SubPro WT 4: IDN / Technical / Operations

Meeting #12 2000 UTC 08 June 2017

Agenda

1-2
Welcome and Opening Remarks SOI updates

3
Full WG Update

4
Madrid May 2017 events

5
Community Input on Name Collisions

6
Name Collisions Framework

7
AOB

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks
2. SOI updates

3. Full WG Update

4. Madrid May 2017 events

Madrid, May 2017

- ICANN GDD Summit 2017 May 09-11
  - “DNS Primer”, May 11, 91 minutes
- ICANN ITHI Workshop (May 12 Morning)
- ROW Workshop #6 (May 12 Afternoon)
- ICANN DNS Symposium (May 13)
  - “That's Still a Lot of Packets: Garbage Traffic at the Root” (Morning, 30 minutes)
  - “Introduction to the OCTO Research Middlebox Lab” (Afternoon, 40 minutes)
  - “New Datasets Available for Colliding Domains” (Afternoon, 20 minutes)
- DNS OARC 26 (May 14 and 15)
  - “OARC Engineering Report” (May 14, 30 minutes)
  - “The Dark Side of the DNS” (May 15, 30 minutes)

5. Community input on Name Collisions

CC2 questions and possible policy options

- 4.4.2:
  - List of names to be excluded ? Method to produce such list ?
  - Name collision evaluation of each string ?
- 4.4.3:
  - Reduction of controlled interruption period ?
- 4.4.1 and 4.4.3:
  - Initiating the interruption period before end of evaluation and delegation ?

Input received on name collisions

- JAS Advisors:
  - “Don’t change the winning team” (ALAC also)
  - Look into SLD collisions (notifications)
  - Consider variations of 2012 problematic strings
  - Use DITL and ORDINAL datasets
- SSAC:
  - Create a “do not apply” list
  - Create an “exercise care” list
  - Consider what to do with previously delegated TLDs
  - Identify private namespaces
  - Coordinate with IETF on special-use domain names (IETF also, problem statement last call)

Input received on name collisions

- INTA:
  - Avoid APD-type lists; if used, cannot contain trademarks
- RySG and gTLD registries:
  - Lack of predictability
  - No need to extend 2-year 2-hour readiness
  - Reduce controlled-interruption period to 60 days
  - Assess risk instead of just quantity
- Thomsen Trampedach:
  - Initiate controlled interruption period sooner rather than later
- OCTO:
  - Reach out to DNS-OARC, IETF DNSOP, RIPE DNS-WG, TEG

6. Name Collisions Framework

Name collisions framework in 2012-round

- All 2012-round TLDs were required to pass a controlled interruption period and be able to respond within two hours for life-threatening collision reports, for the first two years of delegation
- During the controlled interruption period of 90 days, names would respond with an internal invalid address to warn affected users without exposing them
  - For APD lists, the same applied for those names in the list
- Current number of collision reports is 37 occurrences reported to ICANN, of which 0 were life-threatening
  - Other collisions might have been reported directly to registries, and some not reported at all

Name collisions framework for subsequent procedures (aggregate proposal 1/2)

- Before the procedure, ICANN Org would provide a “do not apply” list (as they did in 2012) and a list of “exercise care” strings where they already expect a more detailed study to be required
- Every application, whether or not to those already identified “exercise care” strings, would be allowed to file a collision mitigation framework
- All applied-for strings would be evaluated as to their risk of collisions: low risk, aggravated risk, high risk
- A high risk finding terminates the application(s)
- An aggravated risk requires a non-standard mitigation framework to move forward
- All low risk strings would share a common framework, using controlled interruption

Name collisions framework for subsequent procedures (aggregate proposal 2/2)

- All low-risk strings could start controlled interruption right after their findings are published; ICANN Org could even contract DNS providers to do so before other evaluations, contention resolution or contract signing.
- Minimum 90-day interruption period (same as 2012)
- No 2-year readiness (issue: data not yet available)
- Mitigation frameworks would be evaluated by RSTEP
- No APD or other per-label lists, unless required by an specific collision mitigation (ex: [appname].TLD)
  - Label-specific non-wildcard responses, based on registry request and ICANN Org approval ?
- Data-driven decision making using trusted research-accessible data (like DITL and ORDINAL)

7. AOB