
KATHY SCHNITT: Thank you, Jay. Recording the NCAP discussion group Teleconference on Wednesday the 24th of April 2019, and Jay, I will hand it back over to you.

JAY DALEY: Thank you, so welcome to the first NCAP discussion group. We are going to start off some introductions from those of us who are running this group, and we are going to explain a bit about how this discussion group will be managed and talk a bit about what SOIs mean there.

So, just to be clear at the outset, of the non-SSAC people, the non-ICANN staff people on the call, we believe only two of you have submitted SOIs, which are Steve Crocker and Rubens Kuhl. So I will be asking you two to introduce yourselves directly in a moment, but others we have not had any SOIs from so we won't be asking you to introduce yourselves or to participate properly, though Jim will explain a bit more about that.

So, my name is Jay Daley, I'm one of the two co-chairs of this. I am an SSAC member and in the ICANN space I'm also on the board of .ORG, and a rector ICANN attendee as an independent consultant. Jim, would you like to introduce yourself?

JAMES GAVIN: Thanks Jay, James Gavin for the record, I am also one of the co-chairs of the NCAP work discussion group here and work party. I am an SSAC member, for ICANN purposes I do work for Afiliias, one of the registered

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

service providers in the ICANN community and even prior to my employment at Afiliast, I have been an ICANN member for quite a long time. So I think that my introduction. So thanks Jay, back to you.

JAY DALEY: Great, thank you, Julie could you introduce yourself?

JULIE HAMMER: Certainly, I am Julie Hammer, I'm vice-chair at SSAC and I am retired, I have no company affiliations and no interest in a commercial sense in the outcome of this work. I am on the NCAP admin committee which oversees this whole project and looks after or participates in managing the financial aspects. Thank you.

JAY DALEY: Right, thank you. Steve Sheng.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, my name is Steve Sheng, I am the staff support for SSAC. For this project, at this moment Kathy and I served as interim secretariat for the discussion group who helped to manage cost, manage SOI submissions, subscribe to the [inaudible] we will continue serving this until a permanent solution has been found, for a permanent secretariat for this project. Thank you.

JAY DALEY: Thanks. Kathy.

KATHY SCHNITT: Hi, thank you, my name is Kathy Schnitt, and I'm SSAC support for SSAC and interim with NCAP, so I am the one you will be reaching out to submit SOIs and any questions you may have. So I'm happy to be here.

JAY DALEY: Okay, thank you. Matt Larson. Sorry folks, Matt is not on the call yet, so we will come back to him. So there are two – Is Rod on the call now, sorry? Yes Rod is on the call now, Rod, if you can introduce yourself please.

ROD RASMUSSEN: You hear me now?

JAY DALEY: Yes.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay good, I'm Rod Rasmussen, SSAC chair, no affiliation with anything as I am also [inaudible] I'm participating in this in a role as SSAC chair [inaudible]. Thanks.

JAY DALEY: Okay, thank you. Matt Larson, come back to you.

MATT LARSON: Sorry, rebooting the laptop with audio issues. My name is Matt Larson, I am Vice President of Research in the office of the CTO. I am ICANN.ORG staff and as we're going to explain a little later the logistics of the project, OCTO will be coordinating a lot of the actual work, and so I am the person ultimately responsible in OCTO for that.

JAY DALEY: Great, thank you, Matt. So now I am going to turn to the non-SSAC members who have signed up the statement of interest, so Steve Crocker in you could introduce yourself, please.

STEVE CROCKER: Hello, thank you, my name is Steve Crocker, I am no longer a member of SSAC but was for many years and I watched this problem appear over the years and get discussed over time, so I have multiple thoughts about it, a rather short note that I hope circulated and available for this call, but just to get things started, my basic thought is that framing the problem is the most important thing and I'm not sure that I have seen that properly. It makes me nervous about going out on a [inaudible] or doing a lot of work. I think that we will make a great deal more progress if we have a clear statement of what the issue is, then identify whether or not we need any hard data. If we do, that's fine but we should know why we need it and what we are going to do with it after we get it.

JAY DALEY: Right, thank you Steve. We have a definition and collusion that will be shared later on in the meeting. Rubens Kuhl, you also submitted an SOI.

RUBENS KUHL: Thanks Jay, Rubens Kuhl here. I am a computer Engineer disguised as a marketing and policy guy. I work for NIC.br, a ccTLD registry operator and gTLD [inaudible] provider. I have been dealing with this thing since I was an applicant, so if you have read any of the comments from the then existing new] gTLD applicant group, and the from the [inaudible] stakeholder group, I usually co-wrote all of those. Although I serve in other groups like the GNSO Council and [inaudible] leadership, I need to be perfectly clear that I do not represent any of those groups [inaudible] stakeholder group, GNSO Council or subsequent procedures [inaudible] in this group while I can facilitate any connection that anybody wants to do. Thanks.

JAY DALEY: Great, thank you. Now I am going to turn to the SSAC members who have submitted their SOIs and ask them to briefly introduce themselves please. And there may be a short pause while we find you and mute you on the list as we do this. So, do I have Barry on the call? I don't think we do, do we? So next on the list would be Chris, sorry.

CHRIS ROOSENRAAD: And I am unmuted, can you hear me?

JAY DALEY: Yes, we can.

CHRIS ROOSENRAAD: Excellent, right, this is Chris Roosenraad, I'm on the ICANN SSAC. For a day job I am the head of computer security architecture at Capital One Bank in the United States, and as such, I have no business interest in the domain space of any kind. Prior to this I worked at New Star and prior to that Time Warner Cable, but I am no longer with either. Thank you.

JAY DALEY: Great, fantastic. Jaap? We're just going to try again, Jaap you were muted.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: Ah yes, I'm unmuted now. I'm Jaap Akkerhuis and I am on SSAC from the beginning, and in my day job, I'm actually at NLnet Labs and we are not doing anything in the domain name space as [inaudible], but we do provide software for doing DNS, and so that's the interest in what I have.

JAY DALEY: Great, thank you, Jaap. Patrik Fältström is not on the call as far as I can tell, his put in an SOI. Ram Mohan is not on the call, he's also submitted an SOI. Russ Mundy, is Russ on the call? Yes Russ, if you would like to introduce yourself as well please. Just wait to be unmuted.

RUSS MUNDY: Am I unmuted?

JAY DALEY: Yes.

RUSS MUNDY: Good, yes, I'm Russ Mundy, my regular day job is with a company named Parsons, which does a wide range of things but none of which involving registry or registrar services. Also do a small amount of consulting relating to various internet infrastructure activities and have been involved in SSAC from the beginning and this is a piece of work that is of great personal interest personally to me, and that's primarily my involvement. Back to you Jay, thank you.

JAY DALEY: Great, thank you. Jaap. There are two SSAC members who are not on the call who have submitted their SOIs as well. Merike Kaeo who is the SACC representative on the ICANN board and Warren Kumari. So I'm going to hand over now to Jim to explain how this discussion group will be managed and the SOIs. Before I do, I will just note in future we will not do this level of introduction, all we will do is when someone new submits an SOI we will get them to introduce themselves for that meeting, but we are not going to do this level of introductions again in future. Thank you, over to you, Jim.

JAMES GAVIN: Thanks Jay. So James Gavin again for the record. And another detail to add to what Jay just said is we will adopt a typical thing that happens in PDP processes within ICANN. At the start of each call we will offer an opportunity for folks to announce if they have updated their SOI. One

of your obligations as participant here is to make sure that you keep that up to date. So if you ever make a change to it, and you should always do that in a timely way, at the next meeting you will have an opportunity to say that you updated it and whatever change was relevant there. It's just important to put that out there for the record as part of this whole process.

We are going to, the important part of this group is that in order to participate as an active participant and in particular on teleconferences in order to speak and participate and for the mailing list in order to send messages to the list directly you do need to have completed an SOI and have it published on the community WIKI page for this project. That's a little bit formality. It's consistent with the way ordinary ICANN processes work and GNSO and PDP processes and we are adopting that for this.

So in the future it is just something to keep in mind and for those on the call this time, you know you're just observers, observers will always be permitted to be on the calls, to listen, you will be able to participate in the chat room of course, you can always type things there and enter information there. But the only way to actually contribute directly is to join the discussion group or to pass comments on to someone who might bring it forward on your behalf to the group as a way for it to be considered as part of our discussion.

So this might be a good opportunity just to pause for a moment any case anyone has any questions about that process, before we move on to the next item on the agenda. I am not seeing any hands or notes in the chat rooms so let me just turn that back over to you, Jay.

JAY DALEY:

Great. So, just to finish up there, just a reminder, that if you want to participate you need to submit your SOI, it's a really painless and straightforward thing to do. There is no gating of those, we are asking you to do it. We will move on now then. So we've already done item 2 on the agenda, introduction from discussion group members. We're going to move onto item 3, introduction to NCAP.

Now to make this slightly easier I am going to put up a presentation that we provided in Barcelona ICANN meeting. I just want to talk through some bits so we can understand that. I am going to go slightly different way around the agenda, I am going to talk about definition first so that we have that understood and also gets us straight into some technical things as well since I think most people here would like to do something technical.

Right, so definition number 1: We have things that we regard as in Scope and the subject of data studies. That's definitely important, because when we get to part 2 later on we will talk about things that are in Scope but that will not be based on data studies, just so that is clear.

So the first one is the one that everybody is aware of. User Alice uses dot.example in the private context and dot.example is now delegated in the public DNS and user Alice suffers adverse impact as a result. So, those for example are where we have the private use of .Corp, .Home and .Mail, and if those 3 are delegated then private users of those may

suffer adverse impact as a result and that is something that we are investigating.

The next one is where [inaudible] Alice uses example as a label anywhere except as a private use TLD and relies on search list processing where the label example is the terminal label as an intermediate step in that search list processing. Now, for those of you who don't understand DNS deeply, there is a little explanation here, that somebody in a company that -- and that company is say example.com -- may instead of having to type out the full domain name of Dashboard .example .com, can currently just get away with typing Dashboard.example, and because of search list processing, that will end up working okay.

And as a result of dot.example being registered in the public DNS, that behavior now changes. So those are two forms of name collision where we believe are in scope and data is required to investigate those. Before I take questions on this, I am going to go through the rest of it because I don't want any questions to come on in the later bits. I will open this up to questions in just a moment.

So we now move onto things that are in Scope but will be addressed with general advice not the subject of data studies. So this is where [inaudible] Alice uses example.com, it could be any TLD, and Dot.example is now registered in the public DNS and patient Alice now receives multiple queries as a result of search list processing of domains under Dot.example. Our advice on this would be that this ordinary DNS, this already happened, this isn't something new being introduced by delegation of new gTLDs or anything like that.

The next one will be when [inaudible] Alice uses Dot.example as a top level domain in the public DNS and then lets the registration expire. Registrant [inaudible] then registers and delegates Dot.example and traffic intended for Alice [inaudible] Dot.example is now received by Bob's use. This is again an ordinary thing that happens at second levels or third levels [inaudible], it simply doesn't happen at the root so far, but it's an ordinary part of DNS and our advice is [inaudible] dealt with by policy and we may make some suggestions on that.

Then the third one of these is that Registrant uses example.com and lets the registration expire. Registrant Bob then registers and delegates example.com and traffic intended for one is picked up by the other, and that's exactly the same as the one before. This happened all the time and this is not something that we're not going to do any data study of and our advice will be deal with this by policy and we may make some suggestions around that if that felt to be important but otherwise that is a policy issue.

And then the things that are out of Scope to be explicit, are big flip traffic, so this is where cosmic rays change a single bit in a DNS query and for those of you who don't operate with it, it is mainly our large servers. You may not realize this is actually very common. We've ruled this out of Scope because there is no intent behind this, it's an accidental thing that happens, believe it or not, due to cosmic ray. It already happens with .NA and .NO. So we are not going to get involved in that. And the other thing we are ruling out of Scope is general IDN confusion issues.

So returning to the first part of things that are in Scope, subject to data studies. From those that have provided SOIs and others, do we have any questions about that? And Jim and I for this first meeting may be tolerant of people who haven't signed up SOIs if they have questions as well.

STEVE CROCKER:

I have a question. I don't know if you are asking for hands to be raised or not. I listened and I caught most of it but I would want to read and understand very precisely the cases that you laid out and so I am feeling a little behind, but I appreciate that you laid out the case, like the structure of it but I sort of need a table or the details laid down.

JAY DALEY:

Okay, that's fine. We haven't had any plans for doing this any other way, are you comfortable working through this text at some point, Steve?

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah, I didn't have text in front of me as you talking and now I do. I can't scroll, right, so --

JAY DALEY:

No no, we can send this again to the list. I'll send that back to the list. Does anyone have any other questions? If anyone who is only an observer has a question, please just raise your hand, so I can spot it, otherwise we will move on from the definition side of things.

JAMES GAVIN: This is Jim, I will just point out that Jeff Newman noticed an error on the slide, his got it in the chat room there.

JAY DALEY: That's completely unacceptable. Right, okay, because I am presenting I can't actually see the chat room, or it's a hidden window somewhere I can't find. That's an error I would like to right. If there is no other questions I would like to move on from that. So back to the agenda. Ah, I found the chat window. Right, so we will move on then.

The next thing to explain about, I've explained about conflict of interest, so we are going to explain about structural and how this is going to work, from the way it was originally set up to why it's going to work differently. So this is originally intended to be a straightforward NCAP work party and it came from a very lengthy and very specific board resolution asking SSAC to do something.

However, there are some important differences from any other SSAC work party with this. The first one is the initiation I just mentioned with the very specific outcomes and the detailed board resolution. SSAC work parties do not normally have a specific outcome, they're normally a research discussion that ends up working its way into whatever consensus appropriate outcome it.

The second thing is that this requires allegation of its own budget, which is again entirely unusual. It must be developed to a specific timetable with possibly significant dependency on that timetable and requires

profession time management, ongoing monitoring and regular form of communication. So back in Summer time, I think for those in the Northern Hemisphere, we, SSAC went to the board, technical committee and we said we don't think this is an ordinary NCAP working party, it needs to be managed as an ICANN project. And it is now being managed as an ICANN project with OCTO responsible FOR delivering on that project.

The structure, this is effectively -- we have a steering group for the board technical [inaudible] leadership in OCTO which monitors [inaudible] direction and progress of the project; ICANN ORG manages [inaudible] project and manages procurement, and in particular manages the contracting of statements of work for contractors; and the role of SSAC and this discussion group is about technical input, guidance and analysis at well defined stages. So that is the new overall structure of this project.

Okay the final thing I am going to explain of the 3 studies -- and I don't have a policy to explain there, sorry I don't have anything to show there. I'll simply describe this one for you. The first study is to look at previous work in this space and to summarize that previous work and to identify what more needs to be done beyond that. [Inaudible] can be carried forward into this work, and which can't. And there are some obvious things I think we are going to find in there that the original work did not use a lot of resolver data, it used mainly authoritative server data and there are some other things I think we're likely to find there. So that's the first study which we're going to discuss more under current work down there, item 4 on the agenda.

Then the second study is the data analysis segment and this is where we are trying to identify, I may actually have it on the slide, I will check. No. This is where we are trying to identify a series of specific things related to name collisions. We are trying to identify what is -- I'll just see if I actually have that presentation that might explain this a little bit more - no. So we are trying to identify what specifically happens within the name collision. We're trying to look at identifying the causes of it, the effects of it and have a structure around that so that we can understand name collisions as observed in data. So that's study 2, and then study 3 is to observe the impact of mitigations on that, and it's also to search and find out as many mitigations as possible.

So those are the 3 steps related, three studies of this project in a nutshell. Do I have any questions or anything about that at all? Steve, go ahead.

STEVE CROCKER:

Yeah, so I can't quite tell from the description you've given but as I indicated, this is not a fresh subject; we've been through this lots and lots and lots. One could sit down, or a tiny group could sit down and lay out pretty much what's known past and qualitatively about all of this, and then the question that I would have is, what more do you need to know that is related to providing the answers that the board is looking for.

I'd be happy to be just abused to this, but it feels like there is a pressure to go forward with a lot of energy and money to do a lot of data analysis and data gathering without having clarity in view of where you're trying

to go, and the implicit message there is, if you do know where you're trying to go, it could be that you can get there much more quickly and much less expensively. Or it could be that you need to do something different than what's being planned here. So I'm questioning whether the goal structure and the plan work are aligned properly with each other.

JAY DALEY: Okay, thank you, Steve. Before I respond to that, Rubens, you have your hand up. Go ahead.

RUBENS KUHL: Thanks, can you hear me?

JAY DALEY: Yes, we can now.

RUBENS KUHL: Just to comment, a good part of study one, because what was done subsequent procedures, specifically Work Track 4 looking for name collisions, so most of it is already done in reviewing any information that was already published, risking and linking that, later listing a link weak space, I don't know where I collected that. Later I sent to the list a link to the wiki space for Work Track form where we collected that. So most of the man hours of study one should probably be saved in using that. I'm not saying to use any of the conclusions of the working group, which is there now, because only the initial report was published, but most of

the data including data that wasn't published before that PDP, [inaudible] staff to publish it including which were the reported collisions, what they affected.

This is all now public material and it wasn't before the PDP, so most of the data is actually existing now. So, most of it should be pretty quick most of the work of a technical writer, not of a network researcher. So hope we can save some bucks down there. Thanks.

JAY DAILY:

Okay, thank you. So just dealing with those two points in turn. So first of all Steve, we have a very detailed and very specific board resolution with a series that expects some very specific outcomes from that. I'm going to put that up on the screen so that we can see what that is so that you can see just how detailed that is as a request. And so this is what largely what is driving the nature of this project is in order to get that up on this.

Okay, so I hope you can all see I've got the right screen up the board request here. Jim can just nod if that's the right one. No, it's not the right one. Okay, that's fine. Sorry. Oh, it was the right one. Yes. Okay. Sorry.

JAMES GALVIN:

It just took a moment to change up.

JAY DAILY: Right. So as you can see the, there are several things that we are being asked to do here. The proper definition which we're working on, the role that negative answers play, but further on down potential residual risks and then the big stuff suggested criteria for determining whether done delegator string should be considered a string manifest name collisions such more criteria and then measures to protect against things. There is quite a significant output expected from this project and that is why we are aiming to do such a large piece of work in order to deliver that output there. Okay. I think it may be useful as recirculating that as well so that we have that understood. Okay. Yes, Steve? Just need to unmute you. Hold on Steve, please.

STEVE CROCKER: I guess.

JAY DAILY: Go ahead.

STEVE CROCKER: Okay, thank you. Thank you for this and probably a good thing to circulate this to the group. As I read it and then taking the point of view that I was expressing before I go down there and I say okay, some of these are answerable the early parts are answerable because they are structural and qualitative in nature. So you can explain sort of what the causes are, there's a few known ones. You can explain what the impact is and you covered some of those, and then the later questions are fuzzy in two respects because they require characterizing sort of how much

collision is important or meaningful and then it also requires going out measuring how much of that actually happens.

Where in the process is it expected that the thresholds will be defined? So suppose you go out and you say okay, this string gets the following amount of action. And if it's delegated it'll cause this many collisions across these too many people. So suppose you knew all that, how do you translate that into the criteria for determining whether or not an undelegated string should be considered and to keep pushing on that point, can you answer that question prior to doing the measurement?

JAY DAILY:

So, we have discussed this and we may not actually end up doing that. It may be that all we do is provide the data and that is a judgment that the ICANN board or technical material someone needs to make and that's why we're not keen to do that up front to understand those thresholds. And I think we'd like to see the level of data first to understand that. Jim, you wanted to add something.

JAMES GALVIN:

Yeah, if I may I also want to call out that you know, in essence the part of study to which is important here which contributes is understanding the root cause of name collisions. So in order to get to that process of establishing that criteria and those lines and that subjective analysis, you need to study one side of it of ensuring that there's data also identifying if there's any gaps and then if we have what we need or what we need to go get in order to proceed with study two which is about the root cause analysis of name collisions so that we can begin to

develop those criteria and that subjective analysis that you're talking about Steve.

So I think there's plenty of room in the way this project is laid out in the proposal to do exactly the work that you're looking for. We can certainly question whether or not we've got the right sequence of tasks laid out. And interested in what you think about that, but I believe where I believe we've got it covered as far as the opportunity is concerned.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you for unmuting me. So, two comments. I guess on two different aspects on the whether you've got the root causes covered and hence you want to go out and do survey. I get that, on the other hand if you know if all of us and even if sort of an arbitrary half of us were in a room, we would be able to jot down in a few minutes most of what is known about the root causes. The only issue that one might raise is whether or not we know for sure that we've covered them all but we're not unknowledgeable or inexperienced at all. This is quite a bit of data about this.

So I would recommend that we start with a candidate list of what we think the root causes are and then use the survey process for validation and for the ones that we think and exploration of any of the ones that we think might be an addition. But just a straightforward survey strikes me as kind of too blunt and a unknowledgeable. That's a comment.

The other comment that came to mind was very first thing you said Jay about what the board is asking for and saying basically it's out of scope

for this group to suggest the specific criteria so we'll provide the information and leave it to them to make the decision. Let me speak very strongly in my prior capacity as chairman of the board. I hate that answer and the reason why I hate that answer is because the board and I don't know if the current board I can't speak for them of course. I don't know if they take some attitude but I'll tell you what my attitude would be.

The board has quite a lot of expertise but it is not a subject but it is not organized as a subject matter expert on the topic that we're talking about. It really wants solid proposals and it then checks for process and it checks for credibility and feasibility and so forth but having the ICANN board sit there and make up the criteria or determine what it is isn't a good match with what the remit and structure and function of the board is so then that leaves a big hole. Where is that judgment going to come from?

And if it isn't within this group and it isn't in the board, I mean, we got a very very talented set of people on this call been involved with ICANN. There aren't any mysterious hidden places. We know where things are. So how is that going to get done? And the reason why I feel strongly about that is because I think there's much to be gained by having clarity of that and if you have clarity of that, I have a feeling it can sharpen and make much more efficient the process that we're engaged in here.

JAY DAILY:

Okay, thank you Steve. I think the main concern here is that we all have, that someone has to make a judgment about what is an

acceptable level of harm to the global internet from allowing certain things to go ahead and that's not clear that it is something that this group should be making a decision about but we will get to that I think through this process so no decisions have been made about that so I'm comfortable for us to believe that.

I'm going to move on from now for that and come back to Ruben's point that he raised. So Rubens this is the first I've heard about this and it sounds as if you are saying that we don't need to do this because GNSO has helpfully done it all for us in the sub pro and we can simply take that forward. Is that as in study one is that a paraphrase or is there more depth to that? Hold on a moment Rubens before you --

Go ahead Rubens, you're unmuted now.

RUBENS KUHL:

That's it. I believe most of the working collection references is already being done. But I like the auto or group members judge for themselves. Just writing an email message to the list including these references. It can send hearing the chat the main three or preferences you said that they collect report from ICANN contractors, comments from applicants, comment from the root zone operator. You see comments from people that father being collision was a very troublesome issue you see comments from people that see that it's not a problem at all. So it's already collected --

JAY DAILY: So, can I just stop you Rubens, sorry? Great so what you're saying is that the references are collected but there's the DNSO or sub pro hasn't done an analysis of those. They'll prove prior work to understand whether there are any more work needed on those. It simply put together that list of references of all prior work.

RUBENS KUHL: Not just that made it on that list and discussions what the group generated an initial report suggesting Collision measures for the next procedure. So it goes beyond that. But even if you --

JAY DAILY: Okay.

RUBENS KUHL: have a look at the part of reference, which was I what I was mentioned there are mostly dead already.

JAY DAILY: Okay, so, can you also send us a link to what the sub pro has suggested should be the measures for the next round then that would be useful for us to see. Okay, so I'm going to finish up this section now since we're already getting into study one and hand it over to Jim to manage the rest of this discussion.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks Jay. So the next item on the agenda was to talk about NCAPP study one here and let me say a little bit about the process that's going on here. I appreciate all of this discussion that we've been having about how we're going to move forward and the elements that we need. This is important and we do want to take all of this on board even with respect to what Rubens was saying, you know, if we have that on the mailing list that becomes input to what we're doing here with study one.

What we'd like to do is we do need as in order to move forward to be able to issue an RFP looking for the professional help that's going to go forward on beginning with study one and perhaps with the other studies. But you know, they'll all be dealt with separately and we had this project the way it was currently laid out in the project proposal which folks will find on the community wiki page for NCAPP. There is this study one and we had a set of tasks to find for study one, which you're seeing up on the screen here. If you scroll down a little bit more there for me.

The first study goals is something I'll touch on these a little bit here. What we would like to do is to review these goals and I'll take a moment to also review the work product deliverables at the bottom. We'd really like to have this discussion group review the project proposal and these particular elements in specifically so that we can hand them over to OCTO to Matt Larson in particular and they will turn that into a statement of work that they will use to issue for an RFP and in order to move this along certainly is part of that.

We need to continue to have this discussion we're having about whether or not you know study one is properly framed and the things that we need to accomplish. As it stating up here at the top, you know, there are essentially three goals that we're trying to get out of study one and we've been talking a little bit about the first goal here, which is examining all prior work that we can find and collect and clearly the sub pro track for as put together quite a reference list of activities and documents that they have found.

Steve has been talking about some particular elements of framing the question that needs to be answered or at least needs to be researched as part of looking at this prior work and what Jay was referencing when he was responding to some of those questions is that what we need to do is we want someone to actually look at all these reports and provide summaries and examine them and consider their completeness.

And then into the second goal, look for gaps. Where is there, you know conclusions or recommendations that might be missing where were the things that they hadn't considered in their reports that really ought to be examined going forward and in particular is there any additional data that might be useful or helpful in moving forward as we consider looking at the root cause of name collisions and as we begin the process of examining the kinds of conclusions that we want to come to.

I think as Steve was suggesting, you know, it's useful for us as part of our working with this first contractor, you know to lay out these kinds of questions and issues and make sure that they address them. In fact, this is a good time to mention that one of the things that we expect of whatever contractor is ultimately selected that several people, one or

more people from that contractor will actually be added to the discussion group list and we will be able to work with them iteratively to the process. This will not be a siloed work and or a siloed study will have the opportunity to shape these things as we go along as we learn as we understand what it is that we're trying to accomplish here and our path for getting there.

And of course, it's important to know just from an ICANN context that a third goal of this study one is not just an examination of everything that's been done and then an analysis to look for gaps that we might need to also fill in as part of moving on but there needs to be some recommendation and advice, you know from that contractor based on what they've seen and they're working with us in developing their work product here, you know, do they think that this project should continue?

There's a very clear checkpoint and the final board resolution in releasing the budget to actually ask ourselves the question of whether we should go on with studies two and three. So I think that speaks a little bit to some of the concerns that folks have raised here about whether or not we need to go on or if we're going to get everything we need and we can jump to you know conclusions here and fill it out.

Just scroll down to the bottom here. I just want to touch on specifically the deliverables and lay that out. In general, you know, we're taking a little bit of time here to cover a few specific details for this group just to bring people up to speed so you can see where we are and what our plan is for progressing. But all of this of course has been distributed to the list. It's in the project proposal. We don't in general expect to

spend as much time going over this information in the future, you know, ideally we're suggesting folks should make sure to go back and you know pick up this project proposal and review it in detail so that you can comment more fully if not today.

We certainly have some time. We're not looking to make a final decision or consensus today. We would just like to move this along smartly here. So, you know, encourage folks to consider the project deliverables that we're looking for from study one, Jay did present that SSAC had considered and has created a bit of a definition of name collisions as a baseline to start our discussions.

Steve Crocker made reference early on to the fact that he has also proposed some context for a definition, you know part of study one is to examine precisely this question and make sure that we have consensus in the community at large about exactly what the problems face is, in which we're working. So there's ample opportunity here to move forward with that. It'll be one of the work products. What is our definition and all of the details and explanation that go with that word of course did very clearly ask us for that as one of the nine deliverables and questions that the board asked us for in this space.

We expect as we go through study one and with all of the future studies and any future work, you know to be conducting informal consultations with the public and that'll come in a variety of forms, and we're going to leave it to the contractors and park to work through that, you know we'll be using ICANN meetings to make presentations, there will be opportunities through the community wiki for folks to submit things that they want to make sure we consider so there's ample opportunity

to be inclusive of the community and thorough with respect to input that we can get which was also a requirement from the board. We're going to set up mechanisms so all of that can happen and this study group will be responsible for reviewing all of that

We're looking for the contractor to help us keep all of that organized and construct the final work product from our deliberations and all of the material that they can gather as well as being able to give us an overview and summary of all of that background and feedback that they can they can get from this.

So with that let me pause and say two things any comments or immediate reactions from people, let's have some discussion. We're looking for the following questions to be answered. Is there any additional clarity that you think is important as part of this statement of work as to ensure that it goes into the statement of work that will be created as we seek a contractor to help us? And then two, are there any gaps in this request of deliverables and in the tasks that you can go back and review the project proposal.

So those are the two questions where we're looking to have answered in the not too distant future. I mean, we'll have some discussion today. We can continue that discussion on the mailing list and over the next few weeks until it looks like you know, we've got some consensus and we know where we are. Ideally we can try to manage that within a small number of weeks. And so with that I see that Steve Crocker has his hand up. So let me go to you Steve.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. What is the estimated time and cost of this of phase one, first study? Are we talking about two weeks at a hundred K or we talking about, you know, nine months and a million dollars or what?

JAMES GALVIN: So in terms of level of effort the way the project proposal is written in this is actually documented in the project proposal. We imagine that the full calendar time associated with this work is about six months. But ultimately, you know, again we expect that to be iterative with the contractor with this discussion group and it will depend a little bit on what the contractor thinks and so we have to wait for them to make proposals and you know, they'll be reviewed from the set of people who submit and we'll see how that turns out, but we're imagining a calendar time of about six months.

STEVE CROCKER: But that's the whole thing or that's the first piece?

JAMES GALVIN: That's just study one, the final work product out of study one we expect to be done in about six months.

STEVE CROCKER: And do you have any sense of the range of the cost that you're expecting?

JAMES GALVIN:: We do but we're not discussing that publicly that is something which OCTO does have and has managed as an ordinary part of their procurement process. Of course, ICANN has drafted potential budgets based on level of effort that's been proposed and associated expenses, but that's all being held just to the NCAP admin committee and to the BTC the ICANN board technical committee and ICANN of course.

STEVE CROCKER: Just for fun, let me suggest that six months feels like a long time that you could get pretty close to the end product the same thing you're getting six months in one month and I'm serious about that. I mean this is, and you can probably get it from more than one source. You can probably get multiple one month efforts in parallel that would all tell you pretty much the same thing.

In the chat room as a separate matter closely related not quite identical, but very closely related effect came up during the site finder effect in 2003. And so I would recommend including the extensive documentation both the meetings that were recorded and documented and presentations made and then the SSAC report that came out later in 2004. I know it's a long time ago and it feels like it's slightly different but in effect it was similar to Collision and there were the same kind of issues raised about what kind of harm it cost to the unsuspecting affected parties.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay, so let me just quickly respond and say I'm sure that Matt Larson is listening intently to the suggestion that this will take a month rather

than the approximate six months that we had imagined in the project proposal and let me ask Steve that you take a detailed look at the study tasks that are laid out in the in the project proposal in the full proposal.

And yeah, if you could say something on the list about how you imagine all of this being laid out, and thank you to Steve Sheng or Crocker, Steve Cheng or Kathy, whoever stole that back, folks can see what the tasks are that's there and you know make a concrete suggestion to you know, how it is that you think this can all be less and I'm sure that Matt's listening and he will take that in consideration as he's looking at how to evaluate contractors who bid on the opportunity to do this work?

STEVE CROCKER: You're asking me to respond right now or on the list after looking at this more carefully?

JAMES GALVIN: On the list when you're looking at it more carefully. I mean, you can certainly contribute anything right now that you want to that jump out at you, but there's plenty of time here where there's opportunity to provide more detailed input after you've had some time to study it and think about it.

STEVE CROCKER: Okay.

JAMES GALVIN:

Any other comments or questions from anyone? Does anyone have any questions about you know what we're trying to accomplish here with this particular work item. I mean all the discussion we've been having today has certainly been quite valuable and useful and thanks for that and very much appreciate the references to additional background information that we need to make sure we get included here. We'll have to make sure we get this on the mailing list and visible so that we have it in the historical archive.

Again, I'll just take a moment to repeat the questions where we're very interested in whether or not folks believe that additional clarity is needed with respect to what we're looking for in study one and encourage you to go back to the project proposal, please and look at that in detail. And then of course if there's any gaps that you see there's something that needs to be included that we you know missed and need to make sure get added. Those two things are very important to Matt Larson obviously as he seeks to prepare the statement of work to so that RFP can be issued.

STEVE CROCKER:

Can you circulate the proposal?

JAMES GALVIN:

It's on the wiki for the project. It's you can find it right off the homepage for the community wiki and I can put the link to that right into the chat room here.

This is the page which has the proposal on it. It's a PDF and it's on that page for folks who may not have it. I'm assuming everyone here does because they are probably typical active ICANN people, you do actually want an account on the community wiki and in particular there is a members-only area associated with this project. And so if you are a participant you'll want to make sure that you get an account here so that you can have access to the members only area.

Any other questions or comments from anyone with respect to that study? And if not, we're actually I see we're at the top of the hour here. So absent any questions, let me then just suggest one quick call for any other business from anyone.

STEVE CROCKER:

Oh, yeah, what's our schedule of these calls?

JAMES GALVIN:

Yes, so I was going to end by saying that our plan at the moment is to meet weekly in this time slot. We are leaving open the possibility of moving this time slot. If depending on people who join but it seems for the moment at least the couple of people from outside of SSAC who have joined this slot seems to work so, you know, but just keep that in mind for right now we will meet regularly from week to week in this slot and you should see invites going out from Kathy onto the list. It is possible that the zoom room will change in future meeting slots so be sure to take note of meeting invites when they come and update your calendars appropriately

JAY DAILY: I'll just add to that. So the zoom will change currently we're using Zoom meetings. We're going to switch the Zoom webinars for the next one because that gives us better control over participants versus observers. So it will change but then it should then be reasonably fixing that point onwards; so there will be a meeting next week, the week after we're not sure about as it's GDD and a number of people will be GDD, but watch the mailing list for that, and otherwise, we will carry on with this slot as expected.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, but the weekend after that everybody will be in Bangkok 12 hours or so off; that'll be 5 a.m. in the morning, no problem about that.

JAY DAILY: That's why we think he wouldn't do that one. For those of you who are going to be in Bangkok, try.

JAMES GALVIN: So on that friendly note, thanks to everyone. Appreciate your being here and looking forward to kicking this work off and getting started. There's certainly a lot of discussion to be had. So, Kathy, over to you to end the recording.

KATHY SCHNITT: Thank you. This call is now concluded. Have a great day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]