

At-Large Workspace: Draft NCAP Study 2 Report and Responses to Questions Regarding Name Collisions

Public Comment Close	Statement Name	Status	Assigned Working Group	Assignee (s)	Call for Comments Open	Call for Comments Close	Vote Open	Vote Close	Date of Submission	Staff Contact and Email
28 February 2024	Draft NCAP Study 2 Report and Responses to Questions Regarding Name Collisions	ADOPTED	CPWG	Gregory Shatan Carlton Samuels	21 February 2024	22 February 2024	25 February 2024	28 February 2024	28 February 2024	jennifer.bryce@icann.org

Hide the information below, please click [here](#) >>

Name Collision refers to the situation where a name that is defined and used in one namespace may also appear in another (see the [proposed definition](#) of Name Collisions published by the Security and Stability Advisory Committee). Users and applications intending to use a name in one namespace may actually use it in a different one, and unexpected behavior may result where the intended use of the name is not the same in both namespaces. The circumstances that lead to a name collision could be accidental or malicious.

On 2 November 2017, the ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) was tasked by the ICANN Board in resolutions [2017.11.02.29 - 2017.11.02.31](#) to:

- Conduct a study to present data, analysis and points of view, and provide advice to the Board regarding the risks posed to users and end systems if .CORP, .HOME, .MAIL strings were to be delegated in the root, as well as possible courses of action that might mitigate the identified risks.
- Conduct a study to present data, analysis and points of view and provide advice to the Board on a series of questions regarding name collisions.

The SSAC responded with a proposal for three consecutive studies intended to address the Board's requests. In April 2019, the [NCAP Discussion Group](#) was formed to allow interested members of the ICANN community to participate in the NCAP effort.

The [final NCAP Study 1 report](#), published on 19 June 2020, documented prior work on name collisions and assessed name collision datasets. In response to the findings of Study 1, the NCAP Discussion Group proposed a [redesign](#) of the proposed Study 2 to adjust the study goals, and have the NCAP Discussion Group undertake most of the work slated for paid contractors in the original version of the Study 2 proposal. On 3 March 2021, the ICANN Board [directed](#) the NCAP Discussion Group to proceed with Study 2 as redesigned.

On 22 January 2022, the NCAP Discussion Group published for [Public Comment](#) two draft work products that contribute to the Study 2 work:

- [A Perspective Study of DNS Queries for Non-Existent Top-Level Domains](#): The study's main objective is to provide insights and guidance for future examinations of the DNS name collision data that will be used by ICANN for risk analysis and assessments of TLD string applications.
- [Case Study of Collision Strings](#): Case studies of .corp, .home, .mail, .internal, .lan, and .local using DNS query data from A and J root servers. The case studies highlight changes over time of the properties of DNS queries and traffic alterations as a result of DNS evolution.

The NCAP Discussion Group presented at dedicated sessions at [ICANN74](#), [ICANN75](#), [ICANN76](#), [ICANN77](#) and [ICANN78](#) to ensure the broader community was aware of its work, findings, and pending recommendations.

FINAL VERSION SUBMITTED (IF RATIFIED)

The final version to be submitted, if the draft is ratified, will be placed here by upon completion of the vote.



AL-ALAC-ST-0124-01-00-EN.pdf

FINAL DRAFT VERSION TO BE VOTED UPON BY THE ALAC

The final draft version to be voted upon by the ALAC will be placed here before the vote is to begin.



AL-ALAC-ST-0124-01-00-EN.pdf

DRAFT SUBMITTED FOR DISCUSSION

The first draft submitted will be placed here before the call for comments begins. The Draft should be preceded by the name of the person submitting the draft and the date/time. If, during the discussion, the draft is revised, the older version(S) should be left in place and the new version along with a header line identifying the drafter and date/time should be placed above the older version(s), separated by a Horizontal Rule (available + Insert More Content control).

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1bNw184Xr1WKzdcvoUMR7u3uhxGhD4vXu9tH4SFv-Y1Y/edit?usp=sharing>