

NCAP Discussion Group
Meeting #130
11 October 2023 at 20:00 UTC
Meeting wiki: <https://community.icann.org/x/OZNME>

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/q7r5dACg_dRIUkUlyrx8JPDpogYkD09x3ldKAWDGOtjafCE8cMSzgbOSrtygWPQr.-WGT82IHzeweEoaT

1. Welcome, roll call, SOI updates

None raised

2. Recap of consensus decisions from the workshop

- It was agreed that SSAC and ICANN do not need to undertake Study 3. Heather will draft text explaining that mitigation strategies are case-by-case.
 - Previous outreach and mitigation will be referenced to reinforce this decision
- New findings added related to the private use of strings in reference to SAC113
- Text should be drafted stating that the TRT should not have operational authority. Urgent issues should be handled by actual root zone operators or anyone else with proper jurisdiction within ICANN processes
 - The process of how TRT reports issues will need to be developed
- Collision process is a standalone unit that will be placed within the general workflow in ICANN processes
- ACA will be fleshed out
- Warren notes that it would be helpful to be more explicit in explaining the differences between 2012 processes and the current ones

3. Review of the outstanding issues to resolve

- Makeup and job description of the TRT
 - Warren feels that it should be communicated in the document that there could be errors made by the TRT due to flaws in the data analyzed
 - James points out the origin of some of the terminology used within NCAP to explain the ways they are all being conflated. Suggests getting specific and consistent to avoid confusion
 - Suzanne proposes adding in the text a part describing the different terms and why they ultimately don't work within the draft

- Anne calls for consensus to be made for the “collision hold registry” term. It is agreed that each term has its own problems and something new will be thought of
- Anne wants to discuss what NCAP wants to say about strings that are in contention or under objection
 - Suzanne states that this issue has been discussed in several forms already usually involving why a string might get through all the initial checks, including collision risk
 - Warren feels that consensus was still never reached.
 - James believes that name collision analysis should be completed before contention set resolution
 - Suzanne notes that whatever is decided will always come with pros and cons, choosing a path forward is a matter of agreeing which risks are worth dealing with.
- More will be discussed in Hamburg

4. AOB

- a. No meeting next week – 18 October.
- b. Next meeting: ICANN78 in person or remote: Tuesday 24 October at 09:00 CEST (07:00 UTC)

5. Adjourn