

NCAP Discussion Group
Meeting #67
1 December 2021 – 19:00 – 20:00 UTC

Discussion Group Members

Jim Galvin, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Julie Hammer, Justine Chew, Matthew Thomas, Rod Rasmussen, Warren Kumari, Greg Shatan

Apologies

Matt Larson

Observers

ICANN Org

Corina Ferrer, Kathy Schnitt, Jennifer Bryce, Steve Sheng

Contractor Support

Heather Flanagan, Casey Deccio

These high-level notes are designed to help NCAP Discussion Group members navigate through the content of the call. They are not meant to be a substitute for the recording or transcript accessed via this link:

1. Welcome, roll call

See attendance record above. No SOIs provided.

2. Update from the Technical Investigator – Casey Deccio

Casey presented slides on Root Cause Analysis. The group provided feedback to Casey and asked questions. Casey will incorporate the feedback as he continues his work.

3. Current status of the NCAP project – Jennifer Bryce

Jennifer noted the admin group will meet after today's discussion group meeting to update the project plan and as such no updates this week. More detailed update will be provided next week.

Jennifer also introduced Corina Ferrer to group. Corina will assist supporting group's work while Kinga is out on leave.

4. Continued Discussion on the proposed Name Collision Analysis Workflow

Jim walked the group through the slides.

<https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=181305945&preview=/181305945/181307107/Name%20Collision%20Analysis%20Workflow%202021%2012%2001%5B2%5D.pdf>

The group discussed Heather's questions as to what "trusted third party" means (e.g. trusted by whom?) in the context of controlled interruption and honeypotting; Who is managing the honeypot? Who has access to it? Would the honeypot be something run by one of the root servers (which we're proving are equal in terms of whether the data that would come from them thanks to our sensitivity study)?

The group discussed some other questions, including:

- Technical questions around going straight to a honeypot vs. controlled interruption, for example would there be scalability issues?
- How could potential gaming be detected or accounted for in the kind of scenario of sink holing the group is discussing?
- Regarding the third party that will do the sink holing (or honey potting), and the technical review team – does the group envision these to be separate entities, or the same entity? What are their roles and responsibilities?

5. AOB

No AOB items for this session.