

---

KIM CARLSON: Thank you and welcome to today's NCAP Discussion Group Call on 22 May 2019 at 2100 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom list. We have apologies from Eric Osterweil, Ruben Kuhl and Chris Roosenraad, and it looks like Danny McPherson, as well. Our calls are recorded and transcribed, and will be published on the public wiki. As a reminder, to avoid any background noise while others are speaking please mute your phones and microphones. And with that, I guess I turn it over to you, Jay.

JAY DALEY: James is going to do the first bit, I think.

JAMES GALVIN: Sure, why not. Well, we just did the welcome and the roll call. We're not aware of any new members, we don't have any right now, so there's no one to announce themselves and describe themselves. Does anyone have a change to their SOI that they would like to report to the group? Not seeing any hands or hearing anything, then I would say we will jump right to Substantive Discussions, and the first thing here is just a final review of the Study 1 document. Jay, can you pick that up?

JAY DALEY: Yep, so we had a final call for changes to this by the end of day on Monday and so we got a number of questions about it today, but we'll go through those in a minute. What we really want to talk about are engagement at three different levels. We want to talk about the

---

*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.*

---

engagement of the contractor with this group and with the public, how the contractor is going to engage. We want to talk about engagement generally of this group and we use this group. And we want to talk about more public consultation on things.

So, I'm going to start off about the contractor. We need to, and when I say 'we' here, I'm now talking about the NCAP admin group, we believe that we need to find a balance between the contractor being engaged with this discussion group and being available for us to talk to and query, and have visibility of their work.

JAMES GALVIN:

Jay, I'm sorry I probably should have gotten you there in the beginning, but you know, just to be fair, because we have some new people who probably haven't heard this before, we should say who is on the NCAP Admin Committee and very quickly that amounts to you and I as Co-Chairs. It includes the SSAC Admin Committee, so Rod Rasmussen as Chair, Julie Hammer as Vice Chair, Merike Kaeo as the SSAC Liaison to the Board. And it also includes OCTO, so Matt Larson, and of course, our secretariat help, Kim Carlson and Steve Sheng. So I just wanted to make that clear to everyone. Thanks.

JAY DALEY:

Thank you. So, the balance again that we want between the contractors is a balance between them being sufficiently transparent, responsive, and engaged with us and at the same time having an either fixed price job or something that is particularly well managed on the actual work

---

that they need to do, because we don't want that open ended and we don't want to have far too loose.

So just now basically would like to open up to basic conversation with people about any views you have on how you would like the contractor engage with us, with this group, what you're particularly hoping to get from them or particularly hoping how to work with them. So, would anyone like to start? Please pop a hand up. Okay, no hands so far. So, I think then in that case we're going to have to manage that on the way and if we see any problems about that, then we will work with that as we go through that.

The second thing is the contractor will need to reach out to people and say hey, can I have a copy of this or hey, when you wrote this, what did you mean? Or, do you have the data for this, or that sort of thing. We would like to understand from you how much you think that should be done in public and how much of that do you think is acceptable for the contractor to do directly with the people that they wish to speak to. Again, anybody have any thoughts on this? I may just leave it as an awkward silence for 30 seconds now, until somebody has a view on this. Okay, no views on that so far, then.

The third thing, then, is about public presentations from the contractor. We are thinking that the only real place that we should have public presentations throughout this particular project is at ICANN meetings and those ICANN meetings would generally be then, the presentation would be owned by the admin team of a second OCTO with the contractor there quite clearly working for that team and then being asked to do their presentation and us managing it. We are therefore

---

saying that we don't think the contractor or us plus the contractor should go to anywhere else, such as an ITF meeting or a DNSO meeting, or anything like that to talk about this during the lifetime of the project. Is that acceptable to people? Matthew, go ahead please.

MATT LARSON: Is that only for Study 1 or are you also making that as part of Study 2 and Study 3 criteria?

JAY DALEY: We're thinking actually for Study 2 and Study 3?

MATT LARSON: I feel like there should be some peer review that credentials for the work and output, especially for the analysis portion of it. I think it's always helpful to have other people look at it and provide critique. And going to places like DNSO or other research centers, might provide some valuable insights.

JAY DALEY: Okay, so, I wonder, so what may look at, doing for that then, so it matters that we would actually have a form of perhaps, and this is actually built into the original proposal and probably still survived in various iterations of it, is webinar type things, where the contractor presents their results or some of the data analysis things in some depth, open for various people to join and effectively scrutinize and for them to defend in that type of way. Does that sound acceptable to you?

MATT LARSON: It sounds like a good option.

JAY DALEY: Right. So, the next two bits I'm going to go on to, I'm going to talk a bit about the engagement with this group, and then I'm going to talk about deliverables and public consultation of things. So, in terms of engagement with this group. Now, first of all, apologies, I didn't send out any basic simple notes of the meeting last week and we, I'm just trying to remember, I think we get the call thing is circulated, I'm not sure if that comes out. There is a transcript, actually, no, there isn't, sorry, I apologize.

So, anyway, I didn't send out any notes of last week's and that is part of the problem. So, I'd like to know from you, what you want, if you miss a meeting, what type of things you would like to be able to use to catch up. Is the recording of the meeting sufficient? Do you want some notes on it? Do you need a transcript, please dear god, no, but what type of things do you find are important. Anyone have a view on this, please?

SPEAKER: Check the note that Kim just posted.

JAY DALEY: Yeah, so transcripts and recordings, thank you, there are transcripts, I've forgotten that, thank you. So the transcripts and recordings are published. So, are those sufficient for people, or do we also need, well,

---

---

there are notes there as well. What I'm specifically concerned about is are we doing a good enough job of making the previous discussions of things available to you through those notes, transcripts and recordings, or should we be doing something else? Should we be sending something to the list? Do we need to do more in terms of communication, or not. Okay, I'm going to take that as a 'no,' we're perfect; ah, no, I have a hand up. Russ go ahead, please.

RUSS MUNDY:

Thanks very much, Jay. Pardon the phone ringing in the background here. I think it would be excellent to have some short high level summary of the high points of each meeting, in addition to the recordings and the call. Because often times people don't have time, even though they should, before they start to make comments go back and listen to the entirety of either the call or read the full transcript. Where, if there were highlight points, they could look at the highlight points, see if what they wanted to raise had in fact been raised and discussed, then go to the detailed discussion to find out if had been raised. So, I think highlight points would be a wonderful addition.

JAY DALEY:

Right, thank you, Russ. I'm happy for us to do that, so that's quite straightforward, okay. So, now we're going to move on, then, to deliverables and public consultations. So Steve Sheng, could I ask you to explain the changes that you've made in order to make this more efficient?

---

STEVE SHENG:

Thank you, Jay. The original proposal had five deliverables and two public comments and this, just kind of thinking those deliverables through and how it fits the ICANN process, what we propose is combine some of those deliverables together and make it two deliverables; the initial report and the final report. It is expected the initial report to include the definition of the name collision as well as the report on past work and the initial list of gaps in data and additional data sets required to continue with Study 2.

After that, the public consultation will have the final report, which is not much different from the initial report, other than having a summary of the public consultation, as well as a determination based on the results of Study 1, whether we should continue Study 2. So, that's kind of a streamline deliverable, and to ensure community engagement, we will utilize the ICANN public comment process for the reports, but also have the contractor be available to interact with the ICANN discussion group once they have the report published, and also at ICANN meetings. So that's kind of the proposed way forward. Back over to you, Jay.

JAY DALEY:

Thank you. Matt Larson, did you want to add anything to that at all?

MATT LARSON:

I guess just to confirm that what this does mean is that if anyone has any issue with the definition of a name collision, then we're going to be pretty far along before they get a chance to formally make that known as part of the public comment.

JAY DALEY:

Thank you, Matt. So that's the issue I want to raise, as well. So, in front of you on the screen you have basically what Steve has just explained to you, but I'm just going to go through it again, just to make sure that we're all absolutely clear of it. The initial report has a proposed definition, it has the full report on the past work on name collision, so it has the main body of it goes into the initial report, and it has an initial list of gaps and data and additional data sets required to continue to Study 2 and Study 3.

And I think that may also include the availability still of previous data sets and things, as well. So that then goes out to public consultation, which is a 60 to 90 day thing and anyone who has done one of those knows it's really quite thorough piece of work to have to do it. Then we have the final report in Study 1 comes out, now includes A, B and C from the first one finalized. So the final definition and the final report and the finalized list of gaps.

We then have two new things, B is a report on the public consultation, which is basically what people said, and then your responses to it, and then a determination based on the results of Study 1, if we should go ahead with Studies 2 and 3, and how to proceed. So, that means that if as a result of the initial report on Study 1 there is a significant change to the definition of name collisions, then the task B, that has been completed, may need to be reviewed or redone again in between the initial report and the final report. So that's a problem. So, we would like to get to the stage where the proposed definition is as thoroughly accepted as possible before we get to that. So this is open to anybody's



---

views about how we can ensure that we get that proposed definition as well accepted as possible before the initial report goes out. Jim?

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks Jay, Jim Galvin for the record. I also want people to keep in mind that the proposed definition as it stands now has already gotten some public exposure. We talked about it, I believe at least twice it has been presented in an ICANN meeting. Now in fairness to the ICANN community, of course, people don't always notice things which are not formally announced through an ICANN formal process, because those things tend to be tracked pretty carefully, so that's an observation about the quality of that, the visibility of that thing.

To me, I want to frame this question in the following way and also say that part of what we're asking here is what folks think about the formality of a process to allow for responding to that definition. You know, it has been out there, certainly the archives of this mailing list are public and out there. What do people think about all of this and what our responsibilities are and the opportunity to the ICANN community? Thanks.

JAY DALEY:

Thank you. So, does anybody else have any views or concerns or anything else about this? Yes, Matt Thomas?

MATT THOMAS:

I think we just need to really reverse this order that we were talking about.

---

JAY DALEY:                                 Sorry, can you explain that again?

MATT THOMAS:                             I think we should reverse the order or remove it.

JAY DALEY:                                 Okay, can we switch to the document, please? Study 1 document. The one with the comments in it. Thank you. And scroll up to the definition, yeah that's it, right. So, this, I'm not entirely sure what you meant by reverse it, Matt. Are you talking about what Danny has recommended here, that these things are in the wrong place?

MATT THOMAS:                             Yes.

JAY DALEY:                                 Okay, so that's not the case, and as I explained to Danny on list here. So the first, Section 1A, 1 and 2 there, I don't think we have any disagreement about those being in scope on the subjective data studies, so I'm going to move on to B and C here. With B, what is stated here as in scope will be addressed with general advice.

MATT THOMAS:                             I was talking about #2, I'm sorry to interrupt Jay.

---

JAY DALEY: Ah, oh, I see, right.

SPEAKER: Put 2 before 1 is what you're saying, Matt?

MATT THOMAS: Yes, coming down instead of going up this time.

JAY DALEY: Ah, okay. Now the reason that we're doing this, this way around, is because we have one outstanding recommended change to this, which is that there are certain processes and we have someone who has some evidence of this, that emit a broken DNS resolution, for some definition of broken, and that is impacted by a new delegation at the root.

And the reason that they've suggested that this is different is because the other ones that we've listed here are all about intent, and that is an unintentional one, where if someone may be caught out without realizing that their kit is working badly in that way. And so we were going to ask the contractor to just examine that or speak to that person and get that evidence and see if we could then incorporate that in there. So, that's the reason why that's that way around. Matt Larson?

MATT LARSON: Yeah, Matt Thomas, were you suggesting, so we've got 1s and 2s, the roman numeral I, finalize the definition, not roman numeral, arabic,

---

finalize the definition of name collision, and 2, undertake the public consultation, is the 1 and 2 you're suggesting should be reversed?

MATT THOMAS: Yes.

MATT LARSON: So, basically take this list, take this definition of name collision here, put it out for public comment as the first thing, and then once we get the feedback and make any changes to it, then proceed with the rest of the work?

MATT THOMAS: Correct.

MATT LARSON: So, the only issue with that is that a public comment, as Jay said, does take a long time. One possibility would be to try and streamline that. I think there is a lot of value in making sure before we start doing the work that there is no one with objections to this definition of name collision. I mean, here in the discussion group we do have what is effectively an open list that anybody can join, provide a base and then an SOI, to comment on it.

One possibility is we could somehow get the word out, I know we're sort of inventing a new thing here, but in the interest of time, to try to do this in such a way that the comments happen here on the discussion

---

group as opposed to the longer 60 to 90 day process. I'm just throwing that out there as something we could think about.

JAY DALEY: Okay, thank you. So, Matt Thomas, now that I've explained the reasoning for us having it in this order, and the general aversion to having an actual proper public consultation there, are you comfortable if we don't reverse it but we still try to address the concern of having an official process for getting people's consensus on this?

MATT THOMAS: I think that works, but timing wise, I guess Matt Larson, what were you thinking in terms of the public comments feedback, that it's just too long in order to solicit that? That it's timing on this that would delay too much, or is it that the revisions and the scope of work is then just kind of lingering forever?

MATT LARSON: I'm not making a judgment on the time, I'm just point out that ICANN public comments do take a while, it can take 60 to 90 days. So if we're inserting that step anywhere here, we need to just be mindful of what that does to the timetable.

MATT THOMAS: I gotcha.

---

JAY DALEY: Thank you. So, we have a question from Anne in the chat. In the public comment on the NCAP project proposal, did any commenters object to the definition? I think I'm going to, if this is okay Steve Sheng, could the secretariat go back and check the public comments to see whether we have actually asked for feedback on this full definition that we've got here? Because if we have, then that I think is pretty useful for us.

STEVE SHENG: Yes, we can check, Jay. Of course, if I recall correctly, this was presented at the public meeting. This list of definition of name collision is not included in the original project proposal that went through the public comment process. So the only thing we would check is the feedback to the transcript from those meetings regarding the definition. Thanks.

JAY DALEY: Thank you. So yes, this has definitely been publicly consulted on at two ICANN meetings, because I've done it. I think was there a second public consultation on the revised proposal?

STEVE SHENG: No, there isn't.

JAY DALEY: Okay, so there is only one, as you said, it wasn't in the first one. Okay. Unless anyone has any other view, oh, Jim, sorry, go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN:

Jim Galvin for the record. I think we're being a little loose with the terminology here and I'd like to be a little more definite and careful about what we're saying here. Unfortunately, you know, formality applies and so we need to be careful. So, there has not at all been a public consultation in any kind of formal sense on this definition. The only thing that we can say is that the definition has been exposed to the public, and so it was visible to them. And the question is how far do we want to go in interpreting what that does or doesn't mean, you know, to the community at large, when we think about our work product, okay?

This is my concern here, I'm sorry to harp a little bit on formality, but let's just be clear about what we're talking about. This is why in the beginning I said the real question here for us to consider is do we need, as Matt started to go down the path of describing, do we want to invent a little bit of process here so that we can find a way to formally announce to the community at large that this definition is it, and thus formally allow the community at large to respond if anybody wants to respond. I'm simply acknowledging there is an argument to be made, none of this has to happen.

But you know, this is ICANN, people like formality and process matters, and that's really the only issue in front of us. I like Matt's idea, maybe there is a way for us to create a little bit of a streamlined opportunity here to be a little more formal about the definition, in the sense that the definition matters to all of our work, we probably should take that on and since Matt had an idea for how to make that happen, let's let the OCTO staff come back and sort of try to progress that and propose

---

something to us, and let's work with that. It's probably the safest thing to do. You know, I don't want to put our work product at risk, is where I'm coming from.

So, I think it's important that we apply some bit of formality, even it's not a formal public comment period, let's try to do something here to make sure that this gets visibility and this step has been accomplished. And I see Matt in the chat room is agreeing. Would anyone else have a comment or an opinion about that? Thanks.

JAY DALEY:

Okay, I see no hands. So, thank you Matt for your input, and Dan, for yours as well, and I think we will then as the admin group just come to a decision then about what we do about that. Can we please switch back to the document showing the initial report and then the final report? Anymore comments on this proposal from Steve to streamline the various different reports? If we don't hear any substantial comments or any objections, then we are going to agree and go ahead with that.

KIM CARLSON:

I'm sorry, which document do you want to see?

JAY DALEY:

It's the one that shows we were looking at previous to this, Kim. The one that shows the initial report and then the final report for Study 1. Actually, don't worry, because I think we're happy and we're agreed with it, and nobody has any comments on it. So, Matt Larson, is there



---

anything else you'd like to get from us regarding public consultation, or can we move on to the next part of the agenda?

MATT LARSON: I guess I was under the impression that we had talked about pulling out the name collision definition so that we were going to depart from what's currently on the screen, we were going to try to just resolve the definition first, and only then proceed with the work.

JAY DALEY: I agree, that needs to be resolved a little bit more in the admin team as to exactly how we're going to do that and maintain the formality of it, that Jim would quite rightly like maintained. So, yes, I agree with you on that, but otherwise, this would be the plan. So, is there anything else on that you want us to finish off?

MATT LARSON: No, nothing else.

JAY DALEY: Alright, fantastic, thank you. Kim, could we switch back to the agenda, please? And Jim, do you want to take the next bit about meeting cadence?

JAMES GALVIN: So, the question is whether or not we need future meetings and if we have topics to talk about, and I think that's an important question. I

---

think at this point it's possible that we might be able just to stick with the mailing list, and as long as we're comfortable with the Study 1 proposal, we're probably fine for right now. Let OCTO go forward, let that process happen.

You did, Jay, start a discussion, maybe you did this on the admin list, we were suggesting maybe we can start a discussion of Study 2 and do some prep work in terms of what we think wants to happen there, but I'm wondering if maybe we want to wait and we'll do that at our first face-to-face slot. We'll have an hour slot, SSAC is going to give us some time, and we'll have a little opportunity there for folks who are present and remote participation and we can pick that discussion up there.

So this might be an opportunity to pause for just a few short weeks while we get the contractor going, as opposed to picking up and moving forward. And so we're interested in getting some feedback from folks on what you want to do going forward and if you have concerns or questions. And I see Steve has got his hand up, so Steve, go ahead please.

STEVE SHENG:

Thank you. So I don't have any problem with suspending these meetings, but it has the risk that things become quiet, and then if things don't go along at the expected pace, no one notices, or at least we don't get told. So I would recommend or maybe request that if we're going to go silent for a while, while the procurement process goes forward, that there be regular updates as to whether the procurement process is proceeding according to the schedule that is expected. So, I guess you

---

have to say what that schedule is, and then if there is progress toward it fine, and if there's not, then we get an update on that. But just not have no information, of course that's a double negative.

JAY DALEY: No, that sounds good, that's certainly a very fair question. Let me ask Matt if you wouldn't responding to that?

MATT LARSON: Yes, happy to agree to that.

JAY DALEY: Okay, that sounds good. I do think you're right, Steve. We should make sure that there is forward progress and that something is happening. We don't want people to think that we have totally fallen off the map here. And of course, leading up to Marrakech, the meeting there will certainly have an agenda posting, a call for topics, our own proposal about discussion points, so we can pick up and hopefully we will have had some good progress on where the procurement process is going. Kathy Schnitt is saying there is no meeting in Marrakech. Okay, yeah, I'm not sure...

STEVE SHENG: That's correct.

---

KATHY SCHNITT: Thank you Jay, I was stressing out here. Thank you, yeah, we decided no meeting in Marrakech.

JAY DALEY: Okay, well, then, my apologies for missing that, but that just means that we'll our next teleconference sometime after the Marrakech and we'll have to decide on the mailing list when that is, we'll have to pick an appropriate point in time. I hope it will be sometime in July, it will depend a little bit on the progress of the procurement process. So I guess I'll just realign what I was proposing there. Any comments from anyone about that plan?

So, not hearing any comments, I think that's the path that we'll take here in the short term here. So, we'll suspend our meetings for the moment, we don't have a committed time for the next meeting except to say that it will be sometime in July. I think we should have a touch point in July regardless, we'll just have to pick an appropriate week, depending on how the procurement is going, because we do want to make sure that as Steve pointed out, we do know that progress is moving forward and whatever discussion that folks are concerned about and questions that might come up as we go along here. Any objections to that as a plan? We'll meet in July, we'll just announce when that is as we go forward here.

STEVE SHENG: That means no meeting next week, right?

---

JAY DALEY: Yeah, that means no meeting next week, in spite of what it says on the agenda.

STEVE SHENG: I'm deleting it from my calendar. No meeting on June 5.

JAY DALEY: No meeting on 5, 12, or 19, or 27 and we'll let you know about July 3rd during the month of June as we progress. Although given the significance of that day in the US, that might not be a good day for a meeting anyway, but we'll decide that later.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you.

JAY DALEY: Yeah, I'm not seeing any hands or comments about all that, so I guess with that, that brings us to the end of our agenda here.

STEVE SHENG: No other business.

JAY DALEY: Yeah, I think we're done. Thanks everyone for participating, please stay in touch on the mailing list, and we're adjourned. You get 20 minutes back.

---

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**