

NCAP Discussion Group

Meeting #119

28 June 2023 at 20:00 UTC

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

Attendance: See meeting wiki.

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/QIXcz52aUanBHvDeAXFmiWmo7NMUw32tP7VyDvuf79ibgYloHwbucYBI4_Ng_yk_.RPOIHp4lt6luJS-i

1. Welcome, roll call, SOI updates

No SOI updates provided. Attendance recorded on the wiki.

2. Recommendations - pick up discussion on recommendations in the Study 2 doc (Pick up from Section 5.4.4 Recommendation X - ICANN should update its name collision reporting process)

Among the discussion points were:

- 5.4.4 Recommendation X - ICANN should update its name collision reporting process:
 - Anne suggested that group discuss the general topic of guidance to the Technical Review Team given that this came up at the last NCAP DG meeting, held during ICANN77 in Washington DC.
 - Heather noted this topic is connected to Finding E.b: The criteria for use of ICANN's name collision reporting form negatively impacted its use. She noted that the recommendation goes beyond the finding. The group discussed this topic and the bar (threat to human life) being too high, and that many people anecdotally mentioned issues but did not use the reporting tool.
 - Heather will go back and check what the Discussion Group has said previously on this topic and if there is anything else to be added to the finding E.b. given that the group has had much discussion about this.
 - Suzanne suggested the finding should be expanded along the lines of the discussion on the call today.
 - Heather noted she has the clarity she needs for moving this forward.
- 5.5 Recommendation X - ICANN must develop and document a process for the emergency removal of a delegated string from the root zone due to collision risk or harms:
 - Warren noted that the group discussed that in the process there needs to be a clear chain of command if a TLD is delegated and something goes wrong, but they did not conclude on this topic.
 - Jim noted that he believes this recommendation is there because there is a gap currently in that there is no process to notify people that the root zone is about to change in an out of sequence way. The recommendation should create this process.

- Jeff noted that these discussions took place previously and encouraged people to read the [2015 report](#) for the existing process.
- Anne raised some questions regarding the contracting process.
- Warren noted that it would be helpful to be clearer about which step in the process we are referencing when we discuss these points. Suzanne noted that there is a diagram that Matt and Suzanne should revisit with Heather to aid this.
- Suzanne summarized a few points:
 - The EBERO process is not necessarily the right fit however a comparable governance model is required.
 - We need a diagram of the different process stages that the group implicitly assumes – the group should review this and revisit it.

Action item: Co-chairs to look at the previous diagram that was put together to identify the different stages in the process. This diagram needs to be revisited and shared with the group again for improvements and clarifications.

3. AOB

None raised.

4. Adjourn