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- The Chair suggested changing the name of the Working Group to “Contact Repository Implementation” in order to clarify the exact purpose of the group, the repository.

- The Chair presented a timeline with 3 points that need to be addressed by the group, 1 and 2 before Dakar and 3 at a later stage:
  1. Investigate costs and relevant factors to implement, maintain and operate an incident repository.
  2. Find and propose funding, management and governance models to implement the repository.
  3. Prepare a Request for Proposal.

- The Chair suggested that a contact centre could provide part of the service to create and maintain the repository and he mentioned Packet Clearing House as a possibility as discussed in the Incident Response Working Group. He noted that other service providers and resources should be investigated as well.

- The Chair suggested that part of the work to gather ccTLD contacts and build the repository could be organised by the Regional Organisations (ROs) since they know their own regions well and have the required contact details already. He also mentioned the IANA database as a trusted resource for contacts details.  

  Bart Boswinkel pointed out that all ccTLDs are not members of the Regional Organisations and that they would need to be included as well if the ROs would be involved.

  Wim Degezelle noted that even if the ROs could help building the repository they could not be expected to update the contact data since that would require too much work. The
Chair confirmed that the ROs would only be consulted in the first phase of building the repository.

- Bart emphasised that the contact repository would not be set up for profit, however the creation and maintenance would be costly and small ccTLD registries would not be able to afford the required annual fee. Therefore the group needs to discuss the best solutions for funding models.

- Isak Jacobsen reported that the northern ccTLDs is planning a meeting in Island in mid September and offered to bring the suggestion forward about the potential involvement of the Regional Organisations in the initial construction of the repository.

- Bart presented a graphic overview of the tasks of the Working Group:

  1. Creation of the repository (buy or build)
  2. Submission of the data
  3. Maintaining/Updating data
  4. Operation (requirements for using the repository)

- Bart raised the issue of who would define an incident and what would trigger use of the repository. He stressed that there must be a trust relationship between the repository members and the parties operating and maintaining it.

- The group discussed the option to split the work with the repository into the identified three parts: Creation/Maintenance/Operation.

  The Chair offered to draft an overview of the different tasks and include suggestions on how to approach them. Bart offered to assist.

- Bart suggested that the members should individually consider possible funding models and operational requirements to discuss at the next call.

- The group agreed to have its next meeting in two weeks time.

The meeting closed.