

---

**ICANN Transcription**  
**GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group**  
**Monday, 19 October 2020 at 20:00 UTC**

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

Attendance and recordings of the call are posted on agenda wiki page:

<https://community.icann.org/x/NwjQC>

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

<http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

ANDREA GLANDON: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP working group meeting being held on Monday, the 19th of October at 20:00 UTC.

In the interest of time, there'll be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom room. If you're only on the audio bridge, could you please let yourselves be known now? Thank you. Hearing no names, I would like to remind all participants to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes and to please keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

Thank you. With this, I will turn it over to Jeff Neuman. You may begin.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Thank you, Andrea. Welcome, everyone. I want to thank everyone. I know it's been a very long day, evening, night depending on where in the world you are, with the ICANN meeting going on. In fact, if you were in one of the sessions that was

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

probably about six or seven hours ago, I think we talked about kind of the issue with having meetings during an ICANN week. But like I said during that call, it's kind of tough with some of the ICANN meetings because it's hard to find time within those ICANN meetings to actually do the work that we're supposed to be doing. And with the ICANN meeting being two weeks plus an extra week of prep calls, we just didn't want to miss out on several weeks, especially because we have deliverables by the end of the year.

So let me just quickly ask if there's any updates to any statements of interest, and then we'll talk about the agenda and get moving on the call. Any updates? Okay, not seeing any. So today's agenda is going to be really to focus on comments from the SSAC, the Security Stability Advisory Committee on the draft final report. Rod and I and Cheryl have exchanged e-mails over the last few weeks, especially just prior to when the due date was for comments on the draft final report, and Rod let me know that the SSAC, because of all the work that they had, all the different projects going on and their process which takes longer than the 30 days that we allotted for the comments—or actually 40 days—they said that they would not be able to give us a written response, and in fact, the first note from Rod had said, "So we'll just send our comments to the GNSO council when the work's done," and Cheryl and I met quickly and just decided it would be much better if we could hear—if the problem was putting the comments down into writing, we would love to hear any comments they could give us during our work so that we weren't put in a position where our work was completed and only then do we get the comments from the SSAC. So we immediately had suggested that we get together on one of our calls, and Rod immediately went to work on trying to

---

find some time and dates that would work with the other SSAC members. So here we are.

As a result, we did not have any written materials to review prior to the meeting, but I sent around a list of topics that we were given from Rod and the ICANN support team on Friday, so hopefully everyone has a copy of that list of issues. I don't know if we can ask Emily or Julie to post that up on the screen. They've certainly put it in the chat.

So the topics are the root zone delegation rates, how names are constructed, which includes IDNs and variants and restricted character combos, DNS abuse itself, and a proxy for other meta issues. There's registry testing, pre-evaluation process for backend operators, TLD types, rationale for rejected SSAC advice, name collision and interaction with the private TLD proposal.

So there's a bunch of items on there, and I want to thank Rod, and I know I see Warren and Suzanne, Wolf, and there's probably a bunch of others on this call. So thank you for coming on to this call, and I'll turn it over to Rod. For the members of the working group, this is really just kind of an information gathering exercise and to ask questions. So Rod, I'm going to turn it over to you.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Thanks, Jeff. Thanks for the time to be able to spend with you today. Appreciate being able to kind of be flexible on that and able to provide at least some perspective from the SSAC.

---

I want to note up front we don't have a formal SSAC advisory or even consensus on what we want to talk about today, but we wanted to at least get members of the work party who've been looking at this to get out here just to cover some of the things we saw that would be probably good for you to have some input on, as you said before, as you're doing the work. So I think this is at least a decent way of providing a heads up on some of the things we've flagged as concerns or whatever, however you want to go about it. I don't think there's anything really amazingly alarming that we're worried about. There are some—definitely when you start digging into something this massive, there's always bound to be questions and the like. So we want to have really a conversation here.

We've got several of the work party members on the call. And yeah, this process timing worked out very poorly for us because on top of normal stuff which we may have been able to deal with, we have our annual workshop which we normally hold in face-to-face in September. We just held that virtually over half the month. So it really just did not jive well with us being able to go through and kind of all these public comments are always a challenge for us, and sometimes we're able to get those done, but on something like this, of this scale and scope, and bad timing with all the other work we have—you can imagine with an annual workshop. It just didn't work out. So glad we can do it this way. And we don't want to make a habit of responding via a conference call, but on sort of a one-off basis like this, it'll hopefully be useful. So I want to, again, thank you for that opportunity.

---

And then of course, if these any questions beyond the topics here that we have that folks on the SubPro team want to bring up—because we have the opportunity, I'd be happy to take that. So we've been working through this and have kind of a couple of different big buckets, I guess we call it. One is kinda more the meta issues, and those may be things that were passed to the SubPro team to take a look at and then you passed back, or overall kind of how this whole thing works. So that kind of thing. And then there's specifics on various items that were brought up.

So kind of thinking of the feedback we have on that or the way we've been approaching this is that there's two kind of sets of issues. I'm sure you've had some of the same trying to look at the thing holistically and also on specific issues over the course of your work.

So we put this list of topics together to kind of group some of the things that we looked at as we've gone through the draft final document, and we actually split it into two things. One was what's in the document, [what's ahead,] how did it deal with prior advice from us and others. At least when it comes to SSR issues, we did not dig into non-SSR areas or areas that wouldn't have some sort of effect on security, stability and resiliency, because that's really outside of our remit for the most part.

So those that are in the document itself, how were those dealt with, and then there's, okay, what's the gap analysis of what wasn't covered or what are the remaining questions, at least in our mind, on how to do things? And so that's where the work party has been focused, and we've pulled together a bunch of different things, unfortunately not really organized enough to the point

---

where we can share a draft paper, but I'll do my best in orchestrating, I've been working with our staff and our work party to make sure we've got those kind of put in these little buckets here for walking through.

So we have about eight topics, I think, or so. So let's walk on through that. I'll take any questions before we jump into that, if anyone has any process or other issues they want to bring up, and then I can just walk through some of the things we've flagged and discuss them.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Thanks, Rod. And we're recording this, so those that couldn't attend for whatever reason, we're recording it so I'm sure we'll be going back through this and taking notes. So we definitely appreciate you all being here. Thanks.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

And I look at this as a two-way education process as well, just because I think as you guys are working on tightening things and finishing things up, we've got the work we're doing here and then having some of the thoughts behind what the words are on the paper that we're looking at would be useful for us in how we approach whatever we finally write down on this. So looking really for this to be co-educational and conversational that way.

The first major grouping—and this is where we can talk about some of the meta issues I think as well, is just the root zone delegation rate topic. This gets into, I think, one of the biggest issues you probably were looking at, is how this expands, grows

---

over time. I would note that a lot of the things that were in the prior SSAC advice on this, which is SAC 103, were well addressed within that. Rates of expansion, various things along those lines were brought up by us and others. But those were, I think, well covered and I think we've noted that where that was dealt with, and that was much appreciated, that there was a lot of thought put to that.

There are some issues, I think, that are kind of outstanding around measuring and monitoring, and how do you make decisions about when things are not going well, at least from an SSR perspective. The OCTO 15 paper just came out in regards to that, which we're going to be commenting on, most likely, that looked at this a little bit as well. But that's an area that still remains, I think, a bit fuzzy as to when and how those measurements or metrics are dealt with.

And as part of that process, there's this concept of the SPIRT.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Actually, Rod, can I just jump in for a second? So everyone's kind of on the same page, the OCTO 15 was a paper written by OCTO, the chief technology office of ICANN, and it addressed a question from—I don't remember which it was, SSAC 103 or even before that.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Before that, yeah.

---

JEFFREY NEUMAN: On coming up with an early warning system for when the root was being congested or overwrought with requests or changes to the zone. So there's been requests that have been outstanding for years on this. And just about a week ago, maybe a week or two ago, OCTO published a paper that basically said, well, nobody in the technical community—I'm paraphrasing, so let me know if I'm putting too much judgement in this, but the technical community couldn't necessarily agree on a solution and/or on objective tests or metrics, and so therefore essentially, we think the only way to really monitor is just to ask people what they think, because basically, the RIRs will let us know if things are going wrong and ICANN staff will let us know if there's too many applications to process. it's basically just like trust everyone, they'll just let you know.

It was an interesting paper. I wrote my own kind of personal—not working group—blog piece on this. So anyway, that's what Rod's referring to. Sorry to interrupt, Rod.

ROD RASMUSSEN: And that's important context because it's addressing this overarching issue around understanding how do you know when things are going in a direction that could cause problems and do it in an objective way so that you don't overreact and don't underreact? Because there are problems either way. Trying to slow something down when there's not really a problem and trying to push on when it could cause issues.

You want some sort of certainty guidepost to that, wherever it's physically possible to do so. Yeah, I think your paraphrasing is



---

fairly—we haven't had a chance to discuss it within SSAC yet other than very briefly on our recent call as a two-minute topic, so I don't have a sense yet from the rest of the membership where they are on that, but my impression was it left a lot to the operators themselves to say, "Hey, there's something going on," and then they'll do something at that point. And I'm not sure what the something is and who has authority to do that. So those are important questions which I think would be definitely within the remit you guys have to at least have some thoughts on as far as that goes.

Part of that was, does the SPIRT concept provide for that kind of overarching look, or is it more narrowly focused on particular issues that came up? The impression from our work party team that looked through that was that that SPIRT would be more focused on specific issues around individual delegations rather than having some sort of overarching [how's the poll] process going, are there capabilities built in for the SPIRT group or some other group to be able to make some sort of decisions around making adjustments as progress goes along, whether that's some process adjustments, whether that's slowing things down, whether that's saying, "Hey, we've got to stop expansion for X period of time," and that's kind of a question that would be interesting to get feedback, I think as we dig into that some more and provide more thinking on that from our side, is just to understand where the language that you have on the SubPro document has stopped versus what the kind of background concepts were and the assumptions of how that would actually be implemented, because there is that implementation of that.

---

And there's some questions around what kind of expertise would be on there, how you select that, and you don't want to get things too political as they can get in ICANN land, and how that vision of how that process would work and how that group or some other group would deal with the unknowns that are undoubtedly going to crop up as we push forward with delegations. I'll stop there and see if you have any comments or if any other of the SSAC members who were looking at this want to raise their hand, chime in a little bit more on my kind of summary of the discussions we've had.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

And while we wait for people to come in, also, if anyone from the working group wants to ask questions or jump in as well. I will say that just from the SPIRT team—and this is not on behalf of the working group, but I think you said it was meant to deal with individual issues, but it's really meant—so the short answer to your question is I don't think we've discussed that particular scenario with the working group as to whether that would be kind of the SPIRT team role and whether people in the group would be comfortable with that being in the role.

The SPIRT team will allow for calling of experts on particular issues. The SPIRT team is not to address individual application issues but more—there were so many things that came up during the program last time, whether it was ICANN changing from their custom based ticketing or [TAS] system for entering applications to something else and what was the impact, and the data breach, and going from digital archery to ... That kind of stuff.

---

So it was meant to deal with more process issues but also to help ICANN staff understand, when an issue does arise, that it may involve policy and then to serve as kind of the shepherds to say this is policy so we really need to make sure the GNSO has notice of this and can weigh in on this through the GNSO's processes.

So I think that—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: You've got hands up, Jeff.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. Good. So let me go to them and anyone in the working group that wants to respond. I see Geoff Huston and Ram Mohan. Thanks, guys.

GEOFF HUSTON: Look, that OCTO document is an opinion, and that's all it is. It's actually a brief opinion. I would totally hesitate to think that that's a definitive last word on this topic. And frankly, I certainly have a contrary view to the one espoused by Paul Hoffman in that document. And so I would really hesitate to take that as authoritative input at this stage. There are so many aspects of scaling the root that that document did not cover, and frankly, I think if ICANN or anyone else were to resource a study, it would actually find a lot more data, and perhaps a conclusion that's at variance with that relatively informal conclusion written by Paul. Thank you.

---

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Thanks, Geoff. Why don't we go to Ram? And then again, everyone's welcome, the working group or SSAC, to jump in. Ram, go ahead.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks, Jeff. So just to expand a little bit further on what Rod was speaking about SPIRT, our reading, it makes it appear that perhaps SPIRT is set up to review process problems or things like that, either at individual applications or contention sets or things like that.

But our concern is that it's entirely possible that there might be overarching systemic issues that are more, say, technical in nature, and it's not clear that SPIRT is set up to have the capability or even the ability to review those kinds of issues. That's one part.

The other part is even if it had the capability, it's not clear in our reading that it has the power or is empowered to do something about it other than make a recommendation.

The last part is, especially when it comes to somewhat contentious and some would say subjective topics like root scaling or the velocity of adding names to the root zone, etc., it's entirely possible that you might find extremely qualified experts who might have differing points of view. And in those cases, it's not clear to us whether the intent is those kinds of contentious issues will get referred to SPIRT and then it's not clear also what criteria SPIRT

---

might use to make a recommendation about those kinds of issues?

I would say in probably the highest order concern is that SPIRT not make decisions or not come to recommendations on issues that may actually be serious or potentially serious technical security and stability issues, not arrive at conclusions or recommendations without having the appropriate amount of technical clue before arriving at those conclusions.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Thanks, Ram. I think you've put that very subtly. But I think everything you said is—you're right, the SPIRT was not set up to be a decision maker. It was set up to basically help ICANN staff when issues arose. And Ram, you remember, just as well as anybody else, that it seemed like a lot of the decisions made were in siloes and not really thinking about impacts on the applicants or impacts on the objectors or public commenters or users of the systems, etc.

So the SPIRT is really there to help ICANN understand the potential impacts and make sure that when it comes to making a decision on that particular issue, the right parties are involved.

So the SPIRT does have the ability to call in experts. It only gets its referrals, if you will, from the ICANN board, ICANN staff or the GNSO itself. It's interesting the GAC had asked during their meeting today whether the SPIRT would consider or whether the working group would consider SPIRT being able to take referrals from the GAC. That's not something we discussed at all within the

---

working group, just like this kind of novel issue of a very serious issue of, “Look, if something needs to happen where it needs to halt ...” I think the SPIRT could be kind of instrumental in helping to make sure that the technical people are in the room, not that the SPIRT itself is overly technical, but that the SPIRT could say, hey, wait a minute, ICANN, you're talking about a change, we need some experts in here because this is way over our head and we really need to—don't make this change without involving others in the community.

So that's really more of why the SPIRT was kind of constructed. But Paul does say in the chat, we were concerned about opening up the SPIRT to lobbying by organizations that wanted their issue heard because they weren't satisfied with something. And that's why specifically—Paul's correct, that's why we specifically only made it that, look, an issue needs to be serious enough by the ICANN staff, ICANN board, and/or the GNSO in order to get referred, that it didn't want to be lobbied by members of the GAC or members of a constituency to take up an issue.

The GAC did mention that they would like us to consider it, so of course, we'll go back within the working group and I'll relay the request from the GAC or the comments from the GAC and then we'll discuss that as a working group. But you see some of the members of the working group weighing in on the chat.

Thanks, Jeff. There's a question that kind naturally arises out of this. I think this is good to get your thoughts on how kind of systemic issue would then be dealt with. So take an example, we see that there's some sort of—let's say some SSR issue comes up that shows that as we've been adding things, there's been

---

some technical glitches, and things aren't resolving or something, we need to figure out what the heck is going on. Who would have that decision making-authority based on the work here?

And SPIRT could look at process issues and offer some recommendations, but who would actually have the authority at the end of the day to say, "Hey, we need to slow down delegations or this type of delegation is an issue we need to look at and put holds on" or something of that that you're? Where would that authority lie based on the policy work you've got here??

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

It's interesting because the board raised a similar or related comment. Ultimately, it's the ICANN board at the end of the day. They are the ones that would put a stop to the program. I think the way we constructed SPIRT was, hey, hopefully you'll keep us in the loop so we can help educate you on the impact to applicants and other stakeholders, especially within the GNSO community.

But at the end of the day, it still is the ICANN board that can pull that trigger, and no policy work that we do could really change that. And I think the board sort of wanted that clarified. Maybe even ICANN Org had asked for that to be clarified as well in the terms and conditions.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah, and I think transparency on those decisions would be really important. If somebody brings up an issue or let's say a bunch of root server operators say, "Hey, we're having problems," maybe

---

they don't want that to be publicly published, right? For various reasons.

There's an interesting transparency question there around how that process works. And yeah, obviously, the board at the end of the day either has to take that authority or delegate it to somebody. So just based on the nature of things.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

It's an interesting balance because I know the RIRs don't want—there's lots of things that they want to keep confidential for their own important reasons, but at the end of the day, when something like that does have a large impact on the applicants and other users, then the board needs to weigh all of that together. And I think the SPIRT—I think it was Elaine that put a comment in there about having an SSAC liaison if that's something that you all would think is a good idea. And then of course, the working group.

But certainly, the decision lies with the ICANN board, but the hope with the SPIRT is that it could help ICANN and the rest of the community understand what's going on and the potential impact on other than the technical community the impact on the applicants and other participants in the new gTLD program.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

And just the process—I think Ram put something in the chat that is useful there around how do you actually—if you're seeing issues of some sort, how do you bring that to folks' attention? I think the SPIRT device allows for that, it's just then the question is—and as you're going through your work here, obviously, the



---

board's already asked you about this too, is maybe to have some thoughts on how that process is both enabled and transparent so that the applicants know what's going on and the community knows what's going on, etc. And we certainly want to make sure people have confidence in the system and that there isn't a thought that potential issues are being ignored, or overblown, either way, it's really important to have them evaluated appropriately and if you're going to make decisions on allocations, either going forward or slowing down or some other thing that changes the processing, that those decisions are made with as much transparency as possible to keep the confidence on what's going on.

I think that probably covers the first topic area here pretty well. We do want to have some time to dig into some of these other ones. So the next area we had was a bucket on how names are constructed, and this actually covers several different things that are all kind of different points that appear throughout the documentation you have as well.

I know there's some homework that some of the members have to do on referring to some of the RFCs, etc. that are dealing with, for example, the discussion around digits and two-letter, two-character, number-digit combos which the report left an opening for maybe we should look at that, and we'll definitely be saying that's a bad idea for various technical reasons. But the ambiguity being number one. And for those of you who are technical, you know the hexadecimal things are numbers and letters, and those can be very bad if you don't know which ones they mean, just as an example. Not the entirety there.

---

There were some interesting things that were brought up around looking at confusability and determining contention sets that I think from a purely technical perspective, the SSAC will probably say that it doesn't necessarily make a lot of sense to look at intended use as a way of determining whether a string is confusingly similar and has a potential need for evaluation differently, just from a pure kind of ... You can't pre-cog, as you will, intent, but you can take a look at strings as they are and have rules around that.

There's also, it seemed there were some inconsistencies around how plurals were handled in the prior rounds, which SSAC hasn't really weighed in on, but based on what was put in the report, we were curious about what data or what studies may have been done as the background for that language.

Oh, there was a comment on replacing the SWORD system. We're just concerned that one faulty system may be replaced with another, so what were their criteria? That might be good to expand upon that a bit to provide a better outcome. And then I've got some notes here I'm referring to.

One of the things was on universal acceptance, thought that it would be good to have a defined time period in there from a policy perspective, something like three years or something like that. That's kind of a minutiae point, but it's just something that we note. So I don't know if you want to talk about any of the things that fall into that bucket there or if anybody else had additional comments from the SSAC or any reactions to the points, examples brought up there, how names are constructed, that topic area.

---

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

So while people are getting into the queue, I can go over just a couple of those. And I might go actually backwards. I think the recommendation was not that we replace SWORD, it was that we eliminate it. So I don't think we envisioned it being replaced with some other automated tool to determine the visual similarity.

So I can go back, and if anyone ... I know the recommendation says to eliminate it, but I can't remember if we said anything different in the rationale, I'm trying to remember now, but I think it was just sort of eliminate it.

The plural and singulars, so you started out by saying it's hard from an intended use, that you're not necessarily fans of using intended use—I'm paraphrasing—in terms of putting things in contention sets. I think you're right in saying the plurals and singulars were just treated in very different ways, and the working group at one point was considering doing a study on plurals and singulars, but what happened is that most of the plurals and singulars were eventually acquired by one entity. So at the time, we were like, "Okay, yeah, we should do a study on this," and then it turned out that the same car that had auto then acquired autos and the same company that had car acquired cars and so on.

There's still a few examples out there where there may be plurals and singulars, but a lot of them sort of went away by just acquiring it through consolidation. So that really wasn't ... We didn't do any studies. But essentially, a lot of the plural and singular kinds of issues came up with things like brands and others where one could look like the plural or singular of the other but be a

---

completely different purpose and use. And so certainly with brands, it's pretty easy to understand that—and I don't know why I can't think of an example off the top of my head. There are so many of them, but just whatever it is that we discussed within the working group.

And then it came up to—we went back and reviewed the comments that were filed during the initial questions the board sent out in 2013 or '14, whenever that was, about plurals and singulars, and the vast majority of them were to not have them, that, yeah, maybe technically there's not a technical reason that they look confusing, but at the end of the day, we don't want to be putting things into the root that confused the users as well and have it just be kind of a system where—we talk about DNS abuse a lot, right? So that certainly has potential for abuse, especially if the singular has one set of policies and the plural has a different one. So overall, I think it was the nontechnical reasons why the working group thought that plurals and singulars, having them both, were not generally a good idea, unless it was evident to a user that they're really not plurals and singulars of each other, that they're two totally different things, like new and news. Just adding an S or an ES—and that's only in the ASCII characters didn't make for something being the plural of another.

So that's kind of the discussions on that. On the two characters, obviously, we'd love to hear some more thought on that. There were, back in the day, requests from companies like 3M and O2 and others that wanted to have a top-level domain, and I don't think we ever came out with a—I think there are opinions going way back, I know there are, of having all numbers or a majority of

---

numbers in the top-level string, but we didn't really have anything to draw on to that said something like a 3M would be a bad idea for 3M.

So I'll stop there. I see Ram's got his hand up. Ram, go ahead.

RAM MOHAN:

Thanks, Jeff. So on the topic of intended use, just to expand a little bit further on what Rod was speaking, we're just concerned that intended use should not be considered any kind of a defining characteristic for whether applications should be placed in the same contention set or not. If you look at even the 2011 round or the rounds before that, there's a TLD that's applied for, there's an intended use, the community looks at it a different way, and intended use changes over the passage of time.

So what is confusingly similar, what is considered not confusingly similar today could quite easily become confusingly similar down the road. So we're just concerned about the specific idea that you look at prospective future use or expected use in a particular context that may actually not be how it's used in real life.

I'll give just an example directly from the company I work for. In the previous round, we launched a TLD .red, and our idea, the intended use was a color. It turns out that red means net in a couple of languages, and a bunch of folks who ended up buying it because they thought, hey, this neatly represents .net in our particular lingua franca. So we didn't know.

And the downside is that if somebody had gone in and said, "Oh, red means net, and net would then be confusingly similar to .net,

---

therefore you shouldn't allow .red to go through," so it's those kinds of very thorny issues that come up if you start looking at intended use as a defining characteristic or a criteria to either place or to remove something from a contention set.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Yeah. Thanks, Ram. And red is an interesting one. And this is, I think, why we didn't want a set of definitive rules saying all plurals and singulars should be banned. Like if you have a plural, you shouldn't allow the singular and vice versa, because with red, you could have Cincinnati Reds, who knows if they would want reds, right?

But on the other hand, it does say something when the owner of the TLD .book acquires—well, actually, sorry, .book is not an example because there was no—anyway, but like auto and autos, and car and cars, and those are all—obviously, what we've seen happen over the time is that they were just acquired by one company because I think everybody had expected—if you had asked everybody before the 2012 rounds started whether plurals and singulars would be in the same contention set, I would say nine out of ten would have said absolutely.

So I think that was always the expectation. So I think there was a different interpretation applied by the ICANN board. Many people still to this day disagree with that, and of course, that's what kind of led to the working group discussions. But again, we didn't want to set the hard and fast rule that anything that looks on paper as plural and singular of the other shouldn't be allowed, especially if

---

they deal with two completely different things. And that is the case in a lot of situations, especially in the English language.

RAM MOHAN:

Yeah, you're right, Jeff. I don't think there's any dispute on that. It's that it's often context dependent, language dependent, and in our internal discussions in the SSAC, we just thought it was not such a good idea to apply intended use as a defining characteristic. It might be interesting to have it as something to note or to take into consideration, but not the intended use as a standalone rubric to be a litmus test on whether a particular applied for string is confusing or not.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Let me add to that too because this actually touches on a topic that's later on in the agenda. But they're so interrelated, might as well just—we already talked through this a bit, but is that you have this issue where you have the intended use changes over time. And what are the rules for that?

You'd almost think there's a gaming problem too. I could come in with an application saying, "Oh, it's for this community purpose." Really, I'm going to do it for some other generic thing, and then a year later, "Well, this isn't working out. I'm going to change this generic which I was planning on doing the whole time but I didn't tell you about." Not that that's been a problem up to this point, we're just looking at a logical extension of using that a contention set. That might lead to some issues around gaming of applications

---

when the intended use may not be exactly what the long-term plan is.

And that's a hypothetical semi-malicious example, but there's other perfectly innocent examples where people have changed from like a community-sponsored thing to a more generic thing, and if you're applying contention sets, I imagine that's going to create a can of worms if somebody else wanted to apply for it for a different purpose and was then at some point put out of the application because it was in a different contention set.

So I think what we're trying to identify there is a source of potential problems in the process that could be avoided by simply saying this is not a primary gating factor for contention sets.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Okay. I see Paul McGrady has his hand up, so let me go to Paul.

PAUL MCGRADY: Thanks. So just playing with the example I've put in the chat, .apple and .apples. .apples was applied for the by the Apple Growers Association. They agree in their application that they're not going to sell computers or phones or anything that Apple the computer company cares about.

That's a great example of an intended use that could void a contention set if the two parties agree that that's okay, and one of the reasons some of us fought so hard for private resolutions was so that they could agree, they could do a side agreement between the two of them which would become binding. The ICANN



---

wouldn't have to opine on it other than to say that there's been a private resolution and that the contention set can be disentangled and both applications can go forward, and then in the future, if it turns out the apple growers decided they wanted to get rid of their TLD, they'd be stuck with a private agreement that would be enforceable privately in a court by not ICANN, by a third party, Apple.

So that's sort of the thinking there about how intended uses could play a part, but again, it would be really a part between two private parties and wouldn't drag ICANN into the business of content regulation, that kind of thing. Thanks.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah. Thanks, Paul. Ram, please.

RAM MOHAN: Thanks. Just a very brief question. What happens if somebody then registers bad.apples and uses that site to talk about all the bad Apple computers that they have had? So I think it's those kinds of things where semantics ends up becoming a factor, and I think really, there's not any disagreement that some specific cases exist where a plural of adding an S or a plural of a name could have a different use.

But I think the fundamental thing that we're saying is that it's a bad idea to have intended use be the defining characteristic. It perhaps is more suitable to be an identifying factor rather than a defining factor.

---

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Thanks, Ram. So a question to that is, what does that mean, an identifying factor? So if it's involved in the decision as to whether to put them in a contention set or not, then presumably, that's something that the community would want enforced afterwards because if ICANN says, "Well, look, one is Apple, well, Apple is already in the root but they're clearly for their brand, and this is apple growers, so we're going to weigh that as a factor to allow them to go forward," isn't that saying sort of the same thing whether it's the definitive factor or a factor? At the end of the day, someone's not going to be happy if an end user registers bad.apples.

And we appreciate kind of the technical view of these things, but at the end of the day, there's contracts, and whether they're privately enforced as Paul has said, or whether it's enforced because it was a voluntary commitment made to ICANN and the registry needs to be held accountable and to actually watch over what its registrars do, I think we're getting into an interesting age where I don't think—although I certainly object to where many of the laws are going in a lot of the countries, but I do think that there's certainly movement on the notion that—well, I don't want to get into that debate, but let's just say that we understand and we've had those same discussions within the group, but I think what the discussions within the working group have been are about confusion to the end users, not from the visual similarity of the string necessarily, but because of the significance.

And I think that's what we have with domain names, unfortunately, is that we're converting—although lots of people like to say it's just

---

a string, at the end of the day, that's not how it plays out in the real world.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah. This stuff is hard. So anyway, I think in the interest of time, we probably should move on because I'm sure we could redo a whole bunch of the work you've already done in a session like this. But anyways, I think it's an interesting topic space and certainly, you want to think about ways to mitigate those risks, right? And that's, at the end of the day, how to deal with that. And these are not always black and white or really easy to deal with situations.

The next section we have is DNS abuse, and using that issue as a proxy for other meta things. And that particular one, we know that you took a look at the DNS abuse issue that was passed down to you from GNSO council which came from the board, which came from us, and I think from the CCT review and other places, "Hey, this needs to be looked at," and came back and said, "Hey, this is an issue for all TLDs," which is true. It's something that needs to be looked at.

And there's [inaudible] other topics like that, I believe, that were— where you took a look at and said this is something that needs to be dealt with in overall policy, which is true.

A couple questions that come from that, and which we're just going to ask as questions, basically, is, okay, so these are issues that were noted as part of the last expansion as being potential issues in the case of DNS abuse or a few TLDs that were really

---

highly polluted. But the majority of new TLDs actually were pretty good.

So there's some specific problem TLDs. So, have we learned those lessons, why that was the case? Has that work been done? And it appears that that's something you guys didn't take on because it was determined that the scope was not within the remit of the SubPro. I may be wrong and I'm happy to be corrected on that.

But then, okay, so, are those lessons learned—do we have that—given the fact that we did experience those problems, one of the things that can be done to address that, does a PDP need to be taken on right away to address these issues like abuse and others that are meta issues? How does that interact with the subsequent rounds? Is that a negating factor, is that a consideration? Is that something that needs to be done as we go? How does that work?

There's also a valid engineering concept around being able to do things in a new space where you don't have kind of existing infrastructure in the way to deploy something new and see how that works. So from taking that analogy to a policy perspective, are there best practices and things that can be rolled out in new TLDs or some subset of new TLDs that address some of these issues that have been brought up that could be basically the proof of concept to be implemented into the full gTLD space?

So those are some of the questions we had around that. It's more around, how do we deal with these issues that we know are outstanding on there? Has the research been done on some of

---

these things? And how does that actually interact with the rollout of new things?

At the end of the day—and speaking specifically about the abuse issue—if you have similar problems to what you had in a few TLDs, the technology and capabilities that people have now for filtering and blocking and doing things like that on the TLD level are even more prevalent than they were when the new rounds came out.

And so we would really hate to see the reaction to new problems cropping up, be it the wide painting of a bad brush to all new TLDs as they come out, because network operators have been doing that, at least in specific cases. So we really want to see that any issues like that are handled and understood up front, and mitigated to the extent possible to make everybody successful. So that's kind of an overarching concern around abuse issues.

But where is that properly handled? Where do we include those considerations in the process? So those are the questions we have, and I don't [inaudible] have an answer.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

So I think—and this is a discussion I think you had with the GNSO council and with the number of the stakeholder groups, and so I tend to think of it in a little bit of a different way. The abuse that occurs in TLDs now is not because something is new versus something that's old. The abuse happens primarily because it's cheap, or it's a registry—maybe it's a ccTLD that doesn't necessarily take down sites. In other words, the driving factor for

---

abuse is not the fact that one is new and the other is old and therefore we should put restrictions on the newer TLDs as opposed to dealing with them in the older TLDs.

If you look at the instances—and even percentages of abuse, for the vast majority, they're just as high, if not higher, in the legacy TLDs as the new TLDs, and that'll just get exacerbated further, because I remember you looked at me funny, it's kind of a truism that there is no abuse in TLDs that have not been delegated yet. Right? It starts off at a zero rate. All the abuse that occurs today are in existing TLDs that are delegated.

ROD RASMUSSEN: [inaudible].

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Right. But the point is that I think abuse needs to be—well, as Ram said, abuse existed before new TLDs and it'll exist after. It needs to be handled on a global level, and I know the GAC didn't like this in the report because the working group had mentioned it should cover ccTLDs as well, and the GAC said no it shouldn't because they're governed under national law.

But at least with legacy gTLDs and regular gTLDs, the end of the day, one of the reasons for introducing new gTLDs is to promote competition, and when you promote competition, you usually don't saddle new entrants with more regulation and make it harder for them to come into the market than you do for the existing players.

---

Now, in theory, more responsible market players should emerge and should drive best practices towards the better players. And in fact, we have seen some of that happen. I think before new TLDs were—I can even go back to 2001, when seven new TLDs were introduced at that point, or a few of them, we know that the legacy TLD, .com and .net, instead of relying on their old protocol RRP saw that the future was moving towards EPP, and so even the legacy operator there had changed to EPP and established auth codes and things like that.

So I think that making this an issue—let me go back one step too. There's a lot of people in the ICANN community that like to take the view of, well, since we can't get the existing operators to agree to something, we're going to stick it on the new players that haven't come in yet because we can do that, and then we'll force it on the legacy players because they're going to have to get their contracts renewed, so that's the way we should regulate the TLDs. And I think that that's not—something the working group discussed, it's not really the appropriate way to deal with this.

And let's face it, new TLDs aren't coming into the root until, what, 2023, '24, who knows, right? So there's a lot of abuse going on now. I think the appropriate place is right now where we sent the issue to, which is the GNSO council, to decide the best path forward on setting policy on DNS abuse for all TLDs or at least all gTLDs, and I think, as you heard from them, it's on their agenda, and I think that they will—well, they'll take it up. I don't know what they'll do, but they'll take it up. And I think [Rubens] points to something as well. I think with the newer TLDs, you've seen voluntary practices come about, including, yes, PIR and .org was

---

one of the legacy TLDs on it and one of the sponsors, but a lot of new TLDs signed on to that and are doing it.

So I think we didn't want to use the DNS abuse exercise as one to punish new entrants and to make it harder for them to come into the marketplace. We do believe as a working group that it needs to be dealt with on an overall, holistic way, and so yeah, that's why we referred it. I'm just looking at your post. What were the primary drivers of concentrated abuse? Pricing, right? Filtering of bad actors likely would be really good to have solid understanding and to make good decisions.

Yeah, but I think the pricing issue has been there since—well, not the very beginning, but since new TLDs were introduced in 2001. There were some TLDs that dropped their pricing to near free or free and immediately, we saw abuse coming in. So those registry operators learned a lesson, as I think most new TLD operators are learning that lesson as well. But yeah. Does anyone want to add anything to the working group? No? Okay, Rod, we have some more time. We have 90 minutes, so we have 300 more minutes.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

I had one last point I put in there too. I know of at least one new operator that had all kinds of things going on that was like, wow, this is really interesting, we're getting all these domains that nobody wants to go to, it turns out.

But yeah, knowing this is really important, and I don't think that anybody wants to punish new operators. What we're really trying to do is, I think from our perspective, is, how do we make sure



---

things are successful? Because knowing how people react to things, if they have a bad experience with something up front, they'll tend to stay way from it. So how do we make sure things are successful next round and learn lessons from last round?

So I think if we have a concentrated effort that happens, it sounds like there's a lot of interest in doing so, that a lot of this will get addressed. But it would be really useful to learn lessons from what happened when new people stuck their toe in the water and some did really well and some got bit. Why is that? Understanding that, getting the data from those is really, I think, useful. So [we'll be commenting] on how to move forward on that is learn the lessons and don't repeat mistakes.

So, anyway, to address Maxim's last quote there, success—I'm not talking about financial success, I'm talking about success in being able to have, if you think about it, universal acceptance of TLDs being put into the zone. So if people are looking at filtering TLDs because they're not sure if a new TLD may equal danger, that becomes kind of a stability issue, especially when it comes to how you end up doing that blocking and filtering on the other side, because that oftentimes can lead to other problems. So if you just think about things like nameserver definitions where if you can't resolve a TLD because it's on a blocklist and it's a domain on a different TLD, good luck trying to figure that problem out, as just an example.

Oh, [registry testing.] A bunch of interesting conversations we've had on that, and pre-evaluation and those kinds of things, which we think are, in general, a good idea. There are some things that we've been thinking about and look to get your thoughts on that.

---

The idea of having backend operators in particular prove that they can do it, and have to do it over and over again for basically the same set of requirements, makes tons of sense. Why are you repeating something that we know you can do?

It becomes interesting, though, when you start thinking about a couple of different circumstances. One is just scaling itself. I can set up an organization that can run a TLD no problem, two or three TLDs, no problem, but 1000 TLDs, that might be a different issue that you'd have to test for. So there's that scaling issue of just sheer number of TLDs, because what you found is there's a lot of concentration in backend operators, which I don't know that we were expecting going into the first round or not.

Another one is just, hey, what happens if you come up with a name that's the next .com? Which everybody hopes—they want to do, I guess. But how is that scaling? So you can run a TLD at 10,000 names, 100,000 names, but how with about 100 million names? So those are just some thoughts there.

But then there's also specific requirements that some TLDs have. There are different technical requirements that you probably won't have [to] say,, “Okay, well, if there's a base set of testing, that gets you to here, but there's these specific requirements that aren't being done by [inaudible] TLDs. You should probably have to prove that you can do that too and not just get certified that you're certified as a backend operator for this, doesn't mean you necessarily can cover these special circumstances.” That's something to think about.

---

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah. Rod, on that, if I can just jump in. And this is indicative—so we've had so many conversations over the years on this and changed the term so many times of what we called them. It was accredited, then it was certified, then it was preapproved, and now it's pre-evaluated. If you think about—and there's a reason for it. We're not trying to say that ICANN is certifying that these backend registries are A+ and that they're the best in the world or anything like that, and that they can do all these things.

But if you looked at what happened in the 2012 round, everything was judged from the paper. And it was all done—and it relates to an ICANN board comment as well, because ICANN just had evaluators that read the papers, the answers that were submitted, and that it either approved it or didn't approve it as far as—or passed it or didn't pass it on the evaluation, and it was never looked at again.

So the board made a comment that's sort of relevant that said, well, what happens if they breach a contract or they fail an SLA later, are they still considered pre-evaluated? And the answer to that is yes. Just like what happened in 2012. If you passed the evaluation in 2012, but it was in 2014, there was an SLA violation, it's not as if ICANN went back and said, "Well, we know we passed you in 2012 on this and your string's not delegated yet because of contention issues, and therefore we revoke your passing of the evaluation."

The way you need to think about the pre-evaluation is it's nothing more than doing the evaluation earlier in time than you would have done it during the application process. That's it. It's not certifying, it's not an approval. It's not an endorsement in any way.

---

It's doing exactly what's happened in 2012, except several months earlier or a year earlier. And when you think about it in that light, it might make a little bit more sense. But your point on the other functions, we also do state in there that if you are saying that you're using a pre-evaluated backend operator, but you are proposing technical services that are not of the type that are being evaluated—I know I'm speaking at a high level, but it'll be much clearer than that more specific—then yes, you need to get evaluated for those new or additional services that the backend operator was not pre-evaluated for.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

That's good to hear on that. And speaking of that—I didn't go through the evaluation process, but some of our members did, and there was some frustrations around the different things that would show up and the way that that was handled. I know you guys have tried to address those issues.

Ram, did you want to add anything in this particular area? I know that's an area that you'd spent some time thinking on. He may have stepped away. And then one of the things that we were considering on this is recommending that ICANN Org—based on the prior experience that ICANN Org might put together, [inaudible] RSP 101-type documentation, here are the things you need to be able to do to be able to pass evaluation. And it also would be useful for the evaluators themselves, the people that come in, because—and I'm trying to recall conversations I had, because I personally wasn't involved in these kind of things, but members were, where you have—going through this process, DNSSEC implementation was one of the classic ones where it

---

was difficult for people to come in and get things done. And what ended up happening is people got set up and they passed an evaluation, but then six months later, a year or two later when they needed to do a key roll, they were not set up for success, let me put it that way.

So having some sort of materials and a really good guide to how to be successful with that for new entrants into the market. Obviously, the people who were doing it and have running TLDs right now probably have got that figure out, but part of what expanding will mean is likely more entrants into the space, so giving them capabilities is one of the things—I don't know if you'd said anything towards training materials and things like that, but feel free to steal the idea if you haven't.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

In one of the sections that we addressed very early on and went into the report, we did talk about more of the how-to guides and including—I'm trying to remember which section it's in, but yeah, we do go into some detail about consolidating all of the knowledge base and producing not just the applicant guidebook but more training materials and things like that to guide applicants so that they can understand what's going to be required of them.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah, there's the applicant side and the backend side, and I think we want to concentrate on the backend, because-yeah, the applicant side, I think we definitely spotted that and highly agree.

---

JEFFREY NEUMAN: I think the issue there is that ICANN doesn't have an actual relationship with backend providers, unless they happen to be, of course, frontend providers as well, which most of them are. But if someone is purely just a backend operator, ICANN doesn't have any kind relationship with them.

So even though we're saying it's like in the applicant training session, we would still include things that they should in theory pass on to their ...

ROD RASMUSSEN: Right. And I think we're in a position where we could say it wouldn't be a bad idea just to have some documentation, and certainly would—especially looking at some of the more difficult technical things, the lessons learned from the key roll problem, things like that, take care of that.

Okay, anybody have anything else to add or talk about there? We have another 15 minutes, we're almost through this. That's good. So I've got two more things, because we talked about TLD type. Just a couple of things. Just wanted to dig into on a couple of things that we had in SAC 103 that were ... You'd looked at, you acknowledged and said, "No, we're not going to worry about that."

One was the publicly traded company thing where we pointed out it's fairly easy to become a publicly traded company in various jurisdictions and what the thinking was there, because there is a concern around the way—if you get a program where you're starting to really expand the namespace like we anticipated in 2012, which it expanded but not nearly as much as we thought

---

back then. There is a concern about a bad actor being able to game the system.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Yeah. the issue there is very similar to the issue we faced way back when with trademarks. In some jurisdictions, it's pretty easy to get a trademark and doesn't require the same substantive review as it does in other jurisdictions, but from a political standpoint to actually say, "Yes, you can have a trademark from the United States or from other countries but you can't have it from the Benelux countries," it's not something politically you can actually say.

So in general, most publicly traded companies have very strict requirements for financial requirements and/or obligations, and for avoidance of crime and all that kind of stuff. So I think it's not that we just ignored it, I think it was one of those tough ones where we can't really call on ICANN to single out jurisdictions to say, "Yes, you could be from here but not from there," or, "If you're from there, you undergo an additional type of review." It's a hard one.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah. And it wasn't that you ignored it. And thank you for the explanation there, we'll definitely take that into consideration. It's tough. You do have those concerns. We as technical types don't have to pay as much attention, [at least] within this remit, so to speak.

And then there was—I'm trying to remember what else. Yeah, we already talked about the contention set stuff, so that was—and

---

then some of the criteria to skip evaluation. I'm going to just move on to the last—because there were just a couple of little things in there and I take your point on that.

So the last area was around name collision, and then the private TLD proposal which obviously just came out from SSAC that was SAC 113. And unfortunately, Jim Galvin who was one of the co-chairs there wasn't able to make the call, but we continue that work. And then Jeff, you've been in the discussion group, and I think several other folks that were in SubPro were on the discussion group there. So we know where that progress is. We're going to continue moving forward to offer—try to answer those board questions and get that out there. the discussion's been around how does doing some of this work interact with what phases of the expansion program when that comes out. I think there's plenty of time between now, and as you mentioned, Jeff, it's going to be a few years. I think there's enough time for us to get all that work done, because we are making progress on that.

And then the question really becomes, what are the criteria that come out of that? And the criteria will be the criteria. The board will decide what to adopt. Hopefully that'll be done well enough in time that folks that want to make applications will be able to consider that.

And we kind of know—the data is published around things that are noisy, at least in the namespace. So the stuff that DNS OARC and Verisign and others publish on a regular basis kind of give you a guidance to, “Yeah, if I'm an applicant, if I see that my string is on that list, I might be at least concerned about it already today.”



---

So knowing what to do about it is the next question, but at least there's some, I think, signaling around that.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

So on the name collision stuff, because the working group is here and we have you, something I've heard on the NCAP calls that I think would be worth repeating to the full working group, there are members of the working group that have been debating back and forth whether the work of the NCAP project should serve as a dependency for certain elements of the launch of the next round.

And I say certain elements because, yeah, it may be—there's different points of the program where you could say, “Well, yeah, I might not delegate TLDs until I have the advice of SSAC, but sure, I can go ahead and publish a guidebook and I can publish this, move it forward.”

I've come back from the NCAP meetings and so maybe you can just—the way I've interpreted it is that the NCAP group is not making any sort of recommendations as to whether their work should or should not be a dependency for the next round, that that is going to be a decision not by the NCAP group but rather by ultimately the board, and so just maybe talking about that a little bit for the rest of the working group so that they have that background.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah, and the board has not delegated us any such authority, so at the end of the day, we're an do our best to get the questions answered in a timely enough manner that it's part of the

---

considerations, but it's certainly not in our bailiwick to make any decision, or I would even say recommendations around that where there certainly opinion around having knowledge and understanding of things to mitigate people's risk. And the more you know, the sooner you know it, the better off you are.

But at this point, there are certain risks, there are unknowns. We're trying to lower those risks or at least understand those risks better so people can make better informed decisions. That's the goal we're trying to achieve here.

There are specific questions around .home, .corp and mail, which we will be offering—we were asked specifically about those and the risks. And again, the board's going to have to make the final call on that and we'll present our opinions on that, but it's not our decision to make, it's the board's decision. But beyond that, it's really trying to provide a framework for understanding the risks involved and being able to make decisions around either mitigating those risks or deciding whether to proceed or not proceed based on objective factors, delegation of a particular name.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:

Yeah. Thanks, Rod. The good news or not so good news depending on how you look at it, .corp, .home and .mail or any of the specific applications from the 2012 round are not within our jurisdiction, so we are not making any recommendations or any advice on those strings. It's all future looking, using lessons of the past but looking towards the future. I know we do not specifically comment on what to do with those strings.

---

The other thing that's important is, you're right, it's a matter of opinion as to what dependencies there should be for the next round, and so when someone has come to our group and even within the working group they we say, "Well, we shouldn't go forward until we have the NCAP project done," I ask them very specific questions and say, "Okay, when you say we shouldn't go forward, does that mean we the working group shouldn't publish our final report, or does that mean the GNSO council shouldn't make a decision on the report, or does that mean that the board shouldn't publish the report, or the board shouldn't approve the report, or the board shouldn't start—the GNSO starts the IRT with ICANN staff, or ...? There's a lot of steps before you actually get to the delegation. And I try to get everyone as specific as possible, because as you said, there are some political issues, some that want and don't want TLDs, and we're trying not to use that as a political argument but rather saying, "Okay, at what point in the process do you absolutely 100% need the recommendations of a group like the NCAP, and therefore, what work can you do up until you reach that one point?" Hard question, I know.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah, and really outside of our remit to answer that. I'd just point out the questions do need answering, because at the end of the day, as you rightly bring up [on the] discussion group, applicant support need to know whether or not they're an have a problem with their applications. And that's what we're trying to determine here, is the best way to provide a framework for doing that. And it's obviously over time and all that is going to vary on a case-by-case basis, so you've got to have objective criteria where people

---

can agree that this is the process and I'm going to do it this way. So that's what we're trying to get to.

Just on the last bit there, the question with the interaction with SAC 113, which is the private namespace report we put out. That there is kind of an ICANN/IETF interaction for creating a name that would be—a name or potential names, that's a policy decision whether you want to have more than one—that would be basically reserved from ever being published in the DNS root, that people who have various reasons—you can read the report to say why people are using these things—would have that space to be able to utilize for some sort of private use, whether it's private network use or a device, IoT type thing, those sorts of other use cases.

That is to try and address the issue where people keep picking up names and using them for stuff like that, because there is no space to do that, is one of the biggest driving factors there. It will not stop that practice, but the hope is it would mitigate that practice to some extent, so you would have less eventual potential collision sets at the end of the day. Belkin is a string that we cited often because that's used by Belkin routers in setup and other things, and it leaks like crazy all over the Internet and there's a potential danger to delegating that, getting access and control to those types of devices.

So the idea there is you provide a space. One of the proposals would be to use .internal. There's other ones, .zz is another one. There are other proposals for doing something similar to this as far as .name goes. That's not quite as important as actually just having something delegated. We have some things around that. It needs to actually be valid. In theory, you'd want something that's

---

fairly short and memorable and meaningful, which are of course things that are desirable to register as TLDs. There's that issue.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: And that's the point where you jump from technical to policy, right?

ROD RASMUSSEN: No, well, there are technical reasons for that. You want adoption.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Everyone wants adoption of their TLDs.

ROD RASMUSSEN: [inaudible]. Technical users tend to use things that make sense.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: I think the overall issue there is that—and there's a part of our recommendations that talks about the IETF and the reservation of strings, and I think we do need to set up that coordination—we've been talking about it for years—between the IETF and ICANN, and frankly the GNSO for that matter, because it is the GNSO that sets the policy for the gTLD space.

And if you use something—like I don't think anyone would care too much if you used some random made up thing, but using an actual attractive name, that's where you get into some policy issues. And I think it's more figuring out what the coordination mechanisms are as to what that string is, and so I know it's been

---

talked about in technical circles that this is an issue between ICANN Org and the IETF, but I think it does touch into other parts and we all kind of need—when .onion was delegated, that were a lot of people that were very much not happy, not to mention the people who have trademarks in the onion.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Onion growers association?

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Oh, no, but like the paper, the comical ...

ROD RASMUSSEN: Yeah, satire. So hence we did not recommend a name. So yeah, I know there's—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Jeff, I'm going to have to remind you of the time.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: No, I've got it.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Well, I'm at the end of my agenda.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: Yeah. And thank you. We're at the end of ours. We'll get up the notes and of course have the recording, and thank you, everyone,

---

for attending. It made for a very long day, evening for everyone, but certainly appreciate all of this and getting the feedback now as opposed to after the fact. And I think we have a lot to talk about over the next few months.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Good luck with all that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks everybody.

ROD RASMUSSEN: Appreciate all the work you're doing, and thanks for the time today.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Rod.

JEFFREY NEUMAN: And Jim, I know you had an AOB thing, but we'll cover that on e-mail. So, sorry about that, and the next call of the working group is—if someone can post it—

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: 27th?

ANDREA GLANDON: That's Tuesday the 27th at 03:00 UTC.

JEFFREY NEUMAN:            There you go. Thanks, everyone.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:    Thanks, Andrea. Thanks, everybody. Bye for now.

ANDREA GLANDON:         Thank you. This concludes today's conference. Please remember  
to disconnect all lines and have a wonderful rest of your day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**