

# NCAP Discussion Group

## Meeting #88

25 May 2022 at 19:00 – 20:00 UTC

Meeting wiki: <https://community.icann.org/x/GAPCCw>

<b>Discussion Group Members</b> James Galvin, Matthew Thomas, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Barry Leiba, Geoff Huston, Julie Hammer, Rod Rasmussen, Suzanne Woolf, Thomas Barrett, Warren Kumari	<b>Observers</b> None
<b>Apologies</b> Kathy Schnitt, Jaap Akkerhuis, Justine Chew	<b>ICANN Org</b> Matt Larson, Jennifer Bryce, Kinga Kowalczyk, Steve Sheng
	<b>Contractor Support</b> Casey Deccio, Heather Flanagan

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/uPGlzEcrpBUeM4xCi0EfueCl3oKsyt0zrKsQrbdIGOLsVhojPibyA33HMxtu04I2.jrwk9QTiTyvwjziU>

NCAP Discussion Group action items and decision log:

[https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1DE5lcOqFujazdw4\\_x5ii9vcBnsoskAUJnBee\\_HaVHn8/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1DE5lcOqFujazdw4_x5ii9vcBnsoskAUJnBee_HaVHn8/edit?usp=sharing).

### 1. Welcome, roll call - Jim

See attendance record above. No SOIs provided.

### 2. Current status of the NCAP project; changes made to any action items – Jennifer

Jennifer noted no changes to the action items and decisions from last meeting. She presented the current status of the project plan. Jim noted the date for publishing the draft NCAP Study 2 report for public comment, currently scheduled for early July, will likely need to be adjusted.

### 3. Continue discussions on the Study 2 [draft document](#) (see section: Controlled Interruption vs. Passive Collision Assessment). Questions under discussion (carried from last week):

- a. Is passive collision assessment really non-disruptive?
- b. What criteria can we offer that scopes high-risk labels?

Matt T noted that he has reached out to some technical communities (OCTO, DNS OARC) for feedback regarding technical concerns with passive collision assessment. Also, DNS OARC will meet at the end of July so there is a good opportunity to present there – Matt will work with Jim and the SSAC to develop a presentation for this.

Jim noted that the outreach is because question (a) above is very technical and as such the Chairs agreed it would be useful to outreach to additional technical groups to hear reactions from others.

Regarding question (b), Jim noted that with the first two steps of the static lists (ITHI, magnitude) and then passive collision assessment, the question is if there is a way to determine which strings might be more high risk. Anne noted support for the passive collision step, in line with the SubPro recommendation 29.5.

Warren presented an example to the group as to how the ITHI data could be gamed.

#### **4. Technical Review Team - functional requirements of the group (see [Google doc](#))**

Jim walked through the document, highlighting the four key proposed responsibilities of the technical review team:

- Assessing the visibility of name collisions. They will do this at three points in time: looking at the static lists, during passive collision assessment, and during active collision assessment.
- Document their findings and recommendations based on the data.
- Assessment of the mitigation and remediation plan.
- Watch what happens when a delegation happens, for emergency response.

The Discussion Group will pick up the discussion again next week.

#### **5. Summary of action items and decisions – Jennifer**

No discussion.

#### **6. AOB**

None raised.