NCAP Discussion Group
Meeting #121
12 July 2023 at 20:00 UTC
Meeting wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/ZJWZDg

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/_ImZZS72hqpfY65wrmsUoZxPIG8V0AJCOn0Lx_Nv_XAaWq58zOJXgO5LfX-T92el.HCx2A7YlYk2z4TLU

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 Recommendation ??- It is possible to identify some name collisions with minimal disruption.)**

Among the discussion points were:

- Recommendation ??- It is possible to identify some name collisions with minimal disruption:
    - Anne prompts a discussion regarding the language of the recommendation. It is concluded and clarified that the recommendation is suggesting that there be a less disruptive way assess collisions
    - Matthew clarifies the purpose of reviewing this recommendation and encourages any valuable input, as mapping out this recommendation will likely play a role into the workflow steps
    - A rough consensus is reached for support of dedicating an empty zone and using passive collision assessment, though a more fleshed out plan will be discussed later on.
    - Jim points out an ordering issue in the recommendations that may be contributing to the confusion encountered when discussing this recommendation

- Topics members of the group wanted to bring up
    - Anne reflects on last week's discussion about the the best ways to interpret longitudinal data and its possible effects on today's discussion.
        - She references an email from with supplementary information from the Jeff from last week's meeting. Jeff was no longer present to speak to what was sent
        - No other member recalls seeing an email from Jeff in months. This topic will be cataloged by Jennifer to be covered another time, though it will likely come up as the group gets deeper into the ACA vs PCA discussion.

- Workflow details around ACA and PCA
    - Jim summarizes the current status of the workflow. References the 5-step process in 5.4 that helps assess high risk strings
    - Matthew notes the preference of going in sequential order when reviewing each step.
    - Step one: Static assessment by applicant and subsequent assessment by TRT
        - Matthew notes Warren's previously expressed opinion regarding the manipulability of the data used and the need to further flesh out that conversation.
    - No objections to step 2 or is sub-recommendation.
    - Jim notes the need to ensure consistent vocabulary when presenting the 5-step mitigation process
    - Matthew stops the discussion at before delving into the ACA discussion with respect to time
    - Topics for next week
        - Anne questions the suggestion for the creation of neutral third party. Unsure if the TRT is being conflated with such a party
        - Jim expresses the desire to better elaborate and describe the role of TRT

Action item: None

3. AOB

None raised.

4. Adjourn