

Summary

The document describes a list of metrics for measuring the security level with regards to phishing websites' hosting providers. They have identified hosting providers as the most important actor on which they apply the ideal, existing and defined metrics. The posed risk on hosting providers as defined by the group, is at least partial responsibility to detect and take down fraudulent websites. The group defined ideal metrics from all four aspects as covered by the online lectures, as well as some additional metrics that were not categorized. The existing metrics are: website take down time, number of unique clicks on the phishing websites, percentage of the visitors of the website who provided legitimate information, and a combination of various kinds of attacker information. The dataset used by the group to construct metrics contains URLs and timestamps. Based on this they defined a metric indicating which of the TLDs are under or overrepresented in the dataset. Another defined metric is a ranking of how often certain keywords appear in the URLs.

Strengths of the assignment

The authors clearly show that they have reviewed multiple possible actors before settling on the current one. In addition, there is a clear list of ideal metrics that do seem to be very useful to validate the security against phishing attacks. The section dedicated to describing the metrics used in practice appears to be comprehensive, and does describe nice metrics.

A list of major issues

- The defined metrics are not properly evaluated with the assigned dataset.
- There are no visualizations included in the report validating the metric.
- There is no clear link made between the dataset and the devised metrics.
- The metrics used in practice, does not include any comprehensive frameworks. After a quick Google search I was able to find several frameworks that could be included.
 - A framework of anti-phishing measures aimed at protecting the online consumer's identity by Rika Butler for example.
- The evaluation section is purely theoretical, refraining from providing any insights in the validity of the metrics.

A list of minor issues

- The ideal metrics do seem useful, but an extra sentence could aid in the reasoning why these metrics have been chosen. What can actually be done with the metric.
- Furthermore, an explanation of the different metric categories would have been a good addition.
- There is no structure in the defined metrics section. A clear overview of the defined metrics would help a lot.

Please note that this paper has been received very close to the deadline, limiting our ability to go into more depth on our review.