

STAFF ASSESSMENT

Abuse Contact Policy Update

AFPUB-2018-GEN-001-DRAFT01

Proposal	AFPUB-2018-GEN-001-DRAFT-01
Title	Abuse Contact Policy Update
Assessed	12th August 2018

1.0 Staff Understanding of the Proposal

- a. The proposal replaces the current CPM 8.0 (Abuse Contact Information)
- b. Instead of the current "irt" specifications, the proposal makes mandatory an "abuse-c" attribute in inetnum, inet6num, autnum objects issued directly by AFRINIC to members. The value of an abuse-c attribute is an e-mail address (abuse-mailbox)
- c. The abuse-c attribute in child objects (PA assignments, sub-allocations) is not mandatory.
- d. The proposal requires AFRINIC to periodically validate and verify that the specified abuse-mailbox email address is active. (Sec 8.4)
- e. abuse-mailbox should be verified upon creation, and at least once every 3 months.
- f. Members that fail verification of listed abuse-c are in policy breach, and usual measures apply.
- g. AFRINIC should avail an email address to escalate abuse related incidents to (to allow for manual revalidations, etc).
- h. the "irt", "mnt-irt" objects will be deprecated.

2.0 Staff Comments

- a. Our observation is that there is already an existing solution through the IRT object, which is currently optional. Suggestion to the author is to make use of the current IRT solution (which seems to address the intent of the proposal), and make it mandatory for directly issued resource objects by AFRINIC. (If the proposal intends to get rid of the IRT solution, the author should explicitly indicate so in the problem statement, and clearly state why the IRTs are not working, and why the current solution is better. The IRT, for example, provides more abuse info, such as physical address and phone – whereas this proposal just provides for an abuse email address).
- b. In an e-mail to the list, the author indicates that he is OK with using both abuse-c and IRT. If this is the preference, the proposal text should be very clear about it.
- c. There is already an attribute in the org object called "abuse-mailbox", whose value is an e-mail address. We propose that if the author insists on going ahead with this, the abuse-c attribute proposed be renamed to "abuse-mailbox" attribute for consistency and less implementation effort.
- d. In proposed 8.6, it's better to not specify an email address, as this can change. It's better to reword like "AFRINIC should provide a method to report or escalate.. invalid abuse email addresses"
- e. Proposed section 8.7 (and possibly 8.5 and 8.4) should move out of the CPM, to another section of the policy proposal document - such as under section 2, titled "non-binding examples or recommended practices". These are implementation and operational details that need not be in the CPM.

3.0 Comments from Legal Counsel

None

4.0 Implementation

The proposal will be implemented within the timelines provided for in the PDP.

4.1 Timeline & Impact

An optimistic estimate is a minimum of 1.5 months of man-hours (possibly longer) for development, testing and deployment. This may however increase based on other as yet unforeseen commitments and priorities.

4.2 Implementation Requirements

Some software development work.