**Title of Effort:** PDP – Fast Flux Working Group

**Start & End Dates:**  MAR 2008 – JAN 2011

**Link to Effort:** <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/inactive/2011/fast-flux>

**Key Contributors:**  Chair (XX); Staff (Liz Gasster, Marika Konings)

| **#** | **Question** | **Response** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1** | Was this effort a PDP or non-PDP? | PDP – initiated 8 May 2008 |
| **1.1** | if a PDP, were Consensus Policy recommendations made and approved by the GNSO and ICANN Board? | No Consensus Policy recommendations were made, but actions were assigned to ICANN staff. (Refer to final outcomes row, below) |
| **2** | What was the issue/problem identified in the Final Issue Report and Charter and did any of the initial staff recommendations based on data (analysis)? (yes/no + description) | Issue Report (31 Mar 2008): <http://gnso.icann.org/issues/fast-flux-hosting/gnso-issues-report-fast-flux-25mar08.pdf>Initial Staff recommendations called for greater research and analysis before initiating a PDP – and staff offered to employ their resources to this end. Staff called for guidance on how to conduct research(p. 14 of Issue Report)“Staff recommends that the GNSO sponsor additional fact-finding and research to develop best practices guidelines concerning fast flux `hosting, and to provide data to assist policy development and illuminate potential policy options. The development of best practices should be done by collaborating broadly with knowledgeable individuals and organizations and shared broadly to encourage broad input and wide adoption. Some registrars may already implement some of the measures identified in SAC 025 and staff recommends consultation with these registrars to determine the efficacy of these measures how they can best be implemented. Staff resources can be made available to support these research activities and objectives.”“SSAC’s study of fast flux hosting, as well as several trade articles have focused on the following important questions, including:• Who benefits from fast flux, and who is harmed?• Who would benefit from cessation of the practice and who would be harmed?• How are registry operators involved in fast flux hosting activities?• How are registrars involved in fast flux hosting activities?• How are registrants affected by fast flux hosting?Some additional questions that might productively be addressed as part of fact-finding include:• How are Internet users affected by fast flux hosting?• What enforceable rules could be applied to reduce or eliminate the negative effects of fast flux hosting?• What would be the impact (positive or negative) of establishing limitations, guidelines, or restrictions on registrars and/or registries with respect to practices that enable or facilitate fast flux hosting?• What measures should be implemented by registries and registrars to mitigate the negative effects of fast flux? Should these measures be documented and promoted as “industry best practices,” incorporated into registry contracts and registrar accreditation agreements, or promulgated in some other way?”Charter (29 May 2008): <http://gnso.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-30may08.htm> “The working group charter was approved on 29 May 2008 and asked the working group to consider the following questions:- Who benefits from fast flux, and who is harmed?- Who would benefit from cessation of the practice and who would be harmed?- Are registry operators involved, or could they be, in fast flux hosting activities? If so, how?- Are registrars involved in fast flux hosting activities? If so, how?- How are registrants affected by fast flux hosting?- How are Internet users affected by fast flux hosting?- What technical (e.g. changes to the way in which DNS updates operate) and policy (e.g. changes to registry/registrar agreements or rules governing permissible registrant behavior) measures could be implemented by registries and registrars to mitigate the negative effects of fast flux?- What would be the impact (positive or negative) of establishing limitations, guidelines, or restrictions on registrants, registrars and/or registries with respect to practices that enable or facilitate fast flux hosting?- What would be the impact of these limitations, guidelines, or restrictions to product and service innovation?-What are some of the best practices available with regard to protection from fast flux?The Group was also tasked to obtain expert opinion, as appropriate, on which areas of fast flux are in scope and out of scope for GNSO policy making.” |
|  |  |  |
| **3** | Was data readily available or specifically collected for this effort? (i.e. was data identified, collected and analyzed during the WG deliberations) | Preliminary report and framing of issue by SSAC and ICANN Staff.Active WG email thread (800+ msgs).Further data was noticeably lacking. The WG members agreed that data was necessary but they were lacking a clear definition of the issue and its aspects (i.e., various definitions of “fast flux” and whether or not it was a + or - behavior), (p. 48, Initial Report). WG studied data in general, and what parties (Registries, Registrars, ISPs) had access to information (p.50, Initial Report).There was no public database or portal for the public to report a fast flux domain at that time (p53, Initial Report). |
| **3.1** | Yes, If collected, how was it collected, how long did it take and how much did it cost (if any, considering the type of cost (direct bill vs. significant time/effort))? | Fast Flux Metrics (Annex V, Initial Report), collected by 2 research fiims: Arbor and Karmasphere. 8 month study v. 3 month study. reports do not mention how this was collected but it seems like through unrelated efforts that the WG was able to harness, possibly free of charge though this is unclear. |
| **3.1.1** | What were the primary sources of the data? (ICANN, Contracted Party, external) * Did any data providers impose restrictions on use of data?
 | Polling of various ICANN constituency groups; (required step in WG process)Other WGs (Anti-Phishing WG);SSAC 025: <https://www.icann.org/en/groups/ssac/documents/sac-025-en.pdf> Annex IV Fast Flux Case Study (Final Report)Annex 5, Fast Flux Metrics (Final Report) |
| **3.2** | No, what is the general conclusion as to why no data was used? (i.e. it was not needed, did not exist, lack of access, restrictions that prevented its use, confidential) | n/a |
| **4** | Working Group Output (work products/template) Inventory: |  |
| **4.1** | Did the Final Issue Report mention or request the WG to collect data? What kinds of data were included, if any? | Yes, Issue report called for: Research to inform best practices development; provide data to assist pdp; illuminate potential policy options. Broad input from knowledgeable parties was sought. Registrars were encouraged to share lessons learned. Existing questions highlighted by staff; new questions from staff raised; staff resources offered to help benefit fact-finding.  |
| **4.2** | Did the Charter establish a task for the WG to collect data, and if so, what types? | “[T]he Council sought a structured fact-finding effort to examine the issues of fast flux (beyond the staff-authored Issues report), but because no such mechanism exists, this effort was conducted in the context of a PDP. (p.68, Final Report).The task to collect data but the lack of direction and resources seemed to be a large hindrance to this WG, and it recommended that any future effort have a more clearly defined scope p.73, Final Report |
| **4.3** | Did the Final Report refer to data collected? Were recommendations supported by data? | Yes, but it seemed to refer to a lack of data more often than it did to the data that it had on hand. |
| **5** | What types of data may have been useful that was not considered by the WG? If, possible make reference to data that was likely available at the time and did not appear to be used and also make a distinction of data available only today that could have been useful during the past effort. | The final report notes that data collection, DNS monitoring, and data sharing among parties would lead to better understanding (p.12, Final Report).The final report calls for the creation of a FF Reporting System (FFDRS), which would aid further work on this issue (p. 13, Final Report). |
| **6** | What type of problems/difficulties faced during the collection of data, if collected? Any suggestion/proposals to resolve the issues to collect data next easily  |  |
| **7** | Final outcomes of WG effort: | GNSO Resolution (13 JAN 2011)RESOLVED,The Council accepts the approach identified below for the adopted recommendations (see http://gnso.icann.org/meetings/minutes-03sep09.htm) and instructs the ICANN Staff to implement these recommendations as set forth below:1. Adopted recommendation Fast-Flux Working Group (FFWG) #1: To encourage ongoing discussions within the community regarding the development of best practices and / or Internet industry solutions to identify and mitigate the illicit uses of Fast Flux
	1. Proposed implementation: This recommendation is encompassed by the Registration Abuse Policies WG (RAPWG) Malicious Use of Domain Names Recommendation #1 which recommends the creation of non-binding best practices to help registrars and registries address the illicit use of domain names.
2. Adopted FFWG recommendation #2: The Registration Abuse Policy Working Group (RAPWG) should examine whether existing policy may empower Registries and Registrars, including consideration for adequate indemnification, to mitigate illicit uses of Fast Flux;
	1. Implementation completed as it was addressed by the RAP WG in its final report (see http://gnso.icann.org/issues/rap/rap-wg-final-report-29may10-en.pdf)
3. Adopted FFWG recommendation #3: To encourage interested stakeholders and subject matter experts to analyze the feasibility of a Fast Flux Data Reporting System to collect data on the prevalence of illicit use, as a tool to inform future discussions;
	1. The RAPWG Final Report and the Fast-Flux Working Group Final Report indicated that fast-flux is generally a domain use issue and not a domain registration issue, and as such falls outside the purview of the GNSO and ICANN. Therefore no further action is recommended\*.
4. Adopted recommendation #4: To encourage staff to examine the role that ICANN can play as a "best practices facilitator" within the community;
	1. Proposed Implementation: Integrate this recommendation into the RAP WG Recommendation on "Meta Issue: Collection and Dissemination of Best Practices" which recommends that the "GNSO, and the larger ICANN community in general, create and support structured, funded mechanisms for the collection and maintenance of best practices."
5. Adopted FFWG recommendation 5: To consider the inclusion of other stakeholders from both within and outside the ICANN community for any future Fast Flux policy development efforts;
	1. Proposed Implementation:It is assumed that if the Registration Abuse Policies WG's (RAPWG) Malicious Use of Domain Names Recommendation #1 is adopted by the Council, that the subsequent effort will be open to participation by stakeholders from both within and outside the ICANN community.
6. Adopted FFWG recommendation #6: To ensure that successor PDPs on this subject, if any, address the charter definition issues identified in the Fast Flux Final Report.
	1. Proposed Implementation: No action needed at this point, but should be included if any future PDPs are initiated on this subject.
7. Adopted FFWG recommendation #6: To form a Drafting Team to work with support staff on developing a plan with set of priorities and schedule that can be reviewed and considered by the new Council as part of its work in developing the Council Policy Plan and Priorities for 2010.
	1. Proposed Implementation: The Council deems this work to be completed in conjunction with the above-proposed implementation proposals.

RESOLVED FURTHERThe Council now considers the work of the Fast Flux WG complete. As such, the "Fast Flux Council Follow-up" action item is deemed closed and will be deleted from the Pending Project List. |