LOS ANGELES – Name Collision
Wednesday, October 15, 2014 – 10:00 to 11:15 PDT
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Hello, everyone. We're about to start the session. This is Francisco Arias, director of technical services within the global domains division. And to my right I have Karen Lentz, director of operations and policy research, also in GDD. We are going to give you brief update on name collision mitigation. And let's start.

This is the agenda for today. And the -- it's basically two parts of the presentation. First it will be -- oh, I need to do this. Yeah. Okay. Not my laptop. Thank you. So the first part is an update on the mitigation measures that (indiscernible) have to implement, and the second part is what Karen is going to present about the data section between name collision measures and the rights protection mechanisms. I'm going to skip this name collision basics. I think most people have seen this many times and these are in the published deck so you can see a brief explanation of what a name collision is. So let's go directly to the matter.

The subject of the implementation measures of the last part of the implementation measures was -- include as part of a new TLD program committee of the ICANN board resolution in 30.09 that has four components. First, adopting the name collision according to management framework that defines the last set

of measures that new TLDs have to implement regarding name collision. The second part is regarding a (indiscernible) mechanism for the names in the SLD block list. And a tier element of that resolution is working with GNSO for potential policy work regarding a long-term plan to manage name collisions, not only on new TLDs but also future rounds of gTLDs and also legacy gTLDs. And last item is to share information and best practices with ccTLDs.

The framework, it has two main components, one is defining the things that ICANN has to do and the other is what the registries have to do. In regards to what ICANN has to do is defer delegating .MAIL. .MAIL, it has been added to the list of the high-risk strings together with CORP and HOME that were already there since last October and when the NGPC passed the overall plan to manage name collisions.

Second item in the framework is to produce information and materials on name collision which we have done, and they are available in the name collision home page on the ICANN Web site. And there are two pieces of work for future long-term plan to manage name collisions. One is to work within the IETF to identify an IPv6 option for the controlled interruption measure. I'm going to talk about that later in the presentation. The second is to work with server operators to measure and store data for long-term -- a future long-term plan to manage name collisions. And other items for ICANN to implement is to limit the emergency response regarding name collision reports to only when there is clear and present danger to human life. And

the other part is to develop or have (indiscernible) to cover cases in which the registry is unable or unwilling to implement the name collision measures that are required for a specific SLD that is having trouble. And in the extreme case a last resort procedure to remove a TLD that is causing name collision harm, this is in the case in which the TLDs is being used as a dotless name in an interLAN network and remember, in order for ICANN to request something from the registries, so in this case to act and remove the TLD temporarily, there will have to be clear and present danger to human life.

And this is only during the disruption of the 90 days that are required.

So this was what ICANN has to do. And now let's talk about what the registries have to do. So the registries have to have a mechanism to handle name collision reports for the first two years of the life of a TLD. This is counted from delegation.

They have to respond, meaning they have to make the change that has been requested within two hours of receiving the request from ICANN. These requests will be delivered by ICANN to the registry emergency contacts. Those are the emergency contacts that the registry has already provided during onboarding to us. They are used for other things in general. For any emergency that we may have, we report to them. For example, when there is an emergency with the services, DNS is down, for example. We communicate to the emergency contacts. So it's important for the registries to have emergency

contacts that are available 7 by 24. Because we can contact them at any time, and we have done so. Not for name collision, but for other things.

If we ever send a request like this, we will do so by a signed email and from the email address listed there. And we will also call the emergency contacts, similar to what we do with the SLA monitoring system.

There are two types of requests that we envision that will happen. First is to place a domain name in server hold status, meaning removing the domain name from the DNS. This is temporarily. The other will be to remove the wildcard records from the DNS if the TLD is doing a wildcard controlled interruption for the whole TLD. We -- like I said, these are the two measures that we envision could be requested. And those are the ones that we are expecting the registries to be able to execute within two hours or request from ICANN. So you have to be prepared to do this. There could be other measures that we at this moment do not foresee. For those we are not going to hold the registries accountable to the -- to our SLA. But we will still request you to act as quickly as possible.

The main new component of the name collision mitigation measures is controlled interruption. There are a few flavors. There used to be two. Now there is five of them.

But, in general, they share the same characteristics listed here. They last for 90 days. And they are -- they are expected to be a

continuous controlled interruption, meaning you don't turn on and then off and then on again. Just keep it on for the 90 days.

Hello? Is this working? It's good? Okay.

So I was saying the control interruption measures have to be continuous. And they also use the loopback address listed there. It's special IP address, let's say, that helps avoid sending a potential sensitive information to the Internet IP address or the whole block for the matter. It's a block that is not routable in the Internet, meaning there will be no information leaking if we are using this IP address.

There is no IPv6 option available like this. And, therefore, there is no requirement to implement -- to add IPv6 records in the -- during the controlled interruption measures. What we have there is to say that, if we ever find an IPv6 alternative, we will request the registries that have not completed controlled interruption at time to add that to their controlled interruption implementation.

And the other thing important to consider is, while doing controlled interruption, the registries can continue to do -- to allocate names and undergo sunrise and claims subject to other applicable provisions in the registry agreement.

As I said before, there are different flavors of name collision. There are two main types. The TLD wildcard controlled interruption, that's one. And we have SLD controlled interruption that has four variations. But let's talk first about

the TLD wildcard interruption. This is by far the preferred method; however, this is not available to everyone. This is not available to those TLDs that have gone through the alternate path to delegation and, therefore, have activated names under the TLD.

This measure is mandatory for TLDs that were delegated on or after 18 August. So, at the end of the day, we're going to have most of the TLDs to use these, which is the superior measure for name collision mitigation.

This option is available to TLDs that were delegated before 18 August. But, as I said before, only if the TLD has not activated other names under the TLD, with the exception of NIC, which has a special purpose of mainly to offer WHOIS services. And there are reasons why we want the WHOIS service to be turned on, for example, to offer that to the certification authorities. And that's required to mitigate the internal name certificate issue also related to name collision.

The TLD wildcard controlled interruption adds A, MX, SRV, and TXT records for the Apex and wildcard records of this type to effect the controlled interruption.

The other thing important to consider is that no activation of names can happen until after the 90-day controlled interruption has been completed. So registries do not -- are not required to start controlled interruption immediately. They are strongly recommended to do it as soon as possible. But they cannot

activate names until they have completed this wildcard TLD controlled interruption.

Hello? Okay. Great. Then we have SLD controlled interruption. This is for TLDs that were delegated before 18 August and that have activated names.

It uses the same type of records, A, MX, SRV, and TXT. But they are put under each of the SLDs that are in the SLD block list. So no other DNS records can be added for those SLDs that are undergoing controlled interruption. And another important thing is the TLDs cannot switch between SLD and TLD controlled interruption. Once you have issued one, that's the one you have to implement until the end.

So we received -- as soon as we published the assessment for each of the TLDs, we received requests for considering variations of SLD controlled interruption. The first one is to have wildcard records under the SLDs, not under the TLD, but under the SLD. And this will have similar effect as it happens under the TLD but only under the SLD.

This was an interesting case. We were -- we received communication from one registry, Uniregistry. They were seen in the queries for one particular SLD, high.link. They were seeing more than 99% of the queries to go for names that were TIFF level and below. So, when they were implemented, the flat SLD controlled interruption that we first requested from registries, the effect was that there was no controlled

interruption for 99% or more of the queries. So we immediately realized that was not the spirit of the recommendation.

By the way, we received similar communication from our friends from Brazil. And now I see Roman's here. I just remembered that.

We issued a new communication to the registries saying we strongly recommend you to do SLD wildcard controlled interruption, which is one of the variations that I'm going to mention in a slide. And we also received a request to consider allowing delegation of the SLDs and adding the controlled interruption records in a separate zone in another server. This is to accommodate registries that have limitations in their -- in the systems that only allow them to do delegation of records.

This is going to be available on 17 November. We're still working on the changes to our monitoring system to allow us to monitor this implementation.

So this is the case that I was referring. First, we require this type of controlled interruption, flat, so we have the SLD there and the records. And we changed that to the strong recommendation now to have a wildcard under the -- each of the SLDs in the SLD block list.

So these are the full list of controlled interruption variations. The TLD wildcard controlled interruption, as I said, that's the preferred method by far. However, it's not available to everyone. So if you have activated names, then what we

recommend you to do is 2.1, the in-TLD zone wildcard SLD controlled interruption which is something you can do. And I should mention that doing a change in between the variations of SLD controlled interruption is okay, you can do it. It's okay. There's no need to tell ICANN that you are changing. We will capture that in our monitoring system. But we strongly recommend you to do the wildcard SLD controlled interruption if you are doing SLD controlled interruption.

The details on each of the variations of SLD controlled interruption can be found in the URL below. If you have any questions, you can send them to customerservice@icann.org or start a new case in the gTLD portal.

The assessment also contain waivers for the registries, in particular to allow them the use of wildcard records and also to allow the insertion of some of the -- the DNS resource records that were not -- that are not normally allowed for TLDs as described in the exhibit A of the Registry Agreement. It's important to mention that the waivers are only for the purpose of implementing the controlled interruption measures and they cease upon the termination of this measure in the TLD.

Also very important to mention that the remainder of the obligations contained in the Registry Agreement are still in place while you were doing controlled interruption. So, for example, you still have to do DNSSEC. We expect you to sign your TLD zone files with DNSSEC. We are also expecting you to do WHOIS and so forth.

In terms of details, you don't have to let ICANN know that you started or finalized controlled interruption. We are monitoring this. The main method we're using right now is the zone files that are provided to ICANN on a daily basis. So we look at the zone files, check that you have all the records that you are expected to have, nothing more. And we let you know if we find any issues. And so please, make sure that you have your zone files transferred to ICANN working, otherwise we're going to mark specific data as not implementing controlled interrupt so that will not count for the 90 days.

And in regards of the stats of what we're seeing in our monitoring system, we have 344 TLDs in SLD controlled interruption. This is expected since so far most of the TLDs have been delegated before 18 August. But we are starting to see a growth in the number of TLDs that are doing TLD wildcard controlled interruption. Currently 70. And as I said before, as time passes, we are going to see this number to be the largest. And we have 4 TLDs that have not started controlled interruption. We -- last Friday we published these reports and they are listed there. Those are updated every day. They are CSB reports that list what we have seen for each TLD and SLD if they are doing SLD controlled interruption. So we list when we first saw you starting controlled interruption and how many days have we seen you in controlled interruption. So take a look up there, see if what we have seen matches what you have implemented and let us know if you find any discrepancy.

As I mentioned, one of the things that we're requested for staff to implement in the original plan last year and the resolution in 30 July was to develop informational materials for potentially affected parties to get to the help they need. So we developed that in the name collision hub, but now the question was how to make it available to these parties. And so we had a communication campaign and we reached out to several organizations, but we also had a web ad campaign and these are the current stats as of 6 October. And that's the number of impressions, the number of times someone did a search that resulted in our ad to be shown. And the number of clicks, that's when someone actually click on the ad. So they were taken to the ICANN Web page where they saw the information that we have for them. The number one key word, not surprisingly, was the special IP address we put for controlled interruption.

And we have the -- this measuring which people can report to ICANN the name collision harm. This is -- before controlled interruption started we had zero valid reports, meaning we had some spam and some people that reported all issues that were not name collision. And starting the controlled interruption we started receiving reports and we keep receive them from time to time. There aren't many of those, 13, 1-3. By no means we are going to say here that that's the extent of the name collisions that have happened. We, in fact, know that there are at least two big companies that decided not to report to ICANN, perhaps for some sensitive issues regarding the information that may be in the way the name collision happened to them.

We also know that there are in the way of some chatter about other name collision issues, particularly with one TLD that has been in use apparently in either search list or internal names. So for this report it's probably not statistically valid information. As I said, it's just a very short list of reports that we have. But we have a breakdown of the -- the root cause of the name collision, the main cause of our search list. There are a few that are using internal names, the non-public DNS. One interesting case of configuration typo, that was very simple to fix. So one that was using Google mail service and they -- instead of doing Google.com they had the Nameserver to be just Google and they quickly fixed it when they realized that they just were missing the .COM at the end. And no reports that we have received involve harm to human life. As you remember, this is the threshold for requiring us to take action and request registries to do something about it.

However, we have sent some of the reports to the registries so that they know what's going on and in some cases to talk with the -- the affected parties so that they can talk and see if something can be done. What else do we have here?

Next steps. So as I said before, we need to work within the IETF to identified a potential IPv6 option for controlled interruption. To formally reserve the names in the highly -- high-risk list. And for the future to work on how to measure and store data related to name collision. We -- during this week, on Sunday we reached out to GNSO regarding potential policy work on managing name collisions for future rounds and legacy TLDs and

we also started -- we updated our procedures to handle the cases when there are new ccTLDs, and we have the first two cases a few days ago. Can't remember the countries, but they -- they had two strings that were approved and we published a page within the name collision hub site in which we explained the recommendations for new IDN ccTLD managers. New ccTLD managers. Doesn't matter if it's IDN or ASCII. In this case the two were IDNs.

So the recommendation we're making to ccTLDs is to implement the same measures that are required for new TLDs, the 120-day period for mitigating the internal Nameserver issue, which by the way, I forgot to mention before, that's still in place. You still have to not activate names for the first 120 days counted from the signing of the Registry Agreement. So we recommend ccTLDs to do that, to do the work of TLD controlled interruption. In their case it doesn't make sense to talk about SLD controlled interruption and also to have mechanism to report, to receive reports of name collision harm and so on and so forth, basically, a mirror of the measures that are required for gTLDs. We're recommending the ccTLDs to do the same.

This is a list of the resources we have made available to the public. And perhaps the most useful for IT professionals and system administrators is this guide to name collision identification and mitigation that we had Paul Hoffman that I can see here sitting in the public. He's well-known in the technical community, and he helped us develop this guide.

We have also the link to report name collision issues. And the -- another thing that we put available -- and this was most focused on CAs and browsers, certificate authorities and browsers, is we have a list, a CSV list that is listed there in third bullet, of the TLDs, the new TLDs that have signed a registry agreement. And we updated when they have delegated. So we have the date when they signed the agreement and the date when they were delegated so that CAs and browsers can use this. And I know, for example, that Mozilla is using these to update the public list that is helping quickly recognize the TLD list. But this is a topic for the universal acceptance sessions later today. And, of course, there is the link at the end of all of the rest of the information in the name collision hot page.

And with this I turn the microphone to Karen.

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, Francisco. I will be covering one component of the implementation of the name collision management framework relating to rights protection and names that had previously been withheld as part of a -- as part of the name collision plans and what should be applicable there.

Thank you.

So, as Francisco mentioned early on, the NGPC resolution adopting the framework also directed us to consult with the community for a 90-day period on what would be the appropriate rights protection considerations for names that

were withheld from a sunrise or a claims period, names that were on a block list, and names that had been verified as trademarks by the trademark clearinghouse.

So for that consultation we developed a summary of the issue and the feedback that we had heard. We opened a public comment period. And that has recently closed, so we'll go through with you the results of that.

I wanted to clarify one thing on what we call the block list, and that is that block refers to activation. So names could be -- names on the block list could still be allocated to the registrants but could not be activated subject to further work on the name collision framework.

So this is just -- hopefully, that will help you visualize the universe of names that we're talking about. It's the intersection between labels that are in the trademark clearinghouse so they correspond to a verified trademark, names that were also on one of the SLD block lists for one or more TLDs, and the TLDs did not make them available for allocation during sunrise or claims.

So, as I said, we had a comment period. And most of the comment was focused around a particular proposal which was a joint proposal by the business constituency intellectual property constituency and the registry stakeholder group. It was the most supported approach in the comment period. I called it here the exclusive registration period proposal, because that's how it was described in the proposal as one means of addressing the situation for this special case, this unique sort of

set of circumstances where the -- you have this intersection due to the name collision discussions.

So what the proposal consists of is that the registry would offer what would be an exclusive registration period for those names. So, during that period, the only people who could register those names would be those with an SMD showing that they had had rights verified by the trademark clearinghouse.

There was quite a bit of discussion about, you know, if we are going to go through establishing additional special periods, that there needs to, you know, be clear communications to help support that so that rights holders who are seeking to protect those names are aware of these special periods and the opportunity to obtain those names.

So the exclusive registration period would provide that opportunity. And then the -- once that had been completed, the registry would not need to apply the usual claims period after that period.

So also in the proposal there are a few -- there are a few options that the registry would have as to how to implement the exclusive registration period. One is to try to help communications and streamline efficiencies across all of the parties here by having sort of coordinated exclusive registration periods that many TLDs would join.

So the first option would be that there would be these previously scheduled and previously announced waves where

the exclusive registration period would be. And then a registry would be able to provide 10 days' notice of its intent to join one of those periods.

There's actually kind of two notice periods. There's notice that the registration period is going to occur, and then there's notice that TLD would give of its intent to be part of that period. There was a little variation in the comment as to how much notice would be appropriate there.

So then the registry, if it did not want to join one of those combined registration periods, it would also have the option to do one on its own on an individual basis. So, in that instance, what the registry would need to do is to provide an exclusive registration period under the same terms as occurred for the original sunrise. So, if they had done a start date sunrise before they would need to provide the same notice and the same time period for registrations.

A few other components of this proposal: The registry would, during this registration period, continue to notify the trademark clearinghouse when names were actually registered, as they do now during a sunrise or a claims period by uploading their LORDN file, which is list of registered domain names. That enables the clearinghouse to generate the notice to -- that goes back to the rights holder advising them that the name matching their mark has been registered. So that component would continue to apply to apply so that the notices could still occur.

Also a component of the proposal is that the communications via the -- or between the registries and registrars could occur via some out of band or manual process as opposed to needing to follow all of the EPP specifications that are typical during sunrise. But the -- that would be -- besides the requirement in the first bullet to continue to upload the LORDN files would continue to apply.

And, finally, the registry offering an exclusive registration period would need to use the same eligibility requirements. Hello? Hello? Are you sure? Okay. They tell me it's working.

So the registry would need to use the same eligibility requirements and the same sunrise policies it had done previously in its sunrise. So there shouldn't be a -- a new set of requirements just for the exclusive registration period that would apply to -- that would apply to the sunrise dispute resolution policy as well. That should continue to be available.

I'm holding too many things here. Okay. Next steps. So this is, according to the name collision occurrence assessment that directs registries in that -- who have those circumstances to continue to withhold these -- this category of names while we do this consultation, so that -- that document provides that should there be new requirements that are developed and published as a result of the consultation that those would then be included in an updated name collision occurrence assessment. And so the -- the 90 days of consultation continues through about the end of the month, but this is the -- the

current -- current approach that we wanted to describe here and take any questions or feedback on that proposal.

So I think that's the last slide, and I will turn it back to Francisco and I think to all of you for questions.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yes. So if there are any questions, please go over to the -- I think on this side we have another microphone. I guess we need to keep holding this one.

(Off microphone).

Oh, really? Okay. We can -- we can try again. Is this any better? Yeah, another option is people can move up. You may be better able to hear. So we talk about that it was difficult to hear the next steps slide, but I wonder if holding the microphone close to me, can you hear me in the back of the room? Yeah, it seems? Would you like to give a try up here?

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you. Okay. Can people hear me?

[Laughter]

Okay. So just to recap on the next steps, so in the name collision occurrence assessment that was issued as part of the framework for the registries who have these circumstances applicable where they are being asked to withhold -- continue to withhold names during the consultation, it provides that, you

know, if we -- if we develop and publish new requirements as a result of the consultation that those would be included in an updated -- an updated assessment that would then be issued to the registry. So then I said that the consultation period, the 90-day consultation period, goes through about the end of the month. So the -- the public comment period is closed and this is kind of the most supported proposal. So we wanted to describe it here and see if there are questions or feedback at this meeting. Thanks.

[Laughter]

(Off microphone)

RUBENS KUHL: Morning. Rubens Kuhl at NIC .br, for the record. I have a comment on name controlled interruptions procedure. We thank ICANN for allowing the variations, but in allowing those variations, ICANN decided to not allow those variations that ICANN could measure. So if you wanted to delegate to self and wildcard SLD, registries would need to have to wait for ICANN to be able to measure it. This is a presumption of bad faith on registries. This is -- this actually makes the ones that proposed this, which was us, not using that. So by over-regulating this area, you've actually prevented people that would like to be -- do better options in public interest to not use them because since we were not allowed to do that and we were -- we need to impose a time to market issue on our client, we actually used the only one matter that was available, which was without

wildcards for us. So in the future it would be nice for -- if ICANN can measure where people are doing what is better for the community, they would allow registries to self certificate that they are doing that. If you can measure, for all means measure it. But if you can't, allow them to do what's best instead of preventing. So we won't use the option because by 17 of November, I think, controlled interruption for that TLDs will already be over. So the end game is we chose the worst option available because it was the one only that wouldn't trigger compliance notice. That's it. So sometimes trying to be a control freak doesn't work. That's my comment.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So just wanted to point out the statistics. As you can see most of the TLDs are doing controlled interruptions, so I don't see the effect that you seem to imply that some registries have been unable to implement. As you can see –

RUBENS KUHL: No, we have been unable to use the wildcard SLD controlled interruption. We are using the controlled interruption without wildcards. We could use the wildcard SLD controlled interruption if the delegates to self option was available. And I can recognize that the option would be a valid option, but it just doesn't allow us to do that before 17 of November because ICANN could measure it.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Oh, I see what you mean. Well, we need to balance. I understand your point about -- but we also need to be able to point out if there is an issue with implementation, which has happened with some registries. We have to point out some things that need to be changed in order to do as was requested. And so I think it's just a matter of balance. And we're talking about -- if you look at the big picture, in a year or so, we're not going to even remember this. This is just the start-up of the controlled interruption. We started allowing the controlled interruption in just a few days in order to allow registries to move forward with their business plans. So I think it's just a matter of balance. I think -- a point well taken, but I think looking at the big picture, I think this is something that we're not going to remember later.

RUBENS KUHL: Maybe it's also a matter of principle. So if you -- have a presumption of bad faith, that's a matter of principle, and that's something we won't forget. Thank you.

JEFF NEUMAN: Hello. Jeff Neuman. I have three questions. The first one I think is pretty simple. Can you just go back one slide to the solution? Or sorry, next steps. That's right. So just to clarify, because it's not on the slide, what you're saying when you showed that Venn Diagram at the beginning, so if you did make those available, those names available during sunrise initially, if you did an initial sunrise, what this is not -- or what this is saying

is that we can delegate those names. In other words, if it's not in that triple section. So I'm not saying that correctly here. If you offered names during the initial sunrise, you are free to delegate those after the controlled interrupt period, correct?

KAREN LENTZ: Yes. You made the names on the blacklist available for allocation during the sunrise. And now you wish to activate them, according to -- yes.

JEFF NEUMAN: Okay. I think, maybe when we kind of put that out there, we should probably be a little more explicit. I know it's kind of abbreviated there. It says, "Per measure II, section C in the name collision occurrence." I don't know if everyone knows that when we publish that. The second thing is: So I know that the community proposal is out there. My question is what is staff recommending to the board? Are you recommending that this is the option to proceed with? So I'm not getting a feeling for -- I know you're saying the community says this. But, ultimately, the board is going to turn around to the staff and say, "What do guys recommend?" So can you just maybe go into that a little bit?

KAREN LENTZ: Yeah, sure. So the NGPC directed us to -- oh, the microphone works. Good.

The NGPC directed us to do this consultation. You know, we -- our recommendation to staff is what I've been describing. So sorry. That wasn't clear. But, based on the consultation, this is -- you know, seems to be the most widely supported and implementable means to address the concerns that were raised.

JEFF NEUMAN: Great. Thank you.

And then the third thing is more towards the original presentation of -- when we do a full review -- and I know, Francisco, a note has been sent to the GNSO to kind of start a policy development process. What I would really love to see happen is kind of an accounting of everything that's happened as a result of some fear that was expressed in the community two years ago. Right?

I would love to see kind of the cost/benefit analysis. Because, really, what we're seeing is millions of dollars and delay and applicant's money that they can't get back because their money was put towards this. And I love JAS Consulting. I love Jeff and everyone. But the money we've spend on all of this is just tremendous. Millions of dollars for what you've reported now as seven incidents that were referred. None -- some of them anecdotal. None of them rising to the level of really having to do much of anything about.

So I would love to see as part of the review a way to -- because this stuff will continue to happen. Issues will continue to be

theoretically raised based on philosophy. And, during the review, should do a complete accounting to see what should happen the next time that someone kind of raises a fear which may be purely theoretical and how we can minimize the time and the cost to deal with that situation. Thanks.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you, Jeff. Just to point out on the numbers it is 13, not that it makes a big difference. But it's 13, not7.

And the other thing is remember there are also measures that I have to confess we don't know what is the effect that they had. For example, the 120-day period of no activation for the CAs to affect the changes they have to do, we don't have the numbers of what was the effect of that. So just to keep that in mind. And also we -- as I mentioned before, 13 are the cases that people -- that is the set of people that had an issue that were able to find the information that put they are available and that had no issue sharing that with ICANN. Just –

JEFF NEUMAN: Right. But, just to be fair, if you remember the initial papers that came out said heart monitors would stop; people would die; oil rigs would -- you know, stop; the electrical grids would go down. I mean, you were all at these same meetings. If any of that stuff happened, we'd know about it.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So Jordyn Buchanan with Google. Three quick points. I thought I only had two, but just to maybe to build on what Jeff just said. I do think it would be useful to, perhaps in retrospect or even soon, because controlled interruption is going to be happening for a while, to try to take a look and see whether it's effective or not. I know we're actually doing some data analysis right now in terms of our public DNS infrastructure that will tell us what's happening for the sort of fraction of Internet traffic that crosses them. But it might be useful for ICANN to, for example, look at your root data server or something like that to see if queries declined over time for these TLDs once they're delegated in the controlled interruption period or something like that to get a sense of whether the controlled interruption period actually changes people's behavior or not. Because, if not, then it seems like it may not be that useful. But it would be good to get some sort of metrics on the effectiveness of it at some point.

My second point is just to thank Karen and the folks from the staff who I think have engaged on the RPMs and name collision topic over the past -- since London -- I guess 90ish days.

I think it's been really helpful to be able to engage with staff while developing a proposal instead of just sort of tossing letters back and forth and public comments and what not. Karen and other folks on the staff made themselves available for a number of calls with the community that I think were incredibly helpful in finalizing the proposal and making sure that now I think ICANN and the community seem to be really well-

aligned in terms of how to approach this particular problem. So just wanted to thank the folks on the staff that were involved.

With that, my third point is my actual question, which is relating to mail, home, and corp. Francisco in your presentation you said the next steps on those was to work with the IETF to block them. When I look at the name collision framework, it matches more what I thought was the plan which was to work with the IETF and the technical community to figure out what the appropriate action is which may be blocking them. But I don't think there's necessarily a presumption in the name collision framework, as I read it, that that's necessarily the right outcome. I thought we had deferred that -- I mean pushed that conversation to the technical community as opposed to having a presumption that that was necessarily the correct action.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So I don't know if you are aware there is a proposal by some people in the IETF in the DNS ops to reserve this and other strings.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I guess I'm more curious about whether ICANN has -- whether the stance of ICANN is the next step is to block it, or is the next step to let the IETF decide what the right thing to do is? Those are two different presumptions about what ICANN's role in that process is.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So I think the guidance from the board or the direction from the board has been to defer delegation indefinitely. And, like I said, the community in the IETF or at least the people that are proposing that in -- within the DNS op, the proposal is to reserve them and in the -- what is called the special names registry in IANA so that they are delegated. >>JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, I understand that. I guess I'm saying, if the IETF were to say oh, never mind, we looked at it and said that's actually not -- they put a proposal out there. There's discussion. And then the end result of that is they decided not to reserve them, presumably, that would have a different outcome. Then we would have to come back to the board and sort of talk about what to do under that scenario as opposed to just assuming that the outcome of that is that the names would be blocked.

I guess I'm just trying to get to whether ICANN has decided that these are supposed to be reserved, in which case probably ICANN could have just done that itself, or whether it's a discussion that we're deferring -- that we're delegating to the technical community, in which case I guess the right answer is we're going to wait and see what happens from the technical community.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: I would say the information that we have so far from the reports from both Interaisle and JAS point to those three strings to be a bad idea to redelegate them. That's according to data

we have. Things, of course, can change in the future. You never know.

And the other thing regarding the procedure to reserve names, that's kind of a gray area and subject to discussion. The IETF has a procedure described in an -- obviously, I can't remember the name -- that established a special names registry within IANA that seem to imply that the IETF can suddenly declare that certain names can be reserved and could not be delegated in the public DNS.

ICANN, on the other side, has its own set of rules in the applicant guidebook, for example, which says these names cannot be delegated in the root.

So it seems like there is an opportunity there for the two organizations to work together somehow to come -- to have a common procedure to define what cannot be delegated in the root.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah. That sounds like it would be super helpful. Thanks.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Hi, Jim Prendergast, Galway Strategy Group.

Francisco, on the policy suggestions document that you put out last week, there was one recommendation that talked about looking at drop catching as a potential source of name collisions. Not everybody in the room when the GNSO prep

session on Sunday took that up. And you got some pretty straightforward and frank feedback about how those folks felt about the idea of drop catching or reregistration of domain names could be considered name collision.

Have you had any thought, change of heart, discussions internally since that time? And can you give us a little insight as to how you might be treating that going forward?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Not really. I mean, there have been several conversations. But, in this case, I must say I'm not the one saying that.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Valid point, recommendation 14.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: This is a recommendation coming from our report. That's all I can say.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Valid point. Recommendation 14.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: This is our recommendation coming from our report, right. That's all I can say.

JIM PRENDERGAST: So then, what is the -- what is the vehicle for the community providing feedback on that specific recommendation in your policy document?

FRANCISCO ARIAS: That's a good question. I have to be honest, I'm more of a techie than knowing the ways of the policy development within GNSO. So we raised the issue with GNSO and I'm unclear what are the next steps. That's just –

JIM PRENDERGAST: So it will be within the GNSO mechanism probably.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: I probably would think so.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Okay. Thanks.

PAUL HOFFMAN: Paul Hoffman, responding to an earlier statement of we should be starting to measure these things and such like that. One of the things I think a lot of people don't realize is it's not just the 127.0.53.53 that is causing -- that is preventing some of these -- the damage happening. The 120 days where certificates are being revoked and in the actual act of revocation I have heard personally that that has caused organizations to discover that they were using specifically internal names and such like that.

It's usually not for the search list, it's for the internal names, and that that has actually sort of revolutionized -- at least two companies that have reached out to me that when their CA said we're taking your cert away, they quickly turned around and did the right thing. That is something you will not be able to measure. So for the personal earlier who said oh, I hope we can measure it because look at all of these things -- money we're losing, I assure you you won't be able to measure the positive that has come out of the name collisions. Simply because that 120 days which happening from the CA/B forum and you'll never see.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Do we have any remote questions, Dennis.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Yes, we have four questions on the chat. First question from Mark Svancarek from Microsoft. How will IPv6 collision be detected? Since most modern OS prefer IPv6 it would seem a user would encounter the AAA record first and never even proceed to the A record site.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Thank you. So when -- with IPv6, as I said, we did not find a good option to use for controlled interruption. We looked at doing a -- one thing that is called IPv4 map, mapping the 127.0.53.53 in IPv6 format. That's one thing you can do. However, we recognize -- or JAS where they're doing their

investigation -- have found that that had not a -- not a predictable behavior within all their operating systems and in general, so we didn't find interruption to -- at IPv6 at the moment. And we also look at the number of queries in the little data that we had available on IPv6, and also presently it's a small number. I don't remember the exact number, but it's close to 1%, if not less. Or less than 1% is what Paul is telling me. So we took a position, based on risk management, and we thought that it may be a risk that we can live with.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: This question is from Mick Szucs. The exclusive registration period would exist only for names in the TMCH question mark or other APD names would be released without claims or sunrise? Further to this previous question, the exclusive registration period only applies to names in the TMCH at the start of the exclusive registration period, question mark? If names on the block list are added to the TMCH after the exclusive registration period begins, they will be exempt from this process, question mark?

KAREN LENTZ: Thank you, Dennis. Thank you for the question. There were a few questions in there. The first one, I think, was for an exclusive registration period, is it limited to the set of names within the intersection that we looked at, those that are in the clearinghouse and were a part of -- were a part of the block list. So the proposal was for it to be specific -- as specific -- a period

specific to those names. I don't know if there are views in the community about, you know, whether other names could be -- could or should be part of that as well, but the intent of it is to provide that priority opportunity for the names that were in the clearinghouse.

There was another question about a time limit. And, you know, did the -- did the mark, for example, have to be in the clearinghouse as of a certain date? That wasn't proposed as a condition. That's something perhaps also that people might want to give feedback on. But in terms of whether -- you know, if someone puts their mark in the clearinghouse after that period, it would be -- you know, it's same case as anybody who, you know, does that -- records their mark in the clearinghouse once a sunrise has already taken place. You know, names may still be available in the registry, just in general availability, and so the -- there's a specific period that gives an opportunity to those that are eligible for it. But once that period is over, then the registries' general rules would apply. Thanks.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Next question coming from Michael Flemming. I am assuming ICANN will make clear what registry operators and what TLDs will be subject to these exclusive registration period. However, at this stage, how are we to know what registry operators and TLDs have withheld allocation of names in the block list and if they will be participating in the exclusive registration period, question.

KAREN LENTZ: So thank you, Dennis. Thank you, Michael, for the question. So -- so two things. When I showed the -- the three circles with the -- when I showed the diagram with the three circles and the different lists of names, there are those that are, you know, known, clearly known. You know, we can tell if something is in the clearinghouse or not. We can tell, you know, all of the names that were on block lists. We don't -- you know, we haven't asked -- you know, gone back and asked every TLD to tell us, you know, whether they made names available for allocation during these periods or they did not. The assessment requires them to follow the procedures in whatever case applies to them, and so it's an issue where there would be -- essentially we would address it on a case-by-case basis if there was some complaint or issue raised that, you know, a registry was not following the requirements according to its category, whether it had or had not made these names available previously.

You also asked about how -- how are we to know when these periods are and which TLDs are going to be part of them. So communications is actually a big part of this. Now, every registry that starts up needs to submit to ICANN its start-up information, so all of the dates for its claims and sunrise periods, all of its policies. And we publish and update that on a regular basis. And so one of the things that we've contemplated here is, you know, first of all, to make sure there is advance notice and some coordination on communication so that all of the rights holders are aware of which TLDs are going to be

participating in this process in which time frames. And secondly, that, you know, that is information that the registry notifies ICANN of so that we can go ahead and publish that so it's available to the community as well. Thanks.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Next question -- next question from Edmon. Following up on Jordyn's question, given the minimal impact on IPv6 networks and the interest of ICANN and the community to promote the deployment of IPv6, perhaps we should consider allowing only IPv6 registrations under those identified TLDs.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: So perhaps I misspoke. What I meant is not that there are no name collisions on the IPv6. It's that we did not find an option to help mitigate these issues.

So I don't see how that will be helpful.

RUBENS KUHL: Rubens Kuhl, for the record. Just a comment on IPv6. Since the controlled interruption records only has an IPv4 address that also generates the controlled interruption for IPv6-enabled hosts because they have an IPv4 address, the only problem would be with IPv6-only hosts which are much, much less than 1%. It's like 1 in a million, 1 in a billion. Every IPv6-enabled hosts are also IPv4 enabled, would see the same controlled interruption as everyone else.

FRANCISCO ARIAS: Yeah. Thank you, Rubens. You're right. If a host has iPv4 and IPv6, which is probably a majority of the hosts that have IPv6, they would probably still see controlled interruption. Correct.

Do we have any more questions, Dennis? No? Are there any more questions in the room? No?

Well, with this, we close the session. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]