

Discussion Agenda/Objectives:

1. Intro to table and how it works
2. Determine which safeguards (ie intensity of focus) should be subject to SubTeam study
3. Review, suggest, and assess methods to measure individual safeguard **effectiveness**
4. Prioritize and determine skill sets required to inform any future RFP and selection of external research vendor

Guide:

1. Method options: Vendor vs ICANN-led
 - a. Vendor
 - i. Qualitative: survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview
 - ii. Quantitative: statistical analysis
 - b. ICANN
 - i. Review of existing sources + qualitative methods as appropriate
2. “Bang for Buck” (bfb) index: meaningfulness of possible results + amount of research legwork + sample size + methodological expertise req’d = BFB (high bfb → hire vendor)

NB: “Qual” methods in chart = cannot be quantitatively correlated to DNS abuse rate

<u>Safeguard</u>	<u>Qual or Quant</u>	<u>Source and Method</u>	<u>Notes</u>	<u>SubTeam Comments</u>	<u>Decision Points (BfB Index)</u>
DNS Abuse Report			Effectiveness = safeguard → DNS abuse Response variable ?: Safeguards effective at what? To prevent what kinds of abuse		Effectiveness

Vet Registry Operators	Qual	<p>Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</p> <p>ICANN: review PwC reports, Program Implementation report, public comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot measure deterrent effect 0 cases of RA termination per background screen 	<p>Carlton: low bfb KL: limited data; talk to applicants on amount of info collected; BA: part of qualitative vendor work? Drew: does one TLD have high abuse and is there something about the Registry operator</p>	<p>BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: low bfb</p>
DNSSEC Deployment	Quant	<p>Vendor: Correlate DNSSEC deployment in TLDs with abuse rates (TLD DNSSEC reports)</p> <p>ICANN: descriptive stats</p>		<p>KL: all RO's req'd to deploy DNSSEC Calvin: CZDS for number of signed zones Drew: rickeng.br Jaime: 2nd level</p>	<p>BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb</p>
Prohibition of Wildcarding	Qual	<p>Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</p> <p>ICANN: interview SMEs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 compliance complaints received on wildcarding Generally perceived as effective 	<p>Carlton: SSAC reports; where is this occurring?</p>	<p>BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: low bfb</p>
Removal of orphan glue records	Qual	<p>Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</p> <p>ICANN: interview SMEs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot be quantitatively tied to DNS abuse rate Generally perceived as effective 	<p>Carlton: SSAC reports; where is this occurring?</p>	<p>BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: low bfb</p>
Require Thick WHOIS records	Quant	<p>Vendor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correlate WHOIS accuracy (ARS) to abuse rate "Perception of Effectiveness" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PC: support "accuracy" as measure PC: Accuracy 	<p>Carlos: also has PDP and other part of AoC review</p>	<p>BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb</p>

		<p>survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</p> <p>ICANN: hot potato</p>	<p>reporting doesn't account for privacy/proxy services (IPC)</p>	<p>Laureen: need targeted survey of law enforcement</p> <p>Drew: value added on correlation btwn abuse data received Hard to draw useful info given "accuracy"</p>	<p>Carlos: already being addressed in PDP and AoC</p> <p>Jaime: consider dropping</p>
Centralization of Zone File access	Qual	<p>Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</p> <p>ICANN: interview SMEs</p>		<p>Jaime: monthly reports of credentials of zone files (ZFA password)</p> <p>Some generics have more credentials</p> <p>Ease of use?</p> <p>Drew: cyber security researchers could use</p>	<p>BfB: high low</p> <p>BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb</p>
Documented Registry and Registrar level abuse contacts	Qual	<p>Vendor: : "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</p> <p>ICANN: interview SMEs</p>			<p>BfB: high low</p> <p>BRIAN'S 2¢: low bfb</p>
Expedited Registry Security Request process	Qual	<p>Vendor: : "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</p> <p>ICANN: interview SMEs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few instances of use 		<p>BfB: high low</p> <p>BRIAN'S 2¢: low bfb</p>

Create draft framework for high security zone (HSZ) verification	Qual	Vendor: : “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview ICANN: review public comments, interview SMEs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal safeguard doesn't exist, so no "effectiveness" to test Much input received in public comments and ICANN internal correspondence 		<p>BfB: high low</p> <p>BRIAN'S 2¢: low bfb</p>
Spec 11 and GAC advice			Response variable?: Safeguards effective at what? To prevent what kinds of abuse?		
Requirement to use registrars under 2013 RAA	Qual	Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview ICANN: hot potato (see notes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underlying question: is 2013 RAA effective in terms of safeguard provisions? 		<p>BfB: high low</p> <p>BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb</p>
Registry-specific PICs (Q18 Applicant Guidebook)	Qual	Vendor: Textual analysis software (contract with university consulting?) ICANN: Examine relationship between stated commitments in RA and stated commitments on website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results from preliminary research not meaningful Conduct “blind study”: 1 person ID key themes in Q18 response, 1 person ID key themes in website commitments independently. Compare. Q18 came from GAC advice to evaluate applications based on social benefit/costs 		<p>BfB: high low</p> <p>BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb (contract to university consulting?)</p>

Prohibition of abusive activities (eg phishing, malware)	Qual	Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview ICANN: infer from baseline DNS abuse data (vendor selection in process)	• Spec 11 Registry reporting standards not yet finalized		BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb (aspect of DNS abuse baseline data currently being sought)
Registry conduct of periodic statistical analysis of security threats	n/a (see notes)	n/a	• Spec 11 Registry reporting standards not yet finalized		n/a
Requirement to operate TLD in transparent manner	Qual	Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview ICANN: description/overview (zero sum)	• Is there anything to measure here?		BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: low bfb
No exclusive registration criteria for generic TLD strings (GAC Category 2 Advice)	Qual	Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview ICANN: description/overview (zero sum)	• Applications that dropped exclusive registration policies could proceed (184/186 did); others were deferred until next round.		BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: low bfb
GAC Category 1 Safeguards ¹	Qual	Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group,	Are registries checking for proper credentials		BfB: high low

¹ **GAC Category 1 Safeguards**

Regulated AND Highly Regulated Sectors:

Registrant terms must require compliance with all applicable laws.

Registrants must be notified that compliance is required.

Registrants collecting sensitive financial & health data must secure properly.

		interview ICANN: description/overview + case studies of registry practices	and compliance with all laws?		BRIAN'S 2¢: low bfb
Rights Protections Safeguards			Have extensive descriptive data on RPMs RPM effectiveness being analyzed elsewhere eg PDP To prevent what kinds of abuse?	CG: applicant/ applicant process and use orientation KL: AoC = effectiveness of safeguards built into program TM protections key set of issues built into the program	
Trademark Clearinghouse	Qual	Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview			BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb
Sunrise Period	Qual	Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness"	• Correlate sunrise		BfB: high low

Highly Regulated Sectors:

- Publish point of contact to facilitate relationships with relevant industry / regulatory bodies.
- Registrants must provide current administrative contact information (abuse).
- Registrants must possess licenses or credentials for relevant sector.
- Registry to consult with authorities re: credential authenticity complaints
- Registrants must report updates / changes to credentials.

Special Safeguards

- Registration policies must minimize risk of cyber-bullying / harassment.
- Registrants mustn't misrepresent or falsely imply government or military affiliation

	Quant? (see notes)	survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview + correlate pricing to abuse rate ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview	pricing (or pricing in general) to abuse rate? • Pricing widely hypothesized to correlate with abuse rate		BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb
Trademark Claims service	Quant Quant? (see notes)	Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview + correlate claims to abuse ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview	• PC: examine correlation between copyright infringing sites and abuse		BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb
Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) system	Qual	Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview			BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb
Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedures	Qual	Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview			BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb
Trademark Registry Restrictions	Qual	Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview			BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb
Public Interest Commitments	Qual	Vendor: Textual analysis software (contract with university consulting?)	• Results from preliminary research		BfB: high low

(PICs)		ICANN: Examine relationship between stated commitments in RA and stated commitments on website	not meaningful		BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb
Other Safeguards					
Name Collision	Qual	Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview			BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: low bfb