

## TRANSCRIPT

### Contact Repository Implementation Working Group Singapore

*23 March 2014*

#### Attendees:

Luis Diego Espinoza, expert  
Cristian Hesselman, .nl  
Antoinette Johnson, .vi  
Erwin Lansing, .dk

Guest: Norm Richie, specialist

#### ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel  
Kristina Nordstrom  
Gabriella Schitteck

Unidentified Participant: Well, let's start. Yeah?

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. And it's probably fairly simple, I think that we don't need to spend too much time. First of all, you've all seen the presentation, haven't you?

Unidentified Participant: Have they seen the latest version of the presentation? Maybe that's it.

Unidentified Participant: Hmm? I think so. Because the only thing I dropped out is the -- I dropped out two slides, so it's a bit shorter now. So basically what it shows now is what is the Working Group history and purpose, then it shows the motivation for doing the survey, then the survey results and then the proposed way forward, that's it. So that's -- I think it's around eight or nine slides right now.

Unidentified Participant: Okay, and maybe send it around once more, or you can run it--

Unidentified Participant: Do you want us to do -- put it on as prints?

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. Maybe just a simple, so everybody has seen it before we present it on Wednesday, so we can then view -- that there is something here--

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. There is.

Unidentified Participant: I think secondly, and maybe that's an idea Norm, say, for the -- that's why you probably have seen it and heard it, so you've been away from when you've got involved from a very elaborate system, based on the results of the survey. And then the question is, for us, or for the Working Group, is how to take the next steps? And probably -- but first is based on that survey, the recent conclusion then is the Working Group agrees then maybe it's -- may even have a comment on it. We run through the--

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)?

Unidentified Participant: He's already down (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Yes, we do.

Unidentified Participant: Okay?

Unidentified Participant: So I also changed the title a little bit, it's now saying: "Survey Results and Propose the Way Forward," and these are the two main points that we would like to make, I think, so I then I'd say -- let's hear what -- the Working Group history, and then there is objectives (ph) and goals, feasible models, and also basically where the Working Group originated from. That will at the bottom, go there.

Then each slide on the survey, so why did we carry out the survey, I think there are four main reasons for it, so the first one was to -- the thing that we establish was that it was difficult to convey the added-value of the service without any, you know, real world used cases, it sounds realistic. Maybe I should see the real world.

Then we have the financial and trust constraints that complicated, the development and operation of a system like this, and then the impact of the -- the potential impact -- the potential impact that it depends on the number of subscribers of the system, and fourthly that the -- basically that the Working Group was established quite a long time ago, and therefore that the landscape has considerably changed over time.

So these would then be the four prime motivations to carry out the survey. So these are the results, so there is two graphs and two table in there, the top one -- the top-left one is the -- pertains all responses, so even for people who didn't fill out the survey completely, and then the bottom table is only those people, those folks who filled out every question. So there were 53 respondents and 26 of them filled all the questions.

But it doesn't really matter in terms of results, just the primary result is basically the orange circles over there, which is the tension, if you will, between the added -- the perceived added value of the repository and the willingness of ccTLDs to actually pay for it. And that's the -- you know, the key problem in negotiating.

So, the conclusion then that I'm drawing is that there's still the perceived need for a contact repository -- for a global contact repository for Internet response, based on the survey results, but there's a clear tension with the willingness to pay. And therefore our recommendation is to actually move forward in a much simpler way with a secure mailing list, which we could iteratively expand into a more complex system based on people's experience with this more simple solution. And at the same time we should also consider alternatives, such as a more regional approach, for instance in central or in (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: And this is just to give the audience a bit more feeling for what we are -- bit more feeling for how to implement this as a secure mailing list, so it could be a (inaudible) server, read it

somewhere, on mutual ground, if you will, so that ICANN or ISOC or (inaudible), and could be subject to these rules I outlined there, so only accessible to security accessibility representatives, also the gTLDs (ph) and most people posted securely on the list. CEOs determine who gets on the list for their organization, and that's (inaudible).

Of course, this is not the only possibility, there are probably more, but this is the one that (inaudible). So anyway that's a pretty bold statement in there, which is I think that this should be doable to get it up and running before the ICANN Meeting in London. So this is -- I'm not even sure if you can read this but--

Unidentified Participant: So the purpose of this picture is to show that we should -- that we propose a major, iterative approach with us being over here, so this is the CRI Working Group, and we aim to finish at the end of April, beginning of May somewhere. And then we go into the stage where we set up the secure mailing list which, after a while, we can expand based on experience, and that we have with this mailing list. So, basically that's the iterative approach in which you would, you know, reconsider, if you would want to develop a more complex system.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: This picture is difficult to read.

Unidentified Participant: And then -- I think that also I should mention here that this is supposed to be the task for a new working group, so I think the CRI Working Group should end here. Also, this is basically what I just said, so final report by CRI Working Group, closure of the Working Group and then start a new Working Group to be implemented -- the secure mailing list and other recommendations, and one slide to basically ask people, "Okay, how did you feel about this approach," so they can rate their orange, red or green comments, and they've obviously done.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. (Inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. We were thinking about this approach of the mailing list it's not as -- but with all the requirements of the original Charter, and we were talking with Norm Ritchie in South Africa about these contacts (inaudible) implementation, and it's a good thing, because Norm was the Chair of the -- include the sponsoring at the beginning, and this was what we did in response, create this other -- the Contact Repository Implementation and then he has an idea what our Charter is to his Working Group. In this way, it's a good thing to provide something simple, and quicker to provide a solution, but in the way we are the person will not respect you. It is not a contact group or story in the way that some decide to manage. Then I'd like to maybe, for the final report, provide some information about the --what could be or to be the path in the future, and after that finish and keep going with the mailing list. But at least leave something of the work we do in the past about this.

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: And may -- I'd say the final -- say, the way I've envisioned it, the final report is, you want a very simple final report just to say what the mandate was by the -- why we ended up this way, why we had the survey -- results of the survey based on that, and say what we did in the meantime, because this Working Group did a lot of work that is if -- that it is taking into account into the annex, and therefore available for future use, and among the future use would be, say, if you look at the -- say, at the iterative approach -- on the iterative approach, and so over time you fall back on the requirements, et cetera, if you would go for it, because that was always the consideration.

Going for a full scale contact repository as well as the starting point as envisioned, because that is not wasted in that sense, but say that's the -- that was the sanity check we've done, if you would start implementing this at once, you would really run into the funding problem, and the governance problem, because that's not even included. And if you -- and that's probably -- maybe it's too much of an assumption, but it's in the question side: this is only successful if most -- a vast, vast majority of the ccTLDs subscribe to it.

If it's just a limited group, you can forget it. Why do it anyway? And then, especially for a vast, vast majority, the funding issue will become a real issue if you just think about, say, what -- we did the calculation for at the time. And Trusted IT (ph) I believe it's called. We would end up in quite a lot of money on a yearly basis, and then you come into the funding. Who is going to pay for it?

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. I remember we talked to some members about the \$1,000 per year per member. Yeah. And we are thinking about the small facility we'll not allowed to pay, that's plenty of money, and including money there. And we found the -- yeah, we found the (inaudible) the big issues about this full-sized (inaudible) story is the maintenance?

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Unidentified Participant: That is the role of contract is it were. The thing is if we -- this is very, very important because we provide some exit. But, you know, for final report I (inaudible) from some of the formations.

Unidentified Participant: You provide both? You provide -- first of all you provide an exit, because in a way when we started it was a dead-street, from the start maybe already, but secondly the work is not lost because it shows, say, these are the consequences if you start moving into that, into that world, and you need to take this in to resolve these issues.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. And, well, taking into consideration this full repository, if more closed than -- more closed to instant response team, like a third, also third, well, Norm has some experience, and in this kind of environment, security environments, than the idea to bring him here, or we could talk -- pleased to talk about. Maybe we can include some additional proposal about the -- how it could look like the Contact Repository in full with a proposal of--

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Norm Richie: Okay. Norm Richie, guest. And so I'm here representing the Secure Domain Foundation, which will officially launch actually Monday morning. Yeah. The stuff we've been working on for two years. If you want to have a look at the website, go to [www.securedomain.org](http://www.securedomain.org), but the whole idea is to really work in a cooperative way on mitigating the use of domain names. So that's Registries, Registrars, Hosting Companies, not affiliated with ICANN though, And so this doesn't mean there is no ICANN involvement here, just a separate entity. Obviously it's all voluntary, it's been extremely well received so far, the first I've actually presented the idea was at Tech Day in Costa Rica, actually, so it's two years ago.

We have an extensive repository now of malicious contact information. So that would be like -- we have about 7.5 million email address that are associated with malicious activity. We track, we actually analyze about 200,000 pieces of malware per day, extracted domain names, and you know, share that with whoever wants the information, so for instance a ccTLD, on a daily basis will say here is the domain we are seeing, but unless ccTLD that's -- we've found , and here's why we are calling them malicious. It's up to you what you'll want to do with that.

However, the goal of this was really to combat malicious behavior so, with the contact database, when I saw this on the agenda I said, "Hey --" Well first of all, it's something I actually started way back when, and it kind of fell apart. I still believe very strongly that's the right thing to do, and in the end you just can't all the pieces together and it simply have no contact, that outreach so you don't get another taste of (inaudible) C, but you know, the passing of everything else is a big mess. Couldn't even reach the ccTLDs in many cases.

In one case, the contact was actually dead for five years, that's how bad it was. There's a strong, political ramifications of that as well, you know. People at the ITU, they look at the ccTLDs and say, "Now you're a bunch of cats hanging around. You're hurting cats." You know, you can't even get them to cooperate on one simple little thing. That's a great example of why they should be taking over, right. What's coming off again, like governance is a big (inaudible) to pay. Perhaps it's going to come up again.

ccTLD is going to be a hotspot, and once again it's going to be just hurting cats, and things. So I think it's extremely important, and at the very least that you get the contacts done for the instant response, not just for the members of the ccNSO. They have like 142 members now that they can -- the ccNSO, which is great, but that I believe there is about 300 or so ccTLDs. I think that's more than the number of countries there now. So yes, we have to also outreach to them, we intended to do it anyway, because we need to establish those contacts and also we are going to say, "Hey, we will help you deal with your loss (ph) of behavior." We are doing that anyway.

So we are more than happy, if you want, to host your contact databases, there will be no charge, there's no charge for the (inaudible) registry. We have -- we are funded by sponsors and, to be honest, we have more offers for money than we can deal with. So it's a good problem to have, right?

Unidentified Participant: We wouldn't even call it a problem.

Norm Ritchie: Yeah. Yeah. You know, that's a good problem. Well, for a nonprofit it actually is problem, you can't (ph) have too much money, but we started out doing it free, and something that's near and dear to the ccTLD as a -- we don't want to charge to -- that would make it difficult for small registries and small registers to participate in that. So we try to figure out how to solve that problem so it's (inaudible). We also work with the gTLDs of course, and the new gTLDs, and I think we probably have in (inaudible) opposition forwards, or intend to, I'd say, probably just -- probably (ph) 95% of the gTLDs.

The ccTLDs not as much as -- tend to be the major ones. Some have concerns about privacy which I, you know, understand but that they have to deal with that on your own. We can't force anyone to participate. It's just--

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Norm Ritchie: Yeah. But you know, I think though, the SDF can certainly help you, but we will go after the same ccTLDs and bug them. The more people going after them I think the better, and they get the message. So I guess we are offering to join forces with you. Also offering that if you want the repository we have -- we are posted (ph) Amazon now. We have to be because we know where we are going to get hit. That's why we know it's a very robust environment. So if you want we'll post that for you at no charge.

Unidentified Participant: May I suggest that as a way forward, say, we are going to present this, if we include infancy in the final report, say this mechanism as a potential way in which you can do it, and probably there

are others as well, but this is say, people who know the CCs, and this is a way to set up -- set it up quickly, and in order to achieve the goals as such.

Norm Ritchie: Yeah. And so we have a development resources as well, and we have people that volunteer their time, but we also have ones that we pay, and he's quite brilliant. He could throw something together pretty quick or, you know, get a package or whatever. I would suggest though that you don't use a single repository, you have something to back up.

Unidentified Participant: Right.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. Cool. Thanks.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. I mean, an example and as you present a way to implement this, but as we said, and was from the slides from Christian, if you wanted to do -- by now it is about time that it's done quickly if you do a lightweight system, and if you do a lightweight system, then you need to join forces.

Norm Ritchie: Yeah. So that's actually one of the things about the SDF, it's very lightweight. And we don't have a lot of legal documents, on purpose, and the ones we do are very short and terse, and we don't have a large Board to deal with or anything. It's Chris Davis and myself, and we make the decisions, and where we have no bones about it, we do it. But that works, and so it's worked very well so far. You know, and once we get -- the SDF gets growing, I'm sure it will get slower, but right now the whole idea is to be very nimble and responsive.

Unidentified Participant: Let me say that we'll do -- (inaudible) --

Unidentified Participant: As an alternative, say, in the event of -- (inaudible) of an alternative as a potential way forward, and --

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)?

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Unidentified Participant: Just what -- do what in the end, to bring them to talk about this a little bit, to add value to the proposal. And put that on the table as a--

Unidentified Participant: As a (inaudible)?

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Norm Ritchie: Yeah. The other thing too, the (inaudible) you might want to join yourself, because it's interesting to you. You know, it's not just Registries, Registrars, it's also like feedback, PayPal, security professionals. We actually have people that are in human rights involved as well, because we (inaudible) a Net app, (inaudible) bringing attention to the domains. We have safeguards and stuff so. But anyway I have a lot here, it's at [www.securedomain.org](http://www.securedomain.org), and look for the press release, and we'll be rolling.

Unidentified Participant: Right. Excellent.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. I think let's go back to one -- if I can just suggest one thing, so for Wednesday morning, the two of you will present, Luis and Christian, and you will say, because Wednesday morning is the presentation on it, yeah, so you're going to sit on the front and let Christian do the presentations. Something like this, the logistics of it. It's just a way we end it, yeah.

Unidentified Participant: I sort of assumed that.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. Yeah.

Unidentified Participant: Just to make sure this would happen, it is an idea that Christian and I write up the final report, and as a group we sent it to the Group, and then we would say, the offer from Norm, because this can be done very rapidly. And we will send it around, and include the reference to say what you just said, your offer, and include it as well. And then put the annexes where we will have one more read with it as the Working Group, and then submit to the Council.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. Sounds like a plan.

Unidentified Participant: I agree with it.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. All right. Are you okay?

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. I'm okay.

Unidentified Participant: I'm okay.

Unidentified Participant: Yes. And then we have a reasonable way forward I guess, and some -- yeah, and then try to get it on Council Meeting, -- when is the next Council Meeting? Not in this week, but somewhere in April, I believe. Otherwise, say, you're ambitious about (inaudible), but at least we get something done; if we can get it on the next Council Meeting, not this one, but the second meeting of April.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Unidentified Participant: So we send out a Doodle Poll for a call two weeks in advance. So next round, 3<sup>rd</sup> April. So that --

Unidentified Participant: Is the release after this meeting?

Unidentified Participant: That's the--

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. Because I need to recount them.

Unidentified Participant: And that there's a Council Meeting every two weeks, or every four weeks.

Unidentified Participant: No. Every four, five weeks. The other one will be somewhere end of May.

Norm Ritchie: The end of May? Okay.

Unidentified Participant: So it's about one week before.

Unidentified Participant: Say that there is no time we can say certainly one week before. If I know we can put it on the agenda.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. Maybe she's trying to do the -- to finish it for the April Council Meeting.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah, but I will come, I'm just trying--

Unidentified Participant: That's the mission, try to close it at the April Council.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. We are done.

Unidentified Participant: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Do you want to say something?

Unidentified Participant: Just no comment.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Thank you.