

NCAP Discussion Group

Meeting #116

24 May 2023 at 20:00 – 21:00 UTC

Meeting wiki: <https://community.icann.org/x/-4WZDg>

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

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/vsyweU16w6K-qEzAc9x9jznlYOfsN8yPDkP0oP6mkwhV_IgoJUmHNk1d3Bwx-7k.XGw8Xc3z1mDYcgw8

1. Welcome, roll call - Matt

See attendance record above. No SOI updates recorded.

2. Recommendations - pick up at Section 5.4 Recommendation X: ICANN should replace the existing Name Collision Management Framework (see NCAP Study 2 Sections 4-5 [document](#))

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

- 5.3.1 Recommendation X - ICANN should support a mechanism that allows applicants to request a string be removed from the Collision String list
 - The group discussed procedural questions. Jim suggested that getting more information about how the sequence of steps worked in the 2012 round would be important in understanding where name collision would fit in the overall process, especially given the questions about contention sets and the timing that were raised during the last meeting. He suggests the name collision assessment would be part of the overall due diligence and reported as another recommendation in the overall process vs. directly to the Board. He suggested some slides would be helpful to visualize the process and offered to work directly with Co-Chairs.
 - Suzanne suggested that looking at the old applicant guidebook would be useful to reviewing the process.
 - Anne proposed a potential recommendation could be to document the pros and cons to consider when determining the appropriate time for the name collision risk assessment.
 - This discussion will be revisited once the group has discussed the recommendations about the process.
- 5.4 Recommendation X: ICANN should replace the existing Name Collision Management Framework

- The group shared differing opinions on the use of ACA, controlled interruption and hybrid models.
- Casey noted his opposition to recommending ACA and explained his rationale.
- Geoff noted his disagreement with Casey's comments on what ACA can do and provided rationale for disagreement.
- Jeff proposed an example of what a repeatable, predictable process might look like.
- Jeff noted that manual "sleuthing" and reviewing of open-source intelligence such as was used in the previous round is not something this group has discussed too much, and perhaps should be thought about more.
- Matt summarized the points from this discussion that need additional consideration and can be discussed on the next calls:
 - Contention sets: Document the pros and cons accordingly and decide if a separate recommendation is needed on this, or if it can be incorporated into an existing recommendation.
 - Decide on what guidance should be provided to create an expected, default, repeatable course of action as part of the process.
 - Continue discussion on the ACA, telemetry, and active measurements and how these fit into the workflow before a consensus decision should be made.
 - Review the 2012 application workflow for possible guidance.

3. AOB

None raised.

4. Summary of action items and decisions

No specific action items recorded.