

PDWG Meeting Minutes, AFRINIC18

Where:

Lusaka, Zambia

Co-Chairs:

Alan P Barrett

Emile Milandou

Session Agenda

| Session 1: 19 June 2013 | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| 1400 – 1405 | Welcome | Alan P Barrett |
| 1405 – 1420 | Overview of the AFRINIC PDP | Alan P Barrett |
| 1420 – 1530 | Out-of-region Policy Update | Philip Smith, Leslie Nobile, Sergio Rojas, Andrea Cima. |
| 1530 – 1600 | Policy proposal: Remove requirement to announce entire v6 block as a single aggregate. AFPUB-2013-V6-001-DRAFT-01 | Steve Wiesman |
| 1600 – 1630 | Policy Proposal: AFRINIC <i>whois</i> Database Clean-up AFPUB-2012-GEN-001-DRAFT-02 | J R Hountomey |
| 1630 – 1700 | Policy Proposal: Anycast Assignments in the AFRINIC region AFPUB-2012-V4-001-DRAFT-01 | Mark Elkins |
| Session 2: 20 June 2013 | | |
| 1100 – 1130 | Policy Proposal: No Reverse Unless Assigned AFPUB-2012-DNS-001-DRAFT-02 | Tim McGinnis |
| 1130 – 1200 | Policy proposal: IPv4 Address Allocation and Assignment AFPUB-2013-V4-002-DRAFT-01 | S Moonesamy |
| 1200 – 1230 | Policy proposal: Academic IPv4 Allocation AFPUB-2013-GEN-001-DRAFT-02 | Andrew Alston |
| 1400 – 1430 | Policy Proposal: Inter RIR IPv4 Address Transfers AFPUB-2013-V4-001-DRAFT-01 | Chad Abizeid |
| 1430 – 1530 | Policy Development Open Microphone | Emile Milandou |
| 1600 – 1630 | Election of the PDWG Co-Chair | Douglas Onyango |

Session 1: 19 June 2013

1.0 Welcome & PDP Overview

Alan Barrett, one of the PDWG Co-Chairs, welcomed participants to the AFRINIC18 public policy meeting, went through the detailed agenda of the two-day policy sessions and introduced the AFRINIC region PDP.

He mentioned that anyone can submit a proposal, post it on the RPD list for discussions not lasting less than 4 weeks before it is presented at a face-to-face meeting where if there is consensus, the PDWG co-chairs forward the proposal to a last call review period lasting not less than 2 weeks. If there is no consensus, the proposal goes back to the mailing list where the author(s) can perhaps work on revised versions of the proposals based on feedback received or withdraw it entirely. The proposal, after a successful last call period, is sent to the board for ratification and to AFRINIC for implementation.

Alan stated that anyone can subscribe to the resource policy discussion (rpd) mailing list and participate to policy discussions irrespective of their location or affiliation.

1.1 Out of Region Policy Update

Representatives from the other RIRs each talked about the policies that have been recently approved, and proposals that are actively under discussion within their respective regions.

1.2 Policy proposal: Remove requirement to announce entire v6 block as a single aggregate. AFPUB-2013-V6-001-DRAFT-01

Steve Wiesman from Accenture remotely presented this proposal, upon which the co-chairs opened the floor for discussions. The following comments were made on the proposal during the meeting:

- ARIN and APNIC stated that in their IPv6 allocation policies, there is no requirement that restricts routing the entire allocation as a single aggregate.
- RIPE NCC mentioned that this clause used to exist in their IPv6 allocation policy but was removed by the community.
- Some members stated that it seems the current IPv6 allocation policy is being misinterpreted by AFRINIC staff since it does not seem to explicitly impose a condition to announce an entire allocation as single aggregate.
- AFRINIC clarified that the clause as written in the current policy is interpreted to imply that if the LIR plans to de-aggregate the allocation and announce fragments from separate Autonomous Systems, it would be a breach and the request would be denied.
- Some suggestions came up about just deleting 6.1.1(d) from the current policy, as this achieves exactly the same result that the proposal is trying to address.
- Several people supported the proposal as written.

After consultation, the co-chairs agreed there was consensus on the proposal and recommended to move it to the last call period.

1.3 Policy Proposal: AFRINIC *whois* Database Clean-up

AFPUB-2012-GEN-001-DRAFT-02

Jean Robert Hountoumey stated that from his work in the Operations of the AfricaCERT which started in May 2010, it was discovered that many person objects in the AFRINIC *whois* database have e-mail addresses that are unreachable. He therefore found it useful to submit a policy proposal for AFRINIC to be able to request members to update their contact information periodically.

He stated that people have moved from company to company due to Job Rotation and Organizational changes. Staff are not at the same position they had when the *whois* was updated and don't deal any more with AFRINIC and those who have replaced them may not necessarily be aware.

Other causes of wrong contact information, such as phone numbers, major changes in Telecom infrastructure (more or less digits in phone numbers), Mergers and acquisitions and other unforeseen factors all lead to the *whois* database gradually getting full of bad contact information.

Jean Robert further stated that the AFRINIC Registration Services Agreement states that members should provide accurate and complete information when applying for services.

This proposal therefore asks AFRINIC to maintain accuracy through periodical database clean up as well as performing *whois* database information validation at least once a year or at the renewal of resources.

The following feedback was received from those present in the meeting:

- AFRINIC staff indicated that there is already an internal project going on with the main aim of ensuring that members' contact information is up-to-date and accurate. Some data provided by AFRINIC showed that about 80% of members contacted have responded and updated their information. AFRINIC therefore recommended that the proposal is perhaps not needed as it addresses something AFRINIC is already doing.
- Some comments indicated that reclaiming resources of members with bad contact information is too harsh.
- The AFRINIC legal adviser stated this is not harsh as it is clearly indicated in the RSA (Registration Services Agreement) that the member must keep their contact information accurate.
- There were several comments supporting the fact that if AFRINIC already is doing this work internally, and that the author should consider withdrawing the proposal and let AFRINIC proceed with this activity.
- Some felt that the presence of a policy will compel AFRINIC to conduct this clean up and be held accountable when they do not.

The co-chairs determined there was NO consensus and recommended that this proposal be sent back for further discussion on the mailing list according to the PDP, as the author plans how best to proceed on the proposal.

1.4 Policy Proposal: Anycast Assignments in the AFRINIC region

AFPUB-2012-V4-001-DRAFT-01

Mark Elkins as one of the co-authors presented the proposal. Mark indicated that according to current AFRINIC policies, it is not possible to justify the minimum assignment or allocation if all that is needed are about 4 IP addresses to deploy an anycast service from the requested block. The proposal suggests the possibility of an organization to receive a block of IPv4 addresses for purposes such as anycast or GRX. The issued prefixes must be used for the sole purpose of any-casting web or authoritative DNS servers as described in BCP126/RFC 4786.

Feedback from the meeting:

- The proposal does not incorporate IPv6 and should perhaps be amended to cater for IPv6 *anycast* requests.
- If the proposal is to incorporate anycast, it should not be specific over specific services (such as GRX as indicated in the document). It should encompass any services over anycast.
- AFRINIC indicated that several requests for anycast have been turned down because the initial utilization requirement for the requested prefix size is not usually met by the anycast space applicants, and this proposal would solve that issue.

The co-chairs determined there was consensus on the proposal as written and recommended to move the proposal to last call.

Session 2: 20 June 2013

2.0 Policy Proposal: No reverse unless assigned

AFPUB-2012-DNS-001-DRAFT-02

This proposal was presented by Alan Barrett, the PDWG co-chair, as the author could not participate in person nor remotely.

According to the author, Public Whois records are supposed to have information about networks visible to the public (other network operators usually) and it is evident that AFRINIC LIRs do not actively register networks of their customers and even the LIR's own infrastructure in the AFRINIC whois database, as they should be doing per the policy.

AFRINIC has a workaround for this so far, by issuing NO further allocations until assignments are correctly registered by the LIR in the whois database. However, the LIRs will comply if this denial of rDNS services is written into policy.

The co-chairs opened the floor for discussions, and the following feedback was received:

- The proposal addresses only LIRs and does not cover End-Users. Reverse DNS applies to both irrespective of whois database records.
- Many people felt it was a good idea for LIRs to ensure whois records are accurate and expressed support of the proposal.

The co-chairs determined there was consensus and moved the proposal to last-call.

2.1 Policy proposal: IPv4 Address Allocation and Assignment AFPUB-2013-V4-002-DRAFT-01

S Moonesamy, the author of the proposal, could not participate in person or remotely and Alan Barrett, the PDWG co-chair, presented the proposal. Alan Barrett noted the proposal introduces several revisions to the current IPv4 Allocation and assignment policy (AFPUB-2005-V4-001) with key areas and insights from the experience gained from 2005 since it was implemented and noted the following key changes (as summarized by AFRINIC staff):

- **Conservation** has been removed as one of the goals of the *registry system*.
- Removed the need for all communication with AFRINIC to be in English.
- Removed statement "Requestor must be an AFRINIC member in good standing" from resource eligibility criteria.
- Added the resource eligibility criterion ***"A minimum initial allocation may also be considered if an Internet Service Provider interconnects with other networks at an Internet Exchange Point in the AFRINIC service region which has an open policy. Additional information may be requested to justify the allocation"***.
- Added a recommendation for a **maximum allocation limit set to /10**.
- Removed the following clause defining what constitutes "end-user" and "LIR" IP address assignments: *"IP addresses used solely for connecting an end-user to a service provider (e.g., point-to-point links) are considered as part of the service provider's infrastructure. Such addresses should only be registered as part of the service provider's infrastructure. When an end user has a network using public address space, this space must be registered with the contacts of the end-user. If the end-user is an individual rather than an organisation, the space may be registered with the contact information of the service provider but with the end-user referenced in the AFRINIC whois database object."*

After some discussion and review of the discussions that happened on the list, the co-chairs moved to return the proposal to the mailing list for further discussions as the meeting did not fully understand what problems the proposal aims at solving.

2.2 Policy proposal: Academic IPv4 Allocation AFPUB-2013-GEN-001-DRAFT-02

Andrew Alston and Sunday Folayan, the authors, presented the proposal to the meeting. Andrew stated that the proposal is designed to make it easier for Higher Education Institutions (HEI's) to access IP resources and reduce the dependence on NAT within these institutions. He further stated that it encourages IPv6 rollout within these institutions (to qualify for space under this proposal, IPv6 rollout also becomes mandatory) and reduces the need to prove certain unquantifiable elements which may delay academic allocations towards getting IPv4 addresses from AFRINIC.

Andrew highlighted the following:

- The number of addresses assigned to an institution to be based on student/staff headcount within an institution, on a multiplier or ratio, but an institution has the option to apply for less space, or exceed the multiplier by providing more stringent motivation and documentation.
- An institution applying under this policy is required to provide documentation of planned and/or current IPv6 rollouts. Such rollouts must be to the edge of the network and NOT just the core.
- The proposal defines HEI's as de-facto end-users, unless the HEI specifically opts to be an LIR or is specifically allocating address space to legal entities that are third parties.
- The proposal does away with the need to provide detailed proof of infrastructure within an academic institution, since by their very nature such infrastructure is a requirement in the daily business of an academic institution.
- With the ever-growing use of WI-FI on University campuses, the requirement to provide proof of infrastructure no longer makes sense – it is impossible to prove concurrent usage on a WI-FI network until the network is rolled out and that requires address space, it's a chicken and egg situation.
- The ratios as proposed were increased from 3:1 to 5:1 after extensive debates on the RPD list – the authors are open to further debates on this number.
- The proposal does *NOT* attempt to deal with fees or costs associated with IP space, outside of the fact that Universities are de-facto end users. The authors stand by the fact that fees are the purview of the board and outside the scope of the policy process.

As far as documentation is concerned:

- The proposal does not eliminate the requirement for all documentation from an institution, it merely reduces the burden on the institution to prove things that are not quantifiable.
- HEI's are required to provide documentation on staff and student figures and associated documentation (information from student registration systems, published figures etc.)
- HEI's are still required to provide proof of registration and accreditation.
- A letter from the institution would be required stating that address space will not be used outside of the campus/academic environment – this prevents a de-facto end-user from acting as an LIR.

The proposal was then open to discussion from the meeting and feedback below was received:

- AFRINIC provided the following comments after studying the proposal:
 - The proposal mentions “Higher Education institutions” and “Academic institutions” in two separate clauses. There should be a specific definition of such institutions.

- Section 3.9 of this proposal is in contradiction with Sections 7.3 & 7.4 of the current IPv4 address allocation & assignment policy (afpub-2005-v4-001) by exempting applicants under this proposal to submit “documentation relating to the networks in question”.
- Section 2 (b) of the [fees schedule](#) states: “AFRINIC will apply a 50% discount to organizations which justify that they are official Academic or Research Institutions in their countries and demonstrate the exclusive use of assigned/allocated resources for not-for profit academic or research activities.” Section 3.8 of the proposal will be superseded by the clause in Section 2(b) of the fees schedule.
- Scope of Section 3.3 “details of planned/current IPv6 roll-outs, including committed time frames for the roll-out of IPv6”.
 - Should this check be enforced, say, when the HEI comes back for additional range of IPv4 addresses?
 - Should information on the planned rollout be submitted in the IPv4 request or in a simultaneous IPv6 request?
 - What should be the “committed time frame”? (Number of months?)
- Andrew indicated the willingness to expand the definition of HEI’s to make it cover a broader range of institutions, as the community requires. He also stated that a new proposal would supersede an existing policy if passed and hence there is no contradiction. About the fees, he stated that all existing practices and procedures would remain unchanged and no discounts are being forced. On the planned IPv6 rollout, he stated that that an applicant without IPv6 would need to apply and get it first.
- Some did not agree with the fact that it costs the HEI lots of money because of the delays in processing their requests by AFRINIC, and urged the HEIs to adequately plan for the possible time and delays that could be experienced if they do happen.
- Others felt there is a need to pay special attention to the requirements of academic institutions since a lot of research and development that enhances the user experience and growth of the Internet comes out of these institutions - and supported the proposal.
- Some NREN representatives also supported the proposal and suggested that as an additional requirement, HEIs provide AFRINIC with bandwidth usage as it reflects growth.
- Others felt that it is important to demonstrate the need for IP addresses, and using a ratio or multiplier kind of forces users to get IP addresses they do not need, while contravening the already existing policy of justifying need by way of documentation and planned growth, and hence did not support the proposal.
- Other points of interest and discussion were:
 - Matters of abuse and spam since there are going to be many IP addresses available to a student.
 - The need to burn through our IPv4 inventory faster so as to motivate migration to IPv6 once IPv4 is fully depleted.

- The need for the authors to make some changes, notably, the consistent use of the HEI or Academic Institution wording, and clarification of the usage ratios.

The co-chairs called for a show of hands to gauge consensus on the proposal as written. The majority of participants supported the proposal as written, with a handful opposing the proposal. The co-chairs then called for a second show of hands, to gauge consensus on the policy with the following two modifications:

- a. Changing the wording to make it consistently use only one of the two terms "Higher Education Institution" and "Academic Institution", instead of using different terms in different places;
- b. Making it clear that an organization may apply for less address space than would be implied by the formula in the proposal.

Most participants supported the amended proposal, and no hands were raised in opposition to the amended proposal. The co-chairs determined there was consensus to move the proposal to last call.

2.3 Policy Proposal: Inter RIR IPv4 Address Transfers **AFPUB-2013-V4-001-DRAFT-01**

Alan Barrett presented the proposal since the author, Chad Abizeid, could not make it to the meeting nor was he able to participate remotely. Alan indicated that the proposal makes it possible for AFRINIC region entities to transfer their unused or free IPv4 addresses to entities in another region that are willing to receive them, and the other way round.

He read through the entire proposal as written by the author, and opened the floor for discussion and comments.

The proposal received vast opposition with all speakers strongly urging the author to withdraw it immediately. No single statement of support was received.

The co-chairs determined there was no consensus on the proposal for moving to last call and advised it be sent back to the mailing list for possible further clarification by the author or possibly withdrawing it.

2.4 Policy Development Open Microphone

The following comments were observed during the open microphone session:

- Possibility of AFRINIC making a form of contract for legacy space holders, the way ARIN is currently relating with them and perhaps getting them to pay some fees.
- Possibility of AFRINIC encouraging legacy space holders with unused space to return it to the free pool.

2.5 Election of the new PDWG co-chair

Douglas Onyango, the NomCom 2013 Chair, briefly informed the meeting about the roles of the PDWG co-chairs, their term of office and the election process. He said Alan Barrett's term has ended, and stated that when a call for nominations was sent to the community, two volunteers responded, and they were Seun Ojedeji from Nigeria and Jean Claude Welo from DRC. He further stated that Jean Claude has since withdrawn his candidature and has at the same time endorsed Seun Ojedeji, and hence, Seun is the only volunteer up for election.

Douglas called upon Seun to talk about his background and plans for the AFRINIC PDWG. Seun indicated his willingness to serve as the PDWG co-chair and his availability to fully commit to fulfilling all the responsibilities required of him in this function.

After a show of hands in support of his candidature, Seun was declared the new co-chair in replacement for Alan Barrett. Douglas thanked Alan for the service he has tirelessly rendered to the community in various capacities including the PDWG and welcomed Seun into his new role.

2.6 Summary on the result of the discussed proposals:

| Proposal | Status |
|---|--------------|
| Policy proposal: Remove requirement to announce entire v6 block as a single aggregate. AFPUB-2013-V6-001-DRAFT-01 | LAST CALL |
| Policy Proposal: AFRINIC <i>whois</i> Database Clean-up AFPUB-2012-GEN-001-DRAFT-02 | BACK TO LIST |
| Policy Proposal: Anycast Assignments in the AFRINIC region AFPUB-2012-V4-001-DRAFT-01 | LAST CALL |
| Policy Proposal: No Reverse Unless Assigned AFPUB-2012-DNS-001-DRAFT-02 | LAST CALL |
| Policy proposal: IPv4 Address Allocation and Assignment AFPUB-2013-V4-002-DRAFT-01 | BACK TO LIST |
| Policy proposal: Academic IPv4 Allocation AFPUB-2013-GEN-001-DRAFT-02 | LAST CALL |
| Policy Proposal: Inter RIR IPv4 Address Transfers AFPUB-2013-V4-001-DRAFT-01 | BACK TO LIST |