

**Transcription ICANN Los Angeles
Name Collision
Sunday 12 October 2014**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#oct>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Jonathan Robinson: And so let's go straight on then with Francisco. Right so if I can just - if you can just clarify that we've got audio, we're ready to commence the recording at the back. Are we good to go with the recording? Thank you very much, that's great.

All right, welcome Francisco. I know this is a - yeah, if I could have your attention in the room please? Thanks. Welcome, Francisco Arias from ICANN staff to talk with us about the latest updates on the name collision and the prospective impacts on policy work in the GNSO. Over to you, Francisco.

Francisco Arias: Thank you, Jonathan. Hello everyone. So some of you may be familiar with the work that has been going on regarding name collisions. This is slightly different or a potential (unintelligible) different track regarding name collision. If we could go to the next slide please?

So...

James Bladel: I'm sorry to interrupt, can we - I can't hear you.

Jonathan Robinson: Well, shh. If you could continue your conversations outside the room please, keep the - leave the doors closed and if there's any private conversations if you could have them outside the room please. Thank you. Francisco, please go ahead.

Francisco Arias: Thank you. Hello again. So this is before going into the matter I just want to give a brief description of what name collision is, a simplified version of it. So name collisions happen when there is someone using a name that is not delegated in the public DNS. And for some reason they leak, let's say, that queries to the public DNS. Next slide please.

For example in a corporate network it is very common that - or is fairly common that they could have some internal name and they have of course mobile users. And when they go to the outside - to their homes or hotels or any other public WiFi they connect and they intend to use the same name but only this time they are sending that query to the public DNS.

So next slide please. Oops, that's - so could you go back. So problems ensue when the name is delegated in the public DNS so people instead of going to the Website in their corporate network for example they will go to a name in the public DNS.

Now next slide please. Background on the work that has been done so far regarding name collisions, you may be familiar, last year in October before a delegation of the first new TLDs, the New TLD Program Committee of the ICANN Board adopted what is called the new TLD collision management plan that describes a few measures that - will have to be taking place before delegation of new TLDs will happen.

And one of the elements of the plan described was the creation of the next element, (unintelligible) in the second bullet which is the name collision (unintelligible) framework data (unintelligible) measures that new TLDs have

to take - have to implement regarding name collision. And except that second element was adopted by the NGPC just last July.

Next slide please. The (unintelligible) NGPC resolution includes four elements, one of those is the one that I mentioned, the - adopting the framework that's the first one.

Second is direct undertaking a consultation regarding RPM, rights protection mechanism requirements the SLD, secular domain names, in the block list that were recorded in the clearinghouse and some other conditions.

This consultation is going on. And the public comment period I think finalized just a couple days ago. And we are processing the comments and there is more information on this on a session that is on Wednesday where Karen and I are going to talk about name collision and she's going to give an update on the RPM consultation.

But the most important item for discussion here is there is a number three items in the resolution regarding concern potential policy work within GNSO regarding a long term plan to manage name collisions.

The other item in the 30-July (unintelligible) was about sharing the information and best practices with ccTLDs which we have been done now the recommendation we are sharing with ccTLDs is that do (unintelligible) the new TLDs and we have the first two items of data with the first two IDNs in the list that passed the evaluation a few weeks ago.

Next slide, please. Next. So the current work has been focused only on the 2012 round of gTLDs. There is also a limitation on the measures. They must obtain this at two years after delegation of the gTLD. And also there are no measures for gTLDs that were delegated in previous rounds. So all the previous 18 gTLDs they don't have any measures for name collision.

Remember that name collision is not an issue that appears only when you delegate a new TLD. This happens all the time when there is a, let's say, a recycling of names once a name that was for a registrant, the name gets deleted for whatever reason and then someone else takes that name then that recycling will end up causing name collisions.

It also happens when, for example, adopted names from certain misguided documentation there are a few very famous cases that have led to name collisions caused by recommendation by certain companies that I'm not going to mention but that are very famous and they were recommending people to use names under very well known gTLD - a legacy gTLD.

And in the (unintelligible) one of the (unintelligible) for the new TLD name collision measures they reported the extent of that name collision occurrence in legacy gTLDs. That led to our recommendation in that report to explore they call it domain (drop) catching and (unintelligible) I think the (unintelligible) term will be that recycling of names in gTLDs that have been long-delegated and where there is the need to do something about it.

Next slide please. So with that in mind I'm following the direction of the NGPC here. And we have - we provided a briefing paper, hopefully some of you may have seen. In that paper we describe a few questions for your consideration regarding this potential policy work.

First there is what if any measures shall be taken into account for name collision for vanishing the name collision risk for future rounds of new TLDs so what comes in the future should there be any name collision measures there?

Second is whether we need a collision measures - name collision risk management - risk mitigation measures for the current round of new TLDs beyond the two-year anniversary of delegation. And here where there is a

need for such measures for gTLDs delegated prior to the 2012 round the so-called legacy gTLDs.

And next slide. Related to that topic is whether there should be any safeguards regarding the domain drop catching practice and similar services under gTLDs referring - gTLDs in general not any particular round.

And there is of course the question on where we need further data on the current effective measurements and effectiveness of the current mitigation measures of some other aspect before a decision can be made.

Next slide please. And so given the nature of the issue at hand where if any policy work is decided to be taken on this topic where the participation of SSAC in some form will be needed in order to inform or help with this work.

And finally the last question we put in front of you is where policy development is the best approach to develop these measures of if there is any other method by which this work will be done. And I believe that's the last slide. Yes it is, okay. With that are there any questions?

Jonathan Robinson: (Unintelligible) keep that other slide up.

Francisco Arias: Could you go back to the previous slide?

Jonathan Robinson: So any questions or comments on this? There's the three different questions for - okay over - to the floor mic then Jim.

Jim Baskin: Thank you. Jim Baskin, member of the Business Constituency. Been following the domain collision analysis and work that's been going on for quite a number of months now. And just one question about the status of the report, the semifinal report, I forget exactly how they referred to it, came out at the last meeting or just before. And it still was redacted. It did not have certain information about the data that was used to come to their conclusions.

It's been another three months and I haven't seen anything. Maybe I missed it but I'd like to know if there's really something as serious as they say, and I believe that it is a serious thing, but I don't know what it is, that the amount of time that's gone by is well beyond established norms for dealing with supposedly very critical issues of the nature that they appear to be talking about.

Where do we stand?

Francisco Arias: Yeah, I can answer that. So then the reason why the updated version of the final report from (unintelligible) has not been published is because we're still waiting on the affected vendor to raise the patch in the affected (unintelligible).

The timeline we have now is that they hope to have it ready by the end of the year but there is - they are still working on it. So as soon as that is ready we could then start talking about releasing the updated version of the final report.

We are following the (unintelligible) policy in ICANN regarding responsible disclosure of (unintelligible).

Jim Baskin: But as I said, I think most other - or many other organizations that deal with these kinds of discoveries and disclosure really only give the affected parties maybe six months before they force things by disclosing more information. But thank you for your update.

Francisco Arias: So just to clarify, it depends really on what is the vulnerability that is there. And there are certainly different practices regarding disclosing vulnerabilities. Some parties just release it immediately as they know and some others try to coordinate with the affected vendor so that there is a patch. So we're trying to be responsible here by not releasing information that could be used to attack third parties. Thank you.

Volker Greimann: Edmon, go ahead.

Edmon Chung: Edmon Chung here. So first of all I think in terms of moving forward I do think this - to take it as a policy development is appropriate. I think this issue obviously is, you know, there is a strong technical element to it - security and technical element to it. We've had all those - the many studies and reports and we can base that on it.

And I do think there is a policy element because how we deal with it, especially in future rounds, is going to, you know, have a very big impact on how - I guess the actors that will engage in the second, you know, in the next future rounds as well because right now if we use the same implementation, for example, I think, you know, it opens up a lot of potential abuses to these type of issues into the future.

That, you know, and in terms of SSAC, you know, obviously we should invite them to participate in the discussion. In what format I, you know, it could be a joint group, it could be that they just participate. I don't think that's such an important thing. And I think it's SSAC decision also to - whether they would, you know, be a joint group.

One thing though you mentioned that, you know, raise the flag just now - you mentioned about the issue about drop catch. I - there is a consensus policy in deletion - the domain expiry policy. So - and in those discussion I think the issue was explored quite extensively as well. So there is, you know, a provision for that type of issue.

So I'm not sure we should reopen that discussion unless, you know, we are revisiting that particular consensus policy.

Francisco Arias: Thanks. I got it more like a comment rather than a question or is there a question for me?

Edmon Chung: Well it's - the first part is a comment which I think, you know, I think the Council should think about taking it on. I know it's on the Council agenda. The second one is kind of a question, are you asking for us to reopen the expired domain consensus policy?

Francisco Arias: I guess we are relying (unintelligible) from the (unintelligible) report where the information they provide they are recommending that this topic be reopened I guess, that would be the way to say it.

Volker Greimann: Phil.

Phil Corwin: Good morning. Philip Corwin, member of the Business Constituency. And following up on the subject of drop catching, the practice of allowing potential registrants to acquire expired domains has been around for years. I have never heard of any association at the incumbent TLDs of that creating any name collision problems. So I'm surprised to hear - I have several questions. One is this JAS report that recommends looking at drop catching, is that available yet?

Second, is there - is the reason that it's recommending that something arising from the new TLD program, because we've never seen a name collision problem from drop catching in the past. And, third, what - are there any mention of what specific measures might have - the creators of that report might have in mind in regard to drop catching practices?

I think this is a subject - and let me just comment, I think this is a subject that reopens something on which there is consensus and I think if there's a recommendation to get into it it needs to be gotten into very carefully with lots of opportunity for community comment from registries, registrars, domain investors, everybody involved with the drop catch market now. So I'd welcome any response to those questions.

Francisco Arias: Yes, so the JAS report (unintelligible) was published on June, I don't remember the exact date, but is reference in the name collision resolution of 30 July. I can give you the link later; I don't have it here in the presentation.

Regarding the measures I don't think the JAS report recommends any specific measures in regards to drop catching. It only recommends that the issue be studied and to see if there are any measures that should be taken in that regard.

Phil Corwin: Okay. And has there been any evidence that drop - that the preset operation of drop catching in any way has created name collision issues? Is there a reason for the suggestion that it be reopened and explored?

Francisco Arias: Right, I think there is some reasoning on that regard in the JAS report. Most of the issues that are described there, or at least some of them, are related to name collision under legacy gTLDs, not new TLDs.

Phil Corwin: All right, thank you.

Volker Greimann: Okay, I have a question myself as well. I think these are very excellent questions for us to consider, however, to avoid drifting into the realm of pure speculation we would need data, i.e. what cases have there been? What affect did those measures that have been implemented by the Board and by the applicants that have then gone the alternative part, delegation and implement the various measures to prevent any occurrence of name collision harm? What affect did these measures have - positive effect, negligible effect?

You say we have two large cases of large well known companies that have gotten problems - seen problems with name collision. But were those problems (unintelligible) by the measures that have been taken, were they reduced by those measures? So any data that you can give us is the

precondition for us to consider any further action or reduction of action or anything that might lead to the future.

Francisco Arias: Yes, point taken. Regards the data points that I can offer to you right now it's, as you may know, we have a name collision harm reporting measure. This is going not be on the Wednesday presentation. But we have had so far 13 reports - 13 confirmed reports of name collision from different organizations and individuals.

And as Patrick mentioned yesterday in his update to your, there are at least two big companies that decided not to send a report to ICANN but we know that they had some name collision issue that it's a known issue, let's say.

Of these 13 reports that we have received, none of them - none of them creates an issue regarding human life danger or anything like that. And we also know that there has been some other reports in the Web. We have seen reports out there and we have not received those reports in the mechanics that we put for the community to report those.

And I have a few other numbers that I cannot remember right now but they will be provided in the presentation on Wednesday.

Volker Greimann: Thank you, that's helpful. Maybe just a small follow up. Were those reports that you have received directed at the availability of a TLD in the root zone, i.e., did the disruptions occur because of the TLD becoming active or due to individual domain names within that TLD?

Francisco Arias: It was related to SLDs or - well let's say names under the TLD, yes. We don't have any report of issues created by dotless name let's say.

Volker Greimann: Okay thank you. And I think - we're all looking forward to the report on Wednesday.

Jim Baskin: Jim Baskin again from the BC. Just for clarification I think this drop catching doesn't really - in my mind clarify what exactly we're talking about. We're talking around things, we're not giving any - not necessarily a real example of one that has been found but what is it? In my mind it sounds like Company XYZ, I hope there's no real company XYZ, that had a domain in dotCom - okay, lmn.com - is there anybody that has that? Okay. Not yet - well you will tomorrow.

Okay, lmn.com is doing business and they have people logging in and they're doing business and people are, you know, could be banking, it could be whatever, and then LMN goes out of business or decides that they're going to drop their TLD - not their TLD, their SLD, and go out of business or whatever.

Someone else registers lmn.com and then in some way impersonates LMN for people that had been doing business with them or wanted to do business with them and because of that the people who are trying to get to lmn.com are reaching an - someplace that's doing possibly bad things with the interaction with this customer. Is that what this drop catching is all about?

Francisco Arias: Yes, I guess it's something like that. So one reuses the name of a previous company or individual and they (unintelligible) take advantage of that to impersonate the previous registrant.

Jim Baskin: So to me that's not exactly the kind of collision that we've been worried about; it's really more of a phishing or fraud thing that is - yes it's related because people aren't going where they think they're going but it's not because of something that's been active out there or been used by people in a non-active TLD and suddenly the fact that it's active is causing these collisions.

Not a totally separate issue but I wanted to be clear that we're talking about the - the reuse of a TLD and potential bad deeds that are being done by the person who has reregistered the - SLD, sorry.

Francisco Arias: That's a very good point. And name collisions - if a name collision happens it doesn't necessarily mean that there is a - a security issue there. Name collision will happen and that could mean simply, as you said, that someone is now the legitimate owner of the name and they want to use it for their own purposes. They're intending to do fraud or anything like that.

But in both cases legacy gTLDs and new gTLDs the problem is when there is a bad actor behind that new name in the public DNS if there is a bad actor they could take advantage of that name collision, that's really the issue behind this.

Volker Greimann: James, go ahead.

James Bladel: Respectfully, that is not a name collision issue; that's something, that's a problem. That's - but that's way outside the scope of this particular issue in my opinion. That's possibly grounds for UDRP or lawsuit. I think that the only mention I see in the JAS report of drop catch or expired names is to applaud the ERRP as an example of where controlled interruption does work and gets the attention of people who have maybe lost the use of their name.

But I think that really what we're doing in the context of this discussion about drop catch is we're making the case for SSL certificates. So to make sure that you're dealing with the party that you think you are. I don't see it as a function of name collision. Sorry.

Volker Greimann: Do you want to answer to that or should I go to the next in the queue?

Francisco Arias: No, I mean, the only thing I will say is technically is the same workings there but I get the sentiment.

James Bladel: I'm sorry, it's not though. Respectfully, it's not the same - even the same category of problem. Name collision is that there is something that's happening on internal networks and that we've inserted something into the

public DNS that resembles what's happening on internal networks that was already in place.

This is - I mean, you're talking about - I get it, we're talking about a false positive on a DNS resolution, I think that's what they share in common. But there I think the similarities end both on how to - how we arrive there and what we should do to be fixing it. They're completely different situations in my opinion.

Francisco Arias: Just one more data point on that, if you look at the SAC report - I think is 62 or 66 probably, I can't remember the number. One of the (unintelligible) on name collision date present more technically strict definition than the basic slice that I show there where they are saying name collision is whenever someone is trying to access or is using a name and they go to the - a different party where they intended to go.

So that would cover name collision in a more general term that what example in the slides is.

James Bladel: Absolutely correct. And that definition would also include cache failures of resolvers that are giving you stale data on an IP, I mean, that is such a broad definition as to be almost unactionable.

David Cake: I would agree with James that, I mean, name collision I thought is where two - essentially two different resolution systems produce different results not when it has been transferred within the - something's happened within one resolution system that is unexpected.

James Bladel: Much better, more succinctly put. Thank you, David.

Volker Greimann: Okay next in the queue I have Steve DelBianco. But I would like to go to the microphone first.

Elaine Pruis: Thanks. I'm Elaine Pruis. So I just - there's some confusion about what name collision is so I'd like to try to answer Jim's question with a real life example. But first I want to say if we're worried about drop catching causing name collision carry that down two steps, that means we never reregister a name the was once registered previously.

So it's - drop catching is not the problem, it's will this name again surface some time? So trying to deal with name collision through drop catching is just - there's - it's not going to work.

A real life example of name collision would be when we - Donuts - put one of our TLDs into wild-carding, we heard about a problem where a network administrator had set up their network so whenever anybody inside their network queried a name it went out to the Internet and said, is this name here or not?

They got an XD, non existing domain name, error back, which then signaled their system to go back inside their internal network to find that information. Just really bad network configuration.

So name collision is the controlled interruption is working to expose bad configurations, that's an example of a name collision, not somebody buying a domain name later that had once been bought before.

Volker Greimann: Thank you. Steve.

Steve DelBianco: Steve DelBianco, NetChoice. And on Volker's point, for Wednesday, Francisco, it would be useful to hear not just data, since there isn't much data yet, but to have a richly described case studies such as what SSAC brought up yesterday with dotProd, registries doing exactly what they're supposed to do, wild-carding. And to the extent you can let's describe whether we think it's working in just a case study since it's too early to have comprehensive data it would benefit for you to reveal everything you can about actual studies.

Volker Greimann: Thanks.

Francisco Arias: Yes point taken, yeah.

Volker Greimann: Okay are there any more questions, comments? I would like to thank you for coming over and giving us this report. We are looking forward to the session on Wednesday. I think it's 10:00 to 11:15, right?

Francisco Arias: I think so. Very quickly, yes, 10:00 to 11:15 you're right. Thank you.

Volker Greimann: Okay. Then I yield the floor back to Jonathan.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Francisco. Thank you very much for bringing that to our attention.

All right so I think that's more or less concludes our morning sessions. As I said a little earlier we can take the opportunity to have a lunch break now. There are tables outside, as you know, from yesterday.

For the meeting with the Board which will take place promptly at 1:00, and I'll take any questions and input before we break up, but which will take place promptly at 1:00. If you could just make sure that the table is only occupied by councilors to make sure that there is a space an opportunity for the ICANN Board to join us. I think there's something like 40 seats around the table.

We don't have a coffee break scheduled this afternoon but when we do go across to the GAC to meet with the GAC at 2:30 there's a half hour gap between when we break here and we go across to the GAC so there'll be an opportunity to get coffee over there. The meeting, I understand, is in a tent outside and adjacent to the swimming pool.

Any questions or comments or points I've forgotten? Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I just wanted to let people know about an additional meeting that's being held. And if I could use this moment to talk about that? A meeting has been scheduled but it's not on the schedule that's basically covering a human rights perspective on ICANN's policies and procedures. So I wanted to let people know about that. It's Wednesday at 12:15 to 1345 in the Encino room.

So it won't be on the schedule. I've tweeted about it. There may be other notifications. I just wanted to make sure people knew about it so that's the human rights perspective on ICANN's policies and procedures. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thank you, Avri. Any other comments or questions before we break for lunch? And please be prepared to be - back in session at - promptly at 1 o'clock. Thank you.

END