AFRINIC-31 Public Policy Meeting
Minutes of the PDWG meeting held on 4th & 5th December 2019
Luanda, Angola

Session Co-Chairs: Moses Serugo, Abdulkarim Oleyede

Agenda:

    Day 1: 4th December 2019

-    11:00 – 11:10   Welcome and Code of Conduct
-    11:10 – 11:20   An Overview of the AFRINIC PDP
-    11:20 – 11:40   Staff reports
-    10:40 – 12:00   Policy Development Updates from Other RIRs
-    12:00 – 12:30   Multihoming not required for ASN
-    12:30– 14:00   LUNCH
-    14:00 – 14:45   Adjusting IPv6 PA Policy
-    14:45 – 15:30   Abuse Contact Policy Update
-    15:30 - 16:00   BREAK
-    16:00 – 16:45   AFRINIC Policy Development Process Bis v5
-    16:45 – 17:30   RPKI ROAs for Unallocated and Unassigned AFRINIC Address Space

    Day 2: 5th December 2019

-    09:00 – 09:45   Resource Transfer Policy
-    09:45 – 10:30   M&A Resource Transfers
-    10:30– 11:00   BREAK
-    11:00 – 11:45   IPv4 Inter-RIR Resource Transfers (Comprehensive Scope)
-      11:45 – 12:30   Impact Analysis is Mandatory
-    12:30 - 14:00   LUNCH
-    14:00 – 14:45   Internet Number Resources review by AFRINIC
-    14:45 – 15:30   AFRINIC Number Resources Transfer Policy
-    15:30 - 16:00   BREAK
-    16:00 – 16:30   Chairs Elections Process
-      16:30 – 17:30   Open Microphone

1. Welcome, Introduction & Agenda Overview

The session was introduced by Madhvi Gokool who welcomed the delegates to the AFRINIC-31 Public Policy Meeting and introduced the co-chairs, Moses Serugo from Uganda and Abdulkarim Oleyede from Nigeria who were elected for a 2-yr and 1-year term respectively during the AFRINIC-30 meeting in Kampala June 2019.

Abdulkarim thanked the community for their election and stated that they understand their role as co-chairs. They shall listen to the community and that they are not the decision-makers. They would determine rough consensus based on the discussions.

He also introduced the AFRINIC Code of Conduct that shall guide the discussions. He called for the respect of the agenda, timekeeping and discussions on-topic, and language differences. To state the name and affiliation and to also state the reason while opposing or agreeing with a policy.

He also sought for any clarifications.

Reactions and Questions Received:
. I am a member. Quick issue, I want to talk to keeping the interests of AFRINIC at all times, the phrase that we have there.

Now, I want to believe that if you are considering the interest of AFRINIC you will always represent your opinions independently and without any cohesion, without any influence and in the process of policy development, even during debates and discussions on policy developments.

It appears members of AFRINIC who have been coerced into some positions, coerced into some positions that they do not truly believe them that they are not able to articulate and defend.

They are only carrying a message from somebody else which we might view… It is not serving the interests of AFRINIC, not putting AFRINIC's interest's front.

If there is anything that is happening where people in this house were having mock sessions to prepare on how the day will be conducted, how the debates will be conducted, the chair's office only to confirm or investigate such an allegation. Thank you.

Lucky Masilela said that keeping the interests of AFRINIC at all time

Members of AFRINIC that appear to have been be coerced in some positions that they are not able to defend, they are carrying messages from others.

Jordi - mentioned that people who have not previously participated in AFRINIC meetings and that since voting is not being done, consensus only fails when there are valid objections to the proposal.

2. The AFRINIC PDP

Moses presented the AFRINIC Policy Development Process, and stated that it's based on the principles of a bottom up approach, openness and transparency. A proposal can be posted by anyone to the rpd policy list which is open, discussed for at least 4 weeks, and is then presented at a public policy meeting. A proposal is then sent to last call if it attains consensus at the public policy meeting (else it goes back to list for another discussion). If no issues during last call, co-chairs send a report to Board recommending ratification, and the Board ratify and ask staff to implement, provided that the process was properly followed.

AK re-emphasised on the transparency of the process. There will be no show of hands and that everyone intervening at the mic needs to state the reason to oppose the policy or why the policy must be passed.

Reactions and Questions Received:

Why is it not possible to use a different language than English? Co-chairs responded that it is possible to use French, Portuguese and Arabic and that translators can be used

How do we go about calling consensus and ensure transparency? Will co-chairs publish an open issues lists that will also be transparent so that everyone can see the progress being made?

Webinars are not in the process and the expectation of the community is that the outcome of the webinars will be published. Proposal to either modify the process or pass a new policy process.
The co-chairs responded that webinars were discussed and found to be in the nest interests of the community and in no way they were trying to modify the process. The purpose of the webinars is to allow authors to come online and discuss their policy and is an avenue for discussion

Staff reports

Presentation:https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic-31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/98/1575479603_tmpphpWIPdVv.pdf

Madhvi gave an update regarding the policies that reached consensus during the AFRINIC-30 PPM in Uganda.

Pending Implementation: - AFPUB-2019-v6-001-DRAFT02 amends the IPv6 Provider Independent (PI) space policy that provides IPv6 space for end-sites

Implemented:-
1. AFPUB-2018-V6-002-DRAFT03 which provides clarification on IPv6 Sub-Assignments
2. AFPUB-2018-v4-001-DRAFT-01 which amends section 5.4.7.2 of the Consolidated Policy Manual

Policy Implementation Experience Report
Presentation:https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/587/1575460752_tmpphpk9SzDP.pdf

This was presented by James Chirwa who mention that the aim of the PIER was to provide feedback to the members and Community regarding the Challenges experienced while enforcing implemented policies and the recent changes and any ambiguity/lack of clarity in the Consolidated Policy Manual (CPM)

Highlights from the PIER on ambiguous CPM content:
1. Section 5.4.6.1 requires 90% utilisation of existing allocations for additional resource requests as per Soft-landing policy implementation while Section 5.5.1.4.1 requires 80% - conflicting text and creates confusion for the members
2. Section 5.4.5 requests for justification of 8 months needs and conflicts with Section 5.6.3 mentions projection for 12 months. This was raised in previous PIER and authors have started correcting the relevant sections.
   Question to community - will AFRINIC staff be allowed to update the CPM with the sections that are no longer valid?
3. Section 5.7.1 allows for IPv4 resource transfers only and members face a challenge as IPv6 and ASNs are not transferrable. Based on the policy proposals under discussion in this PPM, the problem may be attended to.
4. Section 5.5.1.2.1 states that AFRINIC's minimum allocation is /22 or 1024 IPv4 addresses. Section 5.4.3.2 Exhaustion Phase 2 requires during this phase, a minimum allocation/assignment size will be /24, and the maximum will be /22 per allocation/assignment.
   Question - Can staff go ahead and update the CPM once AFRINIC enters Soft Landing Phase 2
5. Implementation of lame delegation policy in 2019. Statistics show a drastic drop and AFRINIC are actively working to get its members to fix their lame delegations. 14.17% of the reverse delegations are lame at the moment.

Status of recently ratified proposals
Presentation:https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic-31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/98/1575479603_tmpphpWIPdVv.pdf

1. AFPUB-2019-v6-001-DRAFT02 - IPv6 PI Clarification
   Ref: https://afrinic.net/policy/proposals/2019-v6-001-d2#proposal
   -Amends section 6.8 of the Consolidated Policy Manual Deploy provider independent address space within twelve (12) months. To extent practicable, aggregate announcements to minimize global routing table growth. Apply Sparse Algorithm to maximise potential of Contiguous Address Blocks Possibility to rectifying the size of the initial assignment received

   This policy is still pending Implementation as the Coding part (automation) is not yet concluded and we are waiting for test results.
   However, AFRINIC is accepting requests for a bigger prefixes from its members that are interested in deploying IPv6

2. **Clarification on IPv6 sub-assignments**
   Ref: https://afrinic.net/policy/2018-v6-002-d3#proposal

Appends to section 6.8 of the Consolidated Policy Manual
 - Provide an exception to Section 2.6 for IPv6 assignments - Allows use of the IPv6 assigned addresses for: a) the assignment holder network b) third party devices operating within that infrastructure c) interconnections. This policy has been implemented as it required adjustments of processes, documentation and procedures.

3. AFPUB-2018-v4-001-DRAFT-01 - SL-Update
   Ref: https://afrinic.net/policy/2018-v4-001-d1#proposal

 - Amends section 5.4.7.2 of the Consolidated Policy Manual - Revokes board's prerogative on the reserved /12 from the last /8 for some unforeseen future uses. - If reserved /12 remains unused by time the remaining available space has been allocated, the /12 will be returned to the AFRINIC pool for distribution under the conditions of the phase 2 of the soft landing policy.
- Status: Implemented. The /12 that was reserved when Soft-landing Phase 1 was implemented is still kept as reserved in the AFRINIC inventory

An overview of reactions from delegates:-
- Suggestion to improve the Consolidated Policy Manual to help someone to find the exact policy which matches the specific sections on the CPM
- Expunging those areas of the CPM when new policies come in and maintaining version control
- Request for a working group to look at how the CPM is handled
- Staff may be able to send small policy proposals
- Staff can modify its M&A guidelines
- Staff cannot and should not modify the text in the CPM. Suggestion is to summarise the different sections staff see the conflict in, push them as a single document, it is a policy. We can fast track that through the process
-

Policy Development Updates from Other RIRs

Presentation:https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic-31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/1255/1575480017_tmpphpJ0dQdd.pdf

Guangliang Pan Registration Service Manager at APNIC gave a quick update about the policy proposals in the APNIC region

5 Policy proposals during APNIC-48
Two proposals reached consensus
- prop-131: Editorial changes in IPv6 Policy – This proposal suggests multiple editorial changes in the IPv6 policy. The intent is to remove non-necessary text and simplify the policy.
  - • Status – Waiting for APNIC EC endorsement
• prop-132: RPKI ROAs for unallocated and unassigned APNIC address space (AS0 for Bogons) – This proposal gives APNIC the authority to create AS0 (zero) ROAs for APNIC's unallocated address space to resolve the issue of bogon announcement.
This was very important proposal. It is a proposal to give APNIC authority to AS0, in that space.

The committee believes it is a good intention to get people to use the space and the technical and legal problems.

• Status – Waiting for APNIC EC endorsement

One policy has not reached consensus
-prop-130: Modification of transfer policies – This proposal aims to change the existing transfer policies to allow scenarios from a partial or complete business merger, acquisition, reorganization or relocation, in both intra-and inter-RIR transfers. Currently, the inter-RIR transfer only allows the transfer of IPv4 addresses and AS numbers, but this proposal seeks to include IPv6 addresses as well.

Two proposals were abandoned.
More details on the policy proposals can be obtained from the APNIC website

At a query from the audience, the policies were tabled for 1.5 yrs before they were abandoned.

Madhvi Gokool presented the update from the other RIRs
Presentation:https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic-31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/98/1575461052_tmpphp9oDs3Y.pdf

ARIN
1. One policy proposal regarding the pool replenishment, in that proposal resources allocated from a reserve pool that are returned, reclaimed or revoked will be returned to the reserve pool they were additionally located from, regardless of the current level of each pool.
2. The second policy is about IPv6, the proposal specifies to require that those who receive transferred IPv4 space to have in place an operational IPv6 network.
3. There is an Inter-RIR acquisition proposal being discussed when the merger or acquisition results in a surviving legal entity that is incorporated outside the service region, focused outside the service region. Or is merging with an organisation that already has a relationship with another RIR. Resources may be moved to another RIR in accordance with the receiving RIR policies.
4. They also have another proposal regarding merger and acquisition activity, resulting in a surviving legal entity, not incorporated in the surface region, will be permitted to hold resources directly allocated or assigned.

There are more policy proposals in the region, but we selected a few that were of similar proposals in the AFRINIC service region.

RIPE NCC
1. a policy proposal regarding validation of abuse box. The proposal introduces away for abuse contacts in the RIPE database to be validated.
2. Another proposal regarding the default size for Internet exchange points. The proposal changes the default IXP assignment size from a /24 to a needs-based model, with a /27 as a minimum.

LACNIC

1. This proposal recommends that LACNIC issue ASN0 ROAs for allocated and assigned address blocks as a method to indicate that draft announcements of such blocks should not be accepted by networks using the RPKI Routing Origin Validation.
2. The second proposal refers to the elimination of the ASN requirement for end users. The proposal eliminates the current requirement for end users to have an AS in order to make use of addresses they are assigned, since those entities do not need an ASN in the first place.
3. Registration and Validation of abuse contact Proposal introduces a way for "Abuse Contacts" in the LACNIC Database to be validated.

4. Another proposal regards the modification of the time required for a proposal to be presented at the public policy forum. The proposal modifies the LACNIC PDP, extending the discussion period for presenting the proposal at a public meeting from one week to 3 weeks.
5. LACNIC also has the acceptable use policy for the policy list. The proposal seeks to implement an Acceptable Use Policy for the policy discussions mailing list, as no such a document currently exists.
6. They also have a proposal regarding the PDP election procedure. The proposal establishes some changes to the current PDP chair election procedure in the LACNIC region.

Feedback from the floor:-
Query regarding the absence of other RIRs staff at this AFRINIC meeting and suggestion that remote presentation is used for the RIR policy updates

The policies to be discussed was kickstarted.

1. Multihoming not required for ASN

Proposal URL: https://afrinic.net/policy/2019-asn-001-d4#proposal
Presentation:https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic-31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/3283/1575460998_tmpphpYxHb1D.pdf

The author shared the following points with regard to this proposal:

At the time the policies for ASN were designed, there was a limited number of ASNs because of the 16 bits limitation. This is no longer a problem since several years ago, when we got the 32 bits ASN numbers.
At the beginning, in all the regions, the idea was that only organisations that need to connect with multiple providers get a public ASN number.
This has evolved because today there are organisations that have a need to keep their own public AS number and have a single provider, but maybe they are doing bidding with other providers, or maybe they have specific routing needs, or maybe they have a single transit location in that country and the provider as part of the contract forces them to have a public ASN.

The proposal tidies some text in Section 7 of the Consolidated Policy Manual and amends the eligibility requirements:-

7.2 In order to qualify for an AS number, the requesting organization must be an AFRINIC resource member and fulfill any of the following requirements:

7.2.1 Interconnect (including peering) with more than one AS.

7.2.2 Show a unique routing policy or demonstrate a technical need for a coordinated globally unique ASN.

An organization will also be eligible if it can demonstrate that it will meet the above criteria upon receiving an ASN (or within the following six months)

Sites that do not need the global ASN can still use a private ASN per RFC1930, RFC6996.

Staff assessment of the policy proposal was presented by Madhvi.

Staff assessment is we look at the policy proposal, we try to understand what it means to address, then we look at where it impacts AFRINIC. If it is registration, services, resource policies, processes and procedures on our system, on the WHOIS database.

. There are three conditions people can get an AS number, if they are multi-homed, if they show a unique routing policy or demonstrate a technical need for a coordinated globally unique ASN. In this case,"A "single interconnection with a provider that requires a public ASN" is an example of a unique routing policy. It is also an example of a technical need for a coordinated "globally unique ASN. Or ● An organisation (Resource member) will also be eligible if it can demonstrate that it will meet the above criteria upon receiving an ASN (or within the following six months). - planning to be multihomed

Policy if consensus is reached can be implemented within the timelines of the PDP

An overview of reactions from delegates and Remote Participants:

1. Commendation of the standard of the author's policy presentation
2. An organisation requiring an ASN in future can request for an ASN 6 months in advance
3. Ease of doing business - encourages business enterprises to grow
4. we should be concerned as to how the organisation requesting for an ASN shall affect the global routing table
5. Suggestion of a modification to 7.2.2 to request for the prefix that shall be announced
6. There is a possibility of disaggregation
7. Debate regarding the problem statement and that it does not get published in the Consolidated Policy Manual
8. Follow needs-based requirements
9. An issue about sections in the comparative policy of the NRO being broken.

Co-Chair Decision: Consensus

2. Adjusting IPv6 PA Policy

Proposal URL : https://afrinic.net/policy/proposals/2019-ipv6-002-d1#proposal
Presentation:https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic-31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/3283/1575461785_tmpphpPk2w7i.pdf

The proposal corrects and aligns recent changes to IPv6 PI policy with IPv6 PA policy, especially on the need for issued IPv6 PA space to be announced within 12 months of receiving it, and to the extent practicable, as a single aggregated prefix, so as to minimize global routing table growth.
In some very special cases, the space may not be announced, however it must be duly justified.
The current need to assign a /48 to a PoP (6.5.4.2) is also removed

Staff Impact Assessment

● In regard to the AFRINIC systems, in case the policy goes through and has to be implemented, AFRINIC note that the verification of the announcement shall be automated and we require some changes on the AFRINIC IPv6 allocation forms, some changes on the website as well to update the documentation.
● The implementation period can be done within the timeline in the PDP, except for the automation, we will have to confirm that.
● Author confirmed that consequence of not announcing should be according to what is adopted for the IPv6 PI policy
● The policy will apply to IPv6 prefixes received by members as a result of Mergers and Acquisitions

An overview of reactions from delegates and Remote Participants:

1. Request for an example where IPv6 may not be announced - private network not connected to the Internet
2. Impact of not announcing IPv6 prefix

Co-Chairs Decision: Rough Consensus has been reached

3. Abuse Contact Policy Update

Proposal URL : https://afrinic.net/policy/proposals/2018-gen-001-d5
Presentation:https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic-31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/3283/1575480793_tmpphpRpHVEH.pdf

Author made a short summary. Today there is a non-mandatory abuse record called IRT in AFRINIC. Abuse contact is used to report abuses and if the abuse contact which as minimum is an email, the abuse cannot be reported. Less than 1 % of the AFRINIC members have adopted the abuse contact. RSA already says that AFRINIC should verify the accuracy of the contacts and if the abuse contact is not mandatory, it cannot be validated.

• The proposal makes it mandatory for AFRINIC to include with each resource registration a contact where network abuse from users of those resources will be reported.
• Proposed whois DB attribute (abuse-c) – to be used to publish abuse public contact information
• There's also a process to ensure that abuse report must be received by the recipient, and that contacts are automatically validated by AFRINIC regularly. Reason for validation is that people change jobs and the information becomes inaccurate.

The author also proposed an example of how AFRINIC can validate the abuse contact and after 15 days, an escalation to other contacts is done. Validation is every 6 months and members have 15 days to respond. AFRINIC should have an escalation process that that they can be contacted to work on correcting
AFRINIC should change the MNT-IRT to abuse-c.

Staff Impact Assessment

AFRINIC understands that the abuse C attribute will become mandatory in the aut-num, inetnum and inet6num objects as well as in any other objects that may be used in the future.

If validation fails, escalate to other member contacts and said a new validation period not to exceed 15 days. The most applicable member contacts, would be the admin-c. What happens in cases where admin C and tech C all have the same email as the abuse mailbox? Will AFRINIC enforce different emails? That is one clarification being requested from the author.   Author mentioned that policy does not mandate AFRINIC to change its operational matters. Any policy violation shall follow the same process for other policies.
If members continuously makes the mistake or does not follow policy at all, AFRINIC can take measures as defined in the RSA.
And what happens if there's no response from the other contacts after the new 15 day validation period? AFRINIC does conduct validation for various other triggers, but this validation procedure may take more than 15 days.

I think for the purpose of automating the validation period, does the 15 day validation period exclude weekends and public holidays?

As per author, 15 natural days is being proposed and the validation should not take many days.

If the policy reaches consensus and is stratified through the systems that will be impacted are the WHOIS database and myafrinic member portal and regarding the implementation period, AFRINIC Secretariat will inform the PDP on the implementation timelines?

An overview of reactions from delegates and Remote Participants:

Some delegates supported the policy

Some delegates did not support the policy

A question was asked as to whether AFRINIC staff evaluated the workload for the proposal ? As per Madhvi, this will be done and communicated at a later stage.

If a lot of emails are sent, then it is a lot of work.

Co-Chairs Decision: Back to Mailing list for further discussion

4. AFRINIC Policy Development Process Bis v5

Proposal URL: https://afrinic.net/policy/proposals/2017-gen-002-d5#proposal
Presentation: https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic-31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/246/1575480536_tmpphpoC2VqW.pdf

The proposal is a complete revision of the current Policy Development Process (CPM 3.0).
Key highlights are:
  • Provides for different and distinct phases for a policy proposal's cycle through the PDP - from adoption through the last call to Board ratification.
  • Clarifies the consensus process around major and minor objections
  • Clarifies responsibilities of Chairs of the working group and their role on how to determine the presence (or lack) of consensus.

Alain Aina presented this proposal as one of the co-authors.

The authors have tried to address the weaknesses:-

The current PDP does not have provision for proposal adoption, which induces duplication of proposals dealing with same problems, lack of clarity of problem statements and proposals out of scope of the PDP. It also does not define clear method for moving proposals forward.

The consensus process for decision-making is not defined, opening doors for interpretations and inactions. Chairs election process is not well defined and does not cope adequately with resignations.

The current PDP does not have provision for board adopting policies as per section 11.4 of the AFRINIC constitution in the varying of the process (Align the PDP with the bylaws)

How the WG can be handled? Charter, co-chairs, election of co-chairs, co-chairs resigning or unable to attend the PPM

PDP process and guideline go together.

Another proposal is under discussion to solve part of the problem instead of the root cause.

Staff analysis will be requested to provide after the review phase

Requirements for co-chairs have been specified

Version 5 - includes an option for the presenter to request for funding to travel to the PPM if the policy will be tabled at the PPM.

Staff Impact Assessment

AFRINIC Secretariat notes that there is a new policy proposal making impact analysis mandatory under discussion. It will be helpful to have convergence between these 2 policies should they both reach consensus as they are tackling problems related to the PDP

An overview of reactions from delegates and Remote Participants:
1. No support due to adoption phase section
2. Implementation within 6 months should be driven by staff
3. Request for funding is not a good idea
4. Proposal encourages community to not withdraw policies
5. Necessary to keep the current practice as there are other priorities to implement
6. Proposal was not updated with comments from PPM held in Kampala

Co-Chairs Decision: No Consensus back to list for further discussion and refinement

5. RPKI ROAs for Unallocated and Unassigned AFRINIC Address Space

Proposal URL: https://afrinic.net/policy/proposals/2019-gen-006-d1#proposal
Presentation:https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic-31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/187/1575480617_tmpphpN1F76a.pdf

The purpose of this proposal is to restrict the propagation of BGP announcements of address space not yet issued by AFRINIC.
- AFRINIC to create ROAs with origin AS0 (zero) for all unissued address space.
- For space to be issued, ROAs with origin AS0 will have to be revoked, and ROAs with origin AS0 must not be visible in RPKI repositories.

Staff Impact Assessment

Proposal requires AFRINIC to create ROAs with origin AS0 for all its unallocated and unassigned IPv4 and IPv6 address space that it currently administers.
Only AFRINIC the RIR shall have the authority to create RPKI ROAs for address space not yet allocated or assigned to its members. For the above to happen, AFRINIC the RIR (NOT ORG-AFNC1- AFRINIC) has to become a resource holder so that it can create AS0 (zero) ROAs for the resources it has under their account/administration.
"Address space managed by AFRINIC which has is either "Unallocated" or "Unassigned" is considered "Bogon address space". " May the Author clarify on the source of this statement unallocated and unassigned space here means available and reserved space as per the AFRINIC extended delegated stats file.
When AFRINIC allocates address space to one of its Resource Members, the RPKI ROA or ROAs with origin AS0 covering the space will first have to be revoked AND not be visible in the repositories, before the allocation/assignment can happen.
At the moment, a bogon prefix can be the one that appears in the extended delegated stats file with status either 'available' or 'reserved'.

IXPs at the moment create ROAs with AS0 for their peering LAN IPv6 & IPv6 prefix (RFC7607) - Implementation of this policy shall keep in consideration this scenario.
BGP announcements covering this space will be marked as Invalid by networks doing RPKI based BGP Origin Validation using APNIC's TAL. May the Author(s) clarify why APNIC's TAL is mentioned here? AFRINIC has its own TAL.

An overview of reactions from delegates and Remote Participants:

● The proposal has no issues as written however there are technical realities that must be taken into consideration, we should not forget that up to now, some of the Bogon, where you get on the Bogon sometime is difficult to be removed. Or you may have some delays, when the certificate expire or the ROA revoked, the bogon list caches across the globe may take time to update as they are all not in sync in real time
● This could have been a global policy instead of going region by region. The Authors should probably coordinate with the authors of the similar policy in the APNIC region and people at NRO. Global policies requires action from PTI/IANA.
● What is the validity period or window to determine that the prefix is useful to the one it was assigned to before AFRINIC takes it back to the free space?
   ○ We are not talking about withdrawing the IP space but rather withdraw the ROA.
● Comparing it with some of the existing policies on the ground, like the review policy, are you looking at this to be a substitute? Because you can easily use this to audit, right? Are you using this policy as an alternative to the one that is currently under proposal? Because if it is passed, you can use it for auditing.
● The policy should be fine-tuned towards AFRINIC and avoid cut and paste.
● A similar policy is accepted and adopted in APNIC and in a few weeks it will be adopted by RIPE and so on, and authors have trust that the AFRINIC staff can build it.
● A clarification made that in RPKI, ROA's are not withdrawn, you have to revoke ROA's. This process needs to be well thought of.
● The policy proposal covers only space allocated and assigned by AFRINIC, it does not cover legacy space.

Co-Chairs Decision: Rough Consensus

Day 2:

On day 2 of the PDP session, the Co-chairs stated that they had decided that they will not make a decision on any other policies after the presentation. "We will wait until after the policies that have been presented before we come to a conclusion".

6. Policy Proposal: Resource Transfer Policy

Proposal URL: https://afrinic.net/policy/proposals/2019-v4-003-d1#proposal

Presentation:https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic-31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/4955/1575532336_tmpphpDa6Cvo.pdf

● Allows for transfers of IPv4 resources (only) between AFRINIC and other regions.

- No limit and conditions on resource size and frequency of transfers, as long as both parties mutually agree.
- No needs assessment by AFRINIC on the recipient.
- Legacy resources retain legacy resource status after transfer.

Staff Impact Assessment

It enables a two-way inter RIR transfer of IPv4 resources. Starts with a resource holder who submits a transfer request to another party and also provides an agreement of resource transfer signed by both parties.
 The source must be the rightful holder and not involved in any disputes. No limit to the size of resources transferred and source can request for additional resources from AFRINIC at any time (no hold down period)
Recipient of a transfer is not required to justify the IPv4 needs. Eliminates the justification of needs

Can author(s) clarify if recipient of transfers in AFRINIC service region are required to be AFRINIC members?

5.4.5 The current allocation and assignment period of 12 months shall be changed to 8 months.
The current allocation and assignment period of 12 months shall be changed to 8 months. This will help to ensure that LIRs request only for resources they need in the short to medium term, and promote fairness in the equitable distribution of the last IPv4 address pool. This assignment period will remain the same throughout the lifespan of this Policy.

Resources evaluated under this policy clause can be immediately transferred under this policy proposal.

Reactions from the floor and remote Participants:

- Several concerns were made in regards to the lack of need justification in the policy; many commented that the policy is not in line with AFRINIC roles as an RIR and such a policy proposal would break the RIR model as it is built on "needs basis".
- Several comments were made alluding to emphasize that LIR don't "own" the resources but rather hold the resources in trust and on a needs basis hence thinking of LIR's transferring out resources is taking a wrong direction. If a member no longer has need then they must give back to AFRINIC.
- Several suggestions were made stating that it would be helpful if policy authors for competing policies could work together and have a single common policy.
- There were several comments stating that the policy is good and will make the Internet market more competitive
- The policy will encourage the transition to IPv6
- Comments were made stating that the policy would help in the economic development of AFRINIC, it will remove blockages in doing business and enable investors to bring their IP resources into the region, Africa would also become competitive globally.
- Comments made on the policy proposal regarding enabling business is a high level speculation; rather its best to use the justification based on network operations
- Comment was made regarding the contradiction between the problem statements; "With the exhaustion of IPv4, several regions have adopted transfer policy to accommodate the shortage of resources" and AFRINIC statistics on allocations, showing a decrease since soft-landing was reached; the statistics does not concur with the problem statement.

- Concern was raised regarding an Inter-rir policy proposal attempt to replace an existing intra-rir policy. It was stated that it would have been better to write a fresh inter-rir policy as the two scenarios are significantly different.
- Comments were raised against the "theno holdback period and no any limit and any number of times", sounds deadly and opens up to potential leasing companies.
- The proposal is not necessary because AFRINIC is the only region with available IPv4 space hence there is no need for the policy.
- There is no need of moving at a quick pace, we should develop an African ecosystem first. We should consolidate and develop our ecosystem in the same way others have before we can start transfers outside the region.

7. Policy Proposal: M&A Resource Transfers

Proposal URL: https://afrinic.net/policy/proposals/2019-gen-004-d1#proposal

Presentation:https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic-31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/3283/1575461654_tmpphpwBioEw.pdf

- Because AFRINIC does not currently have a policy for transfers of resources as a result of M&A (Mergers and Acquisitions between companies), this proposal attempts to establish such a mechanism for such cases.
- Only applicable to Intra-RIR cases (companies under the AFRINIC service region).
- Replaces the current "procedure document defined by staff" as this is not optimal and falls totally outside community control.

Staff Impact Assessment

The Policy proposes a new section in CPM that consolidate all Resource transfers in a single place accommodating policy text from section 5.7 of the current CPM and in the future, any transfers-related policies. The new section's numbering and order to be determined by staff.

All types of resources shall be transferable, i.e IPv4, IPv6 and ASN.
Recipient organisation shall have to justify the needs for the resources and comply with all existing policies. If required, new RSA(s) may need to be signed by the resulting company or companies.
The policy proposes leaving the required supporting documentation up to be determined by staff as such documentation will not necessarily be the same in every case.
 "1. Resource Transfers due to Mergers, Acquisitions, Reorganizations or Relocations" - Can the author explains what is meant by relocation.
Current transfers based on M&A guidelines are published in the transfer logs on AFRINIC ftp site. Is the author's/community intent to publish re-organisation and relocation as type of transfer in the transfer stats? If yes, an impact analysis & additional implementation time will be required to publish such granular stats.
Policy can be implemented within 3 weeks of ratification date (2.1 a)-c)) if the re-organisations/relocations are to be published as simply M&A.

Reactions from the floor and remote Participants:

- There were several sentiments alluding to the fact the current M&A guidelines serves the purpose just fine.
  - May be necessary if there would be an inter-rir
  - M&A are more of an administrative issue
  - Adds complexity to what the staff are already doing
- The policy is conflicting and bring confusion between M&A and transfers
- The policy is important to allow the community have control on anything resource related otherwise let staff to develop the policies
- The current guidelines lack mechanism to allow an out of region organisation from doing M&A hence risk being taken to court for legal action
- It was also raised that the author had not taken into consideration some input from mailing list
-

8. Policy Proposal: IPv4 Inter-RIR Resource Transfers (Comprehensive Scope)

Proposal URL: https://afrinic.net/policy/proposals/2019-ipv4-002-d3

Presentation:https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic-31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/3283/1575532486_tmpphpHVU94r.pdf

- A transfer source can only receive additional resources after 24 months of the previous transfer
- A resource can only be transferred after 12 months after issue.
- IPv4 legacy resources lose that status after transfer.
- Outgoing transfers cease if for 6 months, outgoing resources are more than incoming resources.

Staff Impact Assessment

Proposal Maintains "needs basis" as a requirement in section 5.7. No limit to the size of resources transferred. Hold down period is being eliminated and Source entities will no longer be eligible to receive any further IPv4 address allocations or assignments from AFRINIC. 5.7.2.3 Source entities must not have received a transfer, allocation, or assignment of IPv4 number resources from AFRINIC for the 12 months prior to the approval of transfer request. The recipient must be a member of the relevant RIR, subjected to its policies and legal documents/service agreements.
5.7.3.4 IPv4 legacy resources will no longer be regarded as legacy resources:
  ● In the case of intra-RIR transfers.
  ● In the case of inter-RIR, when incoming to AFRINIC service region.

5.7.4 Provisions for ASN transfers "Only" In case of transfers of the majority of the IPv4 resources from the source AND other relevant policies are fulfilled.

Author to clarify majority threshold. (50%, (50%+1), ... ?
The Inter-RIR transfers will be triggered only once AFRINIC enters into Exhaustion Phase 2 (as defined in 5.4.3.2)

The inter-RIR transfers will be suspended in case:
  ● the number of outgoing IPv4 addresses exceeds the incoming ones by 6 consecutive months.

● 5.7.8.2 the staff can provisionally suspend any suspicious operation and request more information to all the parties, so the board can take a decision.

Staff must implement a monitoring system for all organisations closed due to transfer

Reactions from the floor and remote Participants:

● Comment raised that any inter-rir transfer is not necessary now but after we finish the last /8.
● Concerns regarding the procedures not being well defined, also where staff escalate to board on suspicious transaction for board to take action and board intervening and closing a request is problematic. Policy to introduce more strain on AFRINIC staff and board.
● Complaint raised regarding the author's reference to other competing policies as a means for justifying one's policy. Authors must promote their policy without referencing others.
● The author must clarify whether the policy is trying to create a market or enable inter-rir transfers as the problem statement has a section stating the proposal establishes a mechanism to align AFRINIC with a market that already exist.
  ○ Author emphasized his interest in facilitating the inter-rir transfer and further admits to being approached by brokers (Present during the session) and being offered a commission to which he declined.
● Concern raised on having multiple policies trying to solve the same problem, there is a need for a mechanism to try and avoid this situation and ensure the number of policy proposals at the PPM are minimised.
● Request made for more details regarding the assertion that the policy will benefit the region more as there will be more inflow of resources than out; the author was asked to provide the confidence level to the assertion and data/figures from which it is being based on
● The use of the reciprocity term was questioned as in such a case there would be a situation where there is a quid pro quo; but in reality, that would not be the situation.
  ○ Author clarify reciprocity refers to the terms of the policies not the resources being transferred
● 6 months period to observe the behavior of the transfers is problematic because any undesirable effect may take place within the period, this could have been put in terms of monitoring the resources transfers only for the board to make a decision whether to stop the policy or not.

9. Policy Proposal: Impact Analysis is Mandatory

Proposal URL: https://afrinic.net/policy/proposals/2019-gen-005-d1#proposal

Presentation:https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/3283/1575532556_tmpphpDmueE8.pdf

● Modifies CPM 3.0 to make staff impact assessments of new proposals mandatory, along with other minor changes.
● Introduces new timelines for submission of draft proposals
● Requires each new draft proposal to have a staff analysis 4 weeks after it's received
● If AFRINIC needs more time, the justification to be provided to community

Reactions from the floor and remote Participants:

- Comment raised indicating the importance of staff impact assessment prior to the PPM, community is able to know in advance of certain impact of the policies and able to update efficiently.
- Concern raised with this policy is that it may not be feasible for staff to adhere in instances where numerous policies are submitted last minute. It also leads to micro-management of staff and the co-chairs, as this should be prerogative of staff/co-chairs to determine the need for staff assessment report as some policies may not require the assessment report to be made.

10. Policy Proposal: Internet Number Resources review by AFRINIC draft8

Proposal URL: https://afrinic.net/policy/proposals/2016-gen-001-d8#proposal

Presentation:https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic-31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/892/1575532847_tmpphpcnCjVX.pdf

- Audits can be random or selected (by AFRINIC) or reported (by whistle-blower).
- Resources not complying are recovered and can be reallocated.

Reactions from the floor and remote Participants:

- The policy is missing a lot of input from previous meeting that were raised and required to be reviewed.
- Concerns raised regarding the likely increased stretch on AFRINIC human and technical resources in conducting the review/investigation
- Concerns raised on lack of clear definition of the review selection process and likelihood of policy misuse to witch hunt member organisations.
- The policy shall bring about transparency on resources assigned and better management of resources, this is a good practice worldwide; it happens that we need to make controls and we understand that there is a problem and we ignite measures.
- There is a need for a way to make a statement that the RIR is in control and has records that reflect the reality; if there are cases of abuse or hijack of those resources; and people can't trust the RIR records anymore then it means there is loss of integrity of the resource records.

11. Policy Proposal: AFRINIC Number Resources Transfer Policy

Proposal URL: https://afrinic.net/policy/proposals/2019-gen-002-d1#proposal

Proposal URL: https://afrinic.net/policy/proposals/2019-gen-002-d2#proposal

Presentation:https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic-31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/920/1575533516_tmpphp0ffsKk.pdf

- The proposal allows for transfers of IPv4 and ASN resources (only) between AFRINIC and other regions.
- The recipient must demonstrate the need for the resources.
- Legacy resources once transferred will lose that status and fall under RSA.
- Reserved resources cannot be transferred.

Reactions from the floor and remote Participants:

- Query was raised on whether reciprocity with other regions is possible to ensure that if adopted, other regions should be able to also transfer to AFRINIC.
- Suggestion from author to let AFRINIC establish the feasibility of reciprocity with other regions.
- Concern raised that the community may be taking a direction of making AFRINIC regulator or controller rather than a facilitator and a custodian as the policy/policy presenter repeatedly used the word control.
- Query on what powers we have over legacy resources; if we do not have power over legacy space then there is no need to be thinking of transfer of legacy resources and the policy is not addressing anything.
- Concerns raised regarding discrimination of legacy from the RIR pool and classification introduced in the policy are likely to cause confusion.
- Comment made in respect to the principles of policy development; policies are developed to address a burning issue, in the absence of one or no problem statement then policies are not necessary

12. Policy Proposal: Chairs Elections Process

Proposal URL: https://www.afrinic.net/policy/proposals/2019-gen-007-d1#proposal

Presentation:https://meeting.afrinic.net/afrinic-31/components/com_afmeeting/speakers/3283/1575533889_tmpphpl45g5O.pdf

- The proposal is an effort to improve the process for election/selection of Policy Development Working Group (PDWG) co-chairs.
- Addresses conflict of interest issues.
- Restrictions for co-chairs to be from different countries.
- Co-Chairs must represent AFRINIC members or be nominated by AFRINIC members.
- Must have been active on rpd@afrinic.net list for at least 6 months.
- Must present planned achievements

Reactions from the floor and remote Participants:

- Several concerns were raised with regards to to e-voting citing exposure to fraud, due to challenges regarding mechanism of voter verification, voter eligibility based on period on RPD mailing list, new responsibilities and burden to the voting process custodians, programs and digital fingerprint can be manipulated; one person can own multiple and be able to vote multiple times.

- Several concerns on candidate eligibility by period on RPD regardless of whether they have been actively participating or not is a challenge and opens the process to being used in a wrong way.
- Removal of the face to face and manual voting makes things significantly different and must be reviewed if the policy is to be considered.
- Possibility of a candidate winning the chair seat before the PPM eradicates the impact of the presentations made by the candidates.
- Concerns raised against the possibility for longer serving co-chair to step down and contest again for the vacated seat.
- Concern was raised that the policy proposal does not support gender equality.
- Comment was raised in regards to Africa being less interested in importing things these days and would hence leverage on itself and if there is something good done here then its best to advance that; this was with regards PDP BIS proposal which tackles the issues in a holistic manner while this proposal will only patch one bit.
- Concerns raised on restriction that co-chairs shouldn't come from the same country, this will bring divisions and also restrict credible candidates, and candidates must be elected on merit.
- Suggestion in support of online voting for members and ballot voting for the attendees during the session.
- Query on the 7 day period for objection of results; what would happen if a strong objection comes after 7 days?
- Is there a limit to the number of nominees/candidates? What if two people from the same country are the only nominees?

Day 2 - Co-Chairs Decisions

6. Policy Proposal: Resource Transfer Policy

Co-Chairs Decision: No Consensus

Back to list for further discussion and refinement
The proposal did not reach consensus as some objections was raised such as the proposed No need basis

7. Policy Proposal: M&A Resource Transfers

Co-Chairs Decision: No Consensus

Back to list for further discussion and refinement
This proposal has not reached a consensus because of concerns about the necessity of this proposal has not been addressed. There are voices that the current system works well and that this proposal is pointless without an Inter RIR transfer policy. These remain unaddressed.

8. IPv4 Inter-RIR Resource Transfers (Comprehensive Scope)

Co-Chairs Decision: No Consensus

Back to list for further discussion and refinement
This proposal has not reached consensus. The proposal puts in place a mechanism to transfer IPv4 and (some ASN) resources between AFRINIC and other RIRs, as well as between AFRINIC members/entities.

9. Policy Proposal: Impact Analysis is Mandatory

Co-Chairs Decision: No Consensus
Back to list for further discussion and refinement

This proposal has not reached a consensus because of concerns about the necessity and practicality of this proposal have not been addressed.

10. Policy Proposal: Internet Number Resources review by AFRINIC draft8

Co-Chairs Decision: No Consensus

This proposal has not reached consensus after many iterations spanning over 8 iterations spanning over 3 years (from May 2016).

The Co-chairs are considering dropping this policy entirely because it has been around for some time without achieving consensus. It is also noticed that the authors failed to attempt to address a lot of concerns.
  Co-chairs have spent a lot of time on this proposal (over the last 1 month) reviewing comments and responses from previous meetings and believe that the authors did not address or attempt to address most of the major issues raised in the latest version. The CPM allows us to vary the process in the best interest of the community hence we shall work with the authors of this proposal in the coming months to see if there can be a way forward on this proposal. A decision shall be made based on this before the next policy meeting to avoid wasting the limited and precious time during the policy meeting. A proposal cannot continue to have an infinite loop hence the need to vary the process.

11. Policy Proposal: AFRINIC Number Resources Transfer Policy

Co-Chairs Decision: No Consensus
Back to list for further discussion and refinement

This proposal has not reached consensus. Concerns regarding the unclear wording about the assignment and the excessive amount of need for AFRINIC's approval have not been addressed.

12. Policy Proposal: Chairs Elections Process

Co-Chairs Decision: No Consensus

Back to list for further discussion and refinement

This proposal has not reached consensus. Concerns on e-voting and the criteria of chair candidate have not been addressed. The policy was not supported by anyone during the Public Policy meeting

Open Microphone

Co-Chair, Abdulkarim opened the session by stating that there are three issues that were promised to be discussed during the open microphone.
- First of all, the issue of the webinar.
  - Co-Chairs felt the need to bring in some innovations in the PDP, make it better because they actually noticed there were few people participating in the PDP process and want to try something new.
  - 2 webinars done before the PPM meeting and feel it's an impressive thing to do, based on the feedback got.
  - Few people expressed that it is not a good idea; however, nobody has stated that it should be stopped. Co-chairs sought input on ways to improve it and stop it where justifiable to do so.
- Another issue is on language on the mailing list
  - Co-chairs to discuss with staff to find out if features such as auto-translate could be implemented.
- Bring the community together
  - As Co-chairs, unity amongst the community is one priority area to be achieved.
- The community was reminded of the official language in Angola; Portuguese and expressed that there was no contribution made in Portuguese hence encouraged local community members present to take the opportunity and use the open microphone session for contributions.
- Commenting to the colleague who said before, to elect a co-chair, we need to elect for other countries. It is good.
- The PDP process needs to be improved. It is a deep need for us, appeal to all to work on it. Without a clear PDP, one that we can all adapt and work with, we will not be able to build our future. We all need to work on it. We should say what is good, what is not, and how to change it.
- Point of order to the Co-chairs; negative feedback doesn't mean it is harming, negative feedback actually helps improve the proposal and fix what was not seen by author.
- Appeal to all members not to be emotional when giving comments on proposals, must look into the pros and cons, you could have interest groups from anywhere in the world, not only Africa but, as someone who has come to proofread and review the proposal, you have to dissect the proposal and give your own contribution rather than based on sentiment on author
- Vote of appreciation on the way the chairs handled the session, at some point it looked as though they were being pushed, but they were calm and controlled things when attacks arose. Encouragement to the chairs to continue with that and make the meetings a friendly, progressive place.

- In support of webinars, today here, we are speaking of the Internet, digital technology and where we are moving. One time, we may even be having these meetings remotely. Even as a community, we take advantages this technology has given us. Issues on accountability can be addressed by minuting the meetings.
- Not happy that, out of 14 policies, one, if not two were approved. Or, none at all. It is the process. But if we have a way to minimise the number of policies that come to the open discussion, we may have a way where the community actively participates, and be able to reach consensus. Policies should not promote individual interests but policies should help Africa grow.
- During the policy discussions, I did not see an interpreter for the deaf and dumb, what is the policy of AFRINIC, if it does not include people who are deaf and dumb to participate in such a meeting.
- Suggestion to find a mechanism to filter all qualifying proposals that need to be presented during
- Co-Chairs must state clearly which mechanism they use to declare consensus or not; whether a question of feeling or based on the number of "I oppose" or "I support"?.
- There was an observation that one co-chair was more active than the other; could the moderation be the proposals be split amongst them.
- There is a real need to consider policies over the element of settling personal scores; an element that is not making us progress.
- There is need to consider in the PDP process to prioritize policy areas, policy assessment lacks the priority areas and board and the staff of AFRINIC can try as well in consultation with the community to identify what are the priority areas.
- On the Co-Chair election process, I do hope that we do a certain level of control where even in appointing co-chairs, we do this in a more dignified way. What happened in Kampala, I don't think this is the right way.
- The problem of webinars is language. What language will be used? Some participants risk not following, they will be harmed. It seems the co-chairs are doing two ways and two measures in driving the two sessions, even giving their own opinion, this is not correct. It is not credible.
- Concern on webinar use is the likelihood of two groups emerging from the community, those who are participating in the PDP listed activities and those who participated only at the Public Policy meetings. With that fracturing approach, we will have more bad experiences than surprises.
- There should be clarification on the mailing regarding consensus, the difference between membership and community and elections because most people confused these terms during various sessions and it resulted to further consultations.
- People must participate more on policy discussions mailing list, this will result in having better policies discussions during the policy meeting, it will also make it easy to identify priorities and reduce the fractured approach.
- Responding to query about consensus, co-chair indicated that consensus is reached by looking at the points that were raised and not based on the numbers for and numbers against