NCAP Discussion Group
Meeting #1004
25 January 2023 at 20:00 – 21:00 UTC
Meeting wiki:
https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=228787601

Discussion Group Members	Observers
Matthew Thomas, Jim Galvin, Suzanne Woolf, Julie Hammer, Warren Kumari, Thomas Barrett, Rod Rasmussen, Jaap Akkerhuis, Hadia El Miniawi, Geoff Huston, Anne Aikman-Scalese	None
	ICANN Org
	Steve Sheng, Kinga Kowalczyk, Matt Larson
Apologies	**Contractor Support**
Jennifer Bryce, Heather Flanagan, Barry Leiba	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/play/QigY6Yw3kYhu09JPS6udzE-jy8Yt-dm-EdiT2BJdxuANnP36pjv5RO5-N7Ok4T1iVIDHQvhEyZk_T93T.e5kZ_Cn7vw34jxMt?continueMode=true&_x_zm_rtaid=jCga1VsCQseRrWcBPfPcoA.1674761604849.f269c08eebb94e1eaee9c793a5bc1ecf&_x_zm_rhtaid=18

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 SOI updates noted.

2. **Discuss Study 2 report sections 1, 2, and 3 – Matt**

The group continued the discussion on the Study 2 report. Comments raised during the discussion:

- Casey mentioned that he still is reviewing the document making editorial changes along the way (nothing significant to point out to the DG at this moment).
- Jim reviewed the comments provided by members of the group and he agrees that the report is in a good shape and will be soon finalized.
- Matt reminded a conversation that the group had a few weeks ago about being able to annotate or cross-reference the Board questions to Study 2 report to provide additional references and make those answers clearer and with additional context for the Board.
- Suzanne agreed that adding references to each section will be beneficial and raised an additional question to the group about what level of technical details would be appropriate for

the entire report. Jim's opinion was that if the report is specific and detailed, it will benefit the implementation of the recommendations.

- Warren commented that the report is written for the audience that is technically advanced. It might be a good idea to establish what type of a target group the report is directed to. Anne agreed with this concern and proposed that the Study 2 report remains highly technical and the answers to the Board's questions are addressed to less technical audience. Jim added that maybe different parts of the documents have different audience. Jim also added that the executive summary should be broadly approachable.
- Jim also pointed out that the terminology in the documents should be more consistent.
- The conversation will be continued at the next week DG meeting.

3. AOB
None raised.

4. Summary of action items and decisions
No specific action items to report.