

NCAP Discussion Group

Meeting #120

5 July 2023 at 20:00 UTC

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

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/f3AFsEtd7HGmyx7xCDKTSKcWi-OvH6uzzyRzfDmkFFH8oA3GrxgzF25ARNNogzh.FdKSXA8CNGeHYSAZ>

1. Welcome, roll call, SOI updates

No SOI updates provided. Attendance recorded on the wiki.

2. Recommendations - pick up discussion on recommendations in the Study 2 doc (Pick up from 5.6 Recommendation X - ICANN should continue their education and outreach efforts to the community on the name collision topic)

Among the discussion points were:

- 5.6 Recommendation X - ICANN should continue their education and outreach efforts to the community on the name collision topic:
 - Jeff, notes that clarifying that ICANN wants to more broadly solicit information and data regarding name collisions would ease some of the confusion encountered in this and the previous section.
 - Suzanne believes that the type of outreach and will need to be fleshed out more in time
 - James supports broadening the scope of data gathering, noting that it would expand the opportunity to feed the TRT.
 - Heather questions what a recommendation about education and outreach has to do with data collection. James clarifies that the outreach process creates an opportunity for data collection.
 - Casey notes the difficulty of not having permission to follow up on submissions.

- 5.X Recommendation X – ICANN should consider the need for mitigation and remediation efforts for high impact strings:
 - James notes the 5 step mitigation model
 - Assessment determines if string is high-risk
 - Applicant is notified their string is high risk and likely will not be granted
 - Applicant allowed chance to offer how they would lower the risk. And can submit their mitigation plan
 - Plan is evaluated by TRT
 - TRT provides evaluation on plan and string

- Suzanne advises using more precise language when speaking about risk management.
- 5.X Recommendation X – ICANN should establish and maintain a longitudinal name collision repository
 - James notes that the main focus of this recommendation is making TRT more effective at detecting gaming
 - Warren questions the effectiveness of using longitudinal data. James notes that it is still the best option currently, but it would be beneficial to be clear about its limitations while encouraging eventually transitioning to more effective forms of data.
 - Warren recommended using recursive data. Casey notes that recursive data has its own caveats in comparison to root data.
 - Warren's diagrams and presentation on the level of effectiveness of root data may have to be expanded on next meeting.
 - Casey comments on the added difficulty of the 90-day timeline

Action item: None

3. AOB
None raised.

4. Adjourn