

NCAP Discussion Group

Meeting #122

19 July 2023 at 20:00 UTC

Meeting wiki: <https://community.icann.org/x/M4XxDg>

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/_ImZZS72hqpfY65wrmsUoZxPIG8V0AJCOn0Lx_Nv_XAaWq58zOJXgO5LfX-T92eI.HCx2A7YIYk2z4TLU

1. Welcome, roll call, SOI updates

- In the interest of capitalizing the momentum of progress working through Study 2. There are 2 potential changes being introduced: Weekly meetings will be extended to 90 minutes and an in-person workshop to deal with the last large issues of Study 2. Jennifer to send out polling on these changes.

2. Continue focused discussion on workflow technical details - ACA, PCA

Among the discussion points were:

- Workflow technical details - ACA, PCA
 - Step one: Static Assessments, applicant can view data before submission.
 - Anne questions if applicant will be noted of resources available to them
 - Jim notes the “off-ramp” choice of the applicant at the first step
 - Matt also notes the Name Collision Registry being made available would be useful
 - Jeff worries about being overly prescriptive in their report
 - Step two: TRT Static Assessment
 - Anne notes that it would be beneficial for the TRT to be notified of the potential risks of whatever data type they examine
 - Jim later on notes that the TRT should have a number of interactions with the applicant
 - 90 day timing
 - Jim emphasized that despite the expressed concerns about gaming potential, the static listings are still useful.
 - Anne questions the 90 day period for the assessment. Jim clarifies point of 30-30-30 split
 - Jim notes that the transition from step 2 to 3 is a decision point for the TRT on whether there is a need to proceed with PCA or not.
 - Step 3: PCA
 - Matthew defines and describes Step 3
 - Jeff adds context to how the interactions worked in 2012 and how they valued fairness and confidentiality

- Anne and Jim disagree with the notion of trying to mimic the older way
- Jim expresses the necessity of fleshing out interactions between the TRT and the applicant that will prompt and create opportunity for the applicant to develop a mitigation plan

Action item: None

3. AOB
None raised.

4. Adjourn