

# NCAP Discussion Group

## Meeting #113

26 April 2023 at 20:00 – 21:00 UTC

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

<b>Discussion Group Members</b> Matthew Thomas, Suzanne Woolf, Julie Hammer, Barry Leiba, Warren Kumari, Jeff Schmidt, Tom Barrett, Anne Aikman-Scalese, Jaap Akkerhuis, Geoff Huston	<b>Observers</b> Fanny Salyou <b>ICANN Org</b> Jennifer Bryce, Kathy Schnitt
<b>Apologies</b> Rod Rasmussen, Justine Chew, Jim Galvin, Matt Larson	<b>Contractor Support</b> Casey Deccio, Heather Flanagan

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/zAwdE5pFI8gn8C7fu8h8qNKZGVj9NOzTG6sMyAgZtrx7kQyAuvFfYqRyPLu\\_xbWG.te-TioS7NwEANDkg](https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/zAwdE5pFI8gn8C7fu8h8qNKZGVj9NOzTG6sMyAgZtrx7kQyAuvFfYqRyPLu_xbWG.te-TioS7NwEANDkg)

### 1. Welcome, roll call - Matt

See attendance record above. No SOI updates recorded.

### 2. Continue discussion on Study 2 report section 4: Findings – Matt

The group discussed findings in the [document](#), picking up from Finding E. Among the discussion points were:

- Finding E: User notification and reporting is problematic.
  - Warren asked why the DG cannot use both notification modalities that were discussed, one for 45 days and the other for 45 days. He provided his justification for this approach, including that he believes this would address many people’s concerns.
  - Casey raised a question as to if the group is constrained to 90 days? If there is more time, he recommends going to 120 days.
  - Jeff noted that in pre-public comment of the JAS report, 120 days was suggested. He noted this was heavily commented on and JAS found it difficult to justify the longer period. Casey noted that this was under the constraint of one mechanism, whereas this group is proposing two so he thinks it could be argued differently if the group chose to do that.
  - The group discussed different options to make sure the finding is clearly separate from the recommendation in this case.
  - Anne encouraged the group to make sure the text is clear about what was learned from the 2012 round.
  - Heather will draft some text based on the discussion and meet with Suzanne and Matt before sharing with the group.

- Ea. Controlled interruption is not effective for user notification.
  - Given the discussion on Finding E above, the group agreed to skip it for now while the adjustments to the text for E are made. To be revisited once new text for E is written.
- Finding Eb. Reporting threshold should be lowered.
  - Warren suggested that people will only file reports if they know what happened and where to file reports, and there are reasons companies for example might not be willing to file a report. The group had a discussion around this.
  - Several people commented on how to separate the finding and the recommendation here.
  - Heather will update the text ahead of the next meeting.
- Finding Ec. Client issues TBD.
  - Based on the earlier discussion on the call about Finding E in general, the group will come back to this one when the redrafted Finding E is ready.
- Finding F: Supporting IPv6 is important.
  - Minor comments from the group around the wording which Heather will incorporate.
- Finding H: There is no process for emergency changes to the root zone to address collision risks or harm.
  - Warren suggested some adjustments to the wording for clarity.
  - Jeff questioned this finding and why it is in the report, as he believes it is not accurate. He noted text in the JAS report on this topic. The group discussed this, and the relevancy or otherwise of the EBERO process.
  - This finding will have to be revisited as no clear consensus on direction was reached.

### **3. AOB**

None raised.

### **4. Summary of action items and decisions**

No specific action items recorded.