NCAP Discussion Group
Meeting #134
29 November 2023 at 8:00 UTC
Meeting wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/SQD8E

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/1nOvJAP0JN0ppOEiGTSQolM2R8eUZo1vSvZ5ml8qK7Y_UEWVp3kfb8gGYmSPQhhY.fel__Sf67XVyB71z

1. **Welcome, roll call, SOI updates**
   - None raised
2. **Admin: Regular Meeting Time – Doodle Results**
   - Majority voted to move the meeting one hour later to maximize the available participants of the meeting
   - Michael, the new upcoming technical writer will start attending meetings next week to improve the transition of Heather's departure
   - The Board is interested in knowing having NCAP be completed to coincide with the timing of external projects with dependencies like subPro
3. **Start working through Outstanding topics doc**
   - ACA Options: Unable to move forward currently
     - There is tentative agreement on where to go, but now there is no existing text to review
     - If Heather is unable to finish a draft, Michael could be able pick it up
   - Collision String/Hold Registry
     - Main contention regarding this topic is who decides what strings belong on the "naughty list"
     - Warren feels who maintains the list is not as important as establishing the list's existence. Suggests asking the Board for their preference on whose responsibility it is..
     - James also feels that it would be more practical to focus on the technical requirements of the list and leave it up to the Board if they choose to delegate the responsibility to the TRT.
     - Suzanne brings up the dynamic nature of the list. Asks to consider the maintenance of the list as a factor
     - There is a general consensus on the essentials of this topic. All that is needed now is to see written words and review them
   - Strings in contention / under objection
     - Newest finding states that NCAP agrees that TRT evaluation should be a point in time evaluation. There is a question now if a recommendation should be made to map around this finding.

- Warren feels that it is a decision that could be left between the TRT and IANA
- James notes that the key point of this topic is name collision analysis is done before granting to an applicant. He feels that while there is plenty of ground to cover with the details, it cannot be an effective discussion until they have written wording to review, and so the main focus of discussion today should be the key point.
- Suzanne notes that NCAP will have to make a decision on where name collision analysis fits into the decision whether to delegate a string or not
- Warren suggests letting the final step be that the name service gets set at 127.0.53.53 so that it provides an ongoing signal that the string is still in progress.
  - James feels that the only reason to pull something from the root zone should be emergency situations
- James feels there is no need for any form of risk management. He states that the pros and cons of each decision of when analysis takes place can be communicated.
- Casey brings up time limits for review. References the 90 day timeline that was previously discussed.
  - Suzanne notes that NCAP can suggest the existence of a time limit and leave how long it should be as an implementation detail.
  - James agrees with not needing to specify the length of the time window, but does want to note the increase of risk the longer the window is
- Discussion reaches an impasse. Suzanne states a potential compromise would be either suggesting which risks are most manageable or simply stating that they could not agree on their recommendation
- Operational Responsibilities and Qualifications of the TRT
  - James feels there is no need to dictate the differential roles between the TRT and the NSP. He feels NCAP should speak to the functions and the roles that need to be present.
    - Also notes the "NSP" role does not absolutely have to be a neutral service provider. Key aspect of the role is its independence and that should be outlined
  - Matthew wonders if when communicating the details of this topic with community members if the "NSP" should or should not be mentioned for the sake of clarity
    - General consensus (esp. James and Warren) is that they should be discussed as separate entities
  - Matthew then questions where TRT responsibility begins and ends
    - Warren and James feel it should be as described by NCAP, but recognize that there is intersection between the 2 roles
- Workflow
  - Matt put together a new diagram of the newly agreed on workflow. Invites review and improvement upon it.

4. **AOB**
   a. None Raised

5. **Adjourn**