Minutes of AfriNIC-13 Public Policy Meeting

(24th & 25th November 2010, Protea Hotel Balalaika, Sandton – Johannesburg, South Africa)

Discussion Leaders (Interim Policy Development Working Group - PDWG)

1.Alan Barret [APB] - <apb at cequrux.com>
2.S. Moonesamy [SM] - <sm+afrinic at elandsys.com>

Agenda

a. Appointment of Interim co-chairs, AfriNIC Policy Development Working Group
b. Abuse Contact Information in the AfriNIC service region Proposal (AFPUB-2010-GEN-006)
c. Addition of Real Contact Email into ASN Whois Bulk Data Proposal (AFPUB-2010-GEN-007)
d. Global Policy for IPv4 Allocations by the IANA Post Exhaustion Proposal (AFPUB-2010-v4-003/AFPUB-2010-v4-006)
e. IPv4 Soft Landing Proposal (AFPUB-2010-v4-005)

Meeting Report

[a] Appointment of Interim co-chairs, AfriNIC Policy Development Working Group

Dr Viv Padayatchy, Chairman of the AfriNIC Board of Directors chaired the first part of the Public Policy Meeting, and on behalf of the Board announced the Board's decision (https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2010/001165.html) to appoint S. Moonesamy and Dr Paulos Nyirenda as interim PDWG Chairs until proper elections can be organised.

Alan Barrett wanted a clarification on the implementation of the new PDP specifically because neither S. Moonesamy, Dr Paulos Nyirenda nor the AfriNIC Policy Development Working Group had accepted the Board's appointment. On this point, the Chairman of the AfriNIC Board put it to the community as to whether there was any objection of appointment of the co-chairs and for Dr Paulos Nyirenda and S. Moonesamy to make up their minds on whether or not they accepted the appointment. While S. Moonesamy accepted the appointment, Dr Paulos Nyirenda declined, opting to wait for elections. S. Moonesamy proposed Alan Barrett as interim co-chair and Allan Barrett reluctantly agreed to accept the appointment subject to the appointment being approved by the community. The Chairman of the AfriNIC Board determined that it was the consensus of the AfriNIC Policy Development Working Group to appoint the two Interim co-chairs. At this point, Dr Viv Padayatchy handed over the chair to S. Moonesamy and Alan Barrett who requested a ten minutes recess.

After the recess, Adiel Akplogan, CEO of AfriNIC, clarified the issue of elections for PDWG chairs as follows:

1. The appointment of S. Moonesamy and Alan Barrett is NOT an election
2. The 2011 Nominations Committee will be responsible for the election of the PDWG Chairs for AfriNIC-14

Discussions about the various proposals were conducted under the Policy Development Process in the AfriNIC service region (AFPUB-2010-GEN-005).

[b] The Abuse Information in AfriNIC Service Region [AFPUB-2010-GEN-006]
 http://www.afrinic.net/docs/policies/AFPUB-2010-GEN-006.htm

In the absence of the author of the proposal, S. Moonesamy presented the proposal and then called for comments.

Mohamed Ibrahim asked for a bit more context about the proposal - why we have it in the first place and what problem it is trying to solve. Graham Beneke provided the context by introducing what Abusix (the organisation with which the proposal author is affiliated) does (sending spam abuse reports) and that by the nature of their work, the automated reports that their systems send regularly trips the constraints put in place to protect the Whois database from abuse.

Alain Aina re-counted that there had been previous disagreement on the creation of a new object rather than just adding an attribute on an existing information object. S. Moonesamy clarified that the text of the proposal left that implementation detail up to AfriNIC's technical department. Alan Barrett also later clarified that a key change from the old version was that this facility is optional and not mandatory.

Graham Beneke wanted to know the implications of the RIPE Abuse Finder as mentioned in the proposal. As an individual comment, S. Moonesamy responded that it means that AfriNIC will have to put the information in the RIPE abuse finder. Adiel Akplogan clarified that as soon as the appropriate information is updated, the RIPE abuse finder has access to the AfriNIC Whois bulk data and so nothing explicitly needs to be done on AfriNIC's part.

The Interim co-chairs determined that there was consensus on progressing this proposal to Last Call. No changes were suggested during the meeting.

[c] Addition of Real Contact Email into ASN Whois Bulk Data [AFPUB-2010-GEN-007]
http://www.afrinic.net/docs/policies/AFPUB-2010-GEN-007.htm

As the author of the proposal was absent at the meeting, Alan Barrett briefly presented the proposal after which he called for comments.

Graham Beneke submitted that the previous proposal (Abuse Contact Information) that just passed addresses the same issue as this proposal. He thus saw no reason for an additional proposal. Saul Stein in agreeing with Graham Beneke also pointed out that if abuse information is added to ASN, abuse reports will go to the wrong person - the LIR that has the ASN rather than the specific site to which the prefix has been assigned.

Mohamed Ibrahim raised an objection to the wording of the proposal (it seems to referring specifically to Google) to the exclusion of the AfriNIC community.

Mark Elkins suggested that the proposal be dropped because Google hasn't signed any agreement with AfriNIC with respect to the data, that the proposal is not well written. This position was also supported by Dr Viv Padayatchy.

The Interim co-chairs determined that there was no consensus for this proposal. Some objections were that it was too vague, that it seemed too specific to one particular user of the data, and that the intent of the proposal could be satisfied under the abuse contact information proposal (AFPUB-2010-GEN-006). The author will be contacted by the PDWG chairs to either withdraw or re-submit the proposal.

[d] Global Policy for IPv4 Allocations by the IANA Post Exhaustion [AFPUB-2010-v4-006]

The proposal (AFPUB-2010-v4-003) was discussed on the 25 November and was presented by Martin Hannigan, who is one of the authors, with some changes.

Alan Barrett clarified that as a global policy, if many changes are done at this meeting, it will reduce the probability of it passing at the global level.

Alain Aina wanted to know if the NRO-EC had looked at this proposal and what their plans for it are. In response, Axel Pawlik said the NRO-EC was waiting for it to pass at all RIRs then they would pass it to the ASO-AC to check that everyone's comments have been heard. After that it will go to the ICANN Board for ratification. He further stressed that the proposal as passed in other RIRs must not vary significantly in content.

Alain Aina wanted clarifications as to whether any reserve block (for example that specified in the IPv4 Softlanding Proposal - AFPUB-2010-v4-005), held by an RIR affects the RIR's eligibility to receive allocations from IANA under this policy. Martin Hannigan responded that so long as that reserve space remains longer than /10, it should not affect an RIRs eligibility i.e. the exception is for a /10 entirely, including all reserve pools in the inventory.

Timothy McGinnis voicing support for the proposal said it is just good house keeping even as he pointed out that in the long term they might not be many people returning address space. It also will save the RIRs from criticism from other folks in the global Internet governance eco-system.

Martin Hannigan reported that from financial analysis of post-exhaustion costs, the average black/grey market address which now costs US $1.63, post-exhaustion, will increase by 263% to about $4 of the RIR-normalized cost in some regions. He referred to an eBay auction for a /24 that went up to US$40 an address which could be a sign of things to come.

William Stucke wanted clarification of the phrase in the proposal that states: "*address space can only be returned by the issuing RIR*". In response Martin Hannigan said it was in anticipation of an inter-RIR transfer policy. This would prevent organisations that got an allocation from an RIR from bypassing the RIR and returning space directly to IANA.

Alain Aina proposed that due to the fact that the latest version of the proposal was not yet online, it is better if the discussions on the proposal are taken online. Adiel Akplogan clarified that the reason the latest version is not online is because it was not submitted to the mailing list before the deadline of the 18th November 2010 set by the PDP-MG for all modifications to policy proposals.

Timothy McGinnis asked Martin Hannigan to give his opinion of what this proposal means for Africa in terms of the IPv4 Soft Landing. Martin Hannigan said that it will be a while before the proposal impacts the region since it will likely be the last RIR that will be seeking additional space from IANA. The policy ensures that post exhaustion, addresses will remain within the RIR system and at a low cost which will help support certain organizations that for some reason still need to run IPv4.

In response to concerns that the text presented by the author was not the same text that is on the mailing list and web site and that it was important that the community have ample opportunity to review the latest version, the Interim co-chairs determined that it would be better to give people more time to look at the updated text and for the discussion to resume after lunch.

After the break when everyone had had a chance to read the updated copy of the proposal (AFPUB-2010-v4-006), Dr Nii Quaynor wanted to know if a similar proposal had been adopted in other regions. Alan Barrett answered by referring to the "Policy Discussions Guide" that it is under discussion in other regions and was in last call in the ARIN region.

Dr Viv Padayatchy said that while there was nothing in the policy that was detrimental to our region, he didn't see a need to rush to adopt it here. This position was also supported by Dr Nii Quaynor. Cathy Aronson, from the ARIN Advisory Council, and Mark Elkins in response said that although Africa may not be affected in the short term, not passing this policy will mean that IANA has no policy to guide possible address space that becomes available post-exhaustion and this will adversely affect other regions that may need the extra addresses.

Summarizing the discussions so far, Alan Barrett put it to the community that even though there is no opposition to the proposal, should it proceed to last call now or should we wait and see what happens in the other RIRs?

Alain Aina and Adiel Akplogan said that due to the small violation in procedure of not posting the updated text to the mailing list for sufficient time for discussions by all, it would be better to send it back to the mailing list for discussion, bearing in mind that the new PDP allows for emergencies. This position was supported by Dr Nii Quaynor, Dr Viv Padayatchy, Dr Paulos Nyirenda as well as Ashok Radhakissoon, AfriNIC's legal adviser.

The Interim co-chairs determined that there was rough consensus in favour of the AFPUB-2010-v4-006 proposal, but there were concerns about the fact that the version of the proposal presented at the meeting was not the same as the version posted to the RPD mailing list or posted on the AfriNIC web site before the meeting.

As a result of confusion during the transition from the previous Policy Development Process (AFPUB-2008-GEN-001) to the new Policy Development Process (AFPUB-2010-GEN-005), the following requirement of Section 5.2 of AFPUB-2010-GEN-005 was violated:

"*No change can be made to a draft policy within one week of the meeting. This is so that a stable version of the draft policy can be considered at the meeting.*"

There was a view to allow the proposal to progress to Last Call despite concerns about the process. There were also comments about the need to follow the process even though it would cause problems for a proposal that otherwise has consensus, and some people expressed the hope that a method could be found to allow the proposal to progress rapidly without violating the process.

The Interim co-chairs determined that, even though there was rough consensus in favour of the proposal, compliance with the Policy Development Process requires that the proposal should not progress to Last Call now. Accordingly, discussion should continue on the Resource Policy Discussion mailing list, and the proposal may be considered again at the AfriNIC-14 meeting. If passing this proposal becomes urgent, it is possible that the emergency process (section 7 of AFPUB-2010-GEN-005) may be invoked before the AfriNIC-14 meeting.

[e] IPv4 Soft Landing Proposal [AFPUB-2010-v4-005]
http://www.afrinic.net/docs/policies/AFPUB-2010-v4-005.htm

In the absence of the author, Alain Aina presented the proposal.

Graham Beneke raised concerns about the routability of a /27 or longer range but supported the proposal non-the-less. As an individual comment from the floor, Alan Barrett also supported the proposal with a few comments/suggestions:

- Change the phase names from "Modified status-quo" and "IPv6 Transition" to "Exhaustion Phase 1" and "Exhaustion Phase 2".
- Even though we can't route anything longer than /24, it may change in the future hence there is no reason to remove the /27.
- The proposal should be modified to address space received after the final /8.

Alain Aina clarified that the use of the /27 is more to deal with IPv6 transition mechanisms and not much to do with routing.

Dr Viv Padayatchy wanted clarification about whether members requesting for resources in the exhaustion phases must also have IPv6. Alain Aina clarified that the proposal allows for simultaneous applications of IPv6v6 (if the member does not already have any).

Fiona Asonga and William Stucke both voiced support for the proposal as it is but wanted that there be provisions to incorporate any space that would result from the post exhaustion outside the final /8, in essence supporting Allan Barret's earlier proposition.

Alan Barrett, as Chair, put it to the community to decide on whether the proposal's requirement to make a member eligible for a new /22 when they use 90% of their first /22 should be kept or if requests should be limited to a single /22. Mark Elkins pointed out that we cannot limit request to only one /22 because then we will never use up the remaining space.

The Interim co-chairs determined that there was consensus on progressing this proposal to Last Call.

The following changes or clarifications were suggested, and all gained consensus:

- Policies under the exhaustion phase apply equally to all IPv4 address space available to AfriNIC during this phase, regardless of whether or not the address space is part of the "Final /8".
- Change the names of the two sub-phases within the Exhaustion Phase (sections 6.1a and 6.1b) to "Exhaustion Phase 1" and "Exhaustion Phase 2".
- Clarify that the maximum allocation size of /22 (section 6.1b) applies independently to each allocation. There is no limit to the number of times the same organisation may receive allocations under this policy.

There was a concern that the minimum allocation size of /27 (section 6.1b) would lead to problems with routability. Other people expressed the views that this proposal would probably remain in effect for several years, that technology changes in future might allow routability for small blocks, and that some allocations might be used in ways that do not require global routability. The consensus was that this issue did not require any change to the proposal.

The Public Policy Meeting was adjourned.