
KIM CARLSON: Welcome to today's NCAP Discussion Group Call on January 22nd, 2020 at 20:00 UTC. In the interest of time there will be no role call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom list. We will update the Wiki Page with the names of the attendees as quickly as possible and the link will be posted in the chat. No apologies have been received.

These calls are recorded and transcribed so recordings and transcripts will be published on the public Wiki. As a reminder to avoid background noise while others are speaking, please mute your phones and microphones. And with that, I'll turn the call over to Jim and Patrik. Thank you.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thank you very much. This is Patrik that will lead today's call. As you all saw we do have an Agenda for today. And let's start by checking whether there any updates on the SOIs. So, I don't hear anything so I will presume that there are no changes for the SOIs, right? Kimberly, there are no SOIs that you know have changed?

KIM CARLSON: Yes, that's correct. No updates.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Do we have any new members?

KIM CARLSON: We received two requests. I've sent an email to them asking if they'd like to be observers or members. I have not heard back so I won't officially add them until I hear back from them.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thank you very much. The next thing we have on the Agenda are the Board questions, but I suggest that we do it the other way around and start by discussing the first preliminary report that we got from ICANN. I hope that all of you have at least seen the report. You might have read just the introduction. You might have read just the headings. Some people have been more, looked at this more in detail just like [inaudible] that found yet another reference that you would like to add. Thank you very much.

So, let me start by just opening it up for general comments on the report as a whole, if there is anyone that have any overall chain of comments to say, please. Okay, I see people in writing things in the chat. Unfortunately, I'm not really sitting by a computer at the moment so unfortunately I must ask you, Kim, if you can help seeing whether there is anyone that would raise some specific issues.

KIM CARLSON: Yeah, nothing specific. Anne says that she read it, it's easily read and understandable to a lay person which is great. Warren adds to be honest he didn't read it. And then Steve Crocker has his hand up.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Steve, please.

STEVE CROCKER: Can you hear me?

PATRIK FALSTROM: Yes, we can hear you.

STEVE CROCKER: Good. I read the report and the only thing that I would have liked to have seen more of, or maybe there's yet to come, is understanding, a deeper understanding of what causes the collisions. For example, just to pick one that I'm mildly familiar with, in the case of the Belkin occurrences, the corrosion of .belkin in the root which would cause a big occurrence if Belkin were delegated, it's because they released a product that had quite a bit of leaky occurrences of strings that probably they didn't intent.

And in the case of Corp, we also know that that's because there had been advice, persistent advice, during some period of time when it was suggested by the vendor that that be used. What do we know about others and what's our interest in what generates these kinds of uses?

PATRIK FALSTROM: So, this is Patrik. Let me just ask you a question in return. So, what you are asking for is, at least not directly at this point in time, a change in the various definitions that have been in the report. What you talk about is to look a little deeper on the root cause analysis for the various

incidents that we actually do have material about. Have I understood you correct?

STEVE CROCKER:

Well, I don't know that that would cause a change in the definitions, but yes, a deeper understanding of the root cause particularly in the sense that that might lead to a better understanding of whether the risks can be mitigated or whatever, you know... How to deal with that sort of thing.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Thank you. Anyone that would like to add something to that before I try to summarize what I think Steve has been talking about?

JAMES GALVIN:

So, Patrik, this is Jim. I had my hand up. I'll go in and I'll watch the que here, too. I see Warren has his hand up, too. The answer to that question, Steve, is actually part of Study 2 where we want to investigate what we know. The purpose of the Study 1 is just for Karen to document what's been published and pull that out. So, if that information was not part of what she was documenting, then she wouldn't have access to it and wouldn't be able to put it in this Study Report. So, this is just a cataloging of what we know and what's there.

So, your particular question is part of an analysis that we need to do and then we get to consider whether there's other data that we want or... In fact, we had actually said to ourselves that we wanted to look at the incidents that... ICANN has a few that they actually were able to pull out

and track along the way here as well as these, the Corp [inaudible], even the Belkin which is from the historical study that Schmitt had done back in the day, too. So, that's sort of the direct answer to your question, answer to come.

STEVE CROCKER: That's cool. Thank you.

JAMES GALVIN: And with that, Warren took his hand down so I'm guessing he didn't want to say anything else. So, Patrik, back to you.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Yeah, so one thing I would like to add, though, is that I think this to some degree is a corner case because the next thing I would like, I was thinking of us talking about, is not the overarching thing in the report. That is to... I think there are two other things that we should look at in the report that we can talk about if people have anything to say or we can leave it to later.

One is to see whether there are any more reports that should be added to this list, and we've got [inaudible] one more. And the second thing is we see for each one of the reports, there is an excerpt which is what are the important things within this report, and I think this is where we have a corner case where maybe some of the more data that Steve is asking for actually is in one of those reports and the question is then whether it should be in portion 1 or... Sorry, in Step 2 of this project.

JAMES GALVIN: Yeah, so thank you, Patrik. Matthew, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

MATTHEW THOMAS: Can you hear me okay?

JAMES GALVIN: Yes, go ahead.

MATTHEW THOMAS: Great. So, first of all, I've read the document and Karen has done an excellent job here. I think it's a really good piece of work so thank you for that. I did have one kind of comment slash suggestion on Section 2.2 which is actually the definition of name collisions. And I'm not trying to be pedantic here but referencing the original PDF that we put out for the proposed definition of name collisions, we had two sections of in scope, in scope but not intended to, and then out of scope.

And I found that some of the terminology that was in there kind of gets lost in Section 2.2 of the document. I don't see a clear mapping of like the items under Section A and Section B, how they map to 1, 2, 3, and 4. And I also, I know this is probably just me being too geeky and understanding it of what's going on in some of the name collisions, but the difference is in the original proposed definitions, it is using Alice whereas in this new of Phase 1 Document, it's Alice's company.

And so, I'm sitting here and I'm having a little bit of confusion in my mind if Alice is the actual person intended or, in the case of suffix search lists, is that actually Alice's company and a system administrator. So, I think it would just be useful if we set on one set of terms for that. And then also we had a very clear mapping in the Section 2.2 to what was exactly in that proposed definition.

JAMES GALVIN: No other hands, Patrik.

MATT LARSON: Matt, this is Matt Larson. Could I ask you to maybe expand on that a little bit with a message to the Discussion Group?

MATTHEW THOMAS: Yes, I'll be glad to do that. No problem.

MATT LARSON: Thank you.

MATTHEW THOMAS: Yeah.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thank you very much. Thank you.

JAMES GALVIN: There is another hand, Patrik. Over to Warren.

WARREN KUMARI: So, as I say, I apologize as I did not read the document when it first came out, but having a quick skim through it, I wanted to make sure that the sorts of things that had been disclosed or the work that people had done that they disclosed in their SOI had also been incorporated into this. While looking through this for my name, I found some mentions, but I thought that there were more things in my SOI which were listed as documents I had worked on which seems like there would be a good...

MATT LARSON: Warren, this is Matt. Did you look at the bibliography that Karen sent out before she sent this report? I mean, there have been weeks to look at what she was doing. The entire reason that we sent the bibliography was so that people would know in advance what documents she was considering.

WARREN KUMARI: I think I glanced at it and then got sidetracked. I was just saying it seems like a good spot to make sure that we have everything that people disclosed as likely related. But...

MATT LARSON: Okay, so I would ask you to please make that more actionable by if you think anything that you disclosed that should be considered in the

report is not in the report, please send an email to the Discussion Group.

WARREN KUMARI: Okay.

JAMES GALVIN: And Steve Crocker has his hand up, but Patrik, first to you or you can redirect to Steve.

PATRIK FALSTROM: No, please. Steve. I'm currently setting up my computer here at home so I will be able to participate in a more active way in just a few minutes.

STEVE CROCKER: No problem. Two small points. On the first page, the lines 105 to 110, let's see... The reference to the new gTLDs starting in 2005, there was actually a round prior to that at around 2000. It wasn't a very big round but just for completeness if one reads this, just to line this up with what the exact sequence was of creating new gTLDs.

And then there are a couple of references to a study that was, or a paper that was written as an internet draft and renewed a couple of times but not brought to conclusion and I kind of wondered why it wasn't packaged up in some form that was permanent instead of being allowed to expire. It didn't have to be an RFC, it could be an SSAC

Report or it could be indeed anything else. But it seemed a waste to have that work, that paper written and then just abandoned.

JAMES GALVIN: So, Steve, do you know which?

STEVE CROCKER: Yeah. So, there were two references. The one I flagged was line 352 on page 10 and there was a previous one. If I recall there were three authors, some of whom might actually be on the call. Let's see. And I also just noted as an entirely separate matter, at the bottom of page 9, 332, 333, 13 names of PayPal recommended be permanently reserved, it listed all of those and I noticed that mail was not included which I thought was curious, but that doesn't change whatever the fact was of what they said. Let's see, you want me to find the actually reference to...

JAMES GALVIN: And while you're doing that, we'll go to Jeff in a moment, but let me also follow in Matt's footsteps here. An ideal thing to do would be to send a note to the Discussion Group with the particular references and things that need to be updated. I mean, I'm taking notes here as I'm sure that Kim is taking notes and we'll get a transcript and such, but we do need that archival record on the mailing list in all of this, too. So, let me go to Jeff. Go ahead. And, Jeff, if you're speaking, we can't hear you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay, how about now? That better?

JAMES GALVIN: That's perfect.

JEFF NEUMAN: Sorry. One of the things I also noticed that was missing is that, I mean, I know we're talking about gTLDs here but there have been a lot of ccTLDs that have been introduced into the root, especially through the Fast Track Process. And if we're going to be complete on studying name collisions, I'm not sure why those are all left out or not mentioned in any of these studies or anywhere in this paper.

JAMES GALVIN: That's a really good point, Jeff. You're right. We do tend to think and focus on this in terms of gTLDs but there's no reason we shouldn't be talking about TLDs. It really doesn't matter. That distinction should not be relevant in this context for what we're doing.

JEFF NEUMAN: Right. And there's been a Fast Track, a quote Fast Track Process, since at least 2000 and... Steve would know much better. But it was probably 2008, 2000 maybe even earlier, or 2009. I don't know, somewhere around there is when it started. But they've been using that for years. So, I think we should be, as you said, looking at TLDs as a whole and not just gTLDs.

MATT LARSON: Hi Jeff. It's Matt Larson again. So, Karen's reacting to documentation that she could find and summarize and so I guess my question would be is there anything written that she could do that with?

JEFF NEUMAN: Well, I'm sure there are. I mean, just to be complete, we can look at the program itself and whether they do any kind of technical review and just look at the process. I don't know if anyone's written about name collisions in ccTLDs but I'm not sure that they were looking at it, to be honest.

JAMES GALVIN: It might be, Matt, if I can jump in here for a moment and just suggest something, that maybe the action here is just to observe this. This might be a gap issue because... There's probably a record, of course, of all the work that went through the Fast Track Process, so that can probably be tracked down. I don't know if it's necessarily in a nice archival place on the ICANN website but surely that information is available in some way.

And then as Jeff said, I don't know if there's any documentation that goes with that. But in the absence of that, this is... If it does not exist, this is certainly a gap of data to make sure that we don't exclude any TLD, that we really do need to consider all TLDs in this and stop making this distinction about gTLDs. Does that seem reasonable, Matt?

MATT LARSON: I'm trying to get there. I mean, what we're largely doing here is talking about definitions and scenarios where name collisions have been talked

about. So, you know, we're going to have to be able to find documentation that's talking about name collisions in a ccTLD context if we're going to put it in here. And I'm concerned that we need to be able to give Karen some direction on where to go look.

JAMES GALVIN:

Yeah. I think, just to repeat what I heard Jeff say and he can jump in if I get this wrong here, but we should look and see if there's any documentation that was part of the Fast Track Process, anything, any kind of controlled interruption step or anything, which I don't think there was, but if there's any documentation there as part of what went through that process.

I mean, if there's not, that's fine. Then I will accept that there's nothing for Karen to do as far as her responsibilities are concerned, and then I think what we need to take onboard as part of the Discussion Group is the particular issue of making sure that as we think about our analysis, we focus on TLDs, not this gTLD, ccTLD distinction and we should identify as part of our analysis that this Fast Track Process is something which is probably going to need an update to reflect that they need to consider name collision issues as part of what they're doing, too.

So, I think that's where I would go with this. Now, we've got all kinds of hands up. Let me give you a word, Matt, if you want to say something or we can go through the hands at this point.

MATT LARSON: Yeah. So, could I just ask for then the Discussion Group's assistance in finding documentation for Karen? Because I will be very uncomfortable asking her based on just the discussion we've had so far to go off and find things because I'm not sure we've given her... You know, she's not an ICANN groupie like the right of us. So, we have to give her a little bit more detail, a little bit more guidance, if we want her to go look for something related to this topic. So, could I ask people to please send messages to the Discussion Group?

JAMES GALVIN: Absolutely. Thank you for that. Folks should always be offering additional insight. Jaap, your hand was up before we got into this issue. Do you want to go onto something different? And if so, can I move on the list on the hands to stay on topic for the moment?

JAAP AKKERHUIS: No, I was actually going to react on the Fast Track a little bit.

JAMES GALVIN: Oh, please, then go ahead.

JAAP AKKERHUIS: As far as I know, there is not a process itself about collisions, but I know this really from, doing from memory. As far as I remember, there's nothing there but it is that the rules for Karen, ccTLDs and IDNs are pretty reasonably limited. I mean, you cannot get anywhere that has to deal with country or the name of the country and the language of the

country and it should be in the ccTLD already. And at least in the two character list already.

So, it's pretty limited, I mean the possibilities of creating TLDs like that. So, the chance of having collisions are not high. But for every TLD there is always an IANA Report which has all the considerations why a TLD should be there. And, say, for the ccTLD, so you might have to look at IANA side to look at the various ccTLDs approval or reports there.

JAMES GALVIN:

So, thanks, Jaap, for this suggestion to look in IANA. I know that you're generally pretty well familiar with what goes on with ccTLDs. Would it be too much to ask if you might look, poke around a bit and helpfully provide a spot for Karen to go look and document things so that she doesn't have to search through it?

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

Yeah. Remind me that I should do that.

JAMES GALVIN:

And Warren posted a resource already about ccTLD mitigation.

JAAP AKKERHUIS:

Okay.

JAMES GALVIN: So, we should take a look at that and see what that is in the chatroom. Okay, Patrik, you have your hand up. Go ahead please.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Thank you. I hope that this... Do people hear me now?

JAMES GALVIN: Yes, perfect. Thanks.

PATRIK FALSTROM: Okay, good. So, I think what is important to talk about here is to try to uncover what kind of issues we now have found in this jar of rats that we just opened. One, I see in the chat discussions of use of site finders on other kinds of sort of technical things in ccTLDs. So, that is one question. Is there any material specifically on ccTLDs that is missing that Karen should do?

Two, the actual assignment of and request for ccTLD Fast Track, which includes a whole lot of things regarding whether there is any collisions directly because of addition of those, which is a question of course whether there is any material for that.

The third one which is something that I don't think that we should open is all the work regarding ccTLD Fast Track regarding confusability because we don't talk about real collisions there in the most of the work that has been because it's not really a bite by bite comparison thing. We talk about confusability between strings and that is a whole different kind of thing. And from my perspective, I did not think that confusability

use is something that isn't included here. We just talked about collisions according to the definitions that we have been talking about.

JAMES GALVIN: So, just to be clear, Patrik, although you're reminding us about the confusability work, you're suggesting that we not include that here or are you suggesting that we should? I wasn't clear.

PATRIK FALSTROM: No, sorry. No, that we should absolutely not include it here. We talk about just collisions, not include the confusability work. Confusability is out of scope for this work but maybe that needs to be said explicitly if we're going to start mention things like ccTLD Fast Track and stuff because people might be confused.

JAMES GALVIN: Exactly. No, good. Thank you. Thank you for the clarity. And then let me offer for anyone in the group, although Patrik says that it should be excluded, if someone wants to present a counter position, you should feel free to do that. I mean, let's at least have the discussion. We have a starting point. Certainly, we're not done with our discussion here. So, with that, Greg, you have your hand up. Go ahead please.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. This is Greg Shatan and a pleasure to finally have found the time to get on one of the calls. With regard to ccTLDs there's a chance

that this is largely a rule out exercise given the relative unlikelihood of actual occurrences.

Looking at what Warren posted is a controlled interruption scenario for new ccTLDs, and obviously that's germane. I also found through the miracle of Google a Draft Board Resolution from the ccNSO relating to name collisions in ccTLDs from January 12th, 2015 and relates to similar issues recommending the ccNSO consider undertaking a study. I think that indicates that we should obviously look in the ccNSO box of wonders to see whether, where this, if this went anywhere as well.

Of course, forward looking the chances of name collision are clearly not limited to gTLDs but given the two letter restriction that most people are more aware of, you know, it's likely that if the vast majority of other names spaces stayed away from two letters but that's... So, I don't think we should expect that Karen's going to find a treasure trove but certainly we do need to know what's out there. Thanks.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thank you, Greg. Appreciate that. I want to call out a couple of things going on in the chatroom before I go to Jeff here. Warren is posting some helpful commentary there. So, we do have... Warren is quoting some text here from the resource that he had posted about new ccTLD managers should implement controlled interruption, and that being suggested.

He had a comment there to you, Steve, about the collisions between .co and names in .com and are they considered in scope of what we're doing? And then he's also making some comments about work going on

in the World Trademark Review. I just want to call this out for folks to go look at there. And he's got some nice RFC references and we just need to make sure that they're also in the document that we have here that we're collecting. So, Jeff, go ahead please. Jeff, if you're speaking we're not hearing you.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, sorry. I forgot I have to unmute on both the phone and the computer. So, yeah, everyone's talking about ccTLDs being two characters and they're not. They're two character ascii for that ISO list but every single Fast Track or IDN ccTLD is by definition more than two characters because they'd have to be xx, sorry, xn dash dash whatever. So, ccTLDs are not two characters anymore. That's not a relevant distinction so we should be very careful about having that.

The other thing is... So, I think this is good. There are materials out there. But the other comment I had which is sort of lost is that this whole paper is designed around gTLDs in that this is just gTLD issues and we're just looking at the new TLDs that the gTLDs, like Steven mentioned the 2000 proof of concept around... It's not in here.

But there's... Even in the definitions of domains, what domains are, it doesn't include references to other types like ccTLDs which is an important omission. DNS Wildcarding, that section has no references to the ccTLDs and there are... I mean I could tell you from a quick search as well there are materials about the Wildcarding Service. I know because I made the mistake of launching it at Neustar for .us for a very brief test out period and got smacked around for it. So, I do know that there's

materials out there on that wildcard stuff which is the ccTLDs because even when Neustar filed some paperwork they pointed to other ccTLDs that had already been offering it.

So, yeah, I think this report where it mentions gTLDs should just be... Obviously if it's citing a study that only looks at gTLDs, that's perfectly fine, right? That is what it is. But if there are materials in here where Karen has kind of summarized or just her general statements, then we should look at those and make sure that, is it really only applicable to gTLDs or is it also really any type of TLDs? Thanks.

JAMES GALVIN:

So, thank you for that additional clarity, Jeff. Let me try to make this actionable for Karen in the following way. Yes, I agree with you that one of the things that we need to be careful about here is that we go forward thinking about name collisions and TLDs. This is not about cc versus gTLD. And so, any introductory material that is original material, if you will, that she is drafting and happens to write, and of course for our own purposes in the Discussion Group, anything we produce going forward, we need to be careful to not make the distinction because it really is not a relevant distinction in this technical issue that we're addressing here.

However, as you said, for any documentation that Karen is cataloging, if it refers to ccTLDs or gTLDs or whatever it refers to, then it is what it and it should be documented that way. I'm certainly not looking for her to make any interpretation about what was in a report. That would be for us to do as part of the analysis if we want to extrapolate a report

that references only gTLDs and say, “Oh, well, they said gTLDs, but they really meant all.”, kind of thing. And that’s up for us to decide later.

So, I hope, Matt, you kind of took that and we took that action down and I hope that was clear for Karen to take on that visibility as far as her text is concerned. Patrik, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Yes, so, thank you for pointing out and remind us that we should talk about TLDs and not only gTLDs but as Matt has said there is also a request to us to find references not only to TLDs, gTLDs, but also to ccTLDs and if you find them. So, Jeff, if you already know references and have found things, please try to find them again and send them over to Karen.

I would also like to just point out one detail about the two characters that you pointed out, Jeff. Yes, it is two characters if you look at the ascii characters but assume that you look at, for example, two characters in other scripts, they are then expressed in more than two characters of ascii so we need to be careful with the terminology and this is something that, among other things, I will look out for and one of the good things by not looking at confusability. Thank you.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks, Patrik. And Matt, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

MATT LARSON:

Yes. So, I'll talk to Karen about this. I mean, we hear the message that we need to keep in mind that name collision is to be considered in a TLD context. But I just want to point out that this report is a result of Karen's exhaustive search for name collision literature and the references that everyone sent. And so, what you're seeing is the fact that all the name collision references that she could find and all the ones that you all sent are in a gTLD context.

So, I just want to stress again, I can't ask Karen to go on a hunting expedition with the information we've given her so far. So, I'm going to please say that you're going to have to please send us specific references to specific documents about name collisions in a ccTLD context if you want them to be included in the report because so far those things, Karen has missed those in her exhaustive search process.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thank you, Matt. Well stated and a reminder to us all to be careful about the completeness of this document. It is important to look it through it and check for, and if you come across references, make sure they're in the document or not, and pass that on. So, alright. So, this has been an excellent discussion about the document. Very much appreciate that. Let's just open the door here.

Any other comments that anyone wants to make about the current draft report? This is our opportunity. In general, if you haven't had a chance to look at it, I know that people only just received that within the last week, so the door will be open for a little bit longer for folks to continue. I mean, please do read it. It's best, of course, to send

comments and questions to the mailing list so that we can address those, and we can collect them up. Keep in mind that just because you sent it to the mailing list doesn't make it actionable for Karen.

Again, we're just trying to manage our contractors time here so we will, they will... Comments do need to be curated in some way via Patrik and myself and Matt to make it actionable for Karen, but it is important to get that documented history. Please make your comments there and be as specific as possible and that'll be helpful, and we'll move that along. So, any other last comments from anyone? And Jeff, you have your hand up so go ahead, please.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Yeah, I just want to comment on Matt's last statement because it sounded a little frustrated. So, I understand your frustration, Matt. But I guess the other point I'm making is that a number of the articles that Karen does cite do contain references to ccTLDs in comments that are in there. So, I guess what I'm saying is more important than just looking for any unique articles on ccTLDs that may not mention gTLDs.

What I'm saying is to structure this report to be catered towards all types of TLDs because I believe the [inaudible] reports that are cited here, and I know even ICANN's information itself are on TLDs as a whole, not just on gTLDs. So, part of it is looking for unique sources, that's correct, but the second part of it is structuring the report to where these sources don't only mention gTLDs to put it in a complete TLD context and not in a gTLD context. Does that make sense, Matt?

MATT LARSON:

Yes. No, I get it. The idea is that... So, I think there are two things, or I think two things need to happen. One is to ask Karen to please look at the report through a lens of TLD and not necessarily a lens of gTLD to the extent that she might have been doing that. And then the second is... Oh, and part of that first bit might involve looking at sources that have already been used and considering them in a larger TLD context if she in fact might have considered them in a more narrow gTLD context.

And then the second, though, is that if there is, and I don't want to be a broken record, but the second would be that if there are additional sources then we need pointers to those to look at those if we've missed anything specifically about a ccTLD context for name collisions.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thank you, Jeff, and thank you, Matt. Last call for any other comments at the moment about the draft document. And Anne is typing a comment in the chatroom, but I thought I heard Jeff ask me for more summaries or documentation experience related to wildcarding.

If there is something, again I think just applying what Matt was saying more broadly, you know, if there are references that you're aware of that have not been covered, then please do help identify them and note them on the Discussion Group list. References are pretty easy for us to pick up and offer to Karen to go grab and catalogue and make sure that we have them down.

I think that she's done what she can do for right now. We need help from everyone here to make sure that we have a thorough, as thorough and complete a list of what we know right now and in this work

product. Oh, and Anne's commenting she didn't think that wildcarding stuff is specified in the RFP per say. I'm not sure how to respond to that.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

I don't think we have to respond to that. I don't think it was explicitly included in the RFP either. But once again, I think we in this group have to try to separate when we think that something is missing, which is okay to sort of tell each other we need to look into various things.

But then we have also to do our homework and be very constructive as Matt has pointed out multiple times because we need to get clear instructions to Karen and pointers to documents and whatnot if that is really what we want to do. But even if that is what we want to do, I think it is okay to do some handwaving in the chat and on these calls so we as a group can move forward. Thank you.

JAMES GALVIN:

Good. Thanks, Patrik. Okay. With that, I'll just note that we can certainly keep on our Agenda for next week continue discussion about the document when more people have some chance and an opportunity to look through it and review it, and that'll be good. We'll certainly take more discussion about it. That's our role here in this Discussion Group. This is our opportunity to review and offer insight and influence into this document so that we can get this Study 1 from Karen. And yes, being careful not to ask Karen to expand the scope of the RFP.

With that, the next item on our Agenda was to take our Board questions. We had for a couple of weeks in December some discussion

about each of those items to consider what they meant, what we think we needed to know, and where we needed to go with respect to responding to those questions. That will ultimately be our job. After we get this Study 1 completed we will certainly move forward with that. It's a separate question is to whether a Study 2 completes.

But part of what we need to do here is now to map that discussion that we had on each of those Board questions and take those notes and look into that spreadsheet that Kim has helpfully put up on the share screen for us and try to map that into questions. What kinds of questions do we actually have for ourselves? What kinds of... What are we going to do in the analysis phase here to respond to those Board questions? And actually, let me pause there and say Patrik, if you wanted to pick up and go forward here and offer your own introduction to how you want to proceed.

PATRIK FALSTROM:

Yes. Thank you very much. So, one thing that, because of problems with access rights to this document which is probably my problem, I could enter comments in this. You see the Column E, that what you see there is a reference in the draft report. I have entered some comments which are my own notes on whether this question is actually... Whether the question on that row is addressed, from my perspective, in the preliminary report or not.

So, one thing I would like everyone to do is to try to compare the Board question, try to analyze whether the Board question is clear enough and see whether you believe that that Board question will be answered by

the continued work that will be done by this report that Karen is doing. So, a mapping exercise be the Board questions and the preliminary report.

This can be used, from my perspective, in two different ways. Let's use this as an introduction to a short discussion on whether I'm correct or not. This can be used a gap analysis to see whether the report that is now in its creation will be able to be used as a reference that answers all these questions. So, basically will we be able to with the help of this report to answer these questions? And we can start. And the idea here that I have is that we should add in Column E various pointers that can help us get answers to those questions.

Does this make sense to people, what I mean? Let me ask it differently. Has anyone started to look at the Board questions and read the Board questions while they have been looking at the preliminary report? I presume that given that very few people have been looking at the preliminary report, you might not have had time to read the preliminary report and the Board questions side by side, question mark? Okay.

I don't see any hands, so I presume that we haven't really been able to do the work. I did a short sort of cross reference between them, but I have not really entered the text there more than as comments. So, let me suggest as a Work Item that people, apart from looking at the report, whether they do believe the report is correct, that people also, when you go through the report, that you also try to look at the Board questions and see whether there is any gap missing there, any clarification that the Board question, whether we need to discuss the Board question itself to see that we really understand it. So, let me

suggest that the Work Item for next week and we can have this as an Agenda item for next week as well. Thank you.

JAMES GALVIN:

And, Anne, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please. Anne, if you're speaking we're not hearing you. And, Anne, we're still not hearing you so I'll give you a chance to figure out what your audio issue might be there, or you can type in the chatroom there. I'll read it out for you.

I think with that, what Patrik's suggestion is probably the right thing. Now we have a directed targeted homework assignment for everyone. Please do, as we've said already, review this draft report and let's comment on it, as we did today. We had a really good discussion today. Thank you all for that. That was really quite excellent.

But as you continue to read it or pick it up for the first time if that's where you are, please do go back and consider this spreadsheet of Board questions and consider whether or not there is material in the draft report that speaks to these Board questions. And in fact, please do make references in the report for where you think there's material that is relevant to those Board questions.

It would be helpful if, you know... Folks should be able to put comments into this report. I believe that everyone has the ability to do that. You don't have edit privileges, I don't think, but you should be able to insert a comment, and anyone should be able to add comments about stuff that's there and so please do that. That would be most helpful.

And Anne now has her question in the chatroom here. Have we identified whether questions can be addressed by Study 1, 2, or 3 by which portion of the Work Plan? Actually, that's pretty straightforward. To a first order, Anne, all questions are answered in Study 2 because that's our analysis phase. Study 2 is about getting access to other data stores and perhaps asking questions of that data store.

If Study 2 is going to happen, then we need to construct a set of questions that we want to ask data stores that will help us to answer the Board questions, but our responsibility as a Discussion Group is once Study 1 completes is to do our analysis and go through the process of answering these questions, either by motivating a Study 2 or by just having our own discussions about assumption we have enough data, we have other reports from all of the things that Karen has cataloged, and we need to come to a conclusion and an assessment of the data that's available us, and what we're recommend to the Board as far as how to answer these questions.

So, Study 3 is about looking at mitigations, by the way, mitigation methods. That's all that's really in that one. It was about potentially building a test harness in which we could review mitigation methods and thus gain greater insight into their efficacy and thus be able to say something in our recommendations about the use of something other than controlled interruption, or perhaps as a compliment to controlled interruption. I mean, that's for us to explore and comment on if we can. So, I hope that answers your question for now.

With that, any other questions or comments from anyone about anything? Not seeing any hands going up. Okay. So, we'll see everyone

next week. We will continue our discussion on the Board questions with references to the report. Thanks everyone for joining us. We're adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]