NCAP Discussion Group
Meeting #90
8 June 2022 at 19:00 – 20:00 UTC
Meeting wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/gwEVD

Discussion Group Members	Observers
Matthew Thomas, James Galvin, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Barry Leiba, Geoff Huston, Jaap Akkerhuis, Jeff Schmidt, Julie Hammer, Thomas Barrett, Suzanne Woolf, Rod Rasmussen	**ICANN Org** Matt Larson, Jennifer Bryce, Kinga Kowalczyk, Steve Sheng, Kathy Schnitt
Apologies Warren Kumari, Casey Deccio	**Contractor Support** 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/ojco0Fbxz8FAF69jLDbGbH-F8fdcaFH38MloArbYp4TJx-hyUt2KKkR6G4qcWCM.PlPrxTOi8wpYEJvM.

NCAP Discussion Group action items and decision log:
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1DE5lcOqFujazdw4_x5ii9vcBnsoskAUJnBee_HaVHn8/edit?usp=sharing.

1. **Welcome, roll call - Matt**

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. Discussion Group members requested that calendar invites be sent for the NCAP Discussion Group meeting and NCAP update session taking place during ICANN74.

Action item: Kinga to send placeholder calendar invites to Discussion Group members for the 2 NCAP meetings taking place during ICANN74.

3. **Critical Diagnostic Measurements - Questions include: What CDMs are collected? How do we interpret CDMs (impact = volume vs. diversity)? - Matt**

Matt walked through a draft CDM document (Google doc here). Comments and questions from the Discussion Group members included:

Passive Collision Assessment:

- Geoff Huston noted his belief that diversity is one metric in one context, but in some cases it might be misleading. As such, he queries the emphasis on diversity. Secondly, he queried what is within the scope of the work, because identifying a collision and fixing the issue are different issues, and he believes that mitigating the issue is beyond the scope of ICANN's activities.
- Jeff Schmidt supported Geoff's comments, particularly that at this phase the focus needs to be on identifying rather than fixing. He also pointed out his view that the Passive Collision

Assessment CDMs listed in the document are the same as the ones as from the Interisle report from 2012.
- Anne asked if PCA would be done within ICANN or a third party, to which Matt suggested this could be an implementation detail. She noted that the Board questions ask about mitigation and remediation and agreed with the comments so far that the work has not reached this stage yet.
- Geoff H described the proposed ad-based measurement as another additional potential CDM. He suggested that a trial be launched on a domain that hasn't been applied for.

Active Collision Assessment:
- Jeff S asked if the points 1, 2, 3, and 5 on the ACA list were effectively honeypots, to which Matt confirmed they are. He noted his belief that all of the items on the list, with the exception of the ad network were discussed in the JAS report and in the SSAC report.
- Steve asked if the N client IP addresses could be known through the ad network. Geoff H clarified that this is not the case and provided an explanation.

4. Summary of action items and decisions – Jennifer

Action item: Kinga to send placeholder calendar invites to Discussion Group members for the 2 NCAP meetings taking place during ICANN74.

5. AOB
None raised.