

NCAP Discussion Group

Meeting #142

13 March 2024 at 9:00 UTC

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

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/RPgDWgfwBDInJORUNdvEzneRzi_D30BGNtDMQdgEZ45h08Is5VrsfXiop4lteli1.eviMTSOhwJstc0tG

1. Welcome, roll call, SOI updates

- None

2. Finish review of ICANN org public comment

- Comment 4: Rubens Khul
 - Casey's Response: Two elements that need consideration are whether or not it disrupts and whether or not affected users can understand why the disruption happened. Ruben's suggestion may be a step backward because of the latter part.
 - Suggestion of the study may not be within the scope of the Discussion Group, but Suzanne notes that it can be implementation guidance.
 - Jeff feels that the whole IPv6 issue does not belong in NCAP's consideration other than noting that it is not important
 - While James agrees with many of Jeff's feelings towards Ruben's suggestion and importance of IPv6. He still feels that it is of growing importance and a solution should be accommodated at some point.
 - In the interest of time Matt calls for discussion around this comment to be held for later. Text will be developed due to the issue likely only needing a couple clarifying statements
- Comment 5: ICANN Business Constituency (BC)
 - Michael and Suzanne both note that NCAP could reference the section on gaming stating the TRT will look at historical data
 - The notion of publicly available data feels both ambiguous and risky. Jeff notes that there are other sources of data already available to reference.
 - Response: NCAP will affirm that publicly available data will be helpful to their application and then reference text already on the report while strengthening the excerpt
- Comment 7: ICANN Org
 - Recommendation 5:
 - Jeff: The reality of the situation is that there will always be some risk involved. Creating the report necessitates rearranging and assigning risks to parties. Being responsible for the delegation of strings is a decision the ICANN Board will simply have think about

- Recommendation 6:
 - Their observations are materially the same as Business Constituency. The response can be the same as well
- Recommendation 8:
 - Casey's Response: Despite the comparison of risks and benefits being mentioned multiple times, the actual benefits are never explained. There is a difference between VI and VIN and it is not clear if ICANN sees them as different.
 - It should be noted that it is not clear at this point if ICANN intends to be a data controller.
 - An acknowledgement will be made regarding ICANN's eagerness to be directly involved in reviewing the report material
 - Consensus made around Casey's response
- The mailing list will be used to sort out any loose ends on these responses in the interest of time
- 3. Reminder of discussion topics that need DG input**
 - Michael needs to review what led to these topics being backlogged before sharing them with the group
- 4. Begin walkthrough and review of redline edits to the draft Study 2 document**
 - Will be reviewed through email
- 5. Determine availability for a call week of 25 March (IETF week)**
 - Next week's meeting will be forgone in order to review redline changes on March 27th
- 6. AOB**
 - a. None raised
- 7. Adjourn**