

a. Brief description of the topic under appeal.

Appeal against the confirmation of consensus declared by the PDWG chairs on the Abuse Contact Policy.

b. Date of the appeal.

16th June 2021

c. Name and email address of complainant.

Meriem Dayedaye (meriemdayday@gmail.com)

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

- i. Aziz Halim (azizlfax88@gmail.com)
- ii. Elvis Ibeanusi (ibeanusielvis@gmail.com)
- iii. Wijdane Goubi (goubi.wijdane@gmail.com)

e. i) Date of the decision made by the Policy Liaison Team

2nd June 2021

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

1. 2nd June 2021, Policy Liaison Team announced consensus is achieved

Appeal Submission

1. Reference is made to the matter relating to the Abuse Contact Policy.
2. The following appeal addresses the fact that a full consensus on the Abuse Contact Policy proposal has not been reached. According to the CPM, if consensus is not reached, the concerned policy cannot be ratified, and an appeal shall take place. Normally, the policy shall be discussed and debated. Nevertheless, many concerns have not been addressed by the author which implies that a full consensus has not been reached. In this situation, we are in the obligation to submit an appeal for the staff to reconsider our point of view.
3. We do not agree with the said policy, since its pillars are poorly placed, and more importantly, AFRINIC's existing abuse contact information policy is sufficient and well-engineered. To emphasize and clarify our opinion, the existence of two channels or abuse contacts is highly efficient, because the automated mailbox can manage recurrent and frequent complaints, by providing automatic solutions and direct answers already incorporated in their database. Instead, the personal communication email can handle much more complex complaints, requiring human intervention to suggest solutions or further actions.
4. That said, we are convinced that both channels are of extreme necessity in handling abuse complaints and providing complainants with different ways to deal with unfortunate situations. Also, it saves AFRINIC efforts trying to create an abuse-c attribute all over again, and it prevents the members' from wasting precious time developing useless policies, that are only a duplicate of the CPM policies, and initiating the long procedures of approval and ratification.
5. To some extent, this policy is open ended, because If people had the freedom to

say decide whether it is an abuse or not, then the essence of this policy is ambiguous if AFRINIC cannot determine what is considered an abuse.

6. Given that the period is different for people to respond to abuses, that is considered a bit of a stretching on AFRINIC itself because the concept of abuse is undefined and difficult for people to understand. Secondly, it is complicated for people to respond to these abuses within the given timelines. As a matter of fact, it just puts a lot more responsibility which is out of AFRINIC's scope, in other words, through this policy, AFRINIC will be policing ISPs.
7. Another thing is that, since RSA is compulsory, and abuse contact is already incorporated in RSA, the purpose of this new policy remains unknown.
8. According to the policy proposal, it is implied that network-holders must provide AFRINIC with their confidential data even though they already showed technical needs during the application process, which is completely invasive and unnecessary.
9. Indeed, it is important to have a mandatory abuse contact policy, however having to put 6 months verification is very unrequited because it is up to the members to decide if they are willing to reply or not. Henceforth, the members should have the option "not to reply". Moreover, it is not in AFRINIC's mandate to decide or dictate how network-holders manage their abuse mailbox. They have the liberty to choose the adequate actions to be taken. To sum up, this policy contradicts with internet values, as it makes AFRINIC play the role of a central government.
10. Equally important, we cannot neglect the significant waste of resources and the extra cost that Afrinic will have to take in charge, and which impacts automatically its members. The author did not address this important concern but has rather dismissed it by stating that Afrinic is the one paying for it, as if it

does not concern the community as a whole. The essence here, is that by refraining from wasting resources and money on unnecessary policies, we are saving them for more important causes and urgent matters that require more implication, efforts and attention.

11.As pointed out several times from various community members, during the RPD discussions and the PPM, the RIR is merely a registration service which serves the purpose of book-keeping. One of the major unaddressed objections that this policy faces is that it is overstepping its limits and boundaries by requiring people to have a valid mailbox and forcing them to deal with abuse. RFC2142 is just a suggestion which should not be interpreted otherwise and “abuse” definition differs from one country to another and from one jurisdiction to another.

12. Additionally, AFRINIC since the very beginning have never been able to handle abuse. Instead of implementing a whole unnecessary and wasteful policy, they could just get members to publish their mailbox without the need of being intrusive and overstepping what is not in their scope. As an alternative, the General Abuse Contact Policy will allow the same effect and results by simply publishing the member’s abuse mailbox all while restraining from being intrusive to members.

13.Implementing this policy means that AFRINIC will start managing people’s network, which is a serious act of overstepping the policy process of this community, especially that the ICP2 does not give AFRINIC the mandate and the right to manage people’s networks.

14.By forcing people to reply as a way to validate abuse mailbox will only incur cost for members and AFRINIC because a good network will deal with abuse properly

with or without AFRINIC's forceful validation; a bad network might be forced to reply but this won't change the fact that they will not deal with abuse properly. In other words, this cannot improve network operation in a meaningful way.

15. Abuse handling is a part of network operation. As in ICP-2, AFRINIC does not have mandate in network operation, hence interfering with how members handle abuse is out of the scope of AFRINIC and the community.

16. We agree that network should have abuse contact in their WHOIS registration as part of the AFRINIC's registration service. However, whether the network will reply to the email sent to the abuse mailbox is entirely up to the network itself as it is out of the scope of AFRINIC's mandate.

17. Based on the co-chairs' action of declaring consensus on the concerned policy, and the fact that it passed to the last call, which is done with no regards to other members opinion, it is safe to conclude that the consensus is biased and far from being reached. Based on the above, I urge the Appeal committee to investigate this serious matter and resolve this appeal by standing with what is right and fair.