NCAP Discussion Group
Meeting #127
13 September 2023 at 20:00 UTC
Meeting wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/xQAFE

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/FI3GlGXN7iiehV1zcNJ4hh5kV3kYzL0Nh3uSPaDhPeW-CpYBgR63Og7s8b7WEJ7J.9EG8bKT3vLn8b3G8

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

2. **Workshop 3 - 4 October discussion:**
   ●

3. **Technical details of PCA:**
   ● Jeff reviews governance in the 2012 round
      ○ The board is not involved in routine delegations, but reserves the right to get involved on an individual basis. In general, they did not approve string-wise applications
      ○ Any evaluation of a collision must produce a yes/no answer or it will not fit inside of the precedent already set
      ○ Discussion between Jim and Jeff
      ○ Suzanne comments on how modular the process is. Points out how many of the working parts of the reviews can be done in parallel and how there is no real need for a pipeline.
      ○ Anne notes that based on previous conversations in the group, it seems unclear if the board has any opportunity to make a decision (even with the likelihood of a security risk) due to the TRT being established as the decision-maker on a mitigation plan
         ■ Jeff clarifies that the intention is not to depend on the board, but to stick to a structure that aligns with the board as ICANN was entrusted and delegated to do so
      ○ James makes a case for modularity. Prefers not to be overly prescriptive on the decision point to provide flexibility for how the process may evolve
         ■ Suzanne remarks that while there is a point to made on being overly prescriptive, making a recommendation could also be helpful

- - - It is concluded that this topic will be given more discussion and consideration for the another week
  - Delegation/IANA issue and the subpro conflict
    - Jeff feels that recommendations 26.2 and 26.3 from subpro would prohibit multiple IANA delegations per string
      - Delegations in this context are being used as a general term including actual delegations and any administrative change
      - Notes bulk delegations as an example of something that could not be allowed because they contradict the policy of conservatism
    - There is a concern about doubling the work for IANA
    - Jim notes that depending on how things are built, it is possible to create a situation where multiple changes can be made without additional IANA actions
      - A method that allows the TRT to urgently withdraw a delegation must exist
      - By the way subpro is currently being interpreted, a bulk delegation would never happen.
    - Topic established as an agenda item to follow up on with IANA for the workshop

4. **AOB**
None raised.

5. **Adjourn**