

OWNERS: Drew (lead), Fabro, Calvin

Refer to Lauren's Model Issue Paper -

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1rswTUNmvB_Lkt2RDwU2OuNx13pptdP_TpgCZ3V77UBk/edit?usp=sharing

CCT-RT DISCUSSION PAPER WORKSHEET (LAUREEN'S TEMPLATE ADOPTED ON PLENARY DRAFT #17)

Scroll down for prior work

HIGH LEVEL QUESTION: *[These are the discussion paper topics]*

OWNER: *[primary drafter]*

SUB-QUESTIONS: *[what foundation questions need to be answered to fully address the high-level question; these should be as specific as possible]*

FINDINGS: *[a list of relevant findings and supporting data; the presentation of the findings needs to correspond to the numbered subquestions]*

CAUSES:

PRIORITY TO ADDRESS: *[ex. Prior to Subsequent Procedures, Mid-term, Long-term
This is an important area for community input]*

RECOMMENDATIONS: *[recommendations to ICANN. For each, specify: 1. Target of recommendation (i.e. Staff, Board, SubProc PDP); 2. Nature of recommendation; 3. Implementation details, exceptional costs, etc.]*

REVIEW: *[how the effectiveness of these recommendations will be reviewed; e.g. data source recommended for review and recommended timeframe for review]*

CCT-RT HYPOTHESIS WORKSHEET

HIGH LEVEL QUESTION:

What role did the new gTLD safeguards play in preventing DNS abuse?

OWNER:

Drew

SUB-QUESTIONS:

(ex. Was the new gTLD application and evaluation program effective at serving the developing world?)

1. What were the new gTLD safeguards and what types of DNS abuse did they intended to prevent?
2. What instances of DNS abuse did the safeguards prevent?

FINDINGS:

(a list of relevant findings and supporting data)

1. What were the new gTLD safeguards and what types of DNS abuse did they intended to prevent?
 - a. New gTLD registry operators are required to undergo enhanced screening, including a criminal background check, due diligence assessment, and a vetting of their history with cybersquatting.
 - i. This seeks to prevent bad actors from operating registries.
Source:
<https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/reviews/dns-abuse/safeguards-against-dns-abuse-18jul16-en.pdf>
 - b. New gTLD registry operators are required to implement DNSSEC.
 - i. This seeks to prevent spoofing of DNS resolution and DNS cache poisoning.
 - c. New gTLD registry operators are required to use registrars that are signatories to the 2013 RAA.
 - i. Section 3.18 of the 2013 RAA requires registry operators to “take reasonable and prompt steps to investigate and respond appropriately to any reports of abuse.”
 - d. The 2013 Registry Agreement prohibits operators from permitting DNS wildcarding.
 1. This seeks to prevent misdirected DNS queries, which could potentially lead end users to malicious websites.
 - ii. Thick WHOIS records
 1. This seeks to ensure that administrative and technical contact information is available to help affected parties reach out to relevant contacts.
 - e. Removal of orphan glue records
 - i. This seeks to prevent bad actors from operating name servers referenced in defunct zone records.
 - f. Centralization of zone file access
 - i. This seeks to ensure cybersecurity researchers have access to one portal instead of the need to individually request zone files from each registrar.
 - g. Documented registry and registrar abuse contacts
 - i. This seeks to ensure that victims of DNS abuse and other complainants have access to appropriate contacts for reporting abuse.
 - h. Expedited registry security request process
 - i. This seeks to ensure that law enforcement has a mechanism to quickly intervene to stop threats affecting the systematic security, stability and resiliency of a TLD or the DNS.
2. What instances of DNS abuse did the safeguards prevent?
 - a. (NOTE: DNS abuse study will inform this section)

CAUSES:

(refer to relevant hypothesis worksheets on causes)

PRIORITY TO ADDRESS:

*(ex. Prior to Subsequent Procedures, Mid-term, Long-term
This is an important area for community input)*

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(recommendations to ICANN. For each, specify:

1. *Target of recommendation (ie Staff, Board, SubProc PDP)*
2. *Nature of recommendation*
3. *Implementation details, exceptional costs, etc.)*

(ex:

1. *Begin Outreach 6 months prior to accepting applications*
 - a. *Staff recommendation*
 - b. *Likely 20% increase in outreach cost*
2. *Use more radio advertising for outreach*
 - a. *Staff recommendation*
 - b. *Likely 30% increase in outreach cost)*

REVIEW:

(how the effectiveness of these recommendations will be reviewed)

1. *Data source recommended for review*
2. *Recommended timeframe for review)*

(ex:

1. *Repeat applicant cohort survey, look for 40% increase in awareness*
2. *Review in one year to make changes if an increase is not observed.)*