GNSO gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group Statement

Issue: "DNS-CERT Operational Requirements & Collaboration Analysis Workshop"

Date: July x, 2010

Issue Document URL: http://icann.org/en/topics/ssr/dns-cert-collaboration-analysis-24may10-en.pdf

This statement on the issue noted above is submitted on behalf of the gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG). The statement that follows represents a consensus position of the RySG as further detailed at the end of the document. The RySG statement was arrived at through a combination of RySG email list discussion and RySG meetings (including teleconference meetings).

RySG congratulates ICANN for highlighting the important issues of DNS stability and security to the Internet and DNS security communities. We note developments at the recent ICANN meeting in Brussels, where:

- ICANN Staff indicated that ICANN is not interested in operating the DNS-CERT,
- ICANN reiterated that it has not allocated any funds for the DNS-CERT in the FY2011 budget, and
- Important discussions are now taking place about how an industry-led DNS-CERT (or CERTs) for Internet and DNS security might be created in and with the broader Internet community.

ICANN's hosting of a Birds of a Feather session (BOF) in Brussels was a useful step for building and furthering this communication, outreach and work.

As previously expressed by the RySG and the other parties who made comment on the DNS-CERT Business Case, the Internet community needs to take a number of key steps as an industry-led DNS-CERT (or CERTs) is contemplated:

- There need to be clear statements and substantiation regarding what problems need to be solved. There is currently no agreement or documentation regarding the threats to DNS security that a DNS-CERT would be established to address.
- There needs to be a proper scoping of the Internet and DNS security problems and their potential solutions. The ICANN DNS-CERT Business Case's scope and mission was unclear and overly broad. It also remains unclear whether and how security needs are already covered by existing entities, how and where any unfulfilled needs should be filled, and what ICANN's role should be versus industry-led organizations that already exist for response operations.
- There is the problem of buy-in and trust from the various stakeholders that own and operate relevant resources across the DNS and Internet.
- A full and balanced gap analysis should be performed, to help understand not only the operational work performed by existing institutions, but also their scope and mission.

The RySG submits that these fundamental scope and mission issues must be better understood before operational requirements and gap analyses for a DNS-CERT can be finalized. The DNS-CERT workshop, to which these particular comments are directed, did not address these pre-requisite issues, and while some of the discussions in the workshop were helpful, the exercise was premature in some ways.

RySG Level of Support

1. **Level of Support of Active Members**:   Supermajority

    1.1. # of Members in Favor: 11

    1.2. # of Members Opposed: 0

    1.3. # of Members that Abstained: 0

    1.4. # of Members that did not vote: 2

2. **Minority Position**(s): N/A

General RySG Information

- Total # of eligible RySG Members[1]: 14
- Total # of RySG Members: 13
- Total # of Active RySG Members[2]: 13
- Minimum requirement for supermajority of Active Members: 9
- Minimum requirement for majority of Active Members: 7
- # of Members that participated in this process: 13
- Names of Members that participated in this process:

    1. Afilias (.info & .mobi)
    2. DotAsia Organisation (.asia)
    3. DotCooperation (.coop)
    4. Employ Media (.jobs)

---

[1] All top-level domain sponsors or registry operators that have agreements with ICANN to provide Registry Services in support of one or more gTLDs are eligible for membership upon the "effective date" set forth in the operator's or sponsor's agreement (RySG Articles of Operation, Article III, Membership, ¶ 1). The RySG Articles of Operation can be found at <http://gnso.icann.org/files/gnso/en/improvements/registries-sg-proposed-charter-30jul09-en.pdf>. The Universal Postal Union recently concluded the .POST agreement with ICANN, but as of this writing the UPU has not applied for RySG membership.

[2] Per the RySG Articles of Operation, Article III, Membership, ¶ 6: Members shall be classified as "Active" or "Inactive". A member shall be classified as "Active" unless it is classified as "Inactive" pursuant to the provisions of this paragraph. Members become Inactive by failing to participate in a RySG meeting or voting process for a total of three consecutive meetings or voting processes or both. An Inactive member shall have all rights and duties of membership other than being counted as present or absent in the determination of a quorum. An Inactive member may resume Active status at any time by participating in a RySG meeting or by voting.

5. Fundació puntCAT (.cat)
6. Museum Domain Management Association – MuseDoma (.museum)
7. NeuStar (.biz)
8. Public Interest Registry - PIR (.org)
9. RegistryPro (.pro)
10. Societe Internationale de Telecommunication Aeronautiques – SITA (.aero)
11. Telnic (.tel)
12. Tralliance Registry Management Company (TRMC) (.travel)
13. VeriSign (.com, .name, & .net)

- Names & email addresses for points of contact
  o Chair: David Maher, dmaher@pir.org
  o Vice Chair: Jeff Neuman, Jeff.Neuman@Neustar.us
  o Secretariat: Cherie Stubbs, Cherstubbs@aol.com
  o RySG representatives for this statement: Greg Aaron, gaaron@afilias.info; Kathy Kleiman, kkleiman@pir.org