

NCAP Discussion Group Meeting #89

1 June 2022 at 19:00 – 20:00 UTC

Meeting wiki: <https://community.icann.org/x/fgH5Cw>

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

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/uSeySB6N9ErqGjvgrYXe5FQweVaPpGWBGkMB3kHyDzBFi5j-B2sy1hDLKRhd7PmX.aa2UOKn8TmieG55M>

NCAP Discussion Group action items and decision log:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1DE5lcOqFujazdw4_x5ii9vcBnsoskAUJnBee_HaVHn8/edit?usp=sharing.

1. Welcome, roll call - Jim

See attendance record above. No SOIs provided.

Regarding ICANN74 at The Hague, Jim noted there are 2 NCAP meetings: NCAP Discussion Group and NCAP Update Session. Discussion Group members should be registered for both but should check to make sure. Jim and Matt plan to use some variation of the slides the Discussion Group was using regarding the high-level workflow to present the five steps, noting this is a work in progress.

2. Current status of the NCAP project; changes made to any action items – Jennifer

Jennifer noted no changes to the action items and decisions from last meeting. She noted the dates in the current project plan are at risk, in particular the date for publishing the NCAP Study 2 document for public comment. Jim noted the end date of September is still the target date, however the project plan will need to be updated in the coming weeks and presented to the Discussion Group.

3. Continue discussions on the Technical Review Team functional requirements (see [Google doc](#))

Jim walked through the 'Neutral Third Party' section of the document. The Discussion Group discussed some questions, such as how can the conflict of interest be balanced against the limited pool of people who will meet the skill requirements? And, how should the Discussion Group call out the finance/budget implications of this proposal?

In summary, Jim noted that the intent is to bring additional input from the SSAC work party to the Discussion Group call next week. Then, the writing team will be pulling together all the threads into the draft NCAP Study 2 document.

4. Summary of action items and decisions – Jennifer

No discussion.

5. AOB

None raised.