



SUBJECT

Approved minutes of the 35th TF-CSIRT meeting
30 January 2012, Rome, Italy
Version 1.0

Page 1/12

35th TF-CSIRT meeting

30 January 2012

Aula Magna del Rettorato, Rome, Italy

Please note that a seminar was held the following day. The presentations can be found at <http://www.terena.org/tf-csirt/meeting35/>

1. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the last meeting held on 22 September 2011 were approved.

2. Actions from last meeting

31.1 TI Review Board to discuss how to deal with Spamhaus problems and what further action to take.

Resolved during meeting.

32.2 Marco Thorbrügge to send pointer to information about Article 13a to the mailing list.

Ongoing.

3. ITU-IMPACT Capacity Building for Least Developed and Developing Nations

Marco Obiso gave a presentation about the ITU's International Multilateral Partnership Against Cyber Threats (see <http://www.terena.org/tf-csirt/meeting35/obiso-impact.pdf>). This had been created in the framework of the Global Cybersecurity Agenda to increase knowledge and skills, and provide training in how to effectively prevent, manage and defend against cyber threats.

To this end, they had established several centres of excellence and ran a number of specialised training programmes. Since 2009, training had been provided to more than 300 cybersecurity professionals, law enforcement officers, and telecoms personnel in 19 countries. A further 220 scholarships had been provided to 41 countries.

One of the aims of IMPACT was to encourage the creation of national CSIRTs, particularly in developing countries. There is still a low level of preparedness in many of them, and this could have wider implications on networks elsewhere in the world. It was therefore important to have CSIRT capabilities in all countries, and establish communication and coordination across regions. To date, readiness assessments had been completed in 32 countries in Africa, Asia and South-East Europe (Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia) with 10 moving to the implementation phase.

Another activity was cyberdrills in order to enhance and improve cross-border communication and collaboration. These also aimed to identify weaknesses in processes and procedures with respect to malware, web defacement and spamming incidents. A drill had recently been conducted in 2011 between CSIRTs in Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar and Vietnam.

4. Spamhaus issues

Baiba Kaskina outlined the problems that Latvia had experienced with Spamhaus over the past year (see <http://www.terena.org/tf-csirt/meeting35/kaskina-spamhaus.pdf>). Latvian data centres were attractive for customers from Russia, Belarus and Ukraine etc.. but there had been several blacklistings during 2011 and most recently the whole of Lattelecom had been blacklisted. The ISPs were willing to remove spammers, but had subsequently found it difficult to remove the blacklistings.

The main problems appeared to be that the information provided by Spamhaus was insufficient to file incident reports and they were slow to provide additional details. The blacklistings often appeared to be based on outdated information, and transit providers were being blacklisted as well. The escalation procedure was also undocumented, and Spamhaus reacted very slowly to removing IP addresses even where ISPs and CSIRTs were cooperating.

This issue had first been raised last January and the TI Review Board on behalf of TF-CSIRT had been asked to consider how to approach this problem. Unfortunately though, this action had not been progressed for various reasons, but so it was agreed to put this back on the agenda in order to ask the question whether any other CSIRTs and ISPs had problems with Spamhaus, and if so, what could be done?

Several CSIRTs replied that they were aware of several ISPs that had significant problems with Spamhaus and in subsequently removing themselves from blacklisting. They understood the reasons why they existed and that customers were willing to pay for their service, but felt the escalation processes were not well enough defined, and nor were they responsive enough to legitimate CSIRTs.

Eric Ziegast said he had contacts with several members of Spamhaus and offered to put CERT.LV in touch with them to discuss the Latvian problems (which he actually did during the meeting). However, perhaps it would be useful for TF-CSIRT to meet with some people from Spamhaus to discuss better channels of communication. He suggested inviting Spamhaus to either the next TF-CSIRT meeting in May, or the FIRST Conference in June.

It was agreed the TF-CSIRT Secretary should follow-up on the contacts provided by Eric and invite Spamhaus to meet with TF-CSIRT.

Action 35.1 – Kevin Meynell to discuss meeting between TF-CSIRT and Spamhaus.

It subsequently transpired that Spamhaus did not wish to meet at the FIRST Conference in Malta, but would consider coming to the next TF-CSIRT meeting in Amsterdam.

5. CERT Polska presentation

Przemek Jaroszewski gave a presentation about CERT Polska (see <http://www.terena.org/tf-csirt/meeting35/jaroszewski-cert-polska.pdf>). This was operated by NASK who maintain the Polish ccTLD registry (.pl) and had been established in 1996 (as CERT NASK). It was the CSIRT of last resort in the country, with PIONIER CERT, TP, CERT.GOV.PL, Alior Bank CSIRT and the Military CERT providing incident response to their constituencies.

They had most recently been involved with P2P Zeus incidents, as well as misuse of typosquatted domains. However, on 21 January 2012, the Polish government revealed plans to sign the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement that resulted in DDoS attacks on

computer systems of the Lower House of Parliament (Sejm), the Prime Minister's Office, a number of government ministries and agencies, as well as the defacement of private websites of several politicians. These attacks were coordinated via an IRC channel and the government had initially been slow to respond to the problem.

Dave Monnier asked how much network capacity these attacks had consumed. Przemek replied it had only amounted to a few gigabits, and the targeted hacking of the websites had done more damage.

6. GARR-CERT team update

Simona Venuti gave a presentation about GARR-CERT (see <http://www.terena.org/tf-csirt/meeting35/venuti-garr-cert.pdf>). This served the Italian research and education networking community and was established in 1999.

The team is comprised of five FTEs who undertake incident handling and response, CA and AAI issues, as well as network monitoring and research. They are authorised to handle all types of computer security incidents occurring at nodes connected to the GARR network, and every effort is made to respond within one day. No direct support is given to end-users who are expected to contact their local system administrators.

GARR-CERT also provides proactive services such as auditing, vulnerability dissemination, and developing and testing security tools. In particular, it operates a honeypot system and offers a remote vulnerability scanning tool (<http://scarr.garr.it/>).

A total of 3,654 incidents were experienced during 2011, mostly relating to viruses, illegal content and spam. These were currently all handled manually.

7. CERT-LEXSI team update

Thomas Gayet gave a presentation about CERT-LEXSI (see <http://www.terena.org/tf-csirt/meeting35/gayet-cert-lexsi.pdf>). This was an independent CSIRT that was established in 2001, and offered multilingual services around the world.

The team's clientele was largely banking, but it also served the energy and utilities, transport and distribution, and telecoms sectors. Services provided included incident response; cybercrime detection, investigation and mitigation; vulnerability management; stress testing and code auditing; and training.

CERT-LEXSI had also developed the Extranet platform to check and manage alerts, as well as malware analysis sandboxes for smartphone operating systems. Indeed, the smartphone security and monitoring was a growing area of business.

8. CSIRT Operational Gaps and Overlaps

Andrea Dufkova provided a summary of the ENISA report on CSIRT operational gaps and overlaps (see <http://www.terena.org/tf-csirt/meeting35/dufkova-csirt-gaps.pdf>).

ENISA had been tasked with determining how cooperation can be better facilitated at a European level by analysing the key activities undertaken by national and government CSIRTs. They had therefore surveyed 20 teams and followed-up with interviews in order to reach their conclusions and produce recommendations.

Incident handling whilst recognised as the service where most synergies were possible, also appeared to be service on which CSIRTs cooperate the most. With respect to announcements, 15 of the 20 respondents acknowledged the potential for more synergy, but only half actually provided such services. The situation was better with alerts and warnings where there was somewhat more cooperation.

Of ten other areas, eight were determined to have operational gaps, although in four of these areas, the surveyed CSIRTs felt less strongly that European-wide coordination was needed than ENISA. The other two areas were considered to have overlaps that could benefit from more coordination.

It was apparent that different CSIRTs had different views and needs and it was not always easy to reconcile these. However, ENISA had developed 17 recommendations for the future, assessed against their relevance to the ENISA mandate and general levels of acceptance in the CSIRT community.

9. GN3-JRA2/T2 update on X-ARF

Simona Venuti and Tilmann Haak provided an update on the GN3-JRA2/T2 research to discover and identify botnets, and then exchange information in multi-domain environments (see <http://www.terena.org/tf-csirt/meeting35/venuti-x-arf.pdf>).

X-ARF was a structured data exchange format based on YAML and JSON that allowed both human and machine readable information to be sent via e-mail. It was therefore considered suitable for exchanging information between entities involved in security incidents, but whilst it works well for single reports, it is inefficient for bulk data. The specification also suffered from particular ambiguities and did not support S/MIME or PGP/MIME.

An extended specification was therefore being considered to allow multiple reports to be aggregated into a single X-ARF report, and to add digital signatures and encryption. Two different formats had been proposed, but the existing e-mail requirement imposed limitations and new software would need to be developed to handle reports. It would therefore either be necessary to complicate the existing standard or implement something that was non-compliant. As a result, another solution being considered was to drop the e-mail requirement and use another method of transport such as HTTP(S) or XMPP.

Alexander Talos-Zen commented that he didn't really mind receiving a lot of e-mails and passing them through scripts, although the example of 6,000 messages sent in a few hours did suggest that detaching X-ARF from SMTP might be worth considering. Kauto Huopio concurred with this.

10. Report on OAS/CICTE Cyber Security Workshop

Gorazd Božič reported on the OAS/CICTE Cyber Security Workshop he attended on 28-30 November 2011 in Bogota, Columbia (see <http://www.terena.org/tf-csirt/meeting35/bozic-oas-ws.pdf>). TERENA had been invited to attend and present the European situation, and in turn had asked Gorazd to attend on behalf of TF-CSIRT.

The workshop had been organised by the Organisation of American States' Inter-American Committee Against Terrorism, and involved CSIRTs and government representatives from North and South America as well as the Caribbean region. TF-CSIRT and ICANN were invited as guests.

The history of TF-CSIRT and its associated activities such as TI and TRANSITS was presented. An emphasis was placed on the fact that European cooperation was well developed, and this had practical value during the likes of the Estonian and Georgian cyber crises.

The impression gained from the workshop was that team relations appeared good in the Americas, but it was a wide and diverse area and this led to different operational approaches. Nevertheless, there were some ideas to create a regional coordination body along the likes of those in the European and Asia-Pacific regions.

11. New TRANSITS developments

Kevin Meynell provided an overview of some planned changes to the TRANSITS training courses (<http://www.terena.org/tf-csirt/meeting35/meynell-transits.pdf>).

TRANSITS courses had been run since 2002, initially under the EU-funded TRANSITS project, but since then by TERENA with financial support from ENISA. 21 workshops had been held in Europe and had trained more than 500 personnel from existing and new CSIRTs. A further 72 third-party workshops had been held elsewhere in the world, that had trained another 1000 or more persons. It was therefore considered to be a successful activity.

TRANSITS faced a number of challenges for the future though. Demand generally exceeded supply and TRANSITS-I courses were being run with an average of 30 participants rather than the more optimal 25. The newer TRANSITS-II courses had been well over-subscribed, and there was increasing demand for the licensed courses run by third parties.

TRANSITS was also heavily reliant on volunteer tutors and the goodwill of their employers, but the availability and number of qualified tutors had been declining in the last couple of years. Perhaps more concerningly, they were located in a handful of countries which made it difficult to hold more local courses or recruit more tutors.

Finally, the TRANSITS-I modules had started to become outdated. Whilst they were currently all in the process of being revamped by Cybersecurity and S-CURE, it was clear that a more regular programme of updates would be required in future.

In order to try to address the issue of demand, it was proposed to organise an extra TRANSIT-I workshop, to take the total number to three per year. In addition, it was proposed to shorten the interval between TRANSITS-II workshops to 9 months.

This meant that the pool of tutors needed to be expanded, and TERENA was therefore actively recruiting for both TRANSITS-I and II tutors. To this end, a TRANSITS Trainers workshop was being held later in the week to which 25 potential new tutors had been invited. Furthermore, it was proposed to introduce a payment of EUR 1,000 per tutor per workshop.

With respect to the course materials, every module would now undergo a major review and update at least once every two years. This would effectively see 3 to 4 modules being refreshed every year, which would be financed from licensing fees charged to third parties.

Kevin mentioned that the TRANSITS materials had originally been developed by TF-CSIRT members, and in particular a number of individuals who were thanked for their contributions. Whilst the materials were generally copyrighted by TERENA, this was on

behalf of the TF-CSIRT community and materials were made freely available to TERENA member organisations and ENISA.

It was important to stress that TERENA did not profit from the TRANSITS courses, and indeed contributed staff effort to organise the workshops. TERENA was committed to providing additional effort in 2012 in order to improve TRANSITS, and it was hoped these improvements would keep the courses current and relevant in the future.

It was announced that the next TRANSITS-I workshop would be held on 28-29 March 2012 in Porto, Portugal, with the next TRANSITS-II workshop being held on 2-4 April 2012 in Prague, Czech Republic.

Wim Biemolt felt that paying tutors was problematic and felt the money would be better spent on improving the course materials more frequently. Kevin replied that the shortage of tutors and regular updates of the material had to be addressed together, and this seemed the best method of achieving this. He appreciated that some institutions did not allow their employees to accept payments whilst on company time, or indeed even undertake external paid work at all. Equally though, not all institutions were prepared to release their employees for nothing, whilst other individuals were freelance and needed to be compensated for their time. The payments would not be compulsory though, and indeed TERENA wished to express its thanks to those organisations that did allow their employees to act as tutors.

Serge Droz raised the issue of the structure TRANSITS-II courses, and said SWITCH had expressed concern at the lack of time to cover certain modules, and that current mix of modules was not entirely complementary. Kevin replied that the original idea was to teach certain modules in a standalone manner at ad-hoc events, but given that the modules were largely untried and tested, the decision had been taken at a TRANSITS Trainers Workshop to run everything together as single workshop. Only one pilot and one 'proper' TRANSITS-II workshop had been held to date, so some fine tuning was undoubtedly necessary. However, although the concerns were noted, it was inevitable that compromises between the depth and overall length of the workshop needed to be made, as anything beyond three days would make the workshop prohibitively expensive in terms of cost and time away from work.

The idea of teaching individual modules in a standalone manner could be revisited after April, but some were too short to justify dedicated workshops. There was also the inevitable issue of when and how the courses should be organised, as holding them before or after TF-CSIRT meeting had previously been discounted by the tutors themselves.

12. TF-CSIRT Restructuring

Kevin Meynell presented the proposals to restructure TF-CSIRT as outlined in the paper circulated to the TF-CSIRT community (see <http://www.terena.org/tf-csirt/meeting35/meynell-tf-csirt.pdf>).

TF-CSIRT was created in 2000 and over the past 11 years had established itself as one of the main forums where CSIRTs could discuss and exchange experiences and knowledge. It had also established a number of spin-off activities such as Trusted Introducer (TI), TRANSITS and RTIR upgrades.

The average attendance at TF-CSIRT meetings was between 60 and 70 participants, although this rose to approximately 120 participants at the meetings held jointly with FIRST. In the past year, around 60% of participants had come from academic CSIRTs,

20% came from government CSIRTs, 15% came from commercial CSIRTs, and 5% came from other types of organisations.

Allied to this, the TI service had been established in 2001 as an accreditation and listing service that was financed by the CSIRTs (currently amounting to EUR 89K per year) and provided under contract by a third-party supplier (currently PRESECURE). There were currently 84 accredited teams of whom 44% were academic, 28% were governmental, and 28% were commercial; as well as 143 listed teams of whom 39% were academic, 24% were governmental, and 37% were commercial. The average attendance at each TI meeting was around 50 participants.

There were a number of reasons motivating change. TF-CSIRT had no formal notion of membership which was increasingly expected by external organisations, and there was confusing overlap between TF-CSIRT and TI, with (often) different Chairs and Secretaries. This led to duplication of functions and awkward coordination, whilst not permitting common use of staff resources.

TI was also now well established and should therefore be considered an essential element of the European CSIRT community rather than an 'add on'. Certain other services such as TRANSITS both supported and relied on the European CSIRT community, but had little direction or oversight from TF-CSIRT.

TF-CSIRT had also been moving away from its former cooperative approach and more input was needed from community representatives and staff. The community needed to be more connected with those providing leadership/direction, especially now that non-academic CSIRTs constituted the majority.

Some ideas had been presented at the TF-CSIRT meeting in June 2011, and Kevin had been asked to produce a paper that summarised the current situation, made the case for change, and provided more detail on the specific ideas. A Working Group had also been formed to provide feedback on this paper, and this had been sent to them on 2 August 2011.

A number of comments were received that were taken into account when this was discussed further within TERENA. These comments were positive and a number of small changes were suggested. These were then mostly incorporated into a revised paper that was circulated on the mailing list on 4 January 2012.

There were four main proposals. The first was that membership should be introduced that corresponded to TI status – namely Accredited Members, Listed Members and Individual Members (TI Associates), the latter of which would have to be renewed annually. Employees of Accredited and Listed Members, plus Individual members would be automatically entitled to subscribe to the mailing list(s) and attend meetings. The mailing list subscribers who were not currently affiliated with Accredited or Listed teams or who had TI Associate status (of which there were around 20 in number) would be considered for Individual or Liaison status. Non-members could still be invited to meetings though, at the discretion of the Chair as now.

The second proposal was the introduction of a elected Chair, and the transition of the TI Review Board into a TF-CSIRT Steering Committee. This new body would have an enhanced role that would include the coordination of TF-CSIRT, TI, TRANSITS and other related activities; advising on future developments and strategic directions; and acting as a programme committee for TF-CSIRT meetings. It would continue to review the performance of the TI service, make recommendations to change or expand it, and deal with certification, accreditation, listing and other membership issues.

The third proposal was to remove the increasingly artificial distinction between the TF-CSIRT meeting and seminar, except with respect to joint FIRST/TF-CSIRT meetings. The TI meeting would be renamed the 'TF-CSIRT Accredited Members Meeting' for clarity, whilst Accredited, Listed and Individual Members would receive automatic invitations to each meeting.

The activity list would be reviewed annually instead of every two years, and there would be return to more regular updates on current activities. To assist with this, support for up to four working groups would be available from the TI service.

In addition, TF-CSIRT would be promoted beyond its traditional NREN focus by identifying teams in other sectors and making contact. To help with this, information would be produced what outlined what TF-CSIRT is, what it does, and the benefits of being involved.

TERENA was committed to continuing its support for TF-CSIRT and associated activities, and the TF-CSIRT administration would continue to be funded from the GN3 project until April 2013. The TI service would continue to be operated on a cost-recovery basis.

If the TF-CSIRT community was in agreement with the proposals, the plan was to draft new Terms of Reference by April 2012; in consultation with the Working Group. These would be discussed at the May 2012 meeting, and would then be submitted to the appropriate TERENA bodies (TEC/TTC) for final approval. The aim was to introduce the new structure from 1 September 2012, and hold elections for the Chair and at least one Steering Committee member at the September 2012 meeting.

Andrew Cormack asked about the funding situation after the end of the GN3 project. Kevin replied this was still undecided, but it was anticipated that funding would continue in the proposed GN3+ project. However, the TF-CSIRT administration did not require a large amount of money and this had been covered from TERENA's own funds in the past.

Andrew Cormack also asked how members of the mailing list not affiliated with recognised CSIRTs would be handled. Kevin replied that around half were associated with organisations that actively liaised with TF-CSIRT (e.g. FIRST, ENISA and OAS) so the plan was to consider these as 'Liaison Members' or similar. The remainder had all worked for CSIRTs in the past although no longer did so, so would be contacted to see whether they still wished to be involved in TF-CSIRT, and if so, consider them for Individual Membership.

Kauto Huopio asked how much work would be required to produce the new Terms of Reference. Kevin replied the plan was to combine the existing TF-CSIRT Terms of Reference which were quite simple, and the more detailed TI procedures. He did not anticipate it would be a lot of work, although there were several issues that needed careful consideration. He reiterated this would be undertaken in consultation with the TF-CSIRTng Working Group.

There were no objections to proposals as presented and it was proposed that the Kevin should proceed with drafting new Terms of Reference.

Action 35.2 – Kevin Meynell to draft new TF-CSIRT Terms of Reference.

13. Date of next meeting

Lionel Ferette thanked Roma University Tre and GARR for hosting the meeting, as well as TERENA who provided logistical support.

The next meeting will be held on 10-11 May 2012 in Amsterdam, The Netherlands (hosted by GOVCERT.NL & SURFnet). The following meeting will be held on 27-28 September 2012 in Ljubljana, Slovenia (hosted by SI-CERT).

Open Actions

- 32.1 Marco Thorbrügge to send pointer to information about Article 13a to the mailing list.
- 35.1 Kevin Meynell to discuss meeting between TF-CSIRT and Spamhaus.
- 35.2 Kevin Meynell to draft new TF-CSIRT Terms of Reference.

Participants

<i>Name</i>	<i>Organisation</i>	<i>Country</i>
Hillar Aareleid	CERT-EE	Estonia
Bente Christine Åsgård	UiO-CERT	Norway
Shin Adachi	NTT-CERT	United States
Shehzad Ahmad	DK-CERT (UNI-C)	Denmark
Marc Andersen	Danish GovCERT	Denmark
Adrian Balog	STS	Romania
Pal Benyo	CERT-Hungary (TPF)	Hungary
Javier Bercano	INTECO-CERT	Spain
Johan Berggren	NORDUnet	-
Wim Biemolt	SURFcert (SURFnet)	The Netherlands
Gorazd Božič	SI-CERT (ARNES)	Slovenia
Matej Breznik	SI-CERT (ARNES)	Slovenia
Tomas Bukowski	CERT Polska (NASK)	Poland
Nils Byström	SUNET-CERT	Sweden
Valentino Cavalli	TERENA	-
Robert Cecchini	GARR-CERT	Italy
Ian Cook	Team Cymru	United Kingdom
Andrew Cormack	JANET(UK)	United Kingdom
Goran Čuljak	CERT ZSIS	Croatia
Michelle Danho	CERT-RENATER	France
Vincent Danjean	INTERPOL	-
James Davis	Janet CSIRT	United Kingdom
Serge Droz	SWITCH-CERT	Switzerland
Andrea Dufkova	ENISA	-
Jacqueline Dulmaine	BELNET	Belgium
Per Arne Enstad	UNINETT CERT	Norway
Lionel Ferette (Chair)	-	Belgium
David Ford	OxCERT (Uni. Oxford)	United Kingdom
Thomas Gayet	CERT-LEXSI	France
Mikael Ganev	RU-CERT	Russia
Manuel García-Cervigón Gutiérrez	esCERT-UPC	Spain
Jaap van Ginkel	SURFcert	The Netherlands
Espen Grøndahl	University of Oslo	Norway
Vincent Hinderer	CERT-LEXSI	France
Peter Haag	SWITCH-CERT	Switzerland
Tilmann Haak	DFN-CERT	Germany
Martin Hathaway	BT	United Kingdom
Arjan van Hattum	XS4ALL	The Netherlands
Patrick Houtsch	GOVCERT.LU	Luxembourg
Kauto Huopio	CERT-FI (FICORA)	Finland
Przemek Jaroszewski	CERT Polska (NASK)	Poland
Aart Jochem	GOVCERT.NL	The Netherlands
Robert Jonsson	CERT-SE	Sweden
Keisuke Kamata	BTMU-CERT	Japan
Baiba Kaskina	CERT.LV	Latvia
Hideo Kinoshita	BTMU-CERT	Japan
Klaus-Peter Kossakowski	PRESECURE	Germany
Vytautas Krakauskas	LITNET CERT	Lithuania
Andrea Kropacova	CESNET CERTS	Czech Republic
Pavel Kácha	CESNET CERTS	Czech Republic
Franz Lantenhammer	CERTBw	Germany
Eitan Levi	Danish GovCERT	Denmark
Serguey Linde	RU-CERT	Russia

Antonio Liu	Trusted Introducer	Germany
Kevin Meynell (Secretary)	TERENA	-
Francisco Montserrat	IRIS-CERT (RedIRIS)	Spain
Maciej Milostan	IBC Polish Academy of Sciences	Poland
David Monnier	Team Cymru	United States
Eileen Monsma	Dutch NHTC Unit	The Netherlands
Luis Morais	FCCN	Portugal
Arne Nilsson	SUNET CERT	Sweden
Leif Nixon	SUNET CERT	Sweden
Assel Nurusheva	KZ-CERT (CTSAT)	Kazakhstan
Marco Obiso	ITU-D	-
André Oosterwijk	GOVCERT.NL	The Netherlands
Adrian Pauna	STS	Romania
Martin Peterka	CZ.NIC	Czech Republic
Peter Peters	SURFnet	The Netherlands
Silviu Gabriel Pietris	CERT.RO	Romania
Leila Pohjolainen	FUNET CERT	Finland
Timo Porjamo	FUNET CERT	Finland
Michal Prokop	CZ.NIC	Czech Republic
Christian Proschinger	CERT.at	Austria
Juan Quintanilla	DANTE	-
Margrete Raaum	UiO-CERT	Norway
Dennis Rand	DK-CERT (UNI-C)	Denmark
Igor Smud	CARNET	Croatia
Robert Schischka	CERT.at	Austria
Andreas Schuster	Deutsche Telekom	Germany
Udo Schweigert	Siemens CERT	Germany
Derek Simpson	BTCERTCC	United Kingdom
Jan Soukal	CSIRT-MU	Czech Republic
Robert Stevens	University of Oxford	United Kingdom
Don Stikvoort	S-CURE	The Netherlands
Erika Stockinger	CERT-SE	Sweden
Yoshiki Sugiura	NTT-CERT	Japan
Alexander Talos-Zens	University of Vienna	Austria
Kensuke Tamura	NPA Cyberforce	Japan
Masato Terada	Hitachi IRT	Japan
Marco Thorbruegge	EU-CERT	-
Dan Tofan	CERT-RO	Romania
George Toth	GOVCERT.LU	Luxembourg
David Tresgots	Cert-IST	France
Marius Urkis	LITNET CERT	Lithuania
Christian Van Heurck	CERT.be	Belgium
Koen Van Impe	CERT.be	Belgium
Anto Veldre	CERT-EE	Estonia
Simona Venuti	GARR-CERT	Italy
Karel Vietsch	TERENA	-
Folkert Visser	KPN-CERT	The Netherlands
Filip Vlastic	CARNet	Croatia
Torsten Voss	DFN-CERT	Germany
Jan Vykopal	CSIRT-MU	Czech Republic
Robert Waldner	CERT.at	Austria
Wilfried Wöber	ACOnet-CERT	Austria
Christian Wojner	CERT.at	Austria
Jyrki Yli-Paavola	TS-CERT CC	Finland
Alexandros Zacharis	GRNETCERT	Greece
Yerden Zhumabekov	KZ-CERT (CTSAT)	Kazakhstan

SUBJECT

Draft minutes of the 35th TF-CSIRT meeting
30 January 2012, Rome, Italy

Eric Ziegast
Takayuki Oku
Eric Ziegast

ISC
INTERPOL
ISC

United States
-
United States