

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	Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview ICANN: review PwC reports, Program Implementation report, public comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: low bfb
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 [Drew report: DNS Stability, Security and Resiliency report could be a primary source]
Prohibition of Wildcarding	Qual	Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview ICANN: interview SMEs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 compliance complaints received on wildcarding Generally perceived as effective 	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot be quantitatively tied to DNS abuse rate Generally perceived as effective 	Carlton: SSAC reports; where is this occurring?	BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: low bfb
Require Thick	Quant	Vendor:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PC: support 	Carlos: also has	BfB: high low

WHOIS records		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correlate WHOIS accuracy (ARS) to abuse rate "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview <p>ICANN: hot potato</p>	<p>"accuracy" as measure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PC: Accuracy reporting doesn't account for privacy/proxy services (IPC) 	<p>PDP and other part of AoC review</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>BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb</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>Drew: data could be collected by ICANN compliance</p> <p>Laureen: monthly and yearly reports; if there are complaints, compliance has</p>	<p>BfB: high low</p> <p>BRIAN'S 2¢: low bfb</p> <p>Drew low bfb</p>

Expedited Registry Security Request process	Qual	Vendor: : “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview ICANN: interview SMEs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Few instances of use 		BfB: high low BRIAN’S 2¢: low bfb Team: 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	<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 		BfB: high low BRIAN’S 2¢: low bfb Low bfb
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? 	LK: 2013 agreement contained new safeguards; required to use ICANN accredited Rrs KL: applying extra requirements to registrars (may be out of scope for our group) Drew: relevant for context 3.18 (reasonable investigation into abuse by Rrs); could lead to	BfB: high low BRIAN’S 2¢: high bfb

Compiled by Brian Aitchison

brian.aitchison@icann.org

				<p>differing anti abuse policies; useful for context; understand Rr</p> <p>3.7 (WHOIS accuracy validation)</p> <p>Carlos: not whether it was signed</p> <p>Drew: may be interesting</p> <p>compliance data; useful mostly for context; are there complaints and how to above provisions tie into other safeguards</p> <p>Laureen: difficult to ask general question on effectiveness; so many provisions; zero in on particular provisions above; who do we focus on?</p> <p>David Taylor: also difficult</p> <p>Laureen: can't do everything at this junction; prioritize, ID potential issues.</p> <p><u>How do we prioritize this ?</u></p> <p>Carlton: evidence based</p> <p>David: Rr</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>stakeholder group may be able to provide data [see Secure Domain Foundation: ...proactive anti abuse: registrars differ in their interpretation of responsibilities under 2013 RAA)</p>	
<p>Registry-specific PICs (Q18 Applicant Guidebook)</p>	<p>Qual</p>	<p>Vendor: Textual analysis software (contract with university consulting?)</p> <p>Interviews with SMEs?</p> <p>ICANN: Examine relationship between stated commitments in RA and stated commitments on website</p>	<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>KL: goal of including question to inform applicant reviewers as to whether objection or early warning should be filed; more an “essay” question; compare application statements to how well they’ve committed to those statement; IAG recommended metric</p> <p>Carlton: not worth much; voluntary; no way to measure them; PICs are not part of mediation process and therefore are not useful “too many outs” for everybody</p>	<p>BfB: high low</p> <p>BRIAN’S 2¢: high bfb (contract to university consulting?)</p>

Compiled by Brian Aitchison

brian.aitchison@icann.org

				<p>Laureen: public interest dispute resolution process is a problem; is there a difference between what was said</p> <p>Carlos: 3 cases where relevant: diff people from community apply; someone who didn't get domain name is in IRP with icann; when business failed; semantics of "public interest" still not defined</p> <p>Carlton: first two issues brought up by Carlos issue in ALAC deliberations; used as arguments for why more enforcement needed for PICs</p> <p>Carlos: keep track of studies</p> <p>Karen: make two lines separating question 18 pics and PICs</p> <p>Carlos: look at emerging definitions of public interest</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

<p>Prohibition of abusive activities (eg phishing, malware)</p>	<p>Qual</p>	<p>Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</p> <p>ICANN: infer from baseline DNS abuse data (vendor selection in process)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spec 11 Registry reporting standards not yet finalized 	<p>Carlos: IAG asked for follow up on reporting ; Need to find solution Karen: what are the levels of activity this is trying to guard against? Has there been an impact on MC activities because it was included in the agreement Carlos: this can be enough to file suit in any jurisdiction Laureen: could be a deterrent effect? Carlos: takedowns? Laureen: will take down only if law violated, not if parties to contract? Calvin: takedowns apply more to content</p>	<p>BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb (aspect of DNS abuse baseline data currently being sought)</p>
<p>Registry conduct of periodic statistical analysis of security threats</p>	<p>n/a (see notes)</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spec 11 Registry reporting standards not yet finalized 		<p>n/a</p>
<p>Requirement to operate TLD in transparent manner</p>	<p>Qual</p>	<p>Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there anything to measure here? 	<p>Karen: can at least check that there is a registration policy? Fabro: transparency</p>	<p>BfB: high low BRIAN'S 2¢: low bfb</p>

		ICANN: description/overview (zero sum)		= public information, public participation, accountability and public review Laureen: above may not be “transparency”, is it more visibility only? Fabro: to see how many people access, how many page views of the terms of service	
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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applications that dropped exclusive registration policies could proceed (184/186 did); others were deferred until next round. 	Laureen: bears on competition issues rather than trust; shouldn’t have restrictions on who can take on TLDs (not a consumer trust safeguard)	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	Laureen: quite important; GAC	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.

Highly Regulated Sectors:

Publish point of contact to facilitate relationships with relevant industry / regulatory bodies.

Registrants must provide current administrative contact information (abuse).

		interview ICANN: description/overview + case studies of registry practices	and compliance with all laws?	safeguard advice given, not all accepted (eg credentialing); some domains have voluntarily restricted registration policies; <u>not a requirement</u>; need to ID which were implemented to determine effectiveness	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	Qual	Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness"		Karen: independent	BfB: high low

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

Clearinghouse		<p>survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</p> <p>ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview</p>		<p>review of TMCH (recommended by GAC); how it operates; due Q3; data on RPMs, public comments on RPM review report</p> <p>KL: RPM report did not focus on effectiveness; look at reasons why TMCH was proposed</p> <p>David: early discussion: should TMCH be mandatory?</p>	<p>BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb</p>
Sunrise Period	<p>Qual</p> <p>Quant? (see notes)</p>	<p>Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview + correlate pricing to abuse rate</p> <p>ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correlate sunrise pricing (or pricing in general) to abuse rate? • Pricing widely hypothesized to correlate with abuse rate 		<p>BfB: high low</p> <p>BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb</p>
Trademark Claims service	<p>Quant</p> <p>Quant? (see notes)</p>	<p>Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview + correlate claims to abuse rate</p> <p>ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC: examine correlation between copyright infringing sites and abuse 		<p>BfB: high low</p> <p>BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb</p>
Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) system	Qual	<p>Vendor: "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</p>			<p>BfB: high low</p> <p>BRIAN'S 2¢: high</p>

		ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview			bfb
Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedures	Qual	<p>Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</p> <p>ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview</p>			<p>BfB: high low</p> <p>BRIAN’S 2¢: high bfb</p>
Trademark Registry Restrictions	Qual	<p>Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</p> <p>ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview</p>			<p>BfB: high low</p> <p>BRIAN’S 2¢: high bfb</p>
Public Interest Commitments (PICs)	Qual	<p>Vendor: Textual analysis software (contract with university consulting?)</p> <p>ICANN: Examine relationship between stated commitments in RA and stated commitments on website</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results from preliminary research not meaningful 		<p>BfB: high low</p> <p>BRIAN’S 2¢: high bfb</p>
Other Safeguards					
Name Collision	Qual	<p>Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</p> <p>ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview</p>			<p>BfB: high low</p> <p>BRIAN’S 2¢: low bfb</p>