

---

KATHY SCHNITT:

Welcome to today's NCAP discussion group call on Wednesday, April 8<sup>th</sup> at 19:00 UTC. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Zoom list. Kim and I will update the Wiki with the names of their participants as quickly as possible. No apologies have been received. All calls are recorded and transcribed and recordings and transcripts will be published on the public Wiki.

As a reminder, to avoid any background noise while others are speaking, please mute your phones and microphones. With that, I'll turn the call over to Jim. Jim, please go ahead.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks, Kathy. I appreciate that. Let me welcome one of our co-chairs, here. We've got Matt Thomas with us. I just want to acknowledge that he's here, and I'm Jim Galvin. We are your designated moderators for this discussion, I guess. Yeah. Okay. She's putting the link in for the document, so we'll get there. So that's good. Thanks very much.

So, welcome everyone. [I had the] roll call. Anyone have any updates to their statement of interest that they need to announce to the group, here? I'm not seeing any hands and no one is jumping up and shouting. Okay.

We don't have any new members this week from last week and that's probably fine. Although, folks are always welcome to join if you have friends, neighbors, and countrymen looking for something to do while they're on lockdown if they're here in the US. Yeah. Welcome to our

---

*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.*

---

group. Could always use more voices, I suppose, but thanks very much for that. Okay.

So, let's jump into the principal work item that we have here for this week. Last week, we had a draft proposal for what we are just generically calling a gap analysis. We've kind of restructured that thanks, primarily, to Matt Thomas who picked this up. After our review last week, we took another look, here, and we tried to restructure this.

The document was made visible earlier this morning so I apologize to those who are in bad time zones for all of that, but hopefully most of you have had a chance to look at this. You're encouraged to comment directly in the document. Everyone who is a panelist should have access to be able to edit the document but please use the suggesting mode and feel free to type in whatever you would like here into the document for discussion.

We took on board the comments from last week. It is important to make, I think, one important distinction here that I think is probably useful to start with, that this is our consensus or, ideally, this or whatever it becomes after discussion is intended to be our discussion group consensus on both a technical gap and a data gap with respect to name collision analysis. That's the way that we structured this document.

And that should not be confused with the fact that Matt Larson, as the OCTO representative and project owner, from ICANN's point of view, has an obligation with Karen as the contractor to produce a work product from study one that he will naturally produce to the board.

---

What we write here will serve as input to that process and we're hopeful that all of that's going to stay aligned. If it doesn't then there will be more discussion to be had here, but let's focus here on the fact that this is our view, so the point of view of this discussion group, about a consensus on a gap analysis, and this is a short statement of that.

We basically restructured this a bit from last week. The dataset section is still there but we tried to identify the other three things that we had talked about and label them, in fact, as technical gaps as we see them.

And this is our summary of what we've gotten out of discussions before. Recall that we had our spreadsheet where we were looking at the board questions and then identifying our own issues with respect to answering the board questions.

So, I think that's my little bit of intro about what's here, I believe. We tried to take on board all the comments and suggestions that we had from last week, and discussion, and I certainly would welcome any comments or questions from anyone here. I'm not seeing any hands jump up. Maybe what I should do is look over to Matt and ask Matt if there is anything that you would like to say by way of introduction or whatever to add to what I said about this document and where it is.

MATTHEW THOMAS:

Sure. I think you did a great job there, Jim. I did take the opportunity during this restructuring, also, to add some annotations in the four different groups that specifically point to the specific board questions that are presented and in which study phase that these particular items or gaps that we have would ideally be answered.

---

If you feel that maybe some of the questions are inappropriate for that kind of data or section, please feel free suggest/edit as you see fit. This was taken, again, also from that Excel spreadsheet that we've all worked on together and mapped them in accordingly through that way.

I do not believe all of the questions were addressed in here. I believe question nine, which had to address the measurements to protect against intentional or unintentional creation of situations hasn't quite found a home in this yet. And at the end of the document, there is an appendix that lists the nine questions so you can quickly reference back and forth between the two. But yeah, that's roughly where it is now. I look forward to commentary/suggestions.

JAMES GALVIN:

Great. Thanks, Matt. So, do we have any comments or questions from anyone? Not seeing any hands or chatter. This is going to be a short phone call today if we don't have anything to go forward with with this. We'll talk about what our next steps are going to be here. Folks, we'll certainly have another day or so. I mean, this will be visible on the mailing list.

Folks can certainly comment there if you want to take some additional time. If you want to comment on that, that would be good, too, anybody who wants to say that they'd appreciate more time, so that we make a point of checking in with you on the mailing list. Thanks, Julie. I see your comment in the chat room.

Okay. I think that this ... Well, obviously, I'm quite happy with this document, and what it represents, and how we got to where we are. So,

---

I think that this is a good thing. My view about next steps from this is this document ... What I would like to do, just for the historical record, I guess, is make sure that we ultimately get a PDF of this that we then send around to the mailing list so that it gets into the e-mail archive in that way.

And we'll take this, then, and the assumption is that ... And maybe, Matt Larson, if you want to speak to this a little bit, that then Matt can speak to what the next steps are from there. We do have on our agenda for today talking a bit about, or noting at least, the public comments that are there that we got. But let me turn it over to Matt Larson. I'll let you jump in and see where you want to take our conversation. Thanks.

MATT LARSON:

Thanks, Jim. So, I have been hearing from Karen that she thinks the revised document is sufficiently actionable that she can use that text to update section five in the study one report, the data subsection there. So, I'm pleased that it has gone in that direction.

I had sent the e-mail last week asking for more explicit, specific suggestions for what data to be changed or added in section five in study one but I think now we're good, according to what I've heard from Karen. So, we have the public comment report just about ready to go. I'm happy to share that with this group. If you've read the comments, you know that they're not ... I want to use the right word to characterize them properly. There was nothing earth-shattering in there. There was nothing that expressed great dissatisfaction or would cause us to really rethink or change direction.

---

So, the report is reflective of that and Karen is already addressing the comments. For example, the plan had always been to add an executive summary but that was one of the comments, that we needed an executive summary.

So, in terms of going forward, Karen will update section five, the dataset section. Then, she'll also write the executive summary and she'll write the conclusion. So, I had previously been thinking out loud about the best way to package up all the deliverables for the report and, in talking with Karen, we think the best way is to just make the report completely self-contained.

So, of course, I'm not looking at the list of deliverables right now. I don't remember which number it is but that's basically the recommendation about how to proceed. That will basically be in the conclusion of the report.

So, just to recap, there will be three substantive changes to the study one report. The section five, datasets will be updated. Karen will add a conclusion and she'll add an executive summary, and then we'll get that to this group. But then, that's really it and the only thing that remains after that is a public comment, which we would like to open in time that we can present the report to the board by the end of June.

I just went out on a limb and told the board that we'd have them the report by the end of June. I told the BTC that just today and I think we can do that based on the schedule that we have. That was the schedule all along and I think we can still make that happen. So, that's a fair amount

---

of talking. I'll pause and ask if there are any questions or if anyone has any comments.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks, Matt. Just to make sure that everyone is tracking, Matt said BTC. That's the Board Technical Committee which, on behalf of the board, has oversight of this project that Matt Larson is the project owner for. And while I'm waiting for other comments to come up, I think, Anne, we answered your comment there.

Ultimately, the next generation of what's produced will go out for public comment again. In addition, I will separately point out that we'll wait a few more days here, on the mailing list. We'll call it out. We'll get a deadline for it for people to offer any additional comments that they want for this particular gap analysis brief that we've prepared here.

And then, just as a matter of historical record, then Matt Thomas and I will create a PDF of this and distribute that around to the group as our final consensus version from the discussion group, just so that it's there and it's captured and visible, as opposed to just being left as a Google Doc that somebody might actually delete, I suppose, at some point. Who knows?

And then, we'll pick up and go forward with our other work. We'll wait and we'll see the revised document that comes from Matt Larson and Karen. We'll work with that when that happens.

So, I'm still not seeing any hands, so no other chatter. You're welcome, Anne, in the chatroom. I think, then, the other item that was on the

---

agenda was just to review the public comments but, as Matt Larson was saying, there are some important comments but nothing – I’ll use the phrase “materially substantive.”

So, nothing that fundamentally changes anything, just some stuff to address and take care of, which is easily done as an ordinary part of process. It doesn't require any significant discussion or work to go with it. And that’s a fairly ordinary thing in this whole ICANN public comment process.

Of course, if anyone wants to object, if anyone has looked at those comments and you feel like there is something that you want to talk about and you have something to say, please do feel free to bring it up and speak out. We’ll certainly welcome any discussion that folks believe we need to have on any issue that surfaces. Okay.

So, with that, actually, maybe today really is a fairly short meeting. I really had not prepared to start the rest of the work. The next step for us, currently ... Oh, the steps from your public comments is the report that should come out. That’s what Matt Larson was just saying is being produced and will be sent around, and that will be sent around to this group, too. So, we’ll get to see the summary of all the public comments as an ordinary part of process, here. Okay.

The direction that we’re going to go in next is we are going to pick up and ... There are two objectives in the work that we’re going to do going forward. We are going to start doing some serious brainstorming and analysis based on what we have available today.



---

So, we are, ourselves, going to have to study the bibliography that comes out of work-study one that has already been done here, that we now have. And we are going to begin to take on these questions. We can take them in any order that folks seem most interested in doing and we're going to begin to talk about what our answer is and what it really means to answer those questions in detail and specifically, and start that analysis/potentially start doing what is work-study two, project two, from the original project plan.

Now, along the way ... So, that's one big piece. That's a big chunk of work. That's what we're going to start to do week to week going forward, here, in our meetings. We can track that work. We'll build it out. We'll propose a plan and build it out. We'll just manage that from week to week.

However, in the relative near-term—and what that means is kind of in parallel with finishing up work-study one, getting the final package out, and all of that product—we are going to have to track this question of whether there will be a proposal and a development of a project with funding for a contractor to do some additional detailed analysis of data for us.

We'll have to track that happening and what's going on, there, because a part of our future analysis, here, is to identify specific questions that we believe data can provide some input to us for, or specific questions that data can answer for us.

So, questions that we want to ask of data. Let's begin that process of developing that because, ultimately, that should become the statement of work for a future contractor that does the detailed data analysis part:

---

going out, collecting the data, getting access to the data, and arranging for all of that to happen so that we can ask the proper questions that we want to get asked, and we'll start going through that process and bringing that into our discussions as we begin the actual work in study two.

So, that's going to be our goal overall. We're going to start to get into the meat of what the NCAP project is really all about, is the elevator speech, I guess, on where we're going to go here. It's really digging into the details and having our discussions about what it all means and what we think is a suggestion for the future on how to manage this.

I'm going to pause there for a moment to see if anyone jumps out with any questions. Anyone? Certainly, there will be plenty of time to shape that as we're just getting started. We do have a project plan so that'll be our foundation from which we'll move forward.

The rest is just us developing the details for ourselves. We're certainly hoping for any suggestions from anyone as we go along, here. We'll have plenty of time to shape that and answer any questions that folks have.

Not seeing any questions or comments. Nothing in the chatroom. No hands going up. I think with that, then, we'll go back to our agenda, here, and I believe that just leaves us with any other business. So, anything else that anyone wants to bring up today?

Again, not seeing any hands or hearing anything. Anne is pointing out, "SubPro is scheduled to discuss name collisions in April. Will anyone from NCAP participate?" That's a question for the team. Is there anyone here who will be part of the SubPro discussions about name collisions? I will

---

say for myself, Anne, if I'm available I will certainly, probably, try and participate for myself.

I'm not actually tracking the SubPro work carefully and I'm not tracking the agenda. I think you're actually part of that group and you were there. We don't have Jeff Neuman with us here today, right? But if you wouldn't mind posting onto the NCAP discussion group awareness about the meeting schedule in the agenda topic, that would be helpful.

And then, certainly, I would recommend ... I mean, I'll certainly try and make myself available and it would be very good if other folks from here would participate in that group, SubPro, just to see what they're up to and where the schedule is going to go. Rod, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

ROD RASMUSSEN:

Yeah. I do think this might be an opportunity for, if this is a topic that SubPro is going to be digging into substantively on a particular meeting day, it might be good to actually make a formal request, so to speak, or send out an invitation with a kind of agenda of topics that the SubPro group might like to hear from the NCAP discussion group, here, and we can see if we can get it as one of the chairs or somebody to at least take part in that who is familiar with the work and where we're at and be able to answer questions and provide some input. I think that actually would be useful, if that's appropriate, from the SubPro's perspective, but useful to work on some collaboration between the two efforts. That's my thought. What do you think, Jim?

---

JAMES GALVIN:

Yeah. No, Rod, I like that. Thanks much. I'm seeing in the chatroom here that Anne, and Greg, and Justine are all members of SubPro and, of course, Jeff Neuman who is one of the co-chairs of SubPro. So, I think we have pretty good overlap. I think that the folks that are on the call, here, from SubPro, can certainly take as an opportunity to offer to have NCAP come and do that.

I'll certainly make an opportunity to talk to Jeff, in particular, and ask him if he'd like to set up something a little more interactive and direct the responses. If he has particular questions, it would be good to do that. It's great that we have such extensive overlap. Justine is also pointing out Rubens Kühl is also in the meetings, so great. I'm glad that we have all this overlap. Greg, you have your hand up. Go ahead, please.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. I had to find all 17 mute buttons. I just want to encourage this. I think this is very positive and I think that, although Justine, and Anne, and I are all participants there it would be good to have what I'll call "the senior management" of NCAP comment – the chairs and those, frankly, who are more core technical experts than any of the three of us that I just mentioned, or at least myself. I don't want to pre-judge anybody else.

But I think this is a point where there needs to be liaising, and coordination and, to some extent, division of remit, but more to the point of not letting anything fall between the cracks, as opposed to trying to play territorial games, but rather try to cover what's going on here.

And there are certain things about name collisions that have been discussed as being somewhat out of scope or at least out of policy scope

---

for SubPro, so it would be good to just figure out how the two groups can produce the best combined result. Thanks.

JAMES GALVIN:

Thanks for that, Greg. Very much agree with you. I don't think that either one of us would want to get in the way of each other's work but it certainly is very appropriate to understand where the division of work is and, of course, be supportive of each other. So, it's great that we have the amount of overlap that we have, here, which is excellent.

So, if any questions come up in between that would be good. I'm certainly more than happy to join and I'm sure that Matt Thomas and Patrick would welcome the opportunity to come and join the SubPro group and provide any insight as far as the division of labor is concerned there, too. So, yeah, we'll make all that happen.

All of you folks that are part of both groups should certainly take the opportunity to represent that. Getting the two groups together at least once would be a good idea just to make sure that we understand everyone. And I will take as a personal action to reach out to Jeff, at least—Jeff Neuman—and just make sure that the offer is there, explicitly, and then we'll see where that goes.

Okay. Thanks for that, everyone, and thanks, Rod. Anything else in terms of any other business from anyone? Okay. Then with that, thanks very much, everyone. I'm going to give you back 30 minutes of your day. We'll see you all next week. We're adjourned.

---

KATHY SCHNITT:                    Thanks, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]