NCAP Discussion Group
Meeting #78
16 March 2022 at 19:00 – 20:00 UTC

Discussion Group Members	Observers
James Galvin, Matthew Thomas, Geoff Huston, Jeff Schmidt, Justine Chew, Suzanne Woolf, Tom Barrett, Rod Rasmussen	KC Claffy, Jim Prendergast
	ICANN Org
	Matt Larson, Kathy Schnitt, Jennifer Bryce, Steve Sheng, Kinga Kowalczyk
Apologies	
Anne Aikman-Scalese, Barry Leiba, Jaap Akkerhuis, Julie Hammer, Warren Kumari	**Contractor Support**
	Heather Flanagan, Casey Deccio

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/HZ_anRx2YR2aKuBhAwgttoZFAN6gd_uGYF-bDr8uavy-coIi9JgsAiNDuD1dk4te.MdSA3TAlJxl1zabw.

NCAP Discussion Group action items and decision log: https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1DE5lcOqFujazdw4_x5ii9vcBnsoskAUJnBee_HaVHn8/edit?usp=sharing.

1. **Welcome, roll call**
See attendance record above. No SOIs provided.

2. **Update from the Technical Investigator – Casey**
Casey provided a high-level update noting that since his last update he's been doing a lot of data gathering. His next step is to identify contacts where potentially name collision occurred with new gTLDs, based on his findings. He is preparing forms for outreach that would be used to collect further information, see draft example here.

3. **Current status of the NCAP project; restatement of summary of action items and decisions made from last meeting – Jennifer**
Jennifer noted one additional public comment received to date (from ISPCP) on the 2 NCAP DG documents currently posted. She recapped the action items from the previous meeting as noted in the action items tracker.

4. **Review of the workflow – Jim**
Jim walked through the workflow slides. He noted that the slides have not materially changed since the last discussion (around November timeframe) but some things have been tweaked as the writing team has tried to look at the workflow with the vision of what has to go into the final report and in doing so noticed some areas where more detail needed to be added.

Matt Larson commented that as the workflow is high-level he has a concern about how it will be actionable. For example, with regard to the critical diagnostic measurements on slide 3, there is nothing quantitative about what the applicant is supposed to do. Jim agreed that more detail needs to be added

and this is something the writing team is aware of and working on, to be shared with the Discussion Group.

Jeff presented some slides to explain why he holds the views that he has shared on the list. The slides present collisions as a "unicorn management problem"; sometimes we fall into the trap of assuming that everything is a unicorn in advance and trying to set our posture that any string we delegate could be a ticking time bomb. Jeff encouraged the group to not take this posture right now and presented a possible alternative.

<u>Action item</u>: Jeff to make his slides available to the Discussion Group for viewing.

5. Summary of action items and decisions made – Jennifer

<u>Action item</u>: Jeff to make his slides available to the Discussion Group for viewing.

6. AOB
None raised.