

Terri Agnew:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 4 – IDNs/Technical & Operations on Thursday, 04 May 2017 at 03:00 UTC for 60 minutes.

Terri Agnew:agenda wiki page: [https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A\\_community.icann.org\\_x\\_J9TRAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0A1gn-H4xR2EBk&m=IHwdrFAKqR2LZNmybdbVgD8BwyTzc4o1mfxG6WavQCw&s=6B9gp6IA6fM1S5QF1pPvQrE980iPbBaMRtnVtBSYCqw&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_J9TRAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=DRa2dXAvSFpClgmkXhFzL7ar9Qfqa0A1gn-H4xR2EBk&m=IHwdrFAKqR2LZNmybdbVgD8BwyTzc4o1mfxG6WavQCw&s=6B9gp6IA6fM1S5QF1pPvQrE980iPbBaMRtnVtBSYCqw&e=)

Jeff Neuman:Rubens sounded a little quiet to me

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Sounds fine Cheryl.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@staff - now getting the echo chamber with Cheryl's voice

Jeff Neuman:It now sounds choppy....

Rubens Kuhl:For me too.

Rubens Kuhl:Not choppy.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):audio gremlins Sorry team...

Steve Chan:Indeed, next SubPro meeting is 15 May, a full WG meeting at 1500 UTC

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):next slide

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):beat me to it ;-)

Jeff Neuman:I am not sure I understand the second bullet. Do we need to state what causes it?

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Jeff - probably so if we intend to explore possible remediation "fixes" to address it.

Jeff Neuman:I do not believe we will be exploring what fixes it, but rather just how to mitigate it when it happens. All of the causes are outside the control of ICANN, the Registries, Registrars, etc.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@ Jeff - I was referring to "mitigation" as "fixes" - sorry for the short-hand.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):So you believe we need to state that the issues caused by software attempting prediction from partial text which is "caused by software behavior trying to ... .. " in different terms OR explore why this results in collision risk more?

Rubens Kuhl:045

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Party expects he or she is still on internal server but they land on an external server?

avri doria:Well perhaps in the same way the UA effort is trying to change external behavior to make IDN work better, there could be a recommendation made on the creation of a similar process for collisions. Not perhaps a binding recommendation but perhaps an useful ancillary recommendation. I like what 45 says about warning applicants, perhaps a step beyond that is trying to change the behaviors that cause them.

vitor zhang:I think this name collision problem must be fixed before the NEXT ROUND of New gTLD application.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Excellent point in terms of proposals from our WT for the PDP Plenary to consider Avri... Thanks

Jeff Neuman:There is a bunch of resources at [www.icann.org/namecollision](http://www.icann.org/namecollision)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Noted Vitor, I suspect SSAC would agree with you that it needs to be addressed' which may as Avri is outlining be warnings as opposed to actual mitigations per se.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):and some flexibility might be well worth exploring as well

Jeff Neuman:Controlled interruption was applied in all new gTLDs

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC): Weren't there some mitigation steps taken for other TLDs in the first round? In other words, "controlled interruption" applied for a certain period?

vitor zhang:Thank U, CLO

Rubens Kuhl:Anne, please note that some people call 2000-round the first round and other people say that about 2012. So I, personally, prefer to refer to the year of the process.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):COMMENT: Per SSAC "name collisions will always be with us". So it's a question of degree and frequency. That's apparently why JAS Advisors recommended permanent reservation of certain TLD names. COMMENT

Jeff Neuman:The JAS final report agreed with the fact that there will always be collisions....but there are still more collisions in .com. In addition, collisions occur once a name is deleted and re-registered avri doria:but it should take a policy process to determine how to implement such an SSAC proposal. i.e the reason we need to look at it. In the round of '12, it was all handled directly by the Board without community comment.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Agree Avri - Board delegated decisions to subset of Board that did not have conflicts of interest - New gTLD Program Committee or something like that.

avor zhang:I really think namecollision problem should not be some people's excuse for blocking competitors .....

Jessica Hooper:Any path forward with regard to Name Collision should be navigated with the SSAC advising the community.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Agree with Jessica on this.

Jeff Neuman:@Jessica - we will be discussing the the SSAC on the next call.

Jeff Neuman:But I am not sure they will necessarily take this issue up for new advice

Jeff Neuman:We cannot force items onto their agenda

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Jessica that view is why we are pleased to have Patrick join our WT for the next call to better 'bring us all up to speed, and to progress our discussions on this important matter...

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):COMMENT: SSAC has issued new advice in SSAC 90. They discussed this with the Board in Copenhagen. COMMENT

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):and Yes I am biased here ;-)

Jessica Hooper:@Jeff & Cheryl - Perfect! I know we can't force it, but it's in their best interest to discuss this.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):This next meeting of our WT will be just after the CC2 inputs come in so we will have additional input to consider from the communities within ICANN to consider as well

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):and in our best interests to fully understand and explore the SSAC advice given

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Cheryl: Glad to know Patrick will join for next call.

Jeff Neuman:I don't read SSAC 90 as offering advice on name collisions per se

Jeff Neuman:it talks about coordinating with the IETF on reserved strings

Jeff Neuman:but really just refers back to SSAC 62

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@jeff - It also emphasizes predictability for the end user. There were three strong points made in SSAC 90.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Yes Anne we had that confirmed by Emily in our Leadership call earlier today, he was unable to make today's call but can contribute more time to us in our next meeting :-)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):sorry it was confirmed by Julie not Emily ( sorry Julie ;-)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):and Rubins and I thank Julie on behalf of our WT for assisting us with reaching out to SSAC and gaining some time in Patrick's schedule

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):should read behalf \*sigh\*

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): agree @Jeff some data updates would be appreciated

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):QUESTION: Why would we NOT get an update from JAS Advisors? QUESTION

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):QUESTION: SSAC said we should coordinate with IETF and others. Can Patrick or someone else within ICANN get us the IETF list of special reserved names? QUESTION

avor doria:that list is already folded into the ICANN list.

Jeff Neuman:I think (personally) that if we reduced the controlled interruption period to 60 days (which JAS seemed to indicate was fine), then the 1 size fits all should not be an issue

avri doria:and the closer coordination with IETF is one of the thing that is being recommended. There is also work inside IETF to try and get thsi coordinated.

Jeff Neuman:The IETF List of names is published in an RFC, but as Avri said there may be more under consideration

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@ Jeff - You may be referring to JAS Advice on names not permanently reserved when you talk about the 60 day period.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Personally @Avri I think that would be very helpful

Jeff Neuman:@Anne - yes.

Jeff Neuman:@Avri - the question is whether the IETF wants to coordinate with ICANN :)

Steve Chan:@Anne, there are a collection of questions developed by this WT directed at JAS, which were sent to GDD. We are still awaiting a formal response from GDD. Their initial feedback is that the questions likely represent new work and would therefore require a new contract.. New research requests are something this WG can consider, but comments like Jeff's about the existing framework appearing to be a once size fits all solution, should be taken into account. That said, I'll be sure to continue to remind GDD that they owe the WT a response.

avri doria:yes, they add names through the RFC6761 process. i think there is one moving forward at the moment .alt. there a 6761 on on .homenet, but that has been changed to .home.arpa. it is something i, among others, do follow.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):COMMENT: One question to SSAC (Patrik) in advance of the call is whether SSAC is making efforts now to coordinate with IETF on name collisions. COMMENT

avri doria:at the moment, the main coorination point is those who particpate in both efforts.

vitor zhang:Is there any new data updated for name collision study , if new method or study tech has been introduced for this problem ?

avri doria:SSAC would advise, other would decide how to coordinate.

Jeff Neuman:I just went to alt.com to see if that was a brand or someone that would mind.....DO NOT Go to ALT.COM.....it is not an appropriate site :)

avri doria:(:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):not an appropriate site ?

Jeff Neuman:@CLO - ummm - Lets put it this way. Not safe for work.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):OK ...

Jeff Neuman:@Anne - correct.....we are not disussing .corp, .home or .mail

Jeff Neuman:discussing

avri doria:i would argue the .corp, .home and .mail are just bigger than the therrs but are indeed fit for one size fits all

Jeff Neuman:Who is the IETF liaison to the Board?

Jeff Neuman:Can we get them on the phone?

avri doria:Jonne

Rubens Kuhl:If you can speak Göran correctly, you can take a chance with Jonne... ;-)

Julie Hedlund:Not on sound, but Patrik will address this on the call on 25 May.

Jeff Neuman:That may be ok, but the SSAC is not a substitute for the IETF (in my opinion)

Julie Hedlund:It is addressed in SAC090

avri doria:IETF is not eager to jump into what they consider a political issue. they do technical stuff.

Terri Agnew:Next call: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 4 – IDNs/Technical & Operations will take place on Thursday, 25 May 2017 at 15:00 UTC for 60 minutes

avri doria:That is why they did not reserve the name as requested by ICANN

Jeff Neuman:@Avri - That's interesting as well. they consider it political and not technical?

avri doria:yep

avri doria:political and financial, both out of bounds for the IETF

avri doria:there is not a protocol reason for those names to be reserved.

Jeff Neuman:@Avri - that is an important point

Jeff Neuman:Thanks everyone!

avri doria:bye

Edmon:bye

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):Bye THANKS !