

# AFRINIC-26 Public Policy Meeting

## Minutes of the PDWG Face-to-Face Meeting

The BOMA Hotel, Nairobi - Kenya  
31 May 2017

### Agenda

1. Welcome, Introduction & Agenda Overview
2. Overview of the AFRINIC PDP
3. Policy Update from other RIRs
4. Lame Delegations in AFRINIC Reverse DNS
5. Route Aggregation Policy
6. IPv4 Soft Landing-BIS
7. Soft Landing SD
8. Inbound Transfer Policy
9. Anti-Shutdown-02
10. Internet Number Resources review by AFRINIC
11. AFRINIC Policy Development Process BIS
12. PDWG co-chair Election
13. Open Policy Microphone & Closing

**Session Co-Chairs:** Sami Salih, Adewole Ajao

#### 1.0 Welcome, Introduction & Agenda Overview

The meeting was called to order at 0900 local time, Nairobi by Sami Salih, who welcomed delegates to the 26<sup>th</sup> AFRINIC Public Policy Meeting, and advised that due to the packed agenda, presentation and discussion time would be limited per policy proposal.

#### 2.0 Overview of the AFRINIC PDP

The AFRINIC PDP flow chart was shared with and explained to delegates by Sami.

The community was also updated on the recently ratified policy proposal – IPv4 Resource Transfers within the AFRINIC region (AFPUB-2016-V4-003-DRAFT03) – which is already in the implementation phase. AFRINIC legal advisor and staff are working on a revised Registration Services Agreement (RSA) that is free of constraints to resource transfers. The revised draft RSA will be shared (after Board approval) with the community for a 30-day comment period.

### 3.0 Policy Update from Other RIRs

Policy proposals under discussion in the communities of ARIN, RIPE, LACNIC and APNIC were respectively presented by Sean Hopkins, Marco Schmidt, Sergio Rojas and Paul Wilson.

#### 4.0 Policy Proposal: AFPUB-2017-DNS-001-DRAFT01 Lame Delegations in AFRINIC Reverse DNS

Authors made the following remarks during their presentation:

- 8 expressions of support on the *rpd* mailing list were observed by authors.
- No objections except for concerns about staff resources as communicated by staff in their assessment report.
- On the observation by staff about the recommendation to have explicit wording on how to handle legacy resource DNS records, authors advised they would not do this, so as not to treat legacy resource holders any differently.
- The comment from staff about expounding on “unanswered communications” would be looked at and considered by authors.

Comments and questions from delegates were noted as follows:

- Lameness checks should be run on spot when creating objects rather than later. Authors advised that this bit should be left to staff at implementation, as the proposal mainly targets to clean existing lameness as well as mitigate future lameness.
- Authors were asked to explain if legacy resources, as well as “minority” records are covered by this policy and if legacy resources were included during computation of their lameness statistics. A question was also asked about the amount of DNS traffic hitting AFRINIC NS as a result of lame DNS records.
- Authors stated that “minority” records are outside AFRINIC control (those are from other RIRs) and cannot be provided for in the proposal, and that legacy resources will not be treated special in anyway either – and that if there are rdns records for legacy resources, they too will be checked the same way.
- A concern was raised about why this proposal has been co-authored by 2 AFRINIC staff – noting that because of this very reason, the proposal appears to be addressing an operational level matter – perhaps negating the need for the policy proposal in the first place.
- Authors noted that the proposal addresses the need to auto-delete lame DNS records from the WHOIS database, and that because these records were created by members, the same members need to authorize any actions by AFRINIC to remove those records from the WHOIS database; and the only way for members to authorize is through the PDP. The action by staff is also meant to sensitize the community on the need to have a clean whois database, which is the ultimate goal.
- The process of whois object cleaning should be separated from that of lame DNS delegation removal.
- A question about workload on staff was raised and experiences from other RIRs on the lameness process. ARIN responded that it was never implemented due to ambiguous definitions of lameness. APNIC said the workload involved in implementing such a policy would be non-trivial.

**Co-Chair Decision: *No Consensus – proposal goes back to list for further discussion.***

## **5.0 Policy Proposal: AFPUB-2017-V4-002-DRAFT-01 Route Aggregation Policy**

The author made the following remarks on the proposal above:

- Although the routing table size cannot be currently decreased or improved, it can still be enlarged through RIR allocation practices.
- To avoid further enlarging it, AFRINIC needs to aggregate approved requests, by treating multiple requests from one member as one request, evaluate them at once and issue resources at once for all.

Remarks and comments from delegates:

- The proposal appears unneeded since we are in the process of transitioning out of IPv4 to IPv6.
- The process of aggregating should be best left as a staff effort.
- Staff already does what this proposal is putting in place and hence the author should consider to abandon the proposal.
- Staff indicated in their assessment report that the proposal is not implementable as written – and it is not specific enough as written, and that if the proposal were more specific about the amount of space to reserve, perhaps it would be easier to interpret.

**Co-Chair Decision: *No Consensus – proposal goes back to list for further discussion.***

## **6.0 Policy Proposal: AFPUB-2016-V4-001-DRAFT-04 IPv4 Soft Landing BIS**

The following highlights were shared by authors:

- The soft-landing policy currently in use (ratified 11/11/2011) does not make any distinction for allocation practices between existing and new members and does not make any provisions for supporting IPv6 deployments.
- This proposal addresses the above issues by reserving a dedicated block for IPv6 deployment. It also sets maximum issuable size at /18 in phase 1 of exhaustion and removes the /24 minimum prefix limitation.
- It also sets the planning window from 12 to 8 months while setting the maximum prefix to /22 in Phase 2 of exhaustion.
- In reaction to the staff comments, authors agreed to keep the minimum issuable prefix to /24, instead of doing away with it altogether.

Reaction from delegates:

- It is better to avail the IPv6 deployment reserve to new LIRs only.
- The AFRINIC Board should not be involved in determining what to do with the reserved block (in current CPM 5.4.7.2) and this proposal seems to address this matter.
- This proposal is designed to address the soft-landing spirit and intent of fair distribution and is good for the community.
- Concerns were raised that authors of this proposal promised to withdraw it at the last

meeting in Mauritius. Authors clarified that there has never been such a promise.

**Co-Chair Decision: *No Consensus – proposal goes back to list for further discussion.***

### **7.0 Policy Proposal: AFPUB-2017-V4-001-DRAFT-03 Soft Landing SD**

Remarks from authors:

- Authors feel that certain provisions of the current soft-landing policy are not consistent with the objective of ensuring that allocations are managed in the best interests of the AFRINIC community.
- This proposal sets a maximum of /16 in exhaustion phase 1, and disallows allocations (for a period of 2 years) to organizations that have consumed this maximum.
- Sets /20 as the maximum in exhaustion phase 2.
- Sets /24 as the minimum.
- Authors proposed to make some text modifications for clarity as recommended in the staff assessment report.

Comments and reactions from delegates/community:

- AFRINIC staff recommended rewording 5.4.4.2 and 5.4.4.1 to make them clearer.
- It was proposed that the two teams authoring Soft Landing SD and Soft Landing BIS work together to marry the best points from the two proposals.
- It was noted that averages (based on maximum allocation size) don't work well because the policy would penalize some operators over others, especially the large ones.
- Co-Chairs were asked to lead the effort to converge the two proposals into one.
- It was noted that on the issue of fairness to large operators, as this is the last /8 – it is not right to give a big chunk of this remaining space to a few large members.
- The community is not just ISPs but a combination of many companies covering many sectors all needing IP addresses.

**Co-Chair Decision: *No Consensus – proposal goes back to list for further discussion.***

### **8.0 Policy Proposal: AFPUB-2016-GEN-002-DRAFT-01 Inbound Transfer Policy**

Authors remarks:

- AFRINIC has the lowest amount of IPv4 space than any of the RIR regions.
- As such, when AFRINIC depletes its current space, there will still be a need for further IPv4 addresses on the continent.
- There may also be circumstances where companies wish to use specific IPv6 resources and ASNs that are unavailable on the continent.
- While the community has voiced concerns that enacting a transfer policy will result in the flow of resources off the continent, this policy addresses this concern by purely catering for inbound transfers, without allowing or affecting transfers flowing out of the continent to other RIR service regions.
- The proposal does no harm to AFRINIC and the community in any way. We only stand to gain.

Comments from delegates/community:

- This proposal should be discussed later, when it's actually relevant - and not now. It is not needed by the community at this point.
- Others noted that the policy does no harm to AFRINIC as it only brings in more resources, and therefore makes sense.
- The policy is unfair on other regions as they have less stock of IPv4 than us, hence we do not need it.
- The Policy is unfair to others because it does not allow bi-directional transfers.
- Authors seem to contradict themselves as they preach quick transition to IPv6 – a principle that seems to collide with the intent of this policy – by delaying IPv4 lifetime.
- Author should add a trigger to make the policy only take effect in exhaustion phase (author indicated willingness to make such a modification)

**Co-Chair Decision: *No Consensus – proposal goes back to list for further discussion.***

## **9.0 Policy Proposal: AFPUB-2017-GEN-001-DRAFT-02 Anti-Shutdown-02**

Remarks from authors:

- Over the last few years, governments have been shutting down free and open access to the internet in order to push political agendas.
- These shutdowns have been shown to cause economic damage and hurt the citizens of the affected countries.
- The Internet is a human right – and shutting it down will impinge on aspects of Articles 12, 19 and 20 of the Universal Declaration of Human rights as proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in Paris on the 10<sup>th</sup> of December 1948.
- If an individual or entity believes that a shutdown has occurred, or is in process, the entity or individual shall communicate this to AFRINIC.
- AFRINIC shall then appeal to the community for evidence of the alleged shutdown, and a two-week period shall be given for submissions.
- The evidence shall then be submitted to the AFRINIC governance committee for evaluation and adjudication and the committee is free to use whatever means they choose in their deliberations and investigations. These deliberations and investigations should be completed within two weeks of the submission of evidence.
- The actions shall apply to the government of the country in which the shutdown is occurring, and to any entities in which the state holds greater than 50% shareholding.
- In the event of an internet shutdown performed at the order of a government that is either total or partial; for a period of 12 months following the end of the shutdown – AFRINIC will allocate no resources to all entities of such government.
- In the event of a transfer policy existing, AFRINIC shall not assist or participate in any transfers to any of such government's entities.
- All sub-allocations and assignments of space within said country involving said government entities shall cease.
- In the event of a government performing 3 or more such shutdowns in a period of 10 years – all resources to all such government's entities shall be revoked.
- There is an exclusion from this policy for all academic and educational institutions, irrespective of their relationship to the governments concerned.

Comments and reactions from the community:

- Liquid Telecom, the authors of this proposal and also the connectivity sponsor - disconnected the internet at this workshop to prove the shutdown point, but the act is very unprofessional as the workshop objectives are beyond this policy proposal.
- The AFRINIC PDP is not the right forum for discussing such internet shutdown issues.
- AFRINIC assessment clearly states the proposal is not implementable – and we should not even be discussing it.
- The Problem statement doesn't fit within scope of PDP.
- AFRINIC does not have the resources to judge that a shut-down and its reasons were legitimate or not.
- RIR number allocation policies are based on needs, not political considerations, and this proposal is misplaced.
- Authors should revise the proposal to punish governments while minimizing collateral damage to citizens/end users.

**Co-Chair Decision: *No Consensus – proposal goes back to list for further discussion.***

#### **10.0 Policy Proposal: AFPUB-2016-GEN-001-DRAFT-04 Internet Number Resources Review by AFRINIC**

Remarks from authors:

- The proposal allows AFRINIC to conduct regular reviews of resource utilization held by members.
- All resources whose usage is not in compliance with the Registration Services Agreement and policies shall be recovered.
- Reviews and audits can be triggered by a whistleblower, requested by a member concerned, or initiated by AFRINIC at its discretion.
- All recovered resources can be reallocated at AFRINIC discretion.

Comments from the community:

- Correctness of WHOIS data is important and this proposal contributes to ensuring correct whois data.
- The proposal is necessary in these days of massive cyber security threats.
- Audits should be done in cooperation between members and AFRINIC.

**Co-Chair Decision: Consensus - Proposal will move to last call.**

#### **11.0 Policy Proposal: AFPUB-2017-GEN-002-DRAFT-01 AFRINIC Policy Development Process BIS**

Authors' remarks:

- The proposal is based on intensive discussions that have been happening about the current PDP on the rpd mailing list.
- Best practices from the IETF and the PDPs of other RIRs were consulted as authors

developed this proposal.

- Introduces concept of Chair & Vice Chair.
- Clarifies some matters like election and responsibilities of chair and vice-chair.
- Introduces procedures for appeal and appealable actions, while clarifying more on the variance process.
- Detailing of the consensus process and introducing different policy proposal phases and powers of chair and vice-chairs at each phase.

Comments from delegates and the community:

- Concerns around consensus decision by one chair, instead of two co-chairs as in the current process, were voiced.
- The new process appears to have many loops and processes, hence could be time consuming. It may need to be simplified to make proposal life cycle shorter
- A better illustration should be produced by authors.
- There needs to be a consensus process to abandon a policy proposal.
- Where there is a need for the CEO to make decisions (in absence of both chair and vice) – the CEO should not decide alone.

**Co-Chair Decision: *No Consensus – proposal goes back to list for further discussion.***

## 12.0 PDWG co-chair election

The Nominations Committee (NomCom 2017) Chair indicated that only one candidate (Adewole Ajao) responded to the call for nominations that was issued on 17 March 2017 and closed on 22 April 2017. Adewole Ajao was consequently reappointed by the community to serve another two-year term (June 2017 – June 2019) as the Policy Development Working Group (PDWG) Co-Chair.

## 13.0 Open Policy Microphone and Closing

The following were observed during the Open Microphone session:

- Policy Implementation Experience Report: AFRINIC staff shared a report that details aspects of the Consolidated Policy Manual and how AFRINIC interprets these aspects while evaluating requests for number resources from members. Members were urged to use the PDP to air any clarifications if they felt that staff should be interpreting these aspects differently.
- Code of Conduct: Co-chairs to maintain order within the PPM such that discussions are civil and all inclusive.

<b>Summary of co-chair decisions on proposals discussed during AFRINIC-26</b>		
<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Lame Delegations in AFRINIC Reverse DNS AFPUB-2017-DNS-001-DRAFT-01	No consensus; back to list for further discussion	
Route Aggregation Policy	No consensus; back to list for	

AFPUB-2017-V4-002-DRAFT-01	further discussion	
IPv4 Soft Landing-BIS AFPUB-2016-V4-001-DRAFT-04	No consensus; back to list for further discussion	
Soft Landing SD AFPUB-2017-V4-001-DRAFT-03	No consensus; back to list for further discussion	Withdrawn by authors immediately after meeting.
Inbound Transfer Policy AFPUB-2016-GEN-002-DRAFT-01	No consensus; back to list for further discussion	
Anti-Shutdown-02 AFPUB-2017-GEN-001-DRAFT-02	No consensus; back to list for further discussion	
Internet Number Resources review by AFRINIC AFPUB-2016-GEN-001-DRAFT-04	Consensus	Will proceed to "Last Call"
AFRINIC Policy Development Process BIS AFPUB-2017-GEN-002-DRAFT-01	No consensus; back to list for further discussion	