

NCAP Discussion Group

Meeting #96

10 August 2022 at 19:00 – 20:00 UTC

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

Discussion Group Members James Galvin, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Barry Leiba, Jeff Schmidt, Julie Hammer, Justine Chew, Suzanne Woolf, Tom Barrett, Warren Kumari	Observers None
Apologies Matthew Thomas, Rod Rasmussen, Jaap Akkerhuis, Ram Mohan	ICANN Org Steve Sheng, Kinga Kowalczyk, Jennifer Bryce, Matt Larson, Kathy Schnitt
	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/-8dFjf1rbYcEhDd8fA050wrriQ0j05aSAhb_kaqexSPfNv_MW1AvhxDx1gcw22V.wYpFhDU54nH1gJkG

NCAP Discussion Group action items and decision log:

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

1. Welcome, roll call - Jim

See attendance record above. No SOI updates noted.

2. Update from the Technical Investigator – Casey

Casey's documents are on-list for the Discussion Group review. Casey noted he's been responding to questions on-list from Matt and Warren and offered to do a presentation on the sections in question if requested. Jim encouraged people to ask any specific questions they may have for Casey either on-list or during one of the meetings.

3. Project status and updates to any action items and decisions made – Jennifer

Jennifer recapped the timeline presented during the discussion group meeting last week. No new updates or action items were covered.

4. Name Collision Analysis Timeline – Jim

Jim led the discussion on the timeline (see [PDF](#)). The revised timeline discussed last week will be available next week. Jim recapped notes from last week's discussion about what to do with the timeline as it develops for the final report:

- Ensure there is clarity documented about the parties that are engaged in each of the steps.

- Add a note about the time periods for each step (how long PCA and ACA would be executed). As it stands, these time periods will remain as they are now.
- Ensure the risks of each step are properly documented. More development on this part also must happen in the base text of the report.

The group picked up the discussion from last week. The discussion included the following:

- Jeff suggested that the term ‘honeypot’ should be used so that the reader can connect all the previous written information about honeypots to this work.
- Risk of delegation and the harm that may occur. Jeff suggested taking inspiration from the Root KSK Rollover approach.
- Mitigation and remediation need more attention from this Discussion Group. The workflow will identify where this gets developed.
- Jim noted that currently, all strings will go through all assessments. The only thing that might happen along the way is the off-ramps, which are for stings that are identified in the high-risk category. This is when mitigation and remediation would happen. Anne noted that this information needs to be documented, because currently it is not.
- Jeff noted that right now he would not be considered in the affirmative consensus for this timeline, and he provided rationale for this view.

5. AOB

None raised.

6. Summary of action items and decisions

Jim summarized the discussion:

- A couple of people clearly articulated concerns to the timeline, especially about the lack of detail.
- While these have been noted, no consensus objection is noted yet.
- The next step is to get the document into a draft state for the Discussion Group to review. The writing team will continue to work on this and hope to share something for the DG next week. If not, it may be the following week.