

NCAP Discussion Group

Meeting #114

3 May 2023 at 20:00 – 21:00 UTC

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

Discussion Group Members Matthew Thomas, Rod Rasmussen, Julie Hammer, Warren Kumari, Jeff Schmidt, Tom Barrett, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Jaap Akkerhuis, Geoff Huston, Jim Galvin	Observers ICANN Org Jennifer Bryce, Kathy Schnitt, Matt Larson Contractor Support Casey Deccio, Heather Flanagan, Karen Scarfone
Apologies Suzanne Woolf, Barry Leiba	

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/Lrsq6zzEohA0F3eEI0brqwmFu0G4zgGTCGxIG2Lgd1soMsWVfu7iHBzf1hJjV7JZ.Vld1Oyl_DiOuU7XO

1. Welcome, roll call - Matt

See attendance record above. No SOI updates recorded.

Matt welcomed Karen Scarfone, who will be supporting the group as technical writer in the coming months as Heather has some upcoming travel. Karen and Heather will be working together to ensure there are no gaps in the writing support.

2. Recommendations - begin working on the text in the NCAP Study 2 Sections 4-5 [document](#)

Heather provided an update on her work on the findings: She noted she's done some reorganizing and rewording to tell a story more logically. She has not yet added revised text for Findings D onwards and will be working on these in the coming weeks.

Matt noted that moving forward, the group will focus on recommendations, working through the text week by week. He proposed a working method of triage, to identify which recommendations still make sense based on findings, what needs to be edited and what could potentially be deleted.

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

- Recommendation Q: ICANN should adopt a consistent definition for name collision
 - Jim noted the group should be specific about which part of ICANN (org/Board/community). He suggested it is a recommendation to ICANN org to promote the definition.
 - Anne noted the group has been using a working definition and as such is against the idea of starting over again with a new definition. The group discussed this point, and

that intent of this recommendation is that it refers to the definition the group has been using, and it should be that ICANN org promote this definition.

- Casey noted some opposition to the recommendation including that it might be restrictive in the future. Anne proposed to switch the order of the recommendations so that this recommendation follows the recommendation that name collisions should be treated as a risk management problem and proposed adding some text to address Casey's comment.
- Jim noted that the group should keep in mind the specific action item of comparing what exists in the current framework and what is written. The group needs to go back and compare these two items.
- Heather will make updates to the text based on the comments.
- 5.2 Recommendation X: ICANN should treat name collisions as a risk management problem
 - Casey and Jim noted that currently it is not clear what this recommendation means or is asking.
 - Heather encouraged discussion group members to think about what the findings support, because each recommendation should be tied specifically to findings.
 - The group discussed some different thoughts and ideas about what the recommendation is trying to say or should say.
 - Heather noted that this discussion is highlighting some gaps in the findings. Heather proposed that she and the co-chairs discuss how to address areas where this happens.
- 5.3 Recommendation X: ICANN should create a Collision String Registry
 - Jim noted this should be directed to ICANN org.
 - The group discussed what the "registry" is, such as what would be on the registry, what is the purpose, how to get off the registry, and what happens when it comes off the registry.
 - Anne made some comments about the terminology and words used in this recommendation and proposed some suggestions.
 - Heather proposed the findings that would support this recommendation are B.c and D.f. Casey noted that it is a bit at odds with the finding that suggests creating a registry is difficult. He also noted he is not clear about what finding D.f is saying.
 - Discussion on this recommendation will carry over to next week.

3. AOB

None raised.

4. Summary of action items and decisions

No specific action items recorded.