Date: Dec 26, 2017

From: Co-Chairs,
                AFRINIC Policy Development Working Group

To: The AFRINIC Board of Directors

Subject: Report on the Policy Proposal "AFPUB-2016-V4-001-DRAFT07"
                (IPv4 Soft Landing BIS).

Dear Sirs,
In line with the Policy Development Process, we would like to inform you that the above mentioned policy proposal attained rough consensus at the last Public Policy Meeting held in Lagos on November 30, 2017 during AFRINIC-27.

Co-chairs believe that the current version of the proposal (Ver. 7) addresses notes and observations made by interested community members that participated in discussions during the life-cycle of the proposal since the first draft.

The last call period was concluded on Dec. 16, 2017. Although there have been identical petition letters rallied by a community member during this period, we are strongly convinced that the rough consensus attained during the Public Policy Meeting in Lagos was in order, and have carefully weighed that letter against the history and evolution of all discussions from version 1 of the proposal to its current 7th version, at the URL below.

https://www.afrinic.net/en/community/policy-development/policy-proposals/2247-ipv4-soft-landing-bis-

The table below shows the milestones in the policy proposal progress;

Date	Milestone/Activity
09 FEB 2016	Version 1.0 Posted to the rpd mailing list
16 FEB 2016	Version 2.0 A complete new version of the section 3 and so the policy proposal now obsoletes the existing IPv4 Soft landing policy instead of amending it.
22 JUL 2016	Version 3.0 Maximum Allocation/Assignment size changed from /15 to /18 in phase 1 as per discussions at AFRINC-24 public policy meeting and follow on discussions on RPD.
14 APR 2017	Version 4.0 1. Updated version based on consensus from online and AFRINIC-25 discussions. 2. Formatted for direct insertion to CPM 3. "current Phase" replaced by "Pre-exhaustion Phase" 4. No more direct reserve for critical Internet Infrastructures 5. No more direct reserve for New entrants 6. A dedicated reserve to facilitate IPv6 deployment

27 JUN 2017	Version 5.0
	1. Introduced "Allowable Limits & Recurrence" – clauses 5.4.6.1 and 5.4.6.2 (a 24-month waiting period for a member that has received the maximum allocation limit per phase to return for more space). 2. Restored minimum assignment/allocation size in exhaustion to /24 3. Removed definition of "Core DNS Services provider" and other definitions that were not necessary. 4. Addressed most issues in the staff assessment report of AFPUB-2016-V4-001-DRAFT04
22 SEP 2017	Version 6.0
	1. Clarified 5.4.3 on the issue of demonstrated need applying to all phases, and in-line with other sections of the CPM 2. Reworded 5.4.6 for better clarity. 3. Reworded 5.4.7 to clarify some provisions of the /12 reserve (That the previous reserved /12 is replaced by the one in this proposal).
30 Nov 2017	Version 7.0 Last Call announced/initiated for version 7.0 by co-chairs with two modifications 1. Reword 5.4.7.1 to remove specific reference to "XLAT translators" 2. Add "including IDN ccTLDs" to 5.4.7.5.3
16 Dec 2017	End of Last Call declared by co-chairs.

Additional Notes:

On announcement of the last call period, there was objection to co-chairs' last call decision from a member of the community and those he rallied. Everyone had however had several weeks of opportunity to comment when the revised version of the proposal was put out by the authors in response to community feedback. Indeed, one of the objectors had indicated on the list that he was no longer opposed to the contents of the policy proposal. Again at the subsequent public policy meeting, the only comments received were toward refinement and these were duly incorporated before sending to last call.

Apart from the "petition letter" received on the RPD list during the last call period (allegedly regarding procedure), the only objection that highlighted a specific issue with the policy proposal was one in which a community member commented that the proposal to tighten restrictions will adversely affect multinational companies with large operations. Co-chairs inquired from staff and got the information that multinational companies are actually able to acquire number resources for their multi-country operations as separate entities so they are indeed not constrained to a single application.

Conclusion

Co-chairs hereby recommend the immediate ratification of Proposal (IPv4 Soft Landing BIS - in its current version 7 - "AFPUB-2016-V4-001-DRAFT07") as Policy based on its incorporation of the community's input and its alignment with 3.2.3 of the Policy Development Process.

Sami Salih, Dewole Ajao
PDWG Co-Chairs