NCAP Discussion Group
Meeting #84
27 April 2022 at 19:00 – 20:00 UTC
Meeting wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/eIWpCw

Discussion Group Members	Observers
James Galvin, Matt Thomas, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Warren Kumari, Geoff Huston, Jeff Schmidt, Julie Hammer, Rod Rasmussen, Tom Barrett, Greg Shatan	**ICANN Org** Matt Larson, Kathy Schnitt, Jennifer Bryce
Apologies Barry Leiba, Heather Flanagan, Kinga Kowalczyk, Casey Deccio	**Contractor Support**

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/T488TJpkyeDLvKYrGq0dapbj0ZubI2k9IpvRvgBHGeTRLI5-sQPZ-kpbajlITdq2.wsqBUemIJUuAMOV0?startTime=1651086466000

NCAP Discussion Group action items and decision log:
https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1DE5lcOqFujazdw4_x5ii9vcBnsoskAUJnBee_HaVHn8/edit?usp=sharing.

1. **Welcome, roll call**
See attendance record above. No SOIs provided.

2. **Current status of the NCAP project; restatement of summary of action items and decisions made from last meeting – Jennifer**
No update provided as there will be a project management meeting immediately after this call, for updates to be brought to the Discussion Group afterwards.

3. **Discuss responses to Public Comments on NCAP Study 2 documents**
Matt provided a high-level overview of the Public Comment responses. The Discussion Group discussed some minor changes, and Anne suggested that more detail should be provided in response to some of the comments from ISPCP and RySG with regard to how the Discussion Group will consider the input moving forward.

Jeff proposed that the comments from RySG in row 20 of the spreadsheet linked above require a discussion about why the Discussion Group should be proposing to do anything different. He suggested that the NCAP Study 2 document should clearly explain why we are proposing something different to the current process. The group had some discussion around this point.

Action item: The NCAP writing team will adjust the draft Public Comment responses based on the feedback during the 27 April Discussion Group meeting, to be shared with the Discussion Group.

4. **Continue discussion on the workflow – Jim**

Jim led a discussion on the workflow using the [slides](), highlighting the areas that had been updated since the previous discussion. He noted areas that the Discussion Group needs to add more detail around, as reflected in the questions in the slides, such as:

- Is it possible to objectively identify a "high risk" label?
- Is it possible to objectively identify "do not apply" labels?

5. Summary of action items and decisions – Jennifer

Action item: The NCAP writing team will adjust the draft Public Comment [responses]() based on the feedback during the 27 April Discussion Group meeting, to be shared with the Discussion Group.

6. AOB

None raised.