NCAP Discussion Group Weekly Meeting - 5 May 2021

Agenda:

1. Administrivia/Agenda Bashing

2. Action Item Review

3. Discuss draft questions for DNS operators: https://docs.google.com/document/d/10RLM2qYKwZyOmy-g3LNUP_6NYUBaKdUHKZAfv4I0qfM/edit [docs.google.com]

4. ICANN Board's questions regarding name collisions: Board Questions working documents [drive.google.com]

n. AOB

Draft NCAP Data Questions for DNS Operators: no new additions

PURPOSE OF DATA COLLECTION: Sense of name collision and what is going to be available for the future

Board Question #6
potential residual risks of delegating Collision Strings even after taking actions to mitigate harm

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1k2lEDN6o9TgMqjZPquRxz8mZtVLnyF-brd5nft9Zq_E/edit#heading=h.z2g5jf6de200

Board Question #7
suggested criteria for determining whether an undelegated string should be considered a string that manifest name collisions, (i.e.) placed in the category of a Collision String

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Dh_hAbC56e_76N8mpFqlPrfNGL7oHGtG6TGNGkZKH4s/edit#heading=h.z2g5jf6de200

List of strings to be not delegated. How do we determine if it is to be added to the collision string list or not? Discussion on lexical analysis (but broad lexical sweeping analysis not needed)

Data manipulation vs data disclosure

DLink in the root, not a delaged tld. What if Dlink wants the tld

Controlled interruption helped a lot of IT managers with misconfigurations to correct situations with some dignity

Doing outreach is a way to address name collision, not just technical solutions

Controlled interruption doesn't prevent collision, just allows environments of potentially identify where there is failure to resolve somewhere in the DNS

controlled interruption is not a mitigation strategy; controlled interruption is a name collision identification strategy.

Agree with Jim's characterization of "controlled interruption" as a way to discover name collisions. It does not prevent name collisions. Should we be saying that in response to this question to clarify?   I think Jeff Neuman would say it's a way to mitigate "harm" as opposed to a way to mitigate "name collisions". So we may need to define further what we mean by "mitigate".

We're trying to build a decision model

Board Question #8

suggested criteria for determining whether a Collision String should not be delegated, and suggested criteria for determining how remove an undelegated string from the list of Collision Strings

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Fv0ff2dhale1_2Hax33YWsUGhJ_iP_jSXdByGEYVGVg/edit#heading=h.z2g5jf6de200

Is it possible in the future is there criteria to revisit strings put on non-delegation list.

Board Question #9

measures to protect against intentional or unintentional creation of situations, such as queries for undelegated strings, which might cause such strings to be placed in a Collision String category, and research into risk of possible negative effects, if any, of creation of such a collision string list.

https://docs.google.com/document/d/16udpc2ngqPf_r-aSyz68nLc7C9639hO0c9cdNG6xf8I/edit#heading=h.z2g5jf6de200

If one can obtain the raw report on corp.com - it produced the origin IP addresses and the majority of those were proxies and google apps someone could simulate 'diverse' traffic to automate resolutions via proxies and bots

Questions

In Board Question 7, which basically is: "Is there criteria as to whether a string should not be delegated?"   Are we looking for lexical answer?.