
SAN JUAN – Cross-Community Session: Name Collisions

Monday, March 12, 2018 – 15:15 to 16:45 AST

ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

CYRUS NAMAZI: Okay. Welcome, everyone. Welcome to the Cross-Community Session on Name Collision. This session is brought to you by ICANN Security and Stability Advisory Committee, or SSAC. My name is Cyrus Namazi. I'm a member of ICANN organization's global domains division, and I have the distinct honor of actually being the moderator of this session. Just to briefly describe to you -- I'm trying to see where my slides are.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: In front of you.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Good. Thank you. That's even better. So the purpose of this session, the overall purpose of this session is to provide the community an opportunity to learn about a very important project in SSAC that was following a board resolution back in November of 2017. The concept of name collision was elevated into the spotlight back in the early days of the new gTLD program where in several advisories SSAC actually highlighted concerns about the possibility of name collision and its potential

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.

adverse effect. As a result of the introduction of the new top-level domains in the domain namespace and fast forward that to 2018 following a substantial amount of research and effort that went into identifying and mitigating the potential adverse effects of name collision. The ICANN board issued a resolution in November of 2017, essentially requiring -- or asking SSAC to conduct a study, a thorough study, to present data analysis point of view on name collision strings, in particular the three top strings that actually had a high level of name collision in them .HOME, .CORP, and .MAIL.

So fulfilling this request from the board, the SSAC has established a working party name collision analysis project, or NCAP, and today's session is about being able to actually hear from this working party about the details of their proposed approach, providing the community an opportunity to participate in and learn from this project. And also in general learn from name -- about name collision in general.

So to start our discussion ICANN CTO David Conrad will provide a presentation about what name collision is, what it can do in the domain namespace, and what we've done so far to date to mitigate it. David, please.

DAVID CONRAD:

Thank you, Cyrus. Thank you and good afternoon to everyone. I've been asked to discuss what name collision is and provide some background on this particular topic. The definition that was found in SAC 62 is a name that is defined and used in one namespace and then appears in another. The entire DNS tree is one namespace. If I could, in the audience, if your name is Steve, could you raise your hand? There's one Steve? Really? You're going to blow up my analogy by having exactly one?

[Laughter]

So the intent of that was there were going to be multiple people who were named Steve, because I at least saw one, and that was an example of a name collision. But in this case, we have exactly one namespace in which there is one Steve. So there wasn't a name collision. But the issue with name collisions -- excuse me -- are that users and applications can react unexpectedly if they are -- if they're subject to a name collision. If they're expecting a particular response in one namespace and then are made -- are subject to a different response from another namespace, it could cause unanticipated behaviors within the applications or even the users. This can, of course, be accidental or it can be malicious. One of the deliverables of the NCAP project is actually to come up with a better definition of name collisions and that will be work that the project undertakes. Next slide, please.

So this is an illustration of these name collisions that occur even today on the Internet. In many cases internal networks have been created that have their own internal namespace. In the example on the screen, we use a dot example because that's what you're supposed to use for documentation purposes, and when you're within the corporate network the dot example domain name lookups are not supposed to get out of the internal network. But occasionally most, generally because of misconfigurations, they do escape. When they hit the root, they get a response indicating that the name does not exist and the application then goes on, in many cases tries different names as a result of something called the DNS search path. Next slide, please.

Another case is where you have mobile workers who are wandering around and trying to connect their laptops through, say, a coffee shop or something like that network. Internally within the laptop it's still configured to look for locally defined names, and if the VPN back to the corporate network isn't established or some other reason, that name would then leak out again and hit the public DNS. Next slide.

All this is fine until the dot example top-level domain is delegated. You know, the root servers receive an astonishing amount of junk queries, a vast majority of queries hitting the root are actually junk at this stage in time, but the applications

and users don't really notice because the -- they're used to getting a -- maybe a slightly slower response. They don't see the impact of the name collisions until a delegation occurs.

Once a delegation occurs, then the application will get a different response. At the very least, it will get a referral to the name servers for the top-level domain example. Next slide, please.

To give you an idea of the quantity of queries right now that are for non-delegated names at the top level, the graph on the -- well, what is that, right, dyslexia, it's a wonderful way of being confused -- shows queries that are hitting the L-Root server over the last week. The very first line which you see there is mostly red are Nameserver queries going directly to the root that's most likely just diagnostics of one form or another. But the second line and then down are queries that are hitting the root for top level names that have not been delegated. Currently .HOME is receiving about 3.44% of the top -- of queries for invalid domain names at the root. And the numbers here are very, very large. You're talking about on the order of billions of queries per day. And that list shows the averages over a month and a year where things go up and down, depending on what applications are getting weird or what new products have been delivered. Next slide, please.

So what does -- what are the risks associated with name collisions? Well, one is that name collision actually facilitates man-in-the-middle attack. If you're able to set up a machine that is able to respond to a query that formally would result in an NXDOMAIN because a top-level domain or other domain hadn't been delegated, you can then receive those queries and then redirect the traffic to wherever you would like that traffic to go. The other risk is unexpected application behavior. In this -- in many cases as a result of an answer where name does not exist was actually what was anticipated, but it can also be related to timing differences because a response that has a referral will take longer to process than an immediate NXDOMAIN from the root and that can cause applications to behave differently. Next slide, please. Thank you.

Prior work that's been done related to name collisions, the SAC 45 and SAC 57 both have been looking at this particular topic. ICANN has done a study of name collision in the DNS in 2013, the new gTLD collision risk mitigation effort in 2013, and the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework in 2014. Next slide.

So the -- with regards to the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework, that particular framework requested deferring the delegation of .CORP, .HOME, AND .MAIL indefinitely because those three domains were particularly risky should they

be delegated. It required registries to implement a 90-day period of something called controlled interruption in which a wildcard would be established resulting in a response that would allow a response of 127.0.53.53 that would serve as a signal to system administrators that there was a potential name collision occurring and to implement the name collision reporting mechanism.

The charts on the right there show the reports over time. You see, we received a total of 44 reports. The most occurred, you know, within sort of beginning of the new gTLD program. But we are -- we sort of continually get these reports over time. The -- the six down there at the bottom, all of those have been over 5,000 days after the delegation occurred, so these name collisions happen and continued to happen over time. And with that, I will hand it back to Cyrus.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you very much, David. Quite illuminating indeed. So without further adieu, let me hand this over to Ram Mohan who is the SSAC representative on the ICANN board. And Ram will walk us through the resolution from the board that actually led to this project and this undertaking in relation to name collision. Ram, please.

RAM MOHAN:

Thank you, Cyrus. So the reason why name collision is really an issue, as you heard David say, you know, .CORP, .HOME, AND .MAIL, there was evidence that seemed to indicate that there might be a problem there if those strings were delegated to the root, but the real question for the board to understand was the effect of name collisions on interoperability, on resilience, security, and/or stability. And some of that derives from the SSAC's report that -- that provided the board some guidance on some level of caution and a set of recommendations that some studies needed to be done. There was -- there was data but there was not yet information. There was a need for science and that was the motivation for the Board to go further.

Now, what the board did at the ICANN60 meeting was to look at the empirical extent and the impact of name collision as well as to address -- at least attempt to address key questions for not just the existing TLDs but for all future proposed TLDs with the intent eventually of looking at mitigation strategies, the risks associated with various mitigation strategies, to understand what -- what parameters might exist for the delegation of -- of TLDs and strings into the root.

One of the things that the board traditionally has had to do has been to arrive at some level of decisions on the level of risk of delegation. And the -- the question for the board in the past has been using what data under what methodology, are there

studies that it can point to. And that's really why the board made a request last year. And there's a bunch of detail in that request. If you follow that URL you will get the entire detail, as well as the rationale behind this request.

Now, there are a couple of things that I wanted to highlight that are -- that were key in the discussions and deliberations on the board. The first was a clear understanding that what is expected is objective and dispassionate analysis and to look at the data and arrive at a science-oriented or scientific method, if you will, that gets to analysis. That's -- that was one clear need.

The second was an understanding and a direct request to the SSAC that although the request -- the board resolution was aimed at the SSAC, that the SSAC was directed to conduct the study in a thorough and inclusive manner that would include technical experts from various realms. So it would not be only the SSAC that would do this.

There's a third component that the board was requesting the SSAC to do which is to look -- which is to provide at a very good level of detail both the scope of the work, the -- the timetable and scope of the work as well as an understanding of the costing of the work. And the intent was that the board would exercise some level of oversight in making sure that the scope, as well as the spend on the project, would be in a way -- conducted in a

way where there would be discipline and a continued oversight from the board. So that's -- that kind of encapsulates for you the board's motivation and then the way the board articulated its motivation. Back to you, Cyrus.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you very much, Ram. That's very informative indeed. So that takes us from essentially the background of what name collisions are, the potential impact of them to the action by the ICANN board, why and how. And now I'll hand it over to the leadership of SSAC, Rod Rasmussen, who will then walk us through what SSAC plans to do with this direction that's been provided by the board. Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thank you, Cyrus. So from the Abu Dhabi meeting where we had this resolution passed to us until today, I'm going to cover this at the high level and then we'll get into the details via the people -- the work party working on it. But in general we accepted the -- next slide, please, by the way. Thank you.

We accepted the board resolution and request and -- there you go. And got into the -- into the planning and thinking about how we're going to do something that we've never done before as the SSAC and looking at a project like this. And typically what

the -- what the SSAC does in dealing with work is we create what we call a work party within SSAC made up of our members and they will get together and discuss issues on a regular basis, may do some research, may bring in some outside experts on occasion. But now we're being tasked with doing this as a public -- in a much more public and open way than we typically do. So we had to look at that as well as look at the -- the scale of the project that it is.

So the administrative committee put together some preliminary work and plans and then we did form a work party within SSAC has per normal but this will be a little bit different, and we'll get into the details of that further in the presentation. We created that work party internally in January. Jim Galvin and Patrik Faltstrom are the co-chairs, and they will be talking further about this. But the main objective from the outset was to put together a proposal to bring to here in San Juan and have that out for public comment. Again, something unprecedented for SSAC to deal with one of our work products so that we could take where we were in our -- at least our preliminary thinking on how to approach this problem, take that to the community, take that to the board so they could understand where we were and so we could get comments and bring that -- bring that into the -- to the process of putting together a final proposal.

So this is a preliminary proposal. We are still not at any formal consensus within SSAC on this and that's important to note that.

We're looking for this session as part of that. And we're doing some more outreach which, again, we'll hear from more. I want to make it clear, this is an unprecedented project. And we're looking for input from the community on how to deal with a lot of the issues we have here. Send it back to you, Cyrus.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you very much, Rod.

With that I'll hand it over to Jim Galvin who will now walk us through the specifics of this working party's plan to address the Board's resolution.

Jim, thank you.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you, Cyrus. So, as has been described here already by multiple people, SSAC is taking on a new and significant endeavor here in moving forward with this particular project, something certainly the community as a whole is deeply concerned about.

This is a summary slide of -- from the point of view of the project, you know, what we're facing and what's in front of us here.

And we do have a public comment on this proposal period. It started on March 2nd, and it closes on April 18th. So this is not the last opportunity for folks to comment. We certainly do encourage you to take in what we're talking about here. And, of course, take your time to go back and look at the detail again in the proposal and comment in the public comment period under ordinary ICANN processes.

And that's actually an important point to bring up. As part of our obligation to meet the Board's requirement for transparency, SSAC is, for the first time, going to use, rather extensively, as you'll see as we get into talking about the project, normal ICANN public comment periods during our execution of this project. And this is the first step in that. Having the project plan and asking for input from the community on what we plan to be doing.

This is a very large high-level view of what this project looks like. We're currently in the project planning and management side of this, which is just about getting ourselves set up so that we can actually kick off and conduct this project in earnest.

From the point of view of ICANN, it isn't officially kicked off. Because, until the project is approved by the board and we're told to actually begin and execute the process, we're really just

in the planning stage. And SSAC is taking that on itself as an ordinary work party operation in the way that it normally works.

Once we get started, on the left-hand side of the slide, you see that there will be three studies we'll be conducting. And they will all provide input to the analysis that will be conducted by the work party in producing the recommendations that we hope to deliver. And we'll say more about all those as we go along.

On the right-hand side is a quick look at the overall structure of what this project is going to look like. I'm going to have workshops. We'll have sessions at ICANN meetings. And there will be multiple draft reports along the way.

And something which will apply throughout this project on the bottom there is the community input and tracking and evaluation. We will provide a continuous mechanism for the community to be providing contributions to the work party.

In addition to specific asks from time to time, there will be an opportunity for you to provide whatever you think would be interesting for the work party to consider.

And we will have a mechanism available that will track very carefully everything that we get from the community. And we'll also document what our response was or how we addressed that input that we got.

This is an overview of the timeline. This is also in the project plan, if you looked in that in detail. It's useful to see that the way it's laid out in the timeline is mostly serial. So we'll do the studies one after another. We do expect that there will be some amount of overlap. It's also possible that these studies and the work that goes on within them will be rather iterative. They won't be something that kicks off and then, when it's done, we'll get a study and it's there.

We do expect that part of the analysis is going to be looking at data as it comes in, looking at the work of the external parties that will be commissioned to do these things. We'll probably be guiding the kind of work they'll be doing. We expect it very much to be collaborative and a partnership with them. In fact, since studies 1 and 2 -- study 1 feeds into study 2, there is an expectation that there will be some overlap in these projects. It's not laid out this way, but that's roughly what we expect to happen as we get into this. And you can see here that the project is roughly timed to be a 2-year project from start to finish.

As we've already said a couple times, we'll be conducting three studies. I'll walk through each of those as we get to them. There will be separate slides on each of those.

An important part about community engagement is we do expect some draft work products from each of the studies. So there will be something that we will say after each study is completed about what happened during that study. Don't know that there will be recommendations that come from it. But, certainly, as we begin to develop observations about the data, questions about the data, we want to expose that to the community as a way of, hopefully, motivating additional input from the community and also giving the community an opportunity to ask questions, too.

As we give you the data and a look at what it is that we're getting, you may see things that even the analysis that we're doing doesn't see.

And so we're making sure that we give you an opportunity to keep up with the work that we're doing.

The final work product, of course, will also include, you know, a real ICANN public comment period that goes with it so that there will be ample opportunity for people to take a look at what's there. And, if you've been keeping up as we go along, you'll have an opportunity to review the final recommendations. And, if you observe any gaps or issues that we miss, there will be plenty of opportunity for the community to give us feedback so we can pull that back into what we do.

The first study is primarily a look at gathering what we know today about name collisions. In addition to what we had from before this last round of new gTLDs, we had the JAS report and the work that they had done at that time. A number of people had done some things along the way.

SSAC has published a document, as David was talking about earlier when he first presented today.

But we want to be able to go back and look at that and see what other people have done, any kind of related data. ICANN has certainly collected some data with respect to things that have happened. We want to take a look at that. And we want to put all that together and create that and use that as a way for us to conduct the first question that the Board had asked for us, which was to properly define name collision.

SSAC has already taken one chance at that with SSAC 62.

But let's do a more thorough and inclusive definition of that and what we can tell about what's been done before and summarize all that.

We also want to prepare for all the data we're going to collect. So we have to give a lot of thought to how we're going to manage that data, how we're going to process that data. We are expecting it to be a fairly large volume of data. So we need to

think about what it means to collect that and put it together and create a system in which we can manage all of that and have it.

The second study will be to look at that data and now actually go back and do some analysis about the root cause. Not just the root cause, but what happened as a consequence of the fact that the collision occurred. We want to understand why there was a name collision and then understand what the consequences were of that.

And we expect that each of these four parts of this study, there's a certain amount of independence between them. But they do feed each other. There's a certain amount of iteration that will go on as we conduct our analysis of the data that we've collected. We want to pull the data in that we have prepared for and then begin to look at it and see what we learn from it, again, to ultimately influence and inform the conclusions that we want to get to.

In the third part of the study the Board had actually expressly asked us to look at mitigation options. As David had reported in the beginning of this session, currently the requirements are for controlled interruption. Any new gTLD, which is launched, is required to go through a 90-day controlled interruption period. That's not the only mitigation option that was put on the table even before the last round.

So we want to go back and look at some of those options again and actually do a real analysis, as best we can. Create an opportunity for us to test them, and also consider, based on what we identify as root causes, are there other mitigation options that might be an option to think about that might be available to the community? And we want to think about those things and see if we can make some recommendations and say something about all that? So we expect to study all of that in this particular study in the overall project.

Now, getting to where the structure of the work party overall -- traditionally, as Rod was saying, this is a very complex and significant project. And we understand that. So we're trying to provide a little bit more formality to the project and the way it looks and also for the community so that you have recognized mechanisms for engaging with the actual work party members and the work that they're doing.

So there will be the work party. It will initially, as it is today, be comprised of current members of the SSAC. We will be, as required by the Board, providing an opportunity for other technical experts to join the work party.

SSAC already has in its operational procedures a mechanism for folks to join SSAC work parties. And we have actually done that in the past in prior work products that we produced. We've

invited other technical experts to join us when there's something specific we need and we want expertise covered.

So we'll be talking about -- we have not yet decided exactly what it means to be invited, but we'll have those opportunities. And all of that will be visible to the community before this actually kicks off.

There will be an NCAP discussion group. This will be a mailing list and it will be open to anyone in the community who wants to join and to participate and engage with the work party and also to engage just with each other, to talk about issues that are of interest to you and that you think are important and a way to make contributions and suggestions to the work party. There is a comment on here, but you have to complete a statement of interest. And I'll come back around to what that means along the way.

We will have -- all the NCAP work party members will be members of the discussion group. But it is an opportunity, again, for the community to engage more directly with us.

We'll be conducting workshops. And there will be three. The workshops, roughly speaking, are expected to align in some way with the studies. As you saw from the timeline chart, we had expected that the workshops will be used for developing statements of work. And the workshops that we'll have in

between studies 1 and 2 will be for evaluating some of the data that we've gotten also provide additional opportunities for, again, the community to interact with us. We'll use these workshops for dedicated opportunities for work party members to do the work of the work party. We will also provide an opportunity again for the community to more directly engage with the work party members. If you have a contribution that you want to make or some questions that you want to bring to the work party, we'll have that set up as part of it, too.

In addition we'll have open meetings set aside at ICANN meetings.

So this is one example, this cross-community session. We expect we'll probably have more cross-community sessions. We'll have to carefully think about when those will be useful and important. But we'll also tomorrow have an open work party meeting. So there will be an opportunity for the community to come and sit with the work party members and walk through and bring questions and engage in discussions.

Tomorrow's work party meeting is actually 3 1/2 hours, and it's an open opportunity for the community to come join us.

In this case the individuals and for public comments -- anyone can contribute and make a contribution that you believe should be of material interest to the work party. We will have an

opportunity on the community wiki page, in the ICANN's ordinary community area. It will be a place for you to submit that you have material that you want to submit to the work party.

And you will also find there all of the information that's necessary, as is typical with ICANN projects, about the work party and the activities and what's going on.

And here is just some additional details about the invited guests. We -- there's -- details of how all of that is going to work are still in discussion. We invite you to come tomorrow to our open work party meeting, if you have particular interest in that topic to come and talk to us about the details of that. We'd love to take some input and advice from the community on how to deal with that. But, ultimately, that will be published on the community wiki page. And, of course, we'll have public comment periods. And those will be usual standard ICANN public comment periods. And I suspect most people are used to how that works.

The important thing to note about the statement of interest is SSAC is going -- SSAC has, as an ordinary part of its operational procedures, a disclosure of interest. And you'll find that those statements are all part of the SSAC member list page that's on our Web site.

But for this work party we're going to adopt the more typical ICANN standard statement of interest process.

So we will, as part of the community wiki page, have statements of interest from all the work party members. And anyone who is going to participate and be part of the discussion group or make a material contribution to the work party that you want us to consider as part of the data will also have to submit a statement of interest as part of that. This is all about meeting the transparency request from the Board. So we want to be much more explicit about it.

We will adopt sort of the standard questions that folks in the GNSO and the PDP processes are sort of used to. We are actually in the process of creating an additional set of questions, about 10 or so, that will be specific to this NCAP work party that are trying to get at more details to understand better the position that people are coming from. And this is all about having open transparency so that you know the origins of people's positions and what you can decide about the work products that are produced.

We do make an explicit statement about who we won't request a statement of interest from. Sort of the obvious thing. Anybody who is only going to be an -- observer is a term, which is sort of well-understood in this community. Anyone who is just an

observer to this process obviously wouldn't have to fill out a statement of interest. And we're not going to make that for anyone who stands up at a microphone. That would be a little bit difficult to deal with. That's right. You have to turn that in when you come to bring a comment.

So -- the last thing that I'm going to talk about -- and then I'll turn it over to my co-chair here, Patrik -- is I want to call to your attention specifically to a section at the end of the project proposal where SSAC clearly has identified the set of risks we do see that are present in this project that certainly could affect the ability of this project to complete execution of the project.

And we think this is pretty important. We've proposed a certain set of activities. But there are certain assumptions that are made in order for that to work. For example, we don't know for sure that we're going to get all the data that we'd like to have. We sort of have an idea about what we'd like to get as part of our analysis. We have a sense of where we think we want to go to get that data. But it's always possible we won't get everything that we need. And, of course, having insufficient data could always affect the outcomes. So it's important to call that out.

There certainly is a certain degree of active testing that's required that we really want to do, especially with respect to the mitigation testing. But it's not clear that you can test

everything. We've already been pretty creative about the things we'd like to do. And that's a risk. And it does affect your ability to create a recommendation that might be more suitable to the community at large. It's also possible, in spite of our best efforts, that we've underestimated the scope of this project and what it's going to mean. And, similarly, there might be some significant problem that pops up that we hadn't foreseen and didn't know about. This is sort of ordinary project management stuff. And we're calling that out to you. We just want you to be aware that, in recognition of the significance and complexity of this project, we're paying attention to these kinds of issues. And we're stating them right up front. And we're -- stating them right up front and we're interested in your view about these risks. And there are other risks listed in the document. We only highlighted a couple of the more significant ones here. But any comments that you have about these risks and any additional ones that you want to bring up will certainly be welcome.

With that, let me turn it over to Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much, Jim.

I'd like to go into, more specifically, some areas that we'd like to specifically get feedback. You can, of course, give feedback on any sort of open consultation that we're doing here at ICANN on

whatever you want. But I'd like to -- but there are certain things we're looking for.

So, if it is the case that you're -- the more specific you are on the feedback, the easier it will be. And I would also like to remind people that this is the first time we in SSAC is doing an open consultation. We have responded to many, but we've never been to the receiving side. So that will be exciting by itself.

The more clear you are, the easier it is for us to understand and the more likely we'll sort of do the right thing based on your feedback.

So the first that we're thinking of is to look at the requests from ICANN board. And it's a very straightforward question. Do we use the right approach? Could we have done -- can we do this in a different way? Can we do it in an easier way, somewhat cheaper both in terms of labor and also division of labor between volunteers and consultants and then, of course, at the end of the day, money and time?

The work party itself, as was said, is something that we will run as an ordinary SSAC work party according to our operational procedures. And that is a design that we have come up with given how we got the question from the ICANN board.

So the SSAC operational procedures is what it is. But there's sort of a connection there between the operational procedures and the -- and this product plan that is also interesting to get a few comments on, if you have any.

The second thing has to do with the proposed approach for providing transparency and participation.

As you saw in the timeline, also what Jim just described, there are a couple of workshops. There's a certain quite large number of hours and days that we are -- that we invite people. And, from our perspective, to live up to the requirements from the Board, we believe that we need to do this much.

Is that true? If we're going to do all of these kind of things, will people show up? Or will we -- will the rooms be empty? Should we do things through video conferencing instead of trying to meet face-to-face? Or is it not enough time that we are spending together? So please have a look at the whole approach that we're using to provide transparency. And this is also an area which is slightly different for SSAC, because we are -- because, as you know, we provide -- we sort of do our work the way we are used to. Other groups here in ICANN might have good experience and come with recommendations of what we should do and not do based on your own -- what you've done yourself.

The third thing has to do with the proposed approach for statement of interests.

One thing that we are very used to within SSAC is to include people in the discussions that do have something that someone else might think being in conflict. We think that's really important. And that is also how we interpret the questions from ICANN board. It's very important that we include people who actually do work on these kind of things. We want to listen to people which have different -- which have done various experiments.

We need to include all of those people which means we cannot just say, okay, you have written a statement and just -- you worked with DNS, I'm sorry, you cannot be part of this work party. It's actually the contrary. We need people with clue so we need to work with people but we need to know where they are coming from. So statement of interest is very important for us. We are trying to do it slightly different but still use the ICANN methodology. Please have a look at that.

The fourth thing has to do with risks. We have had enormous amounts of discussions within SSAC regarding risk management. This is also a place which, of course, also -- where it might be a difference between what we are allocating as budget which might be a high watermark and how much money

we at the end day will actually spend in the project. And the lower that difference is the more we have to guess, the bigger the economical risks are, of course, in various directions.

So please have a look at both the risks and risk management that we have chosen but also come up with others if you have any.

So the next steps for us is this meeting, the cross-community session. As you can see, we have the work party session tomorrow that Jim pointed out. Note that we are starting at 8:30. So this is an SSAC work party meeting, but it's open for anyone to be there. It's in Room 101-B at 8:30, 8:30, not 9:00. There is coffee downstairs.

No, Goran, we don't expect you to come there and say anything.

The project plan itself is out for public comment, and it closes on 18th of April as Jim pointed out. Really, really important. We really want to have feedback here. This is something which we did throw out this project plan to get comments so that we can adjust. It's the beginning of a dialogue. Reach out to us, please.

So what we will do when we got the feedback is that we update the project plan, submit it to the Board, and then the project will kick off after receiving the Board approval.

Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you very much, Patrik. I would like to thank my panelists for this wonderful presentation. Essentially walking us through the -- from the time that name collision as an issue, as a serious issue, came into the spotlight a few years ago to essentially all the actions we've taken to date and now the Board resolving to task SSAC with essentially undertaking an in-depth analysis to come up with both a better understanding and a more longer-term solution.

So let's open it up to questions from the audience. There are microphone runners. If you have a question or comment, please raise your hand.

Let's go to Jeff Neuman there and then following that, the gentleman next to Jeff.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thanks. Thank you, everyone.

CYRUS NAMAZI: If you would introduce yourself, please.

JEFF NEUMAN: Just about to. My name is Jeff Neuman. First time giving a comment. Well, it's the first time here, so it's okay.

Anyway, I'm commenting now on behalf of the -- I shouldn't say "on behalf," as a co-chair of the subsequent procedures PDP for the next new gTLD process. And so some of the comments and questions I have are really in my role as one of the co-chairs, which I think is important.

Starting with the positive, I think this is a great direction. And I'm so glad to see an open process with the SSAC and inviting public comment and inviting others to participate. I think that's a great initiative, and I'm really happy to see that. And to see an open mailing list and all of that I think is a real positive step forward. I think it's actually a model for a number of issues -- or I hope it's a model for a number of issues to follow.

My question really relates to the time line and expected next actions after all of the studies are done and after your, I guess, recommendations are presented to the Board.

And I'm not sure if you were there, because I know everyone is at different meetings during the ICANN meeting, but the GNSO presented a time line of our estimate as to when we would be ready to launch new gTLDs and our expectation for ICANN staff to start budgeting and to develop the implementation mechanisms for the next round of new gTLDs.

What I'm a little bit concerned about is that the time line we see up here for the studies has your time line going longer than

when we would finish our final report, make recommendations to the Board, and, in fact, hopefully have the development of an applicant guidebook.

What I think we need to do is to coordinate on time lines and to make sure that we are prioritizing what absolutely needs to be done prior to the launch of the next round of new gTLDs versus what may -- what is acceptable to be done after the round -- the next round launches.

So I would go back and ask you all to try to prioritize and let the community know now what your belief is what has to be done prior to launching the next round, what needs to be done prior to delegating new TLDs in the next round, and if there's any other milestones I'm missing.

What caused a lot of frustration the last time around in the community was the fact that it basically brought everything to a halt, right? And I'm not saying not for good reason, but it brought everything to a halt.

So what I'm asking for is -- number one is to make sure that there's coordination with the GNSO, to make sure that we understand each other's time lines and can communicate that effectively to the community. Number two is to understand what the SSAC position is if the GNSO and the ICANN staff were

ready to introduce a new round of gTLDs while these studies are going on.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, Jeff. I see Patrik has got his finger on the button.

Patrik, please.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much for the comment. I think the keyword there is "synchronization" because I also would like to see comments back to -- to us how you think this implementation can be done. It could also be, for example -- excuse me -- that your plan is adapted to maybe a more refined name collision work output, if you understand what I mean.

So it could also be the case that you believe that what we have planned here, all of that work might not be needed to be able to reach the result that is needed to give input to the applicant guidebook. On the other hand, that might increase the risks. So I think -- so I think the synchronization issue that you talked about is the most important issue. Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, Patrik.

Rubens, you had your hand up. Let me ask Rod to also chime in on that response. And then we go to Rubens.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Right. Thank you. I had two points I wanted to make on this besides the fact there's a whole bunch of other processes that tie into what we're doing here in synchronization. And kind of general strategic planning within the ICANN sphere is a good idea. I agree with that.

We are being tasked with a fairly narrow bit that will be part of the entire next round, if there is a next round, all that kind of stuff.

What we're trying to do here is tease out -- you can see even the plan -- what the various things we will deliver over time are. And that all gets delivered back in preliminary reports, and then there's a final report. That final report has to take in because of the nature of the beast all those other things. However, there are some steps along the way.

At the end of the day, we don't have the decision as to what levels of risk, et cetera, that the Board or ICANN org or anybody else wants to take here. We're trying to answer these questions. So while we can coordinate, at the end of the day, we're not the ones making the decision of what actually has to be done. I

think that's a good thing to get feedback on from everybody. Getting that question that you just laid out there is helpful for us. But I would ask for more specifics on that.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Very quick follow-up, Jeff, and then we'll go to Rubens.

JEFF NEUMAN: Jeff Neuman.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Stand up.

JEFF NEUMAN: Don't say "stand up" again. I have heard the short joke too many times.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Sorry, I thought you are actually.

JEFF NEUMAN: So I guess the point is -- I guess a couple other things. What you asked us is a little bit unfair in the sense of you're the technical experts, you're the one raising the issue now that name collision

is still an issue despite the JAS report and other things that were out there.

But the second thing is while you don't make a decision, you certainly provide advice to the Board.

I guess what we all want to avoid is that if the GNSO -- and our schedule is known. It's been out there. It's still out there. It's always out there. We want -- the GNSO community does not want to be surprised with advice after we deliver everything and we are all ready to go and we have done all this implementation work and we're ready to go and then all of a sudden the SSAC says, Whoa, our studies aren't done. Our recommendations aren't out. Our mitigation measures aren't finished. You can't launch.

So I think the more we collaborate with each other and coordinate, we can try to make sure that they are done together and the community is not upset because there's a wrench thrown in at the last minute.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

I think the open processes we are talking about here will help that tremendously. So anything else we can do to be more communicative would be great, and that feedback would be awesome. As you said earlier, we're doing something that's

unprecedented and open. And I think that we should be able to avoid exactly that surprise that you're talking about.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you, both.

It sounds to me like actually it might be beneficial to continue this discussion in more depth tomorrow morning in the open session that you have to get into the specifics and hopefully have a meeting of minds and a plan.

Let's go to Rubens. Then we will go to remote and then Number 2 here.

RUBENS KUHL:

Hi there. Rubens Kuhl. Since I have a total of ten questions or comments, I will refrain from doing all of them at once and focus first on the data questions.

The plan as said -- implies some kind of archiving the data. But there are very interesting data sources that wouldn't allow that data to leave their facilities and go to anything that is planned by the working party, such as DNS-OARC bring to life. So you might consider not needing to store the data yourselves.

And, also, there was mentioned to ICANN data. ICANN (indiscernible) data, even though it's very interesting data, is not

something that is accessible to researchers. So any data in that case would also need to be accessible to other parties willing to challenge the outcomes of that study. So that can be met by DITL DNS-OARC information or original from JAS.

But unless ICANN is willing to provide people access to that data, that wouldn't qualify as data that could be independently verified. So I just wonder whether we are going in that direction.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Jim, please.

JIM GALVIN:

So thank you for that question, Rubens. We are very much aware of the problem of how to get data and deal with it and process it. All of the details of how we're going to address those concerns really are still under discussion. But I can tell you that SSAC has, as part of its operational procedures today, the ability to deal with data that may not be published. So it would be provided on a nondisclosure basis. So we have processes that allow us to deal with that and take that in as part of doing our work product and analysis. So that's at least one piece of what you're talking about.

And another piece is we might not take all the data on board because maybe we need to get access to the data where it is.

For example, the DNS-OARC case you're talking about. It could be it's such a large volume of data we don't want to move it, we just want to get access to it as part of our analysis.

The last part that you talked about is the ability for external parties who want to review the data to come to the conclusions. That's still an issue which is under discussion. I really don't have a solid answer for you at this time. But we are aware of that question.

You know, clearly when we come to a conclusion and a recommendation that we want to make, we have to support that in a way that the community can accept. And if that's dependent on data you can't see, we're aware that we have to deal with that issue. And I don't have an answer for you. But it is a good question, and we thank you for that.

Rod, do you want to answer that?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Let me add to that last point. One of the ways we look to mitigation at least in part that problem is by having the work party open to outside experts who may be the ones that want to take a look at that data to be able to understand the processes that go along. So there is an opportunity for people who might have an interest in how this goes to -- if they are -- would be

those types who would do this kind of research and be able to do that kind of work, those are exactly the kind of people we want on the work party as it is. I think for some people that's an even better solution, is to be part of the work rather than waiting for it to could out and trying to reproduce it.

So I know that don't fully mitigate it, but it is a way for people to -- who have that concern to be able to help allay their fears.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you. I think we have a question in the Adobe room. Please.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Yes, question from Maxim Alzoba. When is the breakdown of the greater than 3 million costs going to be published with more than four lines of text on page 13 of the draft paper?

JIM GALVIN: So I think the answer to that right now is that we are aware and fully accepting of the fact that this is a complex and significant project. We have obviously shared all of the details with the Board and the Board is certainly considering all of the details of the cost and how we got to the final number that's there. It really is not possible at this time to publish those details

because that puts ICANN in a difficult place with respect to negotiating with outside contractors.

I don't know when the date will be that we will expose all of that. Certainly as ICANN's ordinary processes, you will see the expenses as they happen, as ICANN normally discloses. So all of that's visible. But I don't have an answer to your question. But we do take that on board, and we will give consideration to that as go forward.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you, Jim. And benefit Maxim is sitting right there so he's cheating a little bit.

Let's go to microphone Number 2 who has been patiently waiting, please.

STEVE DelBIANCO:

Thank you. Steve DelBianco with the business constituency. For the SSAC members, I truly applaud the idea of putting out interim reports for public comment along the way. And there's a lesson learned within the GNSO with respect to the interim reports that we put out during the PDPs, or policy development process. And that is that for the reviewers of the interim report, it's so essential to learn what your preliminary conclusions

might be. And they might not have consensus of the SSAC and that's fine. You can just note that.

But if, in fact, you put out an interim report based on early parts of a study, it would be so helpful for us to understand what might be the conclusions based on that interim. For instance, might it suggest other strings to a priori be seen as collision risks? Or might those strings be taken out of the list?

Another would be a preliminary conclusion that a new method might be used to analyze strings for collision risk.

All I'm really saying is to translate your findings in your interim report in such a way that we can react knowing what the practical consequences of that would be. And the consequences would show up in strings that people would propose because it's expensive to come up with proposals for new strings.

And it also might cause us to budget differently for how we analyze our strings once there's a new methodology. Some of this gets to what Jeff Neuman was discussing earlier.

And the temptation for the SSAC might be to be conservative. You are very conservative in what you send, right? So you'd be conservative at suggesting preliminary conclusions when you only just gotten the data back. And it's okay to qualify all of that to suggest that preliminary conclusions are subject to further

analysis, subject to consensus. But that helps to sharpen our focus on what we should react to getting back to you. So that's an appeal. It's a little out of character for the SSAC to do that. But you're breaking new ground here. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN:

So thank you for that, Steve. Very much appreciated. We certainly take that suggestion on board. That's a very helpful suggestion, and we'll seek to accommodate that as part of producing our reports. Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you very much. Let's go to microphone Number 1, then we'll go back to remote again.

JIM PRENDERGAST:

Thanks, Cyrus. Jim Prendergast. Just like Jeff, my first comment this ICANN session. Jeff, you talked about no surprises from SSAC, but I don't think the last round should have been a surprise. SAC 45 was issued in 2010. That was the first signal to the board that there may have been an issue with the name collisions problem, and it wasn't until 2013 that there was a study so there was a lag in there that I'm not sure what caused it or why it wasn't addressed more immediately, but I think now, seeing recently that the board is taking SSAC advice through a

scorecard method, so maybe that won't be an issue going forward.

But for the panel as a whole, question, knowing what you know today, would you have allowed people to apply for .MAIL, .CORP, and .HOME, taken the application fees, and let them go into the new gTLD program?

CYRUS NAMAZI: That's a loaded question, Jim, but let me look at my panelists. I'm not sure if there is a yes or no answer to that question. Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Actually the board asked us to answer that very question, right? So knowing what we know now we're going to do a study to figure it out. You know, it's part of our work.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you. Let's go to number 1 remote.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Question from Alison Morgan. What is the process being followed to decide what qualifies someone to be invited to the SSAC work party from the outside? Will the SSAC publish its criteria publicly?

JIM GALVIN: And yes, we will definitely publish the criteria publically and the process that we're going to follow. That will be part of the community wiki page that is supporting this project. We ask that -- the issue is currently still under discussion, and we would welcome additional input tomorrow during the work party meeting. We would love to hear, you know, from the community on how we can better manage that process and suggestions for what to do there. Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, Jim. Microphone 3, please.

FLAVIO GARCES: Thank you very much. Flavio Garces, a young member of the fellowship program. This is my question. Is the name collision related to this cyber occupation?

CYRUS NAMAZI: Can you explain that a bit more.

FLAVIO GARCES: Yeah. Okay. The cyber occupation is when someone use, for example, a trademark or a well-known name in a Web site in

order to catfish people. So this is very similar to name collision -
- well, I guess.

JIM GALVIN:

Right now we don't believe that it's explicitly a concern in this project, but, you know, in addition one of the things is -- one of the reasons why we want to do the analysis that we're looking for is it's not clear if there is a direct relationship. We don't see that right now, but perhaps some of our study of the data we're going to get will create a correlation there that will want to call out to the community and make that visible.

DAVID CONRAD:

Yeah, and one thing to be clear with a difference between name collision and cybersquatting, cybersquatting is -- you know, sort of by definition is a malicious attempt to squat on a name in order to prevent someone else from taking that name. Name collisions is more a -- in my view, at least, an accidental use or a use that has leaked inadvertently into the global namespace. So from my perspective the two are significantly different. It doesn't mean that there can't be malicious use made of both, but in general the -- the name collision occurrences are the result of misconfiguration or accidental use.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, David. Let's go to microphone number 1, please.

JONNE SOININEN: Hello. I'm Jonne Soininen. I'm the IETF liaison to the ICANN board. So I have a couple of questions here. Some of this we have discussed internally in the board within subset in the board technical committee but first of my questions is actually is that we asked you in the resolution to basically also approach to IETF and external -- external experts in that way. And this is the last time the IETF liaison and I'm asking two-fold, like how have you thought that you would do that and then secondly, of course, that would you need help. And I'm, of course, willing to facilitate there.

Then the other things what we were discussing a little bit in the board is, for instance, looking at the scope. So how did you end up with -- this is just a question. How did you end up with the scope? You seem to be looking just the -- on collisions on the root level. You are not looking at the second level. And what was your kind of like thinking process that you came to this.

JIM GALVIN: So thank you, Jonne, for that question. On the first part of the invited experts, we have not actually yet figured out exactly how to go through the process of inviting other people and bringing

them on board. That's the whole invited guest question, and we certainly would welcome your help and participation in identifying IETF people and how we would go about doing that within the discussion that of we have about how to identify invited experts. So I don't really have an answer for you here yet, but we certainly do want to talk about that and welcome the opportunity to welcome you to make that happen.

On the question of second-level name collisions, so, you know, just to be clear, I assume that you're talking about, you know, sort of an example -- example -- second-levelname.exampletld, you know, that kind of situation. So you're talking about the example second-level name, is that not being studied. Our -- the project is about name collisions. I -- you know, I guess the best thing for us to do is just sort of apologize for any explicit reference to the idea that it only refers to TLDs. Our goal is to study name collisions and we will gather data that reflects all of that and consider that question in a very broad sense and analyze the data in that way. So it was not our intent to in any way limit the scope of the project to only talk about TLDs.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you, Jim. Let me go to number 2, then we'll go to the remote.

RUBENS KUHL:

Just a comment on second-level collisions which is one of the topics being looked at by the GNSO and it refers to things like corp.com which can get collisions from actual directory users. So there is ongoing policy work in the GNSO for this. It would be interesting for that to also be looked at by the working party.

Correction one information from Jim Prendergast. What triggered the 2013 issue of name collisions was the discovery of the internal certificates issue which was not known before. In 2000 -- before -- since 2009 there are references, published references, for collisions that could disrupt systems but the security threat vector such as internal certificates were only reviewed at 2012. And that leads me to my comment. I noticed that internal certificates are mentioned in the work plan but since CAB Forum no longer issues internal certificates for many years, they will probably be that useful to identify collisions because they are not issued anymore. The corpus of internal names -- internal certificates dates back to four or five years. So it's probably not that useful. For instance, you wouldn't see like something like .OPENSTACKLOCAL which is a pretty recent development because of the success of that cloud building platform. And that brings me to another comment. This -- my timeline suggests about one or two years between doing the first data collection and using the work result. Things can change in two years. So possibly develop something more interactive

would be useful since outdated information is not that good for information for decision-making as current information.

JIM GALVIN:

Thank you. I believe I heard three questions, so let me see if I can address all of these things together here. You were talking about corp.com and referencing the fact that it's, you know, second-level name collisions and sort of that generates the question. Corp.com is a known quantity for us and there's a dataset there that's a known quantity, and it is on our list of things to reach out and see if we can get some of that data related to that. I know that there have been folks who have done studies with respect to corp.com and what has happened there and taken advantage of that. And we fully expect to ask, and we're hopeful that we will get all the data related to that so we can take advantage of it.

You were commenting about the certificates and single name certificates and, you know, that that might have motivated name collisions and more importantly you were talking about the fact that it's four or five years old and so those datasets might not be useful. Actually, our view is that all data about name collisions for anything within even four or five years, and if we can find significant datasets even prior to that, it would be interesting. The important thing for us is root cause analysis,

and if that problem is no longer happening, how is it that that came about not happening. So we want to understand the mitigation that occurred that caused that to not happen. There might be something to learn there in that process. Now maybe not in that particular example, but in other cases. We are interested in all datasets that manifest name collisions so that we can do that root cause analysis and mitigation study. We think that's an important part that will inform the future.

The last thing that you talked about is also related to having old data and also the fact that this is the Internet and as we're often so fond of changing, there's something called Internet time and things change very rapidly. At one point when I was describing the three studies I also talked about the fact that we expect the work in these studies to be iterative as we're going through them. We're not going to commission these studies and then wait for the report to come back for the work party to continue working. We fully expect to go through these things together with people. There's even the possibility that, you know, like study one, it might stay open for a while as we get into study two and into the next one because we'll want to go back and, you know, iterate again on stuff that happened. So we're very much aware of the fact that circumstances change as time goes on, and two years is a long time for a project when you're trying to do an empirical study. And we very much want to try to take

that into account and expect to work with people in an iterative way so that we're always dealing with the freshest data.

DAVID CONRAD: And just to follow up one bit on the corp.com situation that's currently being archived within the DHS impact database and it's made available along with 50 other domains that JAS Global Adviser has been looking at and has licensed over to that. If you're interested you can go to <http://ordinal.jasadvisers.com> for more information.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you very much. Let's go to remote and then we'll come back to number 2.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Comment from Paul Hoffman. ICANN can possibly make the L-Root data available. We have not been asked, as far as I have heard.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you. That was just a comment. Is there a question in the remote that you'd like to read to us? Go ahead, please.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Question from Edmon. Building on the question from Jim and Alison, perhaps the working party should also consider inviting the applicants of .HOME, .CORP, AND .MAIL this round, at least in part of the discussion to answer the specific questions as mentioned by Rod.

JIM GALVIN: So again, you know, who the invited guests will be and the way that that will happen is still under discussion. So thank you for the suggestion, and we'll add that to the list of things that we consider as we develop the guidelines that we're going to use for that.

ROD RASMUSSEN: And let me just add to that a little bit. Yes, we are working on those guidelines. If there is really useful data and analysis that has been done by people who are applicants for any of those strings or any other strings that might be under contention, those are people we want to talk to and very likely would be included in the membership of the work committee. And I would urge people who may be in that position to provide some comments around our selection process to enable that.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, Rod. Let me go to microphone 2, and then we'll go to 3.

JAY DALEY: Jay Daley. I'm a member of SSAC but speaking in a personal awkward capacity. So really addressing more the subsequent working group procedures working group, if we assume that name collisions were not known about as going to prevent applications at the beginning of this process, we could describe those as a class of problems called unknown unknowns. Now, the reason I say that is because there well -- may well be other unknown unknowns and it may well be sensible for you to have a general plan for dealing with unknown unknowns rather than wait for this, which may not actually resolve everything at the end of it such that this becomes a known known, if you know what I mean.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, Jay. Let's go to microphone number 3, please.

JEFF NEUMAN: Thank. Jeff Neuman. I could quickly respond to that. One of the things in the subsequent procedures that we are developing is called a predictability framework which is a framework on how to deal with the unknown. So we've already kind of come up

with that. And I think this may be a case where we might have to use it.

I just want to clarify the second-level issue because I think there's been a couple of things mentioned which is not what I understood the second-level collision problem to be. And I'm reading from page 14 of the JAS final -- I'm sorry, not page 14. Page 30 of the final JAS report under number 4 entitled Collisions in Existing DNS Namespace. And it says, "It's worth noting that while second levels to register for our research, we made use of publicly available tools designed to facilitate domain drop catching and various squatting activities. One such tool offers to the public the ability to find second levels within .COM that are, quote, available with traffic. The very definition of a DNS namespace collision at the second level within the Internet's most popular TLD." And then it goes on to say, or the recommendation is, "ICANN should request that the appropriate bodies further explore issues relating to collisions in the existing DNS namespace, the practice of domain drop catching and the associated data fields that may be leveraged by attackers when attempting to exploit collisions." That's what it says. I'm not advocating that at all. I'm just saying that's what it says and that's what I thought was supposed to be the -- the response to the gentleman from the IETF that made that

request. So that was what I think was meant by the second-level collision question. Thanks.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Thank you very much for that comment. If you look at the actual sort of the project plan that we are talking about that we are presenting that everyone comments on, what you will see there is that one of the first tasks that we will look into is actually define this terminology. Because one of the problems that we have identified is exactly that, that different terminology is in use. So it's the first step to actually come up with very, very well defined terminology. Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI: Thank you, Patrik. Let's go to the remote, please.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Alison Morgan. What steps are SSAC taking to ensure that the output is, quote, good science, unquote, given the board's desire to get objective and scientific analysis?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So thank you very much for the question. This is one of the reasons why we do believe in having the data and the description of (indiscernible) analyzed the data publicly

available so we can do double verification of the results so other people can -- can validate and come to the same conclusion. So the reason why we are looking for data and presenting the methodology that is used to analyze is not only for transparency reasons but also to make sure that the actual result is verifiable.

Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you, Patrik.

Let's go to number 3 and then we'll come back to remote again.

RUBENS KUHL:

Rubens Kuhl again. I have a question directed to ICANN Board and GDD. What's the funding source imagined for this endeavor? Because I haven't seen anything in the fiscal year '19 budget that looks like this cost item. And a corollary to that is would Board and GDD considering asking the .HOME, .CORP and .MAIL applicants to fund this project?

RAM MOHAN:

Yeah, let me respond to that, Cyrus.

It's a good question. The Board has not yet gone through and considered the SSAC's proposal yet, so we're not at the stage of looking at, you know, where the funding would come from. Until

we get to that point, you know, we really can't provide you a specific answer to that.

What typically happens is -- yeah, what typically happens is the Board will consider the issue and then will ask the ICANN CEO to take further action, and I'm glad that he is sitting right here beside me to say what he will do when the Board gets to that point.

GORAN MARBY:

And that's because you told me to come here and answer that question, Ram.

It's fairly simple. It's actually the community, because what happens is any request for money will come from the same budget as everything else, and we go through the same budget process. So in the end, the empowered community can react to the total budget.

Ask just to give you a small example how it works, about 80 -- 85% of the total budget is already fixed by previous decisions by the community, so we talk about 15% of the budget that can be allocated between different things. And that is the mechanics of how this works.

Thank you.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you, Goran. No more questions in the remote?

Any more questions from the audience?

So we have a few minutes left, and I have a question I wanted to pose to my panel. So perhaps we could do a bit of a deeper dive into the specific timing of this Board resolution, because I think it was highlighted several times actually that the concept of name collision is nothing new; that even before, I think, the new gTLD program, there's been instances of it, discussions of it. It really came to a head -- I think it was back in 2012-13 when the new gTLD program really was sort of beginning to take off. And since then we've gone ahead and actually delegated about 1200 new gTLDs utilizing the controlled interruption technique that we collectively came up with. And no serious instances of security, stability have really been identified that we couldn't mitigate in a reasonable form.

So maybe I'll ask Ram, actually, to kick us off on the specific timing of the objective here. What do you read into that, Ram?

RAM MOHAN:

Firstly, I'm not sure that there is -- there is the science behind that that supports the assertion; right? We see what we observe, but there is other data that folks mention, Cyrus, that talk about,

you know, a large amount of collisions happening for certain names, et cetera; right?

So if you look at it from the Board's point of view, the discussion that we've had is, you know -- Let me go to that slide.

Give me just a moment.

This. This one; right?

So if you look at the Board and you look at the mission, a big part of the mission has to do with safeguards -- standards around security and stability. When we hear the Board level that there may remain still concerns about interoperability, resilience, security and stability, then the responsibility from the Board is to go to the appropriate expert groups and say are you still finding issues? Can you provide analysis?

then what the Board will do is to look at that data and eventually arrive, you know, at a sense of what the risks might be; right? So that's the stage that it's at.

And the second part of the discussion inside the Board was the last time around there was a name collision study, et cetera, that came through. But if you look at the SSAC's report that was sent to the Board with a set of recommendations, the SSAC at that time said further studies have to be done, more data has to be analyzed and has to be brought together. And to some

extent, what the Board is doing here is making sure that before the next round comes through, that this work begins rather than have the work on the next round or an Applicant Guidebook, et cetera, start and then look at it and say, oh, we better do this work.

So this is trying to make sure that that work is scheduled well ahead of time.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you. Thank you very much, Ram.

Let me ask my other panelists to see if they'd like to chime in before we go to the audience.

David, please.

DAVID CONRAD:

With regards to the specific timing, I think part of the timing results from the studies that were done as a result of SSAC raising the issue, the Board taking that issue under consideration, initiating the JAS report. And then some of the outcomes of the JAS report were to suggest that it would be appropriate to engage the IETF and seeing if the IETF had input on what criteria by which a name would be considered to be out of play for top-level domains. The IETF eventually wasn't able to

reach a consensus moving forward with that, so it then popped back to ICANN for further consideration.

So I think that played into some of the timings that were seen with regards to the Board resolution. Not -- I can't, obviously, speak for the Board, but I think there was an interplay of people trying to figure out what the right venue in which to explore this particular question was occurring, and that might have resulted in some of the timings that we actually saw in practice.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you. Thank you very much, David.

The last question for this session, microphone number 2, please.

JEFF NEUMAN:

Thanks. Jeff Neuman.

It's pretty simple, quick. Ram, you said the Board has heard of incidents or things. Can you just make sure all that's published? Because I have not seen anything, and I'm trying to follow this issue. It's important to me, and I've seen -- you know, so if you -- if the Board has heard about issues involving name collision, and I did see that one chart that had a couple numbers, can we publish the results of that, where it's heard it, what's damaged it's caused, how it was reported? Just anything like that,

because the last thing we've seen was from 2015, I think, unless I missed it, in the final JAS report. So that's it. Just a simple request to publish that information.

Thank you.

RAM MOHAN:

Thanks, Jeff. I want to be careful in the characterization here. I think what I was trying to say was that there have been anecdotal reports that have come through rather than the Board has been presented to or that the Board has received reports. If there are reports that the Board has received, we'll make sure that that is part of the record. But the actual motivation for why the set of studies are done is because when you get board members or the Board even being told anecdotally there may soon be problems, there may soon be issues, in this go-round the discussion inside the Board was that's not good enough. Need to go get the work done.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you, Ram.

So this brings us almost to the conclusion of this session. I wanted to ask my panelists if they would like to make a closing statement before we wrap this up.

Let me start with Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thank you. I just wanted to thank everybody for attending today, and some excellent questions and ideas brought forth already here. This is exactly what we wanted to get. And to, again, encourage members of the community with interest in this to provide us the feedback on the current proposal and to contemplate ways they can participate in the work party and providing data, potentially, and ideas for how to go about our work here. And also things that we can get access to and expertise so this we can get through this and really give a good answer to the community.

This is a new process for SSAC, for us to try, and your feedback on how that goes would also be appreciated. And thank you very much.

JIM GALVIN:

I just want to encourage folks again and remind you, to build on what Rod said, we do have the work party session tomorrow. It's three and a half hours. It's your opportunity to dig into the details of the project plan and also bring any questions or comments you have in general about this project. As Rod said,

this is a new space for us, and we very much want the community to engage with us as we move forward here.

So please come and participate tomorrow.

Thanks.

CYRUS NAMAZI:

Thank you very much.

I'd like to thank my panelists. I thought this was a very informative, engaging discussion. I hope the audience both physically here as well as remote found it also to be informative.

Obviously I think there is still a lot of debate and questions and information that needs to be provided, and I'm quite delighted to see that our colleagues in SSAC have a number of options for us to participate in the conversation to help drive this forward. You see the call to action here on your screen. I'd like to invite you to come join the SSAC team on the work party session tomorrow morning. I think that's the right forum to get a bit more involved into the details of some of these discussions and topics that have come up.

So I'd like to thank you very much. This session is closed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]