
KIM CARLSON: Thank you. Welcome to today's NCAP discussion group call on May 8th at 21:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom list.

We have apologies from James Galvin, Matt Larson, Warren Kumari, and Steve Crocker.

All 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. With that, I'll turn the call over to you, Jay. Thank you.

JAY DALEY: Thank you. So, we have two updates to SOIs. Firstly, we've had one person who has moved from a member down to an observer due to the timing of the calls. Kim, could you remind me who that is, please?

KIM CARLSON: It's Justine Chew.

JAY DALEY: Great. Thank you. I'll just check participants. Could you please introduce yourself as the new person [inaudible].

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.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALISE: Yes, thanks, Jay. It's Anne Aikman-Scalise. I was previously an observer. My SOI appears now on the NCAP working document page. I should mention that I'm an intellectual property lawyer primarily, and as we'll be able to see in my SOI, our firm has in the past filed public comments on the topic of name collisions on the project itself – name collision analysis project.

I should also mention to participants that in the 2012 round, our firm filed objections to dot-mail. The primary reason for my joining the discussion group is that I am an active member of subsequent procedures and I worked from the beginning – pretty much the beginning - of work track four in subsequent procedures and found that I have some comments in relation to the consideration of both the report and results related to SubPro. So, thank you for welcoming me to the discussion group.

JAY DALEY: Okay. Thank you, Anne. Danny, I don't know if you've had a chance previously to introduce yourself and your [inaudible].

DANNY MCPHERSON: Yeah, I don't think I did verbally. I [inaudible]. Anyway, I'm Danny McPherson. I'm Chief Security Officer at Verisign. I run [inaudible] research program, in particular, applied security as well. I've one a lot of work with name collisions in the past, both with my SSAC hat on and my Verisign hat on. There's a long list of publications related to those various types of publications in my SOI. If anybody has questions or whatever about those, let me know.

The last thing I would probably add, as most of you probably know, Verisign is an operator to the 13 root servers. We've been collecting data pretty much since our first SSR report in 2013 related to undelegated queries, the root as well as delegated queries at the root, and we anonymize that data in some manner and have some longitude in which [inaudible] to that. If and when it becomes available, we would like to find a way to make it accessible to various parties in some manner, assuming we can find a way to get past any privacy concerns, even though the data is already anonymized largely and we just have [Q name] data and query volume and whatnot.

Anyway, the other thing I will note is that one of the folks on our analysis team, one of our principle researchers, Matt Thomas, who I think probably already introduced himself, he does a lot of the data analysis and work that I shared with SSAC and you'll see his name throughout the publication, in particular in some of the peer review and other work. He's definitely a subject-matter expert. So, if you have questions on Verisign-related stuff, by all means feel free to hit Matt or I up. Thank you.

JAY DALEY:

Great. Thank you, Danny. Does anybody else have any change to their SOI that they wish to share with the group? No? Okay, good. Right.

We'll move on to item four, controlled interruption. So, what we need to discuss here is what we expect the contractors to do about controlled interruption. There is a ... Anyway, no. We'll start off with that.

Matt Thomas, you posted about this the list. Would you be happy to start off by telling us what you would like to see the contractors do around controlled interruption?

MATT THOMAS:

Sure. I think it might be prudent for information and knowledge sharing that is part of the scope of study one that since it is within the goals to bring important information and knowledge from prior to work into the study, that that includes all known previous collisions that happened, implementations of name collision framework and any kind of studies and measurements surrounding that as part of that.

JAY DALEY:

Okay, thank you. We're getting some echo, so I might put some headphones on now. Let's be clear exactly what we mean about previous things that have been learned previously.

Would it be fair to say that what we are looking at is that we want to make sure that the contractors are able to document what people experience as the, with controlled interruption, the effects of controlled interruption, as in how often it was invoked, for example? But we're really not interested in what effort or resources or anything that they had to put into it. That's something for later on determination. Matt, your view on that?

MATT THOMAS:

Yeah. Sorry. I'm trying to make my echo a little less severe for you. Hopefully, this is better.

I think it's prudent that we include the studies of the known collisions that have worked along with [inaudible] data that might have been studied by ICANN or the other delegations so that the contractors can produce a better-informed report to make sure everyone is informed of the prior work, including this aspect of name collisions.

JAY DALEY:

Okay. Does anyone else have anything to add to this about controlled interruption? Okay. So, I'm going to take away to write a brief summary of what they should look at on this. Are there any other ... I mean, as far as I'm aware, controlled interruption is the only mitigation that was put in place, but were there any other mitigations that should be considered as in pre-existing mitigations which we looked at by the contracts as the study one at all? Danny, go ahead, please.

DANNY MCPHERSON:

I was just going to point out that there was [inaudible] alternate path to delegation which was basically if you block all these strings with a high volume of queries, then you can delegate earlier and then that changed when they came out with collision or controlled interruption. I'm not sure that gets to your question; I was just pointing that out as a historical artifact. I don't believe it's a persistent thing or a forward-looking thing. It was sort of an arbitrary [inaudible] based on volume and I think that a lot of people had some concerns with that.

JAY DALEY:

Okay, great. Thank you, Danny. I think we will ... As you said, I don't think we'll work on that. I think we need to be clear that we are very much looking at the data and what actually happened here in terms of the data around controlled interruption. I'm not sure we would necessarily be able to find that from pre-work.

So, if there's anything in the pre-work where somebody has produced a study of the impacted [inaudible] controlled interruption, then that would be useful. If there is nothing like that, then I think we're then punting that forward to study three which is where we are looking at mitigations again across the full set of them. So, I hope everyone is happy with that. Unless I see any hands, I'm going to move on to the next item. Great.

Can we please bring up the study one document, then? Great. Thank you. I've made a bit of an edit to this as well since this is up simply to add in the bit that we discussed via email.

So, starting off, then, this is what we discussed by email about the criteria for prior work to be assessed and we then put in this list of specific prior work that meets the criteria above and should be included at a minimum.

Does anybody have any changes or anything to this? I heard nothing on the list, so I assume we're comfortable to go ahead with this.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE:

Could I make one comment?

JAY DALEY: Yeah, sure, on this particular bit here about criteria.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah. Are we on the study task section or in the ... I'm sorry. My comment is on B, sorry. I'm ahead. I'm on B.

JAY DALEY: So, I'm on study task three here.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Sorry, I'm on 3B and you're on 3A. I apologize.

JAY DALEY: No, no. Go on to 3B, that's fine. Anything in 3 is fine.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: The only comment I have on 3B is that regarding the name collision section of the PDP report, it would be, as a member of SubPro – active member, I guess you would say – it would be my recommendation that we have the contractor look at the final report because the initial report itself, as Rubens pointed out in his email, it's quite preliminary and actually it was never discussed by the full WG.

So, if the contractor is going to be retained to read a report, I believe that should be the final report rather than looking at something that's quite preliminary and as to which, as Rubens stated in his email, there can be strong minority views. Maybe we want the contractor to look at

the public comment on the initial report but there may very well be a second public comment period.

So, I'm just a little concerned that the contractor would end up not having as much credibility having reviewed initial report rather than final report. Thank you.

JAY DALEY: Okay. Thank you, Anne. Danny?

DANNY MCPHERSON: I was just going to second that. I think I may have said that in the chat last week. The compounding factor is I don't believe it's subject to consensus call either – and somebody correct me if I'm wrong, I maybe used the wrong terminology there but I think that's the case.

So, the two factors combined in particular, [inaudible] I don't know why we look at a preliminary report. Anybody can write anything preliminary and I don't think that should dictate what we do here.

That said, when it's complete and in that context, I think it might be worthwhile to review at that point.

JAY DALEY: Okay, great. Thank you, Anne and Danny. So, I intend to then change that to say the name collision section of the final published PDP report, if that is ready at the time of the contractor doing their work. Is everybody comfortable with that? Good.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: I don't know that ... I think it might be something where you would want to add it in the RFP as something that might become available towards the end of the contractor's work because I think we're looking at ... The timeframe on that would be something where we would add it towards the ... When the contractor's work is due. Sorry.

JAY DALEY: Yeah. Okay. That's fine. That will be taken care of. I don't want them to have to hang around notably just for that end of that report. Okay, thank you. Can we move on to point four and five, please? Sorry, four and six.

So, this is again from our call last week. The important points have been documented. Any questions about the data used, the methodology applied, any technical gaps that should be considered and any competitive or imposing recommendation that may be identified?

Then, six, determine if those data sets are still available and any constraints there may be regarding access.

Do we have any comments on these at all? If I recall rightly, there was something on the list. Ah, right. So, nothing from any of you there, but we do have Anne's point raised on the list which was a summary of the harm that may be caused by name collisions. Anne, would you like to talk to that at all?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yes. Thank you, Jay. I had just suggested that in the important points to be covered, because in our summary of the project, 2.2 board requests, there is identified in 2C I believe it is, the board has asked for identification of the harm. I'm not sure that I see ... It does strike me that that's a study one task but if I'm wrong and it's not a study one task, I'm sure ... [inaudible] correct me on that.

JAY DALEY: Okay, thank you, Anne. I have a view but before I say anything, would anybody else like to chime in here? No? Okay.

So, my view, Anne, is that ... That's an important point. Thank you for raising that. We actually need to tackle this in two ways or two stages. So, study one needs to look at any published data about the harms of name collision and needs to summarize those harms. But then when we then conducted study two and looked at the data, we may have more data or evidence to provide about the harms. So, the final section of the harms can't be produced until the end of study two. So, we should insert something here but make it clear it's simply just documenting that as an interim step for [inaudible] assessment as part of study two.

Are you, Anne, comfortable with that and does anybody else have anything they'd like to say?

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yeah, Jay, completely. Yes. I agree completely. Thank you.

JAY DALEY:

Great. Danny has agreed as well. Thank you. Does anybody else have anything they would like to add to this? No? Okay, good. I will update it with that. So, can we switch back to the agenda, please, Kim?

I've not heard anyone say on the list that they have any other edits or concerns with study one, so we will – I will try to update that and get that circulated around as the almost final version so that we can then hand that over to OCTO for them to then take forward as they wish. This is last call basically on anybody who wants to open up a new subject around study one. No? Good.

So, last two items. Any other business? I don't have any. Does anybody here have any other business they would like to raise at all? No? Excellent.

So, our next meeting is same time next week. For those of you on [inaudible], that's the 15th of May. Thank you all for joining and we will try to circulate some form of agenda as to exactly what we're going to discuss next week and hopefully we'll be able to get into something slightly more substantive. Thank you all for joining.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thanks, Jay. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]