SubPro WT 4: IDN / Technical / Operations

Meeting #12 2000 UTC 08 June 2017

Agenda

1-2
Welcome and Opening Remarks SOI updates

3
Full WG Update

4
Madrid May 2017 events

5
Community Input on Name Collisions

6
Name Collisions Framework

7
AOB

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks
2. SOI updates

3. Full WG Update

4. Madrid May 2017 events

Madrid, May 2017

- **ICANN GDD Summit 2017 May 09-11**
  - "DNS Primer", May 11, 91 minutes
- **ICANN ITHI Workshop (May 12 Morning)**
- **ROW Workshop #6 (May 12 Afternoon)**
- **ICANN DNS Symposium (May 13)**
  - "That's Still a Lot of Packets: Garbage Traffic at the Root" (Morning, 30 minutes)
  - "Introduction to the OCTO Research Middlebox Lab" (Afternoon, 40 minutes)
  - "New Datasets Available for Colliding Domains" (Afternoon, 20 minutes)
- **DNS OARC 26 (May 14 and 15)**
  - "OARC Engineering Report" (May 14, 30 minutes)
  - "The Dark Side of the DNS" (May 15, 30 minutes)

5. Community input on Name Collisions

CC2 questions and possible policy options

- **4.4.2:**
    - List of names to be excluded ? Method to produce such list ?
    - Name collision evaluation of each string ?
- **4.4.3:**
    - Reduction of controlled interruption period ?
- **4.4.1 and 4.4.3:**
    - Initiating the interruption period before end of evaluation and delegation ?

Input received on name collisions

- **JAS Advisors:**
  - **"Don't change the winning team" (ALAC also)**
  - **Look into SLD collisions (notifications)**
  - **Consider variations of 2012 problematic strings**
  - **Use DITL and ORDINAL datasets**
- **SSAC:**
  - **Create a "do not apply" list**
  - **Create an "exercise care" list**
  - **Consider what to do with previously delegated TLDs**
  - **Identify private namespaces**
  - **Coordinate with IETF on special-use domain names (IETF also, problem statement last call)**

Input received on name collisions

- **INTA:**
  - **Avoid APD-type lists; if used, cannot contain trademarks**
- **RySG and gTLD registries:**
  - **Lack of predictability**
  - **No need to extend 2-year 2-hour readiness**
  - **Reduce controlled-interruption period to 60 days**
  - **Assess risk instead of just quantity**
- **Thomsen Trampedach:**
  - **Initiate controlled interruption period sooner rather than later**
- **OCTO:**
  - **Reach out to DNS-OARC, IETF DNSOP, RIPE DNS-WG, TEG**

6. Name Collisions Framework

Name collisions framework in 2012-round

- **All 2012-round TLDs were required to pass a controlled interruption period and be able to respond within two hours for life-threatening collision reports, for the first two years of delegation**
- **During the controlled interruption period of 90 days, names would respond with an internal invalid address to warn affected users without exposing them**
  - **For APD lists, the same applied for those names in the list**
- **Current number of collision reports is 37 occurrences reported to ICANN, of which 0 were life-threatening**
  - **Other collisions might have been reported directly to registries, and some not reported at all**

Name collisions framework for subsequent procedures (aggregate proposal 1/2)

- **Before the procedure, ICANN Org would provide a "do not apply" list (as they did in 2012) and a list of "exercise care" strings where they already expect a more detailed study to be required**
- **Every application, whether or not to those already identified "exercise care" strings, would be allowed to file a collision mitigation framework**
- **All applied-for strings would be evaluated as to their risk of collisions: low risk, aggravated risk, high risk**
- **A high risk finding terminates the application(s)**
- **An aggravated risk requires a non-standard mitigation framework to move forward**
- **All low risk strings would share a common framework, using controlled interruption**

Name collisions framework for subsequent procedures (aggregate proposal 2/2)

- **All low-risk strings could start controlled interruption right after their findings are published; ICANN Org could even contract DNS providers to do so before other evaluations, contention resolution or contract signing.**
- **Minimum 90-day interruption period (same as 2012)**
- **No 2-year readiness (issue: data not yet available)**
- **Mitigation frameworks would be evaluated by RSTEP**
- **No APD or other per-label lists, unless required by an specific collision mitigation (ex: [appname].TLD)**
  - **Label-specific non-wildcard responses, based on registry request and ICANN Org approval ?**
- **Data-driven decision making using trusted research-accessible data (like DITL and ORDINAL)**

7. AOB