

NCAP Discussion Group

Meeting #139

17 January 2024 at 9:00 UTC

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

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/N0TPo5vkVNPBF5epOob40zZcJeqIF5vnWVd_-J8j9SjU6McctN2HD0BgZAM-O_IH.thMYzVxIAh7vrcb8

1. Welcome, roll call, SOI updates

- NCAP chairs are working with ICANN staff to plan some working sessions for ICANN79 to review the public's comments. Looking to have it the Monday of the event
- Warren disclosed there was a document written around 2013 by him, Olaf Coltman, Andrew Sullivan, and Jeff Houston on route test delegations that should have been listed as a related document but unfortunately was not
- Warren addressed Amazon's leaking of .INTERNAL. He was able to reveal that Amazon is still using the string, but no longer leaking it to the root server

2. Finalize documents to be submitted for public comment

- Study 2 Report:
 - Michael made several editorial changes
 - Added an executive summary section
 - Made several aesthetic changes as well
 - None of the edits have changed the actual content of the the documents, which have now been consolidated into one document
 - 1.2: Micahel reorganized this section to make it clear that the purpose was for reviewing previous documents
 - Consensus text in 3.6:
 - Casey notes the importance of pointing out the contention the DG experienced on certain topics. It was in this text, but has at some point been removed
 - 4.4.2: Michael added text that drew upon studies carried out by the DG and background texts in order to strengthen findings
 - 5.8: Framework steps have been reworked in order to make the graphic simpler to understand
- Board Questions Document
 - Michael also made several edits here, though not as much has been approved
 - Theme 1:
 - There is no request or plans to change the definition of Name Collision

- Interpretation of “strings that manifest name collisions are so heavily used”
 - Michael needs clarity on the DG’s interpretation of the phrase in order to properly communicate what their response is
 - Rubens suggests removing “high-volume” from the title. Consensus agrees with this solution
- Theme 4:
 - Interpretation of “possible courses of action that might mitigate harm” has not been agreed on
 - Action by Registry section may not be in scope
 - Michael added text to proactive measures
- Theme 6:
 - Criteria for Identifying Collision Strings: Michael wrote a summary to replace text that was previously there
 - Casey feels the summary does not establish any actual criteria to answer the Board question.
 - Anne suggests incorporating the criteria from Study 2 and cross-referencing it
 - Criteria for Determining Whether a Collision String Should Not be Delegated:
 - There is concern that Michael’s rewrite is too narrow when giving reasons the TRT would not delegate a string
 - Michael invites DG members to add more specific forms of harm or risk to fix the issue

3. AOB

- a. None raised

4. Adjourn