

Request to Recall and Replace the AFRINIC PDWG Co-chairs.

Submission date:

July, 26th 2021

Requester:

Lamiaa Chnayti Email: lamiaachnayti@gmail.com

Supporters Names and Email Addresses:

1. **Elvis Ibeanusi** Email: ibleanusielvis@gmail.com
2. **Wijdane Goubi** Email: goubi.wijdane@gmail.com
3. **Gaby Giner** Email: gabyginernetwork@gmail.com
4. **Erick Joshua Lagon** Email: erickj.lagon@gmail.com
5. **Christian Orozco** Email: chresgoro@gmail.com
6. **Brian Sowers** Email: lunatunamapunapuna@gmail.com
7. **Meriem Dayday** Email: meriemdayday@gmail.com

Attn: Board of Directors, AFRINIC.

We write to ask for the current PDPWG co-chairs to be recalled and be replaced subject to the below reasonings and justifications:

The reasonings and justifications below shall encompass two (2) pivotal moments which will lead to the final conclusion on the urgent need for the recall and replacement of the current Co-Chairs. The issues began from the moment the Policy Liaison Team handled the election for the current Co-Chairs and it was never ending until the Co-Chairs further proved their inability to play a significant role during AFRINIC-33. The below reasonings and justifications are clear indications for the recall of the co-chairs as the unique solution to restore the normal operations of the policy development working group, to fulfill the RIR's commitment to a bottom-up, open and transparent policies development which is accessible to all interested parties.

A. THE ELECTION.

1. Due to the previous Co-Chairs being recalled, there is a need for the position to be filled in the anticipation of the coming AFRINIC-33. The initial position was to elect a brand-new duo as the interim Co-Chairs until a proper election is done during AFRINIC-33 where the election during AFRINIC-33 is done in accordance with the stipulated terms of the written documents, namely the CPM and the Bylaws.
2. The sudden implementation of the requirements list by the Policy Liaison Team to basically impose a set of requirements upon candidates to compete for the election in becoming the Co-Chairs. The requirements were nowhere stipulated under the CPM or the Bylaws which was suddenly imposed by the Policy Liaison Team. They could have elected the new Co-Chairs first and put this requirement through the proper approval channel as per any other policy which requires it to be proposed, discussed in the mailing list and being voted at during PPM to for the policy to achieve consensus.
3. But this wasn't the case, the requirement list was suggested and approved by the Policy Liaison Team by them declaring consensus which is not the proper flow and methodology of passing a policy under any of the written rules, including the CPM and Bylaws. AFRINIC had acted beyond their prescribed prerogatives and rights which was entailed upon them.
4. However, upon the declaration of consensus by the Policy Liaison Team, the appointment prospect of both the Co-Chairs were suddenly broaden and extended to a full term and no longer on an interim basis. The fact that this disclosure was only done post the announcement of the consensus raises numerous queries and questions pertaining to the intent behind this act by AFRINIC.
 - a. Why wasn't this decided and announced prior to the election?
 - b. Why wasn't the PDWG given the full picture prior to the election?

c. Were AFRINIC aiming for specific “preferred” candidates to be elected only to announce such position? If yes, why?

5. The entire process flow for the election can be regarded as hasty and the entire flow seems very convenient for AFRINIC. The hasty process would be acceptable to find an interim replacement so that there would be Co-Chairs during AFRINIC-33 and pending the proper election to be held during AFRINIC-33. However, when there is a change for the term of services by the Co-Chairs who were elected to serve a full term and the entire election process is a hasty, unprecedented and is not backed by the CPM and the Bylaws, rendering the entire process and unacceptable.

6. The candidates who were elected on the interim basis would have been able to defend their seats during AFRINIC-33, hence, establishing the basis there are no issues in appointing them on an interim basis. The only difference is that, they would have to contest in a proper election for them to be allowed to seat as a full-term Co-Chairs.

7. When the announcement made that the Co-Chairs were to be appointed on a full-term basis, there were numerous queries which were made against the decision and disagreements raised which were never properly addressed leaving those queries and disagreements being marked as addressed without properly being addressed nor answers being given pertaining to them.

8. References:

a. 26th March 2021, Eligibility criteria imposed by Policy Liaison Team (<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2021/012768.html>)

b. 9th April 2021, Policy Liaison Team announced consensus is achieved (<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2021/013018.html>)

c. 11th April 2021, Board Chair declared consensus
(<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2021/013052.html>)

B. AFRINIC-33.

9. At AFRINIC-33, there was a specific proposal “RPKI ROAs for Unallocated and Unassigned AFRINIC Address Space AFPUB-2019-GEN-006-DRAFT03” which the declaration of this proposal that it has achieved consensus proves that the Co-Chairs do not understand its duties and to the point which they were not able to determine the major flaw of the policy proposal and still allowing it to be declared as achieving consensus and blatantly ignoring the sanctity of the bottom-up policy.
10. During AFRINIC-33 itself, there were numerous disagreements, queries and reservations pertaining to the tabled policy proposal. These disagreements, queries and reservations were left unaddressed without proper explanations or resolutions being offered in order to satisfy those with the queries. Most importantly, there were numerous queries pertaining to the methodology of execution for the said policy, however, the Co-Chairs refused to address them properly and still declared that consensus was achieved.
11. The proposal in reality is incomplete due to the lack of the technical prospect leaving the entire application part of the policy being unaddressed. In essence the policy states that AFRINIC should adopt this policy and that is about it. The “how” should the policy is being adopted is being left unattended and during the PPM the Co-Chairs were persistent in saying that the technical prospect should not be a factor in denying the policy and therefore, the Co-Chairs during AFRINIC-33, despite the policy not addressing the technical part it was still declared to have reached consensus and the proposed policy shall enter the last call phase.
12. Throughout the last call phase, the technical prospect of the policy was still amongst the contentious matter and many of those within the PDWG were pushing for the technical

prospect to be addressed. Succumbing to the pressure, the Co-Chairs had requested for the Policy Liaison Team to provide input pertaining to the technical prospect of the policy.

13. The moment the Co-Chairs had announced the extension of the last call and the request for the Policy Liaison Team to provide the technical input it has established the fact that the declaration of the consensus during AFRINIC-33 should have never happened. By requesting for the technical input, the Co-Chairs have basically agreed that the policy was lacking of the technical aspect as the technical aspect is an extremely important part of the policy which the authors have failed to address.
14. By conduct, the Co-Chairs have agreed that the policy was lacking the technical prospect and the policy was in dire need of the technical input to render the policy as complete. The policy was lacking the technical input from day one and the policy needs to be inclusive of the technical input during AFRINIC-33 for it to be considered and assessed holistically by the PDWG and for the PDWG to understand the policy and how would the application of the policy will take place and how it will impact AFRINIC as a whole. Without the ability to access the policy as a whole it would put the entire process of passing the policy as flawed.
15. The policy was in fact problematic and incomplete since the day it was proposed and the authors have made a dire error in refusing to address the technical prospect of the policy. The fact that despite this being a major setback onto the policy and its ability in being properly implemented and the numerous concerns raised pertaining to it with direct regards to the missing of the technical prospect the Co-Chairs still declared that the policy had achieved consensus. How the policy was able to achieve consensus despite this glaring flaw is baffling.
16. This shows the lack of understanding by the Co-Chairs of what a policy is and how a policy should be drafted. Their inability to detect the need of the technical prospect from the very beginning to the point where they declared consensus, including the recent declaration of consensus and the proposal being submitted to the Board for ratification

raised a serious flaw of the basics by the Co-Chairs on handling policy related matter or it is a blatant ignorance of these requirements in order to simply allow for the policy to be approved despite its obvious flaws. Either way, it is a clear demarcation that the Co-Chairs are ill equipped.

17. References:

- a. June 4th, declaration of consensus and entry into last call;
<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2021/013214.html>
- b. June 17th, extension of last call and the request of the technical input from the Policy Liaison Team;
<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2021/013339.html>
- c. June 29th, issuance of the technical input by the Policy Liaison Team
<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2021/013399.html>
- d. July 21st, declaration of the end of last call by the Co-Chairs;
<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2021/013580.html>
- e. July 21st, a call for the Board to ratify the policy by the Co-Chairs.
<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2021/013581.html>

C. CONCLUSION

18. In conclusion, based on the above points which were raised and addressed, issues are shown from the moment the election was held to the point during AFRINIC-33 the Co-Chairs showed a clear inability to perform their duties effectively and to comply with the required terms of the CPM and the Bylaws.

19. The Co-Chairs whom the PDWG relies on to ensure that a policy is drafted, accessed and passed in accordance with the CPM and they are expected to fully uphold the sanctity of the CPM had failed to do so and had clearly violated their primary duty in order for certain sets of policies to be passed without the proper consideration of the due process and the requirements which it contains.

20. We hereby urge the Board to fully consider this complaint/application and to take the right actions in recalling and replacing the Co-Chairs in order to protect the sanctity of the CPM and the Bylaws. Failure to do so will allow for the further abuse of the CPM and policy making process, including the blatant ignorant of the bottoms up practice.