

## Incident Response Working Group

27 May 2010

### Attendees:

Fahd Batayneh, .jo  
Wim Degezelle, CENTR (Observer)  
Stephen Deerhake, .as  
Otmar Lendl, CERT .at  
Yasuhiro Orange Morishita, .jp  
Katrina Sataki, .lv  
Jörg Schweiger, .de (Chair)  
Zoran Vlah, .hr

### Staff support:

Bart Boswinkel, ICANN  
Yuri Ito, ICANN  
Kristina Nordström, ICANN

### Apologies:

Paul McKittrick, .nz

- The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and the topics for the meeting previously sent to the list was formally accepted by the group.
- The Chair noted that he made some changes to the draft regarding the contact repository data model attribute list and asked the group for comments. *Yasuhiro Morishita* noted that “ccTLD name” and “Registry Operator” name would be the same thing and suggested to merge the two into the term “ccTLD operator name”. *Bart Boswinkel* suggested that “Office times” should be replaced with the term “Business hours”. The Chair agreed to the changes.
- The Chair emphasized that the email addresses in the contact repository must be well maintained by the end users for the system to work.
- The Chair reported that comments (by the ccNSO council) towards the ICANN DNS-CERT initiative were submitted in Nairobi. He further noted that since the comments were not yet addressed, the Incident Response Working Group should not comment on the submissions until ICANN has presented an updated version of the project. *Wim Degezelle* suggested that it would be a good idea to explain the lack of comments from the Working Group to ICANN. The Chair agreed and offered to make a statement. This will be included in the comments that will, once again be phrased by the ccNSO council. The IR WG will submit its comments and participate in the called for bottom-up multi-stakeholder approach towards DNS security and stability once this process is initiated by ICANN.

- The Chair explained that OARC is using a web-interface where it is possible to edit incidents and indicate who you would like to share the information with. He further asked the group whether or not this method would be useful for the Incident Response Working Group. The group agreed that it would not be useful at this stage but perhaps in the future.
- The Chair asked the group who they think should be authorized access to the contact repository. It was agreed that access should be given to ccTLD members, TLDs in general, Registrars operating resolvers and DNS operators. CERTs should be considered on a case-by-case basis as they use a different definition of what is considered to be an incident.
- Regarding the communication tools for the repository, the group agreed that a mailing list would be enough in order to keep the information simple.
- The Chair suggested that the group should address the topic of use cases after he discussed the matter with Yuri Ito. The group agreed.
- The Chair encouraged the group to send suggestions to the list on what the Working Group should present in Brussels.
- The next meeting on 15 June noon UTC was confirmed.

The meeting closed.