
ICANN81 | AGM – SSAC Discussion on Name Collision Analysis Group and New gTLD's
Tuesday, November 12, 2024 – 15:00 to 16:00 TRT

KATHY SCHNITT: Hello and welcome to the NCAP and New gTLD session. My name is Kathy and I'm the participation manager for this session. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, unmute your line and you'll be free to speak. Virtual participants will be given the permission at that time. On-site participants will be able to use a physical microphone in the room, which I do have one if you're sitting in the audience. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. And with that, I'm going to hand the floor over to Steve Sheng.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you. Good afternoon and welcome to this session, a NCAP collision analysis community discussion. First of all, I want to invite people in the audience to sit up front. There are quite a few seats up there, because this is a community discussion. So we want as many community members to be at the table as possible. So please, please come, come to the front. If you're interested in this topic, you think you have a question, please do that. Next slide, please.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Our SSAC chair is briefly delayed at another event. So I will step in to moderate the discussion. This session is really to hear from the ICANN organization on the adopted NCAP Name Collision Analysis Framework. So to my left, we have Francisco Arias and Gavin Brown from the GDS joining us. So thank you Francisco and Gavin and also thank you for the ICANN org's work on the NCAP framework.

But for the discussion, we will probably have a brief overview of the name collision work that the SSAC did. And this is mostly a community group, the name collision analysis, the group, the community group that did the two reports and then followed by SAC124. So we provide a brief overview to that and then we'll quickly go to the ICANN org presentation. And then we will close and we'll have a open discussion. So there are still additional seats at the table. Please sit up front, if you will. So Ram, are you able to talk to this?

RAM MOHAN: Yes, thank you.

STEVE SHENG: Okay, thank you. So let me hand over to SSAC Chair, Ram Mohan.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you and my apologies for coming a couple of minutes late. So the reason to have this session is because we've, as you, ICANN org certainly knows, SSAC certainly knows, but others in the audience, the SSAC published a document, Name Collision Risk Assessment

framework document, went to the Board, Board accepted the recommendations, tasked ICANN Org with moving that forward. And we asked for this session because we thought we should continue the very fruitful and productive dialogue that led to the creation of the original SSAC document, right?

Because there was a collaborative discussion and a conversation between SSAC community members, as well as ICANN Org. So the intent here is to focus on a discussion, a dialogue about what we said, how does that translate into the implementation stages, the design stages, and what are the kinds of input you would like to get from the SSAC? How would you like for us to stay engaged with you? So those are some open-ended questions. And we have experts who are accessible and available to assist in what is really a collaborative effort, but we're not an operational group. We're not here to implement these things.

But it was interesting when the SSAC met with the GNSO two days ago, and we were having a conversation. One of the questions that was asked was, "Oh, are you working with ICANN Org on the framework implementation?" And I said, "Not yet, but we have a conversation." And we have now been invited to send an envoy, which I don't know exactly what envoy means, but I think it's an informal to send somebody from the SSAC to participate in the IRT that the GNSO is doing. Our caution from within the SSAC on things like that is when we have an individual who goes and participates in these kinds of groups, the individuals contribute their individual expertise, right? They have knowledge, they have ability, and they contribute that expertise.

But we have to be cautious that that expertise contribution doesn't provide a perception that, quote, unquote, the SSAC has blessed this design or has blessed this implementation." Not that somebody is looking for our blessings anyway, but mostly I think the concern is if what the GNSO Council folks, Council members are saying was how do we know if something is really off, wouldn't it be better if you, the SSAC, in some capacity was in the room when the design was happening rather than only providing public comments after the implementation was ready and a document was put out, right?

So all of those really provide the rationale for this conversation here. So the overview, I don't think we need to go through the details of what the SSAC said and what the NCAP work party did. Everybody already either should know it or if you don't know it, Google it and you'll find it. We're not going to spend anybody's time on that. But the intent of this session is friendly, informal, collaborative dialogue which begins at the top level with a couple of questions. How would you like-- would you like our input? If so, how would you like us to engage? Is it best done in these kinds of sessions?

So that's the high level framing, Gavin and Francisco, and then the next level deeper is if you have details to share and if you'd like our input, we can provide some top of mind thoughts here, but we can certainly get more deeply engaged if there is a need for it. I see that both Suzanne and Matt are here, so as the most recent last co-chairs of the NCAP work party, do you have any other comments you would like to add?

SUZANNE WOOLF: Only that, particularly with the cross-community discussion group, I think a lot of work went into the proposal, the new framework, and we spent a lot of time both figuring out what has changed since 2012 and what has not, and now it's time for the next steps. So I'm glad, I'm glad to be here.

RAM MOHAN: Okay, so that really is bullet number one done, right?

STEVE SHENG: Kathy, why don't we go to slide 13, and I'll pass over to Francisco and Gavin.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you, Ram. Thank you, Steve. So this is Francisco Arias. I work in the technology side of the GDS division in ICANN that deals with all things related to the gTLD space, and I was involved in the implementation of the name collision mitigation measures in the previous round. So this, as Ram said, this is an overview of what we have so far in terms of the implementation of the NCAP2 recommendations. As you can probably imagine at this point, it's a little bit high level.

We started working this just a few months ago, and first focus on getting the information of the Board needed in order to consider the NCAP2 recommendations. So our focus at this point, for example, is trying to get the language in the draft language for the applicant guidebook that

is intended to go for public comment in the next couple months, as I understand. And in the applicant guidebook, you can expect a high level description of the, how the process works as opposed to the detailed procedures that need to be developed later as part of the implementation of the program.

Okay, next slide, please. Here's the agenda for what we are going to cover in this presentation. Next slide. I'm not sure if we need to really cover the recommendations, but there are there, and they are obviously available in the web. You can find them if you're interested. Next slide. And here's the rest of the recommendations. Next slide.

So the Board considered the SSAC124 advice, which in turn refers to the recommendations in the NCAP2 study in their meeting on 7 September, and they accepted all the recommendations from the NCAP2 report with the exception of recommendation 4.1 that relates to .corp, .home, and .mail. In regards to that recommendation, the Board reaffirmed its previous decision that the applications from the 2012 round for these three strings should not proceed. So it's the first thing on the Board consideration of the advice. And second thing, they directed staff to implement the NCAP2 recommendations. So let's go to the next slide.

One thing that came up during our work in analyzing, assessing the NCAP2 recommendations is in the report from NCAP. There is a lot of description of work that needs to be done by certain bodies like the Technical Review Team. And then there is the assumption that they will talk directly with the Board, and the Board will make the decision. And so one of the things that we noted there is that that's not how it worked

last time. There is obviously a governance model in how the organization works on the next round program.

And so the intention there is that NCAP will be no different to any other element of the next round program. And so there will be some level of decision-making authority that will be delegated to staff on the different entities that will be part of the name collision mitigation measures. So that's one thing to consider. I'm going to pass the microphone to Gavin to take us through the proposal.

RAM MOHAN:

Sorry, this is Ram. Just on this one, speaking just personally, I think this is sensible. I don't think the intent is the Technical Review Team builds a specific relationship with the Board and provides recommendations to the Board. So I think that's a good implementation detail, and it's the kind of thing that just makes sense. You want it to be within the overall framework of how the new TLD program is going to run, and that's going to be run primarily by staff. So it makes sense to me.

FRANCISCO ARIAS:

Thank you, Ram. Next slide. So I'm going to pass the microphone to Gavin to take us through the implementation plan, again, to the level that we have so far. And I have to apologize in advance, but I have to leave because I have another presentation at 3.30. But Gavin is here, and he knows everything that needs to be known about the name collision. Thank you.

GAVIN BROWN:

Thank you, Francisco. Hello, everyone. This is Gavin Brown. So if we can move on to the next slide, what I'd like to do is start by describing how we on the ICANN staff looked at the recommendations and felt that there were certain groups that could be created by taking the recommendations and bundling them together, simply because there were dependencies or there was lots of common ground. So it made sense to treat them as individual projects within a wider program of Name Collision Risk Management.

So you can see here how we did that. And if you're very eagle-eyed, you might notice that some of the recommendations don't appear here. That's because they don't have any kind of constructive work to be done. They're things like they're already accounted for in other activities. We'll start by going through these bundle by bundle.

So the first one is recommendation 6, which is about creating a longitudinal DNS name collision repository. So we can move on to the next slide. So we plan to build and launch the name collision observatory. And I'm very proud because this is the first ICANN acronym that I've created. So it was much worse to start with. This is improved over time. And the purpose of the name collision observatory is to provide access to data sets that may help applicants and analysts and other people to assess the potential risk of name collision for a particular string. There is existing work in this area, particularly the DNS magnitude system and the paper that was published by the gentlemen and people listed up there, which was materialized in work done by Roy Arons of OCTO in the magnitude system.

We plan to take that and turn it into something that provides longitudinal data on risk of name collision occurrence for undelegated TLDs. And that will be something that will be available to interested parties before the start of the application window.

We also are planning to engage with other root server operators and potentially also recursive server operators to provide data to us in an aggregated form that will allow us to provide multiple views or views from multiple contexts for name collision occurrence. That was one of the recommendations from the report and something we want to do.

RAM MOHAN:

Gavin, how do you want to do this? Do you want to take questions on each of these bundles or do you want to go through all of them and then take questions? What's your preference?

GAVIN BROWN:

I'm happy to do it by bundle by bundle. I think that's probably better because then the context is there and we don't have to context switch. So if there are any questions about the name collision observatory, then we can move on.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Could you clarify what kind of resources it you anticipate will require and if there's a particular group of individuals or body that will be overseeing it?

GAVIN BROWN: So this is going to be a system that will be developed by ICANN staff. We obviously, ICANN operates the L root and we have access to data from the ICANN managed root server and we have relationships with other root server operators and we may on a bilateral basis work with them to provide us that data. The actual infrastructure for this will be owned and operated by ICANN org.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks, Warren.

WARREN KUMARI: Thanks, Warren Kumari. So how will this be different to the existing ICANN magnitude thing other than maybe just more data?

GAVIN BROWN: There will be more data. There will be more functionality as well. So at the moment, if you go to the magnitude page, you can see the data for a particular undelegated string today or within the previous 24 hours. You can't go back and look at any historical data. One of the things that the NCAP2 report said was there was a risk of data manipulation. So malicious actors might seek to maliciously alter the perceived risk of a certain string and so only longitudinal data gives you the view as to whether or not that's occurring.

WARREN KUMARI: You probably already have this, but I think I've archived every single magnitude page for the past couple of years. So if you want old copies of it.

GAVIN BROWN: Thank you. Yeah, we have data going back to 2021. So the plan is to try and bring that into the system. So it will launch with a longitudinal long-term view.

RAM MOHAN: Matt?

MATT THOMAS: Do you plan on introducing any other types of quantitative metrics in the updated magnitude for the NCO, specifically looking at a percentage of queries that are coming in QNA minimized or distinct second-level domains under a particular delegated or a non-existent TLD?

GAVIN BROWN: I don't think we have any plans for that. That's interesting feedback and something we might take away.

RAM MOHAN: Other comments? Any questions? Any other questions? Okay. That was a quick and easy start for you, Gavin.

GAVIN BROWN: So if we can move on to the next slide, then, we'll have a look at bundle two. So this is the high-risk string identification initial review. So this

takes place after reveal day and involves a preliminary risk assessment for each applied for string. This is to assess whether or not any of those strings are high risk. This is very similar to the process that was carried out during the last round. Any strings that are determined to be high risk will be placed on a collision string list. And the assessment of this risk will, as you can see, says up there, doesn't tell you a lot, but it will include a review of quantitative and qualitative data. So not just the metrics that we can get from systems like the magnitude system or the named collision observatory, but also semantics of strings as well. Any questions on this? Okay. Next slide, please.

So this is bundle three. This is quite a high-level process for high-risk string management. So once a string is on the collision string risk, collision string list, it will not, any applications for that string will not proceed until a risk mitigation plan has been submitted by the applicant. And that risk mitigation plan will then be reviewed and potentially executed. So there may be steps that need to take place prior to the application proceeding through evaluation. The collision string list is going to be empty initially. There will be nothing from the last round that will carry over. We intend to use an external panel of experts for performing that risk mitigation plan review. A question?

BILL JOURIS:

Yeah, this is Bill Juris for the record. How are you going to build that external panel? What are the criteria for people to be on it or where's that coming from?

GAVIN BROWN: So that's a good question. We haven't formalized the decision on that yet, but the model where we're taking as the basis for this is going to be the RSTEP system. So we'll develop a model for deciding who the standing panel is going to be, and we will also be providing the process that they need to follow. But that's work still to be done in the future. Yes?

JUSTINE CHEW: Justine Chew for the record. Just a quick question. This collision string list, is that meant to change throughout the application period, or is that going to be a fixed list prior to application window opening, and then it doesn't change for the period when applications are submitted?

GAVIN BROWN: So the collision string list will initially be empty. So when the whole application program process kicks off, application processing system process kicks off, there'll be nothing in it. The initial review may find strings that go onto the collision string list. And so they will be added during the course of the application processing. There's also a process for them to be removed from the list, as I was just outlining. And when we get to the temporary delegation section of this, there's also a possibility that the string might be added to that collision string list during that process, but also process by which it may be removed.

JUSTINE CHEW: So just to clarify, so the collision string list is made up of applied for strings? Thank you.

GAVIN BROWN:

Yes. So there's nothing that's not been applied for at that point. So there is a fee associated with the review of the risk mitigation plan, which is something that will, again, likely to be similar to what is currently charged for an RSTEP review. And then if the mitigation plan calls for corrective measures that can only be carried out post-delegation, then any of those measures that are required or called for in the mitigation plan would become part of the registry agreement for that string if it gets to that point.

So this is an opportunity for, there may be some scenarios, the mitigation review plan, we don't know exactly what's going to be sufficient to mitigate risks. It may be mitigations that can take place before delegation, but there may also be things that need to be done post-delegation. So we want to allow for that. We also want to make sure that if the mitigation review plan has those measures in it, that the new registry operator who signs that registry agreement is required to carry those out. I think you have a question, Warren?

WARREN KUMARI:

Yeah, I was just wondering, it's often I suspect going to be really hard to tell if the risk mitigation plan will work or the collision mitigation plan will work. So building it into the registry agreement presupposes that they will be successful with it. Is there a you have to fix it first and then we will sign a contract with you and let you have it, or is that not included in the an option?

GAVIN BROWN:

So at this point, I don't know if we know. So the process is now, so for, there are some examples, I'm going to give some examples, like just theoretical examples. So let's say, and the apply for string is, corresponds to the brand name of a vendor of CPE, consumer equipment, right? And they say, we can fix this just by doing an update to our software and it will be gone tomorrow, in which case that's fine, they can do that pre-contracting. But if they have to make commitments to say reserve certain names afterwards after delegation, then that's something that we probably want to be in a registry agreement. We don't know, as you rightly point out, we don't know how effective those measures may be, but we still want them to do them. Any more questions on this?

RAM MOHAN:

A quick question. So the review of the, the collision, sorry, the collision string list will get created once the applications come in. What happens if an applicant-- because I've heard some applicants or people who intend to apply come and chat with me and say, well, I don't think there are really collisions. So it's an opinion, in my opinion, that's an opinion, right? But they, they were asking me will I get to appeal that a string should not even make it to the collision list that it's erroneously placed. So just bringing that up here.

GAVIN BROWN: Yeah. I can't answer the question as to what the procedure would be in that situation. But that's something I have been working on the applicant guidebook module for this. And there's something in there, but it's bracketed at the moment and needs to be reviewed before we can bring it to the community to look at. Yeah.

BILL JOURIS: Bill Jouris again. There's an additional charge for the review if continuing collision, has anyone looked at how that will play together with the applicant support program, is the applicant support program going to boost how much support they're giving to deal with that? Or is that totally on the applicant? I don't expect you to have an answer. I just wonder if anybody's looked.

GAVIN BROWN: I don't have an answer and I don't believe anyone's looked. But that's again, a good point that we'll take away.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Two questions there.

RUBENS KUHL: It's actually not a question. It's an answer to that. The applicant support program was defined on a percentage basis. So it supports that percentage of any fees that ICANN may collect. So if you have an 85% fee reduction, that would also apply to the name collision assessment. Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW: Yeah, I think it boils down to whether you consider this review as an evaluation process, right? So if it's clearly an evaluation process, then that would fit under subsequent procedures implementation of evaluation fees being covered under applicants support, which you get a discount. So I think we need to establish whether it's an evaluation or not process. And then the complication comes is, if it's an evaluation, then would there be a challenge mechanism tied to that?

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, so I would suggest further questions on fees and things like that, Gavin's got the action, he will pass it on to the right people in the organization. This meeting, I want to focus us back on the technical pieces, thanks.

GAVIN BROWN: Okay, so if we can move on to the next bundle then. This is name collision risk management. This is where ICANN org will carry out delegation on a temporary basis of applied for strings in order to collect data about the volume and nature of DNS traffic for that string. It's worth noting that the rate at which strings can be delegated will be limited based on advice from the RSSAC, so that the root zone doesn't grow by more than 5% per month. Which means that to carry out this temporary delegation for every single applied for string will take some time.

Once the TLD's been delegated and we've been able to collect information from the DNS system, and if necessary, the sinkhole system, where we're using visible interruption. The technical review team will determine if the string evaluation process is safe to continue. The technical review team has been mentioned before. We envisage this to be an internal technical team within ICANN Org and they will have access to data coming from the analysis system that will allow them to make that determination. If the string isn't safe to continue, then it will be placed onto the collision string list.

During the course of temporary delegation, ICANN Org will maintain its 24/7 incident response capability so that if there is a serious threat to human life as a result of a temporarily delegated TLD, that we can initiate emergency response, potentially remove the TLD from the root zone. Any questions on this bundle?

RUBENS KUHL:

Rubens? On the last bundle, you mentioned that the review of high-risk string is not included in the base application fee. But what is included in this one? For instance, we had defined it for, let's say user journeys in NCAP, which was the no interruption, control interruption, visible interruption, visible interruption notification, are all four budget for in the base application?

GAVIN BROWN:

Yes, so the model that we put together has made some assumptions about how many strings might go through each of the different

interruption models and we have sort of indications of the cost of operating those so we were able to come up with a global figure. So just to clarify one thing you said, it's not the high-risk string identification that's charged for, it's the review of the risk mitigation plan. Yes, thank you.

WARREN KUMARI: So you say that the size of the root zone will not grow more than 5% per month. What I'm not clear about is, after you've made the temporary delegation, do you remove it or do you leave it there or?

GAVIN BROWN: No, we plan to remove it.

WARREN KUMARI: Okay, if you remove it and then things get delayed by two or three or four years, do you need to do it again because there's a fair bit of change over time? Like if something bad wasn't happening in 2020, that doesn't mean it's not bad in 2024.

GAVIN BROWN: We hadn't considered the possibility that the delay would be that significant. Obviously, there are some cases from the last round where there were significant delays. That's a good point. Something we'll have to think about is if there is a significant delay between the end of temporary delegation and contracting, yeah.

-
- SUZANNE WOOLF: Yeah, if you don't mind, I'm Suzanne Wolf. The other piece of the answer to that is that the discussion group did discuss all of these and basically, we can't specify every possible set of conditions and mostly what we did with cases like this, the long tail of how things could work out was just try to provide the best guidance we could. But there are going to be some decisions that have to be made as conditions change.
- WARREN KUMARI: And yeah, I mean, I fully agree. We didn't specify everything which I think is why we've been like, which one are you going to do of these? I mean, another option would be to leave it in and just delegate it somewhere else or something so there's a clear signal to users that it's going to be coming at some point or something.
- GAVIN BROWN: Yeah, thank you for that.
- RAM MOHAN: Other questions?
- PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Philippe Fouquart from the ISPCP. Just being curious, but on bullet point two, when you say operated by ICANN org or a designated vendor, is there some thinking given to choosing the, I wouldn't call that the appropriate vendor, but I seem to remember that the collisions last time were not equally distributed so that depending

on the string, one vendor may be more relevant than another and are there criteria to do this?

GAVIN BROWN: Sorry, did you want to say something, Warren?

WARREN KUMARI: I think I just got to say until you do this, you don't know what the scale is and so you kind of got to do this and then you find out what the scale is. So I think you kind of just have to choose somebody who you think is definitely big enough, and I think until you do the delegation, you're not going to know how big it needs to be. So, Irk.

GAVIN BROWN: Okay.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: I guess what I'm getting at is that the sample that you use is relevant for the collision you're trying to assess. For example, last time, I seem to remember, at least in our case, the sources of collisions ended up on certain servers. Well, there were more collisions on certain servers than others so you may not want to pick up those that collect the least number of requests, for example. But maybe I'm thinking a lot, I don't want to get us in the weeds. Thank you.

GAVIN BROWN: So I'm a little confused by your question. We do plan to go through this process for every single applicable string, not just certain strings. So

every string that's applied for, irrespective of what previous data we have about it, it's going to go through temporary delegation and we'll collect everything that we're able to collect during that process.

As the slide says, the decision's not been made for final as to whether this is something that ICANN will do itself or whether we'll find a vendor to do it for us. If it goes to a vendor, it will follow our procurement processes. There'll be an RFP. And the requirements that we have will certainly be part of that RFP, and any vendor would have to meet those requirements in terms of data collection scale, that kind of thing. Okay, so Rubens.

RUBENS KUHL:

May I comment on something? That happened because in 2012, we looked into queries of undelegated strings and in this case, there will be a temporary delegation. So it will work regardless of root server because it will attract traffic and actually see what it looks like instead of some servers having, root servers having different policies and some recursive having different policies. But in this case, there will be an actual delegation. This will make things very different.

GAVIN BROWN:

So obviously, for an undelegated TLD, you're relying on whoever's submitting to DTL or other data sources because the resolver's getting an NX domain answer and then everything stops. With a temporary delegation, there will be DNS servers in the root for this TLD and every

authoritative query will end up going to them and we'll be able to capture them. Any more questions on temporary delegation?

So one more thing to bring to discussion, if we can move on to the next slide, please. So as those of you who were around during the last round will be aware, may be aware, the controlled interruption method only supported IPv4. There was no IPv6 address in the wildcard set that was published at the apex of the root and underneath the, not the root, the apex of the TLD and a wildcard under that TLD. In the intervening time period, IPv6 has become much more widely deployed, significant fraction of global internet volume. And so it would be nice, if possible, to find a way of doing controlled interruption for an IPv6-enabled host.

As you also may be aware, the loopback address for IPv6 is one. It's actually literally one out of 200 and to the power of 128 possible IP addresses, we have one to play with. What we'd like to do is carry out a research study to find out if there is actually an IPv6 address that can be used for controlled interruption, perhaps from one of the special use registries that IANA has allocated through the IETF.

And so we will be engaging to do a research study that will form a documentation review of what's in the IANA registries and what RFCs have been published and then carry out technical checks of end-user operating systems to see whether or not a quad-A query that produces one of those IP addresses results in traffic leaving the host. Because if we can reliably say that no traffic leaves the host as a result of that DNS query, then it may be a potential candidate for doing controlled

interruption over IPv6. And we hope to be making progress on that fairly soon.

RAM MOHAN: Questions? Gavin, this is the advantage of scheduling this session right after lunch. Okay, let's move on.

GAVIN BROWN: So that's the last slide. So if we want to move on to discussion, then let it happen. Oh, sorry, I apologize. Yes, things have moved around and I've forgotten. Sorry, I've also had lunch and I'm half asleep.

Yes, so in the last round, ICANN carried out an education and outreach program around name collision. And the NCAP2 study was very clear that we should continue to do that and to develop it as well. So obviously there's a significant amount of name collision supporting documentation on the icann.org website, which we will give a thorough refresh. And one of the other key components of name collision management in the last round was if you typed 127.0.53.53 or your DNS needs immediate attention into Google, you got a search result, a paid search result that took you to the icann.org website so you could report your name collision issue. We will carry on that. Obviously that was an effective way of getting this information in front of people who were affected.

And in addition to that, we will obviously continue the program of outreach going to technical security communities to raise awareness of this as an issue. And obviously the variety of teams within icann.org

that are very well placed to do that. And it will be integrated into wider kind of communication activities happening in relation to the next round. Warren.

WARREN KUMARI:

Something you might want to consider with this and probably already have is for many of these communities, getting to them is a little tricky. So maybe just finding a person in the community and being like, hey, would you please do a presentation announcement, blah, blah, blah. And they have ambassadors or something who could spread the word.

GAVIN BROWN:

I don't recall exactly, but I believe that may have been something that happened in the last round. So there were kind of name collision ambassadors, if you like, that were doing that and taking that from within the ICANN community going elsewhere. So that seems like a really good idea. Thank you.

MATT THOMAS:

So like you said, with the 127.0.53, you did Google ads. If you thought about, are you going to do that with the IP address for the delegation where the traffic's going to be collected? And have you considered getting a memorable IP address there, like 53.53.53 or something?

GAVIN BROWN:

That's a very interesting idea, a good idea. I think we'll need some help from whoever vendor we pick on that because obviously, we can't just

unilaterally pull an IP address. In IPv6, you can write things sort of inside an IPv6 address. So that's an interesting thought. Thank you for that. Okay. Next slide, please.

So one of the recommendations from the NCAP2 report was to improve the reporting webpage. At the moment, there's a fairly high barrier to submitting a name collision report. You have to attest that there's serious harm being done. And that has deterred people from submitting or is believed that it may have deterred people from submitting. And also there are quite a few required mandatory fields.

So based on the feedback from that, or the recommendations in that report, we will update that reporting webpage to make it a little bit easier to submit and maybe remove the requirement that they have to demonstrate harm because then we can have more data. Maybe we'll ask them how much harm they think it's causing or something like that. So we can have more data from end-user reports about what's happening during temporary delegation.

And the other thing is, one of the other recommendation was to make it clear the use to which that data would be put because at the moment it's quite restrictive. It doesn't really tell you what we'll do with that data once we've got it. Things have moved on in terms of processing of data and we want to make sure that there are legitimate uses for it that you can use it for that. And then next slide please.

So what we want to do is just briefly explain the process that ICANN follows here. So all of the activities around the new gTLD program next round are being looked over by the SubPro IRT. I expect most of the

people in this room are familiar with that, but maybe some people on the SSAC side maybe less so. So this is the community group that we interact with in terms of how we do our implementation.

The applicant guidebook module, which we'll go into more detail than I have here about how the name collision processes work, will be going to the IRT for review next month. And so there's an opportunity there if you're interested to join the IRT and provide your input and feedback in that forum, because that's the forum where we collect that feedback and it influences how we do our implementation. Justine.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Just a comment. So Ram, I think you need to send your envoy to this call.

RAM MOHAN:

Anne had sent a request into me from the GNSO asking to have somebody sent. And we're discussing it inside of the ESSAC, Justine, to have somebody be part of it. I think the desire is to do that. The careful concern from my colleagues is to have it be bounded in scope.

JUSTINE CHEW:

Sure, I think it's up to the person that you send to determine what is best that he or she says, right? We're not going to hold, but I'm just saying that, yeah, Anne's request has come from Council, but SubPro is not part of Council. She's a GNSO liaison to the SubPro IRT, but this is the SubPro IRT call that I'm suggesting that you send your envoy to.

JOHN EMERY: Do you see Anne's hand raised in the Zoom room? So Anne, go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Yes, thank you. This is Anne. Can you hear me?

JOHN EMERY: Loud and clear, thank you.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE: Okay, great. Anne Aikman-Scalese, and I am one of two co-liaisons from Council to the SubPro IRT. And yes, I think that the invitation, and of course, subject to further thoughts from Lars and his team, because they are really managing this process. I can't imagine that he would be opposed to this, but I think the idea is that if someone would come from SSAC, and of course, I'd prefer one of our previous co-chairs, either Suzanne or Thomas to show up to provide some perspective or history as we go through the AGB draft language.

But even more so now that I see this presentation that Gavin has just made, I think it would be extremely helpful to the SubPro IRT team to have that presentation done on the day when we review that draft language. So I think we'll potentially need to ask Lars about that, make that request if that seems reasonable to all of you. But with respect to the idea that whatever one person says from the SSAC is not binding on the SSAC, we are very used to dealing with those types of situations. Certainly we've had GAC reps participating in the SubPro working group

itself for many, many years, and also in the IRT, and everyone knows that one GAC rep cannot speak for the GAC. So it's not foreign to us in terms of ways that we work.

So would appreciate, again, your consideration for both having this presentation be made, because it's very, very well done. Really appreciate it. Thank you, Gavin, and the rest of the team in OCTO, and to Ram and all of the SSAC. And it's complicated stuff. And so we very much appreciate it, especially those lay people like me. So yeah, certainly support further collaboration within the IRT to get this AGB language to where it needs to be. Thanks so much.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you, Anne, and appreciate the comments. And again, understand what you were saying about familiarity with an individual speaking in their own capacity. The caution that you heard me express really comes from long history where, somebody who is an acknowledged technical expert in their own comes in and says something, and sometimes, and this is not just in the SSAC, this is in many for. Sometimes their affiliation carries along with it, even though they may have said something just individually.

So that was me simply being explicit. I fully understand that this is a very seasoned group of people who understand the nuance of having an individual versus others. What I was actually also exposing, Anne, was inside of the SSAC, that is one of the, topics that came up. The very first comment that came back was, oh, can we be really, really clear that whoever goes forward, it won't be an SSAC comment. However, if there

is a desire for it to be an SSAC comment, and we have done a process like this before.

Rod was the chair of the SSAC at that time, and we'd done a process like that where we started up a work party and we did something in parallel so that we could have intersecting comments and responses. So there is a mechanism for it. The question is, it seems like the lighter weight mechanism that is being proposed may be the appropriate one for how the SSAC gets involved.

On this topic? On this topic. So let's go to you, and then let's go to you, Rod, after that.

LARS HOFFMANN:

Thanks, Lars Hoffman, for the record, for Mike and all, just because Anne called me up, I just want to clarify. The IRT is open to everybody with an individual capacity. That's obviously up to the SSAC how you would like to-- if and how you would like to send somebody with the mandate that you see as appropriate. We already had some forward planning, so we just did that today.

Actually, I don't think the IRT has seen this yet. The topic of name collision will probably be discussed just before the holiday break. 18th of December is what we have in mind. We're going to share that with the IRT tomorrow. So just for your internal planning, if there's any desire for anybody but to take part, just contact us, we'll send you an invite, and you're welcome to attend in whatever capacity. Thanks.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you, Lars. Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thanks, Rod Rasmussen. Since you pointed this out, and I heard my name checked, I would highly discourage doing the heavier weight process. That was the first time, only time we've done that. I was in support of the EPDP on who has access, or registered data access. And that became very difficult for us to continue to man, or put people in there, and to keep up with the work. We did it, but it was a bit painful, and I think there might be a little bit of residual reservations to overcome in that case. And I don't think it's really necessary in this case.

I think if we have somebody that goes from the SSAC, we just make it clear that they're there in their individual expert capacity, but part of their being there is to just report back to the SSAC as what's going on, maybe perhaps get some input, but very informally. And I think if we treat it that way, and just make it known that that's the process here, and the scope of their involvement, then I think there shouldn't be too much of a problem.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks, Rod. Other comments? Let me poll SSAC members. Let me start with Matt and Suzanne, with the level of familiarity you have. Do you have any comments you want to provide remarks on this? Let me start with you, Matt.

MATT THOMAS: I don't have anything right now off the top of my head. I'll defer over to Suzanne.

SUZANNE WOOLF: This is Suzanne. I think all I really have to say is just that when we went back into looking at issues around identifying collisions and mitigating collisions, I think we were a little bit surprised at how much has changed about the environment for gathering data and doing things like analyzing queries to the root servers. And there's a lot less public data available. There's a lot less ad hoc processing available, and that's why some of this looks complicated and challenging to implement. So I just want to props to the AI2.org staff for this progress and for continuing with the implementation effort.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks. Any other SSAC members want to opine? Okay. Gavin, thank you so much. Please convey our appreciation to the rest of the team who've done the work. It's a great deal of progress from a report being presented to the Board in May to here we are in November and you've got a plan with specifics and categories and what's going to get done. It's a really good model. It's a very good feeling to have, to watch specific recommendations get turned into Board resolutions in quick order. That was a process working.

And then when it's sent to icann.org, to have that converted into implementable plans that in its first debut is pretty much getting mostly positive or helpful comments. So all of these are really great signs. So

please pass on kudos to the team, to yourself for what you've done. This is, I think, a really good example of the multi-stakeholder model-based process working and the ICANN process working. And in ICANN, we spend almost all of our time hearing people talk about how it's not. This is the a good start for the other way around. So thank you.

GAVIN BROWN: Thank you very much, Ram. Thank you.

RAM MOHAN: That concludes this session.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]