

Minutes of the AfriNIC-15 Public Policy Meeting  
(23rd and 24th November 2011 | Hilton Hotel, Yaounde, Cameroon)

Policy Development Working Group Chairs

Dr Paulos Nyirenda  
Timothy McGinnis

Agenda Day One: 23rd November 2011

1.0 AfriNIC PDP Update - Presentation by PDWG Co-chairs  
2.0 Staff Analysis of the AfriNIC PDP and Outstanding Issues for Full Implementation - Mukom Akong T.

[1.0] AfriNIC PDP Update -

Dr Paulos Nyirenda provided the historical context of the present "Policy Development Process in the AfriNIC" – AFPUB-2010-GEN-005 which replaced the previous AFPUB-2008-GEN-001. He explained the various issues which lead to its amendment. However it was stated that there are still challenges and a need to further analyse and improve this policy.

Paulos explained the meaning of this policy through some of the main contents of the AfriNIC PDP which consists of procedures and guidelines as well as characteristics. The scope of the PDP was explained followed by the principles guiding the PDP namely the three principles of openness, transparency and fairness.

The functions of the Policy Development Working Group and WG Chairs were also explained. The process involved in policy development was then further detailed, from initial submission of a proposal, provision of relevant analyses by AfriNIC staff, mailing list discussion procedures as well as conflict resolution and appeal mechanisms. Paulos concluded by stating that there is a need for an urgent review of the PDP.

[2.0] Staff Analysis of the AfriNIC PDP and Outstanding Issues for Full Implementation

After Paulos' presentation, Mukom Akong T (current AfriNIC Policy Liaison) make a presentation presenting staff analyses of the current PDP with a view to soliciting inputs from the community on aspects that needed more clarity.

Mukom stated that the RPD mailing list is the primary medium in which the work PDP is done. He identified a list of issues that needed clarification for the PDP to be more effective. He also suggested staff recommendations to each of these issues. The issues were as follows:

Issued #1: The PDP does not explicitly state how the PDWG chairs shall be 'chosen' from the PDWG.

Staff recommendation: Use Elections as the mechanism for choosing PDWG co-chairs.

Issue #2: The Policy does not spell out the mechanism for replacing an incapable co-chair.

Staff Recommendation:# If a chair can't server their term, they notify the mailing list and the remaining chair should call for nominations from the community for a replacement for the duration of the term.

Issue #3: The policy only states it is the Appeals committee that resolves conflicts – nothing more is specified

Staff Recommendation:

(i) The complainant shall send their appeal in the form of an email to [policy-submission@afrinic.net](mailto:policy-submission@afrinic.net). The email must mention the names and email addresses of three (3) persons who support it.

(ii) The AfriNIC policy liaison shall contact the supporters to verify their support for the appeal, then send the appeal to the board.

(iii) The board will appoint an Appeal committee and give them the task of resolving the issue.

(iv) The term of the committee shall end once the issue has been resolved and they shall submit their final findings(including proposal for resolution) and decision to the board which then publishes it on rpd mailing list.

Issue #4: Policy only states it is the Recalls committee that investigates recall of a chair – nothing more is specified

Staff Recommendation: Use the same procedure proposed for the Appeals process in Issue #3 above.

Commenting on both the Appeals and Recalls proposals, Aminou Ndala Tita recommended that an independent stand-by committee be put in place to deal with recalls and appeals.

Issue #5: An even number of PDWG co-chairs makes it difficult to resolve differences of opinion between the co-chairs.

Timothy McGinnis (McTim] concurred with having more co-chairs said that having more co-chairs means at least one can attend a meeting which is good for the PDP. Alain Aina said that there shouldn't be any conflicts bw co-chairs as they should always follow wishes of community. In response, Paulos disagreed with Alain, stating that differences of opinion or conflict between co-chairs is a real possibility.

Louise Flynn from APNIC reported that there are three co-chairs for the APNIC PDP. Dr Nii Quaynor questioned whether having a third co-chair will help better manage consensus on open issues.

Issue #6: Establishment of consensus on policy proposals.

Alain Aina stated that co-chairs should always evaluate consensus based on open (contentious) and closed (non-contentious) issues. When asking for consensus for a whole policy there can never be anything wrong. He encourages to look at these as aspects of policy proposal and these are open issues and progressive interests for consensus.

Adiel Akplogan commenting on the relative weights of mailing list and face-to-face meeting comments said that only comments on the RPD mailing list made before the face-to-face meeting should only be equal to those at face-to-face meetings.

Adiel Akplogan, CEO of AfriNIC proposed that the community could review these issues and propose amendments to the PDP. In response, Alain Aina proposed the establishment of a charter for the PDP and a set of guidelines for the co-chairs as an alternative to a policy review.

The second session of the public policy discussions took place on Thursday the 24th November 2011 from 09:15 – 10:25. The agenda was as follows

- 3.0 Panel Discussion on the PDP in other RIRs
- 4.0 Policy Proposals Report since AfriNIC-14
- 5.0 Report on PDP Discussions of Previous Day

#### [3.0] Panel Discussion on the PDP in other RIRs

The session started with PDP MG co-chairs inviting representatives from other RIRs to share recent policy experiences, which they all did. Staff from ARIN, RIPE, APNIC and LACNIC communities shared recent policy discussions at their previous meetings with the community present at the meeting.

From LACNIC, Sofia Silva explained her role as hostmaster and stated how resources are used or should be used according to the resource manual and stated that the PDP should reflect the criteria, realities and necessities of the community. She then explained the LACNIC PDP process and its importance in detail, making the following points:

[+] The LACNIC PDP is about how to create, modify a policy and it is a bottom-up process.

[+] There are two co-chairs, anyone from the community can be elected as a co-chair and the call for nomination is made from a mailing list or web page.

[+] The election for co-chairs is conducted using electronic mechanisms and ratified during the public forum. This is a new election mechanism, as from November/December last year this policy proposal was ratified. Before LACNIC did the elections during the forums.

[+] A secretariat has been set for the execution of the process and administration of the discussion list. LACNIC staff provides the mechanism for the elections but cannot submit proposals and participate in discussions. An impact report is sometimes submitted but it should be neutral.

[+] Once a proposal is submitted, the co-chairs decide if it is necessary to form a working group. If so, the LACNIC Board, the co-chairs or LACNIC Members Assembly form the WG after which the discussion on the mailing list takes place.

[+] The policy proposal is further discussed at the Public forum. If consensus is reached, the proposal goes to the mailing list as Last call for comments for 45 days and if the proposal is accepted by the LACNIC BoD, the policy is implemented.

McTim asking about co-chairing and how is it working. Are there any difficulties in case the two chairs are unable to attend the same meeting?

From APNIC, Louise Flynn explained the APNIC PDP and stressed on the concept of consensus in that process and how it works in the Policy Development Process. Louise stated that consensus reinforces the PDP and it is not limited to a vote in a forum. The various ways of expression of consensus through gestures by show of hands or feedback on the mailing list were discussed. She also talked about about major and minor objections within the PDP process.

McTim wanted to know how many policies and questions typically come up during meetings. Louis replied that in April with Final /8, there was an influx of policies. In New Delhi discussions centered on the types of IPv6 policies to be adopted.

Paulos asked what was the best way to make an objection – on the mailing list or through some other means? Louise said that there is a range ways of expressing objectives on the mailing list and there are processes defined. In some cultures, people prefer to talk about issues and others prefer the mailing list.

Hisham Ibrahim asked how cultural barriers were managed within the APNIC region. Responding, Louise stated that having three different chairs from three different cultures helps. Some cultures do not feel confident to voice their opinion in public. In such situations, an APNIC staff member (Andy) talks to these community members off line and then bring the matter to the mailing list.

McTim wanted to know if an APNIC policy to relax needs-based allocation about six months ago had been restored. He stated that we have the opportunity to see how one region's policy can impact on another region. We do not make policies for only our region, we also make global policies. This politics and interaction between RIRs could be useful.

In response, Louise stated that ASO global policies have a defined protocol to reach consensus on particular issues such as IPv4 exhaustion and transfer of IPv4 space. Proposal-15 (the proposal McTim was referring to) was approved after reaching the Final /8. By this policy, APNIC would enable transfers but it is not necessary to demonstrate the need for resources but after further discussion with RIRs, we modified this particular policy, demonstrating that the need is fundamental. Some issues need to be discussed not only within the community but with RIRs.

From ARIN Paul Andersen stated everything about the PDP is documented and invited the audience to also look at the Meeting minutes. The Advisory council is composed of 15 members who are elected every three years. The role of the ARIN board of trustees and staff was further explained. The basic steps for the PDP, the policies in the NRPM and the ARIN reference manual were outlined. The issue of petitions by members was also highlighted.

From the chat room, a remote participant wanted to know if the members of the ARIN Advisory council were elected by ARIN members or by the ARIN community at large. Paul responded that they are elected by the ARIN members.

From the RIPE NCC Ingrid Wijte gave a detailed explanation of the PDP through the various phases

and explained the roles of each of the parties involved. She said that creating a proposal involves collaboration with between the working group chairs and RIPE policy development officer.

With respect to timelines, she stated that the discussion phase lasts for 4 weeks, the review phase lasts for a maximum of 4 weeks and that the draft policy and the last call for comments also last for 4 weeks.

From the chat rooms, a remote participant wanted to know whether a legal analysis was done for each proposal. Ingrid responded that the impact analysis done also includes a legal analysis.

#### [4.0] Policy Proposals Report since AfriNIC-14

[+] The IPv4 Soft Landing policy progressed from Last Call and is awaiting approval from the AfriNIC board after gaining consensus from the community at AfriNIC-14.

[+] Global Policy for Post Exhaustion IPv4 Allocation Mechanisms by the IANA is awaiting approval from the AfriNIC board after gaining consensus from the community at AfriNIC-14

Other proposals that are still active in the PDP process are as follows:

##### (a) Reclamation of Allocated but Un-routed IPv4 Addresses

<<http://www.afrinic.net/docs/policies/AFPUB-2011-v4-002-draft-01.htm>>

The co-chairs noted that there has not been any discussion on this proposal on the mailing list since the last face-to-face meeting (AfriNIC14) in Tanzania. They sought ‘interest’ from the community present at the meeting, and there seemed to be no interest in discussing this proposal.

Co-Chairs mentioned that an impact analysis of this proposal was conducted by AfriNIC staff, and is available online for reference. It was mentioned that the analysis indicated it could take up to 12 months to implement the policy once ratified.

Mukom Tamon Policy liaison at AfriNIC stated that there have been several attempts to contact the author, and there has been no feedback from him.

The co-chairs noted that there was no consensus on the proposal, and deferred it to the PDP, which, when followed, will see the proposal automatically withdrawn after one year on inactivity.

##### (b) Transfer of IPv4 Space to any Entity

<<http://www.afrinic.net/docs/policies/AFPUB-2011-v4-001-draft-01.htm>>

The PDP MG co-chairs presented the proposal as written in absence of the author.

Questions emerged about whether this policy promotes a black market or unrestricted IPv4 address trading, to which the co-chairs noted that it instead seems to be promoting a ‘grey’ market. There was another question about whether AfriNIC conducted a legal analysis of policy proposals.

A question arose on what the other RIRs experience on this matter, and if there has been any precedence to follow. Louise Flynn stated that this is an opportunity for our region to observe and learn since similar policies have been adopted in other regions. McTim stated that it is not just sufficient to look at what the others are doing, but instead address issues and formulate policies that affect our community as appropriate.

The PDP co-chairs declared that there was “no ground” for support of this proposal from the meeting, and deferred it to the PDP again, where it would expire after one year of inactivity.

(c) Global Policy for IPv4 allocations by the IANA post exhaustion  
<<http://www.afrinic.net/docs/policies/AFPUB-2010-v4-003-draft-02.htm>>

Mukom Tamon, policy liaison at AfriNIC commented on the policy from its historical perspective. He stated that as a global proposal, it has already failed to see consensus in one other region and the authors expressed no interest in pursuing it further and as such the proposal is set to expire on the 25th November.

(d) Addition of Real Contact Email into ASN Whois Bulk Data  
<<http://www.afrinic.net/docs/policies/AFPUB-2010-GEN-007.htm>>

Timothee Mc Guinness stated that the author of this policy has not responded to request for changes. Consensus was not reached during the last meeting. MT stated that this proposal started as a request to the hostmaster and perhaps when writing the policy proposal the author was not clear with the policy objectives.

#### [5.0] Report on PDP Discussions of Previous Day

Mukom Akong T., Policy liaison at AfriNIC briefed the audience on on the issues of the PDP that were discussed by the community during the previous day. Mukom stated that any amendments made directly to the PDP even if there is a 97% recurrence would need to go through the entire PDP process as it currently does not allow amendments.

Mukom laid out the options for improving the current PDP according to yesterday’s discussions as follows:

- (i) A totally new policy
- (ii) A PDWG charter to be used as a working document with the current PDP
- (iii) Guidelines for co-chairs

The co-chairs called for a show of hands on which direction to proceed in and option (iii) had the majority votes (15) McTim asked the audience if they had further queries or requests about the PDP and there was no reaction from the audience.

McTim requested for new ideas or policies from the audience and followed by explanations some of the guiding principles of resource based on assignments and need basis. There was no response from the audience for proposal of new policies.

The session was adjourned at 10:25.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Policy Development Process in the AfriNIC service region  
<<http://www.afrinic.net/docs/policies/AFPUB-2010-GEN-005.htm>>
- [2] Call for Comments on Staff Analysis and Recommendations on the PDP  
<<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2011/001240.html>>
- [3] Discussion Guides and Minutes of Previous Public Policy Meetings  
<[http://www.afrinic.net/ppm\\_minutes.htm](http://www.afrinic.net/ppm_minutes.htm)>
- [4] About the PDWG co-chairs  
<<http://www.afrinic.net/docs/policies/PDWG.htm>>
- [5] RPD Mailing List Archives  
<<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/>>

