EREG – IRIS for ENUM

Andrew Newton <andy@hxr.us>

58th IETF, Minneapolis, MN, USA

11 – November – 2003

Quick Update

- CRISP WG
  - base requirements done
  - protocol selection done
  - moving forward with IRIS
- draft-newton-iris-ereg-01.txt
  - incorporated comments received for –00.
  - removed cruft from section 6
  - updated to be current with iris-core -04

Motivation

Why? Who? What?

Why?

- Is a whois service needed for ENUM?
  - Will ENUM just be a small community of providers?
  - Will all ENUM interactions remain intra-national?
    - cross-border abuse?
    - cross-border coordination?
  - Will there be delegations to private entities?
    - b2b & e2e coordination?

Who?

- Who will resolve ENUM problems?
  - To resolve an issue, does the end-point sys admin have to rely on the upward chain?

- Who do you contact?
  - Large network operators have different sys admins for different purposes: abuse, noc, etc…
    - Which one is which?
  - Is that SOA a SIP address or an SMTP address or an XMPP address?

What?

- Just what can go wrong?
  - Messed up MX records are fairly common, so what's the likelihood of encountering a messed up NAPTR or SRV record?
  - Will fat-fingering cause incorrect delegations or bad NS sets at the zone apex?
- What will we do about abuse?
  - Will ENUM will be easy prey for war-dialing spammers?

This Proposal

- Specifies a vector for coordination.

  - Not mandating "the" vector for coordination.

- Is one part of the answer.

  - No protocol/technology can be the whole answer.

  - Policy plays a major role.

- Attempts to be policy-neutral.

  - Providers have differing requirements based on jurisdiction.

Applicability

- Public-facing
  - account for data miners and abusive users
- Privacy
  - pluggable authentication for adaptable authorization
- Structured
  - well-understood multiple methods of alternative contact
  - I18N
    - localization of protocol elements
    - multiple language contact equivalents
  - standard queries and results