Appeal against the non-consensus determination on the General Abuse Contact Policy -Draft 1

a. Brief description of the topic under appeal.

Appeal against the co-chairs decision of non-consensus determination on the General Abuse Contact Policy.

b. Date of the appeal.

16th June 2021

c. Name and email address of complainant.

Lamiaa Chnayti (Lamiaachnayti@gmail.com)

d. Names of three (3) persons, other than the complainant, who support the appeal and who participated in the discussions

   i.   Wijdane Goubi (goubi.wijdane@gmail.com)

   ii. Aziz Halim (azizlfax88@gmail.com)

   iii. Elvis Ibeanusi (ibeanusielvis@gmail.com)

e. i) Date of the decision made by the Policy LiaisonTeam

2nd June 2021

f. Reference to an announcement of decision which is being appealed

1. 4th June 2021, Policy Liaison Team announced consensus is not achieved

Appeal Submission

1. Reference is made to the matter relating to the General Abuse Contact Policy.

2. The following appeal addresses the fact that consensus on the General Abuse Contact Policy proposal has not been reached. According to the CPM, if consensus is not reached, the concerned policy shall be sent back to the RPD list for further discussion for community inputs and refinement. Normally, the policy shall be discussed and debated. Nevertheless, we noticed that there is no ongoing discussion to improve the policy's shortcomings, which means there is nothing to modify/add. In this situation, we are in the obligation to submit an appeal for the staff to reconsider the policy.

3. First, we would like to address all of the objections and concerns stated by the community, and which you'll find their answers below:

A. *What is more intrusive, asking for a validation or allowing victims to pay for the abuse?*

Whether the victim pays for the abuse is not related to the validation of abuse mailbox by AFRINIC. If a bad network does not care about abuse, the victim will still pay for the abuse even if AFRINIC has forced the network to reply to their abuse mail box. Replies such as "I don't care" will not prevent the victim from paying for the abuse. As a matter of fact, it doesn't matter if the operator is good or bad - because abuse has already happened once the operator receives the abuse complaint. Hence, the cost on the victim is inevitable, regardless of the network's action because the cost (abuse) has already taken place.

B. *What is more intrusive, asking for a validation or because it doesn't exist and you don't even, bother to say "this is not abuse for me", get the full network filtered by the rest of the world, or even worst, many AFRICAN networks become filtered?*

1. If the network is a good player, they will put a valid contact mailbox in abuse-c and deal with abuse properly without requiring AFRINIC's intrusive intervention.
2. If the network is a bad player, forcing them to reply to every abuse report with "I don't care" does not in any way prevent them being filtered by the rest of the world.
3. The validation of abuse mailbox does not in anyway make a network a good or bad player. Furthermore, whether the network will be filtered depends on their action and attitude towards the abuse, but not their choice of replying to the abuse mailbox. So this concern is invalid from the very beginning.

C. *What is more intrusive, asking for a validation to the resource holders, or imposing the cost into AFRINIC, which is covered by members?*

This policy will not impose any extra cost, because we include abuse-c as part of whois registration by adding it under section 7.5.1 "Registering contact persons" which already covers the other mandatory contact - admin-c or

tech-c. As for the Abuse Contact Policy (Draft 7), the extra validation will incur additional cost.

Since the very beginning, abuse handing is always part of network operation, hence out of AFRINIC's mandate as a registration service. Instead of implementing an unnecessary and useless policy, it is more logical to get members to publish their mailbox without the need of being intrusive and overstepping what is not in their scope. Alternatively, the General Abuse Contact policy will get the same results by simply publishing the member's abuse mailbox while restraining from being intrusive to members.

D. *What is more intrusive, asking for a validation or enforcing the RSA, which stands for appropriate use of the resources? It is appropriate to ignore abuses from your customers?*

1. AFRINIC is established to maintain a registration database and distribute resources based on technical need.
2. AFRINIC does not judge on the moral ground of technical need.
3. Ignoring abuse or dealing with it actively (a.k.a abuse handling) is part of network operation that is out of scope of AFRINIC
4. It's up to local jurisdiction to define what is abuse and what is not.
5. Hence this "ignoring abuse from customers or not" is out of scope of policy discussion and is therefore not a valid objection.

E. Redudant Proposal - members should already have abuse contact or an alternative if they really needed it.
1. AFRINIC's position is to keep an accurate database and allocate resources.

2. The alternative proposal involves functions which are out of AFRINIC's scope by intervening in the network's own operation matter.
3. This proposal provides a solution to AFRINIC's existing problem while also preventing it from overstepping its boundary.

Since all the objections pointed out by co-chairs are in fact invalid as demonstrated above, we believe this policy has achieved consensus.