p><i>Please see pages 50-71 for the full recommendation.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey registrars and registries to determine practices being used, and their adoption rates. <p>Uses of domain names unrelated to registration issues are an area in which ICANN can impose mandatory practices upon contracted parties.</p>	<p><u>Supported by 7 member of the RAPWG</u></p>
--	---	---

<u>WHOIS ACCESS</u>		
<p><u>Recommendation #1</u></p> <p><i>Please see pages 71-80 for the full recommendation.</i></p>	<p>The GNSO should determine what additional research and processes may be needed to ensure that WHOIS data is accessible in an appropriately reliable, enforceable, and consistent fashion.</p> <p>The GNSO Council should consider how such might be related to other WHOIS efforts, such as the upcoming review of WHOIS policy and implementation required by ICANN’s new Affirmation of Commitments.</p>	<p><u>Unanimous consensus</u></p>
<p><u>Recommendation #2</u></p> <p><i>Please see pages 72-80 for the full recommendation.</i></p>	<p>The GNSO should request that the ICANN Compliance Department publish more data about WHOIS accessibility, on at least an annual basis. This data should include a) the number of registrars that show a pattern of unreasonable restriction of access to their port 43 WHOIS servers, and b) the results of an annual compliance audit of compliance with all contractual WHOIS access obligations.</p>	<p><u>Unanimous consensus</u></p>

<u>META ISSUE: COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION OF BEST PRACTICES</u>		
<u>Recommendation #1</u> <i><u>Please see pages 97-102 for the full recommendation.</u></i>	The RAPWG recommends that the GNSO, and the larger ICANN community in general, create and support structured, funded mechanisms for the collection and maintenance of best practices.	<u>Unanimous consensus</u>

3. Background, Process, and Next Steps

3.1 Background

- On 25 September 2008, the GNSO Council adopted a motion requesting an issues report on registration abuse provisions in registry-registrar agreements. The issues report was submitted to the GNSO Council on 29 October 2008 and provides an overview of existing provisions in registry-registrar agreements relating to abuse and includes a number of recommended next steps, namely for the GNSO Council to:
 - **Review and Evaluate Findings**

A first step would be for the GNSO Council to review and evaluate these findings, taking into account that this report provides an overview of registration abuse provisions, but does not analyse how these provisions are implemented in practice and whether they are deemed effective in addressing registration abuse.
 - **Identify specific policy issues**

Following the review and evaluation of the findings, the GNSO Council would need to determine whether there are specific policy issues regarding registration abuse. As part of this determination it would be helpful to define the specific type(s) of abuse of concern, especially distinguishing between registration abuse and other types of abuse if relevant.
 - **Need for further research**

As part of the previous two steps, ICANN Staff would recommend that the GNSO Council determines where further research may be needed – e.g. is lack of uniformity a substantial problem, how effective are current registration abuse provisions in addressing abuse in practice, is an initial review or analysis of the UDRP required?’
- The GNSO Council voted on 18 December to form a drafting team to create a proposed charter for a working group charged with investigating the open issues identified in

Registration Abuse Policies report. The drafting team was formed and met for the first time on 9 January 2009. They finalized a charter (see Annex I), which was adopted by the GNSO Council on 19 February 2009, for a Registration Abuse Policies Working Group (RAPWG). The GNSO Council will not make a decision on whether or not to initiate a Policy Development Process (PDP) on registration abuse policies until the RAPWG has presented its findings.

3.2 Process

- The RAPWG started with discussing and developing a working definition of abuse, which has served as a basis to further explore the scope and definition of registration abuse.
- The RAPWG has been researching and discussing what “registration abuse” is, including:
 - a. How “registration” is defined. This term was not explicitly defined, and is essential for understanding the “registration” versus “use” issues that the charter and Issues Report call attention to.
 - b. Which “aspects of the subject of registration abuse are within ICANN’s mission to address and which are within the set of topics on which ICANN may establish policies that are binding on gTLD registry operators and ICANN-accredited registrars.” As part of the RAPWG research, a presentation was provided by ICANN staff about policy-making scope issues and past PDPs.
- The RAPWG developed a list of potential abuses. The RAPWG discussed each of these proposed abuses, sometimes facilitated by the creation of sub-teams. The RAPWG developed a definition for each, considered whether they are abusive or not, determined if and how registration issues are implicated in them and whether regulation is within or outside of policy-making scope, and developed recommendations for further consideration. Further details can be found in the following chapter of this report.
- Several sub-teams were formed throughout this process to explore more complicated abuse types and other Registration Abuse topics identified in the charter. Sub-teams focused on: Cybersquatting, Name Spinning, Malware/Botnet, Phishing/Malware and

Uniformity of Contracts. Findings and recommendations that resulted from these efforts can be found in the chapters below.

3.3 Next Steps

- Even though the RAPWG is not a Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group, in the interest of transparency and participation it decided to follow the practice of PDP Working Groups by producing an Initial Report for community comment and consideration before finalizing the report and its recommendations for submission to the GNSO Council. The RAPWG has reviewed the comments received during the [public comment forum](#) and hereby presents its Final Report for GNSO Council consideration.

4. Discussion of Charter and Scope Questions

4.1 Abuse definition

The RAPWG developed a consensus definition of abuse, which served as a basis to further explore the scope and definition of registration abuse. This definition reads:

Abuse is an action that:

- *Causes actual and substantial harm, or is a material predicate of such harm, and*
- *Is illegal or illegitimate, or is otherwise considered contrary to the intention and design of a stated legitimate purpose, if such purpose is disclosed.*

Note:

- * The party or parties harmed, and the substance or severity of the abuse, should be identified and discussed in relation to a specific proposed abuse.
- * The term "harm" is not intended to shield a party from fair market competition.
- * A predicate is a related action or enabler. There must be a clear link between the predicate and the abuse, and justification enough to address the abuse by addressing the predicate (enabling action).
- * The above definition of abuse is indebted to the definition of "misuse" in the document "Working Definitions for Key Terms that May be Used in Future WHOIS Studies" prepared by the GNSO Drafting Team¹.
- * *The WG achieved **unanimous consensus** on the above definition and notes, which should be taken together. In favour (13): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Bladel (RrSG), Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), Neuman (RysG), O'Connor (CBUC), Queern (CBUC), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC), Young (RySG). Abstentions (1): Seltzer (NCSG). Against, or alternate views: none.*

¹ 18 February 2009, at <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/whois/whois-working-definitions-study-terms-18feb09.pdf>

4.2 Definitions of “Registration” and “Use”

Registration issues are related to the core domain name-related activities performed by registrars and registries. These generally include but are not limited to:

- the allocation of registered names, and reserved names
- maintenance of and access to accurate and up-to-date information concerning domain name registrations – i.e. WHOIS information.
- the transfer, deletion, and reallocation of domain names.
- functional and performance specifications for the provision of Registry Services.
- The resolution of disputes regarding whether particular parties may register or maintain registration of particular domain names.

These are generally within the scope of GNSO policy-making. Many of the above are specifically listed in registration agreements as being subject to Consensus Policies, and the extant Consensus Policies have to do with these kinds of topics. Other potential outcomes of policy work are also possible, such as advice to ICANN on possible contract amendments, or the development of non-binding options such as codes of conduct or best practices.

Registration abuses are therefore abuses associated with the above kinds of activities or topics. ICANN has made consensus policies for several registration-related abuses. Examples² include:

- The AGP Limits Policy, instituted to curb abuse of the Add Grace Period—specifically the practice known as domain tasting.
- The WHOIS Data Reminder Policy, instituted to remind registrants that provision of false WHOIS information is abusive and can be grounds for cancellation of their domain name registration.

² <http://www.icann.org/en/general/consensus-policies.htm>

- The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy, designed to guarantee that registrants can transfer names to the registrar of their choice, and to provide standardized requirements for the proper handling of transfer requests by registrars and registries.

Note that in this context, “registration” is not a synonym for the *creation* of a domain name. As per the lists above, registration abuses may occur at various points in a domain name’s life cycle.

In contrast, domain name *use* concerns what a registrant *does* with his or her domain name after the domain is created—the purpose the registrant puts the domain to, and/or the services that the registrant operates on it. Use issues are often independent of or do not involve any registration issues.

A domain name can have nearly infinite uses. It can be used for various technical services, such as e-mail, a Web site, file transfers, and can support subdomains. And it can support all kinds of practical uses or purposes – speech and expression, e-commerce, social networking, education, entertainment, and so on. Some uses of domain names are generally agreed to be abusive or even criminal—such as phishing and malware distribution, which perpetrate theft and fraud. Other uses – such as adult pornography or political criticism – may be considered abusive or illegal in some jurisdictions but not generally. Domain names in sponsored TLDs may by design be restricted to certain uses or users.

Are uses of domain names subject to GNSO policy-making? In the Issues Report that led to the RAPWG, the ICANN General Counsel’s office wrote: “Is the issue in scope of GNSO Policy Making? Section 4.2.3 of the RAA between ICANN and accredited registrars *provides for the establishment of new and revised consensus policies concerning the registration of domain names, including abuse in the registration of names, but policies involving the use of a domain name (unrelated to its registration) are outside the scope of policies that ICANN could enforce on registries and/or registrars. The use of domain names may be taken into account when establishing or changing registration policies. Thus, potential changes to existing contractual provisions related to abuse in the registration of names would be within scope of GNSO policy*

making. Consideration of new policies related to the use of a domain name unrelated to its registration would not be within scope.”^{3,4} [Emphasis added].

Other sections of the RAA and Registry Agreements may enable the GNSO to develop consensus policies on the topic of registration abuse. For example, Section 4.2.1 of the RAA (as well as analogous sections of various registry agreements) authorizes development of consensus policies on topics where the uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate the interoperability, technical reliability, or operational stability of registrars, registries, the DNS, or the Internet.⁵ The Registry Agreements generally limit Consensus Policy-making to core registration issues.⁶

Careful consideration of these issues and limiting of scope seems to be consistent with ICANN’s mission. In its 2002 “Working Paper on ICANN Mission and Core Values,” the Committee on ICANN Evolution and Reform commented on the registration-versus-use issue. It said “Though some of ICANN’s registry-level gTLD policies are non-technical in nature, all relate directly to ICANN’s mission to coordinate the assignment of unique identifiers to ensure stable functioning of these systems. For example, the need for dispute resolution mechanisms in the gTLDs flows

³ “GNSO Issues Report on Registration Abuse Policies,” 29 October 2008, pages 4-5.

<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/registration-abuse/gns0-issues-report-registration-abuse-policies-29oct08.pdf>

⁴ See also <http://www.icann.org/en/registrars/ra-agreement-21may09-en.htm> , paragraph 4.2. The new Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) notes that a Consensus Policy may be established regarding the “resolution of disputes concerning the registration of Registered Names (as opposed to the use of such domain names), including where the policies take into account use of the domain names.”

⁵ Please also refer to the transcript of the 1 June 2009 RAP meeting, describing the presentation by Margie Milam on the scope of Consensus policies related to the topic of registration abuse, posted at <http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/index.html#june>

⁶ Principles for allocation of registered names, prohibitions on warehousing of or speculation in domain names, reserved names, maintenance of and access to accurate and up-to-date WHOIS information; procedures to avoid disruptions of domain name registration due to suspension or termination of operations by a registry operator or a registrar, and domain name disputes.

from the problem of unique assignment: it is the assigned domain name string itself that is at issue.... [RAPWG note: i.e. a registration issue is involved.] By contrast, disputes over the content of an e-mail message, ftp file, or web page bear no inherent relation to the assigned domain name, and therefore fall outside the scope of ICANN's policy-making scope. ICANN therefore does not base its policies on the content served by websites, contained in e-mail messages, or otherwise accessed by domain names.”⁷ ICANN’s Core Values⁸ also state that ICANN should respect the innovation and flow of information made possible by the Internet by limiting ICANN's activities to those matters within ICANN's mission, and “To the extent feasible and appropriate, delegating coordination functions to or recognizing the policy role of other responsible entities that reflect the interests of affected parties”—perhaps such as courts, law enforcement, and contracted parties.

Members of the RAPWG devoted significant discussion to the differences between registration issues and use issues and how they may intersect. The RAPWG also found that the distinctions can provide logical boundaries for policy-making. For example, some members noted that ICANN is not in a position to create policies affecting speech or what kinds of e-commerce should be allowed via domain names, because those typically are uses of domain names and do not implicate registration issues. Others pointed out the difficulties of addressing criminal domain name use via ICANN policy and contractual compliance. (This issue is explored in additional depth in this Report’s section about malicious uses of domain names.)

Understanding and differentiating between domain *registration* abuses and domain *use* abuses is essential in the ICANN policy context. Failure to do so can lead to confusion:

- In 2008, the GNSO initiated a PDP to examine fast-flux hosting; the concern was that fast-flux was a criminal abuse that leveraged the DNS. The Fast-Flux Working Group (FFWG) learned that fast-flux is actually a technical practice with both benign and malicious applications, and that most criminal fast-flux hosting did not involve any

⁷ <http://www.icann.org/en/committees/evol-reform/working-paper-mission-06may02.htm>

⁸ <http://www.icann.org/en/general/bylaws.htm#l>

changes of registration records.⁹ The FFWG determined that fast-flux was not always an abuse, and it found that illicit fast-flux was a domain use issue and did not generally involve registration issues. Some constituencies and observers noted that fast-flux was therefore outside of policy-making scope.¹⁰ In the end, the FFWG did not recommend any new policies or any changes to existing policies.

- The “GNSO Issues Report on Registration Abuse Policies” was an initial look into the topic of registration abuse, and did not consistently and thoroughly delineate or define the registration versus use issues. It sometimes used the word “abuse” to refer to both registration and use problems interchangeably. At one point the Issues Report noted that “various registry operators have differing policies with respect to abusive registrations” while pointing to registry policies that have nothing to do with registration abuses.¹¹

Some members of the RAPWG, however, are of the opinion that a difference between registration abuse and use abuse cannot be reasonably expressed. Their opinion is that “a domain name cannot be used unless it is registered, and therefore any abuse of a registered name is registration abuse.” Stated another way, these members believe that policies involving the use of a domain name unrelated to its registration are inside the scope of policies that ICANN can enforce on registries and/or registrars, and ICANN can make policy regarding community-defined use abuses of domain names.

The RAPWG approached each proposed abuse on its list by determining what registration issue exists (if any), and considering if or how it has any inherent relation to a domain name or registration process. Other questions that should be considered in evaluating potential abuses

⁹ The DNS rotation took place at a level below the registries and registrars, and domain and nameserver records were usually not being updated on a rapid basis or at all.

¹⁰ https://st.icann.org/data/workspaces/pdp-wg-ff/attachments/fast_flux_pdp_wg:20090807173836-0-13665/original/Fast%20Flux%20Final%20Report%20-%206%20August%202009%20-%20FINAL.pdf

¹¹ See “GNSO Issues Report on Registration Abuse Policies” Section 1.5 and Annex B. The .INFO Anti-Abuse Policy is strictly aimed at malicious *uses* of domains names, such as malware and child pornography.

and related policies are if and how any policy decision might impact the use of domain names, and establishing whether and to what extent the use of domain names affects the stability and security of the DNS itself, and if so how.

5. Potential Registration Abuses Explored

Early in the RAPWG's existence, members were asked to propose potential abuses for examination. This was to fulfil the RAPWG Charter, which asked the RAPWG to create "an illustrative categorization of known abuses" and perform research "in order to understand what problems may exist in relation to registration abuse and their scope, and to fully appreciate the current practices of contracted parties." In each case, the RAPWG considered the activity by applying the RAPWG's definition of abuse, and by discussing what scope and policy issues existed, especially whether registration issues were fundamentally involved. In some cases the RAPWG confirmed that abuse exists, and in some cases found that abuse does not exist or is out of scope for policy-making.

5.1 Cybersquatting

5.1.1 Issue / Definition

Cybersquatting is currently defined in the gTLDs as the deliberate and bad-faith registration and use of a name that is a registered brand or mark of an unrelated entity, often for the purpose of profiting (typically, though not exclusively, through pay-per-click advertisements).

Cybersquatting is recognized as registration abuse in the ICANN community, and the UDRP was originally created to address this abuse. There was consensus in the RAPWG that provisions 4(a) and 4(b) of the UDRP are a sound definition of cybersquatting.¹² Over the years, a number of issues have been raised regarding the UDRP policy and practices. These bring up issues of how cybersquatting is defined and addressed. For example, cybersquatting has been defined differently in different ccTLDs, national law, and arbitration practices.

¹² <http://www.icann.org/en/udrp/udrp-policy-24oct99.htm>

5.1.2 Background

As part of the RAPWG's work to catalog various types of abuse, cybersquatting was targeted as an area for further work. Developing a universal, global, and technically operable definition for cybersquatting has been challenging, particularly as the RAPWG sought to balance the needs and interests of all parties that can potentially be harmed by the practice. The RAPWG draws a distinction between competing but potentially legitimate claims and cybersquatting, which denotes a bad-faith use of another party's mark. There was consensus in the RAPWG that provisions 4(a) and 4(b) of the UDRP are a sound definition of cybersquatting. Several attempts to expand the definition beyond these by borrowing from other sources (e.g. the Anti-Cybersquatting Consumer Protection Act (ACPA)) have been challenging, and consensus on how to proceed ultimately broke down. There was minority interest in expanding the definition to include additional elements of bad faith intent, as denoted in the ACPA (i.e., 5(v) and 5(vi)). For further details, please see <https://st.icann.org/reg-abuse-wg/index.cgi?cybersquatting>.

The UDRP was specifically designed to address cybersquatting. It is used to settle disputes between parties who have competing trademark claims as well as other cases in which the respondent may have no trademark claim at all or is acting in bad faith. Only disputes in which “the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights” are applicable for UDRP arbitration.¹³ The ICANN Web site’s UDRP page also notes: “Disputes alleged to arise from abusive registrations of domain names (for example, cybersquatting) may be addressed by expedited administrative proceedings that the holder of trademark rights initiates by filing a [UDRP] complaint with an approved dispute-resolution service provider.”¹⁴ The UDRP has generally been considered a success. It has been used to settle thousands of cases, and WIPO has claimed that the UDRP has been a deterrent to undesirable registration behavior.¹⁵

¹³ Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, <http://www.icann.org/en/udrp/udrp-policy-24oct99.htm>

¹⁴ <http://www.icann.org/en/udrp/udrp.htm>

¹⁵ http://www.wipo.int/pressroom/en/html.jsp?file=/redocs/prdocs/en/2005/wipo_upd_2005_239.html

However, since it went into effect in 1999, there have also been complaints about the UDRP. Some of these present policy and process issues. These criticisms have included the following:

- Complainants can forum-shop in attempts to find arbitrators more likely to rule in the complainant's favor.
- Occasional non-uniformity and non-predictability of decisions, and what if any responsibility or procedures the dispute resolution providers have to ensure general uniformity and quality.
- Inconsistency between decisions in cases that present similar situations, notably gripe sites that contain trademarks within domain names. (See also section 5.3.)
- Complainants have the ability to re-file a complaint for the same name against the same respondent – in effect re-trying the same case in hopes of achieving a different outcome.
- The UDRP requires the complainant prove that the domain name “has been registered and is being used in bad faith.” However, many UDRP cases have been decided without the domain names having ever been used. Observers have noted that the usage requirement has sometimes been ignored in the UDRP “case law” that has developed over the years. This suggests study of the body of UDRP precedent and “case law” that has accumulated over the years, including whether it is consistent, and whether it is in keeping with the Policy itself.
- The UDRP is too expensive and too time-consuming for some brand owners, who wish to pursue large numbers of potentially infringing domain names.
- The UDRP procedures lack some safeguards that are generally available in conventional legal proceedings, such as appeals. Such are unavailable even when a panellist orders an action that is clearly inconsistent with his or her finding in a case.¹⁶
- In a possibly related issue, ICANN apparently does not enter into contracts with its Approved UDRP Providers.¹⁷ This may present a number of issues. For example, in the

¹⁶ <http://domainnamewire.com/2010/04/23/seriously-wooot-the-hell/>

¹⁷ <http://forum.icann.org/lists/cac-prop-supp-rules/msg00004.html>

absence of such contracts, it is unclear whether ICANN has the ability to review or assure general uniformity or procedural compliance.

- One UDRP service provider, the Czech Arbitration Court, recently proposed changing some of its own supplemental rules in order to create an “expedited UDRP.” Some community members asked whether the proposed scheme presented substantive issues that can and should only be dealt with in the main ICANN UDRP Rules.¹⁸

- Reverse Domain name Hijacking. As an unintended consequence of the UDRP policy, there are instances where third parties seek to abuse the UDRP. One example of such abuse is Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (RDNH). RDNH can occur when a trademark owner attempts to secure a domain name by making false cybersquatting claims against a domain name’s rightful owner using a trademark registration as leverage. In some instances the trademark registration is filed after registration of the domain name, possibly in contemplation of filing a UDRP complaint; in other instances the complainant may take actions to cause a domain to appear to be infringing its trademark.

Sometimes, in order to avoid the cost of defending a UDRP or for other considerations, the rightful Registrant will transfer the domain to the Complainant. Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy recognizes the possibility of such bad faith complaints and the need for a panel to exercise vigilance by stating that “If after considering the submissions the Panel finds that the complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or was brought primarily to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding.” While the number of UDRP cases filed to date in which abusive bad faith constituting RDNH has been determined to exist is relatively small (less than 1% of total UDRP cases), some registrants believe the actual percentage of abusive cases is higher, and that this low percentage is a result of a lack of uniform evaluative criteria for panellists to consider. Such registrants also believe that the lack of meaningful penalties against abusive complainants provides inadequate incentive for a

¹⁸ <http://forum.icann.org/lists/cac-prop-supp-rules/index.html>

panel to render such a finding, and also provides no effective deterrent to bad faith complainant abuse of the UDRP. In part due to lack of uniform criteria for finding the existence of RDNH and other bad faith complaints, disagreement exists regarding their actual rate of occurrence. This issue of criteria could receive further consideration, and whether penalties for intentional bad faith complaints should be available.

The various issues above suggest examination of the UDRP Policy and Rules, and the practices that dispute resolution providers use to execute them.

Some members of the RAPWG felt that the UDRP is a useful mechanism to counter some elements of cybersquatting, but were of the opinion that: "the scale of cybersquatting is overwhelming and the drain on cost and resources for brand-owners to respond in all instances by using only the UDRP as a remedy is prohibitive. In addition, there are insufficient up-front protection mechanisms to prevent registrants from initially registering infringing domains which are freely monetized from the date of registration, via PPC and other online advertising methods, thus earning revenue for the registrant. They can then simply wait until a UDRP action is commenced before they give up the domain, without penalty. The burden therefore rests with the trademark owner to monitor, investigate and pursue litigation in order to provide protection to Internet users. This burden often includes the registration and ongoing management of large domain name portfolios, consisting mainly of unwanted domains that benefit only the Registry, Registrar and ICANN parties. This approach is already a major concern for trademark owners, in terms of cost and resources, with the existing level of gTLDs and ccTLDs, let alone the anticipated growth of new gTLDs and IDNs."

Other members disagreed with those points, expressing the following opinions:

- a) The UDRP is the long-standing mechanism for addressing cybersquatting. A better first step would be to establish if or where the UDRP is ineffective, and make policy decisions based on facts and data. While some claim that "the scale of cybersquatting is overwhelming," the scale issue was not been quantified in or for the RAPWG, and an adequate factual basis was not provided by the

Implementation Review Team (IRT) that created proposals for new rights protection mechanisms.¹⁹

- b) Those proposed rights-protection mechanisms upend several long-established legal principles. One long-established principle is that the registrant is the party responsible for ensuring he or she is not infringing upon the rights of others. Another is that rights holders have the responsibility for protecting their intellectual property, and that shifting responsibility, cost, or liability for such to ICANN-contracted parties is unfair.
- c) It is inadvisable to begin considering the imposition of those evolving rights protection mechanisms in the existing TLDs, when they are so controversial over in the new TLD discussion. There are many legal, business, and speech issues involved. The effectiveness of those proposed mechanisms is hypothetical, it is not known what impacts or unintended consequences they may have, and it is unknown if they can deliver the cost and process benefits their advocates promised or asked for. It is unknown what consequences those mechanisms may have for speech and expression. Some parties have called for imposition of the trademark clearinghouse RPM during ongoing registry operations, which might effectively stop real-time, first-come registrations. This would be a major change to the industry.

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) provided public comments²⁰ regarding the RAPWG's work. WIPO is the dispute resolution provider for the majority of UDRP cases.

1. *WIPO warned that "The issue is not whether the UDRP itself can be improved, but rather whether a process of this nature is likely to achieve such result," and warned against "any process outcome that destabilizes or compromises the principles and practices" of the UDRP would jeopardize the UDRP as an "effective, predictable alternative to court litigation."* The members of the RAPWG unanimously decided to emphasize that they

¹⁹ <http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-4-29may09-en.htm>

²⁰ <http://forum.icann.org/lists/rap-initial-report/msg00000.html>

- are interested in a *balanced* review of the UDRP that promotes predictability and fairness. The UDRP is now more than ten years old, and the members of the RAPWG saw no reason why ICANN should not review its own policies and processes occasionally. To perform a review to determine if any balanced improvements are possible is a form of accountability to the community.
2. WIPO stated that *“the basis for including the UDRP in the RAPWG, especially against the background of ICANN’s New gTLD Program, is unclear,”* and that *“Discussions occurring within the context of ICANN’s New gTLD Program would seem to already address the Cybersquatting Recommendation.”* The UDRP is considered an ICANN Consensus Policy, and UDRP was designed specifically to deal with cybersquatting, which is a recognized registration abuse. The RAPWG was chartered by the GNSO Council to examine such issues. As mentioned in this report and other public comments, the proposed Rights Protection Mechanisms for the new TLDs are under debate, and it is unknown as of this writing if or how they might interoperate with the UDRP.
 3. WIPO’s comments introduced a new concept, which is that registrars and registries should bear liability for the actions of infringing registrants by being held accountable for contributory trademark infringement. Some members of the RAPWG note that the legal basis of the UDRP has always been that *registrants* are responsible for their actions, and that the concept of contributory infringement is problematic for several reasons.

After consideration, the RAPWG decided not to alter its recommendations based on WIPO’s comments.

5.1.3 Cybersquatting Recommendation

Recommendation #1:

The RAPWG recommends the initiation of a Policy Development Process by requesting an Issues Report to investigate the current state of the UDRP, and consider balanced revisions to address cybersquatting if appropriate. This effort should consider:

- ***How the UDRP has addressed the problem of cybersquatting to date, and any insufficiencies/inequalities associated with the process.***
- ***Whether the definition of cybersquatting inherent within the existing UDRP language needs to be reviewed or updated.***

The Working Group had unanimous consensus for this recommendation. In favour (14): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Bladel (RrSG), Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), Neuman (RySG), O'Connor (CBUC), Queern (CBUC), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Seltzer (NCSG), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC), Young (RySG). Against, or alternate views: none.

Recommendation #2:

The RAPWG was evenly split regarding a second recommendation. The two opposing views are below.

Seven members supported View A: The RAPWG recommends the initiation of a Policy Development Process by requesting an Issues Report to investigate the appropriateness and effectiveness of how any Rights Protection Mechanisms that are developed elsewhere in the community (e.g. the New gTLD program) can be applied to the problem of cybersquatting in the current gTLD space.

In favour of View A (7): Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), Queern (CBUC), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC).

Seven members supported View B: The initiation of such a process is premature; the effectiveness and consequences of the Rights Protection Mechanisms proposed for the new TLDs is unknown. Discussion of RPMs should continue via the New TLD program. Experience with them should be gained before considering their appropriate relation (if any) to the existing TLD space.

In favour of View B (7): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Bladel (RrSG), Neuman (RySG), O'Connor (CBUC), Seltzer (NCSG), Young (RySG).

5.2 **Front-Running**

5.2.1 **Issue / Definition**

Front-running is when a party obtains some form of insider information regarding an Internet user's preference for registering a domain name and uses this opportunity to pre-emptively register that domain name. In this scenario, "insider information" is information gathered from the monitoring of one or more attempts by an Internet user to check the availability of a domain name.

5.2.2 **Background**

The definition above is taken from the SSAC paper "SAC 024: Report on Domain Name Front Running."²¹ Specifically, the RAPWG examined these documents:

1. SAC 022, <http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac022.pdf>
2. SAC 024, https://par.icann.org/files/paris/SSACReportonDomainNameFrontRunning_24Jun08.pdf
3. Benjamin Edelman, <http://www.icann.org/en/compliance/edelman-frontrunning-study-16jun09-en.pdf>

The two reports by the SSAC contain a great deal of material. The RAPWG felt that a few key quotes for these documents are:

- "Checking the availability of a domain name can be a sensitive act which may disclose an interest in or a value ascribed to a domain name. SSAC suggests that any such domain name availability lookups should be performed with care. Our premise is that a registrant may ascribe a value to a domain name; that unintended or unauthorized disclosure, or disclosure of an availability check by a third party without notice may pose a security risk to the would-be registrant; and that availability checks may create opportunities for a party with access to availability check data to acquire a domain

²¹ <http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac024.pdf>

name at the expense of the party that performed an availability check, or to the benefit of the party that monitored the check." (SAC 022, page 2)

- "SSAC strongly contends that any agent who collects information about an Internet user's interest in a domain name and who discloses it in a public way violates a trust relationship. This violation is exacerbated when agents put themselves or third parties in an advantageous market position with respect to acquiring that domain name at the expense of its client." (SAC 024, page 12)
- "SSAC observes a deteriorating trust relationship between registrants and registrars and urge ICANN and the community to consider the implications of continued erosion and a loss of faith in the registration process." (SAC 024, page 12)

The RAPWG discussed issues such as theoretical vs. actual abuse; is domain speculation an abuse; expectations of trust; what is considered insider information; the interaction with the add-grace period and domain tasting; possible legitimate uses of pre-registration data; and, who is harmed by front-running. Commentary regarding these topics is summarized on the RAPWG wiki.²² Highlights of the discussions included:

- One well-known case of front-running is described in SAC 024. Otherwise, the RAPWG was unable to reference any other confirmed cases.²³ The WG members therefore wondered whether the practice exists or is widespread enough to merit further investigation or concern.
- The RAPWG members generally considered front-running an abuse, referencing the SSAC's concerns about registrant expectations and breach of trust. A member also offered that in a first-come-first-served environment, efforts to gain advantage or even game those processes should be considered abuse.
- A member noted that the harm is to people who are new to domains and not educated about how ordering takes place.

²² https://st.icann.org/reg-abuse-wg/index.cgi?domain_front_running

²³ The Edelman study uncovered no additional evidence of the practice. The Edelman study's methodology has been called into question, and some members considered it inconclusive.

- The issue may involve registrars or registries only indirectly. A threat may come from third parties using monitoring to examine traffic and then front-run domains, perhaps even using spyware or malware. In such cases, it is unknown whether a registrar or registry would even be able to detect or do something about front-running. Some registrars have reportedly implemented SSL-protected search pages to help guard against intercepted availability check traffic.
- Members raised some issues regarding the definition of "insider information." For example, what information can registries or registrars collect about their customers, and that some uses may not be inappropriate or harmful. One member stated that traffic data regarding unregistered names (e.g. NX data) is by definition not registration data, while another was of the opinion that such is data that can be used to decide to register domains and is therefore registration data or at worst "lack-of-registration data, which is merely the negative of registration data."
- The new Add Grace Period Limits Policy effectively killed domain tasting, and may have an impact on front running. To be a profitable practice, front-running might require the registration of a fair number of domain names, which might now be prohibitive under the AGP Limits Policy.
- The Working Group discussed that services offered by registrars in the past, such as "Cart Hold" features, may have been perceived as examples of Front Running. Once again, the new policy regarding Add Grace Period Limits has made this practice cost-prohibitive, and there are no known examples of it occurring presently.

5.2.3 Recommendations

It is unclear to what extent front-running happens, and the RAPWG does not recommend policy development at this time. The RAPWG suggests that the Council monitor the issue and consider next steps if conditions warrant.

The WG achieved unanimous consensus for the above recommendation.

In favour (14): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Bladel (RrSG), Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), Neuman (RySG), O'Connor (CBUC), Queern (CBUC), Rasmussen (Internet

Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Seltzer (NCSG), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC), Young (RySG). Against, or alternate views: none.

5.3 Gripe Sites; Deceptive, and/or Offensive Domain Names

5.3.1 Issue / Definition

The issue is whether the registration these kinds of domain names are simply a form of cybersquatting or whether the registration of such domain names should be addressed as a separate form of registration abuse, and whether a consistent policy framework addressing this category can or should be applied across all ICANN-accredited registries and registrars.

- Gripe/Complaint Sites a.k.a. “Sucks Sites”: Web sites that complain about a company’s or entity’s products or services and uses a company’s trademark in the domain name (e.g. companysucks.com).
- Pornographic/Offensive Sites: Web sites that contain adult or pornographic content and uses a brand holder’s trademark in the domain name (e.g. brandporn.com).
- Offensive strings: Registration of stand-alone dirty words within a domain name (with or without brand names).
- Registration of deceptive domain names: Registration of domain names that direct unsuspecting consumers to obscenity or direct minors to harmful content—sometimes referred to as a form of “mousetrapping.”

5.3.2 Background

The RAPWG discussed the issue of whether the registration of these types of domain names should be addressed as a unique category of registration, with discussions that centered on several different areas:

i. Gripe/Complaint Websites:

Several members pointed to the freedom of speech laws (not only in the U.S. but internationally) that govern gripe and complaint sites using a company’s trademark in the domain name, and indicated that registration of these names should not be considered as a

separate abuse category but rather should be considered as potential cases of cybersquatting, if anything. Other members also discussed the intrinsic value of gripe and complaint Web sites to companies and organizations that are seeking to understand the problems that customers may have with respect to their products or services. The WG noted that aggrieved parties could turn to the courts and the UDRP to remedy any claims they may have with respect to the use of trademarks in a domain name. There was some discussion that decisions have not been consistent with respect to gripe and complaint sites, although it is generally understood that that truthful statements in gripe and complaint sites are protected free speech. Examples include:

- http://decisions.courts.state.ny.us/fcas/fcas_docs/2005oct/30060065920045sciv.pdf. A U.S. court ruled that a disgruntled customer of an insurance firm cannot be sued for defamation over statements he made on his “gripe site” because those statements are protected free speech.
- http://www.acluva.org/docket/pleadings/lamparello_opinion.pdf - A U.S. Appeals Court found that a Web site using the domain name fallwell.com, set up to criticize evangelist Jerry Falwell, did not violate trademark laws. There was no likelihood of confusion, ruled the Court.
- <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/decisions/html/2007/d2007-0731.html> - A figure behind controversial business schemes failed in his bid to gain control of the .COM Internet address consisting of his name. A site that criticizes his activities was allowed to keep the name.
- <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/decisions/html/2005/d2005-0168.html> - The domain name AirFranceSucks.com was transferred to Air France. But the airline's victory at arbitration was not without controversy: panelists disagreed about what the word 'sucks' really means to Internet users.
- <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/decisions/html/2009/d2009-1077.html>- The Panel noted that that the domain name Radioshacksucks.com was not redirected to a “gripe” Web site, but was pointing to a Web site with various pay-per-click links mainly aimed at directing visitors to competing third party commercial Web sites. The Panel found for the Complainant and transferred the name.

- At least one article has criticized some of the current UDRP decisions in this area. That article can be found at: <http://domainnamewire.com/2009/12/04/freedom-of-speech-a-concept-not-limited-to-yankees/>

ii. Pornographic Websites/Registration of Offensive Strings:

There appears to be some distinction however between complaint and gripe sites and the registration of offensive strings, and whether these should be treated differently. The registration of complaint site names (a.k.a. “sucks sites”) appears to have a direct impact on organizations and companies, while the registration of offensive words have a more direct impact on consumers. A domain name that contains a brand and an offensive word and also points to a Web site that contains pornographic content can tarnish the reputation and the image of a company’s brand. In addition to court action, the UDRP is a tool that companies and organizations can turn to turn to remediate this problem because of the presence of the brand name. A recent article in Computerworld magazine²⁴ discusses the increase in cybersquatting abuse in general. The article points to the example of the Web site FreeLegoPorn.com that began publishing pornographic images created with Lego toys. The trademark owner Lego Juris AS filed a UDRP complaint with the World Intellectual Property Organization's (WIPO) Arbitration and Mediation Center, which ultimately ruled in its favor.

However, a domain name that is registered for the sole purpose of misleading a consumer can be extremely harmful. For example, the U.S. government enacted the Truth in Domain Names Act (18 USC Sec. 2252B), which makes it a crime to knowingly register a domain name with the intent to mislead a person into viewing obscene material. It also makes it a crime to register a domain name with the intent to deceive a minor into viewing harmful material. These domain names generally encompass typos (but not always) of recognizable names and trademarks as a means of confusing people into visiting objectionable Web sites. Moreover, a number of ccTLDs maintain policies governing the registration of objectionable words, with at least one ccTLD

24

http://www.computerworld.com/s/article/print/9134605/Domain_name_wars_Rise_of_the_cybersquatters?taxonomyName=Networking+and+Internet&taxonomyId=16

registry (.US) apparently preventing the registration of the “seven dirty words” as per a government policy. (The United States Federal Trade Commission also regulates the use of these seven words on broadcast television and radio stations in the U.S.)

The RAPWG discussed some of the practical business challenges that could be presented for a registry to adopt a policy that blacklists all names that also contain some form of prohibited word. For example, the RAPWG noted the difficulty in (i) trying to monitor the use of expletives in different languages, (ii) continuing to adapt to the evolution of obscenities in the vernacular of a specific language, and (iii) addressing “gaming” of the system in this area.

RAPWG members also pointed out that ccTLDs and gTLDs are not in equivalent positions in these matters. ccTLD operators are associated with certain countries, and are usually obligated to adhere to their governments’ directives and laws, which reflect varying local standards of decency. In contrast, gTLDs are by definition global, and it would be difficult to determine baselines and balances for issues involving free speech and morals. Members commented that ICANN is not in a good position to enforce morals in relation to domain names. The issue was effectively settled in .COM/.NET/.ORG in 1999.

The RAPWG members generally agreed that gripe site and offensive domain names that use a brand owner’s trademark are adequately addressed in the context of Cybersquatting for purposes of establishing consistent registration abuse policies in this area.

5.3.3 Recommendations

There was rough consensus to make no recommendation.

The majority of RAPWG members expressed that gripe site and offensive domain names that use trademarks should be addressed in the context of cybersquatting and the UDRP for purposes of establishing consistent registration abuse policies in this area, and that creating special procedures for special classes of domains, such as offensive domain names, may present problems.

In favour (10): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Bladel (RrSG), Cobb (CBUC), Neuman (RySG), O'Connor (CBUC), Queern (CBUC), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Seltzer (NCSG), Sutton (CBUC), Young (RySG).

Four (4) members supported this alternate view:

The URDP should be revisited to determine what substantive policy changes, if any, would be necessary to address any inconsistencies relating to decisions on "gripe" names and to provide for fast track substantive and procedural mechanisms in the event of the registration of deceptive domain names that mislead adults or children to objectionable sites.

Supporting this alternate view (4): Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Shah (MarkMonitor)."

There was strong support to turn down a proposed recommendation that registries develop best practices to restrict the registration of offensive strings. A majority of the WG supported this view for the following reasons:

- *ICANN is not a good forum to make recommendations regarding moral standards.*
- *"Potential harm to consumers" is a vague standard.*
- *The recommendation is problematic for global TLDs, and it was a matter closed in .COM/.NET/.ORG many years ago.*

In support (8): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Cobb (CBUC), Neuman (RySG), O'Connor (CBUC), Queern (CBUC), Seltzer (NCSG), Young (RySG).

Five (5) members expressed significant opposition noting that "Registries should consider developing internal best practice policies that would restrict the registration of offensive strings in order to mitigate the potential harm to consumers and children."

Supporting this view (5): Felman (MarkMonitor), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC).

5.4 **Fake Renewal Notices**

5.4.1 **Issue / Definition**

Fake renewal notices are misleading correspondence sent to registrants from an individual or organization claiming to be or to represent the current registrar. These are sent for a variety of deceptive purposes. The desired action as a result of the deceptive notification is:

- Pay an unnecessary fee (fraud)
- Get a registrant to switch registrars unnecessarily (“slamming”, or illegitimate market-based switching)
- Reveal credentials or provide authorization codes to facilitate theft of the domain

5.4.2 **Background**

What is the ICANN issue?

- Transfer issue (deceptive/fraudulent practices on the part of a registrar/reseller)
 - Pretending to be current registrar
 - Creating a fraudulent transfer event
- Domain hijacking issue (in the case of a non-registrar reseller)
- WHOIS abuse issue -- 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 is still applies, but it falls into the realm of IRTP, hijacking, or WHOIS abuse.

For a number of case studies and examples of fake renewal notices, please see document at:

<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-rap-dt/msg00446.html>

For examples of how governments have used their law enforcement and consumer protection agencies to pursue such abuses, please see: <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-rap-dt/msg00624.html>

5.4.3 Recommendations

Recommendation #1:

The RAPWG recommends that the GNSO refer this issue to ICANN's Contractual Compliance department for possible enforcement action, including investigation of misuse of WHOIS data.

The WG achieved unanimous consensus on the above recommendation: In favour (14): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Bladel (RrSG), Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), Neuman (RySG), O'Connor (CBUC), Queern (CBUC), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Seltzer (NCSG), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC), Young (RySG).

Recommendation #2:

The following recommendation is conditional. If the ICANN Compliance Department sees no ability to enforce or act against Fake Renewal Notice abuse as per Recommendation #1 above, the RAPWG recommends that the GNSO initiate a Policy Development Process by requesting an Issues Report to further investigate this abuse.

The WG achieved unanimous consensus on the above recommendation. In favour (14): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Bladel (RrSG), Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), Neuman (RySG), O'Connor (CBUC), Queern (CBUC), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Seltzer (NCSG), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC), Young (RySG). Against, or alternate views: none.

5.5 Cross-TLD Registration Scam

5.5.1 Issue / Definition

“Cross-TLD Registration Scam” is a deceptive sales practice where an existing registrant is sent a notice that another party is interested in or is attempting to register the registrant’s domain string in another TLD. The registrant is therefore pushed to make additional registrations via the

party who sent the notice – often a reseller who would profit from the additional registrations, and is offering the new domain creates at a higher-than-average market price. This practice is separate from but related to fake renewal notices due to the deceptive tactics. However, the rogue sales and marketing practices here focuses on *new registrations* versus existing registered domains. There is insufficient research about the practice to determine the sources or frequency of the practice. As with Fake Renewal Notices, some suggest that resellers could be the primary culprits, but this is only anecdotal.

5.5.2 Background

A notice is sent to the current registrant of a domain name (typically the registrant of a .COM, .ORG, and/or .NET name), stating the registrant has a limited time to protect the brand in the said country where the threat of the trademark is requested.

An example of a deceptive notice can be found on the RAP Mailing Archive at:

<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-rap-dt/msg00621.html>

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.

A number of governments have used their law enforcement and consumer protection agencies to pursue such abuses. Link to examples: <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-rap-dt/msg00624.html>

Scope and Policy Issues

The RAPWG discussed how this issue involves domains that are not yet created, and members did not come to a consensus that the practice itself can be termed a registration abuse that is

within the scope of ICANN policy making. Some members believed that when a consumer is deceived and commits to the defensive registrations, that begins to enter the ICANN policy realm. Other members did not agree with that assessment, and suggested that ICANN does not have a relevant consumer protection mandate, and that this deceptive practice could or should be dealt with via legal, regulatory, or consumer protection mechanisms offered by governments.

The practice may involve a WHOIS abuse: lists of registrants are being obtained and spammed, possibly in violation of WHOIS policies.

5.5.3 Recommendation

The RAPWG recommends the GNSO monitor for Cross-TLD registration abuse scam in the gTLD space and co-ordinate research with the community to determine the nature and extent of the problem. The WG believes this issue warrants review but notes there is not enough data at this time to warrant an Issues Report or PDP.

The WG achieved unanimous consensus on the above recommendation. In favour (14): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Bladel (RrSG), Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), Neuman (RySG), O'Connor (CBUC), Queern (CBUC), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Seltzer (NCSG), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC), Young (RySG). Against, or alternate views: none.

5.6 Name Spinning

5.6.1 Issue / Definition

This is the practice of using automated tools used to create permutations of a given domain name string. Registrars often use such tools to suggest alternate strings to potential registrants when the string that the person queries they is not available for registration. .

5.6.2 Background

- The main concern is that such tools may produce results that may infringe upon trademarked strings.

- There was agreement in the RAPWG that name spinning is a tool that can be used by people for both legitimate and illegitimate purposes. As such, name-spinning is not in and of itself abusive.
- As discussed in some other areas, a determination of whether or not a particular use of such software is dependent on the user's intent.
- Until a domain name is actually registered, the trademark infringement (and therefore any registration abuse) is purely hypothetical, and therefore not a subject for policy-making.
- As discussed in some other areas, a determination of whether or not a particular use of such software is dependent on the user's intent.
- Domain name registrations that infringe on trademarks may be addressed via the UDRP.

5.6.3 Recommendations

None.

5.7 Pay-per-Click

5.7.1 Issue / Definition

Pay per click (PPC) is an Internet advertising model used on Web sites, in which the advertiser pays the host only when their ad is clicked. The concern raised was use of a trademark in a domain name to draw traffic to a site containing paid placement advertising.

5.7.2 Background

The RAPWG had consensus that pay-per-click advertising is not in and of itself a registration abuse, and that bad-faith use of trademarks in domain names is a Cybersquatting issue that can be addressed under the UDRP. The abuse of a PPC system for illicit gain is most appropriately addressed by the operator of the PPC advertising network (e.g. Google AdSense).

5.7.3 Recommendations

None.

5.8 Traffic Diversion

5.8.1 Issue / Definition

Use of brand names in HTML visible text, hidden text, meta tags, or Web page title to manipulate search engine rankings and divert traffic.

5.8.2 Background

The RAPWG had consensus that this is a pure Web site use issue with no inherent relation to a domain name or registration process, and is therefore out of GNSO policy-making scope.

5.8.3 Recommendations

None.

5.9 False Affiliation

5.9.1 Issue / Definition

Web site that is falsely purporting to be an affiliate of a brand owner.

5.9.2 Background

The RAPWG had consensus that this is a pure Web site use issue with no inherent relation to a domain name or registration process, and is therefore out of GNSO policy-making scope.

5.9.3 Recommendations

None.

5.10 Domain Kiting / Tasting

5.10.1 Issue / Definition

Registrants may abuse the Add Grace Period through continual registration, deletion, and re-registration of the same names in order to avoid paying the registration fees. This practice is referred to as “domain kiting.” This term has been mistakenly used as being synonymous with domain tasting, but it refers to multiple and often consecutive tasting of the same domain name.

5.10.2 Background

Bob Parsons appears to have introduced the term “domain kiting” in a blog post in 2006. In the post he chose to call the activity “kiting”, but his definition described what later came to be termed “domain tasting” (as The Public Interest Registry did in its letter to Steve Crocker on March 26, 2006). This confusion of terms carried forward for some time as can be seen in a MessageLabs report published several months later.

Eventually, the current definition of domain kiting (the serial re-registration of a domain to get a domain for free) solidified. Domain tasting is a different practice, in which a registrant measures the monetization potential of a domain during the Add Grace Period, and deletes it in AGP if the domain is not worth keeping.

ICANN staff looked into domain kiting (while developing the 2007 Issue Report on domain tasting) and could not find anything except anecdotal evidence of the activity. A RAPWG member performed an analysis of the .INFO registry in 2008 and again in December 2009, and did not find any examples of kiting. [1] However domain kiting was a factor in a broader complaint brought by Dell and Alienware against various registrars and individuals in 2007 [here's the link -- http://www.domainnamenews.com/images/dell_doc1.pdf]

5.10.3 Recommendations

It is unclear to what extent domain kiting happens, and the RAPWG does not recommend policy development at this time. The RAPWG suggests that the Council monitor the issue (in conjunction with ongoing reviews of domain-tasting), and consider next steps if conditions warrant.

The WG achieved rough consensus on the above recommendation. In favour (13): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Bladel (RrSG), Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), Neuman (RySG), O'Connor (CBUC), Queern (CBUC), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Seltzer (NCSG), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC), Young (RySG). Against, or alternate views: one member (Queern) supported the following alternate view: 'The RAPWG recommends policy development regarding domain kiting / tasting with input from the appropriate parties'.

6. Malicious Use of Domain Names

The WG discussed how these problems relate to the scope of the Working Group’s activities as well as GNSO policy-making. In general, the RAPWG found that malicious uses of domain names have limited but notable intersections with registration issues.

The RAPWG acknowledges that e-crime is an important issue of the ICANN community. The Internet community frequently voices concern to ICANN about malicious conduct and, in particular, the extent to which criminals take advantage of domain registration and name resolution services. Various parties—including companies, consumers, governments, and law enforcement—are asking ICANN and its contracted parties to monitor malicious conduct and, when appropriate, take reasonable steps to detect, block, and mitigate such conduct. The question is what ICANN can reasonably do within its mission and policy-making boundaries.

6.1 Issue / Definition

The RAPWG was asked by the GNSO Council to examine issues surrounding illicit uses of domain names, an outgrowth of learning done about that topic in the Fast-Flux Working Group (FFWG). Specifically, the GNSO Council resolved:

- “The Registration Abuse Policy Working Group (RAPWG) should examine whether existing policy may empower Registries and Registrars, including consideration for adequate indemnification, to mitigate illicit uses of Fast Flux,” and
- “To encourage ongoing discussions within the community regarding the development of best practices and / or Internet industry solutions to identify and mitigate the illicit uses of Fast Flux.”²⁵

Malicious or illicit behavior may be mitigated by stopping the domain name from resolving. This can be accomplished by the sponsoring registrar or registry by: applying an EPP Hold status; by

²⁵ <http://gns0.icann.org/meetings/minutes-03sep09.htm>

removing or changing the nameservers delegated to the domain; or by deleting the domain name. Some malicious behaviors may be stopped by the hosting provider, and that may be the most appropriate action depending upon the specific case. (For example, hosting providers can take down individual phishing pages while the rest of the Web site continues to resolve.) But in the ICANN context, stopping resolution of the domain is the relevant issue, since that is what registrars and registries have the technical ability to make happen.

This issue is common to many types of abusive or malicious behavior – not only illicit fast-flux, but also spamming, malware distribution, online child pornography, phishing, botnet command-and-control, 419 scams, and others. Some specifics related to some common malicious abuses are noted below.

The RAPWG also discussed how the basic accessibility of WHOIS, the accuracy of contact data, and the use of proxy contact services are registration issues related to the malicious use of domain names.

6.2 Background

ICANN possesses a limited technical coordination function for the DNS. The Internet is a huge and sprawling environment that crosses international borders. It is decentralized by design, and involves millions of parties all exercising ownership of or control over various assets and infrastructure. These parties include network and telecom operators, ISPs, RIRs, registrants, registrars, registry operators, corporations and organizations, governments, the root operators, and more. The Internet and its users also depend upon hardware and software vendors, such as the creators of operating systems and Web browsers. All of these parties are vulnerable to and are often leveraged by criminals. As a result, no one party -- and no one type of entity -- has the power to solve the problem of e-crime alone. Indeed, security experts agree that e-crime cannot be solved – it can only be fought, and hopefully contained, just like offline crime. In the end, all responsible parties have a role to play. Collaboration, data sharing, and education are effective and important tools for dealing with Internet security problems.

Law enforcement becomes involved in only a tiny percentage of e-crime incidents, due to the limited resources available, the large number of incidents, and the difficulties of investigating and prosecuting across national borders and jurisdictions. Instead, the great bulk of abusive or criminal behavior is dealt with via terms of service and contractual rights. The standard mitigation model on the Internet is that malicious behavior is reported to the service provider(s) who may have the right and ability to do something about it. Malicious domain name use is reported to the relevant hosting provider and/or to the sponsoring registrar (and occasionally to the registry operator). The registrar is the ICANN-related party with the direct relationship with—and a direct contract with—the registrant. The registrar (and/or registry) may determine if the use violates its legal terms of service, and decides whether or not to take any action.

Registrars always include language in their registrar-registrant contracts that allows the registrar to suspend or cancel a domain name. The language and terms vary among registrars, and the RAPWG examined this in its explorations of contract uniformity. Generally, registrars can act if the registrant violates the registrar's terms of service, or violates ICANN policy, or if illegal activity is involved, or if payment fails. Some registrar-registrant agreements are broader and allow the registrar to suspend a domain at any time for any reason, or for no reason. It appears that registrars are empowered to mitigate abusive uses of domains if they so choose, and indeed registrars use that freedom to suspend gTLD domains as a matter of daily business.

Some registrars may have terms that address specific domain name uses or abuses. For example, the RAPWG saw how GoDaddy's Universal Terms of Service contains a fairly unique prohibition against use of domain names for "activities associated with the sale or distribution of prescription medication without a valid prescription."²⁶ Some RAPWG members commented that such contractual variances are a way that registrars differentiate themselves in the market, and they can help registrars adhere to the laws of the jurisdictions in which they are incorporated or operate.

²⁶ <http://www.godaddy.com/gdshop/agreements.asp>

Some gTLD and ccTLD registry operators also have anti-abuse policies or provisions. Neustar's .BIZ contract with ICANN require that "The registered domain name will be used primarily for bona fide business or commercial purposes," and Neustar has relied on that requirement to suspended domains being used for phishing and malware distribution. Anti-abuse policies have also been instituted at the initiative of registry operators. For example, both The Public Interest Registry (.ORG) and Afilias (.INFO) instituted policies under their existing rights in their ICANN-registry and RRA contracts.^{27, 28} The resulting anti-abuse policies include lists of prohibited abuses and reiterate the registry's right to suspend domain names. To create these anti-abuse policies, the registry operators relied upon contract provisions that allow the registry operator to "establish operational standards, policies, procedures, and practices for the Registry TLD", in a non-arbitrary manner and applicable to all registrars, and consistent with ICANN's standards, policies, procedures, and practices and the registry's Agreement with ICANN. Most ICANN-registry contracts contain provisions such as the ones relied upon by the .INFO and .ORG registries.

So, it appears that all registrars and most, if not all registries are already empowered to develop anti-abuse policies and mitigate malicious uses if they wish to do so. In addition, they may use the Expedited Registry Security Request (ERSR, discussed below) to address threats to the DNS or their TLDs.

Some malicious uses of domain names involve legitimate domain name registrations that are compromised or infected by criminals and then used to perpetrate crimes such as phishing and malware. The RAPWG notes that any policy or recommendations must not adversely impact innocent parties, including the registrant and the registrar.

²⁷ See: http://www.pir.org/index.php?db=content/Website&tbl=About_Us&id=14 and section 3.5.2 of the .ORG Registry-Registrar Agreement (RRA) at <http://www.icann.org/en/tlds/agreements/org/appendix-08-08dec06.htm>

²⁸ See http://www.info.info/info/abusive_use_policy and section 3.5.2 of the .INFO Registry-Registrar Agreement ("RRA") at <http://www.icann.org/en/tlds/agreements/info/appendix-08-08dec06.htm>

RAPWG members also noted that malicious use of domain names varies significantly by TLD, and some gTLDs have low-to-nonexistent problems. Many factors may explain this, including: eligibility or locus requirements; general availability; price; the registrars the TLD is available through and whether any of those registrars maintains less-than adequate defences or response capabilities; and the general whims of e-criminals. This raises the question of whether “one-size-fits-all” policies are relevant or needed. A WG member suggested that verification of users might be a potential approach to consider suitable for policy development, while others felt that required pre-screening of registrants raises many operational and economic issues.

It was pointed out that as a business practice, some registrars suspend or delete domain registrations that have not been used for phishing, malware, etc. when they discover that the registrant is using at least some of their domains for malicious purposes. In these cases, the registrant has broken the terms of service agreement.

It was suggested that injecting uniform requirements can sometimes be counterproductive – it can inject limitations into a situation where flexibility is often required, and might tie the hands of registries and registrars by reducing or limiting their ability to effectively respond. It was suggested that best practices or minimum standards could be explored. The importance of due process was also noted.

6.3 Intent, Risk, and Indemnification

The decision to suspend a domain name is up to the discretion of the registrar or registry operator, as per their terms of service. Suspending domain names involves risk. Registrars and registry operators especially wish to avoid suspending the domain names of innocent parties (a “false-positive”). A mistake can take an innocent registrant’s Web site and e-mail offline and potentially cause significant economic damage and other problems for the registrant. In turn, the registrar or registry operator may face legal action, and may further face customer service and public relations problems.

The RAPWG’s members also discussed the issue of registration intent. It was agreed that assessing what a domain name will be used for at the time of its registration requires speculation about future intent, which can never be accurate 100% of the time. Some members suggested that if one was able to determine at the time of registration that a domain name will be used for an abusive activity, it might then be considered registration abuse. Some stated that it is not possible to reliably determine at the time of registration whether a domain will be used for phishing, spam or malware. Members provided examples of when it has been possible to predict intent to a high degree of confidence, such as in certain cases of ongoing criminal behavior. Such cases seem somewhat rare, the particulars can vary greatly between cases and over time, and they usually involve small numbers of gTLD domains – perhaps dozen to hundreds over time.²⁹ So for these reasons, even if such cases were determined to be registration abuse, there were doubts that they would be good candidates for ICANN policy-making.

Diligent registrars and registries have procedures for investigating abuse claims. These involve performing diligence and documenting problems as a way to protect registrants and minimize false-positives, to avoid risk, or to balance risk with the benefits of stopping malicious behavior. Some registrars and registries may avoid risk by declining to suspend domains at all, or only in the most pressing circumstances. Some may see domain name use as an issue they should not make judgments about at all. As far as is known, there are no registrars or registry operators that trust heuristics or abuse blacklists in order to automatically suspend abusive domain names. Apparently all require the decisions to be made by an authorized person. Often this function resides with an attorney, a compliance officer, or a specially trained analyst.

²⁹ An example are the domains registered by the “Rock Phish” and “Avalanche” phishing operations. These gTLD and ccTLD domains were registered regularly, in batches, and contained characteristic string patterns. The case of Conficker was unusual in that it involved thousands of *unregistered* gTLD domain strings over time; see the commentary of Conficker and the Expedited Registry Security Request Process (ERSR) elsewhere in this paper.

WHOIS data is an integral part of the investigation process used by registrars, registry operators, law enforcement, and many other parties affected by malicious use of domains. The RAPWG discussed how the basic accessibility of WHOIS, the accuracy of contact data, and the use of proxy contact services are registration issues related to the malicious use of domain names. Accessibility of WHOIS data is discussed elsewhere in this paper, and upcoming GNSO studies will investigate how the contact accuracy and proxy issues are related to e-crime.

The Fast-Flux Working Group also discussed the issues of false-positives and intent. The FFWG examined case studies that show that fast-flux detection systems create false-positives, and that it is not always possible to determine the intent that some fast-flux domains are being used for. There was discussion of how detection systems would need to yield an “acceptably low” level of false-positives, but no agreement about what that level would be. Also, “In order to constrain the working definition of fast flux to lie within the scope of ICANN to address, the FFWG also tentatively agreed to limit the definition to the operation of the DNS and its registration system, specifically excluding the question of what constitutes criminal intent.”³⁰

Along with the provisions that allow them to suspend domains names, registrar and registry contracts include indemnification language. Current ICANN-registry and registry-registrar contracts –and virtually all registrar-registrant agreements—obligate registrants to abide by ICANN, registry, and registrar policies, and require registrants to indemnify and hold harmless registrars and registries for enforcing those policies.³¹ This language is designed to protect the registrar or registry from claims and damages brought by the registrant.

³⁰ “Final Report of the GNSO Fast Flux Hosting Working Group”, page 26:

<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/fast-flux-hosting/fast-flux-final-report-06aug09-en.pdf>

³¹ For example, the .COM Registry-Registrar contract that is part of VeriSign’s contract with ICANN says: “2.14. Indemnification Required of Registered Name Holders. In its registration agreement with each Registered Name Holder, Registrar shall require each Registered Name holder to indemnify, defend and hold harmless VNDS, and its directors, officers, employees, agents, and affiliates from and against any and all claims, damages, liabilities, costs and expenses, including reasonable legal fees and expenses arising

An issue raised in the RAPWG is that indemnification language may not always an effective or practical protection. Despite indemnification language, gTLD registries and registrars have been sued by registrants for enforcing their terms of service.³², ³³, ³⁴ Such legal proceedings can have

out of or relating to the Registered Name holder's domain name registration.”

<http://www.icann.org/en/tlds/agreements/verisign/appendix-08-01oct08.pdf>

³² In *Davies v. Afiliias Ltd.*, 293 F.Supp.2d 1265 (M.D. Fla. 2003), a registry operator was sued in a U.S. district court for locking Sunrise domains that the registrant did not have a right to possess, even though the registrant was bound to relevant terms and conditions and had indemnified the registry operator. In the course of the action, it was claimed that defendant Afiliias incurred approximately US\$100,000 in damages as a result of responding to the action. The court found that: "Plaintiff did not follow these rules, but rather subverted the process by attempting to register domain names for his own use before the names were offered on any basis to the general public, Defendant's 'interference' by locking the domain names was, as a matter of law, justified....summary judgment in Defendant's favor is appropriate."

http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=10308248522650356354&q=%22293+F.+Supp.+2d+1265%22&hl=en&as_sdt=2002

³³ See *Stephen Weingrad and Weingrad & Weingrad, P.C. vs. Telepathy, Inc., Network Solutions, Inc., and Namebay S.A.M.* (05 Civ. 2024 (MBM), United States District Court for the Southern District of New York; 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26952). In this case, a registrar was sued after performing standard renewal and redistribution operations. Registrar Network Solutions notified registrant Weingrad of the upcoming expiration of his domain name. Weingrad failed to renew and the domain expired. When offered, Weingrad then declined to pay Network Solutions a standard redemption fee to redeem the name. The domain eventually became available, and was registered by another registrar. Weingrad then sued Network Solutions. The case was dismissed, and the court noted that Weingrad was bound by the Registration Agreement between him and Network Solutions. Network Solutions believed that it had acted within its Registration Agreement, and within ICANN policies. However, Network Solutions incurred over US\$80,000 in legal fees defending itself.

³⁴ There are many examples of how registrars have encountered difficulties after suspending domain names as per legal requirements and/or the registrar's terms of service. A few include:

- http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/04/us/04bar.html?_r=3&scp=1&sq=liptak&st=nyt&oref=slogin&oref=slogin
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Network_Solutions#Fitna_controversy

significant costs in money and resources, even though the registry or registrar was within its legal rights and may have thought that it had exercised good faith. And as referenced above, registrars have suspended domain names within their rights and then encountered customer and public relations problems, which have costs of their own. Indemnification language in ICANN contracts may fall short of being a true legal “safe harbor,” which reduces or eliminates a party's liability under the law.

The domain-takedown and indemnification issue may come down to this: If a registrar or registry chooses to suspend a domain for malicious use, it is deciding to assume the risk and bear responsibility for possible consequences. But ICANN apparently does not have the power to require registries or registrars to suspend domain names for use issues, and if it did, then provisions to fully protect the contracted party from exposure to harm incurred by implementing ICANN-required mitigation procedures must be considered.

6.4 The Expedited Registry Security Request (ERSR)

The RAPWG discussed the new ERSR, which offers a flexible, contract-related response mechanism for registries to respond to significant malicious threats to the DNS itself or a TLD's operations.

The Expedited Registry Security Request (ERSR)³⁵ was developed to "provide a process for gTLD registries who inform ICANN of a present or imminent security incident (hereinafter referred to as “Incident”) to their TLD and/or the DNS to request a contractual waiver for actions it might take or has taken to mitigate or eliminate an Incident. A contractual waiver is an exemption from compliance with a specific provision of the Registry Agreement for the time period necessary to respond to the Incident. The ERSR has been designed to allow operational security

-
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Godaddy#Suspension_of_Seclists.org
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Godaddy#Deletion_of_FamilyAlbum.com

³⁵ <http://www.icann.org/en/registries/ersr/>

to be maintained around an Incident while keeping relevant parties (e.g., ICANN, other affected providers, etc.) informed as appropriate."

The ERSR was a result of learning from the Conficker problem, and was published for public comment in September 2009. The ERSR was included in the Draft Applicant Guidebook, draft 3 (DAG3) so as to be made available in new TLDs that may be introduced in the future.

The ERSR framework allows flexibility, which will be necessary for responding to the unknown and possibly novel threats to the DNS or TLDs that may arise in the future. It also allows registries to propose operational solutions that may be suited to the situation at hand, and to the registry's technical and operational capabilities. For example, in the case of another Conficker, registries could be allowed to perform relevant domain name blocking and/or registration themselves, or could accommodate arrangements in which a trusted party would register relevant domain names and would receive fee relief from ICANN and the registry. The ERSR also provides for expedited action, and process that involves legal and security experts at ICANN and the registry or registries involved.

6.5 Other Notes

Registrars are often viewed by the public as the key to successfully resolving malicious conduct because the registrars directly interact with those registrants who misuse domain names, and because registrars have freedom to set their terms of service.

- It has been observed that registrars' responses and defensive mechanisms vary widely in effectiveness and timeliness, and that some registrars are much less inclined to address e-crime than others.
- Registrars are the parties that generally possess the most information that can be used to assess the trustworthiness of a registration and a registrant and can link it to malicious behavior. These include credit-card data (criminals often use stolen credentials; see below), the true registrant's identity (when protected by a proxy

contact or privacy service), the IP of the registrant, and what domains that registrant has registered in other TLDs.

- RAPWG members observed that malicious use of domain names varies significantly by sponsoring registrar.³⁶
- Members also discussed apparent recurrent abuse by resellers, which goes back to how registrars deal with their various agents, how those agents are bound to ICANN policies, and how registrars are held accountable for the actions of their resellers.

Some members of the Internet security community are convinced that a small number of domain name registrars knowingly tolerate malicious abuse, or are actively involved in it. Such cases need the attention of ICANN and its compliance department. A key question is what tools are needed and are appropriate to deal with this worst-case behavior.

Given the above, the logical question is whether there are any registration-related policies that can be used to positively affect such problems.

6.6 Examples of Malicious Uses

Phishing

Phishing is a Web site fraudulently presenting itself as a trusted site (often a bank) in order to deceive Internet users into divulging sensitive information (e.g. online banking credentials, email passwords). The goal of phishing is usually the theft of funds or other valuable assets. The great majority of domains used for phishing are compromised or hacked by phishers, and the registrants are not responsible for the phishing. Such cases are not registered for bad purposes and therefore present cases where there is no inherent registration issue, and where mitigation must be handled carefully.

³⁶ For example, see <http://rss.uribl.com/nic/>

RAPWG members Rod Rasmussen and Greg Aaron publish semi-annual Global Phishing Surveys via the Anti-Phishing Working Group.³⁷ Findings from these reports include these relevant to registration and use issues:

- About 81% of domains used for phishing are compromised or hacked by phishers, and the registrants are not responsible for the phishing. These domains should therefore not be suspended, and mitigation must usually be performed by the hosting provider. “Malicious” domain registrations totalled about 5,591 domain names in all gTLDs and ccTLDs worldwide in the first six months of 2009. This was about 18.5% of the domain names involved in phishing.
- Only about 3.5% of all domain names that were used for phishing contain a brand name or variation thereof, designed to fool visitors. Placing brand names or variations thereof in the domain name itself is not a favored tactic of phishers, since brand owners are proactively scanning Internet zone files for such names. Instead, phishers usually place brand names in subdirectories or on subdomains in an attempt to fool Internet users. Most maliciously registered domains were random strings, such as “hodfw42hj.com.es”, which offered nothing to confuse a potential victim.
- Phishers are increasingly using subdomain services to host and manage their phishing sites. These services are below the level provided by registries and registrars, and use of subdomains is not subject to policies maintained by ICANN. Phishers use such services almost as often as they register domain names. Such attacks even account for the majority of phishing attacks in certain large TLDs. This trend shows phishers migrating to services that cannot be taken down by registrars or registry operators.
- Phishing (and phishing using maliciously registered domains) varies greatly by TLD. Many factors may explain this, including general availability or nature of the TLD, price, the registrars the TLD is available through, and locus or eligibility requirements.

³⁷ The last two reports were: Second Half 2009:

http://www.apwg.org/reports/APWG_GlobalPhishingSurvey_2H2009.pdf and

First half 2009: http://www.apwg.org/reports/APWG_GlobalPhishingSurvey_1H2009.pdf

The RAPWG had consensus that phishing is generally a domain name use issue. Those cases that involve misleading use of brand names in the domain string may be treated as cases of cybersquatting.

Spam

Spam is generally defined as bulk unsolicited e-mail. Spam may be sent from domains, and spam is used to advertise Web sites.

Statistics published by various service providers show that spam levels vary significantly by TLD and by registrar.³⁸

The RAPWG had consensus that spam is generally a domain name use issue. Those cases that involve misleading use of brand names in the domain string may be treated as cases of cybersquatting.

Malware / Botnet Command-and-Control

Malware authors sometimes use domain names as a way to control and update botnets. Botnets are composed of thousands to millions of infected computers under the common control of a criminal. Botnets can be used to perpetrate many kinds of malicious activity, including distributed denial-of-service attacks (DDoS), spam, and fast-flux hosting of phishing sites.

Relevant malware (including that associated with Srizbi, Torpig, and Conficker) on these infected machines attempts to contact domains included on some sort of pre-determined list or generated via an algorithm. If the botnet's master has deposited instructions at one of these valid domains, the botnet nodes will download those instructions and carry out the specified malicious activity, or update themselves with improved code.

³⁸ For example: <http://rss.uribl.com/tlds/> and <http://rss.uribl.com/nic/>

It is notable that especially in the case of Conficker, these lists were not domain names that had been created – the great majority of the domains strings had not yet been created as domain names. They were essentially domains that might be registered at some point in the future by the criminal in question. Further, some of the valid domains may already be registered to innocent parties by coincidence.

If the relevant domain name list or domain-generation algorithm is known, white-hat parties (such as security researchers, registries, and registrars) can register and/or monitor the relevant domains. In the case of Conficker, white-hat parties registered the domain names that could have been used for command-and-control, successfully disrupted the botnet, and prevented much of it from being updated or controlled. These parties also sinkholed traffic to those domains (directed traffic to nameservers the researchers controlled). This allowed them to identify the IPs of infected computers, thus estimating the size of the botnet and enabling mitigation and cleanup efforts.

There are several ways in which malware authors and botnet "herders" utilize domain names they control or plan to control at some point in conjunction with their schemes. The most common and well understood is using websites under domains they control to distribute new malware infections to victims. This is often done via social engineering, where the malware is disguised as something else. More and more, we are seeing so-called "drive-by" infections, where a malware author simply gets a victim to visit their site via a browser that is not fully patched or is vulnerable due to a "zero-day exploit". Malware authors are also using domain names to facilitate communication with infected machines and/or to actually control large botnets. Many different malware families use pre-defined "rendezvous" domain names that are hard coded into an initial downloaded piece of malcode. These rendezvous domains will provide further instructions using some sort of communications method, that is often, but not necessarily web-based, to relay further instructions or to provide more malware to download to the infected machine. Typically, the malware author will need to register such domains prior to deployment of their code in the wild. Other, more sophisticated malware programs (e.g.

Conficker, Srizbi, Torpig), use a pre-defined algorithm to get updates from domains based on the current time and perhaps other conditions. This allows malware authors to pick and choose when and what domains to register in order to provide more instructions or control their botnets.

- Descriptions of Conficker can be found at the Conficker Working Group (<http://www.confickerworkinggroup.org>) and on Wikipedia: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conficker>
- Srizbi info is also at Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Srizbi_botnet plus a write-up on the domain calculator it uses at ThreatExpert.com: <http://blog.threatexpert.com/2008/11/srizbis-domain-calculator.html>.
- A relevant research paper is: "Your Botnet is My Botnet: Analysis of a Botnet Takeover" by researchers at the University of California, Santa Barbara: <http://www.cs.ucsb.edu/%7Eeseclab/projects/torpig/torpig.pdf>.

Section 3 of this paper contains a very useful description of how the Torpig bot is controlled via domain names. The Conficker botnet uses a similar means. As the Santa Barbara authors note, "The use of domain flux in botnets has important consequences in the arms race between botmasters and defenders. From the attacker's point of view, domain flux is yet another technique to potentially improve the resilience of the botnet against take-down attempts. More precisely, in the event that the current rendezvous point is taken down, the botmasters simply have to register the next domain in the domain list to regain control of their botnet. On the contrary, to the defender's advantage, domain flux opens up the possibility of sinkholing (or "hijacking") a botnet [such as Torpig](#)." The Conficker bot is protected by sophisticated encryption, and its nodes will only download instructions from a domain that provides an authenticated response.

Newer variants of Conficker generate 50,000 potentially viable domains per day, spread across more than 100 TLDs. Registering all the domains generated by Conficker at market prices would therefore carry an enormous cost. (The Santa Barbara team estimated the cost at between \$91.3 million and \$182.5 million per year.)

Some registries blocked the viable Conficker domains. Those registries refused all attempts to create the relevant domains, thereby keeping them out of the hands of all parties for a certain period of time. Some registry operators were able to accomplish blocking, while others were not able to do so due to technical or policy reasons.

It is generally agreed by the members of the Conficker Working Group³⁹ that:

- 1) Fighting Conficker by acquiring and/or blocking domains was a success in many ways and was worth attempting. The effort prevented many nodes from being updated or controlled, and many nodes were identified and removed from the botnet.
- 2) The counter-measure of acquiring and/or blocking domains is probably not scalable in the long term. It is expected that criminals may expand the numbers of domains their malware algorithms use. The blocking efforts also depend upon the flawless and continued participation of all relevant TLD registry operators.

6.7 Use of Stolen Credentials

6.7.1 Issue / Definition

Criminals often use stolen credentials—such as stolen credit card numbers—to register domain names for malicious purposes. Is this a registration issue, and what if any solutions can be pursued through ICANN?

6.7.2 Background

For the purposes of examining registration abuse and the “use of stolen credentials”, there are three usages that seem to apply:

1. “Identity credentials” – Credentials that establish identity (e.g. personal identification cards, stored personal information)

³⁹ <http://www.confickerworkinggroup.org>

2. "Access credentials" – Credentials that control access to computer systems (e.g. username and password, digital certificates)
3. "Financial credentials" – Credentials that provide access to financial accounts (e.g. credit and debit cards).

Some blending of usages would apply in some cases as well. For example, the use of a stolen e-mail account to establish identity or the authority to modify access to financial credentials crosses multiple definitions.

Given the disparate nature of the uses and protections against abuse the types of credentials identified each have, it would seem prudent to examine them individually. Some commonalities may present themselves to allow for unified approaches.

Identity Credentials

In general, stolen identity credentials allow a miscreant to assume or impinge the identity of another in order to perpetuate one of their own schemes. This can manifest itself in the use of purloined personal information to make a domain registration appear to be legitimate (e.g. false WHOIS) or in allowing a perpetrator to assume control over access or financial credentials. The latter case can be explored in-depth in examining those other two credential types, but the former case is worth considering further.

1. Fraudsters use misappropriated identities of the actual individuals or institutions targeted by a particular scheme in conjunction with a domain registration. The fraudster wishes to make the domain name appear to be associated with the actual victim in order to make their scheme more viable to other victims, and/or their application for the domain legitimate.
2. Miscreants use identities of random, but real individuals/organizations in conjunction with a domain registration, unrelated to the actual fraud scheme. Use of real data may allow the miscreant to fool anti-fraud measures put in-place by the registrar. Victims of the actual scheme may be put at ease by the appearance of "real" verifiable domain ownership information in WHOIS, or they may make complaints against innocent parties. The stolen

identity data may well cause delays in authorities investigating the scheme, as innocent parties are scrutinized. The person who is “spoofed” in this instance may be the registrant for other domains, which may also allow the registration to get past anti-fraud measures, especially if the registrar being used is the same.

3. The miscreant uses stolen identities in conjunction with stolen financial credentials to bolster their fraud efforts when registering a domain. Including the stolen access information in WHOIS and/or account information that matches stolen credit card data can help avoiding anti-fraud systems, as well as all the benefits mentioned above.

Access Credentials

A miscreant can do quite a bit of damage with stolen access credentials. Outside of reselling those credentials, the real value of stolen access credentials lies in what is possible to do with the systems to which those credentials provide access. Two possible attacks seem to be meaningful within the confines of “domain registration abuse” examined here. First are direct attacks against registrar/reseller systems using stolen access credentials for that service.

Second, a perpetrator could launch an indirect attack via access credentials to other accounts.

1. A miscreant with direct access to a domain management account can make new domain registrations using funds or “credits” that account may have with the reseller or registrar. Obviously domains can be taken over, deleted, or otherwise sabotaged from such a compromised account, but those scenarios are likely outside the scope of “registration abuses”. Further, a miscreant may be able to gain access to credit card information that is stored in such an account, or affect purchases with that card that directly benefit that criminal. Again, this is outside scope, as this is more of a theft problem than a domain registration issue, but it is likely a concern that could come up in discussions of this topic.
2. If a fraudster has access to an account that is used to verify identity or confirm change requests, like an e-mail account, they can either attempt to gain access/control over a domain management account, or use a domain registration verification process to register domains using someone else’s account/identity. Some domain resellers may use legacy

models based on the original e-mail based registration and modification system, which would allow for fraudulent domain registrations based on e-mail confirmations.

3. If a criminal has access via stolen credentials (or simply hacking) into a computer/server that is part of some automated domain registration system, they can subvert that system. With such control, new domains can be registered using the victim's automated access to registrar systems. Of course hijacking, sabotage, and other acts can be perpetuated as well, just as if the miscreant had access to an account with the registrar/reseller.

Financial Credentials

Abuses perpetrated with stolen financial credentials are fairly straightforward. The criminal can utilize those credentials to fraudulently register domains and other related resources. This is quite common practice with criminals today, with most of the domains registered in this manner being used to perpetuate other crime, fraud, and abuse. Such credentials include credit cards, debit cards, on-line banking, alternate payment systems (e.g. PayPal), ACH systems, and other various means for affecting payments for domain name transactions.

An interesting aspect for domain name registration via stolen financial credentials versus other types of fraud done via stolen financial credentials is the need to establish domain ownership information (whois and/or account) and domain deployment characteristics (nameservers) at the time of registration. This allows for some unique techniques to expose fraudulent registrations via stolen financial credentials.

Observed abuses

Use of stolen financial credentials would seem, at first glance, to be the primary abuse seen today. Thousands of domains are registered daily using such credentials to perpetuate all sorts of criminal and abusive schemes. However, there has been a shift of late in the way criminals are amassing infrastructure resources, with more emphasis being placed on obtaining access credentials to infrastructure elements. Some level of stolen identity credential abuse co-exists with these other abuses as well, so all three areas deem at least some consideration.

Roles for policy and other industry-wide approaches

These three types of uses of stolen credentials present different opportunities for mitigation efforts, both at the individual registrar/reseller level and across the industry. Some registrars and resellers see fairly frequent abuse, especially of stolen financial credentials, while others do not. There are opportunities for dissemination of best practices, plus potential for “minimum standards” for dealing with various types of abuse in this arena. Further, given the unique nature of domain names requiring access to a shared data system (the zone files) with detailed ownership/contact data in order to function and be in compliance, there may be ways to share information about fraudulent activities occurring at some registrars/resellers to curb those abuses across the industry. No formal system or policy for the latter currently exists.

Free-market forces have largely determined how different registrars and their resellers respond to these issues. There is a strong argument for allowing competition to dictate many of these responses, as there is continuous innovation in these areas, and many market participants compete on these features. And there is a strong argument that is an apparent free-market failure, in which registrars/resellers who appear to be fairly weak in practices to prevent such fraudulent registrations are generally not being penalized. The large numbers of fraudulent domains obtained through the methods discussed previously with infrequent sanctions evidences this. So the question becomes one of balance, as is often the case in such industry issues.

Complicating these issues are the large number of business models currently employed by domain registration companies. “Retail” registrars who sell direct to individuals and businesses will most often process transactions with credit cards or alternate payment services. There are many other models, including large “corporate” registrars that establish credit accounts, multi-level resellers, internal operations that register names on their own accounts, and more. This makes it more difficult to find solutions that effectively cover all vendors well. Perhaps concentrating on the areas that appear to have the highest incident of abuses would be prudent.

6.7.3 Recommendations Regarding Malicious Use of Domain Names

The RAPWG recommends the creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the illicit use of domain names. This effort should be supported by ICANN resources, and should be created via a community process such as a working or advisory group while also taking the need for security and trust into consideration. The effort should consider (but not be limited to) these subjects:

- ***Practices for identifying stolen credentials***
- ***Practices for identifying and investigating common forms of malicious use (such as malware and phishing)***
- ***Creating anti-abuse terms of service for inclusion in Registrar-Registrant agreements, and for use by TLD operators.***
- ***Identifying compromised/hacked domains versus domain registered by abusers***
- ***Practices for suspending domain names***
- ***Account access security management***
- ***Security resources of use or interest to registrars and registries***
- ***Survey registrars and registries to determine practices being used, and their adoption rates.***

The WG achieved unanimous consensus on the above recommendation. In favour (14): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Bladel (RrSG), Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), Neuman (RySG), O'Connor (CBUC), Queern (CBUC), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Seltzer (NCSG), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC), Young (RySG).

Additional view: Seven members expressed a belief that uses of domain names unrelated to registration issues are an area in which ICANN can impose mandatory practices upon contracted parties. Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC), Queern (CBUC).

7. WHOIS Access

7.1 Issue / Definition

The RAPWG found that the basic accessibility of WHOIS has an inherent relationship to domain registration process abuses, and is a key issue related to the malicious use of domain names. It appears that WHOIS data is not always accessible on a guaranteed or enforceable basis, is not always provided by registrars in a reliable, consistent, or predictable fashion, and that users sometimes receive different WHOIS results depending on where or how they perform the lookup. These issues interfere with registration processes, registrant decision-making, and with the ability of parties across the Internet to solve a variety of problems.

WHOIS is an area within GNSO policy-making scope and has had a long history of discussion. Below, the RAPWG comments on the basic availability of and access to WHOIS data, and not the accuracy of contact data or the use of proxy contact services. To avoid duplication of effort and charter scope problems, the RAPWG decided to identify when WHOIS is seen to be a contributing factor in other problems, and not to discuss WHOIS issues for which the GNSO has already commissioned studies. (Those are: WHOIS contact data accuracy, the use of proxy contact and privacy services, implications of non-ASCII registration data in WHOIS records, and technical requirements for the WHOIS service itself – including potential replacements. For background, please see: <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/whois/>).

WHOIS data availability problems have been discussed in other GNSO working groups, for example:

- The Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Working Group (PEDNR-WG) discussed how access to WHOIS data is essential for parties to determine if contact data has been updated upon the expiration of a domain name, and to check domain name expiration

dates. A majority of the registrars polled may make substantial updates to WHOIS data upon expiration.⁴⁰

- The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part A PDP Working Group (IRTP-WG)⁴¹ noted in its final report that gaining registrars sometimes have difficulty accessing WHOIS data, and therefore Administrative Contact e-mail addresses.
- The Fast-Flux PDP Working Group (FFWG) discussed how responders must access WHOIS data when mitigating illicit uses of domain names.

Published WHOIS data for domain names involved in malicious conduct is an irreplaceable part of the investigation and mitigation processes used by registrars, registry operators, registrants, security companies, brand owners, victims, and law enforcement.

- The national law enforcement agencies of the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, and New Zealand have recommended that “ICANN should require Registrars to have a Service Level Agreement for their Port 43 servers.” These authorities consider that this is required in order “to aid the prevention and disruption of efforts to exploit domain registration procedures by criminal groups for criminal purposes.”⁴²

⁴⁰ “Draft Initial Report on the Post-Expiration Domain Name Recovery Policy Development Process”:

https://st.icann.org/data/workspaces/post-expiration-dn-recovery-wg/attachments/post_expiration_domain_name_recovery_wg:20100112125658-0-27743/original/Draft%20Initial%20Report%20-%20PEDNR%20PDP%20-%2012%20January%202010.doc

⁴¹ “Draft Final Report on the Inter-Registrar Transfers Policy - Part A Policy Development Process”:

https://st.icann.org/data/workspaces/irtp_jun08_pdp-wg/attachments/irtp_part_a_pdp_wg_pdp_jun08:20090318145458-1-14319/original/Draft%20Final%20Report%20-%20IRTP%20Part%20A%20-%2018%20March%202009.doc%20%5BCompatibility%20Mode%5D.pdf

⁴² “Law Enforcement Recommended RAA Amendments and ICANN Due Diligence”, November 2009,

[https://st.icann.org/raa-related/index.cgi/LawEnforcementRAArecommendations%20\(2\).doc?action=attachments_download;page_name=05_january_2010;id=20091118185109-0-21002](https://st.icann.org/raa-related/index.cgi/LawEnforcementRAArecommendations%20(2).doc?action=attachments_download;page_name=05_january_2010;id=20091118185109-0-21002)

- The Anti-Phishing Working Group’s DNS Policy Committee has stated that published WHOIS is “an invaluable resource, in fact, without which most of the cited cases would not have been successful. For cases in which legitimate machines or services have been hacked or defrauded, published domain name WHOIS information is an important tool used to quickly locate and communicate with site owners and service providers. For cases where domain names are fraudulently registered, the published domain name WHOIS information can often be tied to other bogus registrations or proven false to allow for quick shutdown.”⁴³

7.2 **Background**

ICANN’s current registry contracts require registry operators to adhere to port 43 WHOIS Service Level Agreements (SLAs). These SLAs require that port 43 WHOIS service be highly accessible and fast. For example, the .ORG contract requires that WHOIS service be functional at least 99.31% of the time per month (with exceptions for scheduled maintenance), and that responses be provided in less than 800 milliseconds. Failure of registries to meet these SLAs have been very rare according to monthly registry reports.⁴⁴

The majority of gTLD registries are “thick” registries, in which all authoritative WHOIS data—including contact data—is maintained at the registry. The .COM and .NET registries are “thin,” and contact data is located only at each domain name’s sponsoring registrar. Registrars are therefore responsible for providing WHOIS service for .COM/.NET names so that contact data may be retrieved. The .COM/.NET registry contains approximately 85% of the gTLD domains in existence,⁴⁵ so registrar WHOIS accessibility is very important. When displaying WHOIS data for

⁴³ “Issues in Using DNS Whois Data for Phishing Site Take Down,”

http://www.antiphishing.org/reports/APWG_MemoOnDomainWhoisTake-Downs.pdf

⁴⁴ <http://www.icann.org/en/tlds/monthly-reports/>

⁴⁵ “VeriSign Domain Name Industry Brief,” September 2009, <http://www.verisign.com/domain-name-services/domain-information-center/domain-name-resources/domain-name-report-dec09.pdf>

thick TLD domains names—especially on their Web sites—registrars often query the registry’s WHOIS, and display that output to users.

The Registrar Accreditation Agreements (RAAs)⁴⁶ require that registrars provide:

- port 43 WHOIS access
- a Web-based WHOIS
- a listed set of information (WHOIS data fields), including:
 - identity of the registrar
 - domain name’s expiration date
 - nameservers associated to the domain; and
 - specified fields of data for the Registrant Contact, Administrative Contact, and Technical Contact.

There are no service levels (SLAs) in the Registrar Accreditation Agreements (RAAs). A registrar-provided WHOIS service is not required to be online for any particular amount of time, nor provided with any particular response speed.

Port 43 is designed for use with automated and machine queries. It can also be queried manually by users who know how to perform telnet sessions and the “whois” command in Linux/Unix/macosx shell. The percentage of Internet users who are technically fluent enough to perform these types of queries (or even know about port 43 at all) is small. Thus, it is required that registrars have a Web-based WHOIS query on their sites.

A sub-team of RAPWG members performed some basic research by querying the Web-based and port 43 servers of 50 registrars. This set included the top 20 registrars by gTLD market share, 15 randomly-chosen mid-sized registrars, and 15 randomly-chosen small registrars. When a registrar’s site was in a language other than English, the assistance of a native speaker was

⁴⁶ <http://www.icann.org/en/registrars/agreements.html>

obtained. In addition to manual checks, automated queries of port 43 were performed to test availability over time.

The sub-team members found WHOIS accessibility situations with 19 of the 50 registrars sampled. Four registrars may have been in violation of their contractual WHOIS access requirements:

- Two did not provide a functional Web-based WHOIS.
- One registrar's WHOIS listed a sponsoring registrar different from that provided by the .COM/.NET registry WHOIS. The registrar's port 43 server provided an expiration date different from that listed in the registry. The registrar's Web WHOIS provided two different expiration dates for the same domain name.
- One registrar did not identify the sponsoring registrar of its domains. The registrar does not operate its port 43 server on the domain indicated by the .COM/.NET registry WHOIS; the registrar's WHOIS service is evidently subcontracted to a second registrar on that registrar's domain; and the sponsoring registrar's Web WHOIS is provided on a third domain not branded as the sponsoring registrar.

In addition, one registrar provided facially invalid registrant contact data for its own .COM name -- including a registrant contact e-mail address on the domain "icann.org". This appears to be a violation of the RAA.

Fifteen other registrars presented these situations:

- Three registrars had port 43 servers that did not return replies for a notable number of queries. One was offline/nonresponsive 21% of the time, one was offline/nonresponsive 20% of the time, and one was offline/nonresponsive 14% of the time. (Based on 100 queries per registrar, spread out over several weeks).
- Ten provided different WHOIS data on their port 43 servers than they did via their Web WHOIS.
 - Four provided only thin contact data via their Web WHOIS, while providing thick contact data only on port 43.

- In two cases, registrars provided two different expiration dates for each domain name via the Web WHOISes. One of the two expiration dates did not match the expiration date provided by the .COM/.NET registry.
- Two sometimes provided full contact data on their Port 43 servers, and sometimes provided just Registrant contact data (and no Admin or Tech contact data) on their port 43 servers. It is unknown if this was due to a rate-limiting activity.
- One registrar did not provide registrant contact data via port 43, and did not provide Admin or Tech contact data via its Web WHOIS.
- One registrar provided a required data field (Tech and Admin contact phone numbers) on port 43 but not via its Web WHOIS.
- Four cut off telnet sessions to port 43 very quickly--effectively disallowing manual queries via that method.

These results indicate that:

1. Some registrars appear to be in violation of their contractual WHOIS accessibility obligations;
2. Users are occasionally unable to obtain contact data due to WHOIS availability problems.
3. Registrars occasionally provide registration data that differs from that provided by the registry.
4. Users are sometimes given different registration data depending on the method they use to access the sponsoring registrar's WHOIS.
5. Users are sometimes given different registration data depending upon who they are; perhaps depending upon whether they are being rate-limited.

These issues were distributed across a notable number of registrars, with different sizes, business models, and locations around the world.

The reasons why registrars provide different data on port 43 versus their Web sites requires further investigation. Some might be attempts to prevent automated data mining by spammers, competitors, and other parties. The RAPWG notes that reasonable rate-limiting WHOIS can be a valid, prudent practice – for example it can prevent spammers from mining WHOIS information⁴⁷, and can prevent WHOIS servers from being overwhelmed by excessive queries. During Web-based WHOIS sampling, the RAPWG members observed that only some registrars employ CAPCHAs on their Web-based WHOIS services as a protection against automated queries.

In addition to the research conducted by working-group members, the RAPWG requested information from the ICANN Compliance Department about how it monitors registrar WHOIS access. The ICANN Compliance Department noted: "ICANN has developed a Whois server audit tool which monitors access to registrars' Whois servers over a Port 43 connection. The script developed for this task retrieves data for 4 registered domain names for each accredited registrar.... The purpose of the audit is to flag Whois servers that are down for an amount of time that is suspect and probably not just a manifestation of periodic server maintenance or scheduled update. ... What is the "reasonable amount of time" for a server to be down? Probably no more than an hour or so per day, although these are ICANN internal, 'soft metrics', not agreed-upon timeframes with registrars. The script records the results and flags registrars that prevent access to data on registered names. Transient network problems are less of a concern, so ICANN focuses on long-term behavior, i.e., registrars which ICANN is unable to communicate with for several days in a row.ICANN also reaches out to registrars that provide access to data on registered names but provide 'thin', not 'thick', Whois data. The former does not provide details on the registered name holder and additional contacts, which is required by the RAA."⁴⁸

⁴⁷ See: "SAC 023: Is the WHOIS Service a Source for Email Addresses for Spammers?": <http://www.icann.org/en/committees/security/sac023.pdf>

⁴⁸ <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-rap-dt/msg00454.html>

Over the last three years, ICANN's Compliance Department has sent seven escalated compliance notices (e.g. notices of breach, termination, or RAA non-renewal) to seven registrars for failure to comply with WHOIS access requirements of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement:

- One registrar did not have its contract renewed solely for failure to provide WHOIS access. (South America Domains dba NameFrog.com, which had less than 300 gTLD names under sponsorship at the time.)
- The other six registrars were cited for both WHOIS access breaches AND at least one other contract violation, such as failure to pay ICANN fees, failure to escrow data, and/or failure to respond to WHOIS accuracy complaints.

ICANN's Compliance Department is in contact with registrars to resolve issues before escalated compliance notices become necessary. The Compliance staff noted to the RAPWG that "some registrars block incoming WHOIS queries traffic by IP address, and Compliance works with the registrars to get them unblocked when there may be a misunderstanding." and, "Aside from metrics on informal outreach to resolve blocked Whois servers and incomplete, or 'thin', Whois data with registrars, which have been more than two dozen in the past 6-8 months, Compliance could provide bi-weekly statistics to the WG from here on out on the number of registrars that showed a pattern of restricting access to their Whois server over a Port 43 connection. These statistics have not been published before."

So, it appears that some contractual violations are cured in an amicable manner, and that public breach letters have apparently been used as a tool of last resort. It is unknown how many WHOIS accessibility issues have been discovered but not resolved.

The last time that ICANN published WHOIS access compliance data was 2007.⁴⁹ That year, ICANN's Compliance Department examined every ICANN-Accredited Registrar's Web site, and did not examine port 43 access.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gnso-rap-dt/msg00454.html>

⁵⁰ <http://www.icann.org/en/compliance/reports/contractual-compliance-audit-report-18oct07.pdf>

The Compliance Department numbers indicate that WHOIS access problems are found regularly. Above and beyond those, the RAPWG research indicates that a notable percentage of registrars might not make WHOIS data available in a reliable, consistent, or predictable fashion.

7.3 **Recommendations**

Recommendation 1:

The GNSO should determine what additional research and processes may be needed to ensure that WHOIS data is accessible in an appropriately reliable, enforceable, and consistent fashion.

The GNSO Council should consider how such might be related to other WHOIS efforts, such as the upcoming review of WHOIS policy and implementation required by ICANN's new Affirmation of Commitments. The Affirmation of Commitments says: "ICANN additionally commits to enforcing its existing policy relating to WHOIS, subject to applicable laws. Such existing policy requires that ICANN implement measures to maintain timely, unrestricted and public access to accurate and complete WHOIS information, including registrant, technical, billing, and administrative contact information. One year from the effective date of this document [30 September 2009] and then no less frequently than every three years thereafter, ICANN will organize a review of WHOIS policy and its implementation to assess the extent to which WHOIS policy is effective and its implementation meets the legitimate needs of law enforcement and promotes consumer trust."⁵¹

The WG achieved unanimous consensus on the above recommendation. In favour (14): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Bladel (RrSG), Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), Neuman (RySG), O'Connor (CBUC), Queern (CBUC), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Seltzer (NCSG), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC), Young (RySG). Against, or alternate views: none.

⁵¹ <http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-30sep09-en.htm>

Recommendation 2.

The GNSO should request that the ICANN Compliance Department publish more data about WHOIS accessibility, on at least an annual basis. This data should include a) the number of registrars that show a pattern of unreasonable restriction of access to their port 43 WHOIS servers, and b) the results of an annual compliance audit of compliance with all contractual WHOIS access obligations.

The WG achieved unanimous consensus on the above recommendation. In favour (13): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Bladel (RrSG), Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), Neuman (RySG), O'Connor (CBUC), Queern (CBUC), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC), Young (RySG). Abstentions (1): Seltzer (NCSG). Against, or alternate views: none.

8. Uniformity of Contracts

8.1 Issue / Definition

Three specific charter objectives of the RAPWG were to:

- Understand if registration abuses are occurring that might be curtailed or better addressed if consistent registration abuse policies were established,
- Determine if and how {registration} abuse is dealt with in those registries {and registrars} that do not have any specific {policies} in place, and
- Identify how these registration abuse provisions are {...} implemented in practice or deemed effective in addressing registration abuse.

The RAPWG formed a sub-team to fully appreciate the current state environment of ICANN-related contracts and agreements, and then discussed the findings in the larger RAPWG.

8.2 Background

The Sub-Team was tasked with the specific topic of contract uniformity relative to abuse as defined by the larger Working Group, and presented its research to the larger WG. The sub-team's membership, meeting schedule, and meeting minutes are found on the RAPWG web site.

8.2.1 ICANN Agreement Landscape:

The following diagram is meant to define scope and visually represent the relationships between parties and the contracts that bind them. Additionally, nested relationships between the agreements themselves are depicted.

Market Participants:


- ICANN
- Registry (Ry)
- Registrar (Rr)

- Registrant
- Hosting Provider
- Internet User

Agreements:

- Registry Agreement (RA)
- Registry Registrar Agreement (RRA)
- Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA)
- Registration Agreement (ra)
- Registrar Reseller Agreement (rra)**
- Terms of Service**
- Terms of Use**
- Terms of Agreement**

**Agreements typically not in scope of primary dispersion research



8.2.2 Dispersion Research

Registry Agreement (RA) Dispersion:

Refer to the GNSO Issues Report on Registration Abuse Policies
Section 4 - Provisions in Registry Agreements relating to abuse
Pages 11 - 29

<http://gns0.icann.org/files/gns0/issues/registration-abuse/gns0-issues-report-registration-abuse-policies-29oct08.pdf>

Registry Registrar Agreement (RRA) Dispersion:

Refer to the GNSO Issues Report on Registration Abuse Policies
Section 4 - Provisions in Registry Agreements relating to abuse
Pages 11 - 29

<http://gns0.icann.org/files/gns0/issues/registration-abuse/gns0-issues-report-registration-abuse-policies-29oct08.pdf>

RRA Templates are contained within the RA and hence the analysis is combined with appendix 1.

Registrar Accreditation Agreement (RAA) Dispersion:

Because the RAA is template driven, a quick inventory of Registration Abuse Types (as defined by the RAPWG) was conducted within the RAA template instead of a formal dispersion study. Two RAAs exist. A version from May 2001 existed until the most recent May 2009 version was released. With over 80+% adoption rates by Registrars to the May 2009 version, it was the only RAA reviewed for dispersion.

<http://www.icann.org/en/registrars/agreements.html>

The May 2009 RAA does contain provisions that align with abuse types defined by the Working Group. These include WhoIS, UDRP, and Privacy language. However, the latest RAA does not contain any language relative to take-down, conduct & use, abuse definitions, and indemnification to protect parties from taking action against abuse.

In parallel to the RAPWG, a Working Group to enhance the RAA is underway. It is the UoC's intent to share any recommendations that appear to align with RAA WG actions. Based on the latest presentations from ICANN Seoul, WG members have already identified gaps around Malicious Conduct, Cybersquatting, Privacy/Proxy Services, and complete information disclosure with Affiliates & Resellers.

Registration Agreement (ra) Dispersion:

Refer to the GNSO Issues Report on Registration Abuse Policies

Section 5 - Provisions in Registration Agreements relating to abuse

Pages 30 - 37

<http://gns0.icann.org/files/gns0/issues/registration-abuse/gns0-issues-report-registration-abuse-policies-29oct08.pdf>

Registration Agreement (ra) Dispersion Study

An evaluation of publicly available online agreements (Domain Registration Agreement, Universal Terms of Service, etc.), from a representative sample of registrars was performed to determine the degree of variation among agreement provisions relative to abuse. This evaluation, essentially, is an inventory of sections within the registration agreement. It attempts to quantify "current state" for the purpose of providing a visual representation of dispersion.

By review of the various registration agreements, sections began to naturally form in to forty or so categories in which the registration agreements could be inventoried. For each of the 22 Registrars, from the representative pool, an Excel spreadsheet was used to track the binary

existence of each agreement category. If a category was found, the spreadsheet would be incremented accordingly, and if the section was relevant to abuse, the corresponding agreement language was pasted in to the spreadsheet. If no section was found, the category requirement was not met, nor was it incremented.

It should be noted, that this was not a compliance exercise, and as such, all results shared are anonymous. The representative sample of registrars is based on % market share of held registrations per webhosting.info as of June 2009. Within that sample, a general guiding principle for selection of the 22 registrars was the top, middle, and bottom market participants. This sample of 22 Registrars makes up approximately 59% of total market share. Additionally, the sample also attempts to gain representation across varying countries.

The actual spreadsheet and presentation reports can be found at the UoC Wiki Attachments section:

https://st.icann.org/reg-abuse-wg/index.cgi?uniformity_sub_team


RAPWG-UofC_Dispersion_Matrix_09152009.xls

RAPWG-UofC_Report_09152009.pdf


The diagram here shows a screen shot of a Registration Agreement (ra) on the left. Each red arrow points to a defined section within the agreement. On the right side of the diagram are the categories that formed from the inventory. Those labelled in the blue boxes pertain to the abuse types within scope of the RAPWG.

This table is a large, multi-column grid. The columns are labeled with various categories, likely related to domain registration policies. The rows contain detailed text and data points. Some rows are highlighted in blue, and others in pink, possibly indicating different levels of importance or status. The table is organized into several sections, with some rows highlighted in blue and others in pink. The content is dense and appears to be a detailed report or data set.

This table is a continuation of the large, multi-column grid from the previous block. It contains more rows and columns of data, maintaining the same layout and highlighting scheme. The content is dense and appears to be a detailed report or data set.



This chart represents categories with the greatest achievement of section definition.



8.2.3 Dispersion & Consistency

The UoC sub-team believed that uniformity does not exist among “RA, RRA, RAA and ra” agreements relative to abuse provisions. The sub-team was of the belief that increased uniformity is important for the marketplace and helps promote equal competition, and that while perfect uniformity is not realistic, it should be striven for when and where feasible.

At the same time, the team also recognized that lack of uniformity complicates efforts to mitigate abusive uses of domains, but is not a predicate for abuse that we see today, and that if policies are consistent, then greater responsibility to enforce the policy consistently falls upon ICANN.

8.2.4 Registration Abuse Provision Baseline

- The sub-team agreed that if any sort of uniformity in agreements is to be implemented, a minimal baseline of provision or language would be the best method to accommodate the various business models.
- The sub-team thought that a lowest common denominator (minimum requirement) approach with abuse provisions is best and allows market participants to not be constrained by exceeding minimums in efforts to promote differentiation within the competitive landscape.
 - The sub-team recognized the spectrum of abuse provisions can range from:
 - General language with broad powers to act against all kinds of abuse, or
 - Specific language which can be limiting; and may not be adaptive to changing conditions
 - Finding the right balance of language that provides adequate authority to respond to abuse with adequate protection from lawsuits is required.
 - A “One size fits all” kind of provision that can anticipate future or unknown abuses was the sub-team’s desire, but equally recognize the existence of varying models prevent this notion.

- The sub-team thought that any provision baseline should be clearly communicated and shared with market participants and that high degrees of transparency is required where participants choose to exceed any baselines or minimums that are established.
- The sub-team agreed that outcomes from any future and not-yet-determined registration abuse policies PDP will be long coming and that in the meantime it would be a useful thing for ICANN, Registries, and Registrars to develop abuse provisions and/or continue to enhance abuse provisions for their agreements with continued voluntary, proactive enforcement as necessary. Additionally, the sub-team agreed that the investigation and deployment of best practices would be a great interim step until such a PDP is complete.

8.2.5 Sub-Team Conclusions & Guiding Principles

Over the course of UoC sub-team meetings and research findings, reoccurring themes developed with consistent agreement leading to sub-team consensus and defined boundaries for recommendations that the sub-team created.

8.2.6 RAPWG Discussion of Sub-Team Work

The members of the sub-team reported their results to the whole RAPWG team for review. When the wider RAPWG discussed the sub-team's analysis, there was not agreement about the sub-team's findings and recommendations.

Some RAPWG members believed that uniformity already exists in the important and relevant ways. Observations included:

- Registries, registrars, and registrants are required to follow Consensus Policies. So, if there is a registration abuse, ICANN can make consensus policy about that abuse, and the resulting policy will be applied to all contracted parties. The Consensus Policy process is a mechanism specifically designed to create uniformity where it is needed, and it guarantees uniformity.

- All registrars are bound to a uniform RAA. While two version of the RAA currently exist, the great majority of the registered gTLD domains are now covered under the new (2009) RAA, and the old RAA (2001) is being phased out in a planned fashion.
- Language in the RAA requires registrars and registrants to adhere to all ICANN policies.
- Some amount of non-uniformity is necessary. For example, sTLDs may require language in their contracts to define their unique sponsorship and eligibility needs.
- Uniformity for the sake of uniformity does not necessarily solve any problem.

The sub-team advocated the exploration of “general language with broad powers to act against all kinds of abuse,” and provisions “that can anticipate future or unknown abuses.” Some RAPWG members expressed concern that these ideas might not be desirable or realistic. They might be a solution in search of an undefined problem, and might not include adequate consideration of who is being harmed, how, and to what extent. The RAPWG did agree in its definitional work that “The party or parties harmed, and the substance or severity of the abuse, should be identified and discussed in relation to a specific proposed abuse.” Members expressed that it is difficult to anticipate future or unknown abuses, and raised the issue that general and/or pre-emptive policies may create collateral damage and harm registrants or other parties in unexpected fashions. In general, the RAPWG discussed how in the past consensus policy-making efforts, specific registration abuses were verified and understood, and then specific policies and procedures were designed to address them.

Some members were of the opinion that the sub-team did not always distinguish adequately in its contracts analysis between registration abuse provisions and provisions designed to address malicious uses of domains. This distinction can be critical for policy-making.

Regarding uniformity of registrar-registrant agreements and TLD-specific terms of service: Registrars do have the right to set their terms of service as long as they are consistent with ICANN requirements. Similarly, many registries have the contractual right to institute policies and procedures for their own TLDs, and it was unclear to some RAPWG members whether ABPs would alter those existing contractual rights. As per the exploration of malicious use above,

ICANN does not appear to have the ability to force registrars and registries to implement domain suspensions for malicious use alone.

There was some disagreement with the sub-team's statement that "uniformity is important for the marketplace and helps promote equal competition;" RAPWG members commented that contractual variances in registrar-registrant agreements are a way that registrars differentiate themselves in the market, and can help registrars adhere to the laws of the jurisdictions in which they are incorporated or operate.

8.3 Recommendations

There was strong support for but also significant opposition to the following recommendation.

Eight (8) members supported this recommendation:

The RAPWG recommends the creation of an Issues Report to evaluate whether a minimum baseline of registration abuse provisions should be created for all in-scope ICANN agreements, and if created, how such language would be structured to address the most common forms of registration abuse.

The members who support the recommendation stated the following reasons: "The analysis conducted by the ICANN staff Issue Report and this Working Group concludes that significant variance (or "lack of uniformity") within contracts does exist, especially with respect to abuse definitions, abuse types, and indemnification to mitigate abuse. Existing agreement provisions, in varying forms, do generally cover suspension of domain names or indemnify select parties, but they do NOT specifically address abuse as defined by this working group. By such regards, this is partly the very condition in which the Registration Abuse pre-PDP was formed. The recommendation does not reduce or remove the rights of market participants to create and manage their own policies, nor does it reduce any competitive advantages that may exist today. Rather, the establishment of minimum Registration Abuse baselines, if any are determined by such a PDP, will begin to introduce predictability in a rather chaotic world. More importantly, minimum standards will enable market participants to better mitigate or eliminate registration

abuse in a more coordinated and unified manner by raising the bar in a method where ALL equally participate in the mitigation or elimination of abuse.”

In favour (8): Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), O’Connor (CBUC), Queern (CBUC), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC).

Six (6) members opposed the recommendation for an Issues Report, for the following reasons:

- *All registries, registrars, and registrants are already contractually obligated to abide by ICANN policies, notably existing or new Consensus Policies.*
- *In those cases where ICANN has defined a registration abuse policy, the abuse definitions and the policies have been clearly and consistently expressed.*
- *The Consensus Policy process is a mechanism specifically designed to create uniformity where it is needed. If there is a registration abuse that needs to be addressed, it should be specifically identified, and a specific Consensus Policy crafted to deal with it.*
- *Consensus Policies or contractual provisions should be created only after the abuse’s scope and impact are understood. The proponents of the PDP advocate for general and/or pre-emptive policies, and those can create collateral damage and harm registrants and other parties in unexpected fashions.*
- *Uniformity for the sake of uniformity is NOT a solution to any identified problem. The supporters of an Issues Report did not identify why “a minimum baseline of registration abuse provisions” is needed, or whether such might better curtail or address any problem, as the RAPWG’s Charter required. It is unclear what purpose might be served by continuing down that proposed path.*
- *It may not be desirable or possible to create a baseline applicable to diverse entities. Some amount of non-uniformity is necessary.*
- *The recommendation could reduce or remove the rights of market participants to create and manage their own policies. Contracted parties already have, and should continue to have, some rights to create their own policies as long as they do not conflict with ICANN policies.*
- *It seems that the proposed PDP could explore not only the creation of registration abuse policies, but also policies to regulate how registrars and registries address the malicious*

use of domains names. That would be overbroad and inappropriate, as the use of domain names unrelated to registration issues is out of ICANN and GSNO scope for reasons detailed in depth elsewhere in this paper.

In opposition (6): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Bladel (RrSG), Neuman (RySG), Seltzer (NCSG), Young (RySG).

9. Meta-Issues

The RAPWG identified registration abuse “meta-issues.” These meta-issues have a number of attributes in common:

- They are being discussed in various Working Groups and Advisory Groups simultaneously.
- Their scope spans a number of ICANN policies
- Previous groups have discussed these issues without satisfactory resolution
- They are worthy of substantive discussion and action, but may not lend themselves to resolution through current policy processes

9.1 **Meta-issue : Uniformity of Reporting**

This working group has identified the need for more uniformity in the mechanisms to initiate, track, and analyze policy-violation reports. The IRTP Working Group identified a similar need during its review of compliance reports in that arena. This issue is much broader than registration abuse, is being discussed by a number of working and advisory groups simultaneously, and will require more than simple uniformity of contracts to address.

9.1.1 **The Problem**

The processes by which a person experiencing a problem learns about their options to resolve that problem, or learns which remedies are covered by ICANN policy and which are not, is sometimes difficult. As a result:

- End-users and registrants find it confusing and difficult to identify the most appropriate problem-reporting venue or action to take when they experience problems.

- Registrars and registries are frustrated if their customers file complaints in error, in the wrong place, or without first seeking help from the most relevant provider.
- Working and advisory groups find their work hampered by the lack of reliable (rather than anecdotal) data upon which to base policy decisions.

In addition, the process of reporting a perceived policy violation could be used to educate people on the limits of ICANN policies and available options if their issue is not covered by policy.

The RAPWG suggests, as a starting point for discussion, that every abuse policy should have:

- **Reporting:** a mechanism whereby violations of the policy can be reported by those who are impacted
- **Notification:** standards as to how contracted parties make visible:
 - where to report policy violations,
 - “plain language” definitions of what constitutes a “reportable” problem,
 - “just in time education” describing reporting or action options that are available when the person’s problem falls outside ICANN policy.
- **Tracking:** transparent processes to collect, analyze, and publish summaries of valid policy-violation reports, the root-causes of the problems and their final disposition
- **Compliance:** processes to provide due process, and sanctions that will be applied, in the case of policy violations.

If the GNSO creates a subsequent effort to address this issue, it might consider the following tentative list of goals:

- Providing “just in time” education and knowledge to people wanting to report problems
- Making it easier to submit a valid complaint
- Reduce the number of erroneous complaints
- Improving understanding of the limits of ICANN policies and other options to pursue if the issue is not covered by policy

- Improving the effectiveness of policy-compliance activities
- Improving the data available for GNSO (working-group) and ICANN (advisory-group) policy-making
- Improving the data available for compliance activities
- Answering the question “which comes first, policy-process or definitive data describing the problem?” along with suggestions as to how data can be gathered when it hasn’t yet been included in the reporting process.

9.1.2 Recommendation

The RAPWG recommends that the GNSO, and the larger ICANN community in general, create and support uniform reporting processes.

The WG achieved unanimous consensus on the above recommendation. In favour (14): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Bladel (RrSG), Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), Neuman (RySG), O’Connor (CBUC), Queern (CBUC), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Seltzer (NCSG), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC), Young (RySG). Against, or alternate views: none.

9.2 Meta-issue: Collection and Dissemination of Best Practices

The RAPWG has identified the need for and benefit of creating and disseminating “best practices” related to aspects of domain name registration and management, for the appropriate members of the ICANN community. Best practices should also be kept current and relevant. The question is how ICANN can support such efforts in a structured way.

This recommendation is a “meta-issue” because it is much broader than registration abuse, is being discussed by a number of working and advisory groups simultaneously, and has potential impact for almost any current and future working or advisory group.

9.2.1 Definition of “Best Practices”

From Wikipedia (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Best_practices):

A best practice is a technique, method, process, activity, incentive, or reward that is believed to be more effective at delivering a particular outcome than any other technique, method, process, etc. when applied to a particular condition or circumstance. The idea is that with proper processes, checks, and testing, a desired outcome can be delivered with fewer problems and unforeseen complications. Best practices can also be defined as the most efficient (least amount of effort) and effective (best results) way of accomplishing a task, based on repeatable procedures that have proven themselves over time for large numbers of people.

A given best practice is only applicable to particular condition or circumstance and may have to be modified or adapted for similar circumstances. In addition, a "best" practice can evolve to become better as improvements are discovered.

The members of the RAPWG discussed that “best practices” should be considered non-binding by definition, and should therefore not have an implication of finality, obedience, or universality. This distinguishes them from binding requirements such as Consensus Policies and contractual obligations, which are considered final and require compliance, and are created via other processes at ICANN. Best practices may often be a good alternative when binding requirements are not applicable or appropriate. (In a parallel example, IETF Best Practices or “best current practice RFCs” are recommendations only, and the IETF chose not to make them Internet Standards for a reason.) Best practices are also flexible, can be updated as needed, and can be adopted and adapted by various users according to their varying needs. As has been noted in this paper, that is helpful because industry parties often face very different problems, to different degrees, etc.

9.2.2 Background

A number of working and advisory groups are coming up with many good ideas for addressing a wide variety of problems in the industry. The group's participants often label these ideas as "best practices". However, many of these ideas do not lend themselves well to crafting as policy, for policies are often narrow in scope, limited in the time they could be effective, or difficult to capture as policy concepts or contract terms. This is particularly true in the areas surrounding malicious use. Yet all industry participants could benefit greatly by adopting many of these best practices. Unfortunately, no formal mechanisms for collecting such practices, keeping them updated, or disseminating them to all relevant industry participants exists today within the ICANN community. Thus, much of the good work done in these groups is not captured effectively if it is not included in their policy-making outcomes.

Best practices in the field of anti-abuse or security often lose their effectiveness in a relatively short amount of time. This does not lend well to formal policy, but sharing effective techniques with peers in the field can still be very beneficial.

Best practices in the field of anti-abuse or security are often very sensitive, and industry participants would not always like some of them made public so that bad actors can learn from them and adapt new tactics. How can sensitive best practices be safely disseminated to industry participants? How can the veracity of all industry participants be assured as well?

If the GNSO creates a subsequent effort to address this issue, it might consider the following tentative list of goals:

- Creating mechanisms within the ICANN community to support the creation and maintenance of best practices efforts in a structured way.
- Creating multiple channels (some private or secure) for dissemination of best practices to all relevant community members.
- Incorporating the gathering and recommendation of best practices into the processes used by various policy and advisory working groups.

- Instituting practices to measure and incentivize adoption of best practices across the industry.
- Launching regular review processes where universal best practices might be incorporated into more formal policies, when appropriate.

9.2.3 Recommendation

The RAPWG recommends that the GNSO, and the larger ICANN community in general, create and support structured, funded mechanisms for the collection and maintenance of best practices.

The WG achieved unanimous consensus on the above recommendation. In favour (13): Aaron (RySG), Amadoz (RySG), Bladel (RrSG), Cobb (CBUC), Felman (MarkMonitor), Neuman (RySG), O'Connor (CBUC), Queern (CBUC), Rasmussen (Internet Identity), Rodenbaugh (CBUC), Shah (MarkMonitor), Sutton (CBUC), Young (RySG). Abstain (1): Seltzer (NCSG). Against, or alternate views: none.

10. Initial Report Public Comment Forum

Following the publication of the Registration Abuse Policies Initial Report on 12 February 2010, a public comment forum was opened to invite the ICANN Community to submit its comments. This section provides a summary of the community submissions received. The comments may be viewed in their entirety at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/rap-initial-report/>. The RAPWG reviewed the summary as well as the full comments in detail during its WG meetings on 12 April, 19 April, 26 April and [TBC] and has updated the report where they were deemed appropriate.

10.1 Comments and Contributions

Eleven (11) community submissions have been made to the public comment forum. The contributors are listed below in alphabetical order (with relevant initials noted in parentheses):

[Blacknight by Michele Neylon](#) (BN)

[Coalition Against Domain Name Abuse by Yvette Wojciechowski](#) (CADNA)

[Coalition for Online Accountability by Steve Metalitz](#) (COA)

[Commercial & Business User Constituency by Steve DelBianco](#) (CBUC)

[Intellectual Property Constituency by Paul McGrady](#) (IPC)

[George Kirikos](#) (GK)

[GoDaddy.com by James Bladel](#) (GD)

[Internet Commerce Association by Philip S. Corwin](#) (ICA)

[Registrar Stakeholder Group by Clarke D. Walton](#) (RrSG)

[Registry Stakeholder Group by David W. Maher](#) (RySG)

[World Intellectual Property Organization by Eric Wilbers](#) (WIPO)

10.2 Summary & Analysis

General Comments

As a general comment, CADNA notes the importance of ‘consistency across different entities’ as the only way to ‘effectively manage the Internet is by enforcing certain uniform practices that are designed to protect Internet users around the world, such as best practices and reporting requirements’.

The IPC supports the RAPWG recommendations ‘which received unanimous consensus, rough consensus and/or strong support’ and provides a number of alternative recommendations for consideration (see below).

Scope & Definition

In relation to scope, the RySG is of the opinion that ‘the RAPWG did not present any issue that might be construed as requiring uniform or coordinated resolution reasonably necessary to facilitate the interoperability, security and/or stability of the Internet or DNS’ which would make it fall within the scope of contractual “security and stability” language in ICANN contracts. The RySG emphasized that ‘it is essential for ICANN to restrict its activities to its limited technical coordination mission’. It furthermore agrees that making the distinction between registration abuse and domain name use abuse is important and supports the view that ‘domain name uses unrelated to registration issues are largely outside the scope of policy-making’. It urged the GNSO to ‘continue to emphasize fact-based policy-making processes, and carefully examine the impact of policy on affected parties.’

In relation to fighting abuse on the Internet, GD notes that ‘ICANN plays an important role in these efforts, but as a cooperative stakeholder and not a regulator of anti-abuse activities’ and recognized the ‘clear limitations to the scope of ICANN’s policy development, which do not include the manner in which a domain name is used, or even if it is used at all’. As a result, GD recommends that the WG ‘avoid advancing any recommendations that lie outside the purview of ICANN’s existing contractual relationships’.

ICA agrees in general with the RAPWG's consensus definition of abuse. In addition, it notes that it is 'critically important to differentiate between registration and other domain abuses that are properly within the purview of ICANN policymaking versus illegal and illegitimate uses of domains that are outside that scope and within the jurisdiction of national governments and international organizations'.

The RrSG recommends that 'the RAP WG should determine where ICANN's policy-making boundaries extend with respect to registration abuse issues and use issues' as it believes that the RAPWG 'considered a variety of domain name "use issues" that are outside ICANN's mission and policy-making boundaries' such as gripe sites and malicious use of domain names.

The CBUC agrees 'with the definition as stated in the Initial Report'. In relation to distinguishing registration abuse vs. domain name use abuse, the CBUC stated that 'A domain name cannot be used unless it is registered; therefore any abuse of a registered name is registration abuse.' The CBUC proposes to 'resolve this debate with the GNSO Council, other Constituencies, and ICANN staff as appropriate' and 'enhance the section of the Initial Report to define this as a recommendation slot and denote the consensus outcome by RAP WG members'.

Cybersquatting

WIPO's comments focus on the cybersquatting recommendation contained in the Initial Report to initiate a policy development process to investigate the current state of the UDRP, and consider revisions to address cybersquatting if appropriate. WIPO notes that 'the issue is not whether the UDRP itself can be improved, but rather whether a process of this nature is likely to achieve such result'. It furthermore finds that 'the basis for including the UDRP in the RAP WG initial report, especially against the background of ICANN's new gTLD Program is unclear' and notes that 'discussions occurring within the context of ICANN's New gTLD Program would seem to already address the "Cybersquatting Recommendation".'. In conclusion, WIPO is of the opinion that 'rather than seeking to amend the time-tested UDRP, independent focus on meaningful complementary mechanisms may yield more practical results'.

The RySG expresses its support for the cybersquatting recommendation to initiate a policy development process to investigate the current state of the UDRP and strongly rejects the second cybersquatting recommendation to initiate a policy development process on other right protection mechanisms and provides a number of reasons why it is inadvisable to consider the imposition of evolving rights protection mechanisms in existing TLDs.

GD offers cautious support to the cybersquatting recommendation to initiate a policy development process to investigate the current state of the UDRP which is contingent on including ‘a comprehensive review of the UDRP, including how ICANN manages the procedures of UDRP providers, and the development of a formal procedure to oversee the modification of their supplemental rules’. In relation to Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPMs), GD is of the opinion that ‘any recommendations from the RAP for policy work in this area must await some degree of practical experience with their effectiveness in new gTLDs’.

GK disagrees with the recommendation that the UDRP should be revisited as ‘this appears to be a biased recommendation, in favour of complainants who already overwhelmingly win at UDRP’. In GK’s opinion, if UDRP is revisited, it should be ‘to address reverse domain name hijacking by complainants who misuse the system’. In GK’s view, the RAPWG ‘overstepped its bounds and scope, as cybersquatting goes into domain name “use”, and is not a “registration” issue’.

BN notes that ‘a review of the UDRP process as a whole would not be welcome’, but adds that ‘any review of the UDRP should be balanced’ and based on actual data.

CADNA supports the RAPWG recommendation to review the UDRP and notes that ‘the UDRP only exists as a reactive, rather than a proactive means of combating cybersquatting. It also suggests the RAPWG considers ‘recommending that a PDP work to develop an initiative to create a mechanism to prevent cybersquatting before cybercriminals can register infringing domain names’. CADNA considers the recommendation to investigate how RPMs can be applied to the current gTLD space premature.

ICA supports the recommendation to initiate a PDP on the UDRP, but ‘only if such PDP is broadly comprehensive’. In addition, ICA does not have an objection to initiate a PDP on RPMs, but ‘believe that this effort, if undertaken, should be coordinated with the comprehensive UDRP PDP’ as noted before. In addition, it supports that ‘any PDP on comprehensive UDRP reform consider the establishment of a “cure period” for minor, transient, and unintentional infringement caused by third party placement of PPC advertising links’.

In the view of the RrSG, ‘it is premature to initiate a policy development process to consider how rights protection mechanisms developed in the new gTLD program can be applied to cybersquatting in the existing gTLD space.

The IPC supports the alternative recommendation to initiate a PDP on RPMs.

The CBUC supports the recommendation on the initiation of a PDP on the review of the UDRP as stated in the Initial Report. In relation to the second recommendation on RPMs, it supports view A (recommending the initiation of a PDP on RPMs), ‘noting that this recommendation is near evenly divided among the RAP WG’.

Front Running

GK disagrees with the proposed recommendation and puts forward a number of preventative measures for consideration.

BN agrees that ‘without any evidence any further discussion on this topic is a waste of time and resources.

CADNA was ‘disappointed to see that the RAPWG refrained from recommending action to solve [...] front running’ and recommends to ‘actively investigate and seek out the root’. The CBUC supports the recommendations made by the RAPWG in relation to this issue.

Gripe Sites; Deceptive, and/or Offensive Domain Names

The RySG supports the majority position of the RAPWG and provides a number of reasons why it supports this position.

GK considers this issue out of scope and should not have been considered by the Working Group. He adds that 'ICANN is not and should not be the global court, police, law maker, judge and jury'.

BN is of the opinion that 'any criteria that would prevent registrants from registering domain names on the basis of causing possible offence would be a danger to [...] freedom of expression' and notes that 'this has nothing to do with the actual domain registration and is therefore out of this group's scope'. Furthermore, he notes that 'if a brand owner has an issue with a domain name they have the UDRP and the courts to address such matters'.

The IPC proposes the following alternative recommendations for consideration by the RAPWG: '(1) Given that the protection of children is a paramount policy concern of all members of the ICANN community, the RAPWG recommends the initiation of a Policy Development Process by requesting an Issues Report to investigate the most effective means to prevent registration of, or promptly cancel, deceptive domain names which mislead children to objectionable sites. (2) ICANN's agreements with registries and registrars should explicitly state that registries and registrars are explicitly empowered, but not obligated, to develop reasonable policies, internal to each contracted party, designed to prevent the registration of deceptive or offensive strings'.

In relation to recommendation 1, The CBUC 'takes note of the minimal support by RAP members' for view B, but recommends that 'view A be stricken as an option and modified where view B is presented as a viable solution to address inconsistencies of UDRP rulings regarding Gripe Sites'. In relation to recommendation 2, the CBUC 'supports the recommendation of View A acknowledging the rough consensus among the RAP Team, noting that 'if R1 – View B were addressed above, this will create a clear path for consistency to develop and negate this recommendation'.

Fake Renewal Notices

The RySG notes that this may be an issue with resellers but also notes that ‘registrars are responsible for the registration activities performed by their resellers’.

GK considers ‘better education the obvious solution, as well as better security at registrars’.

BN supports the RAPWG recommendation and notes it ‘would welcome any actions or proposals to address this that ICANN might develop’.

ICA supports ‘referring the issue of fake renewal notices to ICANN’s Compliance Department as well as the initiation of a PDP on this subject, and urge that it include a focus on the continuing problem of domain theft’.

In relation to recommendation 1, the CBUC ‘takes notice to the strong consensus and supports view A’. In addition, it notes that ‘the issue of “slamming” should be further explored and perhaps separated as a standalone topic’. The CBUC supports recommendation 2.

Domain Kiting / Tasting

GK agrees that this is no longer an issue ‘given that the AGP loophole was removed’.

The CBUC supports the recommendation as proposed by the RAPWG.

Malicious Use of Domain Names

The RySG supports the recommendation for ‘the creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the illicit use of domain names’ and provides a number of reasons why it supports this recommendations such as its view that one-size-fits-all solutions will not be applicable or effective due to the different issues different registries face. The RySG does recognize that there are registrars that ‘do a poor job of responding to abuse reports’ and suggests that ‘ICANN focus efforts on registrars who do not comply with their contractual

obligations’. Furthermore, the RySG feels that ‘key issues concerning the illicit or criminal use of domain names are outside of ICANN’s purview, and beyond the scope of GNSO policy-making’.

GD notes that if ICANN imposed mandatory anti-abuse provisions, ‘we would expect registries and registrars to require some degree of indemnification ‘ from ICANN, and that uniform mandatory procedures might be circumvented by criminals and might diminish the ability of registrars to respond and to differentiate themselves in the marketplace.

GK also notes that this issue ‘was out of scope of the ‘registration aspect of the workgroup’, but adds that ‘there’s nothing stopping the community from developing these “best practices” without ICANN’s involvement’.

BN also supports the recommendation to develop non-binding practices, but strongly opposes ‘any attempts to make such practices mandatory’.

CADNA supports the alternative view described in the report as it considers ‘the recommendation of the creation of non-binding best practices [...] too soft to ensure that registrars and registries actually comply and work to eliminate the malicious use of domain names’.

ICA supports ‘the development of nonbinding best practices to assist contracted parties in addressing malicious domain use, including a focus on account security management and identification of stolen credentials that are associated with domain theft’.

The CBUC supports the unanimous consensus recommendation made by the RAPWG, but also considers mandatory policies to be within Consensus Policy-making scope.

Whois Access

The RySG supports the two recommendations.

In relation to Whois, GK notes throughout his comments that verified Whois is the real solution to many of the issues discussed in the report. In addition, he adds that 'some registrars continue to not provide port 43 access' or block residential IP addresses and recommends 'a Whois archive that is comparable to the TM document retrieval system', in addition to moving to thick Whois for all gTLDs.

BN supports that 'the current system and requirements for registrars to give everyone access needs to be revised to take into consideration such abuse and its negative impact on registrants'. BN also notes that 'many registrars either do not have functioning WHOIS servers or have blocked access to port 43 in such a manner as to give the impression that the WHOIS server does not exist'.

CADNA supports the RAPWG recommendations in relation to Whois access.

ICA supports 'additional research and processes to ensure that WHOIS data is accessible, and urge a focus on fraudulent registrations that may be associated with domain theft'.

The IPC proposes the following alternative recommendations for consideration by the RAPWG: '(1) The RAPWG recommends the initiation of a Policy Development Process by requesting an Issues Report to investigate the connection, if any, between privacy and/or proxy services and registration abuses. (2) The RAPWG recommends the initiation of a Policy Development Process by requesting an Issues Report to investigate the possibility of (a) developing best practices for privacy and/or proxy services to prevent and address registration abuses and (b) developing an accreditation and compliance program to enforce any such best practices'.

The CBUC supports the recommendations made by the RAPWG in relation to this topic.

Uniformity of Contracts

The RySG urges to GNSO Council to reject the proposed PDP because the PDP would have the GNSO 'pursue unbounded policy-making to solve undefined problems,' 'it may be a pretext to

pursue some unstated goals, and it could unwisely harm a variety of parties.... The Consensus Policy process is the mechanism specifically designed to create uniformity where it is needed, and it guarantees uniformity. If there is a registration abuse that needs attention, the GNSO can make Consensus Policy about that abuse, and the resulting policy will be applied to all contracted parties.'

GD is of the opinion that requiring uniformity in registry and registrar agreements with regard to abuse would have negative impacts on innovation, competition, and the problem of abuse itself and provides a number of supporting arguments.

GK states that in his view 'this appears to be another attempt to compel creation of "abuse policies" in every agreement, that go far and above common legal standards'. He adds that 'most abuse happens due to anonymity and throwaway domains by cybercriminal', hence the need to focus on verified Whois.

CADNA supports the recommendations of the RAPWG in relation to uniformity of contracts.

The RrSG 'opposes creation of an Issues Report to evaluate whether a minimum baseline of registration abuse provisions is necessary' as 'all registries, registrars, and registrants are already contractually obligated to abide by ICANN policies, notably existing or new Consensus Policies', with the PDP being a 'mechanism specifically designed to create uniformity where it is needed'. Instead, the RrSG 'supports consideration of possible abuse contact best practices'.

The CBUC supports view A, 'noting that this recommendation shows strong support among the RAP WG'.

Uniformity of Reporting

GK adds that 'there should be XML documents and maybe even APIs, so that reporting and reuse of data can be simplified'.

BN highlights the need for standardization and simplification of abuse reports.

CADNA supports the recommendations of the RAPWG in relation to uniformity of reporting.

The CBUC supports the recommendation made by the RAPWG in relation to this topic.

Collection of Best Practices

GK expresses his concern in relation to the 'funding requirement'. He notes that 'ICANN needs to be focusing on a narrow technical role, instead of engaging in mission creep'. CADNA supports the recommendations of the RAPWG in relation to collection of best practices. COA supports 'the general recommendation that ICANN should do more to promote their development and dissemination, including "structured, funded mechanisms for the collection and maintenance of best practices"'. The CBUC supports the recommendation made by the RAPWG in relation to this topic.

11. Conclusions, Recommendations, & Next Steps

Based on the discussion in the Working Group, having taking into account the comments received during the public comment period, the RAPWG has put forward the a number of recommendations to the GNSO Council for its consideration. Hereunder you will find an overview of these recommendations ordered by the level of support received.

Unanimous Consensus

<u>CYBERSQUATTING</u>		
<p><u>Recommendation #1</u></p> <p><i><u>Please see pages 26-33 for the full recommendation.</u></i></p>	<p>The RAPWG recommends the initiation of a Policy Development Process by requesting an Issues Report to investigate the current state of the UDRP, and consider balanced revisions to address cybersquatting if appropriate. This effort should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the UDRP has addressed the problem of cybersquatting to date, and any insufficiencies/inequalities associated with the process. • Whether the definition of cybersquatting inherent within the existing UDRP language needs to be reviewed or updated. 	<p><u>Unanimous consensus</u></p>

<u>MALICIOUS USE OF DOMAIN NAMES</u>		
<p><u>Recommendation #1</u></p>	<p>The RAPWG recommends the creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and</p>	<p><u>Unanimous consensus</u></p>

<p><u>Please see pages 50-70 for the full recommendation.</u></p>	<p>registries address the illicit use of domain names. This effort should be supported by ICANN resources, and should be created via a community process such as a working or advisory group while also taking the need for security and trust into consideration. The effort should consider (but not be limited to) these subjects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Practices for identifying stolen credentials• Practices for identifying and investigating common forms of malicious use (such as malware and phishing)• Creating anti-abuse terms of service for inclusion in Registrar-Registrant agreements, and for use by TLD operators.• Identifying compromised/hacked domains versus domain registered by abusers• Practices for suspending domain names• Account access security management• Security resources of use or interest to registrars and registries• Survey registrars and registries to determine practices being used, and their adoption rates.	
---	---	--

<p><u>Additional view</u></p> <p><i>Please see pages 50-71 for the full recommendation.</i></p>	<p>Uses of domain names unrelated to registration issues are an area in which ICANN can impose mandatory practices upon contracted parties.</p>	<p><u>Supported by 7 member of the RAPWG</u></p>
--	---	---

<u>FAKE RENEWAL NOTICES</u>		
<p><u>Recommendation #1</u></p> <p><i>Please see pages 42-43 for the full recommendation.</i></p>	<p>The RAPWG recommends that the GNSO refer this issue to ICANN’s Contractual Compliance department for possible enforcement action, including investigation of misuse of WHOIS data</p>	<p><u>Unanimous Consensus</u></p>
<p><u>Recommendation #2</u></p> <p><i>Please see pages 42-43 for the full recommendation.</i></p>	<p>The following recommendation is conditional.</p> <p>The WG would like to learn the ICANN Compliance Department’s opinions regarding Recommendation #1 above, and the WG will further discuss Recommendation 2 looking forward to the WG’s Final Report.</p> <p>The RAPWG recommends the initiation of a Policy Development Process by requesting an Issues Report to investigate fake renewal notices.</p>	<p><u>Unanimous consensus</u></p>

<u>WHOIS ACCESS</u>		
<p><u>Recommendation #1</u></p> <p><i>Please see pages 71-80 for the full recommendation.</i></p>	<p>The GNSO should determine what additional research and processes may be needed to ensure that WHOIS data is accessible in an appropriately reliable, enforceable, and consistent fashion.</p> <p>The GNSO Council should consider how such</p>	<p><u>Unanimous consensus</u></p>

	might be related to other WHOIS efforts, such as the upcoming review of WHOIS policy and implementation required by ICANN's new Affirmation of Commitments.	
<u>Recommendation #2</u> <i>Please see pages 72-80 for the full recommendation.</i>	The GNSO should request that the ICANN Compliance Department publish more data about WHOIS accessibility, on at least an annual basis. This data should include a) the number of registrars that show a pattern of unreasonable restriction of access to their port 43 WHOIS servers, and b) the results of an annual compliance audit of compliance with all contractual WHOIS access obligations.	<u>Unanimous consensus</u>

CROSS-TLD REGISTRATION SCAM

<u>Recommendation #1</u> <i>Please see pages 43-45 for the full recommendation.</i>	The RAPWG recommends the GNSO monitor for Cross-TLD registration scam abuse in the gTLD space and co-ordinate research with the community to determine the nature and extent of the problem. The WG believes this issue warrants review but notes there is not enough data at this time to warrant an Issues Report or PDP.	<u>Unanimous consensus</u>
---	---	-----------------------------------

META ISSUE: UNIFORMITY OF REPORTING

<u>Recommendation #1</u> <i>Please see pages 97-102 for the full recommendation.</i>	The RAPWG recommends that the GNSO, and the larger ICANN community in general, create and support uniform reporting processes.	<u>Unanimous consensus</u>
--	--	-----------------------------------

Split Opinion

<u>CYBERSQUATTING</u>		
<p><u>Recommendation # 2</u> <u>View A</u></p>	<p>The RAPWG recommends the initiation of a Policy Development Process by requesting an Issues Report to investigate the appropriateness and effectiveness of how any Rights Protection Mechanisms that are developed elsewhere in the community (e.g. the New gTLD program) can be applied to the problem of cybersquatting in the current gTLD space.</p>	<p><u>Supported by 7 members of the RAPWG</u></p>
<p><u>View B</u> <i>Please see pages 26-33 for the full recommendations.</i></p>	<p>The initiation of such a process is premature; the effectiveness and consequences of the Rights Protection Mechanisms proposed for the new TLDs is unknown. Discussion of RPMs should continue via the New TLD program. Experience with them should be gained before considering their appropriate relation (if any) to the existing TLD space.</p>	<p><u>Supported by 7 members of the RAPWG</u></p>

Recommendations that Council do nothing

<u>FRONT RUNNING</u>		
<p><u>Recommendation #1</u> <i>Please see pages 34-37 for the full recommendation.</i></p>	<p>It is unclear to what extent front-running happens, and the RAPWG does not recommend policy development at this time. The RAPWG suggests that the Council monitor the issue and consider next steps if conditions warrant.</p>	<p><u>Unanimous consensus</u></p>

Annex I – Working Group Charter

Whereas GNSO Council Resolution (20081218-3) dated December 18, 2008 called for the creation of a drafting team “to create a proposed charter for a working group to investigate the open issues documented in the issues report on Registrations[sic] Abuse Policy”.

Whereas a drafting team has formed and its members have discussed and reviewed the open issues documented in the issues report.

Whereas it is the view of the drafting Team that the objective of the Working Group should be to gather facts, define terms, provide the appropriate focus and definition of the policy issue(s), if any, to be addressed, in order to enable the GNSO Council to make an informed decision as to whether to launch PDP on registration abuse.

Whereas the drafting team recommends that the GNSO Council charter a Working Group to (i) further define and research the issues outlined in the Registration Abuse Policies Issues Report; and (ii) take the steps outlined below. The Working Group should complete its work before a decision is taken by the GNSO Council on whether to launch a PDP.

The GNSO Council RESOLVES: To form a Working Group of interested stakeholders and Constituency representatives, to collaborate broadly with knowledgeable individuals and organizations, to further define and research the issues outlined in the Registration Abuse Policies Issues Report; and take the steps outlined in the Charter. The Working Group should address the issues outlined in the Charter and report back to the GNSO Council within 90 days following the end of the ICANN meeting in Mexico City.

CHARTER

Scope and definition of registration abuse – the Working Group should define domain name registration abuse, as distinct from abuse arising solely from use of a domain name while it is

registered. The Working Group should also identify which aspects of the subject of registration abuse are within ICANN's mission to address and which are within the set of topics on which ICANN may establish policies that are binding on gTLD registry operators and ICANN-accredited registrars. This task should include an illustrative categorization of known abuses.

Additional research and identifying concrete policy issues – The issues report outlines a number of areas where additional research would be needed in order to understand what problems may exist in relation to registration abuse and their scope, and to fully appreciate the current practices of contracted parties, including research to:

- 'Understand if registration abuses are occurring that might be curtailed or better addressed if consistent registration abuse policies were established'
- 'Determine if and how [registration] abuse is dealt with in those registries [and registrars] that do not have any specific [policies] in place'
- 'Identify how these registration abuse provisions are [...] implemented in practice or deemed effective in addressing registration abuse'.

In addition, additional research should be conducted to include the practices of relevant entities other than the contracted parties, such as abusers, registrants, law enforcement, service providers, and so on.

The Working Group should determine how this research can be conducted in a timely and efficient manner -- by the Working Group itself via a Request for Information (RFI), by obtaining expert advice, and/or by exploring other options.

Based on the additional research and information, the Working Group should identify and recommend specific policy issues and processes for further consideration by the GNSO Council.

SSAC Participation and Collaboration: The Working Group should (i) consider inviting a representative from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) to participate in the Working Group; (ii) consider in further detail the SSAC's invitation to the GNSO Council to

participate in a collaborative effort on abuse contacts; and (iii) make a recommendation to the Council about this invitation.

Workshop at ICANN meeting in Mexico City on Registration Abuse Policies - In order to get broad input on and understanding of the specific nature of concerns from community stakeholders, the drafting team proposes to organize a workshop on registration abuse policies in conjunction with the ICANN meeting in Mexico City. The Working Group should review and take into account the discussions and recommendations, if any, from this workshop in its deliberations.

The working group established by this motion will work according to the process defined in [Working Group Processes](#).

Annex II - The Working Group

Following the adoption of the charter by the GNSO Council, a call for volunteers was launched. The following individuals signed onto of the RAP WG; all have submitted Statements of Interest (see https://st.icann.org/reg-abuse-wg/index.cgi?statements_of_interest). The participation (number of meetings attended) by the below varies widely.

For the detailed attendance sheet, please click [here](#).

Name	Affiliation ⁵²	Total Number of Meetings Attended
Greg Aaron (Chair)	RySG	38
Mike Rodenbaugh (Council Liaison)	CBUC	12
James Bladel	RrSG	37
Olga Cavalli	NCA	1
Zahid Jamil	CBUC	1
Beau Brendler	ALAC	2
Jeff Neuman	RySG	5
Nacho Amadoz	RySG	6
Philip Corwin	CBUC	17
Martin Sutton	CBUC	24
Richard Tindal	RrSG	8
Greg Ogorek	CBUC	9
Faisal Shah	MarkMonitor	32
Roland Perry	Individual	12
Paul Stahura	RrSG	0
Jaime Echeverry Gomez	RrSG	0
Li Guanghao	Individual	1
Mike O'Connor	CBUC	29
Gretchen Olive	RrSG	5

⁵² RySG = Registry Stakeholder Group, RrSG = Registrar Stakeholder Group, CBUC = Commercial and Business Users Constituency, NCA = Nominating Committee Appointee, ALAC = At Large Advisory Committee, IPC = Intellectual Property Constituency, SSAC = Security and Stability Advisory Committee, NCUC = Non-Commercial Users Constituency

Berry Cobb	CBUC	31
Jeff Eckhaus	RrSG	0
Robert Hutchinson	CBUC	14
Andy Steingruebl	Individual - PayPal	3
Jeremy Hitchcock	SSAC	3
Patrick Kane	RySG	1
George Kirikos [resigned from the WG on 22 October 2009]	CBUC	13
Michael Young	RySG	6
Rod Rasmussen	Internet Identity	27
Edward Nunes	NCUC	0
Frederick Felman	MarkMonitor	12
Evan Leibovitch [resigned from the WG on 21 January 2010]	ALAC	1
Caleb Queern	CBUC	3
Kristina Rosette [Resigned from the WG on 27 March 2009]	IPC	3
Wendy Seltzer (joined the WG on 11 March 2010)	NCSG	5