

# NCAP Discussion Group Weekly Meeting - July 7<sup>th</sup>, 2021

## AGENDA:

1. Welcome and roll call
2. Action Item review: None
3. Updates to SOI: Jim Galvin (Next SSAC Liaison)
4. Root Cause Analysis (Casey to provide brief update)
5. Review Board question transformation from statements to questions
6. AOB

## DISCUSSION:

### Root Cause Analysis:

The technical writer working on two things. Currently looking at passive data and studying the root cause of WPAD vulnerability (.name) that came in via the ICANN submission form. Looking specifically at timeframe of changes related to remediation.

Jim reinforced the need and benefit of the root cause analysis. Important consideration is to be able to comment on the of future controlled interruption or mechanism that can be proposed for future monitoring of name collisions.

### Review Board Questions Transformation from Statements to Questions:

Jim explained the evolution of the Board Questions. The technical writer has turned the statements into questions. In the coming weeks look at the questions that have been rewritten and then look at the notes and consider if they speak to the question or not (flagging if something is not relevant). Technical writer will draft text that specifically respond to the questions also capture open ended questions that needs answering. The sub-questions has been formed from the analysis and case study and will eventually be pulled into work.

Heather created an introductory text for the whole effort. Setting the stage and parameters. Created questions from bullet points and clarified misalignments in interpretation.

### Introduction:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1QwZQGftOK1ijEseBLV16BBaqQeTylUNfRm4a8rG1PBY/edit?usp=sharing>

### Question 2:

In response to questions 2, Ann A. brought up issue of parameters of end user experience noted in the document by Jeff N.. Jim G. views this issue as a technical question. First reference is in the sight finder report (NX Domains). Jim G. interpret this board question to be speaking about the infrastructure role that NX domain responses play because different applications take advantage and respond and behave differently depending on whether they get those kinds of responses or not and that's really the issue. Ann A. suggested what the end user experience would be vs. what it isn't.

### Q2:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/16phcirWjDASZJefE7IkmiOWetbdrPFRoTfLTxAZvDF0/edit?usp=sharing>

Question 3:

Identifying harm and finding ways to characterizing harm. Highlighted “potential” harm and tried to avoid enumerate all forms of harm and instead create potential categories of harm. The advice to the board should be flexible and able to evolve over time (good framework). Drafted answer to the Initial two categorize of harm (Interception and Manipulation and Signal Interruption).

Q3:

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Q6YulPRof\\_IsPvu3Kt0lebfOE-rr07bvICGk2dp1DNQ/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Q6YulPRof_IsPvu3Kt0lebfOE-rr07bvICGk2dp1DNQ/edit?usp=sharing)

Question 4:

Originally target for study 3. Jim G. suggest taking out reference to ICANN org. What kind of mitigations are possible and who will be responsible for it? Barry L. and Rod R. explained that there are actions that can be done within the remit within the ICANN org remit and policy apparatus or potentially can work with software vendors or IETF, etc. Ann A. explained it is important to list ICANN org as done in other initiatives. Heather brought up the dependency of this question to the next set of questions. Can create categories of mitigation to address harm. This can be used to create categories of who will do the mitigation.

Q4:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1FcSho2wcghmlU8b1DmO61ctQtR0CwYRNsvr8J2awXM8/edit?usp=sharing>

Update:

Jim and Matt have been working on creating a gross level decision tree as a starting point.