

# NCAP Discussion Group

## Meeting #124

16 August 2023 at 20:00 UTC

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

**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/fmjWhuuQlj-ni11YeQtGV771MEK57Sq1X-MILX0pyGytop97oA41JX9QMajXNI6h.xUExaj48-pnFCSf3>

### 1. Welcome, roll call, SOI updates

- Workshop:
  - Occurs on the 3rd and 4th. Dates on the agenda were written in error
  - Travel covers from night before until night after the event

### 2. Focused discussion topic: Definitions and technical details of terminology, and impacts to workflow

Among the discussion points were:

- Recap of last meeting.
  - Discussion on the workflow became too hard to progress due to confusion over terminology
  - Everyone was assigned to reread Sections 1-3 before meeting so that definitions of terms could be agreed upon and solidified.
- Jennifer provided questions that could be picked back up on
  - What actually do ACA and PCA mean?
  - What modifications need to be made to our definitions?
  - What does that mean for the workflow re: ACA?
  - What is the timeline for ACA and PCA?
  - Should ACA be mandatory?
- James notes that he used comments to provide clarifying suggestions for the terms in section 1.4 believing that to be a good starting off point
- Jeff proposes the distinction between ACA and PCA: Techniques that prompt a response from the target vs techniques that do not trigger a response from the target
- Casey notes that ACA is now being described as something completely different, but mostly values getting on the same page currently with definitions.
  - Jeff then proposes starting anew with terminology to avoid confusion
  - Heather notes that much of Section 3 was written by Casey based on his understanding at the time and that if things change, much would have to altered as well
  - James warns of the risk of confusing the community. Recommends getting back to redefining within the current terminology.

- Casey reviews an email he sent out regarding technical details of PCA and the use of a nearly-empty TLD zone.
  - This includes a presentation of potential complications with structuring workflow in this way, as well as ways to circumvent those complications
  - Rubens expresses that the presented guidelines may be applicable to any phase in the workflow.
  - Jim feels that DNS experts should be consulted before committing to a change that could potentially be too disruptive
- Consensus on PCA is not reached. Further discussion is needed during the next meeting.

Action item: None

**3. AOB**

None raised.

**4. Adjourn**