NCAP Discussion Group
Meeting #73
2 February 2022 at 19:00 – 20:00 UTC

Discussion Group Members	Observers
James Galvin, Barry Leiba, Matt Thomas, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Jim Prendergast, Rod Rasmussen, Tom Barrett, Julie Hammer, Justine Chew, Warren Kumari, Greg Shatan	**ICANN Org** Matt Larson, Kathy Schnitt, Jennifer Bryce, Steve Sheng, Corina Ferrer, Kinga Kowalczyk
Apologies Jaap Akkerhuis, Ram Mohan	**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/7FayF5iqbhy-GN2XDzkWQqPMfgCsd9lwAoDll4b2Gj8p4q4Si1Q5WhAJ72cVr-UI.E0Y8jYswICbFT413

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 he and Matt have been continuing discussions regarding the NCAP documents published for public comment last week. Matt noted that they have reached agreement on a proposed path forward, including to incorporate content from Annex 2 of the 'Perspective Study of DNS Queries for Non-Existent Top-Level Domains' into the main body of the document, perform a couple of additional measurements from the data already available, and update figures and revise text accordingly. Casey and Matt hope to get these changes done in the next few weeks. Jim noted that changes made to the document and why will be visible to the Discussion Group.

3. **Current status of the NCAP project; restatement of summary of action items and decisions made from last meeting – Jennifer**
Jennifer recapped the action items from the previous meeting as noted in the action items tracker. 'Confirm distinction between domain name collision and name space collision' was added to the existing action for the Discussion Group to 'revisit the definition of 'name collision' as used in Study 1 and ensure it still captures what the group needs it to'.

4. **Consensus of workflow – Jim/Matt**
This agenda item will be carried over to a future meeting.

5. **Review text from the Design Team: Section 4 of the draft Study 2 final report: Board Questions - Heather**

Jim reminded people that there is a writing team made up of Matt, Jim, Casey, Warren, and Heather that Discussion Group members are welcome to join if they would like. During the regular Discussion Group meetings, the writing group will share text they have been working on.

Heather noted that while the Discussion Group waits for the public comment, there are other sections of the draft report the Group can continue to work on. These include:
- Terminology section: Discussion Group members should feel free to add terms to the terminology section of the document that they feel should be properly defined.
- Board questions: The writing team has started putting some draft text/comments in there from the Discussion Group's earlier documents.

Heather hopes that for future calls, the Discussion Group can start working through items that the Discussion Group has identified as 'need to be discussed', such as the definition of name collisions. Jim encouraged people to go into the document and read and make comments in between meetings.

Action item: Heather to capture the definition of 'name collisions' as used in the Study 1 report and plug it into the draft report as a reference point.

Action item: Jim to plug into the draft report the notes he captured at the time from the Study 1 discussions about what needs to change regarding the definition of name collisions.

Action item: Discussion Group members should read the draft report text in Section 4 that Heather presented during the meeting, and make comments/suggestions. Discussion Group members should let Heather know if they need a word version of the report to read and comment in.

Regarding "harm", Jim noted the Discussion Group has talked about moving away from "harm" and towards "impact", and this should be considered as the Group produces its report. He suggested the Discussion Group should create a mapping for the Board for moving away from harm and towards impact, as an assessment of volume and diversity (as supported by the case study).

Action item: Heather to pull the text regarding 'harm' from Study 1 and plug it into the draft report.

6. **Summary of action items and decisions made – Jennifer**

Action item: Heather to capture the definition of 'name collisions' as used in the Study 1 report and plug it into the draft report as a reference point.

Action item: Jim to plug into the draft report the notes he captured at the time from the Study 1 discussions about what needs to change regarding the definition of name collisions.

Action item: Discussion Group members should read the draft report text in Section 4 that Heather presented during the meeting, and make comments/suggestions. Discussion Group members should let Heather know if they need a word version of the report to read and comment in.

Action item: Heather to pull the text regarding 'harm' from Study 1 and plug it into the draft report.

7. **AOB**
None raised.