Name Collision Analysis Project Discussion Group Meeting Notes
1 May 2019 | 21:00-22:00 UTC

Attendance
Observers: Anne Aikman-Scalese, Jim Pendergrast, Wes Hardaker and Drew Wilson
DG Members: Jaap Akkerhuis, Jay Daley, Jim Galvin, Julie Hammer, Warren Kumari, Danny McPherson, Rod Rasmussen, Dmitry Belyavskiy, Steve Crocker, Ruben Kuhl, Jeff Neuman, Eric Osterweil, Matthew Thomas
Staff: Matt Larson, Steve Sheng, Kim Carlson and Kathy Schnitt
Apologies: Merike Kaeo, Ram Mohan and Russ Mundy

Decision:
- The next discussion group (DG) meeting will be 8 May 2019, 21:00 UTC
- The criteria for inclusion of reference materials are: peer reviewed publications, or in depth database report, or qualitative research on collision experience, or RFCs and Internet Drafts (I-Ds).
- The deadline for input to goals and tasks is 15 May. After which the updated goals and deliverables document will be sent to OCTO.

Action Items from this Meeting
- Add clarifying text around data sets - tasks four, six and eight
- Circulate draft to group for further review

Summary Notes
Call to Order
Kathy Schnitt called the meeting to order at 21:00.
Jay explained rules of engagement (Panelists/Member and Attendees/Observers)

Update to SOIs
No updates to existing members' SOIs

New Members
A number of people who recently joined the discussion group introduced themselves. They are: Dmitry Belyavskiy, Eric Osterweil, Warren Kumari, Jeff Neuman, Matthew Thomas.

Description of project and way forward
Jay explained this is not a consensus based policy process - this is a joint SSAC - OCTO project. There is a project team that will primarily make the decisions. This

discussion group is being convened to get as much input as possible - where possible consensus will be sought but this is not always possible.

Definition
Jay mentioned that the definition of the name collision is not open for discussion. These definitions has went through the SSAC review process, as well as sought up public comments.

Study 1: What background material to include and criteria
The DG had a discussion on what background material to include. They agreed on the following:

1. Criteria for prior work to be assessed (These are OR not AND)
    a. Peer reviewed paper
    b. Report/Analysis based on data
    c. Qualitative research on name collision experience
    d. Proposed or agreed technical standards

2. Specific prior meets the criteria above
    a. JAS and Interisle reports
    b. Two data requests to ICANN (Rubens has details)
    c. Name collision section of PDP report
    d. Technical presentations, including all those given to the London workshop
    e. Any relevant correspondence to/with ICANN (contractor to read summary
first)

Study 1: goals
Jim reviewed the goals for study 1. The three goals are:

1. The first goal is to examine all prior work on the issue of name collisions and produce a summary report that brings forward important knowledge from prior work into this study, and which can act as a primer for those new to the subject.
2. The second goal is to create a list of data sets used in past studies, identify gaps, if any, and list additional data that would be required to successfully complete Studies 2 and 3.
3. The third goal is to decide if the project should proceed based on the results of the survey of prior work and the availability of data.

The deadline for input to goals and tasks is 15 May. After which the updated goals and deliverables document will be sent to OCTO.

Ruben mentioned that the contractor should note whether data sources is made available to researchers. For example DNS OARC data can be made available to users, L-root data, on the other hand, is not available to third-party researchers. Jim mentioned that this issue is covered in the project proposal. It is in the SSAC's goal for the results to be reproducible. However, there may be some data that is not available to researchers for a variety of reasons.

Warren mentioned that we should not overly constraint the contractor. If the contractor disagrees with the interpretation of the data, he should be allowed to examine the original data and draw his own conclusions. Jay mentioned that it is important for the contractor to assess the methodology used in the study, so that an evaluation of the study can be made.

Jim noted study 1 is about reporting on prior work; analyzing and re-analyzing the data is part of the second study. Contractors should, as part of their report, identify questions.

Jay stated the contract of study one is to address the accessibility of each of the data sets that are used in the prior work. The group should be asking the contractors to make an assessment of the methodology used. One thing that will be looked at in study two is having a contractor produce an anonymization mechanism so third party who have data that can share know that the data will be sufficiently anonymized - the exact way in which the data can be anonymized and still suit our purpose.

Jim added some additional clarity can be added to the tasks. Regarding task four, additional wording can be added that they should speak to assessing methodology. Task six and eight speak about data sets - we will add clarity to identifying the data sets and existing availability of that data

Any Other Business
There were no any other business items.

Next Meeting
The next meeting will be on 8 May @ 21:00 UTC

Adjournment

The NCAP Discussion Group concluded its meeting without objections.

Recordings and Transcripts

https://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/Vg9p1WS9b1GIB-tFOtFKxjFo0aJzSi6WhEAAL0bXIjnbqaX2lgyfPG15Unm9p56C?continueMode=true