

NCAP Discussion Group

Meeting #143

27 March 2024 at 9:00 UTC

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

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/0NHbpzOwR7utr66VY4ujokN-4IUAF9CM6k37rzUte4uifx_iDDV024p1nDSjq9dZ.It5csUc50LRIDOuC?startTime=1711569980000

1. Welcome, roll call, SOI updates

- None

2. Walkthrough and finalize edits to the draft Study 2 documents:

a. Edits to draft report based on public comments

- Legal's letter requesting a data privacy and protection plan be developed is determined to be within the remit of ICANN
- ICANN's inquiry of the definition of Name Collision has a response of an approved definition
- Comments of publicly available data will be responded with currently available public data options are constrained and the TRT should recommend which data to make available
 - Jeff does not see how it is feasible for the TRT to be able to do this. Recommends the sentence stating this is struck from the report.
 - James notes that while the report shouldn't explicitly make a point about the TRT making data publicly available, it should state that the data should be visible to an applicant.
 - Jeff reminds the group of the very strict no-contact policy that would exist between the applicant and the TRT. Any mention of the client and the TRT interacting will be removed
 - No reference will be made to the existing mechanism in place, just the TRT's functional responsibility of documenting results will be pointed out
- Requests for special treatment for .brand: special procedure implementation is out of scope for this report
 - This will be a general statement for all strings. Not specifically .brand
 - The statement on Finding 4.9 referencing private use strings will also avoid mention of specific strings
- Comment on 4.7: Last sentence will be deleted
- Recommendation 5: NCAP has consensus on giving discretion to TRT.

- 4.8: IPv6 - It is not within the scope to for the report to recommend more research on CI in relation to IPv6-only hosts
- Statement regarding TRT will be made to use more passive language

b. Annex: Public Comments Analysis

- Anne notes the importance of capitalizing defined terms like Collision String for clarity
- Jeff wants to remain cautious of recommending too much. He suggests some language stating that decisions are made to the discretion of TRT

3. AOB

- a. None raised

4. Adjourn