

NCAP Discussion Group

Meeting #92

29 June 2022 at 19:00 – 20:00 UTC

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

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

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/nzVofNvWpgVsa-i2fJqqeZCRtpsALEvgsO7UBqKWYF5XT9LzRs-482irAJVpciXK.A1_aIiwOB19LAoR-

NCAP Discussion Group action items and decision log:

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

1. Welcome, roll call - Matt

See attendance record above. No SOIs provided.

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

Jennifer provided a revised schedule to the NCAP Discussion Group, noting that the revised target date to publish the draft Study 2 report for Public Comment is 26 September. This is based on the goal to present a preview of the report to the community at the ICANN75 meeting in September.

a. Next steps on the Perspective Study and Case Study - Jennifer

Jennifer noted that revised versions of the Perspective Study and Case Study documents will be shared to the DG list and a final consensus call taken during one of the upcoming DG meetings. Jennifer is working with Casey to confirm next steps on the root cause analysis documents, which will also be shared with the group soon.

3. Workflow Table Exercises - Matt

Matt walked the group through the slides. Discussion Group members raised comments and asked questions, including:

- Regarding “high end” and “low end”, Jeff suggested that it will be important to specify who makes this judgement call.
- Tom suggested that the Discussion Group create workflow exercises and TRT reports for the .corp, .mail, and .home, to create a benchmark.

- Casey suggested that it would be useful to correlate the actual reports of impact/harm from organizations the data, in order to make connections and identify any patterns.
- Jeff noted that it will be important for the TRT to actually make recommendations at the end of the process.
- Anne suggested that the Discussion Group document in the workflow the ways in which the workflow meets the relevant implementation guidance from the SubPro final report.
- Jeff suggested spelling out the logic, rationale, and some options for ICANN to consider in implementation. He provided some examples to this point, one being that ICANN asks for a confidential expression of interest in strings in advance, and then provide some kind of analysis and provide feedback earlier in the process.

4. Summary of action items and decisions – Jennifer

Action item: Discussion Group to document in the workflow the ways in which the workflow meets the relevant implementation guidance from the SubPro final report.

Action item: Discussion Group to consider providing implementation recommendation guidance in the report.

5. AOB

No Discussion Group call next week. The next Discussion Group meeting is scheduled for Wednesday 13th July at the usual time of 19:00 UTC.