SAN JUAN – SSAC: Name Collision Analysis Work Party Meeting
Tuesday, March 13, 2018 – 08:30 to 12:00 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is is the SSAC Name Collision Analysis Work Party Meeting; Tuesday, March 13, 2018; 8:30 to 12:00 in 101 B.

JIM GALVIN: And just another reminder for SSAC work party members, the Adobe Connect, as with all ICANN meetings, will be the one on the meeting webpage, not the NCAP Adobe Connect room that we use. Yes. Yes. You should be in the Adobe Connect room, too.

ROD RASMUSSEN: All right. Okay. Good morning, everybody, and welcome to the constituency day for SSAC, which we're going to start off with the NCAP working party. We have -- this is a first, I think, for SSAC, in doing a public, open work party, so -- and assuming people will wandering in and out, as they will for any public-type sessions -- so, be aware of that -- and we also have all kind of extra facilities. I'm going to turn it over to Jim and Patrick to run the work party. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Rod. So, I'm Jim Galvin, for those who don't know me -- and Patrik's over here, for those who don't know Patrik. I do want to add, there are a few seats up here at the table. It is important to point out that this is an open work party meeting. It is an opportunity for the community to engage with the work party, and we do welcome and encourage you to, please, come up and sit at the table at a microphone, especially if you're planning to actually have a contribution or something to say or want to participate in the discussion. So, please do come up and do that.

As a reminder to our SSAC work party members, this is a public meeting, so please do announce yourself before you speak. We all know each other, but as part of the public record, that's important. Please try to keep that in mind. And, lucky for us, I think this is the first time we've had an SSAC meeting with translation behind us.

We do have Spanish translation behind us, so, you know, people are welcome to at least do that -- and you should have -- if you're sitting at the table, then get your translation things, in case anyone wants to speak to us in Spanish. We don't have a transcript up there on the screen as they do in the public sessions, for all the public forums. And then, one last reminder,

everything in the Adobe Connect room is a matter of public record, so just be aware of that when using the chat. Patrik.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Yeah. Regarding this small, intelligent creatures, Jim and I figure out that if you try to turn them on, and nothing happens, they're not broken -- you have plug-in the headset.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you, Patrik.

JIM GALVIN: Yes. That was an interesting discovery. So -- okay. With that, up on the screen, we do have our three agenda items. These are the agenda items that we have been carrying forward, for the last few meetings, as we've been developing this project plan and all of the process and procedures that are going to go with and go around it. I do apologize to the community, where we're still learning, here, in SSAC, how to do these things in a much more open way, so, unfortunately, some of the text and documents that we've been using to do this have not been posted to the website, so that people would have had a chance to look at them in advance.

We'll have them up on the screen here, so, hopefully, you can participate as we see them here. And, in fact, I think a couple of these things, at least, are Google documents, which it should be possible for you to see. So, you'll get a link here. We'll get the links posted in the chat room, or over on the notes -- if the staff would take care of making sure that that happens, so that folks who are here in the room with us can open up those documents and also be looking at them on their own screens, as well as up on the screen in front of us.

And we will have a slot at the end -- we're going to walk through our three agenda items here, and we will have a slot at the end for any other business -- when we will open for the community to bring any other topic or question, comment that you would like to talk about, related to this, and bring that to the work party. So, with that, let me, first, ask, any agenda bashing?

Anyone want to comment on the agenda, at all? And I think we'll do our usual -- I guess, for our purposes, just a quick question to staff -- I hadn't even thought about this -- but you'll take note of everybody in the Adobe Connect room, for our usual attendance thing -- so, I want to encourage all of our SSAC work party members to make sure that you're in the Adobe Connect. And Ram, please go ahead.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks, Jim. Perhaps this is --

JIM GALVIN: And I'm sorry -- and you are?

RAM MOHAN: Sorry, this is Ram Mohan. Perhaps this is part of -- I ignored it because you already acknowledged me, I thought.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah. [Inaudible].

RAM MOHAN: Perhaps this is part of No. 3, but should we not be having some conversation about scope, given that, you know, our workshop -- in our public session, yesterday, there was some questions asked about what's in-scope and out-of-scope, or is that -- are we already there, in terms of figuring that out? It seems like there is a useful discussion to have on that.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Jim again. Thank you for that, and I would suggest that we add that under item 4. And maybe, if we can just -- since we're keeping that, obviously, here in real-time, let's bring that

discussion forward and add it there. Thank you. Any other suggestions from anyone? I'm probably not going to make a habit of looking behind me at the peanut gallery, so please, if someone notices --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We are very welcome guests.

JIM GALVIN: Very welcome guests, I'm sorry. Very welcome guests. I'm sorry -- be more careful. Yes, please go ahead.

MICHAEL CASADEVALL: Michael Casadevall. What about just a quick recap for those who are new to the session.

JIM GALVIN: If I may, would it be all right if we did that as -- for each of the topics as we get there -- and we go through them?

MICHAEL CASADEVALL: Yeah.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. All right. No other questions or comments, then we'll go up to the first one here -- to our NCAP statement of interest guidelines. If we could bring the document up and make sure that the link is visible here in the Adobe Connect for folks. So, quickly, what we have here is -- we've had a lot of discussion about moving more towards the more traditional ICANN model about statement of interest documents.

SSAC has, as an ordinary part of its operation, disclosure of interests for all of its members, and if you go to the SSAC website, you will see that -- for a list of all the members, and there's a link at the bottom of that list for finding the biographies of each of our members, including their disclosure of interest. And in the interest of making this a bit more, you know, typical, in terms of what it looks like to ICANN, we are creating the statement of interest.

And so, we have up here, in the beginning, just some words, which describe how we're going to work with the statement of interest. This has been adapted, primarily, from the GNSO procedures document, which I'm guessing a lot of people are probably familiar with, and is certainly easily accessible from the GNSO website, in the community area. But we trimmed this down and created some rules -- and if we scroll down past this,

Dennis, down past -- to the first set of questions -- okay, so here are the operational guidelines.

Folks can take a look at that. You know, this is what's been adapted, the specific words and rules, here, about how we're going to work with the statement of interest from the GNSO thing. So, scrolling on down, the work item that we have left here is, in addition to the standard, general questions that you see here that come from the ICANN statement of interest on the community participation page, for all the projects, we have some NCAP-specific questions, and that's where we're working at the moment.

So, we have a set of questions, here, that we're going to add to our statement of interest that everyone will have to fill out, as detailed above. I will open for discussion at the end here, from anyone in the community, once you've had a chance to sort of look through this while we're having our discussion here, if you have any comments or questions about anything that's about what's above.

But, right now, our focus is on questions 13, 14, and 15 in the work party. We're still discussing whether or not these are the right questions, framed in the right way -- you know, are they too broad? Are they not broad enough? And, in fact, you know, are they accomplishing what it is that we're trying to get to? And I

think maybe that's really the first question for all of us here. In terms of trying to answer the question,

Are these the right questions, maybe we should take a step back, here, and discuss what it is we're trying to achieve with our statement of interest; what we're trying to make visible that we believe is helpful. I will say what I think, and what I've heard, and then I want to open for people to offer your comments about what's there. I think we've been struggling a little bit with identifying potential conflicts.

And we've been struggling with trying to find a way to expose anything that might be perceived as a conflict, so that we can consider whether or not there is anything that we need to take action on, or need to do. I mean, in general, we certainly have this principle of inclusiveness, so we're always going to include everyone, unless something should come out here that we think requires attention.

So, the purpose of these questions is simply to see if we can expose something that we think we need to address and deal with -- or is it sufficient to just know what everybody's interests are, and then the work that we produce will simply be evaluated in that context. So, that's my comment about that. And, now, we'll take the floor -- I saw Robert, first, then Ram. Remember to say to your name.

ROBERT GUERRA: My name's Robert Guerra, SSAC member. Just a couple things -- one, I think it would be useful -- and I'll try to make this in my comment -- for those who are new to the NCAP discussion, some of our guests -- I think it's important why we went down this path of SOI and having additional disclosure. From my view, I think it's just to have a -- we're treating this almost like a research project, and so we need to know all the interests that people have that are coming to the table.

Part of our discussion, as well, is, once those are disclosed -- we also had a conversation of what to do once we have answered all these questions -- that they're going to be reviewed, to consider if there are certain discussions that persons may observe, but may, perhaps, not be involved in decision-making. But I think it's just important, because it is a key topic, and we just want to make sure if there's interest or entities or individuals that are involved in this space to tell us that disclosure, so the rest of us can take that into consideration when we have our conversation.

It's not just for disclosing it; it's just also for the rest of us who may not know if there's a bias of any kind, if there's an agenda at the table -- by disclosing the interest, that will help all of us. So, I think that's particularly important, because we want to use the

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

highest threshold possible, which is why we've moved from the normal interest declaration that we have at the SSAC to one that's higher, because we thought -- we want to try to get it right. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Robert. I have Ram, then Jay.

RAM MOHAN: Thank you. This is Ram Mohan. I think that we have to look at this with at least two different lens on. The conflict of interest that I think we care about, inside the work party, is to identify when professional judgment, you know, concerning a primary interest, may be influenced by a secondary interest, for example, financial gain or personal, you know, issues, etc., right. And for the authors or the analysts of the study that we do, these interests, these conflicts may arise when there is a financial interest that may influence, probably even without their own knowing, right.

The interpretation of the results or the interpretation of what others are arriving at, right. So, I think that is -- from my point of view, the primary reason to have the declaration of interest, conflict of interest, is aimed at the authors and the analysts of

the study. It's not for optics; it's for those who are directly involved. So, I want to make sure that we understand that.

Now, the second piece, I think has to do with conflicts of interest, or declaration of interest for those parties who are contracted out to do work on behalf of the SSAC. We arrive at a design specification, or whatever, and then we say, you know, we invite people to bid for that work. Again, in those areas, you want to know what is their background, and do they have conflicts. Are there other financial or non-financial interests that could influence their decision-making or their analysis process, right?

So, I want to separate those two things, and I'd like to bring more of our attention on the first part, which I think is a very critical part. What are the interests that should be declared for the members of the work party, who are going to analyze whatever is the output coming from other places?

And if you take that as -- if you accept that that's an appropriate basis, then I would say that the three questions that are there are too narrow in scope. There ought to be something and some discussion of a declaration of primary -- in my mind anyway, what are your primary interests for working, for engaging in this work party? And what, if any, are secondary interests, which might be financial, etc., right? So, that's the way I look at it.

Now, for the second part, which is for parties who are interested, individuals or entities, that are interested in bidding or doing work on behalf of the work party, on behalf of SSAC, there I think we ought to be asking for other information. We ought to be asking for, not just work that they have done, specific to name collision, but work that may be tangential, but still linked to name collision, okay.

Switching back to the first one, I said that I think this is a little too narrow in my mind. I mean, so I'd like to suggest some other questions that maybe we ought to be asking, generically. We have some of them already there, but we ought to be asking, for example, you know, ownership of stocks and shares, travel and accommodations expenses. Is there a paid consultancy or directorship, or paid or unpaid consultancy or directorship? You know, is there patent ownership, right?

And I'm providing a list that has overlap with some things that are in here, so I'm not saying that it's missing, but I'm giving you kind of a, you know, larger thing. Are you a paid or unpaid speaker on panels? And do you serve on advisory boards, right? Do you get a fellowship? Or, do you get some compensation, in kind, for writing or following-up, you know, on this topic, in the industry, right?

So, I think those might broaden the scope, particularly focused on the members of our work party, and the value of that is, once those are disclosed, we can, then, as a work party, clearly demonstrate that professional interests and secondary interests are, you know, well-documented and properly listed, publicly.

JIM GALVIN: So, thank you for that. I want to highlight just a couple of things that I heard -- all of that was actually quite substantive. I like the separation that you made between focusing on the statement of interest, relative to the work party and its operation; and separating from that, the statement of interest for separate parties, people who are going to do contracted work.

And you also gave quite a nice substantive list of elements of financial interests and other kinds of things, which now I know we can go find in the transcript and capture and pull back. We've been resisting being too explicit in lists here. Prior versions of these questions actually did have some, for example, in a few things there.

But I hear you suggesting that we should try to be more complete, and maybe actually list all of these things if we can think of them and get them in, so that we actually draw those things out, and that's a little bit of a different path than where

we were in our prior conversations in this group -- so, I just wanted to call that out for folks to think about. Because you actually mentioned some things in your list, which I don't remember ever having been part of our discussions before.

So, it occurs to me -- and I liked them -- you know, like even the fact that some of us get travel paid for by ICANN is kind of interesting. It's a detail, but it's probably worth listing; it should at least be known that we have some benefits there. I mean, I heard you say travel support and stuff. So, it's something for the group to think about -- how far we want to go in that list and if we want to spend time doing it.

Okay. I have Jay and then Jeff. I do want to add that, for remote participants, I am managing -- Patrik and I have queue up here that we're managing to keep things in order. If you want to speak and you want to put your hand up in the Adobe Connect, we will -- I will, as we go along here -- as I'm doing here by saying Jay and then Jeff -- I'll let you know when you're on deck and you're coming and that you're on the list. So, thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Jim, just before that, there is -- Steve Crocker and John Klensin provided comment in the Adobe chat.

JIM GALVIN:	Okay. Thanks. You want to -- so, we'll read those out. I didn't see a hand go up, but, okay, I'll put them on the list and read them out. Thanks.
JAY DALEY:	I'm wondering -- sorry, Jay Daley. I'm wondering if, before we get to my comment, we should deal with Ram's comments more thoroughly by scrolling up to the -- some of the earlier points, and considering how we might extend those to cover Ram's points, rather than necessarily taking it offline. If you don't want to do that, then I'm happy to talk about my points now.
JIM GALVIN:	No. Let's do that, if we can. Yes, please. I'd rather just have the discussion, now, and do it, I think. I can't think of any reason not to, so please go ahead.
JAY DALEY:	Well, that means scrolling up, please, on the document to the earlier points and seeing how we can -- how's Ram's things there -- no, no, no -- the -- yeah. The notes -- it's -- yeah -- and 10, as well. Are we going to -- what to 11? Is it 11? There you go. Yep, those are the ones. Ram, looking at those, can you see an easy way to extend those to encapsulate --?

RAM MOHAN: Yeah. So, let me suggest that we add travel and accommodation expenses. Let me suggest that we add patent ownership. That we add membership of speakers of panels.

I'm saying, you know, add 11, 12, 13 -- instead of just editing from here -- is what I'm saying. I mean, these are fairly, you know, open-ended questions. People either have them or they don't have them, so we don't need to optimize the number of questions overall, at least that's the way I look at it. So, I say, add No. 10, there, under general questions. You know, identify whether your work --

JIM GALVIN: I'm sorry to interrupt for one second, but I'm wondering if we can get Dennis to type into the document here -- just create the bolded list of items as we say them. I'm not sure where we're going to put them, in terms of adding them onto question 9 or make them a separate question.   But can you just start capturing, as a bolded list, these items that we're talking about here underneath something? Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Tell you what, Jim. I'm in the document. I'll start typing and you guys can start talking as I'm typing. That okay?

JIM GALVIN: Okay. That would be great. Thank you. So, Jay, do you want to continue then?

JAY DALEY: Yeah. So, can I go onto my substantive points, then?

JIM GALVIN: Yes.

JAY DALEY: Yeah. So, those are 12, 13, and 14 in the document, please. Or 13, 14, and 15. I don't know how it's possible for anybody to answer these questions, except -- as far as I understand it, every new gTLD was considered a potential name collision string and given a risk score. And so, that would mean that everything counted in 13, 14, and 15, which I think is excessive.

And so, I'm wondering if 13, 14, and 15 should be specific to .home, .corp, and .mail; and if we should have a separate question about any involvement in controlled interruption, which is a better way of putting this -- as a way of resolving my

concern that these are impossible- to-answer questions, or that they capture they everybody.

And then, my second point was whether we ought to have something in here about whether or not your company has conducted its own name collision analysis and published any information, data, or recommendations based on that.

JIM GALVIN:

So, I actually like that, and if you could put just some bullet points under 15, for the moment, you know, kind of indent some things and make those couple of points there, so that we can just see it visually, too -- what you're suggesting doing -- that'd be good. I do have a queue that I'm running, but maybe -- do we want to respond, just specifically to this point? Okay. And so, I'll let you jump the queue there, Warren.

WARREN KUMARI:

So, Warren Kumari. So, if you have something like, has your company done any name collision analysis? I think it needs to be much better scoped, because "any name collision analysis" is like -- could our name possibly collide with anything ever, anywhere? It seems very open, so, you know, define it carefully -- that's all I suggest.

JAY DALEY: Sorry. I meant -- and I don't know -- I think I said, "and published a report with any information --

WARREN KUMARI: Okay. I wasn't sure if that those were separate.

JAY DALEY: No, no, no -- no, sorry. I think it's an "and."

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you. I have Jeff, and then I have comments from Steve Crocker and John Klensin. Jeff, go ahead.

JEFFREY BEDSER: Well, you know, as this conversation progresses, I feel that, you know, I have so many interests that I naturally have to recuse myself and run out the door screaming, because this is, indeed, insane. In SSAC, within SSAC, we acknowledge that we've dropped our day job at the door, and we have a desire to do independent, dispassionate observation. But that dropping the day job at the door, is a self-imposed regime. It's not one that, if you will, others police and, you know, start pointing accusatory fingers, etc.

ICANN COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

It's up to each of us, professionally, to exercise that. An open process has changed that, because while it would be good for others who are participating to work within the same self-imposition, they're not necessarily obliged to do so, nor should they. Why? Because this isn't a jury. Truth isn't obtained by the absence of interest. Indeed, all you get is a bunch of folk who have nothing to know about the subject, blathering on, at length, about stuff of no consequence or value. This is industry self-regulatory practice. We all bring interests to the table. That's the idea.

And that somehow, in amongst that collision of interests, there is a common set of acceptable observations that reflect what we hope is some kind of ground truth. That's what we're hoping for. To go through large laundry lists of my life events -- more than I've ever had to reveal for my passport, more than I've ever had to reveal to my employer -- strikes me as marginally, indeed, mainstream insane.

And we can keep on refining this list, and we can probably get to 300 points by, oh, about 9:30, but I'll be out the door by then, because, at least on two of them, I will have failed. I don't feel that folks should, if you will, be excused from the process because they interest. I think they should be encouraged because they have interest.

I think the whole idea is one where you place more responsibility back on folk and stop doing insane laundry lists. I really question this particular effort. I'm sorry -- but, you know, I just don't grok it this way. I'm happy to have folk declare what they think is relevant. I'm happy to have folk do so on their own judgment. I kind of think it's weird to have an inquisition. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you. I'm going allow the jumping the queue here with Jay and Ram, but I want to make a request of Steve, over there -- Steve Sheng -- when it comes time to read things out of the chat room -- it's clear I'm not going to be able to keep up with that while I'm watching the room here. Could I just ask you to make sure that you get your hand in the queue, here, for me? And then, I'll just always call on you to read comments out. Thanks. So, Jay, and then Ram.

JAY DALEY: Jeff, I think that there's a very clear separation between the transparency of what we are declaring, and then, what that then means for participation in the group. And there is no assumption from one to the other. We are trying to be transparent about the former, you know, without going straight

on to the latter. There's a -- if you declare some interest overlap with this, that doesn't mean that you are excluded, necessarily. We have to still determine a threshold for exclusion, which is, you know, a significant conversation in itself.

JIM GALVIN: Ram, please.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks. I'm philosophically, completely, aligned with where Jeff is at. I think, we should move away from -- or should wrap up this conversation on conflicts of interests, etc., fairly quickly. I think the principle that has worked well for the SSAC for all these years, is, you declare these interests, you have them publicly listed, and then you continue to participate.

I mean, the power of the model is in bringing people with knowledge and information inside the tent -- actually working on this thing -- and not recusing, just because they have some interests, right? So, I think that we will really do ourselves and the community a huge disfavor, if we -- I think it's important to list them, okay -- put them out there, let everybody know, this is where you come from -- and then, get on with the work.

Let's actually, you know, talk about or figure out, you know, what are the things that we have to be doing. So, I, for one, am keen on finding a way to wrap this topic up and move on to the other substantive pieces. But I'm -- generally, I'm not aligned that this is insane, but I think if it continued this way, it'll -- I'll get there.

JIM GALVIN: So, thank you for all of that, and what I want to do is go to Steve Sheng to read comments out of the chat room. I want to make sure to get those in the record, and then I will take an opportunity to try and summarize where we are, and what I think we're doing here. And then, hopefully, we can move on from the topic after that. I saw your hand go up, Robert, but I'll -- if you don't mind, I'll try and doing it off that way. So, Steve, over to you.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, Jim. Steve Crocker made a comment in the chat room, "The emphasis on conflict of interests is laudable, but at the end of the day, the credibility of this effort will depend on the quality of the work. The data, reasoning, and conclusions should stand on their own, irrespective of who the authors are. Accordingly, while we should, indeed, attend to the COI issues,

let's not spend too much of our time on this." So, do you want me to read others, or --?

JIM GALVIN: Yes.

STEVE SHENG: Okay. We have a comment from Anne, in the IPC constituency, "Agree with comment regarding primary and secondary interests. Agree with proposed additional questions that may color the data provided by certain work party participants. Thank you for this work. It's refreshing to see this much detail in an ICANN SOI. It's also very important, because data results can actually be skewed and that can very definitely affect the quality of the work."

From John Klensin, "Agree with Steve. I see some risk. If too much emphasis is put in this direction of ending up with a lot of input in a report that is dominated by people who are as pure as to proverbial driven-snow [inaudible] of having many opinions, but knowing absolute nothing." So, that's -- and Steve Crocker has a question, too, but I'll stop there. Yeah. I know.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. But -- so, before we move on in the discussion, let me just take a moment to say where we are, and what I think is going on. And we'll take some more comments after we take a couple from the room, Steve, just so that you know. That'll give you a chance to gather them up. I thought -- let me try to restate where I thought we were with these lists of questions. I think the discussion has gotten a little bit off on the side.

Our purpose here, in these questions -- and we are examining what questions to ask -- is simply to expose a set of interests that we should know about as we do our work in this project. And we believe that the community should know about. Again, our -- as SSAC has always done, and as we want to continue in this work party, our default position is one of inclusion.

This is not looking for reasons for exclusion. It's just about putting whatever results that we create in a particular context, and everyone should be aware of that context as we create our work product. So, that's really all it is. And I agree with Jeff. I mean, there is a certain amount of insanity in how far one goes with this.

There's only so many questions you can ask. What we're struggling with is whether the questions are too broad or too narrow. It's really just about trying to find that balance. What's the right set of questions to ask to expose the right set of

interests that we should all know about and make visible to the community?

We will, as is ordinary ICANN process with its working groups, the PDP groups, especially in these public forums -- when the group has been officially kicked off, the statement of interest will be required to exist as we had said yesterday and proposed in the project plan. Everyone will have to fill one out. It'll have to exist. It'll be there. If there's ever changes, we will announce that at the start of every meeting. Everyone will be asked to simply say if you made a change, or not, and then, you know, if anyone has an issue with the statement of interest, you know, we'll simply talk about it and figure out if we're going to do anything about it.

But, in general, in my experience anyway, and I'm sure others have had a similar experience, you know, no one really raises these questions, and they're just -- it's never really been an issue, and it's not expected to be. But it's there, so that we know, and we don't know what we might do with these things, but we at least need to know.

So, again, my last comment here, in summary, the purpose of these questions is to find a way to expose the things that are good to know about those who are participating in the work --

that we should all know. And let's try to keep that as the scope of our discussion here.

Now, I know there's a lot of points, here, going on, so I'll try and make a queue. I did get Jay -- anyone else? Oh, Robert was first, actually. We'll go to Jay and Steve's hand is gone, so -- okay, down on the end there, too. All right. So, thanks. Robert.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And there's people in the Adobe queue, too.

JIM GALVIN: Does Steve have his --? Steve wants to be back in the queue, too? [CROSSTALK] no, no, I'm looking at Steve Sheng -- Steve wants -- Steve is going to read out the questions from the Adobe room for me, when he's -- so, do I need to put in queue? Okay. Thank you.

ROBERT GUERRA: I like your comments, right now, and I'm also in agreement with Jeff. I think something that we may want to do is -- we have the list of questions -- before we get into the questions, we may just want to have like a preamble, or just, you know, a paragraph or two that just states what it's for. It just needs to be clear, instead of just having a list, why these questions are important;

how they're going to be used, just as you framed it -- because this is something new, and so, I think it's just important for the community and for us to know, why are we asking those questions, and have that.

So, instead of just saying, "There's an SOI; fill it." I think we should have maybe like a paragraph that just, you know, is like a preamble or just like a purpose. And so, just people are clear how it's going to be used, and it's not going to -- you know, so I think that might be a helpful addition. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN: So, let me ask Robert, in particular, if you could look back at the introduction and the guidelines, the two sections prior to these list of questions -- I mean, you make an important suggestion, if you would just review that for yourself, and if you can make some helpful comments in there, and just edit the document, directly, that would be good, okay? I have Jay, and then over to the gentleman up there.

JAY DALEY: Thank you. So, two points -- sorry, Jeff, I didn't understand that Ram had inserted those questions under general questions. I thought they were NCAP-specific questions. And so, I would not be happy with those questions being general, as in, "Please

identify any travel and accommodation that you every have paid for."

Okay. Yeah. No, no, no -- so, it has to be specifically related to name collision, I think, for those questions, 10, 11, 12, 13 -- I would only be happy if they were very narrowly restricted. And secondly, I would delete question 15, as shown on the highlighted ones down there. I think this buys into the lie that there is something wrong with the new gTLD-application process -- that any involvement in it, taints you. And I, therefore, would like this removed entirely.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you, Jay. Could you make this as a comment on the side in the document? Don't strike it out, yet, but -- and let's see if anyone objects to its removal, but just make a comment on the side in the document for folks to follow that thread, if you want to speak on that. So, please, up there in the corner of the room, and then back over to Steve Sheng. Okay. Steve. Steve Sheng, over to you.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you. The question from Steve is, what's the -- a question on the relationship -- oh, let me see -- so, many chats going on

here. "What's the relevance of the question regarding scaling of the root zone?" That's a question.

RAM MOHAN: This is referring to question No. 15, currently in the document, that says, "Have you, in the past, undertaken paid or unpaid work-related to management of scaling of the root zone? Please give details." That's what Steve is asking -- what's the relevance of that question?

STEVE SHENG: Yes.

JIM GALVIN: So, my recollection is that the reason it's relevant, is because the SSAC root-scaling document has been on our list of back references, as being relevant to this project. And so, that's where that question came from. I'm not opposed to tweaking that question in some way, but I believe that's its origins, unless anyone wants to suggest something different.

RAM MOHAN: So, paraphrase what I heard -- it's there for completeness. It's nothing more than that. You know, there was root-scaling --

root-scaling has some orthogonal connection to name collisions or maybe a more direct connection to name collisions -- so, therefore, just listed. Is that it?

JIM GALVIN: That's my recollection. Yes.

RAM MOHAN: Then, it feels like benign. List it, and then we move on.

JIM GALVIN: Okay.   So, we'll keep it, unless anyone wants to suggest we should take it out. And, Rod is in the queue, and then I have Warren.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Rod Rasmussen. So, I want to remember to -- and I think, Jim, you did cover this a bit, but -- we're using this to, you know, elucidate various potential things. At the end of the day, we have been directed by the Board to be inclusive.

So, I don't know that there is any circumstance, at all, where you would exclude somebody based on anything we come up here with on this list. The exception being -- and we've talked about this -- when there may be confidential data shared by one

organization or individual or group or what have you that would be directly accessible, by say, a competitive company -- there would be that kind of tension. That's why it's important to understand who you're currently, maybe, associated with.

And then, there's also, I guess, a potential around people who may contract to do some of this work, right? There's that part of it, as well, where we have to be careful about that. But, in general, for inclusion in working in the work party, if we can get a sane list -- like Jeff's saying -- a list of things that we think are interesting, we just put it down there, and that's it.

This cannot be used to exclude members of the work party. I just want to make sure we're clear on that, because, otherwise, we're going to be trying to draw lines and things like that, that should not exist, based on the way the Board wanted us to go about doing this.

JIM GALVIN: So, thank you, Rod, for reinforcing that. I have Warren, then Lyman.

WARREN KUMARI: So --

LYMAN CHAPIN: Rod just said -- sorry, Lyman Chapin. It looks to me, in fact, that if you can't answer, yes, to at least five of these questions, you have no business being on the work party in the first place. I mean, this is -- in fact, we might even want to just score it, and whoever gets the highest score gets -- yeah. Because this is a list of all the reasons why you might, in fact, have something useful to contribute.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right.

JIM GALVIN: Warren.

WARREN KUMARI: So, Warren Kumari. I mean, Lyman, might kind of have covered what I was aiming for. Ram said that it's benign if you say, you know, you've participated in RSSAC, and Jeff had a whole thing on, you know, you'll exclude yourself from everything. Yes, it is somewhat benign, but also, if we're going to be reporting on this many different metrics, even though, you might still be supposed to, or encouraged to participate, people who haven't been here for this conversation might rank people's input differently, based upon stuff.

I mean, if I've been involved in 27 of the 27 different things, people might assume that that makes me more conflicted and my views should be taken less seriously than somebody who hasn't done anything, at all, ever, because they're obviously not conflicted. So, this is kind of a double-edged sword.

JIM GALVIN: Jay, you wanted to respond to this, and then I have Steve Sheng.

JAY DALEY: Yeah. I just want to say, I agree -- I think this question should be removed. I'm against overcollection, generally, unless we have a specific identified reasoned why that should be here, and I think this is overcollection, this one.

JIM GALVIN: So, I'll -- I mean, I'll take that point, and then assert the following consensus here for the group and see if anyone objects. On the principle of overcollection, I agree. Let's just strike that question, and I'll -- unless anyone wants to object and suggest we do something different, I'm going to say that that's our choice here. So, I'll give people a chance to speak up and say, no, as we continue on through our list here. Anne has objected

ICANN COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

in the chat. Okay. That's one. And, Warren, you want to clarify, or can I go to Steve?

WARREN KUMARI: Not really a -- I don't really want to object. I think I more want to say that, if we're collecting stuff and publishing these, we should make it clear, you know, with some disclaimer above it, or text wrapped around it that these disclosures are not supposed to be taken as a judgment on whether or not the person is conflicted or not. But more, so that everybody's aware -- you know, it's informational, not should be used to rank whether -- I note -- I realize that's not actually going to help, but I think by writing it down might be -- might alleviate some of the concern.

JIM GALVIN: So, I would hope that the introduction and the guiding principles at the top cover that. And so, I would ask, if -- you know, that's our concern and we want to make sure that that point is covered -- you know, please go back up and review that text up there and suggest changes. You can just, you know, type right into the document, here, that would clarify that point. That, at least from my point of view, is the goal of those two sections up at the top -- is to exactly put all of this in context, so that we know what we're dealing with. So, did you want to clarify, Jay, or --?

JAY DALEY: Just wanted to go -- sorry, this is Jay Daley -- to the point about disclosure made in the chat room. Unbounded disclosure would see us with a list of a million questions. Have you ever registered a domain name? You know, do you understand the DNS packet? These type of things. I think that this is -- I understand the need for transparency, but if there is not a relevance in the disclosure, then I think we fall foul of the law of unintended consequences on it.

And it also becomes a bit insidious, as well, in terms of what it's saying about people. And so, that's why I strongly feel that this one ought to be removed. Because we -- unless somebody can show a direct relevance between this and NCAP, I think it should it go.

JIM GALVIN: So, thank you for that, Jay. You know, you said that very well. And it is, certainly, at least part of the reason why I was asserting that, you know, a consensus position of, let's strike the question, and see what kind of objections we might get. I take your point as commenting on Anne's objection.

And I'm still of the mind that we should take away this question, unless we get greater objections from people, a greater number

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

of them, and a motivating point as to why. Let me go over to Steve Sheng at this point, and that's the end of my queue. So, Steve, just continue down through however many, and what you need to read. Thanks.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, Jim. I think we've discussed -- Anne in the chat -- let me just summarize, agree that this is a disclosure, not an exclusion, but she object for question 19 being removed. And her reasoning, you know, what's the harm for -- to disclose? So, that's regarding the question 19. John Klensin -- I'm sorry -- John Klensin wants to raise that this linseed discussion is self-defeating.

You know, people giving up their day jobs, it appears that you are going to ask people with considerable expertise to volunteer significant time to this effort. You know, whether you get that, at least from those who don't have vested interests, is going to depend, at least a bit, on the perceptions -- whether their time will be used efficiently. You know -- you got it? Okay. All right. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Please go ahead.

CHRIS ROOSENRAAD: Chris Roosenraad. So, I guess my question is a process on, here. Is the intent, here, to lockdown these questions, today, in this room? Or is the intent to discuss this to death, and then take if off on a mailing list to lock in the questions?

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. Yeah, my intent is -- you know, the work party is -- we've all already been discussing these questions for several weeks. I'm inclined to be done and, in fact, thank you, that's a very nice segue into the fact that, with no hands, I was going to say, "Are we done?" I think we've -- people have been editing this document in real-time here. I confess, I have not had a chance to keep up with all the edits, but I trust the collective wisdom of the group. I don't know if that's a good thing or a bad thing. I'm getting some chuckles.

So, you know, I really am inclined to think that we have gotten to a good place here, and that we're done -- unless anyone wants to stand up and object to what's in the document now. We will clean it up and run it through one last, you know, sort of a work-party last call.

So, we'll give people a last, you know, 48 hours or something before we publish it, you know, and make it visible to -- our

usual process, for the community that's listening, is the work party does its work. It then has to be distributed to the full SSAC, because the full SSAC is not necessarily part of this work party. And they, then, also get to comment and review. Because, again, all work products that come out of SSAC represent the entire SSAC.

Also, keep in mind that all of SSAC has to fill out this SOI, even if they're not in the work party. That is one of the rules that came with this document. But, you know, as long as nothing egregious happens along the way, then this will become part of the project plan. It'll be posted on the Wiki. So, I'm inclined to assert that we're done, and ask for comments from anyone who wants to say something different than that. Rod. Or Chris, then Rod.

CHRIS ROOSENRAAD: So, in light of the fact that this is now an open process, at what point will the community outside of SSAC have an opportunity to comment on the final language?

JIM GALVIN: That's a good question.

CHRIS ROOSENRAAD: Thank you.

JIM GALVIN: Are we going to -- you have a suggestion? Please.

RAM MOHAN: Yeah. My suggestion is that we've got something that's a pretty good working model. If there are -- if folks think that we are missing something, they can provide it as comments and the SSAC can go and work on it. I don't want to, you know, kind of belabor the inclusive part to say that we should be in an endless comment loop.

So, my suggestion is, you know, we declare success, and we publish this, and if there are people who have objections, they can provide it, and we can consider it down the road. But I don't want to keep this loop open forever.

CHRIS ROOSENRAAD: I was just going to say, I wasn't proposing an infinite loop here, but I was suggesting that there might be some, you know, a call for, you know, a call for final comments or something like that when it gets published -- to allow others to make comments prior to us saying it is locked. If we publish it out as being locked, that doesn't strike me as keeping in the theme of being

open. Even if that comment period is relatively short, there should be some.

JIM GALVIN: So, I think what was going through my mind is when we say comment period, you know, the first thing that jumps into my mind is ICANN's ordinary public comment period, you know, 40-day kind of business, and then I was thinking to myself, "Have I ever seen, in any PDP working group, a comment period associated with the statement of interest that they've had you fill out for these things?"

You know, I think my answer to this is aligned, but I want to be very clear about exactly what we're doing since this is new for us. I think this is a case where we do get to declare success, in the sense that we don't have to formally allow for comment, but I think the general principle that everything is open for discussion, we certainly welcome input from people about things -- you know, we just make that clear and visible. I don't want the formality of this to be overrun and over-iterative.

You know, I think that's the right thing to say. We'll publish it. We'll say it's there. There's plenty of time before this project officially kicks off, in June -- assuming we get a happy path, and everything is approved, you know, by the Board -- for people to

comment if they want to, and the discussion group list would be the way to do that. We have to actually create that list and cause it to come out and see all of that happen. So, declare success, but people can always comment.

And now, I see hands all around. So, I have Rod and Robert, and -- oh, okay -- and then the gentleman on the end. And a reminder to everyone, please -- please do say your name before you speak. We're -- I've kind of slipped out of reminding people to do that. Thank you.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. Rod Rasmussen. So, this particular aspect of what we're talking about here is extremely important to get right and get community alignment on. We're never going to get full alignment, because it's -- there's a lot of diverse opinions out there, but we need, at least, some form of consensus on this from the people we're supposed to be trained to include in this -- that are outside of SSAC.

So, I think it's really important that we have comments accepted from whatever we call, consider, our final proposed draft on this; we have to have a round of comments to come in. I don't know what that mechanism is. That's something we need to figure out. I don't think we need to figure that out in this room, right

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

now, today, but we need to have that -- have that and then incorporate those comments, and then we're done. And I think that's definitely the direction we have to go here. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you for that. So -- and I'm going to close the queue at the end of the next two, so I have Robert and then gentleman on the end.

ROBERT GUERRA: Rod, you stole a couple of things that I was going to say, but I think our -- excuse me, Robert Guerra for the record. I think something that's important is, when we go through a section, whether it's this section or ones that we're going to get to later -- when we think we have a text that we're ready and want to close it off, to your point, I think we should just say, "Let's flag it to the community," and saying, "We think we've achieved this, but we just want you to take a look at it."

Kind of like our 48-hour period, but that 48-hour period, I think, is too short for the community -- and use how we're doing this step for others, as well, too. So, I'm in agreement with that approach, because it is more open and the community's looking.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you. And on the end, please, go ahead.

MICHAEL CASADEVALL: Michael Casadevall. I need to make a pretty strong point, as an outsider to the group. If the document basically gets thrown out there, and has not had a formal explicit comments' period for the public, no one's going to make a comment, because it doesn't look like it's going to be accepted. I would recommend, roughly, a one- to two-week period, where comments are accepted, then the floor is closed. The documents re-amended and then, you know, maybe one or two rounds of that, and then, you know, call it good, put it to bed. Just my two cents on that.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Rod Rasmussen. So, just in response, and to make sure we're clear here -- we can't put every little thing out for public comment before we get started -- before we get started on this project. The idea of creating a discussion group and bringing people into the work party is so that we can then incorporate those comments, in real-time, into the work that's going on.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

And then we will have our standard -- we'll have the new standard, I guess, of having interim reports that we can have public comment on. What we need to identify, at this juncture, are key elements like this one where we definitely need to get public input on this stuff -- and to make sure that we've got this process kicked off properly.

But we know already that, you know, this is a project plan -- I mean, propose that, and then we will start executing on that and have to change course as we go through, because any research project is going to be that way. So, let's not micromanage and engineer everything. Thanks.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Patrick Fältström, co-chair together with Jim. One thing I would like to remind people on, is that this an SSAC work party, which is conducting its process in the open, and we will have -- we have announced that we will have -- that's we'll have invited guests, but the work party, itself, is to operate according to the SSAC operating procedures, which specifies, quite clearly, how we are doing -- how we're doing open consultations and how we are reviewing the results and coming to conclusions within the work party.

And I find it being very important that we are following the SSAC operation procedures when we are conducting things within the work party -- and it's specified there how the -- how to reach consensus. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. With that, I'm going to close this topic on statement of interest. We have a document, and as I said, we'll clean that up, get it to the work party, and follow our usual processes to move it around, with the addition of considering how to announce this to the public. We'll have to take that action onboard as part of the NCAP admin committee, along with the SSAC admin committee, and see what the right way is to deal with that.

So, on to the next item on our agenda -- if we can bring that back here. So, we now have a discussion for guidelines for invited guests. There is some text here, which will come up on the screen. So, those here in the community have not seen this, that's really because this was just a thread that was only just recently started on our work-party mailing list, and we kind of put this up here.

So, it's really short. I'll just say what it is, for those who are new to all of this -- SSAC does have, in its operational procedures, the opportunity to invite guests to work party -- we have actually

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

done this in the past, several times, on several work products. When we have specific, you know, detailed expertise that we really do want to get a recognized expert to participate in, we have reached out and done that, and invited them to the work.

We actually don't have a detailed recommendations, or procedures, or guidelines in the ordinary kind of management-detailed process for dealing with invited guests, but we're being sensitive to the community's desire to set expectations. So, we want to have a discussion, here, about what we can add to SSAC's ordinary operational procedures that would be more helpful to the community in understanding what it means to be an invited guest and, you know, how one might actually volunteer to be an invited guest, so that the work party could consider whether or not to include you, in addition to anyone that the work party might want to reach out to, to expressly include into the project.

So, I hope I have level-set what this discussion is about. Does anyone have any questions about what the discussion is about, and what we're trying to achieve here? I'm not seeing any hands. Jay, please, and Chris.

JAY DALEY: Jay Daley. I would just like us to talk about the terminology of invited guest, in this context, because I believe that we have a different meaning of that from the way it is being interpreted by the community. And that that is potentially problematic in that it's being interpreted by the community as us selecting people to invite, rather than, possibly, people being able to apply to be invited.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Let's have that discussion, and --

CHRIS ROOSENRAAD: I was going to raise the same -- Chris Roosenraad. I was going to raise the same concern, and I recognize that invited guest is a state-of-art, you know, around here, and is a phrase that is used here -- but we do need to do something in the language to imply that, you know, this is -- people need to self-select.

We're not going to go out and choose people from the community; they need to apply themselves or, otherwise, you know, raise their hand to be invited on. Because, otherwise, I have the same concerns that Jay does.

JIM GALVIN: So, just to clarify for Chris -- it is actually the case that SSAC has always in the past, so far -- we just reach out, and we select people, and we ask people to join. You know, we use our own collective wisdom to identify a particular expert that has something that we need for a particular work product, and we go and we get them.

So, we're really trying to find a way to represent this to the community, and I think we are trying to offer the opportunity for the community -- there might be those out there who want to say that they'd like to be apart of things. I don't know -- okay. Please, Jeff, go ahead, and then I have Robert.

JEFFREY BEDSER: Yeah. I was in the line and, quite frankly, I don't see the point of any of this. The difference between traditional SSAC work, closed with invited guests, and then open project -- open, anyone can participate -- seems to me to say, what's an invited guest? I mean, if I invite Christian Huitema, sitting over there, saying, "Come on down if you want," so what? Christian could have made that decision on his own. If we all sit round the table and go, "Let's invite Christian Huitema," again, it makes no difference.

So, I'm sitting here struggling; does this give them a golden key, some secret pass, some ability? You know, it doesn't. It's an open process. And so, I really don't understand why you think some additional, official invitation is even necessary, nor is there any inferred status or role if one is a recipient of such an invitation, in any case. It's open. And as soon as you made the statement, "it's open," we don't need to use the SSAC procedure of bringing people in behind the curtain. So, I don't think this is necessary. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN: Just to clarify -- yeah, when we were putting the project plan, in the early days, right -- I mean, what's going on here is, what does it mean to be an open project? And that really is a -- and I guess that's -- really this question comes right down -- that question comes right down to this issue of invited guests and how to deal with it.

You know, in the normal ICANN context, when they start up a working group, it really is an open-call to the community -- anyone who wants to participate, can -- in this particular case, it's an SSAC work party -- the tension that we are trying to respond to here is, the community is going to have an expectation that anyone can participate. And you're right, Jeff, I

mean that's really what it comes down to -- how do we want to address that tension?

And I'm fine with whatever the consensus wants to come down to. We had pointed out in the project plan that SSAC does have this concept of invited guests, and we -- maybe improperly at the time, and we have not really addressed it very carefully up until this point -- suggested that that meant that people could ask to be an invited guest -- and you're right -- why would we do that? Maybe we should just leave it alone. And Rod wants to clarify something, but then I have Barry, Robert, and Jay in the queue. Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Rod Rasmussen. So, you know, we put this together initially, and it actually is in the proposal -- around limiting the size of the work party to a reasonable number of people, and not having a 1,000 people potentially getting in here. There's also the concept of, "You must be this tall to ride this ride."

This is an -- while this is an open process, it is still an SSAC process, and what we want to avoid are people joining the work party who do not have expertise, knowledge, or data, or something to add to the constructive work of the work party -- and simply are there as provocateurs. That never happens at

ICANN that I'm aware, but we just want to make sure that doesn't happen.

So, this is not -- I would not call this a fully open, to anybody who wants to join it -- that's why we created the discussion list, so that people who are -- who may not be tall enough to ride the ride can actually take part in the discussions without necessarily the actual work of the work party, itself.

So, that is the intent here, so how we decide how tall is tall enough, etc., is really what I think we're talking about here -- it's qualifications to be here. And I think we actually had a list of those qualifications, as somebody mentioned earlier -- I believe Lyman brought up the point that our disclosures or statements of interest are good indication, potentially, of whether or not you are tall enough to ride the ride. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. I'm going to jump the queue here with my co-chair, Patrik, and then we'll go Barry, Robert, Jay.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: What I want you to think about when giving comments regarding invited guests and SSAC members, which are part of the work party -- think about the end game, when we are

reaching consensus document. One of the reason why we wanted to know who were part of them -- of the work party -- was because, then we can use the existing processes we have to reach consensus on the document within the work party. Just think about that, as well -- that we might have to tune that if it's open-ended and anyone is part of that. Although, the final consensus of a document that is an SSAC product is done with SSAC.

BARRY LEIBA: Barry Leiba. I wanted to add one thing to what Rod said about the separation between the work party and the discussion group -- that you have to be this tall -- not everybody who's this tall can be part of the work party either. The point is, we do want to keep it contained and allow completely open participation in the discussion group, but keep a contained group actually producing the document that we're coming out with.

But I also agree that calling it "invited guests" does seem strange to me. Again, it's the two newbies who are part of saying this, so we don't have that history, but just because we've used the term "invited party" before, or "invited guest" before, doesn't mean we need to use it now. And I would just suggest calling them members of the work party.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Patrik Fältström. I need to jump in here. We do have the term "invited guest" very explicitly in our operation procedures.

BARRY LEIBA: I do understand that.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: So, yes -- so, I just want to make everyone understand that if the decision we are making here is whether we are referring to that term as is it defined in the operation procedures, or not. That is important thing for me. The second thing is to explain the terminology, so that people understand what we're talking about. They are two different things.

BARRY LEIBA: Yes.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: And if you want to have a different terminology, I want to know which one of the two things you are doing -- you are talking about.

BARRY LEIBA: I am suggesting that we define some other term that people can understand better in this context. And define it as an "invited guest," according to the SSAC procedures. Simple enough to do, but you're not confusing people who don't understand how they get invited or what this really means.

JIM GALVIN: So, before I move on to Jay -- one thing to keep in mind is, the Board resolution does talk about including other technical experts, so maybe a term that we might consider in this discussion is -- it's an SSAC work party, so it's SSAC members, plus technical experts, and those become members of the work party. Just a discussion point -- want to put that out on the table to think about. Over to Jay.

BARRY LEIBA: Just let me follow-up -- so, we could just say in that that technical experts behave as invited guests, according to the SSAC procedures.

JIM GALVIN: That would be a good point, and you're ceding to Robert. So, Robert, please go ahead.

ROBERT GUERRA: Yeah. No, I was in the queue after Barry. I think it's -- we're all talking about the same --

JIM GALVIN: And who are you?

ROBERT GUERRA: Robert Guerra, SSAC member. I think we're all talking about the same thing, but I agree that our words and our terms, sometimes, are not understood in the community, and so I think we need -- you know, words matter -- and so I think we just need to have that in mind. And so, what is it? It's just like, if you want to participate in this process, we're going to ask you a couple questions to invite you. Why? Because if you're part of this group, there is going be -- you're going to be part of the consensus process, you might have access to data -- so a couple of different things.

So, I think going forward -- I think just that needs to be explained, and then saying, internally, in SSAC, you will be considered an invited guests. And so, people know what that means. That's our term; they will have no idea what that means. And so, I think that's what we -- you know, we just need to that for the rest of the community, and just so they're aware of that.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Robert. And my apologies for skipping over you in the speaking queue. I actually had you on the list -- I just -- jumped and went to Jay, and my apologies. So, over to Jay and then Chris.

JAY DALEY: Jay Daley. So, I think we've got in a pickle, because we started this with an incorrect assumption. This is not an entirely open process, as in an IETF process. There is an open part of it, but there is also a confidential part of it. There has to be a confidential part of it because of access to data and what the terms under which the data were given to us and what may be exposed through that data -- and so, there is a firewall between the two of them.

An invited guest is a process by which somebody can move from one to the other and become part of the inside-of-the-firewall bit. And as people have said, we just need to make it clear that somebody can apply to become an invited guest, but we stick to invited guest in the terminology. So, provided we're clear from the outset, that this is not an entirely open process, I think that should be clear.

JIM GALVIN:	Yeah. So, thank you for that. I mean, I'll just add, also, on top of all this, as a reminder, it is an SSAC work party. That is its origins. So, it doesn't necessarily have to be tied to confidentiality of data; it's just that it's an SSAC work party; this is our process. And I agree, and I understand now -- we need to create a mapping between, you know, community participation and our processes, and make it clear what that is and define all the terminology. Chris, go ahead.
CHRIS ROOSENRAAD:	Chris Roosenraad. I'm trying to figure out how the logistics of this is going to work. If we're going to have an open discussion group that anyone can join, and then there's going to be some other discussion, which only has working group members, or technical experts, or invited guests, or whatever the terminology we end up using as -- that strikes me as being a recipe for information bleeding into the wrong discussion, and secret data becoming not secret, and NDAs getting violated, and things like that.

The more I think about it -- and then I think -- I found Jeff's comments, especially persuasive on this -- either it's open or it's not. And we need to figure out what we're going to do. And so, I understand the concerns about confidentiality of data, and I agree with them, because if we are going to be dealing with

data, there's going to NDAs and there's going to be things like that.

If that's the case, it's not an open discussion, and we need to be honest about that. Because we can't have that, and then also have an open discussion group, and have an expectation that everyone -- whenever we're replying to email, will make sure they're sending it out to the right discussion mailing list.

Otherwise, data will get leaked, NDAs will get violated, and problems will happen. We're human beings; these mistakes will happen, so I think we need to be cognizant of that and honest about that. And if it's not an open list, then we need to treat it as such. If it is an open list, back to Jeff's point, what the heck are we discussing this for? We've got to pick one.

JIM GALVIN: It's an SSAC work party, and there is an SSAC work party mailing list. And, I mean, you're right, Chris, people will make mistakes, but, you know, we are all professionals and we're just going to do what we can do and manage this as best we can. I think that we do need to provide an opportunity for the community to, you know, have discussions about this project and some of the things that are happening as we produce interim reports -- maybe it'll be ongoing discussions about things.

That's what that discussion group is for, and we have a responsibility as work party members to, I think -- I guess, what I'm proposing and suggesting -- the way that we had thought about this when we put this together -- we have a responsibility to be responsive to the community, as best we can. You know, they can have their discussion. We can participate in their discussion. We need to have our discussions about our work product, and that's where we're going. We need to look for input that we might get from the community, from the discussion group, and we can work with them, with the community-at-large on that discussion group list.

I'm not sure what else to say. You're right; it's an SSAC work party -- I think is the guiding principle; that's where we start. Everything else is about letting the community participate, and it's providing the opportunity, and we are all, as work party members and as professionals, going to have to manage that distinction and do the right thing with it. Rod, you have hand up. I don't have anyone else in the queue.

ROD RASMUSSEN: All right. Rod Rasmussen. So, another way of saying this is that we have a work party that actually does the weekly calls, gets information, looks and has oversight on to the process that will be being run by some -- something else we have to talk about is

the structure -- but there is all of those bits, which have nothing to do with a discussion around the topic area. That is what the work party is for, and there needs to be a separation between that and having a public discussion list where people can actually go about it.

There are ways of mitigating -- I agree with Chris, there's a -- if you have a mailing list that has a very similar name to your other one, and we have this happen all the time -- all of us have seen this and, heck, it happens if you have name collision, for example -- I've sent things to the wrong Chris many times, so, you know, that happens with email, so there's some ways to mitigate that, including being smart about how we name such a mailing list, and also whether or not you use some sort of for or moderation or something like that.

So, I think there's ways to address that, but you need to separate the community discussion -- so that we can get that input from anybody and keep that open -- from the actual work of the work party.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. I now have a queue of Patrik, Steve Crocker, Jay, and I also just want to observe -- I would like to try to separate, you know, the implementation issues of how we better help

ourselves make this separation from the concept of whether or not we understand what we're doing and if we believe we can manage this. I get that there are things we can do. Rod is correct about that, you know, but there will be a discussion group area for the community to participate and to have discussions itself.

And for us to look for input and contributions from the community, and perhaps, talk with the community about what is of interest to them in this project. But it is an SSAC work party. We will have an SSAC work party mailing list; it will only be SSAC work party members. And that is where the productive -- no, I don't want to say that -- that is where the activities that will produce the work product are going to take place, and we will reach for input from the community discussion group.

So, you know, let's focus on the fact that we need these two things, and, you know -- that we're going to have them or not. And I think that we've proposed that we are going to have them, so if we're not, we need to talk about how we're going to explain that we're not going to do that and how we're going to respond to the Board's request for inclusion of other technical experts, again. Sorry. You know, we have a Board request, and an explicit requirement, and we have to respond to that. So, Patrik, please.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM: Thank you. Patrik Fältström. I just want to remind everyone that what we are talking about here is also something that, of course, people might comment on during the open consultation, which is currently open for another 37 days, which means that the work party cannot conclude this discussion until we have seen the feedback during the open consultation. I just looked at I couldn't see any comments, yet, but we'll see.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. Thank you for that, actually. And that goes back, even, to the statement of interest discussion, since that's in the project plan, there's some discussion there. It is pointed out and it's listed there. That is -- that's a way for us to remind the community that there's a place for them to comment to us about anything related to the project. I have Steve Crock-[CROSSTALK] -- oh, okay. You read for Steve, please.

STEVE SHENG: So, Steve Crocker says, "Although it may be useful to have proprietary information presented to the work party, the reports have to be complete and permit the reader to evaluate on the basis of the content, not assertions about data hidden from view."

JIM GALVIN: Thank you for that, Steve. I will comment to everyone that we also had a question about that issue in the cross-community yesterday. And at that time, I had responded and pointed out that, although, the work party -- we do recognize that the work party and SSAC ordinary procedures have a way to deal with data that, itself, might not be public -- we are fully cognizant as this work party of the fact that any recommendations that we make have to be supported by something in the work product as a whole, in the details there.

So, we have not, yet, figured out is we're going to have issues with that, but we are fully aware that it would be really inappropriate to make a recommendation based on data that is somehow not visible in the work product itself. And I -- you know, that's a question -- we don't have an answer for it, but it is an issue that we will have to address as we go forward, if that becomes a conflict of some sort. And I have Jeff and then Jay.

JEFFREY BEDSER: You know, it might be surprising, but I don't think SSAC is the fount of all wisdom, and I certainly believe -- yes, stunned -- I certainly don't believe we encompass all the things that are known about the DNS or even a remote, miniature part of this --

so, while I appreciate this emerging sentiment that this is an SSAC work party and they're invited guests, sort of inside the cone; and there's this sort of rabble of discussion outside -- I am, I suppose, personally, less comfortable with it, and part of the reason is, I think, that open and inclusion is actually about the quality and breadth of the work -- that there's a lot that we don't know inside this work party and, quite frankly, I would like us to strive, as much as possible, to admit that there's stuff we just don't know and there's stuff that other people know and to try and grapple with this, we have to incorporate that in some form, way, or fashion.

So, I would not see invited guests, however you want to put it, as being a constraining and difficult case. I would like it to be, personally, "You want to be in; you're in." But I'm sure there's some compromises between those two extremes. I am just simply voicing a view to -- if you've got to be so high to join, I'm holding my fingers, one millimeter apart from each other as to the minimum qualifying height, Rod.

But I'd like those qualifications to be a low as possible, because we don't know everything and, quite frankly, help and data and knowledge is always good in this kind of fight. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN:
So, thank you for that, Jeff. And I want to speak personally and say that, at least, in principle, I'm actually aligned with you. You know, I mean, when we were first putting this project plan together and doing all of this, we really did want to respond to the open inclusiveness of the Board that the tension comes from -- they asked SSAC to do this, so it's an SSAC work party. I agree with you.

You know, we should try to be as open as possible, as inclusive as possible, and we're just trying to figure out to -- if we can document in some way, or you know, say what that compromise position is -- maybe we just deal with it as we go, and we simply state as a principle, our intent is to be as open and inclusive as possible. We'll have to figure it out as we go. I don't really know what the final answer is. And, Patrik, you wanted to jump the queue.

PATRIK FÄLTSTRÖM:
Patrik Fältström. What I think we're talking about here is that we're mixing up the question, whether we should have these two groups and how to move -- just like Jay said -- and how we're moving from one group to the other.

In the project plan, what we are talking about, for example, is that to be able to be in one of the groups, the actual work party,

you have to answer these questions of the SOI -- whatever those questions end up being, for example, but the barrier of entry can be that low. Submit your email address; you end up on the mailing list. There's a subscription, and you add your SOI, and, Boom, you're in there.

So, to have an inclusive process, I think that is what I see people are talking about here, and the need for that to be able to live up to the requirement from the Board, to easily participate. Personally, I fully support that. On the other hand, I do think -- I do like that model, because then we can still use the operation procedures we have for a work party, which I find being a good thing. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN: Patrik, I have Jay, then Steve Sheng.

JAY DALEY: I am Jay Daley. I am not confident that we can guarantee external reproducibility at the outset of this working party. And in the same way that I don't think we can guarantee an answer at the outset of this working party.

And so, I think we should manage expectations on that, at the outset, and that should be a potential trigger for people to apply

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

to be invited guests -- if they think that, at the end of this, they would want to reproduce to understand it. Because if we don't do that, it will be a shock to people at the end of this process, if they, then, wish to reproduce to find that they can't, but they could have if they had applied at the beginning to be part of it. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: So, just to try and summarize for clarity -- to make sure that I understood what you said -- I think what you're suggesting is -- one of the ways to level-set this issue of invited guests or technical experts -- whatever we get to -- is to observe for people that, if you want to ensure that you can reproduce the results and understand how we got there, that that's something that you should be thinking about in crafting your motivations for wanting to be part of the work party, and you should make that visible as part of -- you should join the work party and make that point, you should join the discussion group, and make that point visible as to why you're doing that, and be active, and seek to join the work party on that premise.

JAY DALEY: Yeah. Jay Daley, again. Yes. And that we should be explicit that you may not be able to reproduce after the fact, because we

may only be able to deliver this project by guaranteeing confidentiality around some of the data that, therefore, prevents third-party reproducibility -- without those third parties having access to that data, themselves, through their own mechanisms.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you. I got that. So, I have Steve Sheng, then Julie, Rod, Michael, and then Warren.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, Jim. Some comments from the Adobe Connect. I think Ruben suggests -- is also Rod's suggestion -- to name these two mailing lists very distinctly, you know, have public or private in front of them, so that people don't confuse. But, yeah. That's a comment.

There's a comment from -- there are comment on the guideline here that say, "The related work is very broad. Will a trademark attorney or a CEO fighting the battle -- a name issue in court, fall into this? I think we should have a page for people to offer and contribute. In ICANN, this is all about community work and no one owns the ownership alone, and should decide who can participate and who cannot." Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Where was -- who was that last comment from?

STEVE SHENG: I think -- Ajay Data.

JIM GALVIN: I'm sorry. Jane --?

STEVE SHENG: Ajay Data. Ajay.

JIM GALVIN: Oh, Ajay Data. Okay. Thank you. I want to think about that for a bit. Let me go to Julie, next, and then Rod.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks. Julie Hammer. Just one of the points I want to make about the type of material that the members of the work party will get visibility of is not just necessarily confidential data, but they will be deeply involved in specifying the requirements for the studies and, therefore, the work that is to be contracted.

                         And so, we've got to be very conscious that we don't create a situation where potential bidders to that work have an inside running and perceived inequity from -- when viewed externally

by the community. So, that's the other aspect, I think, of confidential work that the work party might be doing.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Julie. Rod, then Michael.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Rod Rasmussen. I lost my train of thought thinking about some of the things that were just said, so other than it's -- we're getting a long on this topic, so we probably need to wrap this soon, too. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Rod. Michael, then Warren.

MICHAEL CASADEVALL: So, I'm somewhat fundamentally concerned that -- because of the use of confidential information, the results will be nonreproducible -- because doesn't that compromise the entire point? Because that means someone, you know, a member of the public, who may be looking at this, is not going to be able to follow the information or conclusions polled. Because it's happening behind closed doors, it's open, in name only.

Now, I realize that confidential information has a role to play, but if the conclusions that the working group comes to cannot be supported without that information, what's the point of having it open? I mean -- and I'm just throwing that out there as a question -- you know, a general question.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Michael. Can I put Rod back? He remembers his train his thought. Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: So, two things. Rod Rasmussen. Two things -- I want to respond to that last point and I think it's important -- I'll do that first, and then I'll do my other point. And, hopefully, I'll still remember it. So, I think I brought this up at that the session yesterday -- we're doing this as an open project, so that we can bring in people who are concerned about the process, etc. At the end of the day, we're providing advice to the Board as SSAC, right?

So, there may be things that we find out that are based on confidential information; it is still our duty as SSAC to provide that information to the Board. Even if it is not 100 percent reproducible by the public, or by somebody who was a participant in the work party. I don't know if we'll get to that situation or not, but we have to realize that. And I would

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

probably say, if there are such conclusions, then we should specify them within the conclusions themselves. But we can't not do work based on the fact that we have some information. We do this on a regular basis for SSAC work.

So, I don't want -- and we shouldn't even be upfront that. The other point I was going to make is on the "how tall you must be to ride this ride" comment. What we're trying to do there, and my concern about this is not about excluding technical experts, or excluding anybody -- you know, if they're -- in a perfect world, everybody who applied to help do this work would come with the best of intentions and have actually something to contribute.

Past experience working on various PDPs, throughout the ICANN community, proves that, oftentimes, some participants have another agenda for joining a work party. This is an SSAC work party; we're not going to put up with that kind of nonsense. So, being upfront about it and keeping people people out is one methodology. There are other methodologies for dealing with this, and we could do something around the -- "take the person off the ride."

I will point out, though; it's really hard to take a person off a roller-coaster once it's started without doing some sort of damage. So, if we're talking about a Merry-Go-Round, maybe

we can do that, but that analogy doesn't work so well -- a roller-coaster may be more appropriate for our work party. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. I have two more people in the queue, and then I want to draw a line here, and I want to try to summarize, with an attempt at making an assertion about next steps to see what kind of objections we get, or support we get in the work party. So, Warren, then Jay.

WARREN KUMARI: So, Warren Kumari. I mean the whole point of confidential data is that it's confidential, and it's kind of in the name. And I might be fine to share confidential information with a small group of five or six people that I trust. Once the group becomes 10 people, I trust the group a lot less. Once it becomes 15 or 20, you kind of lose trust in it completely, right? Trust is a) not transitive; and b) you lose it exponentially, as a the size of the group increases.

So, if we have any sort of confidential group, and we have it where it gets any sort of size behind it, it immediately becomes not a confidential anymore. There's no point in having it, because people just won't submit data. I mean, I have a bunch of data that would potentially be useful. It would be very hard

to share with a group that is the standard size of an SSAC work party, but I might be able to make that happen.

If it becomes larger and random other people join -- so, when I say random people, who say that they're interested and that much height to them, then it immediately becomes, basically, infeasible to provide it, in which case, why bother having it at all? You know, if it's confidential, it's confidential. If it's not confidential, it's public -- and then, why bother having it?

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Warren. Jay, and then I will try to summarize here.

JAY DALEY: Thank you. Jay Daley. I'm coming to the view, we may need more structure around this -- than we currently have. We may need a group within the group that does such things as specify work for contractors, which is isolated from anybody who may benefit from knowing about that. We may need, again, a group within a group that authorizes access to confidential data.

And finally, we may need to consider a specific process of reproducibility that is inserted at some point within this process, so that -- because I can understand the need for it, but it cannot happen in an unmanaged fashion, I think. And, clearly, having

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

someone as full part of the process for the sole process of reproducibility, will actually be quite problematic. And so, I think we may need to think that through on those sort of issues.

JIM GALVIN:

Okay. Thank you, Jay. For remote participants, mostly, as we are at an ICANN meeting, there is a standard coffee break period that starts in 10 minutes. And I'm going to suggest that we actually plan to take that break here in this work party for those 15 minutes, until 10:30. Partly, because chair's prerogative -- I could use the bio-break. I don't know about anybody else.

But -- excuse me -- with that in mind, let me try to summarize what I think I've heard and, you know, please, as always -- I know that SSAC members know this, but for the rest of the community here -- if I get it wrong, you should just tell me. You know, don't be shy. I know that our work party members are not shy -- and try to suggest some next steps.

And again, if you don't like that, you know, please suggest something different. I'm really just trying to find a way to make some progress, here, on this point, and get to someplace. We have an obvious -- I think in some sense, we have some open questions that might create problems that we don't know.

You know, this falls into the category of, we don't know what we don't know -- so, we're suggesting right upfront, that maybe there's going to be data and things that are going to happen that, you know, we can't expose. We're suggesting upfront that we might make conclusions that we somehow can't support in the report.

All of this is interesting. We actually do say this in the project risks -- at the bottom of the project plan -- so, we're sort of already stating upfront, and maybe we just have to be more explicit about that and expand a little better. We do have an insufficient data risk at the end of the project plan. I think that encompasses, you know, these couple of points here.

And we also have in there, in those risks, a comment about unexpected things happening in the project.   We learned something that we didn't expect to learn and that just puts us in an awkward place. I don't know how -- we're not necessarily going to be able to create rules for dealing with all of those situations. It is useful to point out to the community that those things exist and they're going to happen, and we're just going to have to deal with them as they happen.

I think that on the issue of dealing with data within the work party -- I mean, SSAC has, as part of its operational procedures, the ability to deal with that. It may very well be that we will have

to carve out small groups of people to deal with data that we might learn, for whatever reason -- maybe partly related to the statement of interest; that's why we have them. Because, as Rod had said earlier, there might be competitive interests in play, and so, we may actually, explicitly, have to exclude someone for some reason there. We'll have to deal with those issues if they come up.

And then, we'll have to see where that takes us, and how best to deal with that. We do have a discussion group. We are talking about having a discussion group that's currently implementation is a mailing list. We do have some details to resolve, with respect to making sure that we can make it harder for people to confuse which mailing list they're sending things to. We get that problem; we'll take that onboard and figure out how to deal with that on the -- inside the collective admin committees for dealing with the group. But it's a way for the community to stay involved.

Another point to make is, this work party, because it's an SSAC party -- SSAC, as a body, is an advisory committee. It is important to keep in mind that wherever we get to in our work product, it is just advice. We will do the best that we can. We will support it the best that we can. You know, maybe, we'll provide more information to the Board; although, I would like to

hope we wouldn't go there. We've never done that, so far. That doesn't feel right to me, from an SSAC point of view. Whatever work product we produce should be the same for the Board as it is for the community.

But that's a question; it's an interesting question to raise, and we'll have to resolve that issue later. So, it's important to keep that in mind. We're going to do the best that we can do, and then the community gets to decide what they're going to do with our advice when they get it. One last comment before I start proposing next steps, here, is reminding us that we are going to do public comment periods at key points along this project. We have at least identified three key points along the project -- actually, four, I guess. Well, five. Because this project proposal is one key point where we are explicitly soliciting comments from the community.

So, it's a checkpoint, if you will for the community to keep up with what we're doing, and you know, ask questions, and bring issues that they think we need to pay attention to that might have been overlooked. Three other key points are, after each of the work-studies that we're looking for, we will say something about the work product out of those work-studies.

I don't know exactly what that's going to look like. It was suggested yesterday, in the cross-community session, that there

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

might be interim conclusions or, you know, we might presage some recommendations that we're going to make based on work-study reports. I don't know if that's going to happen. I don't know what the form of the actual work product that comes out of each study will take. But we will produce something, so that it's a checkpoint to the community so they can see where we are, and they will have an explicit opportunity to offer comments and suggestions and questions, concerns to us about how we're progressing.

So, we will stay in touch with the community, in general, even if you're not in the work party. And that will be, yet, another opportunity for people to raise questions about any confidentiality issues that may or may not be present. We'll have to see them as they come along. The last public-comment period of the five that I said exist is, of course, the final work product. SSAC will undertake something we've never done before, which is, when we produce our final report, we will go through an ordinary ICANN public-comment period, take that back onboard, and, you know, analyze those comments and respond to them and address those comments in a final work product that we produce.

So, you know, they'll be plenty of opportunity for engagement with the community. Having said that, suggestions for next

steps forward, and then maybe that's a good time to take a break and let everybody sort of cogitate on that. So, I'll get the last word, and we'll sort of cut it off there, for a break. I think that I'm coming around to the idea -- I understand we need to do two things.

First, I want to focus on those words that were up there about invited guests. So, if you could put those words back in the screen there, right where we were, that you had a moment ago -- the suggestion for words for invited guests. That sentence there, which suggests that, from an SSAC point of view, we want invited guests to have made a contribution to related work or current work in name collisions. I don't know if we can wordsmith that in any way, but I'm beginning to feel like -- I like that as a singular statement.

What I would propose adding to it, we might think about wordsmithing that a bit. I kind of like the way it's there, and I also don't want to go through the process of trying to define any of the phrases in there, like "related work." We got a comment about that. I really want to leave it open. Let the community decide what they think is relevant.

I think that people who want to participate in the work party should join the discussion group, and they should be active there, and they should make some kind of contribution. In

addition, we are going to have the pro forma -- the form that, for anyone who just wants to make a material contribution of data and such -- we're going to get to that discussion next. We haven't gotten to that here. That's a third item on our agenda -- you know, they should absolutely contribute something definite and material to the work party.

And I think the work party will take on the job of paying attention to those in the discussion group, and if there's an active person there, who's actually contributing in some significant way, I would like to think, and propose, that we will invite them to the work party and make them part of things. In the same way, if someone makes a material contribution of data in some way, based on the discussion we're going to have next, you know, the work party will undertake the idea of -- maybe we'll invite them to the work party, so that they can be a part of things.

So, the way to get on to the work party, if you think that you're interested, is to actually participate and join and be a part of things. So, I'm thinking that next steps here -- there's two next steps -- one is to create the mapping we talking about earlier between the SSAC's terminology of invited guest, and what's more relevant to the community. Use the word from the Board

resolution of technical expert, and we'll create some mapping about all of that -- and that's what we'll put in the project plan.

So, we'll take that as a future action, here, in the work party. I don't want to wordsmith that here, but maybe someone here wants to make that contribution to our mailing list. We'll start some words and talk about that. The second part is to add to this, guidelines for whatever we end up calling it -- at the moment, I'm saying, technical expert -- the specific, not only that you contribute, but one way to contribute and one required way to contribute is to join the discussion group and be active there.

And the rest, we simply leave, because it's an SSAC work party. We already have our operational procedures that say how we do this. I completely accept the fact and acknowledge upfront that those are ambiguous and incomplete, but that's -- you know, given all of the other transparency and openness mechanisms that exist, which I had mentioned before; in particular, the discussion group and public comment. I think that that's sufficient and we just let it stand as is.

Now, I know I just said an awful lot and dumped it on. Let me do take a moment to open a queue for -- from clarification -- if anybody has a clarifying question or comment to make, we'll take those, and then we'll break after that for a short bit.

Anyone? Let me look in the Adobe Connect. I'm not seeing anything there. Steve, anything that we need to notice there? No hands in the room?

Okay. Then, it is actually, exactly, quarter past the hour here, by my watch. Let's take a 15-minute break, and we will reconvene at half past the hour. I assume we'll kind of leave things open here, in terms of the Adobe Connect room and stuff. So, thanks everyone. We'll come back and we'll take one brief session of closing comments about this issue -- give people a chance to think about my summary and see if there's any more discussion to have about that and, otherwise, we'll move on to the third agenda item. Thank you.

[COFFEE BREAK]

JIM GALVIN: Just a reminder to folks in the room that we will pick up at half past the hour, and that's in just a couple of minutes. [AUDIO BREAK]

JIM GALVIN: Okay. If the people in the room could take your seats, please; we're going to get started. [AUDIO BREAK]

JIM GALVIN: Again, if we could take our discussions outside, or please take your seats. Okay. I'm sorry. I'm not seeing enough movement. [Clap, Clap] Let's go, folks. Outside or sit down, please.

ROD RASMUSSEN: I'll stand here. [AUDIO BREAK]

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Quick check with staff, we're ready to go forward, recording's on now?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We're ready.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. All right. Thanks again to everyone. We will pick up our meeting. I do want to open any discussion, with respect to the summary that I tried to offer about this whole question of invited guests. Anyone want to make any additional comments, questions, concerns? Otherwise, we'll take what I had proposed as next steps as what we're going to do, and we'll just, you know, add that to our list here, and pick that up going forward. And I'm not seeing any comments or questions.

All right. So, we'll go to the next item on our agenda, which is the discussion of the data submission form, and we'll put that up on the list. Please put the link to this to the document in the chat room, make sure it's available to our remote community and other folks in the room here, so you can look at this. I don't know that there's a lot of discussion to have about this. I mean, quite frankly, even in our work party up to this point, we've had very little discussion about it; although, it's been pointed to people.

For the most part, it's just process, if you will. Our intent here, with this work party, is to provide a way for anyone to give us whatever contribution they want to give us, and to do it in a somewhat formal way. So, this is, essentially, a coversheet that we would expect someone to complete for any data or other type of contribution that they want to provide. There will be a mechanism on the community project website for folks to fill out this form. The form has a way for you to either give us your data, or to provide a pointer, a reference, to where your data is, or if we need to talk to you -- I mean, there's a spot there for you to explain how access to your contribution is supposed to be.

So, we're not trying to make this overly formal. We just want the cover sheet, and then somebody will get back to you if we need to about actually getting the data. You can see that little data

comment box, down there at the bottom, now, on the screen -- "attach data files, weblinks, or information."

So, we're just trying to find a way for people to tell us they have something. The only other thing to think about is, we will require -- if you scroll up a little bit, you'll see there's a reference there to the statement of interest. Everyone will be required to attach a statement of interest with their data. And so, that form will have to be filled out as part of the cover sheet.

And then, again, it's a totally open thing. Our intent, here, is to very carefully track everything that's made as a formal contribution to the work party. So, we will have -- you know, you can imagine as simple -- we have not yet worked out the details of this, but conceptually, you know, you just have a spreadsheet, which lists everything that you got, and all the documentation and stuff that goes with it. So, I see a hand going up here. So, Jay.

JAY DALEY: All right. I'm just saying in the chat -- Jay Daley -- in the Adobe Connect room, somebody's asked for a link to this document. I don't know whether you should pass that on --

JIM GALVIN: I did actually ask in the beginning for someone to put that there -- did they not do that -- it's there? Okay.

STEVE SHENG: Right-hand side of the pod.

JIM GALVIN: Oh, it's on the right-hand side in the session information. It's not actually in the chat room. My apologies if people didn't see the reference there. It's in that pod -- they're called pods in Adobe Connect -- down there on the right-hand side, session information. We seem to be getting a complaint that it doesn't exist. Can anybody click on that clink and make it work? It works? Okay. All right.

Okay. So, I think I've filled time here a little bit. That's the introduction to what this is and the source. Open for any questions or comments from anyone about this, you know, cover sheet. And, again, the inclusion of the statement of interest are really the two critical things here, and we are going to track everything.

Is there any more discussion? Any questions, comments, concerns? From anyone? Good. This is going to be a very short

discussion -- although, I'm seeing frowns over here. Did you want to talk? And you are?

WARREN KUMARI: Warren Kumari. Yep, Warren Kumari, and I guess, just sort of reiterating that, the way that the discussions are going so far, and the sort of scale of the group, I think it's becoming increasingly unlikely that people are going to be willing to contribute data that they're not willing to just publish publicly.

You know, I've got data that I had thought I might be willing to share, but there's no possible way that I could get our privacy people to sign off on it. And I, personally, wouldn't be comfortable with it anymore. And I think that that's going to be one of the big issues -- is the people who I think have the best set of data for this are either applicants, who've seen issues where there have been collisions -- but, you know, they don't want to talk about those, because it doesn't really reflect well on their choice of string, or, what potential risk has been exposed by doing that? And there's been a large number of those, which are definitely not reported to ICANN, for various reasons.

And then, the other major data source, I think, is going to be resolver operators. I mean, TLDs and the root C, maybe -- you know, if I, as a resolver operator, I get a million queries per day

for .internal, the root will see one. So, you know, the set of data, I think, is -- well, the source of data that would be ideal would be resolver data, and resolver operators are going to be very uncomfortable sharing a lot of this. So, the major sources of data, I think, aren't really going to be willing to participate.

JIM GALVIN: So, thank you for that. I take your point that we are going to have to deal with people who may have data and may not want to just give it to us, and we are going to have to deal with that issue. You know, we know that we need that data. We've been saying that to ourselves upfront all along. We need resolver data. We're going to have to figure out how to get at that data and what it takes to do that.

I don't have an answer for you right now, but I do want to believe that we will find a solution inside this work party -- whatever it is that we need to do to find a set of people who can do some, you know, their own analysis of that data. And maybe, as we've said before, if other resolver, large resolver operators want to contribute data, but they want to have somebody, you know, a part of the work party to help manage their data and how it's used -- that's something that we'll consider.

I don't know. I should probably try not to invent solutions. Let me take a step back from all of that. Yes, the intent of this is not -- this is just an opportunity. Whether or not people use it, is a different thing. Inside the work party, we will go out and try to seek data. Part of the work-studies is actually to go ask for data and to make those kinds of arrangements to get it and make stuff happen.

We will have to solve that problem as we go -- whether or not we can access to it. If people volunteer data, that's great. If they don't, we're going to find a way to ask the people we know have data that we need or want. And we will find a way to work with them to get access to that data, or not. So, I have a queue here, to Jay, then Robert.

JAY DALEY: Jay Daley. I think it would be useful for us to consider whether answers to this form are going to be public or not. So, not the data, but simply the things that people write here. Because we may be able to encourage people by more detailed questions about confidentiality, which are, in themselves, confidential answers. What is your concern about the confidentiality, so that we understand?

You know, how few a number of people do you want it restricted to? What level of NDA or this contract do you want? Some of those things, and I think that, as it stands, if the answers are going to be public, that may put people off even telling us those things.

JIM GALVIN: So, let me just say that back, just to make sure that I understand, for clarity. I think you said two things. One is about the form altogether. Will the forms be public? Anybody who's -- will the answers to the forms be public?

And that's a really good question. I guess, my going-in position was the idea that they would be, but now, then, you're raising that question because your second point is that, maybe people don't want that to be, because that's part of the confidentiality of the data, and is there a way for us to deal with that? Okay. Okay. We'll let Julie jump the queue, and then I have Robert -- and Mike, you had your hand up?

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks. Julie Hammer. The way the form, at this stage, was proposed to be used was that if there was a confidentiality consideration, that that would be part of a confidentiality agreement, which would not be visible. And that all that would

be visible here is that there was such a thing. If that allays the concern, that's how it was envisaged. If there's an issue with there even being the existence of an agreement for that data, then we might need to revisit that. Thank you. Robert, then Mike.

ROBERT GUERRA: I think one of the goals that we've talked -- Robert Guerra for the record -- I think one of the things we've talked about, it's important for the work party to have a list of sources of data.

And so, I think it's kind of to Warren's point, and to a few others, is that those who have data, it's good for the working party to know who's got that type of data, and they should maybe -- in this, we should not only have it out there, but we should proactively go to groups like you and others -- and part of questions that we might want to incorporate -- if they're not already there, and I think they may be incorporated there -- is, you know, what are the conditions that they could share? Do they want a large group, or a short group?

And we may want to ask a question that's not there now, which is, would you be okay for some of this information -- if you don't want to list a name, at all -- Julie, to your point -- if it's

confidential, it's fine. We may just want to ask the questions, if it's okay.

 And to Warren's point, it just may be totally confidential, but I think we should have an exhaustive list, and also have a sense of the terms and conditions to share with the group, do you want a big group? Do you want a short group? So, we're just aware, and then the work party can make a decision what to do next. But I think just having that data list available would be particularly helpful.

JIM GALVIN: So, let me just respond briefly to that. I think that -- part of what you said anyway -- I like the simplicity of this form, and I think that I heard you suggesting that we might want to have a more explicit set of questions about the confidentiality and ask them about that.

Speaking only for myself, liking the simplicity of the form and the fact that there is a spot down there for, you know, say whatever you want to say about confidentiality, I'm thinking that, if people want -- they just want to talk to us -- they want to say, "Gee, I might have something interesting to you. You know, I'd like to speak to someone about how to deal with confidentiality,"

I'm thinking that's better. I'd rather just leave it open, and if people have something they want to say to us, they can say it. And if they don't, then that's fine. I guess, let me put that question out to the group, as to -- if people really want to make that distinction or not. Do we want to turn this form into a lengthy, detailed list of questions, or not? And I'll give you a chance to respond -- and then Mike and --

ROBERT GUERRA: Jim, if I may, just a very quick follow-up. So, I'm fine with that section that you have there. It's just in the stuff in the brackets -- we may just want to add, you know, "Just give us more information, in terms of how you might want to envision it."

But I think keeping it simple is helpful. But I think we just need to know what type of answers we're going to get back. Instead of just, it's confidential -- just give us a sense of the terms and conditions and might be -- you know, might allow you to share this.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Okay. Thank you for that. Ram, you want to insert yourself, and then --?

RAM MOHAN: Thanks. This is Ram Mohan. Jim, I thought for this exercise, perhaps, the most effective way to go about this is to, first, solicit input from those who are likely to provide data and ask them what their input is, before we get everybody else to opine. Because, if the form is not usable for them, then we're not going to have the data that we can actually do any analysis with.

So, I think we should go to them first, and then the rest of us, who are going to be on the receiving end, can say, this is good enough, or not. Because otherwise, I think we run the risk of building the perfect form that will be perfectly unusable for those who will be providing the data.

JIM GALVIN: That's -- you know, I like that. You're right. Thank you very much for that. You know, we should focus on getting comments from people who are likely to have data for us, who are in this room, and so, I'm putting Danny and Warren, here, to really think about that and help contribute to this form. And anyone else who we should tag, who might have data that -- really we'd like to hear your opinion as to whether you have anything to say about the form.

I do want to try to honor a queue here, a little bit. So, I just wanted to tell you guys to say something when it comes up. We

had Mike, Steve, and then -- no, I -- oh, you're down at the bottom -- Mike, Steve, Jay. You were already there. But I already had Mike and Steve in the queue. Okay. Let me try to manage the queue. I'm sorry. And -- rather than letting too many people insert. Mike's been waiting awhile.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So, as far as the form goes, I think one thing that should probably be here is the releasability of conclusions on this data. You know, because sometimes the data itself is completely proprietary, but sometimes it's okay to like make a generalized conclusion that can be public, that can be like -- if you ask a resolver, one of the major DNS resolvers, you know, "What sort of things do you see for the top-level domains, in general, you know, queries"?

That, we may be able to include the end result, if not the data and the process leading up to it. And that would go a long a way to allowing said information to go out into the public and reduce the amount of smoke-and-mirrors, I should say. Like the working group can get all the questions; build the conclusion; but as long as we can get that conclusion out, and at least a small idea of how it was reached, that would probably help alleviate a lot of the concerns from a public perspective that,

you know, we're being as open as possible, given the constraints of the real world.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you. Just to make sure that I understand your point -- I think what you're suggesting is explicitly, in some way, either asking or maybe -- similar to what Robert was saying earlier -- expanding a bit on the suggestion in that confidentiality of data suggestion text that's there -- asking people to say something about, "I'm willing to give you this data," but explicitly calling out the difference between, whether the data can be used by the work party versus can the data be included in the final work product? Is that what you're suggesting, or were you saying something different?

MICHAEL CASADEVALL: More specifically, what conclusions can I draw -- can I state publicly from this data, from it -- because, you know, you may get a lot of data about, you know, how many requests per second a DNS provider gets, which I could understand, they would want to keep that proprietary -- so, you know, there's certain generalities that may want to make it out that -- determine what we can and can't -- and this may not be something that can be explicitly put on the form because those

questions may not be known until the data's all comprised and, you know, the relevant minds have gone through it, but I think it's a point to get that, trying to get as much as data out into the public, I think, is an important goal, and it also would work well for the -- I think it was John who said it -- like, you know, having the very small islands, which people have the full data, instead of the full working group, because of the -- just the inherent issues of distributing confidential information. Because, then, those people can build it, and then send it to other people from the working group, and then, perhaps, even further out into the public. So, I'm not sure if my point's coming across succinctly, but --

JIM GALVIN: I think I understand it. I'm going to let the discussion go on here a bit, and see what other questions and support we get from others. So, I have Steve Sheng, Jay, Warren.

STEVE SHENG: I have a comment by Steve Crocker in the chat. "What sort of data are we looking for? Do we have a set of questions that are guiding our interest? Or are we asking the community to provide whatever data they think might be relevant to the general topic of name collisions?

JIM GALVIN:	So, part of the answer to your question, Steve, is a part of Work-Study One, where we are going to be setting up the rules for the datasets and actually examining the question of what kind of data that we want to get. And we want to set up and prepare for collecting data that we will ask for in Work-Study Two.
	So, the initial part of the work party, itself, is to lay out our best guess, initially, at the kind of data that we want. I mean, we sort of have the obvious set of things that we do know about, and then we'll have some more brainstorming discussions about, what else might be related that we want to go get.
	So, I mean, we've talked about getting the data that ICANN already has, with respect to name collisions that it knows about. We know about resolver data, we can get root-server data; and, again, repeat some of what the JAS group has already done.
	So, those are sort of the obvious things that are on our list. And they'll be other things as we kick off this project and think more about what we want in Work-Study One, and then get to Work-Study Two that'll go get the data. But we'll spend a lot of our time in working through Work-Study One, thinking about the data that we want to collect and where we're going to get it from. So, thank you. Over to Jay, and then Warren.

JAY DALEY: Thank you. Jay Daley.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Did you turn your mic off?

JAY DALEY: Oh, thank you. Jay Daley. Just a reminder for conflict of interest -- that my company is -- one of its contracts it has is with ICANN on their open-data initiative. One of the things that I have come across whenever dealing with datasets in this way, and data governance, is that minimal sets of questions are never enough. It always needs a much more detailed data-asset inventory to be created.

There are multiple governance frameworks for doing that with -- for example, people don't understand the different natures of confidentiality -- that we ply the difference between aggregation and access control, and other things. And I think that I agree with the general point, previously, that we should discuss this with dataset owners before rushing in with something too detailed.

But I do that that the output needs more structure around it, because it's going to be important for the third-parties to

understand that we take this seriously. And the more we have thought that through in our form and discussed it, then the more it is apparent that we have taken it seriously, and that we understand the implications.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you for that. Warren. You had your hand up?

WARREN KUMARI: Yes, and I've got no idea why anymore.

JIM GALVIN: Well, at one point, I had tagged you to say something about whether the form, at all, would help you, especially given what Jay just said.

WARREN KUMARI: Actually, I do know one thing that I sort of going to say --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Who are you?

WARREN KUMARI: I'm still Warren Kumari. So, I also help B Root -- USC run B Root, and I know one of the things that they would be willing to contribute is, instead of just providing data, have a thing where the community, or work group, or whatever could ask them specific questions. Like, how many queries do you see for string X? And then, sort of, under some sort of contract, provide that information back. So, that's not really covered by any of our data-sharing, whatever, agreements. These are more targeted question, person answers -- you know, in a public forum, but to private questions.

JIM GALVIN: So, I think my takeaway from that -- and I don't know that I know the answer to it yet, but I think what I hear you suggesting is, somehow we need to allow for the possibility that someone might not share data, but they might share analysis of that data for us, if we could ask them a question.

And, you know, can we capture that in some way on this form, so that people who are, you know, would be willing to do work with their data on our behalf, could be given that opportunity? So, that's what I heard, and you're nodding your head, so we're -- I'm agreeing with that. Okay. Merike.

MERIKE KAEO: Merike Kaeo. So, this discussion leads me to believe that it might be interesting to make sure that the different types of data would have more context surrounded to it. So, considering some kind of data-classification standards, so you can determine some uniformity of the data that is shareable and what is confidential versus not.

JIM GALVIN: I know, at least part of the answer to what you're saying is going to be in Work-Study One, right. Because one of the things we want to talk about is the datasets that we are going to take on -- how are we going to manage those datasets?

And I think the confidentiality question that you're raising -- I think that's also covered in Work-Study One, or it preps for it, because we had this phrase in there about rules for the datasets. And I would say that that should cover the confidentiality question, but maybe not. I'm just -- you know, sort of interpreting. Please go ahead.

MERIKE KAEO: Yeah. I would just encourage people to also look at initiatives that are in the security community, overall, with data sharing. Because there's been a lot of discussion, in terms of knowing what you can share and when, and how you can act upon it. And

especially some of the information that's come out of the first working groups -- the Consortium of CERTS.

JIM GALVIN: Let me ask for your help here. You're suggesting an action for us, so -- I think -- and what are you saying? That we should go reach out to somebody to get what -- their rules and what they've done to process data, or --?

MERIKE KAEO: So, some of us in the SSAC are already quite familiar with what's called TLP, the traffic-light protocol. And while I'm not saying that maybe you should, you know, engage with that particular mechanism, but at least to look at what's been done in the past when you're looking at how you provide different classifications of sharing information. And especially what is confidential versus what can be shared with a limited set of constituents versus what can actually be publicly available.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. So, just to play that back to make sure I understand -- so, the action for the work party -- and I'm not certain it's something we need to do now, so this is a question back to you -- but, certainly, no later than -- when we actually do kick off in June,

and we're beginning to set up the statement of work and activities for Work-Study One, we need to go look for that input and take that into consideration as to how we manage our Work-Study One. So, when we're ready to do that, we definitely want to execute on that particular action.

MEIKE KAEO: Yes. My comment was to have that as a consideration as you get started.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you. All right. Not seeing any other hands, here. So, where are we? We've heard discussion about this form, and I think what I've heard is more about how we process this. The objective of this form, from my point of view -- and I guess I'll assert this again, and we'll test this, so people should step up and comment if you disagree -- this is intended to be a cover sheet over contributions that people make.

However, I think one of the discussion points that we just had, here, is that really what this should be is a form for someone to either give us a particular contribution, whether that's data or some other material contribution that they want to give us -- but it should be a way for people to say, "I might have something

interesting to you. Can I, please, talk to someone about whether or not it is, and what it might take to do that?"

So, to really have some discussion one-on-one with somebody about the confidentiality section. So, let me just say that one more time -- this is form is intended to serve two purposes, I think -- is what I'm taking out of the discussion that we've had here -- one purpose is the original one we started with, which was how to make a specific material contribution to this project, whatever that is.

And the second is, you may have something of interest to us, and you would like to talk to someone about whether or not that's useful and how you might do that. And I think that that's what I've heard. So, I now see Jay, Julie, and Mike. Thank you.

JAY DALEY: Jay Daley. Just very briefly, could you then set up a -- Warren, a meeting a between the people who would make decisions in your organization and Jim, or others, to discuss some of these details about confidentiality?

WARREN KUMARI: Maybe. I mean, this is going to require -- any sort of data-sharing thing is going to require me going along to talk a bunch of

lawyers for a long time, and convincing them that this is anyway a good idea. And their heads are all going to go, "Phoof," because -- I mean the privacy stuff around our resolver data is incredibly, incredibly sensitive, and so, for a formal thing, it's incredibly difficult.

For an informal thing, it's slightly less difficult, but, you know, once we have these sorts of things, it has to become a formal thing. And the chance of getting data out of most public resolvers, I think, is becoming increasingly small. So, I mean I could try and set up lawyer discussions, but it's going to be entertaining.

JAY DALEY: Yeah. So, Jay Daley, again. The purpose, not being to come out with a formal agreement, but the purpose being to inform us when it comes to the production of forms that may lead to that.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you. Julie.

JULIE HAMMER: Thanks. Julie Hammer. This form was intended to be the simple form, by which people with a view, an opinion, information, some data that is not necessarily confidential -- might be able to

submit it. And I think if we can keep that simple purpose in mind, but recognize that for the sets of confidential data, we really have a much more comprehensive process that we need to follow, which includes formal, legal confidentiality agreements that ICANN is already familiar with doing, but that might still be complex to negotiate.

What I would suggest we might be able to do is -- here, on the blank form, under confidentiality of data, we could put a note, "If your data is confidential, and you believe will need to be covered by various special handling, then please contact this" -- whatever it is, email address -- whatever we deem to be the point of contact and that will be pursued separately to this form. Perhaps, that's a way we could go with it.

WARREN KUMARI: I mean, one of the things that I think -- sorry, still Warren Kumari. One of the things I think that we're going to have to do a much a better job on, is trying to explain to people who have the data, why they would want to contribute this. I mean, what's their incentive? It's a huge, or potentially huge, chunk of work. It opens them to a lot of legal liability and loss of trust, because privacy around DNS data is a very, very touchy subject -- for very good reasons. I mean, you expose all sorts of stuff in your DNS lookups.

And so, for the majority of people who have the data, especially people who are TLD applicants and who run TLDs, there is no upside to sharing this data; there's potentially costs and legal risk. And, you know, people who run -- many of the people who run TLDs would like to be able to run additional TLDs, in the future, and this is not particularly likely to expose, everything's fine; let's just move on with life. So, there's a lot of downsides, and I'm having a hard time seeing the upsides, other than, because it's the right thing to do.

JULIE HAMMER: Just to respond directly to that point. The upside might be that by understanding the cause of the collisions and studying that and analyzing it, it might be possible to come up with mitigation proposals that actually allow that name to be delegated.

WARREN KUMARI: So -- Warren Kumari. Yeah, I mean that potentially is an upside or, you know, potentially, maybe an upside for people who want to apply for more. If you're only a resolver operator, like OpenDNS, or you know Quad9, many of them view the entire new gTLD process as not necessarily the best thing ever. And they have no upside, other than -- so, you know, if we could

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM
61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

come up with a short spiel on how this would benefit them, or why this is not dangerous to them, it might be helpful.

JIM GALVIN:

So, I want to try to stay away from too many solution proposals, because I don't want to distract from that, but something that -- nonetheless, I'm going to offer up something that occurs to me. Work Study Two is all about doing analysis of the data that we are able to have, and one of the things we did just say to ourselves is, maybe one of the things that we want from people is not the data, but would they be willing to do analysis of it -- but maybe the next step here is, also to be considered is -- would some of these people who have data be willing to allow a third-party, who would be contracted to do Work Study Two, to do some of this analysis -- could something be worked out, where that party doing the analysis could get access to the data -- they would work that out, however they needed to; and then they would do the analysis that we're asking them to do.

Again, just trying to respond to the idea at there's no upside for someone to do a lot of work for us that doesn't give them any direct benefit, but they might be willing to facilitate this group, because it does have benefits -- what this is group is doing -- and, you know, would they be willing to let others do analysis on their data in some way, or not? I don't know. I just put that out

there as something to think about. Let me go to Mike, Robert, Jay.

MICHAEL CASADEVALL: So, this may be handled by the confidentiality agreement, but I do think there should be one other box -- is, specifically, how the data may be used and any analytics coming from it can be published. Because if the data's coming in, we should also know how the data can go back out. Because we could get a bunch of data, and if we can't say a word about it, except as a private message to the Board, it's something we should know for when the reports have to get ran at the end of the day. So -- just two cents there.

JIM GALVIN: I think I would agree that that's covered under confidentiality. I mean, we sort of have the phrase, confidential, you know, "Is the data confidential or can it be shared openly?" I think you're suggesting there's a third category in thereof, maybe they should tell us how it can be used or not used. Yeah. We could break that out, or we could just fold it in under part of -- the data's confidential, what does that really mean? and let them respond to that. Okay. I have Robert, then Jay, Steve.

ROBERT GUERRA: So, Robert Guerra. A couple of things. I think I mentioned earlier that it's just important to have a list of data sources, like Google and others. The other thing is whether we might be able to tap into it or not, but just having that list. And I think given to -- Jeff just made a comment, which I kind of agree with him -- it's 2018, and there may be sources we do not have access to. And that's a challenge, and that's something we may want to mention in the definition phase. We've identified there are 100 potential sources, and these are some of the problems that exist.

And so, for anyone that wants to do a study afterwards, they know that's a problem, and so, that's good. But we should do that exercise to be able to do that -- so, No. 1. No. 2, if we're asking about confidentiality and this is going to be signed, has anyone consulted ICANN legal? No. 2, we have GDPR -- this may now trigger.

And so, we may need -- at one point, when we're defining this, and we're ready to execute, we might have to send it to ICANN legal, and they may need to get an opinion on how to do it. We may want to do that on the ICANN side; that's one of the complexities of the project, which then would help us with others. Because then if we go to Google, and just saying, "Here's what our lawyers have told us," it might help get that data. So, that's just a complexity that we have discussed yet that may

need to be there. But I think those are two things that could be helpful.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. Thank you, Robert. I had a comment on your first one -- with respect to ICANN legal, let me just not let us get, you know, jump too much into that. I agree with you; ICANN legal's actually a point. I think what's interesting here is if there's going to be a confidentiality agreement between the source of the data and SSAC, SSAC would never sign that agreement; it would always be with ICANN, and we would have to figure out how that'd work.

So, you know, that is something that we will have to deal with. This pro forma form, here, is not to be signed. When we deal with confidentiality, there might be signatures that are involved. And you're right, then it'd be ICANN legal -- and you're absolutely right. I now remember what my other point was -- your first comment -- I want to bring that around and make sure we keep it open for discussion.

You made the comment about listing the data sources. We did still have the question of whether the submission of this form, so the submission of this cover sheet is going to be published, or not. Jay had raised that in the beginning. Robert is reiterating

that question. I don't want to lose track of that question. I want to have some more discussion about that, so that that does that.

ROBERT GUERRA: This is Robert Guerra again. To that point of the data sources, the way I see it is, it's private, but we just want to get a sense, a handle. Because in our definitions, first part, that's a challenge that we have that we just may want to be public about, and so that's a good thing to have.

And I think to the second, is that, if we're going to be engaging entities that have that, I think we might want to get some of the lawyers -- and if I think of SSAC members, Tara might be a good person to engage, because she is also at Google, she's at privacy -- maybe Don and others. They may just want to give us a sense of, what are some other things, just to help when we go down that path, because, again, we're designing something that we're going to engage with companies, and don't necessarily have that expertise right now. So, we may just want to run that through that cycle -- that's all. But thank you.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Robert. I have Jay, then Steve Sheng, and Danny.

DANNY MCPHERSON: Yeah, so Danny McPherson, SSAC. So, I just -- one of the things on the ICANN legal front is, my understanding of controlled interruption and the previous work that was done is that no one wanted to go further than controlled interruption, because of legal concerns on ICANN's part.

And no one wanted to obligate registry operators in a controlled-interruption period to have to report any of the information, which is exactly the point Warren's talking about -- about some of the most valuable data to that effect. And if ICANN has legal advice or observations around that, we might want to understand that before we go any further down this road. Because it's exactly what Warren's touching on, and what I think I see [inaudible] as well.

And then the only other thing I'll say -- and so I think that's a really important thing -- is that if ICANN has legal advice to that effect, then they probably ought to share that with us before we go asking people for data to that effect. And then, I was going to echo Warren's earlier points where we have data from the recursive level; certainly out roots, we've been collecting data for all applied-for names, you know, for a very long time; and Verisign's more than happy to provide that information, but we're going to have to make sure that we don't violate any privacy or, you know, regulatory rules when doing that.

And then the last thing, I guess I would way is that the other part of this, in my mind, is that there are at least three peer-reviewed documents on taxonomies and models for evaluating name collisions and the effects, and so forth -- and the intent of those systems, that I would see being submitted to this work group for consideration, as well as other analysis that Google and Verisign and lots of other folks have done to this effect.

And I think that I would envision that being submitted through this mechanism, as well -- not just raw data of transactions -- for consideration of the work party. So, we should probably keep that in mind. Thank you.

JIM GALVIN: I think one of the things that occur to me -- I'm going to make one summary point as I join together -- you know, Robert pressed us down this issue of, you know, getting ICANN legal involved, and others have talked about legal issues.   I'm beginning to sense that this form, probably needs to just turn into an opportunity for people to advise us that they might have something they want to do, and we're going to have to totally take offline -- you know, set up the discussions about, you know, with somebody -- we have to figure out what that process is.

You know, how can we work something out, so that you can make your contribution and everybody is happy? ICANN is happy, participants are happy and, of course, the person making the contribution. I just want to -- I'm beginning to sense that that's where we're getting to -- that this really just becomes a, "I may want to say something to you, so let's, please, have a discussion about it." I think that's where this form is headed for the moment. Okay. So, I have Jay, and then Steve.

JAY DALEY: Thank you. Jay Daley. I disagree. I'd see this the other direction. This form is okay for public data, but anybody who has any data that they think might be confidential is never going to fill anything out on this form. They will need significant details from us that shows that we understand the problem, let alone that shows something that they can agree to.

And so, we need to have that available upfront, directly for people to read, in some detail, to understand how we put that together, before they would even say to us, you know, "I might be willing to give you data."

JIM GALVIN: Interesting point. And I think that puts us, quite directly, in a place of having to get ICANN legal to create something that sets

expectations in some way, and I can't see that playing out as well as we might like. Okay. Next, we have Steve Sheng and Warren.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you. A few comments on the chat, on this. So, one from Ruben. In a case of public datasets, submissions that parties unaffiliated with the data originators should be accepted. And then, one example that Ruben gave is the DSC reports, accessible at root-server operation websites.

So, allow someone who is not affiliated with the original datasets to submit those as contribution data. There's a comment by Anne from IPC, "I think the discussion should be advised that any data that's being submitted, pursuant to a confidential agreement. That should be made -- a notification should trigger to the discussion group. So, even though the discussion cannot see the exact data, they know that it's being shared." There's a question -- so, those are the two -- yeah, thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. Part of my response to Anne, is I do want to keep open the question in this group. I think the issue that she's getting to there is, will there always be a list of people -- will we always

publish a list of people who have contributed data? Or is it possible that we're going to allow for the possibility that part of the confidentiality agreement is that we won't be allowed to say that we saw certain sets of data. I don't know that I have a position on that, but I want to keep that question open and see if people have anything to say about it. So, I have Warren, then Julie, then Jay.

WARREN KUMARI: So, Warren Kumari. One of the things I'm becoming increasingly concerned about is the fact that the very set of people who have data that will expose any sort of name collisions, are the very set of people who are not going to be willing to provide that data. It's the people who have the confidential data that can show whether or not this happened, and, you know, it's confidential data.

So, I'm concerned that the outcome of the work party is going to end up incredibly biased, because there will be no evidence of any issue, so therefore, everything must be fine. I don't really know how we solve that, other than by having a way that people who have confidential data might be willing to share it, but that's going to be incredibly, incredibly hard to achieve.

JIM GALVIN: Well, we did have as a risk in this project, insufficient data, down there at the bottom -- and, you know, I don't know that we're going to have all the answers here, but it is fair to remind ourselves that we are aware of this risk and we will have to find a way through this as we go along. Go ahead.

WARREN KUMARI: Yeah. Sorry, Warren Kumari, still. A very short follow-up from that is, there's a huge difference between having insufficient data and having a bunch of data, which is biased because the only people who are willing to provide it are those who have a certain set. And so, if it's -- so, often, you might not actually know that what you're seeing is not the full set, because you can't see the full set. So, it's not just insufficient data, it's insufficient of the right set, or a deluge of biased data that you can't tell is biased.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. It kind of falls into the category of, you don't know what you don't know. You don't know that you don't have all the data, because they're not telling you. Rod, did you want to insert, or you're just in the queue?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yes. Rod Rasmussen. And on this specific point, I think that one of the things we can do, short of naming people who we asked for data who refused to give it to us, which is, I think, the appropriate the measure here, but may not be acceptable by the community -- speaking my personal opinion there -- would be to describe the type of data that we tried to obtain in a generic form, and were unable to obtain, due to lack of willingness to share that data.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. So, rather than a name-and-shame, do a context sort of statement.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Well, I like name-and-shame, but --

JIM GALVIN: You like name-and-shame, I know. Can I just add you to the queue? So, Lyman and Mike. Okay. So, I have Julie, and then Jay.

JULIE HAMMER: Julie Hammer.   Yeah, just a very quick comment on the confidentiality agreement that you asked us to think about Jim.

As I said, each confidentiality agreement would need to be negotiated in detail, because every situation will be different, and that needs to be documented. So, there might be a general template, but each one would be individual to the group involved behind the scenes.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you, Julie. Jay, then Lyman.

JAY DALEY: Jay Daley. So, I go back to the structural complexity of this project and the multiple layers involved, and that our initial view of this, I think, was simplistic. And as we are examining and finding out the details, we may need to add more structure in this. So, in this particular case, for example, we may need to consider a sanitization model, where we have a contracted third-party that is trusted, that is given private data, that sanitizes it -- so that we can still produce what we need from it, but removes as much of the confidentiality issues as possible.

Now, that's adding structure, complexity, and cost, but that may be the only way that we are able to resolve this. I'm sorry. And the final point, of course, is that in our project plan, because we have this risk of insufficient data, we have specifically identified the need for a test system that can reproduce the equivalent

issues, and so that -- even if we cannot get the data, at the very least, we can attempt to try all of this ourselves, through something, where, by definition, we have no privacy issues, and we may be able to reproduce a large part of the issues otherwise.

JIM GALVIN: That's interesting. So, I want to capture two things that you said, and say them back, and make sure that you agree -- so that I've got this right, here. One thing that you said is, we should consider in our solution set, a trusted third-party who could anonymize or sanitize the data in some way, and make it useful -- and it's useful to keep that in mind. We had not actually included that in the project plan, explicitly, but it's useful to observe that that's a part of our solution set.

And the second thing that you said is -- and I'm going to characterize this in a different way than you said it -- if we got access to data, which is confidential in some way and we dealt with it however we we're going to deal with that -- and we analyze it and we discovered something, and yet, we can't share that data in anyway -- maybe, we can invent data that demonstrates the issue, and then use that as a way to support our conclusion, and -- okay, Jeff, is laughing at me. Yeah. He

does that all the time. I get it. Do you want to put your hand up? Can I add you to the queue? Or -- go ahead, insert yourself.

JEFFREY BEDSER: You know, the problem is, you're really after queue names, and the first thing that no one is ever going to give us -- quite rightfully so, in 2018 -- is queue names. And, you know, all the process in the world won't get over the fact that we all understand that queue names are a massive, massive privacy leak. And so, this entire exercise is going to flounder on "haven't got enough data," right from the word, "go." Inventing data is kind of mythology -- I'm sorry -- it just ain't going to work.

And so, you've really got a problem here, and I think your methodology of looking around the garbage dump of logs, trying to sift through that to get useful data is actually flawed -- and, quite frankly, almost the only way you're going to find data is to seed the system and look for yourself -- that way, you're not imposing on other people's privacy.

Now, that's a poor substitute, but it's better than inventing data. So, I kind of wonder about all of this -- kind of saying, "Back your garbage truck here, fill in the form, and dump the stuff." Yeah, right. Never going to happen. Not with data that's useful. I'm sorely tempted to invent some data that doesn't have any

collisions and dump it at your door and see what you do with it -- because you can't tell anymore. So, again, the bit of a reality check going on here, why aren't we invent this process, when we know full damn well that any real data is never going to get backed up against this door and dumped here?

JIM GALVIN: So, thank you for that reality check. I agree with you. Getting a lot of nodding heads in the room, as Jeff speaks -- no, you're absolutely right. You want to insert yourself, or can I add you to the queue?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Look to your left.

ROD RASMUSSEN: I'm violently in opposition to that.

JIM GALVIN: Oh. Oh, we have an opposition over here. Okay. I'll let you insert yourself for that.

ROD RASMUSSEN: So, yes, you were looking for queue names, but annex responses are very useful, right, and we have people actually tracking that and providing that data service, today. Yeah, I know -- kind of -- yes, I don't think it's completely useless. I think there's plenty of data out there that people have that are -- and for that matter, we have DITL data, right.

So, we're getting that -- those queries at the roots themselves. I know -- yeah, we're getting into technical precision here, but there is valuable data out there that people have, that they have created methodologies for sharing already, so I don't think we're barking, completely, up the wrong tree here.

JIM GALVIN: Do you need to respond on point, or can I add you to the queue? Lyman, and then Mike. Lyman.

LYMAN CHAPIN: Lyman Chapin. When we did this is 2013, it was extraordinarily difficult to get people to share data. And we came up with all sorts of proposals for how we would anonymize it, using third-parties, and so forth. It is a really, really hard problem, and I won't quite as far as Jeff, only because no one should ever go quite that far, because -- just as a matter of principle -- okay.

But I get awfully close without, you know, taking that last step. We also were completely unsuccessful trying to fallback on -- Rod, I think some of you were just suggesting, which is explaining the nature of the data that we suspected were out there, but that we did not have access to and, therefore, we're not able to include in our analysis. People just looked at that and said, "Well, that's just not helpful at all."

So, we didn't get away with any of that. We didn't try to actually synthesize data, which is an interesting -- and I confess that we got so frustrated that probably -- I think the only reason we didn't try it, is it didn't occur to us -- because we would have tried anything at that point. But the main point I want to make is that -- it's going to be tempting, at some point, to close off, agonizing over whether or not we're going to be able to get data and move on -- and I would actually -- although, ordinarily, I'm a -- you know, I would be in support of something like that -- I think in this case, if we don't have a good answer to some of those questions, there isn't much point in going any further -- and that that really is going to be a showstopper.

And therefore, we had better resign ourselves, if that's what it is, to taking as much time as necessary to figure out how we're going to deal with that issue. Because if we don't have a good answer to that issue, I don't think anything else we do -- I think

it's just going to be a waste of people's time. In this case, it'll be two years worth of people's time and a lot more people.

In our case, I won't say that our study in 2013 was a waste of time or that the JAS study was a waste of time, but they certainly haven't had, you know, the effect that we would have liked, and it's largely because of this issue. Largely because of the unavailability of data, and the way in which the data that we did have access to, potentially, skewed our results, because of Warren's concern about the fact that it isn't just that you don't have it, it's that you have a biased sample. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. I have Mike, then Warren, then Jeff in the queue, and I'll add Jay and maybe another person or two here. I want to make one kind of summary comment and react to something that Lyman said. It might be -- doing a time-check here -- I did want to make sure that we leave time at the end of this -- we still have under any other business, a discussion of scope, and we're -- I think we've sort of treaded into that space a little bit.

And also want to allow time for the community to bring any other question or issue that they have for us, to the table, so, I don't want to use up all the time. So, I now have Mike, Warren, Jeff, Jay, and Steve in the queue. I think I'm going --

COMPUTERIZED VOICE: THERE ARE ONLY ONE PEOPLE IN THIS CONFERENCE. THIS CALL WILL BE DISCONNECTED UNLESS YOU PRESS 88 NOW.]

JIM GALVIN: And I will add Chris, too. So, we now have six, and then I think I want to draw a line under this discussion. What I wanted to ask of the work party is, Lyman brought up a good point, you know, about the questions. Can we add to the bottom -- you know, again, our collective wisdom here -- can we start to articulate?

Go to the bottom of this form, start to edit this document, and let's articulate the questions that we need to get answers to, so that we can move forward. We're obviously going to take this particular topic to our continuing work party meetings, and continue to explore this topic for a while, as we do. So, let's start to try to articulate what it is we're trying to get to here in this whole topic area, down there at the bottom. I would appreciate if we could add some stuff there. All right. Over to Mike.

MICHAEL CASADEVALL: Michael Casadevall. So, I'm mostly going to just reaffirm a lot of the previous points, but going back a little bit, I think one thing --

COMPUTERIZED VOICE: THIS CONFERENCE HAS EXCEEDED THE TIME LIMIT FOR A SINGLE-PARTICIPANT CALL. YOU WILL NOW BE DISCONNECTED. GOOD-BYE.

JIM GALVIN: Well, so let me just ask -- just pause for a minute. I'm sorry. But for the archive and recording -- are we addressing this issue? Are we okay to go forward? No problems? Okay. All right. I'm sorry, please go ahead.

MICHAEL CASADEVALL: I'm just going to start again. Michael Casadevall. So, going back to the -- some of the earlier points -- one of the ones that came up is, will the sources of data be public? And given the fact that, essentially, getting the data in the first place is going to be like extracting blood from a stone and may be skewed, I think it's essential that the sources are public -- because it will show how badly we may be getting skewed with what data we are.

Because, obviously, we're probably not going to get the most ideal data, but we can try and draw conclusions. I also feel trying to fabricate data or, you know, what we expect is going to be there, is going to be, ultimately, counterproductive in the end. So, that's my two cents on that. But -- so, I'll pass it over.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you for that. I like your comment about -- yeah, we do need to know the data sources because that helps expose any bias that may or may not exist. So, I think that's a good point-- just to, at least, keep on our list of things. Warren, you're next, then Jeff.

WARREN KUMARI: So, Warren Kumari.   Kind of responding to one of Jeff's comments. So, it never actually even occurred to me that the data that might be provided might be, you know, raw queue names. That's just so outside the sphere of imagination. I figured things like -- provided data might be a relative ranking of annex domain strings, or, you know, relative ranking of seen queries for a TLD -- at that sort of possible level of granularity.

                     I think anything else is -- yeah. It's also -- I think that it's worth sort of reiterating -- the huge difference that is seen from resolver data versus, for example, DITL data -- I think looking at DITL data is kind of interesting, but it is so skewed, in terms of, you know, the fact of caching that it's -- largely just gives you a very vague taste -- very vague.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you for that. Jeff, then Warren. I'm sorry. Did you want to insert?

MICHAEL CASADEVALL: Direct response to that.

JIM GALVIN: Yes. Please go ahead.

MICHAEL CASADEVALL: So, caching's actually a really good point to bring up --

JIM GALVIN: And you are?

MICHAEL CASADEVALL: Oh, sorry. Michael Casadevall. Caching's a really good point to bring up here because, depending on how the caching is -- unless we have a general model, which ICANN may have already -- we need to figure out how that's going to skew what is already going to be skewed data, you know. With the right data, you can draw any conclusions, so I'd really like to stay biased in reality, if possible.

JIM GALVIN: Yes. Thank you for that. Jeff, then Jay.

JEFFREY BEDSER: So, I think Lyman actually upped on me, rather than moderated, because what he said was, basically, if we can't get data, let's just give up now. And I'm close. I am really close to that, because --

LYMAN CHAPIN: I wondered if you'd notice that.

JEFFREY BEDSER: Yeah. No, I noticed. The only time we've had success in the recent time, has actually been in the RFC 8145 look. And the reason why that was successful is that they were looking for themselves. And that's a really key observation -- that, if you're able to prod a system, and then look for yourself in the echoes of that prod, you can effectively extrapolate behaviors of the entire system by, effectively, that kind of experimentation approach.

And I would urge you, that by the time you're going to hit this brick wall -- and it is a brick wall, and you're going to go straight up against it -- the data you get is not worth looking at. It's not a case of giving up, yet, Lyman. It is a case of trying to understand if there are other ways to actively perturb the system to

understand how it reacts. And that might give you a clue as to why and how you get these kinds of leaks and conflicts flying around.

As a minor example, last time we did this, we seeded the DNS with single labels, and used DITL data to find out how those labels were expanded when they hit the roots. So, there are experiments that do this, and it doesn't rely on any kind of mass statistics. It relies on quite a careful experimental approach that prods and looks for the echoes.

And I suppose my intuition about this is the only time I've heard success with various operators of infrastructure is saying, "I don't care about anyone else; can you give me back me? Just me. You know, find where I am, and give it back." And that's actually a useful way of approaching this.

JIM GALVIN: So, thank you for that. You spoke into a couple of specific examples, but I think the key point takeaway is, maybe we can create experiments to generate data for ourselves that we can use. And so, that's an important consideration for us to think about as we move forward. Okay. I have Jay, then Steve Sheng.

JAY DALEY:	So, I don't know how we ended up talking about synthesizing data, since -- Jay Daley, sorry -- because I don't think anybody is thinking about synthesizing data, at all. Please, dear God, no. I think what we're talking about is what Jeff just described as the careful experimental approach.
	I mean, just to give an example, Microsoft Exchange uses complicated TXT records for federation between Microsoft Exchange servers. If somebody's doing that in a private context, and the potential of a name collision is then -- an annexed domain around that and the loss of federation between those two servers. That is experimentally testable by us, okay.
	Now, okay, we may not want to go to the level of somebody setting up Microsoft Exchange servers to do that with, because that's potentially an unbounded problem -- scale -- when we get to that, but it is experimentally testable. The other point I would make is that we own the root, okay, so we could actually set up all of these tests under private.jeff, okay, and then temporary delegate .jeff -- with, you know, kind permission of IANA and stuff, to test exactly how it all goes wrong, you know. Okay?
	Or some 48-character hexadecimal one just to test that with, you know. There is actually a considerable amount of possibility that we have around our ability to experimentally test this, and that's what I meant -- much more than synthesizing data.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. I'll go over to Steven Sheng, and then we have Chris, and we're going to end it at Rod, please. Thank you. Steve.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you. A question from Anne. "Are there sources of unbiased study data that are not [inaudible] entities as Danny has highlighted? So, that's a question. And then a comment from Ruben, "In sanitization, queue names could have string dash" -- you can read the chat -- I won't bother to read it here. But he was suggesting there are other ways to look at the data, even with queue name minimized. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. We'll have to pull out Ruben's comment as -- to be included in our solution set. And I'm sorry, I did not understand -- I didn't understand the question from Anne. Did anyone -- maybe you could say that again, please?

STEVE SHENG: You want me to read it again? There are sources of unbiased study data that are not operational entities, as Danny has highlighted.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. So, I don't think it was a question. As I interpret what you read, Anne is suggesting that she knows of some unbiased data analyses and reports that we should get access to, or is she asking if those things exist? Okay. And, Danny.

DANNY MCPHERSON: Yeah. Danny McPherson. I was going to clarify real quick. I think what was she was asking is, is everyone that provides data conflicted or biased in some manner, or are there unconflicted or unbiased sources of data? And my only comment was that the data, itself, isn't necessarily conflicted. If providence and sources and methodologies are established and defined, it's that the entities may be conflicted that are providing it and people may choose to trust them, or not, but that's, you know, that's a crux of a lot of what people are already saying.

So, I did, by the way, provide a link in the chat window to an ACM CCS document that provides a taxonomy for analysis of name collisions in new gTLD era, that's a pretty good basis for people that want references and go look at other works. If you start there, and dig back, you'll find a ton of references from the broad community on this, so -- thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you for that, Danny. And that you, also, for the reference. We have Chris, and then Rod gets the last word.

CHRIS ROOSENRAAD: All right. So, I was going to raise one point -- and then Michael's comment, I like a lot -- and I'm going to add on to that, which is that we've had a couple of different suggestions for different data sources, and it sounds like to me that this is something that needs to be settled as part of our phase one, or Study One -- is whether or not, you know, to Rod's point, whether or not there's anything other than queue names that's going to give us the acceptable data that we need? That seems like something that needs to be settled in stage one.

And I really like Michael's observation about, it may be possible that we can take the public data sources that we have, and then possibly go to people who cannot provide public data, to say, "This is what we've found publicly; can you confirm that this matches your observations?"

So, it may be possible that we can go to someone who's not willing to share their data publicly and say, "This is the statistical analysis that we've come up with. Can you verify that this roughly matches -- this matches what you've seen?" "We're not asking for your data. We're not asking you to give us numbers,

but this is what we've come up with"; does this -- you know, "do you agree with this?" That may be a model that we can use.

JIM GALVIN: So, Warren, you want to jump in or --?

WARREN KUMARI: Possibly. I guess so. Hey, I always want to. So -- oh, Warren Kumari -- so, we've been spending a lot of time on talking about getting access to this data. We haven't really, at least here, been discussing, once we have all of this data, and can do useful things, like show what percentage of them have collisions, or not, or something -- what we actually, then, do with that.

Because a string, which shows up millions of times, doesn't actually, necessarily, cause more issues than a string that only shows up, you know, 10 times. There's also the discussion on gaming. I mean, I happen to own Coca-Cola; I do not want Pepsi to have .pepsi as a TLD, and so, immediately, I'm going to start generating collision queries for Pepsi and the root.

So, we've been talking a lot on, you know, make sure we have access to the data -- make sure we can get the data -- make sure we understand what you can do with data, but not actually, is the data actually going to be useful. And if we spend all of our

time analyzing the data, what are we actually going to have ended up with at the end? So, sorry for the downer.

JIM GALVIN:
No, that's fine. Let me -- I'm going to say two things, and then, Rod, you get the last word in. In responding to Chris, I don't see a problem with including in our toolset, exactly what you subscribed, so -- what you proposed, and so, we should certainly, at least include it as a continuing part of our discussion for right now and, perhaps, it is a part of our toolset as we go along.

My reaction to Warren is just to remind us that, as part of our requirements in this study -- is, in fact, to consider the issue of gaming. We actually have that as -- on the table as something that we have to address. Our ultimate objective here is, if possible, to provide guidelines to the Board, so that it can evaluate future collision -- it can make a decision about future collision strings. Meaning, should that string be delegated, or not?

And as part of those guidelines, I don't see how we can escape the fact that we have to speak to whether or not the data that you might be looking at is gamed, or not -- and what that means. And we have to provide that kind of advice to the Board for

ICANN COMMUNITY FORUM **61**
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

future decisions that it might make. I really do want to end this discussion here, and so, I'm going to give Rod the last word, at this point. Sorry.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Rod Rasmussen. So, listening this discussion, which we started with the form, and we've ended up talking about what data we're going to get and how we're going to go after it.

I think we need to really take a step back and look at this holistically and methodically -- and this is probably been done -- Lyman, probably, you've done it -- and some of the studies that Danny's been referring to have probably done at least some of this, which is, let's categorize the various places where useful data might be, the operators who may have access to that data, and then issues that we believe those operators may have -- we can actually go talk to some operators and see what those issues are -- so, we could actually create a matrix of data source -- potential data sources, and the challenges we may face: technical, legal, etc., in getting those.

And do this from a -- and start there, rather than kind of, you know, throwing ideas out, which I -- brainstorming is good because that gets you started, but I think we need structure this part of the work, thusly. Thanks.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. So -- yeah, just to build on that -- this is clearly an open topic still, in this work party. So, it will continue forward as an agenda topic, as we continue our meetings. And taking Rod's point, you know, that's the way to characterize, so we'll see if we can't frame this in a more interesting way for our next meeting after this. And, of course, you know, for the community-at-large, I certainly do welcome any additional inputs that you might have about this issue.

Please do submit them as part of the public comment process, and we'll take that onboard. We will seek -- take as an action -- to get this discussion group actually, formally, created and operational, and make that visible, in some way, to the community, so that there's a place -- so that the community can participate in some of this discussion, too. We will seek to make that happen, here, in the near term, so we can have continuing engagement on that issue there.

And with that, I want to move to -- the time check is we have 15 minutes left. We're into our any other business. We had one topic under the any other business, which was NCAP scope. That was a point that had been brought up yesterday in the cross-community session -- you know, what is the scope of this and what we're doing?

The specific question that I think falls into this category -- and then I'll open the floor for other things that fall onto that -- was from Jonne, who was asking as the IETF liaison to the ICANN Board, he was observing the comment about our project proposal that we had submitted, would seem to suggest that we're only looking at TLDs, name collisions at TLDs because we did use the word TLD -- phrase TLDs a lot in the proposal.

But, in response to him in that public forum, I had said that, "No, the Board asked us to address name collisions. We would certainly be seeking to gather as much data as we can within in that scope and looking at the entire name collision problem -- and see where that takes us. So, it was not our intent when we originally started this to exclude second-level names -- or whatever definition you want to give second-level names -- it's the names collision problem that we are working on, and we'll take all data that might somehow reflect on that. So, that's my summary comment about where we are on this topic. I have a queue now with Jay. So, please go ahead.

JAY DALEY: Thank you. Jay Daley. I had a horrifying conversation after our session yesterday with somebody who explained that they believed that the scope of name collision should include drop caching. And they were particularly clear about this drop

caching -- sorry, so if you don't know what drop caching is, it is where a domain is canceled, but it is yet to be released by the registry, and people then attempt to get that domain and re-register it the moment it is released, because they believe it's a valuable asset -- because it has pre-existing traffic coming to it, and they can use that pre-existing -- they can monetize that pre-existing traffic through advertising or through some other form of setting up a website on that page.

And they're view is that drop caching has already been raised in one of the previous elements here, in one of the previous studies done, and I haven't verified that yet, or not -- so, I don't know if that's the case. But that the scope had to include that, and that that's what people are looking at. Now, I'm raising this with a look of horror on my face. I personally feel that we absolutely should not go there at all, but -- good -- but we just need to be aware that those are some expectations around it.

JIM GALVIN: Thank you for that. Just clear -- when you said the word, "good," you were getting a lot of nodding heads saying, "Yes, it's not something that should be in our scope." But I do want to explicitly call the question, does anyone want to argue in favor of making sure it's included in our scope? Michael, and then Warren.

MICHAEL CASADEVALL: Not to argue in favor, but I do think, as part of the scope, we need to be aware of the problem, and be able to filter that data out, because some of the drop caching -- if we're looking at stuff beyond the top-level domain stuff, then some of the drop-caching stuff may end up in our datasets.

So, we'll probably have to keep that in mind and look at records to determine when domains changed hands, so we can filter that out, and not get false positives when we, you know, go running. So, I just wanted to point that out and get that on the minutes.

JIM GALVIN: That's a fair point. We do need to consider that. Okay. I have Warren, then Rod.

WARREN KUMARI: So, Warren Kumari. I mean, a couple of thoughts on this -- I think that drop caching is something that SSAC should look at some time, because it is potentially a serious security issue for the person who used to have the domain -- you know, and users who rely on it. I don't know if I see that much overlap with this. I

mean, there are certain strings that are, no matter what TLD they're in, they're going to be really popular.

And so, I don't really view them as a collision, right, like the string something is going to be registered in basically every TLD; probably, so is BartSimpson, in every TLD. Should be BartSimpson be a protected string, because it's going to collide with somebody else who's going to register BartSimpson? Probably not.

So, I'm not entirely sure where all the overlap is here, right. Certain strings are just strings that everybody likes, and so, the fact that there's BartSimpson.com and BartSimpson.net, and BartSimpson.food isn't, in my view, a collision. And Jeff looks like he's going --

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. I was going -- I just wanted to say, you know, the way that I had interpreted Mike's comment, and I think we're in agreement -- I don't think that we should look at drop cache, specifically, but I do think that there is a potential issue here. I mean, someone may decide that they want to turn into a TLD, something which was previously registered, and we're going to find some data that's going to maybe show some of this. I don't know. I'm just imagining that this kind of stuff could happen.

So, I don't know that we're going to -- I don't want to look at drop cache, specifically, but I'm imagining that we might see some behavior around that if we look at data. And I'm getting a lot of frowns in the room -- Boy! I'm very provocative here, aren't I? Do you want to respond to that, or should I let Rod talk first, because he had his hand in the queue here?

WARREN KUMARI: I think me first, because I think I'm just wildly confused. I don't see how somebody can turn something that they had previously registered into a TLD. I mean, if somebody had registered food.com, you can't really make that a TLD, because, in order for you to have registered it, it must have been under a TLD at some point, and so, by definition, it's got a dot in it. But maybe I'm just confused.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Have a seat at the table.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. I guess, I don't really want to get too far into solution space here. Rod, you were next, and then Rick.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. So, one thing --

JIM GALVIN: And you are?

ROD RASMUSSEN: Rod Rasmussen. One thing that is clear and is part of our mission is to properly provide definitions for all of these things, so this is partly our responsibility and an education piece. I would note that there is one interesting case of name collision at the top-level, when you've had a string delegated in the past, that has been removed the root, and there are still queries going to it.

And there are various names out there, right, that have deprecated from the root, so those will have residual traffic. I think that's a special case, but it is one where -- I wouldn't call it drop caching; I would think of it as one that we obviously will get data for.

JIM GALVIN: So, thank you for that. And over to Rick.

ICANN COMMUNITY FORUM **61**
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

RICK WILHELM: Rick Wilhelm, Verisign. A drop cache is a special case of re-registration, as it's more formally known -- and that is a special case of names changing hands, which they do all the time in the aftermarket -- for all sorts of TLDs, and so, that is a Pandora's Box, or a can of worms, or can of something -- and so, I would offer that the work party might, you know, strictly limit itself to the task at hand, given the challenges that we've seen over the last 3 1/2 hours, or whatever -- and that going anywhere near the other part of -- which is not nearly the kind of problem that we're talking about.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. I don't think we want to put drop cache on our agenda, but there are some related behaviors that are going to pop out for us, that's all. So, I have Mike, and then Chris.

MICHAEL CASADEVALL: Michael Casadevall. I'm just wondering, while I don't think we should ignore, you know, the second-level domains -- is it that much value not to -- you know, just have that as completely secondary, and just focus on the TLDs? Because I know that it was brought up that we should probably look at these, but I do sort of wonder how much value there is, considering how

frequently these names change with the drop cache. I mean -- just -- unless I've completely missed the point of the last -- okay.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. No, I mean, I think the comment to make is, we don't want to -- we actually don't want to make any kind of distinction, at all. The point is we're studying the name collision problem, and we will go where the data leads us. And that's what we're going to do. So, I have Chris, and then Jay.

CHRIS ROOSENRAAD: Changing gears a bit. The big feedback I had from the public session yesterday was, there's already -- we're already starting to see pushback related to schedule, and how the schedule for this work interplays with the schedule for the next round of gTLDs. And I know we don't want to talk about it, but we have to.

JIM GALVIN: I wouldn't say that we don't want to talk about it, but I think --

CHRIS ROOSENRAAD: Based on my feedback from everybody, I think we do.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah.

CHRIS ROOSENRAAD: We do want to avoid it, but --

JIM GALVIN: Well, let me phrase it this way -- I think that we need to be aware that that's the way the community is going to look at this work. Very clearly, the consideration by the community is the fact that there is certainly the perception, if not the explicit statement, that no new gTLD rounds will start until this work finishes.

So, people are going to look at us, and they're going to call us on that fact. And they're going to make that an issue; we're going to get asked about it at every single public meeting -- and I think that we are going to have to find a way to respond to that. I think, in general, for the purposes of SSAC and this work party, you know, we generally don't deal with deadlines with work.

Our role -- and the way in which we work, is that we do work thoroughly and completely -- and when we're done, we're done. We don't like to force a conclusion to meet any -- I'll call it arbitrary. I'm sorry to use that word to describe it. I don't mean to be pejorative, but you know, we don't work according to

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

arbitrary deadlines. That's the not the way that we try to conduct our analysis and our conclusions.

I don't know that we're going to have a good answer for that question as we go along. And we'll always be -- we'll always be asked that question. We're going to have to manage messaging on this project, and so, I guess we're going to have to take some time to think about how to present it to the community. So, I don't want to escape the discussion. We're going to get asked; we should have an answer for it, and always remind ourselves about what that answer is, so we have a consistent message. And I see Jay, and then Lyman.

JAY DALEY: Jay Daley. So, two points -- one on that one -- I don't agree that it is an assumption that there a dependency between this work and the new gTLD program. I think if we particularly talk about there being that assumption, then that assumption will be created. And I think we need to, you know, try to firewall that immediately, really.

I think that the potential resolution is the one that I tried to give Jeff Neuman in our session yesterday, which is that they need to have an act of God clause in there, because name collisions is,

effectively, an act of God -- and there may be well other act of God things that stop a particular string being delegated.

And the other point is that we may not produce a red/green, yes/no answer at the end of this, and so, if they are foolish enough to wait two years for us to finish, and then find that we don't have an answer, it's really not going to help.

And so, that's why I think the two need to be decoupled. [Inaudible] if you want; otherwise, I'll go on to my second point -- okay. So, my second point is that name collisions, as a concept, does actually cover drop caching -- because what it covers, is it covers the traffic intended for one domain going to another domain.

Now, okay, we're being a little bit pedantic talking about a registration of the same string, being a different -- you know, two different domains, but that's effectively what it is. It also strictly covers bit flips, as well, which are a noticeable issue in different places, okay.

And so, we can't say no to it initially, but my horror was that the breadth of the scope around this and the expectations -- and I agree, very much, with what Michael said -- it's going to appear in the data, and so throughout the process, that's the point at which we prune and narrow as to what our scope is. But

initially, upfront, you know, we may have to accept that it's got something broader that we prune on the way through.

JIM GALVIN: So, thank you for that. I very much agree. Being conscious of the time here, I have Lyman in the queue, and then Steve, and Rod, and we're going to be done after that.

LYMAN CHAPIN: Lyman Chapin. I wanted to reinforce a point that Rod made a moment ago, which is that we're going to have to be very careful with our definitions -- because as I plugged into the wire conversation -- when we looked at the DITL data back in 2013, we noticed that, of the roughly 1,400-plus applied-for strings in the new gTLD program, only 14 of those strings did not appear somewhere in those data.

So, essentially, any string can become a "name collision string." And so, I think we're going to have to be very careful how we define it. I think that it's both possible and desirable to define it a little bit more narrowly than Jay's just suggested.

JIM GALVIN: And I'm sorry, Warren, I am going to have -- because we have translators and such to deal with -- we have to be very careful about the deadline here. Steve Sheng.

STEVE SHENG: Comment by Anne on the chat, "The interaction between the SSAC work and the Work Track 4, of subsequent procedure, is important. My concern is Work Track 4 should not proceed independently of the SSAC work and make policy recommendations that conflict with the SSAC work. That will delay the next round even further." End of comment.

JIM GALVIN: Yeah. So, you know, I want to think Anne for that. I think that's an important comment, and it's aligned with what Jay was saying, in essence -- you know, part of our messaging here is, we do our work and the community -- he was, you know, even Jay was suggesting to pushing back on that -- the Sub Pro working group -- subsequent procedures PDP working group -- just called Sub Pro -- onto the them.

You know, they need to identify the issues that they're concerned about, and they need to deal with those issues, relative to our work. I think that's all I mean by independence and if they have questions for us, they should bring them to us

and we can work that synchronization out. Rod, you're going to get the last word, and then we do have to wrap up.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Okay. Rod Rasmussen. And I'm going to emphasize what you -- everybody was just saying there on this particular issue -- it is not our problem what other people are going to do with this work. We've been tasked with the task, right.

It is fine to coordinate, to some extent, to help with the community who needs to make other decisions -- if they there are some things that we can provide along the way that would helpful; that's perfectly reasonable for them to ask and for us to evaluate at the time they ask it.

At the end of the day, this goes to the Board, and the Board makes decisions about when things are going to get approved, or not. I will also note that in my conversations with several other people in the community, the appetite for pushing fast-forward on a new round seems to be rather limited. And I'll leave it at that.

JIM GALVIN: Okay. Thank you for that. So, in the interest of concluding. For the public, since this is a public session, I first want to thank

those from the community-at-large, who have participated actively, both remotely in the room -- and Michael, we have you up here in the room. I, you know, appreciate that and thank you very much. That is the purpose of this meeting, and we will continue to have these types of meetings, at a minimum, at ICANN meetings.

You know, other logistics have yet to be decided. In responding to the community-at-large, just keep in mind that the public comment period is still open till -- April 18th comes to my mind -- I hope I got that date right, but if I didn't, please, whatever is the proper date.

In addition, we will take as an action, here, to get to relatively quickly, creating the discussion group access, and at least make that available, so that we can start those discussions, and we'll find a way to make that known to the community -- that that's there and visible. We will have to deal with the statement of interest issue, as far as that's concerned, but we'll just treat that as an administrative matter that we'll find a solution to as we go along.

We have more work to do. We're going to continue doing this work, here. The work party in SSAC will continue as we, you know, try to make our way through some of these topics and, hopefully, the discussion group will provide an opportunity for

those members of the community who are interested to also continue to participate in these discussions and say what else they need to add to it. And I think with that, I will say thank you very much. Let me thank the translators, expressly, for all of their work, and we're adjourned.

STEVE SHENG: Thank you, Jim. Just a note -- the IOT work party will meet here at 12:30 -- so, we allow 30 minutes for work party members to get lunch. 12:30.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]