

Networks of Online Stolen Data Markets How Vendor Flows Connect Digital Marketplaces

Interdisciplinary Conference on Cybercrime June 6, 2022

Marie Ouellet Georgia State University **David Maimon** Georgia State University

Yubao Wu Georgia State University

Funding: This material is based upon work supported by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security under Grant Award Number 17STCIN00001-05-00. The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

Vendor migration

Since the launch of Silk Road in 2011 there has been an increase in the number of digital marketplaces (Van Buskirk et al., 2017)

Vendors are increasingly cross-listing their products across multiple platforms (Décary-Hétu & Giommoni 2017; Ladegaard, 2019; 2020; Norbutas et al., 2020)

The flow of 'market refugees' from seized to neighboring markets key to the resilience of the darknet ecosystem (Ladegaard 2020)

Digital displacement

What motivates offenders' decisions to move their illicit activities to a new location - physical or otherwise?

Economic calculus underlie the decision making of illicit actors on digital platforms (Martin et al., 2020; Reuter & Kleiman, 1986)

Social forces "If Silk Road is down, everyone moves to Agora, if Agora is down everyone moves to Evo … and so on [...] the DNM's user base is VERY herd like" (Moeller et al., 2017, p. 1434).



Current study

Digital trace data on the darkweb

Weekly data across 30 English-language marketplaces that sell stolen data products on the darkweb

Database compiles information on:

- Vendor profiles
- Product ratings
- Vendor ratings
- Product descriptions

Interviews with vendors involved in the sale of stolen data

Digital trace data on the darkweb





Vendor Reviews:

Pavanern 🚖 🚖 🚖 🚖

Buyed product: Undetectable fake passports

6 days to Texas, nice on 25/03/2020

Ownarrali 🚖 🚖 🚖 🚖 🚖 Buyed product: Undetectable fake ID cards

Just received the documents, thank you on 08/03/2020

Fayin 🚖 🚖 🚖 🚖

Buyed product: Undetectable fake Driver's License

Thank you for this opportunity on 03/03/2020

Uzudeemi 🚖 🚖 🚖 🚖

Buyed product: Undetectable fake ID cards

Everything went quickly and clean, I got the documents on 01/03/2020

Teffra 🚖 🚖 🚖 🚖

Buyed product: Undetectable fake passports

Thanks to this seller, now I'm a new person on 01/03/2020

Kiashesl 🛧 🛧 🛧 🛧

everything is cool, my documents came yesterday on 24/02/2020

GOLD BUYER Ieladdyan 🚖 🚖 🚖 🚖

Buyed product: Undetectable fake Driver's License



Undetectable fake ID cards

\$699.00 \$299.00





Market and vendor trends on online stolen data marketplaces

Market-level trends Number of vendors



8

Market-level trends Number of listings





Vendor displacement after a disruption

What drives vendors' decisions to migrate to new marketplaces?

Where do vendors migrate after a marketplace seizure?

POLICY \ US & WORLD \ TECH \

Authorities have taken down the dark web's largest illegal marketplace

DarkMarket had almost 500,000 users By Ian Carlos Campbell | @soupsthename | Jan 12, 2021, 8:57pm EST



https://www.theverge.com/2021/1/12/22227929/darkmarket-shutdown-europol-worlds-largest-illegal-marketplace

A network approach

Marketplace networks created by vendor flows (nodes = markets, ties = stock of vendors who move between any set of markets)

Outcome variable: **intensity of vendor flows** (vendor out-flows one month before and after the seizure of Dark Market Jan 11, 2021)

Sample:17 markets, 979 vendor aliases, and 221,094 product listings

Vendor flows pre-seizure

Vendor flows *post*-seizure





Size: 17 markets

Size: 17 markets

Vendor flows pre-seizure

Vendor flows post-seizure





Size: 17 markets In-degree centralization: .401

Size: 17 markets In-degree centralization: .301

Covariates of vendor flows Number of vendors on a marketplace. Proxy of supply (or anonymity)

Price changes on a marketplace. Proxy of demand

Reciprocity. Vendor flows Market A -> B, Market B -> A

Transitivity. Vendor flows Market A -> B & Market A -> C, Market B -> C

Network lag term. Vendor flows in the prior one-month period

The drivers of vendor flows

Exponential random graph models

| Variables | Pre-seizure network | Markets with more vendors were less likely to experience out-flows to other |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|--|
| Sum | 233 (.220) | - marketplaces |
| Market variables | | Markets that had a drop in listing prices |
| N vendors - receiving market | 001 (.001) | were more likely to experience out-flows |
| N vendors – sending market | 003* (.001) | of vendors to other markets |
| Price change – receiving market | 009 (.024) | |
| Price change – sending | 114** (.039) | Out-flows of vendors to other markets |
| market | | tended not to be reciprocated from the |
| Network variables | | receiving market |
| Reciprocity | 582* (.240) | |
| Transitivity | .290 (.189) | Vendor flows between markets were |
| Prior network structure | .670*** (.139) | guided by the collective patterns of |
| AIC | -32.16 | where individuals had moved in the |
| BIC | -3.31 | past |

*** *p* < .001, ** *p* < .01, * *p* < .05, [†] *p* < .10

The drivers of vendor flows

Exponential random graph models

| Variables | Pre-seizure network | Post-seizure network | / | Markets with more vendors were more likely to experience |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| Sum | 233 (.220) | 824*** (.232) | / | |
| Market variables | | | | Vendors were more likely to |
| N vendors - receiving market | 001 (.001) | .003 [†] (.001) | / | move to and from markets that |
| N vendors – sending market | 003* (.001) | .004* (.001) | | nad price drops |
| Price change – receiving market | 009 (.024) | 040** (.013) | | Out flows of wondors to other |
| Price change – sending | 114** (.039) | 034*** (.009) | | markets tended not to be |
| market | | | | reciprocated |
| Network variables | | | | |
| Reciprocity | 582* (.240) | 918*** (.189) | / | Vendors were more likely to |
| Transitivity | .290 (.189) | .854*** (.220) | / | move to markets that had a |
| Prior network structure | .670*** (.139) | .340*** (.123) | | shared market in common |
| AIC | -32.16 | -62.36 | | Vendors were more likely to |
| BIC | -3.31 | -33.51 | | move to markets where their |
| | | | - | peers moved to in the past |

*** *p* < .001, ** *p* < .01, * *p* < .05, [†] *p* < .10

Digital marketplaces as an ecosystem

Marketplaces are highly connected by vendors who span multiple platforms, and an intervention increased the connectivity of marketplaces

"i have plenty of backup storefronts already active and my customers will know how to find me not super difficult." [vendor azon]

"I initially got grandfathered into one of the top markets places also known as white house market, thats where all the real players are. From white house i was able to get vendor bond waived on almost every other market place" [vendor peachmon] Vendor flows shaped by both economic and social forces Changes in market demand shaped vendor decisions to move from a marketplace, and which market they moved to

"If I see something that's a good deal i will buy it just for the sole intention to resell but always bulk listings obviously, that's how you make money" (vendor akon)

Vendor flows were more likely to occur between marketplaces where their peers had moved to in the past

Limitations and next steps

- Data from vendors who listed stolen data products on darknet marketplaces
- The impact of a single shock
- Distinguishing between *vendor migration* and *vendor cross-use* of platforms



Thank you! Questions?

Interdisciplinary Conference on Cybercrime June 6, 2022

Marie Ouellet Georgia State University **David Maimon** Georgia State University

Yubao Wu Georgia State University

mouellet@gsu.edu