

**NCAP Discussion Group**  
**Meeting #136**  
**13 December 2023 at 9:00 UTC**  
**Meeting wiki: <https://community.icann.org/x/M4MYEQ>**

**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/1xoHA--7SOKojCmqPTkyljSaHVVTB0VLGwxaAFVsK1S0vVDKEGgkMhN9sd822RHn.qBbFtLMmB4kXm1zM\\*\\*](https://icann.zoom.us/rec/share/1xoHA--7SOKojCmqPTkyljSaHVVTB0VLGwxaAFVsK1S0vVDKEGgkMhN9sd822RHn.qBbFtLMmB4kXm1zM**)

**1. Welcome, roll call, SOI updates**

- None raised

**2. Focused review on document text where Heather has specific questions or items for DG input**

- *6. .corp, .home, .mail: "Second is to produce guidance on the delegation of C/H/M and other strings where name collisions will occur"*
  - While Warren feels they are too dangerous to delegate, though if they are to be then they should follow the the process of being evaluated by the TRT
  - James shares Warren's sentiments but thinks it should only be disclosed which strings are regarded as high-risk
    - He feels .mail cannot be regarded as high risk because of the fact that strings using it have already been delegated in the previous round
  - *Consensus achieved that it is the TRT's responsibility to judge whether the strings are suitable for delegation or not*
  - Suzanne feels something should be said in the doc even if the TRT is now in control. Also feels that the potential change in delegation of .mail need not be justified
    - Casey also has this sentiment. Noting that NCAP should be speaking to what the Board explicitly asked for
  - Heather asks: Will there be specific recommendations for .corp, .home, .mail and the decision to not do Study 3 or will they be integrated elsewhere?
    - *Due to the Board having specific questions about them, .corp, .home, .mail will have its own recommendation. Consensus achieved*
      - Barry provides guidance on where the recommendation could fit
- *7. Clarify the differences from the 2012 round*

- James feels there are only 2 main differences between the rounds. Due to that low number, he states a chart may not be necessary and that the differences can be explained
- Matt brings into question the level of priority this item should be receiving
- Anne notes that the chart could be beneficial to non-technical community members. Recommends the inclusion of the chart and prose
- Warren suggests publishing the prose first, seeing where community gets confused, and then publish a support chart if needed in the next draft
- *Heather states it is possible that the prose already exists within the document. Michael will take a look and see if a chart can be developed based on the text that exists*
- DG votes to allow Michael to move forward with working on visual elements for the doc
- *12. Supro NCAP testing and Zone addition timing - PSL propagation*
  - Casey plans on adding technical details and background, but nothing that will change the general consensus on this item
  - “The PSL editors simply need to be aware of these temporary delegations and label them appropriately so their users are not confused” -Tom in chat
  - This item is considered not worthy of a recommendation. The main decision is that NCAP will state that they noticed it and it exists
- *14. NCF phases x DNSSEC*
  - The conclusion of Ruben’s thread states that DNSSEC should not be used.
  - The issue with IANA was already talked through at the workshop in DC. They are not concerned about this
  - Group Consensus: The report should acknowledge the DG’s diligence in understanding impact regarding new delegations while also citing RSSAC advice and encouraging RSSAC and public to comment as they see fit
  - Two actions needed to move this forward:
    - Heather will add a finding that touches NCAP’s discussions with IANA and their consideration of past RSSAC advice
    - A letter will be written to RSSAC notifying them of the public comment period and requesting their input
- *15. Tabletop Exercises: Are these now too outdated to include in the report? Should they remain to display work that DG had done?*
  - Heather presents the option to leave this section open for future use following public comment
    - Anne feels this option would require a second draft, which is not possible
  - James feels this could be integrated into the .corp, .home, .mail recommendation
  - *Consensus achieved on dropping this section*
- Michael has developed several forms of material and diagrams and has encouraged the DG to provide feedback

- The backlog of topics has officially been cleared. A DG meeting is still scheduled for next week. The plan is to go through the document sort out any contentious items
  - Members should primarily be focusing on Sections 4 and 5
  - All comments in the doc should be made using Suggestion Mode

**3. AOB**

- a. None Raised

**4. Adjourn**