

## **Name Collision Analysis Project Discussion Group Meeting Notes**

8 May 2019 | 21:00-22:00 UTC

### **Attendance**

**Members:** Jay Daley, Julie Hammer, Barry Leiba, Danny McPherson, Russ Mundy, Rod Rassmusen, Chris Roosenraad, Mohamed Abuabed, Nadira Al-Araj, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Matthew Thomas

**Observers:** Dmitry Belavskiy, Eric Osterweil

**Apologies:** James Galvin, Warren Kumari, Steve Crocker

### **Decision:**

### **Action Items from this Meeting**

- Jay to write up a description/clarification on controlled interruption.
- Jay to circulate the revised study 1 proposal for DG last call.

### **Summary Notes**

#### *Call to Order*

Kim called the meeting to order at 21:00.

#### *Update to SOIs*

No updates to existing members' SOIs

\*Justine Chew requested to move from Member to Observer

### **New Members**

Anne Aikman-Scalese and Danny McPherson introduced themselves to the group.

### **Controlled Interruptions and - Expectations from Contractors**

Matt Thomas stated information and knowledge sharing should be part of the scope of study one - and its within the goals to bring important information from prior work, that includes known collisions framework (including studies and measurements surrounding that)

Jay confirmed - the group wants to make sure the contractors are able to document the effects of controlled interruptions. (ex. How often was it invoked?) (not interested in what efforts or resources they put into it - that is for later discussion).

Matt Thomas added it's prudent to include the studies of the known collisions along with telemetry data that may have been studied so the contractors can produce an informed report that includes prior work.

*Action Item:*

Jay to write a brief summary of what the contractors review

Danny McPherson added there was an alternative path to delegation (APD) - if you block strings with high volume queries, you can delegate earlier.

Jay confirmed the group will look at data around controlled interruption - not sure if this is something that can be found in pre work. If there is prior work, it would be useful, otherwise this will be deferred until study 3.

***Review Edits to Study 1 document***

Jay added criteria for work to be assessed to the document

Anne Aikman-Scalese recommended, as a member of the sub pro group, (regarding names collisions section PDP report) the contractors should review the final report (and not the preliminary report). Maybe it would be necessary for the contractors to review the public comments from the initial report.

Danny McPherson agreed that the final report should be reviewed by the contractors (not preliminary).

(a comment was received on the mailing list on harm that may be caused by name collisions) Anne Aikman-Scalese added the Board asked for identification of harm - is this part of study one?

Jay clarified this should be addressed in two stages - study one should look at any published data about the harms of names collision and summarize those harms. After looking at the data, there could be additional data or evidence to provide around harms so the final section on harms cannot be produced until after study two (study one will just note as an interim step and assessment will be part of study 2).

The WP went through the remaining edits to the Study 1 statement of work and finalized the study proposal.

***Any Other Business***

There were no any other business items.

***Next Meeting***

The next meeting will be on 15 May @ 21:00 UTC

***Adjournment***

The NCAP Discussion Group concluded its meeting without objections.

[Recordings](#) and [Transcripts](#)