

Julie Bisland:Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 4 – IDNs/Technical & Operations on Thursday, 08 June 2017 at 20:00 UTC

Julie Bisland:Agenda wiki page: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_community.icann.org_x_DxLfAw&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=nc_HQj33ajB5LpXfiEafEO86NRstjTpP-38HCqhOECc&s=8UDk9oOvqu01JtdRj4cNv9x2X6YadbW8oBDzHcWOrAE&e=

Jeff Neuman:We are always ready :)

Steve Chan:FULL WG meeting on 12 June 2017 at 20:00 UTC

Steve Chan:@Jeff, not yet, but soon

Jeff Neuman:Ah...gave you all a scoop then :)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):so sorry to be late phones were gremlin ridden and PABX needed reboot

Julie Bisland:Hello Cheryl :)

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO)::-)

Alan Greenberg:Sorry to be late!

Jeff Neuman:Sounds like a Pink Floyd song

Martin Sutton::-)

Martin Sutton:Could we send out links to these presentations?

avri doria:recordings and slides available?

Jeff Neuman:realted to this group, I think that is it....of course we also talked about the SLAs

Martin Sutton:Thx

Jeff Neuman:or the SLA misses

Donna Austin, Neustar:Jeff, what SLAs are you referring to?

Jeff Neuman:right

Steve Chan:I think this is the presentation you're thinking of Jeff?

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_en_system_files_files_presentation-2Dslam-2D13may17-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=nc_HQj33ajB5LpXfiEafEO86NRstjTpP-38HCqhOECc&s=FPIDvsckXP96onKWNLFzuo6194f4LCqP_ym3LuqA0c&e=

Jeff Neuman:Not just questions, but also is there additional testing we can/should recommend?

Sarah L:@jeff +1

Jessica Hooper:Thanks Steve. The data points are on slide 23 of that presentation.

Jeff Neuman:Slides are a little difficult to understand out of context. It would be good if Gustavo could give us a little write up on that.

Jeff Neuman:What does consider variations of 2012 problematic strings mean?

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Jeff, via the RySG RSP WG we have requested more detailed information from Francisco about the events referenced in Gonzalo's presentation.

Steve Chan:@Jeff, Donna, perhaps you can coordinate to determine if there are additional questions we'd like answered by Francisco and Gustavo?

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Jeff and Donna - Who are Francisco and Gustavo?

Jeff Neuman:@Steve - Or you can coordinate with Gustavo and Francisco and make sure they send the answers to both :)

Jeff Neuman:@Anne - they are the technical registry liaisons at ICANN

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Thanks Jeff.

Jeff Neuman:In the brand TLDs (Spec 13), there is a required 2 year waiting period

Jeff Neuman:Perhaps applying that general rule to all

Steve Chan:@jeff happy to work with them, but not sure if the RySG questions will answer everything you're looking for. maybe we can determine if additional information is needed once we see francisco/gustavo's response.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):good point Jeff

Jeff Neuman:Identifying private namespaces is very difficult because they are by their nature "private"

Jeff Neuman:An example of one such network was .gprs and .grx operated by the GSM Association (again a reference to a previous telephone world). That is a private ENUM-related service

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Does anyone know whether this ICANN report has ever been updated since 2014? https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_en_system_files_files_name-2Dcollision-2Dmitigation-2D01aug14-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=nc_HQj33ajB5LpXfiEafEO86NRstjTpP-38HCqhOECc&s=gd15aCbmegK5HXDGVkQzJzLAuWSXdyW62THoSWOYy94&e=

[3A_www.icann.org_en_system_files_files_name-2Dcollision-2Dmitigation-2D01aug14-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_en_system_files_files_name-2Dcollision-2Dmitigation-2D01aug14-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=nc_HQj33ajB5LpXfiEafEO86NRstjTpP-38HCqhOECc&s=gd15aCbmegK5HXDGVkQzJzLAuWSXdyW62THoSWOYy94&e=)

[05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=nc_HQj33ajB5LpXfiEafEO86NRstjTpP-38HCqhOECc&s=gd15aCbmegK5HXDGVkQzJzLAuWSXdyW62THoSWOYy94&e=](https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_en_system_files_files_name-2Dcollision-2Dmitigation-2D01aug14-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3PjP6wrcrwlI3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=QiF-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=nc_HQj33ajB5LpXfiEafEO86NRstjTpP-38HCqhOECc&s=gd15aCbmegK5HXDGVkQzJzLAuWSXdyW62THoSWOYy94&e=)

Sarah L:I just wanted to point out that the feedback from the RySG on CC2 re Name Collision was not subject to a vote

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):My understanding it that SSAC Advice to the Board is consensus based. Or at least there is a vote?

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Sarah and Rubens, I think we can safely say that there were some differences of opinion regarding the 90 day interruption period.

Julie Hedlund:@Anne: The SSAC does not vote, but presents its work as a consensus document. If the Board passes a resolution implementing SSAC advice then it's processes apply.

Sarah L:@Rubens, Yes the CC2 feedback was created by a sub-set of the RySG - yes thank you Donna

Jeff Neuman:@Donna - Difference in the number of days or having it at all?

Donna Austin, Neustar:@Jeff, to some extent both.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Thanks Julie - that confirms my understanding that SSAC Advice to the Board is consensus advice.

Jeff Neuman:SSAC Advice is not consensus advice as defined in the ICANN Agreements

Jeff Neuman:@Anne - Not sure that is what you were saying, but wanted to be clear that there is a distinction

Julie Hedlund:@Jeff: You are correct in that sense. But the SSAC considers that it develops its advice with its own internal consensus methods.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Jeff - are you referring to the GNSO PDP definition of consensus advice?

Jeff Neuman:I am just making the point that just because the SSAC gives advice, does not mean that advice needs to be followed

Jeff Neuman:I am not saying it shouldnt be....just saying it doesnt have to be

Julie Hedlund:@Jeff: That is exactly right Jeff and a very important point.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Jeff - failure to follow SSAC Advice in the 2012 round as to name collision resulted in huge waste of time and money. This is noted in the CC2 comment.

Donna Austin, Neustar:The RySG provided comments on Name Collision on the CC2 and more recently there was a discussion prior to sending the RySG letter to the PDP WG. The wording agreed for the latter was: we believe there should be a formal review of the duration of the controlled interruption period, which was the key mitigation measure used for gTLDs in the 2012 round. It is unclear whether a 90 day period is necessary in order to identify and mitigate collisions. Such a review should include an analysis of TLDs that did require mitigation

Jeff Neuman:@Anne - tjat is debateable.

Jeff Neuman:The SSAC did not provide advice pre-2012 of name collissions other than you should look at the issue. It did give advice on the extent (if any) of any issues, how to fix the issues, etc. It just said essentially you may want to look at this issue

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@ Jeff - I realize that I disagree with you and Avri about this. Nevertheless, I am not the only one who holds this opinion. SSAC said it was serious and needed a hard look starting in 2010 with SSAC 045 I think.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Patrik mentioned this advice in his report to GNSO in Helsinki - it's in the transcript of the GNSO meeting.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):also to note from previous At-Large open-and-shut consequently ALAC Advice is strong support for the often conservative approach taken in SSAC Advice, noting also ALAC and SSAC meet at most ICANN Meetings to discuss such Advice and therefore probably hold great comfort and understanding of views and rationale

Sarah L: I think there are a number of things that we should remember before we start thinking about reducing the length of the name collision period..... First of all, ICANN received at least 37 formal reports of name collisions, and from what I remember there were more that may not have been formally reported... a number of academics published illustrations of where controlled interruption as designed was not effective in dealing with a large and unpredictable number of attack scenarios and lets not forget that recommended actions such as an IPv6 solution for controlled interruption have still not at all been acted upon. Bearing all of that in mind, it seems apt that we would establish a new and informed position on this topic and not just.... dismiss the security implications of name collisions in lieu of expediency again.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):personal

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):try again... personally I agree Sarah

Jeff Neuman:@Anne - SSAC 45 is here: https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.icann.org_en_system_files_files_sac-2D045-2Den.pdf&d=DwIFaQ&c=FmY1u3Pj6wrcrwl3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=Qif-05YzARosRvTYd84AB_UYInlydmFcjNmBM5XgySw&m=nc_HQj33ajB5LpXfiEafEO86NRstjTpP-38HCqhOECc&s=fJxiQAPb5fyynPp9gikJP9dlzoDImcXkL-Fzd-QGWfQ&e= . A reasonable reading of that hardly screams anything other than registries should be educated on the potential risks.,,,,,

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):AGree with Sarah

Jeff Neuman:@Sarah, can you please send around those illustrations

Sarah L:@Jeff, yes I can - will find them

Jeff Neuman:It would be good to get answers in writing

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Jeff - SSAC 062 dated November 12, 2013. and asopted by the Board March 27, 2014. We need to keep in mind the existing Board resolutions on this topic.

Nathaniel Edwards:Also agree with Sarah. Much of the collision conjecture is conclusory and could prove deeply regrettable if adopted as policy without significantly more information/data.

Jeff Neuman:@Anne - my response was to your comment (and the SSAC's comment) that has we listened to the SSAC in 2010 we may not have wated so much time

Jeff Neuman:The JAS Final report was expert advice

avri doria:problen with expert advice is that sometimes you need more than one. JAS as a lot to defend in the way the last round went off. I do not think we can accept that as the only advice.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Jeff - Are you saying our policy development will be relying on the JAS Final Report from the 2012 round?

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Avri - it doesn't have to be from JAS. My point is that if it is not formal advice that is paid for, it is not the same in terms of independent objective verification.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Jeff. But we are suggesting changes to the JAS final report.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):IN addition, the JAS final report does not deal with how you vet new strings for the high risk assessment?

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Jeff - IT was recommended that we look at variations on the 2012 round high risk strings.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@ Jeff - Why would you want to include a statement that policy adopted here should not be evaluated in relation to recent requests from applicants for the Board to resolve name collision issues in relation to .home, .corp, .mail? Why wouldn't they?

Jeff Neuman:@Anne - you are making an assumption that there are future high risk strings

Jeff Neuman:That may be the case....or may not be

Jeff Neuman:perhaps that is a question

Rubens Kuhl:.ltd, .ltda also corporate identifiers, but .corp has an additional issue as Microsoft suggested using .corp... and that doesn't translate to other languages.

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):@Jeff - Current advice from JAS and SSAC says we do need to consider there could be other high risk strings. Why do you want to discount that?

Jeff Neuman:@Anne - Looking at 2012 applied for strings in not withn our jurisdiction or within our charter

avri doria:good presentation. bye.

Julie Bisland:The next New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 4 – IDNs/Technical & Operations will take place on Tuesday, 20 June 2017 at 03:00 UTC for 60 minutes.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO):thanks everyone and especially Rubens today... bye for now then...

Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC):Thank you