NCAP Discussion Group
Meeting #131
24 October 2023 at 7:00 UTC
Meeting wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/6wCfE

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/JAfaiu-33YF96egynW1wcyvX7wue_vrz3Rnt6NNFQYRWWLhw0459kIoFMs41YZoL.c_JbfwuBvW4uRJAR?startTime=1698131256000

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

2. **Finalizing the TRT workflow: Technical Details**
   - A rough outline classifying the kinds of tactics and tools planned to be used was presented
   - Toolkit consists of 4 main options, each ranging in degrees of disruption.
     - 1. HINFO wildcard, no routable IP, "NOERROR NODATA"
       - TRT sets up authoritative server for the zoning question and returns empty answers w/ no error
       - Goal is to create a log to understand whats being queried
     - 2. A/AAAA wildcard 127.0.53.53 ("2012 controlled interruption")
       - Used as an attempted notification
     - 3. Public IP address w/ "reject all" configuration
       - Use of a public IP as opposed to the private 127.0.53.53
       - For sole purpose of counting, not diagnosis or notification
       - Adds value, adds to data; low risk
     - 4. protocol -specific service(s) that provides notification
     - Referred to by numbers currently due to the conflation of various terminology
       - Minimum coverage for basic data is 1,2,4
       - TRT discretion: 4 does have some risk, and 1,2,3 may be adequate
       - TRT discretion: In high-risk cases 4 is still needed
       - 1,3,4 the applied for Tld is also delegated into the route at this point before any of this happens.
   - Anne notes that keeping the numbered toolkit will most likely confuse the community once the details are communicated to them
     - Suzanne clarifies that the numbered terminology is only being used fo the sake of the meeting

- Hadia speaks on potential privacy and nontechnical issues for #4. Questions who can assess the nontechnical parts considering that TRT is strictly a technical group
    - Jeff feels that is simply the trade-off of choosing to implement #4
    - Conversation opens up about the the level of authority and autonomy the TRT should have
        - Anne feels that TRT should be making recommendations and the Board will make a final decision. Also suggests that if a string is found to not be eligible for granting, then the TRT should also be able to send a recommendation to ICANN to have IANA pull the string out of the root.
        - Jeff worries about being overly prescriptive in the report. Feels there may be cases where a string should not be pulled out
- It is concluded that the workflow diagram needs to be revisited to integrate new information
- *Consensus achieved!*

3. **AOB**
    a. Possible discussion topic: Expansion on the conversation regarding the TRT's responsibility to refer a string and its eligibility for delegation

4. **Adjourn**