NCAP Discussion Group
Meeting #82
13 April 2022 at 19:00 – 20:00 UTC
Meeting wiki:
https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=195658255

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

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/imOYxO9TEpQoLFtK22by02dNQGGKyD3pqLCh_7wYcWYd2-0Hh_u6RKPLJ7GOTfOw.Qou3xmHZlfKkeDYo.

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 noted he's wrapping up his draft report. Most of the analysis is complete, the focus now is on completing the write-up. Once the draft report is complete – anticipated by this coming Friday or the weekend – he will share the draft report with the Discussion Group and would like to take some time during the next meeting to present high-level points. He will prepare slides for this presentation and if possible, share them in advance with the group.

Action item: Casey to present high-level points from his report during the next Discussion Group meeting.

3. **Current status of the NCAP project; restatement of summary of action items and decisions made from last meeting – Steve K**
Steve noted no updates to the project schedule or action items tracker.

4. **Revision of the Step 5 Framework – Matt/Jim**
Jim noted that several questions were asked last week, to be discussed during the meeting today. In response to the questions, Jim has updated the slides, the biggest change being to add a new slide (slide

8) to provide more information about the assessment process. The questions from last week (summarized), now addressed in the slides are:

- Is trial delegation for a prescribed period?
- Guidance for assessment: What is the Technical Review Team, and what does an assessment look like?
- How do we move from step 3 to step 4 in the workflow?
- Should notification be a minimum requirement of active assessment?

Jim walked through the slides and highlighted changes that have been made to the deck since last week. The proposal on slide 8 "3.1 Initial Risk Assessment" is new and is based on the discussions to date.

Tom asked if SubPro defines when the application workflow should take place. Anne confirmed there is no recommendation from SubPro in this respect, however Jim suggested the group should consider if it might be useful to provide a recommendation or some guidance as to where the analysis should fit in the process.

The Discussion Group will review the workflow again next week along with any items brought up during the writing team meetings between now and then.

5. AOB

Jim asked the Discussion Group if they would like to have a meeting at ICANN74. He proposed that the Discussion Group plan to have a meeting at ICANN74, as SSAC has agreed to give the Discussion Group time to use the SSAC room. The Discussion Group goal is to have the first draft of the report ready for public comment by ICANN74, according to the current schedule. Matt and Jim propose that the discussion during this meeting could be on Study 3 – whether or not we need a Study 3 and what that would look like. Alternatively, if the draft report is not ready, the Discussion Group could use this as a regular weekly meeting. Anne agreed the Discussion Group should meet and suggested there should be a presentation on the progress if nothing else. Jim proposed to not give a status update at ICANN74 and instead seek a presentation at ICANN75.

Decision reached: NCAP Discussion Group agreed to proceed to plan to meet at ICANN74, using the SSAC room.