The call for the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Sub Team – Track 4 – IDNs/Technical & Operations will take place on Thursday, 20 April 2017 at 20:00 UTC. For other times: http://tinyurl.com/jat98a2

AGENDA:
1. Welcome
2. SOIs
3. Full WG update (if any)
4. Name collisions in legacy gTLDs
5. Name collisions in 2012-round gTLDs
6. AOB

AC Recording
AC Chat
Attendance
Dial outs: Cheryl Langdon-Orr
Apologies: Sarmad Hussain
On audio only: None
Slides

Notes/Actions:

1. Full Work Group Update

   -- Spent the last meeting working on the CCT-RT issues.
   -- Put together a response to the CCT-RT open comment that is up for review. See: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1LC-1Z2auN2XTSjXYW34eWnGnTuNldnOeJ1TcZ7z58/edit.
   -- Next meeting talk through sending off the comment.
   -- Getting ready for the Geo Names at the top level 25 April at two different times. Everyone is invited and please sign up in advance.
   -- Drafting Teams on the open issues working. Staff has provided initial documents to work from.
   -- CC2 comment: Got a formal request for an extension. Looks like we can offer an extension of 3 weeks and still meet the document deadline for ICANN59. Out for discussion in case there are objections -- none yet. If comments are done people should send them in an not wait.

2. Name collisions in legacy gTLDs (.com, .net, .org, etc.)

   Slide 6: Name Collisions: New Name, Old Phenomena (1/2)
   -- End user expecting the DNS to work in one way and it works in a different names.
   -- No policy allowing those problems to be addressed by Contracted Parties.
   -- ICANN does not hold itself as the DNS police.
   -- Adopting a policy could be somewhat unprecedented.
For discussion: Contracted Parties should be forced or could be allowed to take collision domains away from users (policy change)

-- Possible threats does not warrant policy changes; no new policy required.

Discussion:

-- How many names are we talking about? Not clear what is the set of collision domains. SAC090 report and JAS report.

-- One of the problems in defining a policy is such domains are generated by software bugs so we can’t anticipate. Not knowing the scope is one of the things that makes it hard to have a policy on this.

-- Question: How does this area relate to the APB reports issued with the new round? Is there a relationship? Answer: No connect.

-- When we are talking about the SSAC and JAS report we are talking about collisions at the top level, but here we are talking about lower levels. For the last round they did devise certain mitigations.

-- Have there been any studies on second level collisions? Do we have any follow on data on the mitigation strategies used in the previous round. Any suggestions as to their being a yellow track in this that perhaps we aren’t changing the policy but nor are we forcing any behavior, but coming up with a recommendation for greater study of mitigation -- how inform, how educate, etc.

-- Discussion in Copenhagen with Board on name space and coordination with the IETF.

-- Shouldn’t we be getting a presentation from the SSAC on name space/name collisions? Get advice and input from the SSAC.

-- Need to make some recommendations out of this WG.

-- Mark this as a topic to bring in external expertise.

From the chat:

Steve Chan: SAC090: [link]

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): with us yes, but management must in my Biased view, be looked at and resolved

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): thus the importance of this and similar conversations

Julie Hedlund: Also, SAC062: SAC Advisory Concerning the Mitigation of Name Collision Risk (07 November 2013) at [link]

Julie Hedlund: SAC090 is SSAC Advisory on the Stability of the Domain Namespace (22 December 2016)

Alan Greenberg: Middle ground is almost certainly where we will end up.

Slide 7: Name collisions: New Name, Old Phenomena (2/2)

For Discussion: Expired Domain Deletion and Expired Registration Recovery policies should be revised and changed?

-- Possible threats does not warrant policy changes?

Discussion:

-- Are these policies enough?

-- Seems like there is a lack of data.

-- Note sure we are missing data and need to do studies.

-- Still a lot of issues that are hard to digest and not every word in them is gospel. The studies that have been done are old. There doesn’t seem to be new data. Find out if there is new data.

From the chat:

Alan Greenberg: Middle ground is almost certainly where we will end up.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr (CLO): personal view is that I suspect so Alan

avri doria: Alan, we often stick with status quo.
Avri Doria: mitigation is a good middle position in many things

Alan Greenberg: Agreed. Just hazarding a guess.

3. Name Collisions Framework in 2012 Round (slide 9)

-- Requirement to pass a controlled interruption period.
-- Current number of collision reports is 37 -- 0 life threatening.
-- ICANN has not published the collision reports.

For discussion: 2012-round registries should extend such support beyond the 2-year period (implementation change)
-- Occurrence experience does not warrant creation of policy to override what is in the agreements (keep as is)?
-- Is the current 2012-round process enough?
-- No idea of how close occurrences came to being life threatening. Can't make an informed decision. Need to understand what the collisions were.
-- Need to err on the side of caution but not to such an extent that it impacts the industry. You do have instances where you can analyze risk and the cost of mitigations compared to the cost of something going wrong.
-- Just because something hasn't happened yet doesn't mean it won't. Need to know the consequences if it does.