Uniformity of Contracts to Address Registration Abuse

- Final Issue Report -
Why is it important?

• “Registration” and “Use” Abuse Exists (at least 11 different forms of use and registration abuse)
• Registration abuse impacts the security and stability of the Internet
• Some individual anti-abuse efforts have been successful
• Study is needed to see if there are consistent and uniform ways to battle abuse
• GNSO Council agreed with Working Group recommendation to consider “minimum baseline” for addressing registration abuse
• Developed a definition of abuse generally
• Identified and defined 11 types of specific abuses
• Made 14 specific recommendations for action (e.g., WHOis access issues, fake renewal notices, UDRP review, etc.)
• Key recommendation for this topic:

”Evaluate whether a minimum baseline of registration abuse provisions should be created for all in-scope ICANN agreements
And if created;
Evaluate how such language should be structured to address the most common forms of registration abuse”
What the Final Issue Report Says

• Describes recent history of inquiries on abuse
• Reviews Existing Forms of Industry Agreements
• Analyzes specific agreements
• Abuse is “within scope” of GNSO policy work
There may be benefits to a consistent framework of abuse preventions, thus:

- Initiate a formal PDP and
- Form WG to (1) study specific registration abuses, (2) identify specific anti abuse practices and (3) determine if uniform provisions would work. If so, set benchmarks and define reporting requirements.
- Consider asking staff to do some initial research (internal or vendor)
- OR, instead of PDP, ask staff to draft potential uniform provisions for direct community review and comment