

Minutes of AfriNIC-12 Public Policy Meeting

(3rd June 2010, Serena Hotel, Kigali - Rwanda)

Discussion Leaders

1. Vincent Ngundi [VN]
2. Paulos Nyirenda [PN]
3. Douglas Oyango [DO]
4. S. Monesammy [SM]

1.0 Agenda

1. Opening presentation by PDP-MG chair (Vincent Ngundi).
2. Policy Proposal Presentations and Discussions

1.1 Opening Presentation by PDP-MG Chair

The current chair of the PDP-MG, Mr. Vincent Ngundi gave a presentation titled "The AfriNIC Policy Development Process: Why You Should Get Involved" in which he laid out the principles of the PDP, how it works, why the community should get involved in it and how to get involved.

There-after, he laid out the agenda for the presentation and deliberation on policy proposals as follows:

1. The IPv4 Softlanding Proposal by Douglas Oyango
2. The New Policy Development Process proposal by S. Monesammy
3. The Abuse Contact Information in Whois Database by Tobias Knech.

1.1.1 The IPv4 Softlanding Proposal Presentation and Discussions

Douglas Onyango took the stage and gave a brief presentation of the proposal, beginning with its objectives (strategy for allocation and maintenance of AfriNIC's final /8 block of IPv4 from IANA which increases the lifespan of IPv4 to ensure a smooth transition to IPv6), brief summary of the proposal and which current policies were affected by the proposal ([The IPv4 Address Allocation Policy](#) and [Current Allocation and Assignment Period of 12 Months](#))

Discussions

McTim wanted to know whether the the author envisioned any consequences for an LIR that uses more than 10% of resources outside the region in contravention to the proposal. He also stated that this proposal changes the philosophy of allocating resources based on need.

In response to the first issue, the author said that enforcement of the proposal will be left to AfriNIC Ltd. As for the second issue, the author said this proposal's allocation is still needs-based but within new limits. It is an exceptional case for an exceptional situation for which the liberal status-quo is not suitable.

Alan Barret wanted clarification of the about the 10% of resources that could be used outside the region, whether it is it 10% of all AfriNIC's resources or 10% of each LIR's allocation.

The author clarified the 10% is per LIR and that policy will be updated to reflect this.

Owen DeLong noted that by automatically giving LIRs an IPv6 allocation with each IPv4 allocation, this proposal might end up giving LIRs several IPv6 allocations that they might not need.

In response, the author clarified, automatic v6 allocations only apply to the first allocation, not to subsequent ones.

Mouhamet Diop asked when this policy (if implemented) ends. This question was further buttressed by John Walubengo who specifically asked what happens to IPv4 addresses that freed up as IPv6 takes hold.

The author responded that the policy ends when the last /8 runs out. He further clarified that other addresses out of the last /8 gotten from IANA are not addressed by this proposal and a new policy may need to be put up to cover those.

Still on the issue of recovered space, Alain Aina wanted to know whether the recovery of IPv4 space would postpone the start of the Exhaustion phase that this proposal specifies. Secondly, he wanted to know how this affects the allocations to end-users by AfriNIC.

Author said the details of how this proposal affects the end-user have not been developed. Author was expecting more inputs on mailing list. Secondly, another reason the policy deliberately doesn't cover assignments to end-sites is that the author did not want the proposal to address too many different concerns.

Alain Aina raised an objection to the proposal's incentive ... "to extend the lifetime of IPv4". He pointed out that the real incentive was to keep some IPv4 addresses available to facilitate various [possible unknown] transition mechanisms that may evolve in the future.

Mark Elkins further clarified that the 10% he proposed is per allocation to an LIR. He also said that by the time this policy comes into effect, other regions would have run out of IPv4 addresses for about a year. Supporting this proposal or something similar is the right thing to do. He also did not see the need to explicitly tie in IPv6 to the proposal since by the time the policy takes effect; any one who isn't already using IPv6 will be in trouble.

The author said the point of latching IPv6 on to this proposal was to explicitly encourage/push its uptake. He acknowledged that IPv6 was not very significant to this proposal.

Alan Barret supported made the following suggestions:

1. He supported Mark's point of 10% external use being imposed on each allocation that an LIR gets.
2. With respect to the effect of recovered v4 space, he said that was irrelevant and recommended that exhaustion phase remain in place till a new proposal comes up to handle that eventuality.
3. He also recommended that all mention of v6 be removed from this proposal unless to say that "no one can get more assignments under this policy till it shows it has v6 allocation".
4. He pointed out that section 8, gives new responsibilities to the board which they (board) currently don't have (making a decision to replenish the pool).
5. The change of assignment period from 12 to 8 months be made to apply not only to exhaustion but also to the current phase.

Referring to the last point, Vincent said that it required changing an existing policy and so could not be done from within this policy. Alan countered that this was allowed since every proposal was indeed a modification of the policies in existence. The counsel of Ashok, AfriNIC's legal counsel

was called in and he said concurred with the MG chair that the objectives of the current proposal cannot just change the content of another policy and doing that deprives the community of an opportunity to go through various ramifications of such a change. Such a change will have to go through the policy development process.

Nii Quaynor advocated that if we get our last allocation using normal principles (no rationing), then perhaps we should also use normal allocations.

In response Vincent said that because there is a policy for the last /8 to RIRs, then we also need to use different rules.

Scot Leibrand clarified that since there will still be resources from allocations other than last /8 ... then there'll be two concurrent rules and so new resources becoming available will be handled by current rules in the existing policy thus a new policy will not be required.

The author agreed and clarified that when this proposal kicks in, it will not obsolete the current policy.

Auwal Tata said /24 min size is too small to be useful to an LIR and that this proposal unnecessarily prolongs lifespan of v4 and might encourage use of NAT. He advocated that we run through v4 till then end and then people will be forced to move to v6.

The author said that with the last /8, we would have exceptional case (limitation of supply from IANA) which warrants exceptional circumstances (an equivalent change from the status quo)

Alain Aina again concurred with Vincent Ngundi about the fact that this policy was a result of a global policy on the distribution of the last /8 blocks from IANA to the RIRs. Addressing Tata's question, he said the policy says that during the exhaustion period, an LIR could get a /24 and maximum of /23. He also volunteered to send text for new "Incentive" section of the proposal.

McTim said that the proposal tries to address too much but has laudable goals which should be addressed through different proposals (e.g. the 10% clause to keep AfriNIC resources within the AfriNIC service region).

Badru Ntege, suggested that rather than remove all references to v6, the wording should be modified to replace "shall" with "may".

Alan Barret on the IPv6 issue said that the policy could result in an LIR getting more IPv6 that they really need especially if they already have an IPv6 allocation. Will send text about being clear about concurrent v6 allocations. Concerning the fact that two policies will run simultaneously when exhaustion phase sets in, Alan noted that such a situation will be unfair to large LIRs whose request (for a /16) cannot be met from existing pools and so end up getting a /23 from exhaustion pool whereas another LIR that needs a /18 may get it because the existing pool can satisfy his need.

Mark Elkins stated that the policy proposal essentially makes the last /8 unallocateable because it limits each LIR to a /21 and unless there are many LIRs, most of the space will be unallocateable.

In response, Alain Barret and Vincent said when that situation arises, a new policy could be proposed to deal with it.

Ernest from AfriNIC informed the community that Legacy space re-distribution by NRO may generate about 400 /16s which could be allocated to RIRs. He also mentioned that the utilisation of 96/8 block is quite low (end users only) and so there'll be a lot of that block left.

Adiel Akplogan from AfriNIC stressed the importance of the policy to be very clear as to the limits between the current policy and the new policy because the AfriNIC registration services

agreement [RSA) stipulates that allocations are on a needs-basis and so AfriNIC is contractually obligated to allocate the resources a member needs so long as those resources exist. Vincent clarified that the section 5 is clear about that situation. Adiel still stated that he did not think it was clear enough and so Vincent said the counsel of the legal advisor will be sought.

Conclusion:

The PDP-MG chair declared that there was consensus and the proposal be sent to Last Call subject to incorporations of texts from community and that the last call will start once text modifications suggested have been made. An explicit call for reservations against this position was made by the MG chair and there was none

1.1.2 Abuse Contact Information in Whois

The proposal was presented by Dr. Paulos Nyirenda on behalf of the author. In summary, the proposal seeks to create and add a mandatory reference to an IRT object in inetnum, inet6num and as-num objects as the single point of information for abuse contact information. The proposal also calls for deleting abuse-mailbox in all non-IRT objects and for cleanup to start in 2011.

Discussions:

Alan Barret recommended that the use of the IRT object optional rather than mandatory.

McTim said this proposal adds a lot of complexity to a problem that African LIRs haven't identified as a problem. He supported that the IRT object should also be optional and an abuse-c would just be as useful.

Alan Barret again took the podium and said that the IRT is too complicated and not every LIR can do that as it might involve use of PGP. An abuse-c contact should be sufficient and can optionally point to the IRT object. If it is optional, then perhaps this can be done internally without a policy.

Ernest Byaruhanga, AfriNIC's Registration Services manager informed the audience that to implement as written will take at least 60 working days, as this will involve modification of new membership process, MyAfriNIC, registration forms as well as training material.

In response to the above, the author (through the chat room) said that the proposal will only be useful if the IRT object is made mandatory and that there is no requirement to use PGP (which is how RIPE currently has it implemented) so it is not as complex as alluded to by Alan Barret.

Mark Elkins reported that LACNIC uses abuse-c and person objects and the same could be done at AfriNIC in less time to serve same purpose. Giving his reasons for why IRT should not be mandatory, he said there are already several contact objects and some organisations can choose to use those. Also, if it is optional, then people who do fill it will put good information which will make the quality of the database better. If made mandatory, people can fill in rubbish which reduces database quality.

Alain Aina said we really need abuse_c and it needs to be made mandatory otherwise no one will use it. Going for abuse_c on person object is not good. He proposed the abuse_c attribute be rather added to inet, inet6num and as-num objects or even into the org-id objects.

Alan Barret clarified that he wasn't opposed to IRT but he was opposed to the object being compulsory. It should be possible for the other contact objects to refer to IRT but not be made compulsory.

Ernest said to implement the proposals as it is, details of the attributes of the IRT object will need to be defined.

Owen Delong said that making fields that people may not want to use mandatory will reduce database quality because people will put inaccurate information and so a side-effect of this proposal will be to decrease database quality.

Ingrid Widje of the RIPE-NCC clarified that in RIPE, IRT objects were optional and not mandatory.

Decision

The PDP-MG chair declared that there was no consensus and as such the proposal goes back to mailing list for further discussion.

1.1.3 Policy Development in the AfriNIC Service Region

A summary of the proposal was presented by Subramanian Moonesammy to highlight the improvements of his proposal on the current one. To give context to this proposal, Vincent Ngundi gave a brief overview of the policy development process and how it works in the AfriNIC service region.

SM began by pointing out that only a few members of the community really discuss proposals and made it clear that while this proposal will make the process better, it alone will not solve the problem. He however discussed some differences from the current policy:

- Making allowance for emergencies rather than wait for one of the twice-yearly face-to-face meetings to address.
- Introduction of means to address conflicts with the decisions of the PDP-MG chairs.

A copy of the presentation can be accessed http://meeting.afriNIC.net/afriNIC-12/images/stories/presentations/d2_afriNIC12pdp.pdf

Following the author's presentation, the PDP-MG chair gave highlights of online discussions leading to the meeting.

Discussions

Douglas Onyango raised the following issues:

- Referred to point 5, the proposal doesn't explicitly say who should post the proposal to the mailing list.
- Referring to expiry of proposals after 1 year without change of versions, what happens to a proposal that goes for say 9 months without exception, gets into Last Call which extends into the 13th month, what happens in that situation?
- Consensus is still being left to the discretion of the chair in this proposal and it needs to be more clearly defined. He also called for a flow diagram to describe the process.
- The author responded as follows:
- Regarding who submits, he said this is an implementation details and didn't think the proposal should go into such details.
- On the expiry issue, simply re-posting the document with a new version should refresh the document with a history to state that there is no change.

Alain Aina raised the following

- For emergency situation, Alain recommended that board of directors be removed from the request process. Only working group chairs should make that request.

Alan Barret also wanted it specified who will they ask and who makes the decision about whether to grant the variance. He also wanted the number of chairs fixed definitely rather than saying "two or more". He also volunteered to send text to clarify the proposal.

In response the author said Alan Barret's question is an implementation detail but proposed that the chairs could make the request to the rpd mailing list and proceed with variance if no objections are sensed to it. The final decision however lies with the chair.

McTim expressed broad support and wanted to know the transition mechanism

Owen Delong also wanted clarification about how "two or more". Also the eligibility for the working group chairs needs to be more clearly defined as well as procedures for replacing a chair in between face-to-face meetings.

In response the author suggested that anyone present at the meeting or remotely is eligible, however, if a person's identity can't be ascertained, they cannot be a member of the working group and also agreed to propose text to clarify that.

Badru Ntege wanted section 6 clarified, specifically how to determine attendance. He also said that in the spirit of the bottom up, no one should be penalised for not having attended in person at least two of the last 10 meetings.

The author clarified that attendance means the person's name is on the participants list for last 10 meetings.

Alan Barret proposed that the criteria for who can initiate recall of a chair should be that one has attended two meetings either physically or remotely.

The author responded that it was hard to authenticate the identity of a remote participant. Better to use Alan's previous suggestion to reach out to someone who has attended to support your request.

Paulos Nyirenda supported that remote participation also count and also wanted the definition of working group to be more clearly defined.

The author responded that the working group consists of anyone on mailing list, jabber rooms and in attendance at a meeting.

Ray Porzak: Concerning recall of a chair, the proposal does not allow equal access by everyone to the process. He suggested that a petition be used for this purpose that allows anyone to initiate a petition. This position was also supported by Badru Ntege and Alan Barret who further specified that if anyone can get 5 different people within 2 weeks to sign a petition, then it should suffice. Douglas Oyango also supported this position.

Janvier Nolai referring to point 6, if a person disagrees with the action of the working group chairs, who exactly should he address his disagreement to? The proposal should be very clear whether he discusses with WG or WG chair and not a choice. He suggested that the person who disagrees addresses his concern first to one, then the other if first option didn't work out.

Badru Ntege wanted to know how we would transition from current PDP to the new one should it be passed.

The author suggested that it be implemented at the next meeting following ratification. Dr Paulos of the PDP-MG clarified that implementation will follow the process that other proposals follow.

On ratification, first election will elect 2 chairs, one for 2 year, one for 1 year thus in subsequent meetings, there'll be an election for one chair for a two year term.

Decision

The PDP-MG chair declared that there was consensus on the proposal and as such it will go to last call after all proposed modifications.