KATHY SCHMIDT:	Welcome to today's NCAP Discussion Group call on Wednesday, the 13th of May at 19:00 UTC.
	In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom list. Kim and I will update the wiki with the names of the participants as quickly as possible. We have apologies from Rod Rasmussen and Russ Mundy. All calls are recorded and transcribed, and recordings and transcripts will be published on the public wiki. As a reminder, to avoid any background noise when others are speaking, please mute your phones and microphones. With that, I'm happy to turn the call over to Jim. Jim, go ahead.
JAMES GALVIN:	Thanks, Kathy. I appreciate that. This is James Galvin from Afilias for the record, one of your infamous – let's call ourselves infamous co-chairs, it's great. Okay, I'm glad everyone could join us today. A quick question to your Statements of Interest, does anyone updated their Statement of Interest and want to call that out here today? I'm not seeing any hands or hearing anything, so moving right along. We don't have any new members this week. Please feel free. Invite your friends, family, neighbors. There's plenty of people sitting at home these days. Invite them to come join our group and help contribute to the future of our work.
	With that, we do have our general task of wanting to move along, looking at questions, and really digging in on those, but given the discussion the last couple of weeks and our responses and reactions to

some of which in the Work Product 1, it seemed appropriate to take this opportunity to come back and look again at our name collision definition. There were of course a couple of different name collision definitions that SSAC has produced along the way in some of its documents. This discussion group had a definition of name collision that had prepared – I think it was late last year, actually. Actually, a year ago, last year that we had gone through the process revisiting all of that, and we had from that created a document that was produced that was passed on to Karen as part of her production of Work Product 1, and so that was her basis for what she did. So she went forward and created a bibliography based on that.

At the time that we created that, we had said to ourselves that we wanted to close off that discussion unless there was new information that wanted us to revisit the definition. It's just in the general interest of trying to keep the group moving along. We do like to declare success when we [can] and not revisit things. But it's pretty clear from the discussion on the mailing list and such that there are questions about whether this definition is actually in scope or not or properly defined. I think I didn't actually click on this link. Kathy put this link out there. That's the analysis notes document. Okay.

Matt Larson had sent to the list a document which had the definition on it that was used to provide for the Statement of Work. I'm going to put that in the chat room here so that folks can see that document and we can all look at that. But this is the definition that we had produced that was used as part of producing the Statement of Work that Karen used. So there appeared to be some questions about whether or not in particular the descriptions of second-level names as the registration

associated with that is to whether or not those are in scope or not in scope for our work here. So it's appropriate to have some discussion about that now and work through that and see if we want to make that change for our work going forward. Clearly, we all have an agreement of what exactly is a name collision and what's not in order for us to continue our work.

I'm hopeful here that someone will want to jump in and present alternate point of view here and then we'll just open up the discussion here. I believe we are talking – it's been highlighted up here the item which is here, but in this document it's B.c, the question about a registration that expired and then gets picked up, is this a name collision?

I do want to call out one particular detail about calling this a name collision and remind us of one thing about this definition, and then we'll open the floor here. I see Danny has got his hand up. I just want to add one thing. Notice that this is in Section labeled B as opposed to a section labeled A. So it's considerate in scope in the sense that it represents a name collision in a broad sense and the broad sense of it representing a name collision is just that the name suddenly results in data that may have been present before and used in a particular context is now being redirected to another context. So it's in scope with respect to the definition in that broad sense that data that's intended for one place or was intended for one place is [inaudible] somewhere else. But that is just intended for us to be able to talk about that scenario and its existence in the presence of it and what it means for that. It's not intended to be the subject of data studies. In other words, the focus of NCAP is really about studying name collisions at the TLD level because

that's the level at which ICANN has some direct responsibility. That's the level at which the ICANN Board has to make decisions based on that. However, for the purposes of the broader community, we were asserting at the time that we created this definition that C represented an example name collision in the context of data movement, B going to a different place. Thus, we would talk about it in our report as part of our work. I think that's all I wanted to say about that in terms of context. Now let's go to discussion and see where we get. Danny, please go ahead.

DANNY MCPHERSON: Can you hear me, Jim?

JAMES GALVIN: Yes. Excellent.

DANNY MCPHERSON: Good. I highlighted two places in that in the definition and in C, where by the definition, C is out of scope. It says here, "In a different namespace." And a re-registration, by that definition isn't a different namespace. If we wanted to make an argument that it was a collision – and I need to understand what it's actually colliding with because it's the same name in the same namespace and a new a registrant is the holder of that name, and so I don't believe it's a collision at all. I believe that there are issues with re-registrations, they are very well-known, certainly better known than collisions to most people. So that's where my issue was, is that those two things are technically in conflict. It's not

within a non-RZM namespace as I've highlighted there. So something has got to give. To me, it's either non-RZM or C, and I would presume it's C and based on what I understood SSAC's intentions were with this work. But I sort of said my piece and I said it on the mailing list. Thank you for bringing this topic up for discussion. I appreciate that.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Danny. I certainly appreciate your point. You're absolutely right with respect to highlighting the issue there between those two phrases and what's going on. Thank you for that and we'll continue to have this discussion. Let's get some other voices here. Greg Shatan, go ahead, please.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. I was thinking along the same lines as Danny. I think putting in a different way which is that the definition is actually just fine. It's that being the first two paragraphs under Name Collision Definition is when we get to the next section that we go beyond the definition of name collision that at least that is there. A.c that we're talking about or rather b – sorry, I can't scroll. But the one where the separation is in time and not in space is one that's out of scope by the definition. So it shouldn't really be in scope, even be called in scope. We should not be going beyond our mission – I'm starting to feel like Star Trek here – but "boldly going where no man has gone before" and all that. But in any case, it is a problem but it's not a name collision problem. It's actually just dealing with that problem for a client who let their name lapse and

found a Chinese company selling related products three years after he lost his domain name because the business folded.

Then there's also the problem or issue that the name collision definition only talks about the top-level domain space. I think the examples dealing with the second level, I think B.a, that is a question. Unless by B.a we're actually talking about where the TLD itself is the problem and not the second level tag or second level domain, but it's the top-level domain that's causing the problem.

So as long as our focus is on two top-level domains, one which is in the RZM space and one of which is not, then our focus is in the right place. One other problem that we should be aware of at the edges is the cryptocurrency got the theory, among other things that are being snatched up that are non-RZM, but I think they fall within the scope of our examples or just not part of corporate networks. They're actually functioning in the Internet but not in the RZM space. So maybe more problematic, but that's something to think about. Thanks.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. Thank you, Greg. Let me respond a little bit before Jeff goes – I'm sure Jeff is going to ask this question, so this way he'll get the chance to respond to this. Let me speak a little bit to some of the discussion going on in the chat room here about what is and what is not in the Board resolution and what is or is not in scope for this discussion group. It's true that the Board did not in TLD in particular as I recall – and it's being confirmed here in the chat room – in the Board resolution. But I do know that in our early conversations about all of this, and this is

certainly open for discussion here so I just want to bring this out and highlight this and would welcome some comments about it, of course. That's the purpose of this group here. We're supposed to give a proper definition in name collision, and then of course talk about of that and then give all of our study about it, where do they manifest, can you control and what can't you control. As is typical in SSAC's work, we do try to be thorough and complete in our analysis when we look at things, and so our intent here really was to bring that forward to this discussion group. We have a little bit of flexibility about exactly what is in scope and what is not. But I want to offer the following specific comments. From the point of view of our early discussions as I remember them in SSAC when we were having discussions about this, one can make a distinction between what is in control, what is potentially could be controlled by ICANN in some way and what could not be. From SSAC's point of view, including B.c in our output is a good thing because it's a thorough treatment of the topic. So being able to talk about that as a name collision and the fact that that matters to people at that second level, it might matter inside the TLD and then of course further down in zones in a DNS tree, it seems like a good thing to do, that that's why this in scope at least for the purposes of discussion because it gives the topic of name collision a thorough discussion and complete representation. But it is true from the point of view of what can or not be controlled, if you will, by ICANN or space in which it has the most influence, B.c doesn't really fall into that category. That's really the distinction that's being made here by this in scope for data studies and not in scope for data studies. The intent of the data studies, part of it was to really focus in, because we need to create guidance for the Board on how it can address name collisions as we define them. That's where we want to

focus our data studies. The rest is just a descriptive analysis and treatment of it for the purposes of the community and broad distribution. At least that's my recollection of the process up to this point. I hope that makes sense to people and I welcome other discussions about that, and I'll try to be a little more quiet now, get some more voices in here. Jeff Neuman, go ahead, please.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. I think you got to a little bit of what I was going to say in that the ICANN Board resolution – I posted the exact words – they did not mention top-level domains, although in their background, they talk about the notion of collision strings which they cite examples as a non-delegated top-level domain or a short unqualified name. We're spending a lot of time on this. I'm not sure why it's that important. I think if we just have the top part – if you could scroll up – as an overall definition of collision, and then talk about we are looking at the context of top-level domains, and then you could keep that second paragraph there without changing it and then everything else remains the same. I mean, we agreed with Danny last week that re-registration collision or whatever you want to call it, it's not in scope for what we're doing, which is fine. So if we just have that first paragraph as the definition and then the second paragraph is the further refinement of the problem that we're looking at, and that's what's determining the scope. I think anything else is just going to get disagreement with people who have – there's no right or wrong answer, I don't think, in this. No provable or unprovable answer. But if we just have the name collision our first to a situation are names used in one namespace, maybe used in a different namespace, etc. and then for the purpose of our work and what's in

scope, we're looking at top-level domains and then everything follows. I'm not saying the scope of NCAP is all possible name collisions. What I'm saying is the scope of our work is with respect to top-level domains.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you, Jeff. I appreciate that. Patrick, please go ahead. Patrik, if you're talking, we're not hearing you.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Okay, there. I misunderstand how the mute button works on my phone. Sorry. I think, unfortunately, we're talking about two different things here. I think it's good that we're trying to define what name collision is, but I'm a little bit nervous that the Board is not really interested in a formal definition of name collision, even though that is what they're asking. I think the Board is after understanding what risk and what harm a delegation of a previous unlocated that are currently undelegated TLD will have. I think that is the context within which the Board is asking their questions. Which means if we have this TLD a string, what will happen? That is what I think they would like to know. Then there might be a lot of different kind of things that happen including name collisions here and there but it might also be the case that that string might have previously been delegated, which is also something bad. So we have all different kind of scenarios that can happen when a new TLD is added to the root zone. Out of those various scenarios, there's a subset of those which we believe are name collisions. So if you look at it as a Venn diagram, you have a lot of name collisions as to which have nothing to do with adding a new string to the root zone, and then you have other

kind of issues that might happen when a new string is added to the root zone that is not a name collision. Let me suggest to try to focus on how to answer the issues in the Board context, and if we don't really know what the Board wants then we should go back to the Board and ask for a clarification.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks, Patrik. Just to speak a little bit to your last point there, the discussion group, just to remind folks, we do have a path to ask for clarification from the Board if we wanted it and we think we need it. SSAC, of course, does have a liaison who is present on the Board and is present as part of the Board Technical Committee, which is the actual subset of the Board that has oversight of this particular project. So we have a pretty direct path for getting questions answered if we have them, just as a reminder.

Before I respond here, Greg Shatan, you had your hand up. Go ahead, please.

GREG SHATAN: Thanks. A couple of things. First, I think one of the problems may have been just the ambiguity of phrasing that B, in scope but not intended to be the subject of data studies. I think maybe I should've said out of scope but necessary to discuss in order to discuss what's in scope, because it is out of scope for our work. In other words, our end product is not intended to affect that space, should not affect that space. So that was the first thing.

The second thing is that while I agree that discussing that the definition is not, in essence, part of our work but, on the other hand, it isn't critical to define scope and to maintain scope. I remember years ago working on a website where the tech lead would keep yelling about scope. That was basically his job, because the rest of us were also having flight of fancy.

The definition I view as taking the scope, that the scope can't be anything other than what's in the definition. And even if this definition is the biggest definition of name collision, it's the definition of name collision for this project. So the definition is part of the scope. In essence, it's the root of the scope. Thanks.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you, Greg. A lot of discussion going on in the chat room and I apologize, it's a little tough for me to keep up with all the details there and be listening, so I apologize if I missed something. I want to try to capture some of what I'm hearing here and a little bit of what I managed to read in the chat room. Actually, Greg probably really hit this nail in the head here in what I'm thinking. Now I see Jeff's hand, but let me say this first.

I'm hoping that this discussion is more about clarifying what's here than fundamentally changing it. I'll express the way that I saw the examples. If we keep in mind that one of the things that the Board asked for the definition of name collisions and then the Board has some particular things that it needs to know about that it needs to be able to deal with with respect to name collisions, so taking a step back in very broad

strokes, they were looking for this group to examine what exactly is a name collision. I would say, my interpretation, they need to know what name collisions are that matter to them and then we need to provide guidance to them about how to manage the name collisions. I think, though, I want to be careful here, that from the point of view of SSAC, a normal and usual desire to want to give a broad scope to things or a thorough treatment to particular topics, I think the issue here is about stating that in B, those examples in B.c in particular, but they represent examples that the Board, they are the example of a name collision in a broad sense of what a name collision could be. From that point of view, it's worthwhile and useful to point that out primarily because we all know the DNS is a hierarchically structured tree. So the kind of name collision issues that come up at the root level can obviously come up at the apex of any particular zone in the DNS. I think that it is useful – and this is why we had come up with this set of examples here – it's useful to point out that these name collision issues can happen really at anywhere in the tree. You don't get the RZM versus non-RZM distinction which is in the first couple of paragraphs. I get that. That's really what [inaudible] Danny up to to notice this distinction here. He's right about that, of course. But I think from the point of view of what we might say something about, we should point out the fact that name collision issues, not everything about them but certainly concerns of that and exist anywhere in the tree, and that enterprises can encounter, find a problem for themselves and may want to deal with it. I think it's useful to point that out and make that visible. Then separate out that our analysis work, the real focus of the [inaudible] we're going to provide the way in which name collisions are looked at, the definitions, our primary focus and all of our future analysis work to get to the work

product and answering the Board questions is about name collisions at the TLD level, because that's where ICANN has some influence, if not control. Obviously, that's the reason why the Board wanted this project is because those are the things that control, the delegation of TLD, and it really wants to know all about that and how it can work with that. I hope I'm drawing the line here that's making sense. At the moment I guess I'm sort of suggesting – I don't want to eliminate this example B.c, but I do want to better scope all of the definitions that are up here. I want to make it clear that that's not part of our analysis work but it is part of our descriptive background material about this so that the report is useful to the community as well as just to the Board. I think that's an important distinction to make. I apologize it might have been a little bit long-winded. Jeff, you have your hand up. Jeff Neuman, go ahead, please.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. A lot of us I think on this call are getting frustrated because I think we all agree that re-registrations and second-level collisions or whatever you want to call them are not in scope. We all agree with that. We seem to be spending so much time on a definition from this old document that only tangentially relates to one of the questions asked by the Board. We can spend years doing the academic argument of the circular nature of a definition and a scope and how they relate to each other, but it's not helping our work. I'm not even sure what use this document is for the next phase. If we all agree what the scope is, we come up with that paragraph of what the scope is and then we move on. It's in line with what Patrik said. That's what the Board cares about.

	That's what we're here to answer, not to come up with the perfect global definition of name collision.
JAMES GALVIN:	Okay. Thank you, Jeff. Let me offer the following as a consensus statement and so we can move forward here today and maybe not spend a lot of time here spinning our wheels. Clearly, there's not any real consensus about the B.c in terms of whether or not it's in scope at all, let alone whether or not we're going to do any analysis of it. I do believe that we do agree that there's no analysis in terms of guidance to the Board to be done with respect to B.c. I think we have consensus on that. So let me ask that explicitly if there's anyone who objects. Is there anyone who does not believe that B.c is not in scope for advice we would be providing to the Board? Dan has got his hand up. Danny, go ahead, please.
DANNY MCPHERSON:	I would say that B.c should not be. We're talking about the root zone. I think Matt Larson and OCTO would disagree with that and say they should be in scope. So, I'll let Matt speak to that.
JAMES GALVIN:	Okay. I'm afraid that I might have been using too many negatives in my statement, but advice we provide to the Board would not be about how to handle B.c because there's nothing for the Board to do with respect to B.c so we wouldn't be giving them advice about that particular example. Is there anyone who disagrees with that statement? I think,

Danny, you were trying to suggest Matt Larson might disagree. Matt is saying in the chat room that you're incorrectly stating that, so that's fine.

DANNY MCPHERSON: Matt can say what he thinks. Well, what made me happy I think is what you're recommending, Jim, is that we move that C out of scope up above B.c. Whether it includes B.b or not, I don't know. I think that that's a different issue and a great example of that would be McDonald's that still [sees] collision at the root and it's been removed, so I think there is a great example of that. But I think that all of these are very different animals with very different symptoms and very different responses, and I'm not sure they're collisions. So I don't think we need to get into any of that. I basically like removing C as out of scope. If Matt wants to discuss B based on that premise, then Matt is welcome to do that.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. Danny – and I want to be very careful about what I'm saying as compared to what you're saying – I'm not saying that B.c is out of scope. My consensus call here is that B.c is not in scope for advice we're going to provide to the Board. I'm leaving the question whether it's out of scope for future discussions in another time. I want to try to give this some thought and maybe come up with some different words in order to get all these covered. I'm trying to find where our point of agreement is. And our point of agreement is that .c is not in scope with respect to how we're going to give advice to the Board, how we're going to answer

the rest of the Board questions. So if there's anyone who disagrees with that – and, Greg, you had your hand up before I asked the question, but please go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: I would say that I agree that B.c should be out and I agree with Matt that B.b should be out as well. Neither of them are RZM/non-RZM. So they are not in scope for our further discussions and our advice, as interesting as they are.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. We'll come back to that consensus call. One last time, I'm not seeing anyone object at the moment to this statement, so I'm going to just state it once and then we'll come back to what Greg was just talking about. B.c is not in scope for our advice to the Board in terms of how to deal with name collisions. So I'm going to declare that we have consensus on that for the moment then we will move on to talking about B.b, which is what Greg in the chat just brought up. I guess you're suggesting, Greg, there has been some discussion in the chat room and I apologize that I missed it so I don't really want to put words in your mouth here. I don't know if this was your position. You're just calling out the discussion here. But apparently there's a point of view that B.b is also not in scope for what we're going to tell the Board about. Could somebody see that and say more about that? Greg, if your hand is up, you want to go ahead or just take it down? Anyone else? Greg, if you're speaking, we're not hearing you.

GREG SHATAN: Sorry. In b, we're talking about .example in the RZM space. Alice registers the .example in the RZM space and it expires. Later in time, Bob registers the exact same TLD also in the RZM space. So this is actually the example I was talking about with my client who's essentially … yeah. We're using the word register because we're being very loose for the moment, we can always deal with that. In any case, the point is that .example is now a different place but it's still the RZM space. That gets to perhaps issues about EBERO, it gets to issues about security and resiliency, but it's not a collision issue where you basically have an ambiguity at a given point in time. Maybe I think that's an important point. To me, it's about an ambiguity in a given point in time where one half of it is in the RZM space and the other half is elsewhere. Thanks.

JAMES GALVIN: Right. Thank you, Greg. I'm going to get some other position here before I respond. Jeff Neuman, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. I never fully understood example B.b. I didn't really say anything because I figured you guys were smarter than I was at the top-level domain. But so much of B.b just doesn't make sense to me. First of all, a registrant doesn't use the top-level domain, so the whole premise is kind of weird. But if you assume, okay, instead of registrant Alice, it's company X has .whatever as the TLD. Then I don't even understand what the concept of letting a registration expire because a TLD is not a registration, it's a delegation, and it doesn't expire. It can be terminated

but it never expires. Then you have registrant Bob, which again I don't know how or why we're talking about registrant because Bob is a company that applies for and receives a delegation of a TLD. So what we're talking about is essentially whether there should be like a cooling off period between delegation of the same string if the first delegation is terminated for whatever reason.

So the whole thing is worded really poorly unless I'm misunderstanding it. But we should really write B.b as company A is delegated a TLD .example. Company A is terminated for not whatever. Then company B is delegated that same string at a later point in time and now the traffic issue. But it just never really made sense to me. If it's redefined as what I've said then it is at the top level and it should be in scope.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you, Jeff. Exactly my point. I agree with you completely. We do have some terminology issues here. I think that it is important as we read this things to take a step back and think about the point that's trying to be made and after we agree, there's some clarity work that has be done here on this definition so that it's clear to a new reader. So that's why one of the things is it's excellent to have a new set of eyes and fresh read of all of this. Even I can see somebody made a comment in the – I think it was Greg Shatan somewhere up here in the chat I saw that went by. The more I read these things, as I look, and not that I think there's really anything wrong with them per se, it's just that yeah, there's a lot of terminology that needs some tightening up. We're going to get there. Before I try to actually respond to some of the details, Patrik, you got your hand up. Go ahead, please.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you. I think, as everyone said, we need to be clear on terminology. Let me try once again to just say what I just said, because I'm really confused when people say, "What is a collision in the RZM and not?" That is not what I'm talking about at all. I'm talking about the Board being interested in what might happen when they delegate a TLD. I claim that that is what the Board want to look at. Then within all of those various issues, we obviously do have a discussion on what happens if a TLD that have been delegated then undelegated and then delegated again, what kind of problem might that result in for whoever that might have had domain names delegated under that TLD that just disappeared?

Jeff, I'm sorry but there are many TLDs that have gone away that had been undelegated. There were 1,528 TLDs on the 10th of August 2019 and it is now 1,513. So there are 14 of them that have disappeared and had been undelegated. So I think the Board might be interested in that, whether there's a collision or not, I don't know. Whether if it is a collision or not, impacts whether it should be in scope for NCAP or not, I don't know, but that is something we need to agree on. Thank you.

JAMES GALVIN: Thank you, Patrik. Warren and then I'm going to try to respond to these things here. I think there are three points of clarification we can touch on. Warren, go ahead, please.

WARREN KUMARI: Thanks. Are we sure that how we're reinterpreting B.b is actually what was meant? There are a number of things like the fact that it's registrant Alice and a registration expired. Are we sure that what we were meaning when we used B.b was actually as a TLD or is that that part of the definition that is wrong? It sounds like we're going to try and make sure that if a TLD gets delegated and undelegated and re-delegated that that's what we're talking about, but is that actually definitely what we meant when we wrote this? Just like, Jeff, when we had this text, I think I raised the question, what do we actually mean and people seemed to know what it meant.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks for that, Warren. Let me try to summarize this discussion with three concrete things here. If you scroll to the top of the document, you'll see the highlight of that first sentence in which a name used in namespace may be used in different namespace. I want to try to focus on my recollection of many prior discussions, some in this, some not. But again, all of this is open for discussion here. So this is certainly not me saying this is the way it is. I just want to try to grab some of this. I want to try to interpret this as my recollection of the concept or what we're after, which kind of gets what Warren was just talking about there in the end.

So we're talking about use in one namespace versus the name that first highlighted phrase. I think that it's that phrase and then the next one that highlights about the [inaudible] space, it's conflict between those two things which is really catching up to us here. My recollection is this idea that namespace in the first sentence there is used in a very broad

sense. There is a set of namespace concerns that we think about in terms of ICANN manages a certain context of the namespace. The other manager of namespace of course is the IETF, which we should all be familiar with because it has a special use domains registry in which it has essentially a TLD like string which is in there. So arguably, that's a namespace. But there's also the idea that enterprises simply declare a name to be in their namespace. An enterprise all by itself owns a namespace, and it uses a string any way that it chooses and just because it wants to. This is the .corp problem – .corp, .home, .mail problem. Enterprise just decided that .corp, .home, and .mail were their thing. Now they were really using them at the second level, but they were taking advantage of behavior at the TLD level and so that's how they got successful and why we had that broad deployment and why name collisions exist at all. Corp was being used in a local namespace owned by the enterprise and it's now conflicting with the root namespace.

I think that the issue, for me, even in the context of B.c is just that same fact what you have is a particular delegation of a name that is being used in a particular way and it exists in a particular context, the namespace which is defined by the context in which it's being used, and then it gets used in another namespace and in other context. It's worth noting that that's what's going on in B.b. You have a TLD which has been delegated. It's used in a particular way that it gets pulled back and it's not used anymore for whatever reason and it doesn't exist.

McDonald's example is the one being thrown out here. Maybe someday McDonald's will come back and want to register their name. That wouldn't be a name collision, it was just the same registrar, the same

authority for the namespace. But if someone else came along, if there was McDonald's in a different context, that could get the name and wanted it then that would be a name collision, because the context in the redelegation would be different and that would be [inaudible]. It's really all about going back up to the very first sentence, name collision definition, it's where the name could be misinterpreted. The use of the name is misinterpreted. That is the broad definition of a name collision. And that's [why] these other things are all in here. I agree completely that use of the word registrant, use of the word registration instead of delegation, those are confusing terms. They are real terms of art in our industry. And in these definitions, we really were not clear about how we use them.

So what I want to suggest here as a particular step forward on things – and I see your hand, Patrik – one is, definitely there's some clarity that can be done to this definition in terms of trying to be very precise about terminology, so that these examples that are here are clear to everyone and we can have some agreement about what the example means. Because Warren does ask the question even about B.b, is it really about redelegation of a TLD? But I observed, well, there's an authority question there that kind of matters in terms of details and that sort of an issue. One is we need to have an action to go through this and carefully craft some new terminology in some key areas to see if we agree.

The second thing is we have had a consensus calls, we've agreed for the moment that B.c is not part of the advice that we'll provide to the Board. I'm not inclined at the moment to do a similar consensus call for B.b. What I'd rather do is take the action to provide just an editorial

exercise across this definition to make it clear and to properly use our terms of art in our industry in a better way. I guess I get to take the pen to do that. I'm making a point of this. We'll try to do it based on my recollection so that we have something black and white to talk about.

And then we can visit the question of what's in scope for advice to the Board and what treatment or non-treatment we will give to other things. That's where we'll get into the question of whether it's out of scope or at least part of a descriptive survey of what a name collision is for the benefit of the community, not just for the benefit of the Board. I apologize, it's a little long-winded. But, Patrik, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you very much. I stand with my view that we should not define name collision. Like I said before, we should start by defining the scope for NCAP, which is when the Board wants to delegate a string to the TLD. And given that scope, we should stay within that scope, we should look at what kind of situations should we look at and not look at, and it seems to be the case that we are having some disagreements on how much we should write about but we probably have to write some kind of words about redelegation of TLDs and what is outside of the addition of a TLD. I think we should just tell the Board, "This is a hard problem. The community disagree on what the actual definition is. We don't know. It has lots of different kind of weird things. Go ask someone else to answer that question."

JAMES GALVIN: Point of clarification, Patrik. When you're saying, "Don't try to define name collision," are you saying that because … you know that the Board actually asked us to define name collisions. We're after to create a proper definition.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Jim, the previous time – I think it was two times ago when I talked, I read from the Board resolution saying the Board asked, "Define name collision," and I said and suggested, "I think that was in the context of the Board when they were thinking of when they added a TLD to the root zone." And I suggested go back to the Board and clarify and say that we propose that we will only look at name collision in the context of when the Board will add a new TLD. That was my suggestion and I haven't heard anyone saying no to that one but I stand with that. That was my point at this time. I stand with asking for clarification because I don't think the Board asked for a clear definition of name collision in general.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. Thank you for that. That's what I wanted to understand. That was a clarifying question that I had to do that. I see Merike has her hand up, the SSAC liaison to the Board. Merike, you have a question or comment here before I ask about whether or not we're going to seek to task you?

MERIKE KAEO: Just a comment that I will offer to bring any questions that needed to the Board Technical Committee and get clarification for anything if that's what the group needs and wants. That's all.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay, thank you. That's good. I appreciate that. I want to take as an action for the NCAP Admin Committee to consider the question. I'll tell you why I want to do that before I want to – the step that I want to make sure I do here is this discussion group, we can certainly have a consensus for ourselves here as to whether or not we think we want to answer the question of name collision. I'm going reserve for a call for consensus on that question until next week, actually, part of it because I want to get the notes in this, reaching out and see if there's anyone else out there who wants to offer an opinion in context about it. I think it's a valid question to ask and we should seek to see what this group thinks about it.

I also want to observe – and Rod is not with us today, he's chair of the SSAC – I think that SSAC has a role in this too. It is typical for SSAC to want to see things in a broader context. While this discussion group may not go forward doing that, perhaps SSAC will want to revise and revisit this definition and clarify it in an editorial way, kind of like what I was offering to do anyway here for this group, and I just want to draw that line.

Here's what we'll do, I'm going to do the editorial exercise anyway on this definition for the benefit of this group. We will next week call a two-part question. One is whether we want to specifically ask the Board

for clarification on what it wants and related question. I'll think about how to carefully frame these and order them so we get the right consensus out of it. But the other part of the question will be whether or not this discussion group wants to take on the task of creating that definition. We'll do a consensus call on those two questions and discussion about them next week.

I just want to make sure that Rod, as representing SSAC, has an opportunity to hear all that too. Then we'll know appropriately about asking Merike to talk to the Board and get any clarification that we need at what we're going to do. Any objections to that as a path forward? Not seeing any hands. No one's jumping down, speaking out loud.

Okay. All right, let's see here. I'm looking at the time. Wow, we are five minutes of the hour. I'm going to suggest that we actually declare success for today and that we not jump into the next item on our agenda, which was to pick up questions about how to continue forward with our analysis where it strikes me that it takes at least a few minutes to get into the right frame of mind and describe what it is you want to be talking about in order to get into it. I'm thinking that agenda item five there, we won't actually get into that at the moment. We'll just come back to definition and name collision and the two questions that I just talked about here. Any objections to that?

I'm going to move smartly into Any Other Business? Any other comments from anyone about anything here? Then our next meeting will be in a week, the same time in your proper time zone here. Thanks, everyone. I appreciate your time in joining us. Very excellent discussion

today. I very much appreciate it. Let's carry that forward and we'll hopefully come back next week. So thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]