

---

PANAMA – NCAP Meeting  
Tuesday, June 26, 2018 – 10:30 to 12:00 EST  
ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

JAMES GALVIN: Okay, folks, we are just a minute after our half-past starting time here. We'll give it about 30 more seconds while we get set up with the slides and then we'll get started.

Okay, we're going to get started. I apologize. If we can start the recording and bring the meeting to order. I apologize to the remote folks. We're still adjusting the Adobe Connect and the slides and we're having that trouble here in the room also. In the interest of moving forward.

This is the Name Collision Analysis Project, SSAC's project that we created on behalf of the board. This is our open session. This is an opportunity for the community to speak to the NCAP work party, ask any questions that you might have, and of course respond to anything that we're presenting.

I am here myself, James Galvin, and Jay Daley over here next to me. We are the co-chairs, the current co-chairs, of this project on behalf of SSAC at the moment.

We have a number of SSAC members and NCAP party work members in the room. So, for those who are here, just raise your

---

*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.*

---

hands if you're an NCAP party work members, so that everyone else in the room can see who you are and you're around. We tend to be concentrated here, which is good.

Just a reminder, the folks sitting in the back in the chairs, please do feel free to come up to the table. And, of course, if you want to speak, please do step up and ask for access to a mic. Again, this is our open meeting and we're very interested in making sure we get comments and input from the community and questions. Next slide, please.

We have four things that we want to get through today. We'll do a quick, basic explanation of NCAP, why we're here, just to quickly level-set. The presumption here is that most people are up to speed and have been tracking this work and looked at the project.

We'll talk a little bit about what engagement is. We've made some decisions about how we're going to do things. We talked about them last time. We'll reiterate some things quickly.

Then, the bulk of the session, we'll be talking about some of the key issues that we have extracted out of the public comments that we have received to our project. We will take some time to walk through or organization of those and some draft responses to them and give the community an opportunity to react to that

---

and add any additional input or considerations they want us to be thinking about.

Finally, just a totally open session for whatever the community would like to talk about with whatever time is leftover. Good? Next slide, please.

First thing, of course, it's always good to understand what is a name collision. One of the activities of the project itself is to come up with a statement of what is a name collision. Now, for the moment, this is just some text we are working with, but it is helpful. I think it does explain what happens and what it is that creates the consequences and the issues that we're concerned about that we're trying to address as part of this project.

These words come in part from an SSAC document and part from the original JAS report from way back when. So, we've kind of tweaked these a little bit. We're certainly open for comments from folks about what it means for there to exist a name collision, but the work party will spend more time on this as one of its first actions. Part of its work product will be to have a solid definition of a name collision.

The first bullet up there pretty much summarizes it. I'm going to take a moment here to read a little bit of that out. It's when a string is used in a private name space, so in your own enterprise, for example. You might be using a dot-local for example or any

---

other kind of string like that. And if that string should find itself to be delegated in the root zone, and your usage of that in your private space then leaks out into the public space, then you've created a name collision. All kinds of consequences can come from that. The most serious being, of course, to be deliberately exploited with hostile extent.

So, to the innocuous case, you take your laptop out of your work environment to a public situation, a public Wi-Fi and you don't even realize that you're doing your internal request and such and then things are happening. You could then find yourself in an awkward situation, in a best-case situation. Next slide, please.

JAY DALEY:

So, before we go off this, just to be clear, this is not necessarily the full scope of the project. The scope given to us by the ICANN board and a number of people also in the community have asked that we look at second-level collisions, which is still something for us to understand, but could be effectively a domain name that was in use that is no longer in use and queries going for that are then answered by some other way or somebody re-registers it or something along those lines. It's a complex area and we're still trying to understand exactly what we've been asked to look at in that regard.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thank you. So, NCAP basics, the project organization. As folks should know, the project initiated by the ICANN board. There's a fairly lengthy set of resolutions that exist from last year. Folks can go back and take a look at that. One thing that is important to acknowledge is that this project is significantly larger than any previous SSAC project and it also creates a scenario which is new for many folks. It's new on behalf of the board in creating such a project and asking SSAC do this. It's new for SSAC to take this on. It's new for the organization to support this. So, we are having a little bit of growing pains, if you will, starting pains. But we are moving forward with some deliberate actions here in anticipation of being able to work through all the administrative issues of ultimately getting approval from the board to move forward.

We did create a work party, but it's not a normal work party. We're treating this as an SSAC project with some extensions so that we can meet the needs of the board request of us. That includes being inclusive and transparent. So, working in public as much as possible. This meeting is an example of that. There will also be a discussion mailing list that will be created so that the community can participate actively and make contributions to us.

---

We do actually have consideration for a third co-chair. Our preference is to try and identify a co-chair who is not an SSAC members. So, this is not exactly a call for volunteers, but just to make you aware that opportunity is out there. As we grow our set of invited guests and non-SSAC people in the project, we will seek to have one of those people also become a co-chair if we can make that happen.

We also want to emphasize that one of the ways in which we will work is we will make significant use of contractors. That is the intent. It's one of the reasons, unfortunately, why the dollar figure kind of looks the way it does for this project. The work party participants will be focusing on the statement of work and the analysis of those studies. We'll be looking for contractors to pull together the data, do some pre-analysis, some organization, structure, do a lot of the research. All of the research, really, and pull that together for us and make that available to the work party.

We are still looking for a dedicated contracted program manager. As distinct from the project manager that we do have from ICANN staff. As is typical with all projects, we have Dennis here with us, who helps us with the day-to-day operation of the work party, but this party really needs some larger, more senior oversight. Best example of that is managing the contractors,

---

that kind of thing, and managing the whole budget and the operation in that sense. Next slide, please.

I already mentioned the project discussion group, but just to be clear about that, it will be a mailing list that we will have. It will be open. Just as with work party participants, you have to submit a statement of interest in order to be a work party participant. We're going to look for folks on the discussion group to also submit one. That's fairly ordinary in a GNSO context for its PDP processes. Everybody who participates in one has a statement of interest, but of course we have our own statement of interest. It's rather expanded. Folks saw versions of that earlier in previous presentations. So, there will be that. Anyone can join if you submit that statement of interest. That way, you can make contributions and participate in discussions, ask questions. Work party participants will be there. It's a way to engage.

We will draw invited guests directly into the project from that discussion group, and that's an important thing for people to keep in mind. If you really want to be a part of the work party, you have to in some way contribute. That's normally the way that SSAC works. We're a body that depends on engaged participants and engaged members. So, we'll be looking for people to join the discussion group and actively engage there as

---

this work opens and progresses and that's the way in which you'll get pulled into the work party.

There will also be an opportunity for data contributions and there will be a way for you to indicate that you have data that you want to give us or you have data that you want to give us access to. So, we'll be able to have some discussions about the arrangements and the terms about all of that.

There will be a public comment later on about reproducibility and such and we'll talk a little more about what that means. We are going to open the door for a variety of different arrangements for access to data and data that we'll collect for the purposes of conducting the study. We'll see more about that later.

I think that's the setup at this point. This is probably a good point just to pause and see if anybody has any questions or comments. Then we'll jump into the public comments. The way that we've structured our public comments and some draft responses to them. I'm not actually monitoring the Adobe Connect room. Do we know if there's any questions in there? Is there a way to see the chat in the Adobe Connect? Something I only just realized.



---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Not at the moment. We're working on to fix that.

JAMES GALVIN: Okay. Alright, thank you. So, apologize to those who might be there and might have questions. We'll come back to that and deal with that as soon as we can get that. At this point, let me turn it over to Jay, my co-chair here, and he'll lead us through the public comments.

JAY DALEY: Great, thank you. I'm going to go through five draft responses to common points found in the public comments. Ignore the second line there. I'm happy to take Q&A at the end of each one of these slides to discuss the specific issue that's raised. Then there can be more Q&A at the end of it. Next slide, please.

One recommendation that we've received in multiple responses is to use the office of the Chief Technology Officer within ICANN as much as possible. We had, of course, thought about that one, thank you, and spoken to OCTO. They've indicated that they can help with data management. At the time that we wrote this, they did not have the resources to replace contractors, but may now be being addressed by the Board Technical Committee and directly with OCTO around that.

---

So, yes, wherever possible we would like to use OCTO. We think they have the data analysis skills and the facilities and resources to be able to make this work [inaudible] significant pieces of work here. Did anybody from OCTO want to comment any further on that at all?

MATT LARSON: I think it's kind of early to tell exactly what the involvement will be, but Goran has asked OCTO to be supportive of the project and we certainly will be. I think we just need to figure out what that means, which I don't think we'll know until we get further in and see what the project plan looks like, but happy to help.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Could you identify yourself?

MATT LARSON: Matt Larson, ICANN.

JAY DALEY: Thank you. Anybody else like to talk to about this particular point? I'll move on. Thanks, Steve.

We've been asked by a number of people why is SSAC doing this, and the answer is because the board have asked us to, and the board have given us a relatively detailed scope as to what they

---

would like us to do in this regard, which I think answers this one really quite simply. Is there any discussion at all about this one? No? Great. Okay.

So, this is one of the more contentious ones. This is one of the ones I think we should be paying attention to, certainly. We've had multiple recommendations that SSAC should not expect the next round of new gTLDs to wait for the name collision analysis project to complete. We've also actually had recommendations the other way around, that nothing should happen until name collision has been fully understood over several years. But, the majority of them were very much this way around, that it should not wait.

Now, our response is that this is a community decision, not an SSAC decision, and we're not even going to comment on what process should be used by the community to decide that. But, we do want to offer two elements of advice here.

If delegation new gTLDs takes place before the risks are fully understood, then we believe it is highly likely there will be serious issues in some TLDs which we're not yet able to specify. We are very clear that there have been problems with name collision with some TLDs that have been delegated and that there is, while we still need to get a lot more work on the evidence that the evidence so far shows that there are at least

---

some we know that if they were delegated, there would be further serious issues. So, we're very clear that the technical act of delegation, if that takes place before the risks are fully understood is highly problematic.

Our process that we've set up has three studies involved and we believe that the risks will be fully understood after the second study because the third study goes on to deal with mitigations. And we don't know how far that will go with the mitigations. So, this is basically saying it has to ... Well, not that it has to, but we think that if this delegation takes place before study two takes place, then there could well be some very serious issues or there will be some serious issues in some TLDs.

Then, the second point, which is not put as strongly as the first point, but still a point we think is worth making, is that if the application process starts and applied for strings are made public before the data is collected and analyzed, then there is a significant risk that the data could be inadvertently or deliberately biased and thus prevent this project from being able to effectively respond to the board's request.

So, people may attempt, may begin some form of initial test up, put some infrastructure in place. They may do other things that could begin to bias the data or somebody may find out that somebody else is applying for a string and use a botnet to try to

---

make it look as though that is already a very well-used TLD and [inaudible] deliberately delay that. There are multiple different mechanisms we can see that this might happen. So, this is a question about the application process starting before we've got the data there. Would anybody like to discuss this? This is possibly one of the most important elements of it. Excellent. Silence is taken as assent, so it was good that you all agree with us on that one. Yes? Come to a microphone, please. Identify yourself, as well, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: My name is [Tomoff Miyokibo]. I work for DigiCert. Quick question. If the recommendation is SSAC should not expect the next round of TLDs to wait for NCAP to complete, why are we doing this work?

JAY DALEY: As stated on the previous slide, because the board have asked us to. This is a meta-level question you're asking here. It is about why it's being done and how that fits into the process. We're clear that's not at our level for us to understand or discuss. That's a board one. We can give advice on it, but ultimately, the overall process thing is something the board and the community needs to manage.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I believe this work is done to address some issues for some purpose and the purpose would be the next round. Well, when a new TLD comes out. If the work is not ready for that ... I just got a little bit confused.

[JAMES GALVIN]: I think maybe you're confused potentially ... That first sentence, the recommendation, that was the recommendation in a public comment. That's not SSAC's recommendation. So, we're being told that we should not do ... That our work should not complete before the next round. That's our response below to that recommendation.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you.

JAY DALEY: I think also, just to note that there are still leftover issues from the current round – corp, home, and mail – that were bid for and are not yet delegated because name collision issues with them are not fully understood. This particular issue preceded the last round as well. So, I don't think that anybody thinks there can necessarily be real clarity as to when you say this is no longer an

---

issue, this is dealt with. It's going to continue being woven into process of application maybe for every round going onwards.

A few people have asked us, or recommended that SSAC should ensure independent researchers can verify the results of data analysis. This is something we agree with and that we will aim for independent reproducibility both of the method and the results. That's not going to mean that the data is just public and anybody can do anything with it. We are aware that there are significant risks of sharing that data openly and that many of the data submitters may well not provide the data if that's the terms under which it's made available.

So, there will need to be a process for independent researchers. They will need to be vetted in some way. They will need to operate within restricted terms and they will have to sign individual standards contracts with each of the data providers whose data they're going to use because many of the data providers would expect to be able to enforce that contract if the researcher did anything that was unacceptable with that data.

The terms under which that data we shared with independent researchers will need to be agreed before any data is submitted, as it says unless the data submitter is quite clear that they don't mind.

---

Finally, just a note that we have a lot of work that we think we can do on anonymization standards, which may [inaudible] some of the concerns of data providers when those are defined and data providers can then understand the nature of the data of that would then be provided to researchers and to the contractors working on this project as well. Any comments or questions on this particular point? Great.

So, the last of the responses. There are multiple recommendations about the project plan. A number of people have asked for additional stop-go points in the project plan. Multiple people have asked for some way of killing this entire project very early. Particularly 90-day stop-go points or these type of things, so something very, very fixed in that regard.

And a number of people have asked us to deliver the results much earlier on in the project. In some cases, actually specifically stating, “Before you’ve done the work, can you please tell us what the answer should be?”

The response is that, firstly, we didn’t necessarily make it clear that there are implicit stop-go points after each study. There is an implicit stop-go point if insufficient data is supplied. If we can’t get the data to analyze, then it is unlikely that we can necessarily carry on with this.



---

In general, though, we have understood wherever the work can be conducted in parallel and we have built that into the project. We think that there may be a few more examples of where some work can be conducted in parallel and we'll be making that [inaudible] project plan.

However, on the whole, the project plan is, in our view, already at the maximum level of granularity it is possible, given the complex nature of the work, and we have sequenced it in a way that has to be determined by the dependencies which we can't avoid.

So, there is not much flexibility for us to do that. There is certainly no flexibility for us doing certain arbitrary 90-day stop-go point because it is very unlikely that anything will be happening at 90 days in that regard.

So, we understand people's concerns that they are concerned about this and worried about this and would like the next round to start within 90 days plus one or something, but as we said at the beginning, this is not for us to make a decision about whether next round goes ahead. So, these concerns I think are linked to that about when this goes ahead. But we certainly can't do anything different within the project plan particularly to do this. So, any comments or questions on that point at all?

---

ANNE AIKMAN SCELESE: Anne Aikman-Scalese with Lewis Roca Rothgerber Christie. On that point, the PDP that's currently occurring for subsequent procedures, there will be recommendations of preliminary agreement coming out from work track four that will state that that PDP recommends that applicants be able to propose on an individual basis a mitigation plan for name collision and there's a question for public comment about whether ... Who should be analyzing that proposed name collision mitigation, [so plan], on a case-by-case basis.

The question would be whether the SSAC will be looking at the recommendations coming out in the initial report out of subsequent procedures and providing any sort of response that is based on your work plan.

JAY DALEY: I'll answer half of that and Rod may answer the second half. The third study is all about mitigations. It is about us understanding the efficacy of any known mitigation and possibly considering other mitigations as well. That will be both done by looking at the data to understand if the data tells us anything, and by building a simulation system to then be able to test mitigations in that regard as well. As to the other part of it, as to whether or not we would sequence it ...

---

ROD RASMUSSEN: Thanks, Rod Rasmussen, SSAC chair. So, the NCAP work party set up specifically to answer the question that the board posed to us. What you bring up, though, is obviously highly related to areas that we're going to be studying here.

If and when such advice comes out of the PDP process, we would probably take a look at that and see whether it would be appropriate to comment on that just directly and that probably would be the course I think we might take at that point or whether we need to incorporate that in an adjustment in this work party's charter. It really depends on what comes out of that. I do believe, though, that if that is part of what comes out of the PDP that we would be remiss not to at least examine that.

ANNE AIKMAN SCELESE: Great, thank you. It will be published July 3<sup>rd</sup>. Thank you.

JAY DALEY: And just to add this project does not envisage an ongoing role in assessing mitigation plans. That's certainly not part of it. It's to look at the mitigation technology that we're aware of, provide advice on that to whoever would then be looking at that and looking at the applications and the plans.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah. And to set expectations properly as well. In case it wasn't understood, SSAC will not be evaluating any particular strings other than what we've actually been asked to take a look at with the home, corp, mail situation as part of the board resolution.

This is stretching it as it is. We're not really operationally set up to do that. That would be more properly handled by some sort of ongoing process. I would imagine that ICANN would [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Sorry, Jim, go ahead.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you. Just to add, if you look at the board resolution, just to frame this in a slightly more general way, we were specifically asked for whatever advice we can provide to the board about how to evaluate mitigation methods. So, in addition to the specific things that we've said here, we will have to examine that question and offer to the board some ideas and I would fully expect that the work product from this work stream four will certainly be input to that process and we'll see what our analysis produces as we look at mitigation methods.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Great, thank you.

JAY DALEY: Great. So, we'll move onto the last slide. This is the open Q&A for all of your burning questions that I know you've spent ages writing up a long list of. So, while you're all thinking of those burning questions, Jim is going to just update us on the Board Technical Committee and the work that's going on there between SSAC and the Board Technical Committee.

JIM GALVIN: So, I'm sure that folks are curious about is this an official project or not and when is it going to kick off and what's the process, so I thought it would be useful to just take a few minutes to speak to that a little bit so you know what's happening in the background and what's going on.

The Board Technical Committee is the part of the board which has direct oversight of this project. As you might expect, they have taken certainly a very significant interest in this project and the project plan and its review and deciding what to do going forward.

At the moment, we are all acting in good faith. I mean, strictly speaking, in a formal sense, the project hasn't been approved.

---

But, we all expect that the project of this form will ultimately ...  
It will be decided that it's going to be okay.

So, for right now, we're sort of in this prep stage of getting to a place where we have a project plan that everybody agrees to and the work party is moving forward carefully and deliberately in trying to progress little bits of work items, the most notable thing of which is of course revising the project plan and we're already prepping for the statement of work for the first study and getting ready to get that process kicked off.

Everyone is concerned about how long this project might take, so we are trying to move things along as best we can without investing too much until we're clear about the parameters.

In terms of the Board Technical Committee, we've been actively engaged with them. We've actually had – we meaning the NCAP admin committee. And the NCAP admin committee is the co-chairs, Jay and myself. It's Rod as chair, Julie as co-chair, our board liaisons. Well, we have one board liaison. Ram Mohan is the current board liaison. [Meta Cocayo] is the incoming board liaison. She will transition into his role in October, as is the normal process. But she's been actively engaged in all this all the way here coming up to speed. And of course, our project manager over here on my left.

---

We've met with the Board Technical Committee a couple of times to talk about the project, the details of it, so that the board is fully aware of what's going on.

In addition, the Board Technical Committee undertook to hire an independent consultant to do an evaluation of the project. That has actually been done and completed, too. We do have some, in addition to the public comments that we've gotten here from the community, we have some comments from that person that have to be addressed and folded into the project plan as we move forward in trying to revise the project plan.

We also have gotten a commitment from the Technical Committee to help us in providing some resources that have yet to be detailed, but some resources to help us actually revise the project plan so that we can get some dedicated additional staff to sort of work that, to make that happen as quickly as possible.

I just wanted to make you aware that was happening. In fact, we are having a closed meeting here of the work party later on in the week, and during that meeting, the work party will actually be going through those comments that we had gotten from the Board Technical Committee in the same way that we've gone through the public comments here so that we can begin this process of revising the project plan.

---

So, I just wanted to make you aware that we are moving along. This stuff is happening. I know that we have some Board Technical Committees here. I know Avri is here. So, if they want to add anything or say anything to the community about what's going on, I think that would be awesome, too. Thank you.

AVRI DORIA:

The only thing I would add is that not only is the Board Technical Committee tracking it, they've asked Jonne Soininen and myself to actually pay attention and be one more point of communication, so that nothing gets lost down the cracks or anything.

JIM GALVIN:

Yeah. And we certainly appreciate that. This is a big project. It's significant. We all know it and just want the community to hear that we're all actively engaged and paying attention. Back to you.

JAY DALEY:

I'm just going to add this is such a big project. This should actually be considered as two project, where project number one is providing the details and the plan for project number two. We are still at the stages of project number one and we still think that we have not yet done enough work to be able to begin



---

project number two because project number one has not been completed. That's where the Board Technical Committee have been providing resources and helping us with that. We hope to get to a stage where we have a good project plan together that can then be agreed between the working party and the Board Technical Committee. That means we can then move forward onto project number two, which is the actual work.

Just to be quite candid with you, so that you're all aware, the big concern is about the cost of project two, the main one, which is currently budgeted at [inaudible] million dollars and potentially taking some years to complete because it is a very big and very thorough piece of work. So, that's where the concerns are currently.

Thank you for that. This is final call for the open question and answer question, if anybody has anything they would like to raise.  
Rod?

ROD RASMUSSEN:

I just want a clarification. Is this any questions at all? So, not just about what we just talked about, the public comments. I just want to make that clear for the room.

---

JAY DALEY: Yes. This is the open, any questions at all to do with name collision.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. Hopefully, these meetings will be a little more productive in the future. As we get in the real work and the discussion group is going, there will be issues to talk about. I appreciate maybe it's a little quiet right now and we're [inaudible] a little bit to fill time, but hopefully in the future this will be much more active and engaged. That's what we're looking for. Anne, please go ahead.

ANNE AIKMAN SCELESE: The question, if it's open questions, is about the public comment that might have been received on the part of the plan that said that you would be acquiring data studies from entities that might have conflicts of interest because the community is such that you feel that I think that you won't get enough data unless you're able to acquire studies from entities that are conflicted. Maybe I misunderstood that part of the plan, but in terms of that contracting function and the bidding on that, how will you be evaluating the issue of conflict of interest in supplying data in the studies that are paid for by ICANN?

---

JAY DALEY:

There are a number of things to open up there. First, it's not our intention to be paying for any data. We're hoping for data submissions from people to do that with and we think we have the connections and the networks to be able to get that data from people without having to pay for it.

There is always the possibility that somebody that provides us data may have constructed that data or may have chosen a bias set or something like that, so there will be conflicts of interest requirements around for those people, so that the data that is provided to us they can assert is as clean and as unbiased as they are able to make that.

We are quite comfortable about that. We think the biggest risk about data provision is people being unwilling to provide us data because of the nature of how it will be shared, either with contractors or with us or with independent researchers. Rod would like to say something next.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Let me speak to that a little bit. There's a little bit of confusion I have on your question. I'm going to assume my interpretation. One of the things we're required to do, part of this is to actually be inclusive of people who probably have some conflicts because they are looking at particular strings and may actually be tied up with that. We want that data anyway and we don't

---

want to exclude data just because somebody may have some interest in it. What we really need to know is what those biases might be so as we're evaluating the strings—

ANNE AIKMAN SCELESE: I'm sorry. Perhaps the question wasn't clear. I think that's absolutely understandable. I was talking about studies that are paid for.

JAY DALEY: So, for the second half about things that are paid for, this is, yes, a small community with a number of people who can work on some of these things, potentially [inaudible]. And there are SSAC members who have previously conducted these types of surveys.

What our view is that we will not limit the ability of anybody to apply to do this work other than those of us who are on the admin committee who have made clear that we won't do that because we think that doing that, limiting that, would limit the ability to actually deliver this project, potentially.

That means that the admin committee, particularly the co-chairs, are taking considerable effort to sanitize anything that is produced for the working party so that they're not [inaudible] to

---

anything that would give them an unfair advantage in understanding this.

Secondly, all procurement will be managed by ICANN procurement and using the independent program manager that's appointed to work with them. ICANN procurement have some very clear, very thorough processes to ensure that conflict of interest is prevented from becoming an issue there.

So, that's the general [inaudible]. So, there's a possibility that an SSAC member or part of their organization perhaps may bid for some work. There's a possibility they may even get the work. That will have been as much as possible managed so that they get no benefit from being part of SSAC in getting that work and that ICANN procurement will be primarily responsible for ensuring that there is a fair process in place on procurement side.

ANNE AIKMAN SCELESE: Thank you.

ERIC: Eric [inaudible], George Mason University. Has any thought been given to what the studies will actually produce? Are you looking for publications that are in [inaudible] venues or are they sort of internal documents and balancing the transparency with the

---

output? Like if the data is very sensitive, is there the expectation that the measurement studies will result in publications that then are public?

JIM GALVIN:

I'll try and take a crack at this and frame these things. Obviously, we're not going to explicitly ... We're not going to publish in other publications our work product as such, but the plan is to produce draft work products at the end of each study so that the community can see something about what we've learned, what we've gotten, and whatever else we can add to them as we go along. And we explicitly will be asking for public comments within the ICANN arena.

So, if you're talking about publication within ICANN, yes, all of that will be done. Publication outside of ICANN is not in our plan, but once the information is public, I would say that others could probably build on it and take advantage of that.

Now, with respect to the data issue and access to the data, this just gets back again to one of our comments up here earlier. Let me try and frame a response using slightly different words than what's already been said.

Obviously, our plan here ... SSAC is a technical body and our plan is to be as respectful and honorable to the ordinary

---

scientific process as possible. We want people to be able to take this data and repeat it and come to the same conclusion that we did. But, we also have to recognize the fact that some of this data is sensitive for a variety of different reasons, and while we might be able to get access to some set of data, it might not be possible for the data that we use to come to our conclusions to be visible and accessible to others.

As we said in the response up there, it's possible that individuals who want to do research might be able to make arrangements to get access to the data. Academics who do research are used to this kind of thing, so maybe all of that is possible.

It's also possible that we might be able to find a way to anonymize the data and that will depend a little bit on the sources of it, what they are willing or not willing to do. They might be willing to share data. Nobody wants to do the work of anonymizing it, those kinds of issues.

So, will our conclusions be directly reproducible? Well, we hope our method is reproducible and that's what we hope to document, so that people can, if they can go and get access to the data, they can certainly reproduce the conclusions. That's a place that we want to get to at a minimum. Thanks.

---

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: A question about when you would expect to publish the invitation to join the discussion list and fill out the SOI for this project. Do you have anticipated timing on that?

JIM GALVIN: No. We haven't actually committed to a date, partly because there's this nuance about, well, do we start everything up before the project has been approved and it's really kicked off? I don't know. In some sense there's really nothing holding us back from creating the discussion group.

Up until this point, we haven't ... It was only recently between the last meeting and now that we came to an agreement about the statement of interest. So, we'd have to go through the process of putting that out there, making it visible and beginning that. So, maybe we'll just take as input from the community that you'd like to see us kick off this discussion group fairly soon and we can certainly take that on board and we'll see to try to make that happen soon, because you're right insofar as we're kind of moving deliberately forward, we should provide the community an ongoing opportunity to engage seem fair. So, thank you for that.



---

JAY DALEY:

Okay. Final call again for any more open questions related to name collision at all. No. In that case, I'm just going to close the meeting. Before I do, just to let you know that lunch is not for us that has been set up at the back of the room. You are not to touch the lunch. This meeting is being recorded. You will be spotted. Thank you, all, for coming. It's been very helpful. We have some points to take away which we'll be addressing. We will be taking this forward with the Board Technical Committee to see how we can expedite the process. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**