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>
</tbody>
</table>
| Vet Registry Operators | Qual | Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview | • 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) | 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 |
| Prohibition of Wildcarding | Qual | Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview | • 0 compliance complaints received on wildcarding  
• Generally perceived as effective | Carlton: SSAC reports; where is this occurring?  
BfB: high low |
| Removal of orphan glue records | Qual | Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview | • Cannot be quantitatively tied to DNS abuse rate  
• Generally perceived as effective | Carlton: SSAC reports; where is this occurring?  
BfB: high low |
| Require Thick           | Quant| Vendor:                                                                                 | • PC: support | Carlos: also has  
BfB: high low |
### WHOIS records
- Correlate WHOIS accuracy (ARS) to abuse rate
- "Perception of Effectiveness" survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview
- ICANN: hot potato
- "accuracy" as measure
- PC: Accuracy reporting doesn't account for privacy/proxy services (IPC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor:</th>
<th>“Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICANN:</td>
<td>interview SMEs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PDP and other part of AoC review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laureen: need targeted survey of law enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to draw useful info given “accuracy”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BRIAN’S 2¢:** high bfb
Carlos: already being addressed in PDP and AoC
Laureen: need targeted survey of law enforcement
Drew: value added on correlation between abuse data received
Jaime: consider dropping

### Centralization of Zone File access
Qual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor:</th>
<th>“Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICANN:</td>
<td>interview SMEs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**BfB**: high low
**BRIAN’S 2¢**: high bfb

### Documented Registry and Registrar level abuse contacts
Qual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor:</th>
<th>&quot;Perception of Effectiveness&quot; survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICANN:</td>
<td>interview SMEs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Drew: data could be collected by ICANN compliance |
| Laureen: monthly and yearly reports; if there are complaints, compliance has |

**BfB**: high low
**BRIAN’S 2¢**: low bfb
Drew: low bfb
| Issue                                                                 | Methodology                                                                 | Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                 | BfB | BRIAN’S 2¢ | Team  
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------------|-------
| Expedited Registry Security Request process                            | Qual Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview ICANN: interview SMEs | 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 | • 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)                                                                                                                                                    | • 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 | ** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carlos: not whether it was signed</th>
<th>Drew: may be interesting compliance data; useful mostly for context; are there complaints and how to above provisions tie into other safeguards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laureen: difficult to ask general question on effectiveness; so many provisions; zero in on particular provisions above; who do we focus on?</td>
<td>David Taylor: also difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laureen: can’t do everything at this junction; prioritize, ID potential issues. How do we prioritize this?</td>
<td>Carlton: evidence based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David: Rr</td>
<td>differing anti abuse policies; useful for context; understand Rr 3.7 (WHOIS accuracy validation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled by Brian Aitchison
brian.aitchison@icann.org
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Data Collection and Analysis</th>
<th>Findings and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registry-specific PICs (Q18 Applicant Guidebook)</td>
<td>Qual</td>
<td><strong>Vendor:</strong> Textual analysis software (contract with university consulting?)</td>
<td><strong>KL:</strong> 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 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with SMEs?</td>
<td>ICANN: Examine relationship between stated commitments in RA and stated commitments on website</td>
<td><strong>Results from preliminary research not meaningful</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Conduct “blind study”: 1 person ID key themes in Q18 response, 1 person ID key themes in website commitments independently. Compare.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Q18 came from GAC advice to evaluate applications based on social benefit/costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>BfB:</strong> high low&lt;br&gt;BRIAN’S 2¢: high bfb (contract to university consulting?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Laureen: public interest dispute resolution process is a problem; is there a difference between what was said
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
Carlton: first two issues brought up by Carlos issue in ALAC deliberations; used as arguments for why more enforcement needed for PICs
Carlos: keep track of studies
Karen: make two lines separating question 18 pics and PICs
Carlos: look at emerging definitions of public interest
| Prohibition of abusive activities (eg phishing, malware) | Qual | Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview | • Spec 11 Registry reporting standards not yet finalized | 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? is this a deterrent?  
Calvin: takedowns apply more to content | 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 | Karen: can at least check that there is a registration policy?  
Fabro: transparency | BfB: high low  
BRIAN’S 2¢: low bfb |
<p>| Requirement to operate TLD in transparent manner | Qual | Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview | • Is there anything to measure here? | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No exclusive registration criteria for generic TLD strings (GAC Category 2 Advice)</th>
<th>Qual</th>
<th>Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview</th>
<th>Applications that dropped exclusive registration policies could proceed (184/186 did); others were deferred until next round.</th>
<th>Laureen: bears on competition issues rather than trust; shouldn’t have restrictions on who can take on TLDs (not a consumer trust safeguard)</th>
<th>BfB: high low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<td>Laureen: quite important; GAC</td>
<td>BfB: high low</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.

**Highly Regulated Sectors:**
Publish point of contact to facilitate relationships with relevant industry / regulatory bodies. Registrants must provide current administrative contact information (abuse).
### Rights Protections Safeguards

| Interview | ICANN: description/overview + case studies of registry practices | safeguard advice given, not all accepted (eg credentialing); some domains have voluntarily restricted registration policies; not a requirement; 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 | survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview  
|              | ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview | review of TMCH (recommended by GAC); how it operates; due Q3; data on RPMs, public comments on RPM review report  
|              |                                                          | KL: RPM report did not focus on effectiveness; look at reasons why TMCH was proposed  
|              |                                                          | David: early discussion: should TMCH be mandatory?  
|              |                                                          | BRIAN’S 2¢: high bfb |
| Sunrise Period | Qual  
| Qual? (see notes) | Vendor: “Perception of Effectiveness” survey, questionnaire, focus group, interview + correlate pricing to abuse  
|            | ICANN: interview SMEs + descriptive statistical overview | • Correlate sunrise pricing (or pricing in general) to abuse rate  
|            |                                                          | • Pricing widely hypothesized to correlate with abuse rate  
|            |                                                          | BfB: high low  
|            |                                                          | 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 |  
|            |                                                          | BfB: high low  
<p>|            |                                                          | BRIAN’S 2¢: high |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safeguards</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedures | Qualitative methods (interview, survey, focus group, interview) | BfB: high low  
BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb |
| Trademark Registry Restrictions  | Qualitative methods (interview, survey, focus group, interview) | BfB: high low  
BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb |
| Public Interest Commitments (PICs) | Qualitative methods (interview, survey, focus group, interview) | BfB: high low  
BRIAN'S 2¢: high bfb |
| Name Collision                   | Qualitative methods (interview, survey, focus group, interview) | BfB: high low  
BRIAN'S 2¢: low bfb |