

NCAP Discussion Group

Meeting #125

23 August 2023 at 20:00 UTC

Meeting wiki: <https://community.icann.org/x/XAB7Dw>

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/DKvrPWDbPM_pSOmnl6rUXHOLdYe4BwTuzYKzrKURnrKFaeIznN8urD_SNv4HEmFF.nJUvgAOSO72x5Xlh

1. Welcome, roll call, SOI updates

None raised

2. Workshop 3-4 October: Jennifer can give an update on planning

Travel emails will be sent today. For any questions please contact Jennifer or travel team.

3. Focused discussion: Continue discussion of technical details of ACA/PCA with the goal to reach consensus to move forward. Some outstanding discussion points/questions points carried over from last week:

- a. Should we deliberately choose to broaden the scope of PCA to be more than “minimally disruptive”?
 - b. Corner cases: what do we do about these (consider the cost/benefit?)
 - c. What is the timeline for ACA/PCA?
 - d. Rate of change around TLD delegations and IANA functions
 - e. Question for the DG from Casey’s [mail](#) (do we pick one of the options outlined in the mail or leave that to TRT discretion to decide based on phase 1?)
- Casey talked through the [email](#) he sent to the list 23 August before the call. The group had a discussion about this, which is part of the ongoing discussion about the details of PCA. The intention is to reach agreement on what PCA should technically include, and agree on what guidance to provide for what implementation of PCA should look like.
 - Jim and Warren offered support for Casey’s proposal for the wildcard.
 - Ad based measurement:
 - Warren suggested Geoff Huston should be made aware that these discussions are ongoing so he can contribute, as his ad based system is another tool under PCA that could be used.
 - Jim noted that the ad based discussion got “left behind” not because of an objection but because it required cooperation from a third party; it could be revisited.
 - Warren noted the group should be careful about the use of the term “ad based” because it could mean two different things. He referred people to Geoff’s paper.

- Casey noted some hesitations with the ad based measurement and explained these hesitations.
 - Matt suggested to put the ad based measurement discussion on hold for now.
- Suzanne summarized her sense of the current state as: For the wildcard version there is reasonable comfort, and for the ad based measurement there are some questions outstanding.
- Matt asked if the group feels comfortable with either of the approaches as being the recommendations for what exactly PCA is: A non-existent domain being returned, or the H info wildcarding.
- Jeff noted that he likes the wildcard idea as another option for the TRT. He proposed we could propose a set of tools for the TRT to use, and empower the TRT and not overprescribe what the TRT will do and how.
- Matt asked the group to think about where we should put the “musts” and “shoulds” in the recommendations for implementations for PCA, given the overall workflow has no major objections from the group. The questions remaining are around the implementation details.
 - Jim offered his proposal for where the musts and shoulds should go.
 - Warren raised a question about what level of guidance the group is intending to give the TRT. Suzanne agreed this is still an outstanding question and reminded the group about Rubens’ mail which offered a starting point for this discussion: <https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/ncap-discuss/2023-August/001205.html>.
- Heather asked the group to answer if the Board needs this level of detail in the report?
- Warren noted that there is much in the document that the Board probably doesn’t need to know or understand. So perhaps the report serves as a summary for the Board, and there is a separate document that is advice to the TRT.
- Warren suggested that the group define what kind of attributes the TRT should have, to help determine what they will be able to solve for themselves.
- Jeff believes that the NCAP DG has to assume that reasonable experts will be on the TRT.
- Jim noted that there are requirements for the TRT that have been presented to the community on several occasions, see the [slide](#).
- Casey does not believe that group should be less prescriptive around the data collection, given the discussions that the DG has had. Warren also agreed that the DG should be a lot more detailed around the data collection. He proposed a tabletop exercise of pretending to be on the TRT and reviewing the documents to test if the TRT would know what to do, and the outcome is something that the NCAP DG envisions and would be useful to the Board.
- Jim agreed with the tabletop exercise but suggested the DG should be careful to not say what they think should happen with, for example .corp, .home, .mail.
- By way of recap, Matt made the following comments:
 - The group overall has made some good progress on discussions around implementation details of PCA.
 - Overarching concerns still exist around the TRT and what they are responsible for and how that’s being described.
 - Technical details of ACA need to be worked out.
 - Ad measurements - need to come back to this discussion.
 - Rate of churn at IANA in terms of delegations - needs to be worked out.

- Suzanne noted the group should converge on firm recommendations but this doesn't mean the group has to agree completely on what is in the report.
- Jeff proposed the "toolbox" approach to what should be in the report. I.e. provide a list of techniques. Eg. this technique can be used in phase 1. What the DG has done has come up with a collection of techniques that can be used at various times. Suzanne would like to talk to Heather about this.
- Casey thinks the group should get consensus on a proposal rather than the toolbox approach.

4. Impacts to the [workflow](#)

5. AOB

None raised.

6. Adjourn