Abuse-c Validation Proposal:
Status in other RIRs and Way Forward

RIPE77

@JordiPalet

(jordi.palet@theipv6company.com)

Where this comes from …

- Learning from the previous abuse-c proposal ML discussion …

Objectives of "abuse-mailbox" validation:

The procedure, which is to be developed (an actual example is provided as part of the policy proposal) by RIPE NCC, must meet the following objectives:

1. A simple process that guarantees its functionality and allows the helpdesks that deal with abuse reports to verify that validation requests actually come from RIPE NCC and not from third parties (which might involve security risks), avoiding, for example, a single "direct" URL for validation.

2. Avoid ONLY "fully" automated processing.

3. Confirm that the person performing the validation ensure that understands the procedure and the policy, that they regularly monitor the "abuse-mailbox", that measures are taken, and that the abuse report receives a response.

4. Validation period no longer than 15 days.

5. If validation fails, escalate to the LIR and set a new validation period not to exceed 15 business.

Status in Other RIRs

- ## APNIC
  - Consensus (APNIC46 + AMM). Last call ended 16th October/2018
    - 15/15 days, 2 times per year
    - Block access to "myapnic" until updated and re-verified

- ## LACNIC
  - Community asked to relax the timing
    - It was presented as 2/3 days, 4 times per year
  - v3 submitted 2 days ago, considering the APNIC changes
    - + allow the staff to modify the timing (example slow start …)

- ## AfriNIC
  - v1 as in LACNIC
  - Working in v2 to match LACNIC inputs (as per v3)

Way Forward in RIPE

- Officially submitting a proposal in a few days?

- Take a look to APNIC version:
  - https://www.apnic.net/community/policy/proposals/prop-125
  - Will "allow the NCC to modify the timing" (slow start)

- Beyond goal:
  - Standardize in IETF a protocol for abuse reporting
  - One possibility: XARF (https://github.com/xarf)