

# NCAP Discussion Group

## Meeting #115

10 May 2023 at 20:00 – 21:00 UTC

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

<b>Discussion Group Members</b> Matthew Thomas, Rod Rasmussen, Julie Hammer, Jeff Schmidt, Tom Barrett, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Jaap Akkerhuis, Jim Galvin, Justine Chew, Suzanne Woolf	<b>Observers</b>  <b>ICANN Org</b> Jennifer Bryce, Kathy Schnitt, Matt Larson, Danielle Rutherford
<b>Apologies</b> Heather Flanagan	<b>Contractor Support</b> Casey Deccio, Karen Scarfone

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/C2OsGZ0laquoID7s8-nKpAODW61MdVjir7o3Ss2O6X\\_Jvcg9BRLnFt7ecwjay36f.Bj-Vgf-2\\_es\\_hRpP](https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/C2OsGZ0laquoID7s8-nKpAODW61MdVjir7o3Ss2O6X_Jvcg9BRLnFt7ecwjay36f.Bj-Vgf-2_es_hRpP)

### 1. Welcome, roll call - Matt

See attendance record above. No SOI updates recorded.

### 2. Recommendations - pick up at Section 5.3 Recommendation X: ICANN should create a Collision String Registry (see NCAP Study 2 Sections 4-5 [document](#))

The group continued discussing the recommendations. Among the discussion points were:

- 5.3 Recommendation X: ICANN should create a Collision String Registry
  - The group discussed this recommendation and what it entails, and how to make sure the terminology is clear. The group agreed that there is working consensus on this recommendation.
- 5.3.1 Recommendation X: ICANN should support a mechanism that allows applicants to request a string be removed from the Collision String list.
  - The group discussed what the process should be for how to get off the list. Some ideas included RSTEP, a third party, or the working model process that NCAP Study 2 proposes (reapply with a new mitigation plan).
  - Anne encouraged the group to review topic 3 of the [SubPro Final Report](#) which specifies what happens when a string from 2012 is not withdrawn and not characterized as “will not proceed.”
  - Jeff noted that there may be some timelines that do not line up, for example the TRT would exist while ICANN is accepting applications but may cease to exist when a mitigation plan is submitted outside of that timeframe.
  - Jeff believes that the TRT should not be able to say if one applicant’s mitigation plan is better than another; it should be pass/fail like other ICANN evaluations. He suggested including as a recommendation that the TRT outputs are pass/fail and specifically not an input to resolving contention sets.

- Jim suggested that the TRT not make a pass/fail recommendation. He believes the TRT should only be looking at a single applicant with one string, based on the current working recommendation. If there is a contention it should be resolved before a mitigation plan is submitted.
- Matt proposed the TRT could use a risk level instead of pass/fail.
- Based on the discussion, Jim suggested that perhaps one way to proceed is if the TRT finds a cause to call something high-risk, it should suggest to the Board that application should have to fail.
- The group agreed 5.3.1 should be a recommendation, however there are many details that still need to be worked out, either in this recommendation or for subsequent recommendations.

### **3. AOB**

None raised.

### **4. Summary of action items and decisions**

No specific action items recorded.