NCAP Discussion Group
Meeting #65
10 November 2021 – 19:00 – 20:00 UTC

Discussion Group Members	Observers
Jim Galvin, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Barry Leiba, Jaap Akkerhuis, Julie Hammer, Justine Chew, Matthew Thomas, Rod Rasmussen, Warren Kumari	**ICANN Org** Matt Larson, Kathy Schnitt, Jennifer Bryce
	Contractor Support
Apologies	
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/TlfZ2h8V3z-JN1aGAoJAtxYEGKw9iShUzR2nLrY0CFH6h6YjYnIIAGjjnU6S0ivx.KUuFBPGa2Ao8Mcz7

1. Welcome, roll call
See attendance record above.

2. Update from the Technical Investigator – Casey Deccio
Jim noted on Casey's behalf that work is progressing and the draft report will be available to the Discussion Group soon.

3. Current status of the NCAP project – Jennifer Bryce
Jennifer noted the admin group is tracking the progress and may update the project plan soon, particularly to reflect that the Impact and Data Sensitivity Analysis will likely be delivered at a later date than expected and how this impacts other work.

4. Name Collision Analysis – Details of Step 4, particularly the basis for a honeypot
Jim led a discussion using these slides, which include changes to the previous version based on the discussions to date, and are intended to focus on questions that the Discussion Group has not yet come to consensus on. The meeting discussion focused on steps 3 and 4 of the five-step workflow process (the group will pick up the discussion again at next week's meeting):
1. Review risk of applying
2. Application submission
3. **Controlled interruption**
4. **Honeypot**
5. Board gets a final package for review

Some areas the discussion touched on include:
- The responsibilities of the technical review team, which the Discussion Group needs to spend some time detailing. Some questions raised on the call include:

- Is there a way that the technical review team could make a recommendation with respect to controlled interruption, so that the Board does not have to look at every string?
- Could the technical review team be an option for managing the question of whether or not there needs to be a honeypot?
- Some learnings from the previous round that have been considered as part of the workflow.
- Considerations with regard to contention sets.
- Considerations with regard to gaming (the project plan contains a question related to gaming that the group must answer).
- Potential roles for a trusted third party.

5. AOB

None raised.