Incidence Response Working Group Meeting
25 October 2009

Attendees:

Fahd Batayneh, .jo
Bart Boswinkel, ICANN
John Crain, ICANN
Stephen Deerhake, .as
Luis Diego Espinoza, .cr
Ondrej Filip, .cz
Erick Iriarte-Ahon, LACTLD
Yuri Ito, ICANN
Patrick Jones, ICANN
Greg Rattray, ICANN
Norm Ritchie, .ca
Katrina Sataki, .lv
Gabriella Schittek, ICANN
Save Vocea, ICANN

• The Working Group Chair, Norm Ritchie reminded the working group members that the group was formed as an ad-hoc Working Group with the goal to quickly find a solution to respond to attacks – such as the development of a contact repository between the cc’s and ICANN. However, the discussions have now expanded to whether registries can behave more pro-actively to DNS attacks. It is therefore felt that the working group should stay alive and its mandate broadened.

• Bart Boswinkel clarified that although the current charter allows for a wider mandate, just for the creation of a repository it still needs to be redrafted and approved by the ccNSO Council. Also, the wording of the current draft might need to be simplified, as it might be misunderstood. /Note: the updated Charter was approved by the ccNSO Council at their meeting in Seoul on the 28 October 2009. The updated charter is posted at {HYPERLINK "http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/erpwg.htm/"}

• The priorities of the working group were discussed. The group felt that the creation of a contact list should be the top priority.

• Discussions were also held on ways to be able to contact registries day and night. It was felt that the provision of a 24/7 service would be hard for especially smaller registries to live up to. However, it was also felt that there should be a mechanism documented somewhere on how to contact relevant people at all times of the day. It was suggested that a kind of interface mechanism could be developed which should be easy to update. The interface doesn’t necessarily need to be maintained by ICANN, it could also be done by the regional organisations, or CERTs. However, it was agreed that the group needs to establish how frequent such a repository should be revised and followed-up. It was suggested that regular test runs could be undertaken, testing that the communication works. It was agreed that this, and further details are to be established at a later stage.
Discussions were then held on what a realistic time frame would be for the work of the group. It was suggested that the group should have established what kind of information the contact list should contain, what the template should look like and how the information should be updated in time for the Nairobi meeting. By the Brussels meeting, some sort of system for this should already be in place.

It was suggested that Yuri Ito will prepare a first draft on how the contact list could be updated and draft a template for submission of the contact details; she will also look into how to get the regional organisations involved. The present members of the Working Group also welcomed the offer of Grag Rattray to host and maintain the repository with the contact details.

It was further decided to have meetings on a monthly basis. It was suggested to meet on a fixed day in the month; however, the times could rotate in order to accommodate as many participants as possible. Wednesday was anticipated being the most suitable day of the week for these calls.

The ccNSO Secretariat is to propose a meeting schedule leading up to the Nairobi meeting.

The working group members were finally asked to start to think of outreach and how to get ccTLD involved.