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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safeguard</th>
<th>Qual or Quant</th>
<th>Source and Method</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>SubTeam Comments</th>
<th>Decision Points (BfB Index)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNS Abuse Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness = safeguard → DNS abuse Response variable ?: Safeguards effective at what? To prevent what kinds of abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguard Type</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Vendor Requirements</td>
<td>ICANN Analysis</td>
<td>Observations and Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Vet Registry Operators**        | Qual        | Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview | ICANN: review PwC reports, Program Implementation report, public comments | • Cannot measure deterrent effect  
• 0 cases of RA termination per background screen  
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 |
| **DNSSEC Deployment**             | Quant       | **Vendor**: Correlate DNSSEC deployment in TLDs with abuse rates (TLD DNSSEC reports)  
ICANN: descriptive stats | KL: all RO’s req’d to deploy DNSSEC  
Calvin: CZDS for number of signed zones  
Drew: rickeng.br  
Jaime: 2nd level | **BfB**: high low  
BRIAN’S 2¢: high bfb |
| **Prohibition of Wildcarding**    | Qual        | Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview  
ICANN: interview SMEs | Carlton: SSAC reports; where is this occurring?  
Carlton: SSAC reports; where is this occurring?  
Carlton: SSAC reports; where is this occurring? | **BfB**: high low  
BRIAN’S 2¢: low bfb |
| **Removal of orphan glue records** | Qual        | Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview  
ICANN: interview SMEs | Carlton: SSAC reports; where is this occurring?  
Carlton: SSAC reports; where is this occurring?  
Carlton: SSAC reports; where is this occurring? | **BfB**: high low  
BRIAN’S 2¢: low bfb |
| **Require Thick WHOIS records**   | Quant       | **Vendor**:  
• Correlate WHOIS accuracy (ARS) to abuse rate  
• “Perception of Effectiveness” | PC: support “accuracy” as measure  
PC: Accuracy  
Carlos: also has PDP and other part of AoC review | **BfB**: high low  
BRIAN’S 2¢: high bfb |
### Centralization of Zone File access

**Vendor**: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview  
**ICANN**: interview SMEs  

- **Laureen**: need targeted survey of law enforcement  
- **Drew**: value added on correlation between abuse data received and hard to draw useful info given “accuracy”  
- **Carlos**: already being addressed in PDP and AoC  
- **Jaime**: consider dropping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICANN:</th>
<th>hot potato</th>
<th>reporting doesn't account for privacy/proxy services (IPC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Documented Registry and Registrar level abuse contacts

**Vendor**: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview  
**ICANN**: interview SMEs  

- **Jaime**: monthly reports of credentials of zone files (ZFA password)  
- **Some generics have more credentials**  
- **Ease of use?**  
- **Drew**: cyber security researchers could use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BfB:</th>
<th>high low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**BRIAN’S 2¢**: high bfb

### Expedited Registry Security Request process

**Vendor**: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview  
**ICANN**: interview SMEs  

- **Few instances of use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BfB:</th>
<th>high low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**BRIAN’S 2¢**: low bfb
| **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  
**ICANN:** hot potato (see notes) | **•** Formal safeguard doesn't exist, so no "effectiveness" to test  
**•** Much input received in public comments and ICANN internal correspondence | **BfB:** high low  
**BRIAN’S 2¢:** low bfb |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Spec 11 and GAC advice** | **Qual** | **Vendor:** “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview  
**ICANN:** hot potato (see notes) | **Response variable ?:** Safeguards effective at what? To prevent what kinds of abuse? |  
**Underlying question:** is 2013 RAA effective in terms of safeguard provisions? | **BfB:** high low  
**BRIAN’S 2¢:** high bfb |
| **Requirement to use registrars under 2013 RAA** | **Qual** | **Vendor:** “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview  
**ICANN:** hot potato (see notes) | **•** Underlying question: is 2013 RAA effective in terms of safeguard provisions? |  
**BfB:** high low  
**BRIAN’S 2¢:** high bfb |
| **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 | **•** 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** | **BfB:** high low  
**BRIAN’S 2¢:** high bfb (contract to university consulting?) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safeguard</th>
<th>Vendor Inquiry</th>
<th>ICANN</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prohibition of abusive activities (eg phishing, malware)</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</td>
<td>- Spec 11 Registry reporting standards not yet finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICANN: infer from baseline DNS abuse data (vendor selection in process)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry conduct of periodic statistical analysis of security threats</td>
<td>n/a (see notes)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Spec 11 Registry reporting standards not yet finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement to operate TLD in transparent manner</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</td>
<td>- Is there anything to measure here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICANN: description/overview (zero sum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No exclusive registration criteria for generic TLD strings (GAC Category 2 Advice)</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</td>
<td>- Applications that dropped exclusive registration policies could proceed (184/186 did); others were deferred until next round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICANN: description/overview (zero sum)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAC Category 1 Safeguards&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</td>
<td>Are registries checking for proper credentials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> 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.

---

**BfB:** high low  
**BRIAN’S 2¢:** high bfb (aspect of DNS abuse baseline data currently being sought)
### Rights Protections Safeguards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>ICANN: description/overview + case studies of registry practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights Protections Safeguards</td>
<td>Have extensive descriptive data on RPMs. RPM effectiveness being analyzed elsewhere eg PDP. To prevent what kinds of abuse?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Qual | Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview  
ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview |
| Trademark Clearinghouse | BfB: high low  
**BRIAN’S 2¢:** high bfb

### Sunrise Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Qual | Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness”  
• Correlate sunrise |
| Sunrise Period | 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safeguard</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trademark Claims service</td>
<td>Quant? (see notes)</td>
<td>survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview + correlate claims to abuse ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview</td>
<td>PC: examine correlation between copyright infringing sites and abuse</td>
<td>BfB: high low, BRIAN’S 2¢: high bfb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) system</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview + correlate claims to abuse ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview</td>
<td></td>
<td>BfB: high low, BRIAN’S 2¢: high bfb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedures</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview</td>
<td></td>
<td>BfB: high low, BRIAN’S 2¢: high bfb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trademark Registry Restrictions</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview</td>
<td></td>
<td>BfB: high low, BRIAN’S 2¢: high bfb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest Commitments</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>Vendor: Textual analysis software (contract with university consulting?)</td>
<td>Results from preliminary research</td>
<td>BfB: high low, BRIAN’S 2¢: high bfb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICs</td>
<td>ICANN: Examine relationship between stated commitments in RA and stated commitments on website</td>
<td>not meaningful</td>
<td>BRIAN’S 2¢: high bfb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Safeguards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name Collision</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td>Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</td>
<td>BfB: high low</td>
<td>BRIAN’S 2¢: low bfb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>