

# AFRINIC22 Public Policy Meeting

## Meeting Minutes

**Date:** 03 June 2015  
**Chairs:** Seun Ojededeji, Barry Macharia  
**Where:** Regency Hotel, Tunis

---

### Agenda:

#### Session 1: 08:30 - 10:00

1. Welcome and Introduction of Sessions (*Seun Ojededeji*)
2. Review of Agenda (*Seun Ojededeji*)
3. Introduction to the Policy Development Process (*Seun Ojededeji*)
4. Report of Recently Ratified/Implemented Policies (*Ernest Byaruhanga*)
5. Summary of proposals under discussion in other regions (*Ernest Byaruhanga*)

#### Session 2: 10:30 - 12:00

6. Policy Proposal: Out-Of-Region Use of AFRINIC Internet Number Resources (AFPUB-2014-GEN-002-DRAFT-02) (*Douglas Onyango*)
7. Policy Proposal: AFRINIC Service Guidelines (AFPUB-2014-GEN-005-DRAFT-01) (*withdrawn*)

#### Session 3: 16:00 - 17:30

8. Policy Proposal: Resource Reservation for Internet Exchange Points (AFPUB-2014-GEN-004-DRAFT-01) (*Michuki Mwangi*)
9. Status of the Consolidated Policy Document/Manual (*Ernest Byaruhanga*)
10. Policy Implementation Experience Report (*Madhvi Gokhool*)
11. PDWG Election (*Boubakar Barry*)
12. Open Microphone (*Seun Ojededeji, Barry Macharia*)
13. Adjournment (*Seun Ojededeji, Barry Macharia*)

## **Session 1: 08:30 - 10:00**

### **1.0 Welcome and Introduction of Sessions**

Seun Ojedeji opened the meeting at 0900 local time in Tunis, welcomed everyone to the 22<sup>nd</sup> AFRINIC Public Policy Meeting and indicated that the other co-chair, Adam Nelson, had resigned his position recently and therefore Seun would Chair the sessions singly until a second co-Chair is selected by the community, a planned agenda item later in the day.

### **2.0 Review of Agenda**

Seun stated that agenda item 7 (*Policy Proposal: AFRINIC Service Guidelines (AFPUB-2014-GEN-005-DRAFT-01)*) of session 2 will no longer be discussed as the author of this proposal has since withdrawn it (2 days before the meeting).

### **3.0 Introduction to the Policy Development Process**

Seun presented the Policy Development Process (PDP) to the meeting. He stated that the PDP is based on 3 principles of openness, transparency and fairness, and indicated that anyone can participate by initiating new proposals or discussing on already active proposals and policies. He went through the process that a new proposal goes through from the time it is authored, through discussions on the mailing list, presentation at the face-to-face public policy meeting and up until the time it is implemented by AFRINIC.

### **4.0 Report of Recently Ratified/Implemented Policies**

Ernest Byaruhanga provided an update on the policies that have been implemented by AFRINIC since the last meeting (AFRINIC21 – Cybercity, Mauritius) as follows:

- Anycast assignments in the AFRINIC service region (AFPUB-2012-V4-001): This proposal was a sequel to the original anycast services proposal, and was implemented in April 2015. It added IPv6 and ASN anycast provisions to the original proposal. As a consequence to its implementation, an organization that fulfills AFRINIC membership eligibility criteria can request one /24 IPv4 and/or one /48 IPv6 block and/or 1ASN for anycasting any of its services in line with the provisions of BCP126.
- No rDNS unless assigned (AFPUB-2012-DNS-001): Consequent to the implementation of this policy, all Local Internet Registries (LIRs) holding IPv4 and IPv6 address allocations can no longer receive reverse DNS (rDNS) services from AFRINIC unless they record all IP addresses assigned to their customers (and/or LIR's own networks) into the AFRINIC whois database. The policy was implemented and applied retrospectively. Ernest stated that the AFRINIC Customer Services team has been busy contacting affected organizations to comply with the requirements of this policy in order to avoid rDNS service disruption, which would happen 12 months after implementation of the policy.

### **5.0 Summary of policies under discussion in other regions**

Ernest Byaruhanga provided an overview of the proposals under discussion at APNIC, ARIN and LACNIC that could be of interest to the Africa region from the context of what is currently

under discussion (in the AFRINIC region) and the different issues that have been discussed on the “*ripd*” list.

#### **ARIN:**

Change utilization requirements from “last-allocation” to “total-aggregate”: Under this proposal, ISPs must have efficiently utilized all allocations in aggregate to at least 80% (and at least 50% of every allocation) in order to receive additional space. This includes all space that has been issued to customers of the ISPs.

#### **LACNIC:**

Inter-RIR Transfers: This proposal allows organizations to transfer IPv4 space from other regions into the LACNIC service region in order to build more networks in the region. It does not include the option to transfer IPv4 space from LACNIC to other regions.

#### **APNIC:**

- Modification in the ASN Eligibility Criteria: The proposal modifies the eligibility criteria for ASNs so that the absolute requirement to multi-home before an organization can receive an ASN is removed. Under this proposal, an organization is eligible for an ASN if it is planning to use the ASN within 6 months.
- Modification of IPv4 space eligibility criteria: This proposal would extend the criteria for end-site IPv4 assignments so that an organization is eligible to receive an End-Site (PI) assignment if that organization is multi-homed or inter-connected with provider (ISP) IP addresses, or demonstrates a plan to advertise the requested prefix(es) within 3 months of getting them.

#### **RIPE:**

Marco Schmidt from RIPE NCC provided an update on the proposals under discussion at RIPE categorized into IPv6 deployment, Internet Resource Transfers and Out-of-Region use as follows:

- 2015-02: Keep IPv6 PI When Requesting IPv6 Allocation: Proposal aims to remove the requirement that an allocation size will be based only on existing users and allows consideration of additional criteria for non-ISP organizations with IPv6 plans.
- 2014-04: Removing IPv6 requirement for receiving IPv4 space from the final /8: The condition that an LIR must have received an IPv6 block before requesting an IPv4 block from the final /8 is removed by this proposal. The policy attained consensus and is yet to be implemented by RIPE NCC.
- 2015-01: Alignment of transfer requirements for IPv4 allocations: The proposal aims to align IPv4 space transfer requirements with a 24 month “holding” period for all IPv4 allocations such that the LIR that transferred the space and the LIR that received it cannot transfer the same block within a 2-year period. This was put in place to avoid speculators (in the market).
- 2014-12: Allow IPv6 transfers: This makes it possible to transfer IPv6 address space within RIPE NCC members/resource holders.
- 2014-13: Allow ASN Transfers: This proposal makes it possible to transfer AS Numbers between RIPE NCC resource holders. This proposal along with 2014-12 makes it possible to transfer any type of resource within RIPE NCC LIRs.

- 2014-05: Inter-RIR transfer of Internet Number Resources: Allows transfer/exchange of resources with other RIRs that have compatible transfer policies (currently ARIN and APNIC). Implementation of this proposal is expected in August 2015.

Marco stated that there is no active policy or any proposal in RIPE that restricts out-of-region use, and indicated that as part of the impact analysis for proposal 2014-05, the RIPE NCC will only register resources if the network that will be using them has at least “one active element” located in the RIPE NCC service region. Marco stated that anyone can join the RIPE NCC PDP to participate and can freely provide feedback if the RIPE policies could have an impact to the global or regional operations of the Internet.

Ernest advised that most of the above proposals from other RIR regions appear to touch on many aspects that have been discussed in our region before and it would be useful if the community can consider similar proposals for better management of our region’s number resources in case they are necessary. He encouraged the community to pay particular attention during the policy implementation experience report for issues that need policy direction and where such policies have already been discussed elsewhere.

The following issues arose from the floor during question time:

- The two policy proposals (Out-Of-Region Use of AFRINIC Internet Number Resources and Resource Reservation for Internet Exchange Points) appear not to have changed much since AFRINIC21; the speaker wanted to know why time is being wasted on discussing them again. Several other speakers raised the same concern.
- Seun indicated that according to the PDP, the two policies are still very much under discussion, until a time when they are either withdrawn by authors, or if they expire in the event that they have not received any update in 12 months.
- A question was raised about why there is no Inter-RIR transfer policy being discussed. Seun indicated that there is no such proposal, and that the PDP is there for anyone in the community to propose it if they deem it good for the region.

## **Session 2: 10:30 – 12:00**

### **6.0 Policy Proposal: Out-Of-Region Use of AFRINIC Internet Number Resources (AFPUB-2014-GEN-002-DRAFT-02)**

Before he could present the proposal, Douglas Onyango asked whether the session can continue being led by one co-chair, instead of two, and proposed that this needs to be resolved before he can proceed, as a matter of procedure .

There was general agreement with Douglas’ concern, and some proposed that one of the people present in the meeting that is familiar with the PDP (and perhaps acted as co-chair before) could act as the second co-chair, until the regular co-chair position is filled later in the evening. Others suggested that perhaps the PDP co-chair election could be moved forward for the purpose of having two co-chairs.

Ernest quoted the provisions of PDP in circumstances where there is no-chair either by absence or resignation. He stated that the working group (community members present in the meeting) could nominate a chair for the session if one of the co-chairs could not make it to the meeting. Ernest also stated that the same working group can select a chair to complete the remaining term of a co-chair that has resigned, which is also an agenda item planned for the

afternoon. Ernest stated that the process to select a temporary chair for this session (and/or complete the remainder of Adam's tenure) can be done now, and called for anyone that wishes to volunteer (or anyone that can nominate a volunteer) to step up.

Seun Ojedeji acknowledged and accepted the view from the floor. He however clarified that according to the PDP guideline, there is NO procedural flaw in a single Co-Chair chairing a public policy meeting and also sighted AFRINIC19 as an instance of when such happened in the past. Alan Barrett also further reiterated some of the points made by Seun. The nomination then commenced which was lead by Ernest.

Andrew Alston and Hytham El Nakhal both nominated Mark Elkins while Christian Bope nominated Barry Macharia both as temporary co-chair for the session and at the same time, the co-chair that would complete the remainder of Adam's tenure. Barry Macharia accepted the nomination. Nii Quaynor expressed support for Barry to fill in and complete the remainder of the empty seat.

Ernest noted that because Mark Elkins is a Board Member, he is conflicted if he were to serve in the capacity of a PDP Co-Chair as a sitting Board Member. Other members present agreed that Mark's appointment to the PDWG co-Chair position is indeed a conflict. The AFRINIC Board Chair too agreed that Mark is conflicted.

There was a proposal that if there are two candidates for co-chair, and one of them is incumbent, both candidates can fill these positions now by default, and the sessions can carry on. Ernest indicated that this idea could not hold since the election in the afternoon is for one co-chair's tenure that is regularly ending, which could be won by either of the two candidates.

Ernest invited Barry to say a few words for the community to gauge his ability to do the job. After Barry's speech, a show of hands was called for those that think Barry is capable of completing Adam's term. His selection by show of hands was unanimous and Barry was selected to complete Adam's term and was immediately called to co-chair the sessions of the day with Seun.

With the session having two co-chairs, Douglas Onyango was called upon to resume his presentation of the "Out-Of-Region Use of AFRINIC Internet Number Resources" proposal as its author. Among others, he shared the following key highlights of his proposal:

- Current AFRINIC policies do not explicitly allow or disallow Out-Of-Region use of Internet number resources. This proposal if ratified will explicitly permit out-of-region use of AFRINIC number resources.
- It seeks to set a limit of what percentage of Internet number resources can be used by a member outside the AFRINIC service region by allowing up to 40% of the resources in use to be outside the region.
- It also tries to discourage organizations from other regions that want to acquire resources from AFRINIC for use in ways that are not in line with AFRINICs policies and best interests.
- The author does not seek to prolong the lifespan of IPv4 with this policy; rather, seeks to ensure that number resources allocated/assigned by AFRINIC are used by members from the service region to support their legitimate network operations, regardless of physical location.
- Upon ratification of this policy, out-of-region use of AFRINIC's number resources shall be permitted as long it is preceded by use within the region.
- AFRINIC staff at their discretion shall assess compliance, and using whatever means is available.

Before taking questions, Seun used the opportunity to welcome Barry and wished him luck in executing his duties, and also thanked Adam for the time he took to volunteer for the community till he had to untimely return to the USA to take on a new job and be with his family.

Seun opened the floor for comments and the following feedback was received from community members present (physically and remotely) after Douglas presentation:

- Andrew Alston strongly opposed the proposal (as he did when it was initially proposed) on the basis that the 40% is an arbitrary number without basis on how it was arrived upon. He also indicated that this proposal halts the growth of African companies wishing to expand their networks to anywhere in the world to any scale, which principle is stifled by this proposal as they would have to look to the secondary market for IP addresses, which would be a serious financial burden to the LIR.
- Douglas stated that while arriving at the 40% number, there was an assumption that an African domiciled organization would have the bulk of its network operations and customers in Africa and hence, more of the number resources would be used within rather than outside the region.

Other comments received were as follows:

- African region IP addresses should be used within Africa and none should be allowed outside the region, hence the speaker would oppose the proposal as written. If an African company has a huge multi-million dollar client outside Africa, the income from that client can justify buying resources from the secondary market.
- The proposal does not really limit outside usage of IP space because any entity outside can domicile itself in Africa just to get the space and still use it outside the region, hence the speaker opposed the proposal.
- AFRINIC should focus more on IPv6 deployment. It is pointless to hang on to and extend the lifetime of IPv4 space as it will eventually only be available in Africa and not anywhere else, hence could prove to be of no value when everyone else has adopted IPv6. Some members noted that IPv6 is still not yet feasible because CPE support is still poor.
- AFRINIC was created to support and provide services to Africa and African Internet operations, and any policy that promotes usage of space outside the region will be opposed. African IPs should be used in Africa.
- It was noted that to efficiently migrate to IPv6, there is still a technical need for IPv4 during the transition and draining this IPv4 space out of the continent, which is crucial for migration to IPv6 in a way, interrupts the transition to IPv6. The speaker opposed the proposal.
- There were suggestions that every request should be justified based on demonstrated need, whether this will be used in or outside the region. At the same time, there are RIRs (and secondary markets) serving other regions and if a request exists that needs space to use out of region, ICP-2 has recommendations that RIRs serve particular regions and this is the spirit to be maintained. Additionally, there are also similar provisions in the AFRINIC Registration Services Agreement.
- The spirit of the policy proposal is good as written; it does not however solve the problem it is attempting to address.
- Any proposal that attempts to expatriate Africa's resources outside Africa should be rejected, as this has set a bad precedent in our continent's history. On this comment, Douglas noted that the proposal is not expatriating resources outside Africa but rather, allowing genuine African IP network operators to use AFRINIC IP address space for serving out-of-region customers.

- There was a suggestion that if there is a global registry in place, the concept can be applied from the context of the Inter-RIR transfer policy, and make provisions to transfer the 40% suggested for out-of-region use to the RIR serving that region. It makes sense that the RIR where operations are located should be the one to register those resources.
- An issue about enforcement of the policy was raised as there appears to be impossibility for AFRINIC to enforce such a proposal even when ratified, especially for End Users. Ernest clarified that the only available enforcement method is through what the LIR has recorded in the whois database, and that if the LIR registers an IP range with an African Country but uses it outside the region, there is no way for AFRINIC to ascertain (based in whois records) that the resource is used outside Africa – making enforcement an issue. It is also not possible to apply enforcement to end-users (PI space) as there are no sub-delegations registered in the whois database.

After closure of comments and questions from the audience, the co-chairs determined that there was **no consensus** on the proposal. It therefore goes back to the mailing list in-line with the PDP, for further discussions.

## **7.0 Policy Proposal: AFRINIC Service Guidelines (AFPUB-2014-GEN-005-DRAFT-01)**

*The author withdrew this proposal on 02 June 2015 (a day before its scheduled discussion).*

### **Session 3: 16:00 - 17:30**

## **8.0 Policy Proposal: Resource Reservation for Internet Exchange Points (AFPUB-2014-GEN-004-DRAFT-01)**

Michuki Mwangi, one of the co-authors of the proposal, shared the following key highlights from the proposal and indicated that there has not been any new updates to the proposal since it was presented in Mauritius, but said that there must be people in Tunis that were not in Mauritius, hence the relevance and need for fresh discussions and perspective.

- With IPv4 exhaustion around the corner, there are many IXPs that currently have just one /24 but are looking to grow in the future (for their peering and admin/management LANs).
- The peering LAN at IXPs is unicast space that is not globally routed, but is visible to peers, a situation unique to IXPs. Else, IXPs can be used as transit points to ISP networks if the peering LAN were globally routed.
- The proposal seeks to reserve IPv4 space and 2-byte ASN blocks specifically for IXPs to allow them to still grow even when these resources have run out at AFRINIC.
- Not having IPv4 addresses to grow or start new IXPs would create unnecessary and unneeded routing complexity for Internet connected networks looking to peer at IXPs to further their network scope.
- AFRINIC already has an existing policy to make allocations to IXPs but that policy does not specifically reserve IPv4 space to ensure that there will be such, for future IXPs to grow and develop. In addition to reserving IPv4 space, this proposal reserves a set of 2-byte ASNs for use by IXPs for use at IXP BGP Route Servers.
- Proposal is to reserve a /16 block for future requirements for IXP peering LANs in the AFRINIC service region, and that AFRINIC publishes this block publicly. It is further proposed to reserve the equivalent of an additional /16 block for IXP management prefixes, separate from the peering LANs.

- It is proposed that AFRINIC reserves a block of 2-byte ASNs for use in BGP route servers at IXPs in the AFRINIC service region. The number of ASNs to be reserved should be the larger of 114, or half of the remaining 2-byte ASNs within the AFRINIC block at the date of ratification of this policy. AFRINIC will allocate these resources on a first come first served basis.

The following feedback and questions were received from the audience after Michuki's presentation:

- The proposal received support from several community members, some indicating that a few other RIRs have a similar policy either at the discussion phase or already implemented and in use.
- Comments were raised about the 2-byte vs. 4-byte AS Numbers – stating that AFRINIC does not have 2-byte ASNs anymore hence the irrelevance of the proposal. Ernest indicated that there is no differentiation between 2 and 4 byte ASNs, as all RIRs now have one common 4-byte ASN pool, and that it's possible that the authors referred to AS0-AS65536 within the 4-byte pool.
- Comments about the need for IXPs to consider IPv6 were received, stating that IXPs should set precedence by not reserving legacy numbers and should instead embrace IPv6 and 4-byte ASNs. Michuki stated that IXPs are there to connect both legacy and non-legacy networks, and that if a new peer only supports IPv4 or 2-byte ASNs (as may be the case for a foreseeable future in our region), the IXP should accommodate, and hence the spirit of the proposal.
- Some members suggested extending the proposal to ccTLDs and NRENs. Michuki and Nishal stated that IXPs have very specific needs as already discussed that are not aligned to the needs of ccTLDs, hence a new and different proposal would be needed to cater for other interest groups that want their reservation needs to be made by AFRINIC.
- There was a suggestion to split the proposals, have one specifically for IPv4 and another for ASNs that specifically addresses the 2-byte and 4-byte ambiguity (to have it aligned with AFRINIC policy). Some members stated this was not needed as it unnecessarily delays the proposal by another 6 months with no significant value realized.
- Minor changes were proposed and the authors agreed to make the updates accordingly.

After closure of comments, consultation between the co-chairs and call for a “show of hands” to gauge support for the proposal as amended vs. those that think it should be sent back to the mailing list, the co-chairs determined that **there was consensus** on the policy proposal, and that it will advance in the next step of the PDP, which is the “last call” stage.

## 9.0 Status of the Consolidated Policy Document

Ernest Byaruhanga introduced the Consolidated Policy Manual as an initiative that combines all active policies into one document that is easy to browse, refer to and update. The document was presented at the previous 2 meetings where the community recommended that the draft be shared with publicly for comments and all feedback be consolidated into an updated draft for final Board approval.

Information available to the PDWG co-chairs is that the document is currently awaiting the Board's approval. The Board Chair indicated that the document has not been received, and requested the co-chairs to resubmit to the Board for review and approval. However the Board



chair latter confirmed receipt of the document and indicated it will be discussed and considered for approval at the next board meeting.

## 10.0 Policy Implementation Experience Report

Madhvi Gokhool shared the Policy Implementation Experience Report, which contains an overview of the different sections of currently active policies and how AFRINIC interprets and implements them from the context of the issues that AFRINIC faces when handling requests where these policies apply.

Madhvi shared the following highlights:

- “Off-shore” companies: These have become many of late, and are mostly incorporated in economies where they have no infrastructure, neither would their legal status allow them to run any infrastructure or normal business in those countries, most notably Mauritius and Seychelles. It was noted that such companies tend to request huge IPv4 blocks for deployment outside Africa.
- Additional/subsequent allocations: A complete audit of resources utilized by the member is done, starting with routing status of the IP space to historical data that can be established. If members think AFRINIC should conduct utilization audits otherwise, members should provide appropriate feedback.
- The End-User policy (for PI space) requires initial requester to show existing current usage of /25 or prove that they will utilize half of what has been requested within 3 months. Most small sized enterprises do not meet the needs justification for this policy much as they want to multi-home and are able to acquire an ASN.
- Mergers and Acquisitions: There is no active policy for mergers and acquisitions – apart from a “guideline” document that was authored by AFRINIC staff, which does not cover many scenarios regarding internal transfers. There are several pending internal transfer requests because of lack of policy to guide AFRINIC on how to handle them. The community may want to author a revised proposal.
- ASN policy: The policy requires multi-homing (or a plan to do so). AFRINIC checks with provided peers (by requestor) for confirmation, although often times, those peers do not get back to AFRINIC, hence delaying the request. Some ASN requests include just one BGP peer, which also gets them rejected.
- RDNS: We do not offer rDNS services unless there are some customer IP assignments registered in the WHOIS database. We are teaching members the impact of this proposal as some of them have had their services interrupted.
- Sub-Allocations: We evaluate all sub-allocations unless the LIR has been authorized by AFRINIC to conduct sub-allocations themselves.

The following comments and questions received consequent to Madhvi’s presentation:

- Liquid Telecom had many mergers and consolidations done in the previous months which AFRINIC handled quite well, with commendations.
- AFRINIC should consider a REST API for the whois database such that LIRs that wish to integrate their IP Address Management Systems with the AFRINIC whois db can easily do this.
- It was noted that AFRINIC needs to clarify how the stated several pending Mergers and Acquisitions (M&A) requests (in Madhvi’s presentation) relate to the fact that there is no M&A and Internal Transfer policy to guide AFRINIC in handling these. Madhvi indicated that there is correlation and that if the community does not come with a policy to guide AFRINIC, the currently inadequate guideline will still be consulted.

## **11.0 PDWG Election**

Boubakar Barry, the Chair of the 2015 Nominations Committee (NomCom) led the session. He introduced the other members of NomCom, thanked the Board for the opportunity provided to NomCom to serve the community, shared NomCom's Terms of Reference and shared the process and timelines for the PDWG co-Chair election.

Boubakar shared the criteria for eligibility to the PDWG co-chair position as well as responsibilities of the co-chairs. He indicated that the call for nominations was on 03 May 2015, deadline for nominations on 12 May 2015 and publication of candidate slate on 15 May 2015.

There were two nominations received and eventually two candidates: Seun Ojedeji from Nigeria and Khaled Koubaa from Tunisia. Khaled Koubaa sent an email to NomCom withdrawing his candidature a few hours before this election, in which he indicated support for Seun – leaving Seun the only candidate for the position.

Boubakar called Seun to talk to the community for a few minutes before the community can elect him. Seun thanked Khaled for showing strong support for his nomination by withdrawing his candidature and urging the community to support him. He stated that he would continue to uphold the principles of the PDP and serve the community unreservedly as he has been doing.

Ernest indicated that the election of PDWG co-chair is by show of hands and by anyone present in the room. By show of hands, Seun was unanimously selected for a subsequent two-year term as co-chair of the PDWG.

## **12.0 Open Microphone**

The following matters were raised during the Open Policy Microphone:

- A member appealed to the community to look strongly at Intra and Inter RIR transfer policies of IPv4 space. The reality is that legacy holders within the continent want to transfer their space to other organizations and at the same time, when we eventually run out, there could be a situation where AFRINIC companies want to receive space from other organizations both in and out of region. Although there's an impression that AFRINIC still has enough space, it could take a few large requests in large economies to deplete all AFRINIC inventory.
- There was an observation that the community seems opposed to transfer policies because they appear to be motivated purely from the basis of monetary gains and draining resources out of the continent. If such policies can be written from the context of other advantages that could be gained by the community, perhaps the community shall be more embracing of them.
- With governments being the largest spenders in most African economies, it is important to involve them in the AFRINIC PDP, because they could internally take decisions, such as forming national IP registries, that AFRINIC will have to comply with anyway. Ernest indicated that there have been initiatives to dialogue with governments from the context of the work we do, such as the AfGWG, which meets at every AFRINIC meeting. The PDP is open however, and nothing stops governments from participating.

- A member suggested that the AfGWG is an excellent initiative and that AFRINIC could revitalize it by looking at what is not working and making it work better such that there can be more dialogue and participation from governments.

### 13.0 Adjournment

The co-chairs thanked everyone for their active participation and adjourned the meeting at 1830 local time in Tunis.

<b>Status Summary of Proposals Discussed</b>	
Out-Of-Region Use of AFRINIC Internet Number Resources	<b>No Consensus</b>
Resource Reservation for Internet Exchange Points	<b>Consensus</b>