(this slide intentionally left blank)

Assured Path Messaging

RIPE Anti-spam WG, RIPE 46
Amsterdam, September 2003

Rodney Tillotson, JANET-CERT
R.Tillotson@ukerna.ac.uk

APM

- Not a technology

  - technology-neutral

- No direct need for legislation

- Mail abuse is a business issue

  - ISPs have to cooperate

Promiscuous mail has failed

- Receivers listen to all, senders use DNS

    – simple for both

    – widely abused

        - elaborate defences

- No service provision

    – no revenue

Bilateral links

- APM is closed

  - APM -> promiscuous acceptable

  - promiscuous -> APM forbidden

- Agreements between APM providers

  - what addresses

  - what relaying

  - what payments

  - how to maintain separation

Global standards

- Behaviour considered to be mail abuse
    - principally UBE, but eg abuse reponse
    - do not invite legal interpretation
        - inclusive, specific
        - no jargon
- Multilingual
    - compatible with many cultures

Global standards

- APM service levels

  - same for peering and user service

- Public commitment by APMPs

- Maintenance process

Global support

- Maintenance of standards

- Dispute resolution

- Brokering of link agreements

- Last-resort relaying

Local benefits

- Customers get better service

    - which they pay for

- APM facilities not subject to abuse

- APM relaying is a new industry

    - relaying

    - consultancy

Who loses?

- Senders of UBE
- People without access to APM
  - too expensive?

Threats

- Inadequate level of acceptance

- Major operator dilutes standards

- Legal resistance

  - freedom of speech

  - restrictive practice

- Deception

- Leakage at a major APMP

Technology

- Link technology
- Identify APM
  - source IP address
  - sender MX
  - crypto tokens
  - unusual ports
  - SSL

Worth looking at?

- Draft documents

- Design a pilot

- Get initial participants

- Questions?

(this slide intentionally left blank)