# NCAP Discussion Group
## Meeting #126
## 30 August 2023 at 20:00 UTC
## Meeting wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/-QCWDw

**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/CSEsLIYpIy2cCK4umKN6I7f2boKX3_OIjPyr1BEFCTKyF5RecriwrGwUxBEEwzJ1.gThHr0_XKeSvRikn

1. **Welcome, roll call, SOI updates**
   None raised

2. **Admin Items:**
   a. **Workshop in DC – reminder to book travel by the end of the day 30 August – let Jennifer know if problems**
   b. **No DG call next week 6 September. Calls resume 13 September 20:00 UTC**

3. **Technical details of PCA:**
   ● While recapping the previous meeting, Matt urges the need for consensus
     ○ Suggests sticking with PCA vs ACA instead of changing the terminology and focusing on sorting out the technical details at higher level.
   ● Jeff argues that it could be beneficial to divide the timeline into phases as a way to guide the TRT.
   ● Anne asserts there is a fair amount of consensus. No compelling reason to change the established terms was given in the last meeting.
     ○ Agrees with Casey and Jeff that there should be baseline tests the TRT are guided to use and believes the technical appendix would also be helpful. Hopes it will be finalized by the face-to-face meeting.
   ● Anne questions the notion of changing the terminology at the cost of potentially confusing the community. Asks the proponents (Casey and Rubens) what the group can communicate to them
   ● Suzanne and Matt agree that would be beneficial to focus on gaining consensus on the higher order parts of the workflow "the right steps for doing the name collision assessment and risk mitigations"). Some open questions:
     ○ Is this technique always required?
     ○ Is this technique always required for said duration?
     ○ Must this technique always be deployed?
   ● Jeff suggests doing the "Casey thing" (the almost empty TLD zone) for the first 10 days as the first part of guidance for the TRT
     ○ Anne suggests in the chat that it could be established as baseline PCA

- - ○ Warren suggests testing the zone in a lab to ensure it functions correctly. Suzanne concedes that a disclaimer could be provided in the guidance that testing is needed
- Consensus on the timeline for TRT
  - ○ Matt notes that because the group is working a t high level currently, the main goal is to only decide on general guidance on how long each phase should take instead of deciding hard deadlines
  - ○ Jeff suggests thinking of the phases in terms of proportions instead of time measurements
  - ○ Anne suggests giving a recommended number of days and guidelines on what to do with the data in the technical appendix
  - ○ Casey brings up budget. Says TRT needs and adequate amount of time to do analysis in each phase
  - ○ Suzanne suggests a format for the technical appendix: for every technique that is described, there should also be a description of the kind of data NCAP expects the TRT to get out of it and how long it takes to produce meaningful results
    - ■ Heather believes that a provision needs to be made to accommodate for changes to technology
  - ○ Warren believes that a timeline is unknowable at this point due to the many unknown factors (ie: the structure of TRT, the complexity of the data, etc.)
  - ○ Jeff posts the following proposal for baseline passive procedure in the chat:
    - ■ Objective: collect baseline data with minimal risk, address data issues with QNM and caching
    - ■ Casey email 8/23
    - ■ First 10 days following delegation to TRT
    - ■ Provisio: IANA
    - ■ Proviso: Emergency Response, early termination, expert opinion
    - ■ Proviso: Lab test HINFO wildcard
  - ○ Casey recommends 14 days for the initial phase. Feels a 2 week marker would be more sensible
  - ○ Consensus achieved for 14 days as a recommended timeline for PCA
  - ○ Warren notes that although the timeline has been agreed upon, what PCA actually will be has not.
- Jim states that PCA is not about minimal data collection, but data collection with minimal impact. Focuses on the next steps after data collection is completed.
  - ○ Jim feels there is no way to provide notification without being disruptive
- Casey expresses concern that time needs to be accounted for the TRT to perform analysis. He also proposes that notification to users can be done preemptively.

- With respect to time, meeting was wrapped up with the intention to pick up discussion about the steps following phase 1
- Heather was assigned to draft up technical appendix

4. **Technical details of ACA and timeline**

5. **AOB**
None raised.

6. **Adjourn**