

NCAP Discussion Group
Meeting #71
19 January 2022 – 19:00 – 20:00 UTC

Discussion Group Members

Anne Aikman-Scalese, Barry Leiba, Julie Hammer, Rubens Kuhl, Matthew Thomas, Rod Rasmussen, Jim Galvin, Tom Barrett

Apologies

Warren Kumari, Jaap Akkerhuis

Observers

Jothan Frakes, Jim Prendergast

ICANN Org

Matt Larson, Kathy Schnitt, Jennifer Bryce, Steve Sheng, Corina Ferrer

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:

<https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/4wSBtsjvsjTfZVTSxGRhgs9jdV6ckcAkNhbmYXo5HRGfm79kh94udLzM4RMHPKt.SrJ1dMDdNy6-eX7t>

NCAP Discussion Group action items and decision log:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1DE5lcOqFujazdw4_x5ii9vcBnsoskAUJnBee_HaVHn8/edit?usp=sharing

1. Welcome, roll call

See attendance record above. No SOIs provided.

2. Update from the Technical Investigator – Casey

Casey noted his time in the last week has been spent reviewing the data sensitivity analysis document. He also flagged an admin issue with regard to his subscription to the discussion group mailing list.

Action item: Staff should work with Casey to ensure he's subscribed to the NCAP Discussion Group mailing list (noted as complete during the call – action item closed).

3. Current status of the NCAP project – Jennifer

Jennifer noted no further updates to the project plan from last week. She previewed the new 'action items and decisions log' (see link above).

4. Pick up discussion of Anne's question: "Is it possible that the DG should be recommending that ICANN test the system of controlled interruption we are endorsing on strings that were previously applied-for in 2012 and not delegated due to Name Collision issues?"

Anne suggests that if the Discussion Group adopts the workflow as consensus, in order to answer to questions about specific strings it might make sense to test the process against known problematic strings from the 2012 round, in particular those where there are applications which have not been withdrawn, for example .home and .mail. These could serve as examples to the Board.

Casey highlighted the role of the technical investigator as outlined in the [SSAC2021-02: Revised Study 2 Proposal for the Name Collision Analysis Project](#) document and the questions he is answering about reported incidents, in particular the question (see p9): *“What lessons were learned from this experience? Are there any open questions or unresolved consequential issues? Based on this analysis, would collision prevention mechanisms, such as controlled interruption, be effective or could other collision prevention mechanisms be deployed/implemented to better prevent the collision.”* He noted he is in the middle of his analysis and suggests that the group should be cautious about moving forward without having some additional answers.

The group agreed that the question of testing the workflow should be noted as an action item for the group to come back to at a future discussion.

Action item: Discussion Group to consider how to test the workflow. To be discussed at a future meeting.

Tom proposed “controlled interruption” in the workflow ([see slide 2](#)) be made more generic, to something like “names collision assessment”, in order to future proof the text given that controlled interruption is the current mechanism. The group had a brief discussion about this, with Jim proposing that the group could find a way to reference the point that if the root system changes then controlled interruption might change.

The group discussed ensuring there is clarity around what is meant by ‘delegation’ and the definition of ‘name collisions’.

Action item: Items 3 and 4 in the workflow (‘controlled interruption’ and ‘enhanced controlled interruption’) should be renamed to ‘name collision assessment’, or something more generic.

Action item: In the final report it should be clear what the group means by ‘delegation’. For Heather’s action as she prepares draft text.

Action item: The Discussion Group should revisit the definition of ‘name collision’ as used in Study 1 and ensure it still captures what the group needs it to.

5. Consensus of workflow

Jim acknowledged that the method of declaring the workflow as stable has been somewhat ad hoc. In future, the co-chairs will make it clearer when a decision is needed. This agenda item will be carried over to next week; the chairs will send a note to the list between now and next week.

6. Consensus of data sensitivity analysis

Matt T talked the group through some of the modifications he has been making to the [document](#) recently, based on input from Discussion Group members and Casey. Notably the title will change away from ‘sensitivity’, and the word ‘temporary’ added before ‘delegation’. Tom suggested that the terminology section of the document would be a good place to explain what is meant by ‘temporary delegation’.

The Discussion Group discussed if the document is ready for Public Comment yet. If the publication is pushed by one week, the close of the Public Comment period would fall just before the ICANN meeting.

Decision: The Discussion Group determined the data sensitivity analysis document is not ready for public comment yet. Public comment of the data sensitivity analysis and the case studies should be delayed by one week and extended beyond the end of the ICANN meeting (Jennifer to consult with the Public Comment team on the recommended close date).

Action item: Discussion Group members should provide any final comments on the data sensitivity analysis by Monday 24 January at the latest.

7. Summary of action items and decisions made – Jennifer

Decision: The Discussion Group determined the data sensitivity analysis document is not ready for public comment yet. Public comment of the data sensitivity analysis and the case studies should be delayed by one week and extended beyond the end of the ICANN meeting (Jennifer to consult with the Public Comment team on the recommended close date).

Action item: Staff should work with Casey to ensure he's subscribed to the NCAP Discussion Group mailing list (noted as complete during the call – action item closed).

Action item: Discussion Group to consider how to test the workflow. To be discussed at a future meeting.

Action item: Items 3 and 4 in the workflow ('controlled interruption' and 'enhanced controlled interruption') should be renamed to 'name collision assessment', or something more generic.

Action item: In the final report it should be clear what the group means by 'delegation'. For Heather's action as she prepares draft text.

Action item: The Discussion Group should revisit the definition of 'name collision' as used in Study 1 and ensure it still captures what the group needs it to.

Action item: Discussion Group members should provide any final comments on the data sensitivity analysis by Monday 24 January at the latest.

8. AOB

None raised.