

NCAP Discussion Group Weekly Meeting - 21st July 2021

AGENDA:

1. Welcome and roll call
2. Action Item review
3. Review Board question transformation from statements to questions
4. AOB

DISCUSSION:

2. Action Item review

No outstanding action items

A general reminder for the discussion group: there are 4 groupings of tasks overall:

- 1) **Group cause analysis** - Cassey Deccio is working on analysis name collisions reported to ICANN
- 2) **Additional data collection** - Matt Thomas is working on this task and reached out to several root server operators to see if they would be willing to do some data analysis and measurements. A few of them have already responded and Matt is waiting for answers from the rest. Matt will also share a deck with data sensitivity analysis specifically at the root servers with the discussion group at the meeting on August 4th.
- 3) **Answering the Board questions** - update below
- 4) **Case study of CoreComm mail**

All the above steps will be finalized by September. Then, the group will start in depth discussions about the name collision analysis, and afterwards the advice for the Board. Jim Galvin and Matt Thomas have been putting together a baseline draft proposal for a framework of decision tree that could be submitted to the Board. The group is committed to be done with the NCAP Study in June 2022. Considering that there is also a time needed for public consultations and review of the public comments, the work on all 4 tasks should be done by March/April 2022.

3. Review Board question transformation from statements to questions

The discussion was about the Board questions 8 and 9 (the last two questions).

Question 8 - Heather Flanagan, the technical writer, rewritten the bullet points into questions about the suggested criteria for determining whether coalition strings should not be delegated, and also the criteria for determining how to remove an undelegated string from the list of collision strings. We group will have a better understanding of how to draft an answer after reviewing the group cause analysis that is currently being prepared by Casey Deccio, the technical investigator.

Question 9 - this question is also mostly about managing a collision string. Similarly to question 8, in order to draft and answer to this question, the group needs to reach the stage of the work when the mitigation opportunities will begin being discussed. The operative question for the discussion group here is whether or not this particular reframing captures correctly what question 9 is asking the group to look at. Jim Galvin suggested that this question is asking if it's possible for a third party to "game" whether or

not a particular string is allowed to be delegated or not. It might be a good idea to suggest to the Board that it's worth considering having a guidebook for applicants. Such a guidebook should include an admonishment that if an applicant is found guilty of "gaming" there will be a penalty imposed.