# Validation of "abuse-mailbox"

**2019-04 v3**

**RIPE80**

Jordi Palet - jordi.palet@theipv6company.com

@JordiPalet

# Summary

- How many abuse contact emails **validated** by the current policy actually are **able** to respond to a real abuse email?
  - Fake emails (random existing email from another organization or person)
  - Mailboxes never read, abuse cases never processed
  - Full mailboxes bouncing emails
  - Non existent employees
  - …

- Current policy, "Abuse Contact Management in the RIPE Database" does not provide sufficient validation of the actual availability of the abuse-mailbox
  - It is a good starting point, but should be improved
  - Common sense: it must be a *working* mailbox for the designed purpose

- Automated process will be ideal for everyone (standards, not forms!)

# Changes from v2

- Much shorter text
- Choice to support X-ARF/RFC5965/RFC6650 for automated abuse processing
- Do not say anything if you don't want to handle abuse cases
- Removed the operational details
- Explicitly indicated as a foot note, that the RIPE NCC could change the validation period

- Additional Information (NOT part of the policy text):
  - Policy intent NOT to look into how the abuse mailbox is monitored or cases handled
  - Community should escalate, so the RIPE NCC can provide stats (anonymous)

# Changes from Actual Policy

- Intended for receiving -> must receive messages
- Validate the "abuse-mailbox" –> validate if is present and can receive messages
- Annually -> every six months* (RIPE NCC can change it)
- Where the attribute is deemed incorrect -> if the validation fails

New:
- Must not force the sender to use a form
- Clearly state that the validation will not check how cases are processed
- Community should escalate/report back, so stats are provided

# Reality Check

- How many out of 93% are working?

## Results

| Total distinct abuse-mailbox | Automated validation passed | Automated validation failed |
|:---:|:---:|:---:|
| 77168 | 71711 (93%) | 5457 (7%) |

- ~8,000 abuse-mailbox have been updated in 2019

Marco Schmidt | RIPE 79

x

# Status in Other RIRs

- Already reached consensus and implemented in APNIC
  - https://www.apnic.net/community/policy/proposals/prop-125
    - Escalation of failures already working
- Reached consensus in LACNIC (being implemented)
- Under discussion in other regions