

Name Collision Analysis Project Discussion Group Meeting Notes

24 April 2019 | 21:00-22:00 UTC

Attendance

Members: Jaap Akkerhuis, Jay Daley, Jim Galvin, Julie Hammer, Ram Mohan, Russ Mundy, Chris Roosenraad and Rod Rasmussen, Justine Chew, Steve Crocker, Ruben Kuhl, Jeff Neuman, Drew Wilson

Observers: Anne Aikman-Scalese, Jim Pendergrast, Matt Thomas

Staff: Roy Arends, Matt Larson, Steve Sheng, Kim Carlson and Kathy Schnitt

Apologies: Merike Kaeo, Warren Kumari, Barry Leiba

Decision:

- The next discussion group (DG) meeting will be 1 May 2019, 21:00 UTC

Action Items from this Meeting

- Staff to send the materials presented on the first call to the list, including the latest proposal.
- Ruben to send gNSO subpro PDP materials on name collision to the list
- Discussion group members to provide feedback on study 1 goals, in particular any things that needs to be clarified, any gaps in deliverables and tasks.

Summary Notes

Call to Order

Kathy Schnitt called the meeting to order at 21:00.

Introductions from the co-chairs and staff

NCAP Cochairs and staff introduced themselves. The co-chairs are Jim Galvin, and Jay Daley. Other leaders of the NCAP Admin Committee include SSAC Vice Chair, Julie Hammer, SSAC Chair, Rod Rasmussen. Staff support for the NCAP includes interim secretariat (Steve Sheng, Kathy Schnitt), and Matt Larson from Office of the CTO.

Introduction from discussion group members

SSAC NCAP WP members and those discussion group members submitted SOI (Steve Crocker, Rubens Kuhl) introduced themselves.

Introduction to NCAP

Jay gave an overview of the NCAP. This includes the definition of name collisions, how this project differs from other SSAC efforts, the management and support structure of the project, a brief description of the studies.

Regarding the studies, Steve Crocker raised the point that a lot of existing work has been done, and the group need to survey those first and identify the gaps. To answer Steve's question, Jay walked through in detail each of the studies and the sequence.

Ruben mentioned that the NCAP work should take into consideration the reference collected by gNSO subpro PDP, and the collisions measures suggested by the gNSO PDP. The WP asked the references and the suggested measures be sent to the list, to become input to study 1.

Regarding the result of the study, the WP chairs mentioned that the WP may not suggest the criteria for name collisions, but provide the relevant data to ICANN Board to make its own risk calculation. Steve Crocker disagreed, saying that Board has limited expertise on name collisions, and it really wants solid proposals and check it for credibility. If we were to solve it, NCAP is the place.

Regarding study 2 and 3, Steve Crocker mentioned perhaps the best way is to do a root cause analysis by this group, and then send out surveys to validate the group's thinking.

Current Work

Jim described study 1 and the input the OCTO needs to issue the RFP. The study would take 6 months. Steve Crock thought this could be substantially shortened following the sitefinder model.

Any Other Business

There were no any other business items.

Adjournment

The NCAP Discussion Group concluded its first meeting without objections.

Recordings and Transcripts

https://icann.zoom.us/recording/play/2E2u9U8NDFtcd232ZN6cTF5Tv2P3Emly3stCppCv9EkRZtcPzUbOyjM3aG8_0Xn7?startTime=1556139629000