
KIM CARLSON: Thank you. Welcome to today's NCAP discussion group call on December 18th at 20:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by Zoom. As a side note, we are still looking into options to allow attendants to see the full attendance list. We have apologies from Patrik Falstrom, Matt Larson, and Roy Arends. All calls are recorded and transcribed. 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. With that, I'll turn the call over to you, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. Thanks, Kim. Oh, look at that. I discovered a new button, the Q&A button that I've never clicked on before. I see we had a question there and I see that you already took care of that. I guess somebody did, presumably Kim. Whoever did, thank you for that. Although, I'm not actually seeing where the answer goes. Did you do that before we started or is the response in a different spot? Sorry to ask that question, I'm just curious how it works. How is it that Jim asked about ...?

KIM CARLSON: He used the Q&A. He composed his question in there and we can actually type an answer. We can type it and send it to him privately or we can broadcast it to the entire group.

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.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. So you must have typed it in privately because I'm not seeing it. Otherwise, I would see it if you typed it to everyone, I guess. Is that it?

KIM CARLSON: Yeah. I actually haven't responded to him but I did make a note verbally in my opening. That's why he said that.

JAMES GALVIN: Oh, I see. Now I see in the chat that he says, "She covered it in her opening statement." Okay. I wondered if, when he said there, "Thanks," it meant that he saw the list in some way. Okay. Thank you. I'm sorry to distract from that, I just discovered a new feature here and wanted to understand that. It's like a child with a new toy, what can I say? It's that time of year.

Okay. Welcome, everyone. Does anyone have any updates to statements of interest? I'm not seeing any hands go up or hearing anything. Just a reminder that it is important to keep those things up to date for this kind of working group in ICANN. We don't have any new members this week from last week so we're going to pick up and continue our discussion that we had last week. Hopefully, folks can see the link, here. I'll put it in the chat so that folks can see that can get to it easily. We will pick up here with eight and nine, which are down at rows 15 and 16, and pick up our continuing discussion.

Maybe what I should do first is just open and say that hopefully folks have been thinking about this since last week. If anyone would like to go back and look at any prior item and have more discussion about it, I do want to open that opportunity if anyone wants to ask for some further

discussion about any item. And I do want to thank Matthew Thomas for his additional list of items on the mailing list. Thank you for that and collecting those lists of things. We do want to make sure that they get cataloged, Karen. You should talk to Matt Larson, Karen, and just make sure that it's okay for you to pick those up, add them to your list, and include that in the catalog. Okay?

KAREN SCARFONE: Okay.

JAMES GALVIN: With that, unless anyone wants to otherwise go back or open a dialog from last week on anything in particular, I'm going to pick up with number eight, here. I'll pause for a moment. Okay, thanks very much. Jumping right in, here. Number eight: suggest a criteria for determining whether collision strings should not be delegated.

Again, as we've been saying all along here in some of these, this is just another detail in the overarching objective for study two, which is work that we will ultimately have to do. It's providing guidance to the board in general for reviewing applications in the presence of name collisions. What kinds of things can they look for as they consider whether or not a string which exhibits name collisions should be delegated or not? This is a critical question.

Again, our goal here is not to make explicit recommendations but to give due consideration to the kinds of questions that the board needs to ask itself and the kinds of data that it should look at. And then it really is up

to it to make a decision overall about how to evaluate the data that we're going to suggest that they look at.

I think that the critical thing for us, here, is consideration of what data we think is important, here, that's necessary for the kinds of questions that have to be considered when you want to make a decision not to delegate a particular string. Then, once you decide not to delegate it, the other half of that is that as over time, here, the ICANN community grows a list of strings that it calls "collision strings" – that's terminology in the board resolution – that can't be delegated because they are considered harmful from a name collision point of view, would there ever be a reason why they could be released from that list and thus ultimately delegated?

There are two parts to that. One, of course, is the mitigation issues. And then, just in general, depending on the criteria we come up with there might be reasons why we can allow that to go forward. Warren, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

WARREN KUMARI:

Whoops, I'm muted. There we go. I think that one of the questions is not only, "What information do they need?" but, "Is that information even available?" [RCF 78706], aggressive NSAC Q&A minimization, may make it that the information that is needed is simply no longer available. I also don't know if something that should be included in this, which people probably remember from last time there were name collision discussions, is how one separates out actual data from the potential of gamed data; people trying to block other people managing to get a name, or something similar.

JAMES GALVIN:

Yes. Thank you very much for reminding me about gaming. One of the considerations that we will have to make, here – it has been pointed out in prior documents ... Actually, I'm trying to remember if it was actually listed in an SSAC document or if it was just part of some prior discussions. Yes, as we consider the data that is to be collected and used, obviously all of that will be visible. It will be known to applicants beforehand.

“What is the gaming risk?” is an important consideration that we also have to address. Actually, I know what it is. The gaming question is actually in the project plan. We did include that in this project plan as one of the issues that we have to consider as we develop this list of questions that should be evaluated when deciding whether to delegate or not.

These are the discussion points. I've made some notes there in real-time in the spreadsheet. We need to consider the questions that should be asked. Is there data that is needed? What is it? What is the gaming risk? The only additional thing here that it occurs to me to add is ... I had something in my mind. Where did it go?

Oh, the frequency of revaluation. I don't know. Maybe that's something to talk about or maybe it's upon request. We should consider that question and offer some guidance about making that choice, even if we don't want to actually pick whether it's a regular thing or on-demand. We should talk about those choices, there, as far as that's concerned.

Okay. That's all I have on my mind to mention for that. I'm not seeing any hands. A comment in the chat room, here. Anne is pointing out in the

chat room that SubPro, of course, will have a recommendation about developing a screening mechanism for “do not apply” lists.

I think we actually did talk about that up here before, last week, in one of these other items, because one of the things that is interesting is that there may very well be names to be considered. Certainly, prior SSAC reports had spoken about the fact that we have to give due consideration to “special-use names,” I’ll call them. I am deliberately trying to avoid calling them “reserved names.”

“Special-use names” or “do not apply names.” What does that mean? We ought to have some consideration about that and give some thoughts about that from a technical point of view in this document in addition to what SubPro says. We’ll have the opportunity to look at what they said in detail. Rod, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah. Thanks, Jim. One thing I think that we should keep in mind is that question eight and question seven go hand in hand in that seven asks, “What level should we think of this as creating collisions?” and eight is, “At what level are those collisions creating a situation where they shouldn’t be delegated?” It’s kind of a threshold question. I think some of the things that are in question seven apply to question eight. “Where in the frequency,” etc., etc. Special-use names.

At least a few of those things that are mentioned in seven apply to eight. Maybe not all of them but I think that when we’re talking about criteria, it’s some of the same attributes. It’s just, at what level do we ...? And

what are the things that are the factors that move them from just being a collision issue to a “don’t delegate” issue?

JAMES GALVIN:

Thank you for that. That’s a really good point. I tried to capture that by adding a bullet item to the bottom of both seven and eight noting that they are closely related to each other and they are threshold questions when you take them together. I liked that phrase that you had offered, there. That gives us a way of thinking about these things. We’ll have to dig into that a bit. Okay. Thanks very much for that.

Any other comments or questions, here? Okay. I think that speaks to the second half of Anne’s comment in the chat room, there, talking about that we need a gating mechanism once applications are in to test strings as to whether the level of risk is high. In fact, it’s part of what’s going on, here. The distinction between seven and eight is first about, in seven, whether or not it is a collision string. There’s a threshold question there to consider. And then, eight, once you decide you’re there you get to decide separately about delegation or not. Just because something is a collision string doesn’t necessarily mean that it can’t be delegated.

This is where we get into the mitigation question, what we can do about that, and what can be allowed in the role that controlled interruption and potentially other things play. These are all detailed discussions that we have to have as part of study two – at least our analysis work in study two, even if we determine along the way, here, that there’s not more data work to be done.

Okay. Moving on to question nine, “measures to protect against intentional or unintentional creation of situations.” This gets us to the whole gaming question, or partly the gaming question. I guess that really is what it is. We’re trying to see what advice we can offer on the side of making this process predictable as best as we can so that at least people know what the board is going to think about and the questions that need to be considered.

But we want to try and set it up in such a way that even though there might be some hard data that’ll be useful to get, like the negative queries, the NX domain queries that are often seen at the root as a popular item to latch onto and to suggest is useful data to have. I mean, the problem with negative queries to the root is still that people could go about making that visible and intentional. We need to think about whether or not it’s possible to protect against that. This becomes a bit of a thought exercise on our part.

Of course, it might be that we will find some stuff in the cataloging that is being done already. People have already considered these kinds of questions in looking at the data. This is a quality-of-data situation, relative to what we know about name collisions and what we see. Any thoughts we can place about this? Certainly SSAC’s discussion about the “wild card” activity. The reason why wild cards are not allowed under the gTLD zone itself gets into this issue, here. That’s a related issue and a related concern. There is some room for us to look at some prior discussions and thoughts about that. This is the thought exercise that we have to have, dig into, and hopefully find some additional discussions about it in the cataloging that Karen is doing.

I just want to make a note about the wild card report from SSAC. I know that's already on our list of things to be looked at but I don't have anything in particular to add to question nine. Any other comments from anyone else about anything? Otherwise, I'm going to take a step back and just try to summarize the objective, here, in having gone through these.

The reason why I made the suggestion to go through these questions from the board is that our goal here is to actually consider what we think we need to know in order to speak to these issues. What data do we think we would like to look at? What questions would we like to get answers to in order to have what we need to speak to these issues on behalf of the board? Maybe before I go on too far, Rod, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah. I was trying to get it up for the last bit and couldn't. There was fumbling. Sorry about that. I think that one of the interesting things to pause it on in looking for gaming and things like that, is, are there time series reports – and I'm thinking like DITL – that show trends over time? If you have somebody start to game things, as we get closer to a potential next round, that could actually be looked at for potential activity around that, whether it's intentional or not. It could be that somebody created a new app that creates new collisions. That's not necessarily intentional, that they're trying to squat on the space. But if you have time series where you can do comparisons, that's useful for being able to try and detect activity around gaming potential.

JAMES GALVIN: I like that. Thank you. Before I respond directly, let me let someone else talk. Warren, you've got your hand up. Go ahead, please.

WARREN KUMARI: I agree with Rod that that's a useful thing for us to include but we should also stick in a bunch of caveats that the use of these sorts of strings changes. For example, there was recently a huge spike in the .local domain as a bunch of Unix distributions decided to order [metakey stock] using that. OpenStack also went from zero to 8,000 or 9,000 QPS over the space of two weeks as a different Neutron thing rolled out in the OpenStack world. Yes, we should note it, but also this should result in more investigation and not just an approval.

JAMES GALVIN: Thanks for that, Warren. Actually, the thing that I had in my mind was precisely the last point that you made. I added it here; "an ongoing study of time series reports." What I was really imagining in my response to Rod – and you had hit it directly, there – was going to be that if there is any kind of time series reports that have to go on, that feels like it becomes an ongoing task probably for ICANN and, probably, at least given today's structure, the OCTO group. It would be something that they would do on an ongoing basis.

There might be some work involved in figuring out what those time series reports should be. But making the suggestion that there should be some and that maybe we've got some ideas of some starting ones to go with ... And then they just start to keep them and they make them visible. And then, as Warren just said, the most important thing is that having those

reports is interesting but when they change over time and you see changes in whatever the report is showing, you do need to go and look and see what that is and what that's about. Maybe it's completely to be expected and maybe not. Yeah. These are important questions. This will be part of the recommendations that we'll need to make in this space.

Okay. Any other comments or questions about anything? Okay. Going back and continuing my summary before, one of the reasons for going through these questions is partly to get us all back into a common understanding of what we're after, here, and what we have to do. We do have to respond to the board.

We do have study one in progress right now. A second part of study one is for Karen to provide her insight – after she's done cataloging what she can find about name collisions and anything related that we can provide there – on gaps that she sees that are visible. What I specifically was hoping for in reviewing some of this was for us to perhaps see what gaps we see that we want to identify and highlight to make sure that Karen includes those things, or that she also is looking for answers to questions that we have here as part of our discussion.

We've listed a number of items, here. The thing that we have to do now is take these questions in our discussion and the data points that we've talked about here in the discussion and think about those in terms of, "What are we looking for in existing literature and research in this space?" so that Karen can look and make a point of that being one of her criteria for cataloging. Also, it will then contribute to her gap analysis.

Hopefully, she can take that on board and find a way to articulate that gap so that we see it. That will then become motivation for doing study two and, in fact, creating the work plan and the statement of work; what we need for study two in order for us to do the analysis that is the bulk of our job here as this discussion group. The analysis, of course, is answering these ten comments from the board.

I think, with that, let's go back to the agenda slide, Kim. Okay, thank you. We've gone through these discussions. I was hoping for more discussion. I really thought we'd probably be at this a little bit longer than we ended up being. But that's okay. We've made our first cut and this is a good thing. It is, unfortunately, a difficult time of year. I'm just being sensitive to that, too. We are just a week before a big holiday season that will continue for a couple of weeks. A lot of people are away.

I think what I'm going to suggest here, at this point, is that now that we've done this first pass across this I really would like to offer as an action to the group for people, now, to go back over this and think about this. Review this and consider explicitly the question of, what do we need in order to translate and convert our discussion notes that we have here into the questions that we need to answer? What data do we need? What questions do we want to ask ourselves so that we can respond to these points from the board? Again, those are the things that we want to create to become our gap that we want Karen to catalog as part of producing the work product for study one.

I'm going to suggest here in the short-term that we not meet on January 8th, that first Wednesday of the year. Instead, our NCAP admin

committee, your co-chairs and the SSAC admin folks, Rod and Julie, are with us. And of course, Kim, and other SSAC staff will meet.

We're going to think about how to approach and organize the remaining meeting times in January so that we can drive to a slightly better work product, here, than just this spreadsheet. It will give us a chance to have a meeting and do that. I would expect, then, that we will meet on Wednesday the 15th of January, with this discussion group again. Ideally, we will have some more direct advice and guidance from our admin committee here about what to do, our next steps, and how to approach our future work. I do want to make sure that we contribute as much as we can to the work product out of study one.

As always, if folks have any references, if you come across anything, please feel free over the holiday time to do your Google searches, or whatever your favorite search engine is, look for things that you think are interesting, and send them to the list. Let's try to gather up as much as we can, here.

For Karen, as much as you can, Karen, and are able and willing as you're moving along, if you can expose some early questions and data to the mailing list and to the working group so that folks can see it, think about it, talk about it amongst ourselves, and perhaps derive some comments for you to consider in your report to get ahead of the public comment period as much as possible? That would be a helpful thing, too. I leave that to you to work out as best as you can. I think that that covers it.

Kim, I forgot to ask before. Didn't you do ...? No. Those are just the meeting slots for Cancún for the Friday, right? We're going to start at 9:00

AM. We're committed to starting at 9:00 AM and that's just a note to people that those are the meeting slots. Depending on what agenda we develop, that's when we're going to meet, on that Friday. Please, make your travel plans accordingly to make sure that you arrive in time to start on Friday the 6th at 9:00 AM. Was there more to that, Kim? I just want to make sure I'm not forgetting anything.

KIM CARLSON:

No, that was it. I just made a note that we did build in multiple breaks.

JAMES GALVIN:

Good. Thank you for that. Okay. Any other business? Last chance for comments from anybody about anything. I'm not seeing any hands. Happy holidays to all. I hope you have a festive and joyful season with friends and family. We shall see all of you again on January 15th. We're adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]