ERNEST BYARUHANGA:
Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, it is now nine o'clock. The meeting should start now but we will give some time for people outside. Can someone get them in so we can start the meeting?

Good morning, everyone, it's 9:06, we should have started at nine. We should get going. The day is packed, we have 10 policy proposals, we have elections at the end of the day.

And hopefully very active discussions. Welcome to policy day, the public policy-making. We meet twice a year face-to-face as required as stipulated in our policy development process. The policy face-to-face meetings like this one happened twice a year, around this time, and another around November.

Welcome to everybody and I am glad to see we are half… The room has about half capacity, some people are having breakfast, or are late, it should be a vibrant day.

Today we have Dewole from Nigeria, a co-chair from the policy group, he's assisted remotely by Sammi from Sudan, he could not travel, he has a wedding on Saturday. He is with Dewole online. Let nobody say he is not here, you can see him.

I have another small announcement. Tomorrow is the annual general members meeting and in that meeting there will be some elections. It is restricted to members, although some observers could join them.

But for those who want to join in that meeting and do not want to join online, we have the member services helpdesk right outside where you can go and register yourself.

Most of today, we have staff are willing to receive you, early members. If you know you're not an AFRINIC member do not join the queue, you cannot be given ballots.

Your company will be checked, if you're in good standing, if issued a proxy, one member has given you a proxy to attend a meeting on their behalf, carry a proxy to the member services helpdesk so it can be verified. We will give ballots for the AGM tomorrow, so make sure you have fully exercised your right to participate.

So let's go through the rest of the day. Thank you.

DEWOLE AJAO:
Thank you very much. Good morning, once again ladies and gentlemen. I am Dewole, I will be your in room chair for the session. There are elections at the end of the meeting, this will be my last meeting as your co-chair.

Very quickly… Here is an overview of today's agenda. This has been circulated on the mailing lists and is available on the internet website, where… Some 10 minutes behind right now, we will try to catch up. Very important notes.

I really hope that everyone in this room is familiar with the policy development process and has been following the conversations online. This is just a quick description of the policy development process in AFRINIC, anyone may submit a proposal, anyone may participate in discussions online.

Today, we will be discussing some 10 policy proposals. The origin of those proposals is just like this. You submit a proposal on the RPD lists, we discussed the online for a minimum of four weeks, come to a face-to-face meeting like this one and you can see you are the public policy meeting, if there is no consensus it goes back to the list for discussion.

If there is consensus on that then it goes back to the RPD list for a last call for comment, just in case there are issues or individuals who did not get a chance to contribute.

If it is fine and the consensus is preserved, we have a proper consensus, then the PDDW co-chairs would send the ratification to the board of directors and the board of directors simply look at the policy proposal process it has gone through to see if the PDP was followed. If it has been followed then the policy proposal becomes a policy that the company, AFRINIC, implements and administration of internet numbers, resources.

We have been asked a question about this in the past, what happens if the board does not ratify. It would probably be rare since the whole process of doing this goes through a public place where everyone is aware. Whatever issue it is where the board could have picked up at that point, it will be before it gets to the ratification point.

So we will start with a policy implementation experience report. Please go ahead, Alain. Can I have that microphone active, please?

ALAIN AINA:
I am just curious to know how you guys made the decision on the order of the policy to be discussed today. Because we have not been in the discussion on the order or the policy to the discussed today, we saw any agenda the policy, you set the order, policy discussion. I want the rationale - how do you make it?

DEWOLE AJAO:
It is inaccurate to say you have not been in the discussion on how the order was done. A draft agenda was sent to the RPD of which you are a member and contributor. And comments were made regarding the order.

Now, the only item, the only items that something was made for… There is a policy proposal for multi-homing not required for ASN. We believe that is a straightforward policy proposal. If we can save time on that we can fix to other short policy proposals, there are two policy proposals from Jordi touching on the same issue. Instead of giving 30 minutes to both proposals, they are given 15 minutes each.

We could have had any other policy proposal before the break, but any time we says before a break is consumed within the break. We put them together and put it before the first break, everything else, the only thing was Jordi has a couple of proposals are. We don't want to be seen talking to Jordi all day, we get tired before they get to listen to other authors. I hope that answers your question. Please go ahead.

KEESUN FOOKERAH:
I will be walking you through the PIO. Sorry about that. We will be going through details around the recently ratified policies and their status. We'll be talking about experiences that we have been seeing and facing as we are working with the correct policies, and also, give you some feedback concerning the consolidated policy manual and some sections that might be updated, or that we think are currently ambiguous.

So, one of the policies that was recently ratified has already been incorporated in the current policy manual, but the implementation is still ongoing and it has not been completed yet. So, this is about the IPv6 update.

We had another policy that has been ratified. It has not been implemented yet, and it hasn't been incorporated in the policy manual, so this will be done soon and it will start soon.

About the recently implemented policy, it is not 100% because the deletion has not started. We do have a checker tool and the statistics available on the website in case you want to check it, and one of the reasons why we have not actually started the deletion, as you will see, the statistics last year was that around 19,000 delegations were present for 520 resource members, and as of now, there has been a very slow decrease in that number of delegations, and also, the number of resource members that are still being impacted which is about 400.

This is one of the reasons why we have not started using deletion.

Some of the feedback that was previously shared with the community, I know we are pointing it out again, is that the CPM still has sections that are contradictory, and people might be confused or take it as ambiguous because, as you might see, in some of the sections, we still mention implementation in policies that were previously applicable before the phasing, and other things are still being mentioned.

We considered the 5.4 as superseding every other sections of the policy because it is their phase we are currently looking at, but we still request the community if you want to go through the CPM again and check the section needs to be removed or updated, so we will be happy to give you feedback as and when.

This also goes about the 90% utilisation (inaudible), so that when they come back, that is what we give them, but the difficulty is that they are not able to show that, and as you already know, number four is the minimum we can implement, and if they have a secondary site, they cannot be eligible for more. Current members are being impacted by this.

We also have one challenge with the transfers, so right now, we do have members who want to transfer IPv6. This is being catered by cases for mergers and acquisitions, but we do not approve based on the policy, so for example, if somebody comes to AFRINIC and says they want to transfer IPv6 but they are not part of a merger or acquisition, we have to go through the current transfer policy. It limits them and they can't actually go for a transfer.

We would recommend merging the mergers and acquisitions as part of the policy, or, should we still maintain a separate?

We also have one section of the CPM where the sub allocation window is mentioned, so we are still looking at that, but unless there is a change in the policy, it will be maintained for a 12 month period.

We also want to point out that during the phase 2 of the soft landing, the minimum allocation size will go to slash 24, and as for other parts of the CPM, the minimum allocation is slash 22, so, going in, this will be obsolete.

Thank you very much. If you have any questions...

ERNEST BYARUHANGA:
Any questions for Keesun?

KEESUN FOOKERAH:
It is also on the website, so if you have more questions, you can come to me or any of the team, and we will be happy to help you if you don't have any questions at this point in time. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

SPEAKER:
OK, we would be going into the policy discussion session now. Just to note a few housekeeping rules, code of conduct. We are strongly advised to treat everyone else with respect and politeness. If you go to the microphone to speak, please ask the chair. When given the floor, please introduce yourself clearly, where you are from, and generally, the AFRINIC website shows a code of conduct in terms of behaviour, and please avoid giving remarks that are discriminatory. Any perceived personal or social differences. Personal attacks that are defamatory or discover nature we will not be tolerated. If you disagree with someone, please state your opinion calmly and politely.

We have a packed agenda. You keep your remarks on topic for the relevant part of the meeting. Respect the timekeeping, again. Respect language differences and give consideration to the interpreters who have to translate what you are saying into other languages, so try not to speak too fast.

We hope, really hope that we will keep discussions in this room today, focusing on the policy proposals we are discussing, not persons or historical issues that you may have had with anyone. Be assured that you will be asked to leave the room if you do not conduct yourself in a respectable manner.

Thank you very much. We will start with the first proposal, multi-homing not required for ASN.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
OK, so, the first proposal I am preventing today will be multi-homing not required for ASN.

So, the problem that we have is that, when the ASN assignment policy was originally designed, we had concerns because we have only 16 dates. Today, this is no longer an issue because we have 32 bits, and also, there was another point which is that, originally, it was suspected that only organisations which are multi-homing because they have availability, they will require ASN.

Today, this is not a concern. Today, it is perfectly valid for many organisations to have a single link, not the multi-homing, and there are still SLA's that they need. In addition to that, when looking at deployment, there is an increase of organisations that will require ASN, and they will get their own space. This changes the game compared with IPv4 where you don't need that because basically, you can use addresses of the provider and use that.

OK, so, what are the changes I am proposing for this? On your left, you have smaller letters. This is to have the reference, and I put bigger letters in the other column on the right of what I am proposing.

So, I guess this becomes… We have evolved the document from different documents and integrated it into a single policy manual, so there is a repetition of this text in other parts of the policy proposal, so it is explaining that AFRINIC is meant to be responsible for the policies for the region. We don't need to repeat that because it is in the policy manual already.

This means that all these points from 7-0 to 7-2 become short when we review that. In a sense, there is no change here. I am not changing anything in this specific part of the text.

Section 7.3 remains the same, no change at all. It remains the same text that we have because it is definitions that are still valid.

Now, in section… Because we have already said, there is some renumbering. 7.4 now becomes 7.2, and I just mentioned there the AS numbers to make it clear for private AS numbers, and the real change we have is at the bottom of the slides to your right in the red colour, so basically, what we are saying is that, in order to be able to get an ASN, you need to have either a unique routing policy or you need to interconnect with one or more ASN which require global, unique ASN.

If you need to meet the criteria, it is OK because maybe you start the preparation and you will get the links in a few months.

I think that is basically it. I have some references because we have the same changes, more or less, in all the other regions, so we are basically aligning our view on this, and in fact, I proposed a similar change in a previous meeting and it reached a consensus. I think that is all. I will keep this slide in case there are any questions.

SPEAKER:
(inaudible), so can you describe the technical need for requesting a network if it is single homed?

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
It will be in a few months. We may have started the process already.

SPEAKER:
Then they can ask for that number at that time? I mean, If I want to buy a car, it is a simple thing. I was the person who proposed the thing at that time, it is very simple.

This does not require major network configuration differences, to make changes. You get your number…

You know who your upstreams are. You ask for your number, these are the numbers on names. And then that is it, this is not a change that required 18 months. I have seen too many requests that say we want numbers. ASN is to define policy. If people do not have clear established rules, circuits will be lending, I see no reason…

SPEAKER:
You may have multiple billings.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
If you have multiple billings you have special policy. That is acceptable. Again, the only thing the current policy asks, if you mention the numbers, the people you are appearing with. This is a current requirement.

Your example works under the current policy. There is no need to change. The only reason to change it so people can get numbers, I don't know, there is no technical need. Even if they have private peerings, they say we want to peer, they qualify. I don't see any reason to change.

SPEAKER:
This is Alain again, I want to follow up. Seeing that when we decide the ASN policy, the main concern was 16-bit. This is wrong. Because we have updated the ASN policy. We did this, and we had a clear timeline when we start a location at 32 and even if we look at 93, the standard, ASN…

It is not any change in the assignment of the ASN and we updated the policy. So saying that, while we are doing this, it is wrong.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
It was one of the concerns. Having a number of bits, you need to be more conservative. That was one of the concerns.

SPEAKER:
We moved to this 32-bit with the same assignment criteria. That means the current policy, you are trying to amend, has been updated to accommodate the 32-bit. When we did that, we did not change the assignment criteria because there was no need to change that. It meant we had the first paragraph.

The second one, this kind of example in the statement saying… I can't see it online. To assign… We don't put this in the policy. No, this example, we have a large number, let's just get it out. I don't think there should be a problem statement for the policy.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
The problem is of timing, it is not part of the policy debts, it is just… You may disagree.

SPEAKER:
So many problems have been addressed by this proposal. I still have a couple of points.

As was said, the current policy proposal, it looks like staff had the wrong interpretation. Ct said you need policy at the locations, evaluations must be done following 1930. If you read it, it has claimed you may qualify for ASN.

So the policy…

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
You do not support the policy proposal?

SPEAKER:
I raise a technical issue.

(Laughter)

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Next please.

SPEAKER:
Jordi, let's look like you were doing a rush when doing this proposal. Firstly the title of this proposal, I think it is not accurate.

The equipment is not required. Second, item 7.2, point 1, you put an 'o' at the end of the phrase. It is actually contradict with what 1930 is saying.

It is clearly put when you go to… Let me write to you. OK. Basically it is the same phrase with the 'o'. When you put 'o', you mean having a unique policy is just an option. It is not what is being said.

The last point, I want to hear what is your understanding of (inaudible), I can see the difference between what you have put there and the old test, thank you.

SPEAKER:
Just keep going, I do think we need to spend so much time…

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
The Internet Explorer, I support the policy, it should be easier, as discussed, we were conservative when we had a 16 bit numbers. We expanded the number range and stayed conservative, maybe too much.

SPEAKER:
It is my second term.

SPEAKER:
One-to-one consulting, I neither support or oppose the policy, I have no problem with it going forward. But the equivalent policy has been adopted in pretty much every RIR and it has not caused the world to end, there is no sign this is causing any trouble.

I think making less friction for people to multi-hone and deploy internet resources using PDP and a mechanism that will allow them to integrate the larger internet more smoothly is a perfectly fine thing.

SPEAKER:
Thank you.

SPEAKER:
Can we get another slide up please?

SPEAKER:
The last bullet point alarms me. We talk about… I want to point this out. Do I understand correctly, considering IPv6 to be difficult, and then we have worked on 30 years to make possible, you consider it difficult? The numbering to the difficult.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Yes.

SPEAKER:
We have that on record. Is it the intention of the proposal that every organisation that wants PI space to go to AFRINIC, and I have an ASN number please, we introduce and even make worse the problem of non-aggregation.

Every customer getting their own prefix, and causing routing issues which are not solved by (inaudible). Though I understand the proposal correct?

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
The proposal is not changing the IPv6 PI, try not to change that point at all. I am saying if an organisation got an IPv6 PI because they had a specific routing policy they should be able to get an ASN.

SPEAKER:
I guess it is not clear. What do you mean with a routing policy? Please explain.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
They have their own routing positions, they run PDP and have different organisations.

SPEAKER:
What routing decision can you make?

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
If you consider that… It is obvious.

SPEAKER:
Is the current policy says mentioned two numbers, it doesn't say two streams, mentioned to two ASN numbers. Neighbour, number one, number two, is that correct?

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
If services can confirm they are doing that way, yes.

SPEAKER:
Hello. (inaudible) services. For the evaluation of the ASN request, if someone says (inaudible) give us to ASN numbers and they give us the contact numbers.

We would contact the holders of the ASN and get them to confirm. If one responds, the other one does not, we do not call it multiple. We have organisations that connect to the internet exchange point and as long as we hear from the exchange point, these are considered as multiple.

Considered in previous policy implementation reports, what we have observed as host masters, we have an organisation that comes. They say I would like to do PDP, I have only one upstream provider. I need a public ASN to… Write my resources on the internet.

They choose to have one provider. We do ask them are you planning to connect your exchange point that would comply, they tell us no. This is what we have considered so far.

SPEAKER:
Microphone, please.

SPEAKER:
We have considered this case, so an organisation that has only one connection. You considered then that the technical reason to have an ASN (inaudible)

SPEAKER:
OK, what we used to do, we ask the members that if you want to do it, can you use a private ASN. They say no, they would like a public one. Sometimes it is operated to need to be given a number.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Just for clarification, the skin that as a result of the policy report that came out of the last meeting, if I remember correctly.

SPEAKER:
OK, thank you. This is now closed. Go ahead.

SPEAKER:
My name is Pascal from Nigeria. I am looking at 7.2.2 of the proposal. When you say an organisation will be eligible, if an organisation cannot demonstrate and six months because the way I understand the text is that it should be able to assign an ASN, I don't think it is clear because if it cannot demonstrate in six months what has happened, is it revoked? I don't really know.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
This is generic. If you do not match the criteria, you are not matching it anymore, and that is an obvious consideration. I don't think we need to repeat that in every specific part of the manual.

SPEAKER:
OK, All right. Don't you think the duration of six months might be too short?

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
This was discussed in the mailing list. I think I suggested 12 months, the suggestions I got was that we should make it six months.

SPEAKER:
Just to add, I have just been informed that some ISPs, (inaudible) to create the object (inaudible)

SPEAKER:
If you want to create the object, you are just putting the AS, which is the provider. We still have the problem.

SPEAKER:
OK. Please go ahead, Sir.

SPEAKER:
My issue relates…

SPEAKER:
(inaudible)

SPEAKER:

My issue relates to removing our interest in serving think I need, establishing a need basis.

You are removing the value to evaluate, and I have strong concerns there. No matter what it is, I want to insist that we go through the process of evaluation because we have to deal in trust, and so we must commit ourselves more to evaluation of things, making sure that things are really in the form and the way that we have committed to identify in that way. I am very concerned about these kinds of things.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
The new wording is doing the same task without relying in a way that has not been updated in a long time. That is my view.

SPEAKER:
Please, let's stick with what we have committed to. We must still followed the 1930, so why, all of a sudden, you can't remove it? Let's follow the policies that we have. If you don't think the policy is right, we have to find the right policy.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Unfortunately, we did not have the staff assessment on this, but it would be good to have the feeling from the staff if we are removing any capability from them to do a proper evaluation.

SPEAKER:
OK, let's try to speed this up.

SPEAKER:
I think this policy will (inaudible) because of filtering roots in my network. It would be too difficult to filter, but it would be easy to focus on an autonomous number. This autonomous system number could carry multiple routes, so it would be easy for me to make a filter. As an incoming route from a single home entity or network. I supported.

SPEAKER:
OK.

SPEAKER:
To follow up on what was just said, look at 7.2.2, interconnection with one or more ASN which require a global perspective, how do you… How do you determine that an organisation needs a unique global ASN if you are removing 1930? Why remove that?

SPEAKER:
OK, last comment.

SPEAKER:
I think the reference to 1930 is a red herring. We can easily include 1930 in our considerations without having to have it in the policy text. It is how the internet runs. We references numbers all the time without calling them out of policy. It is not a issue.

The discussion is centred a lot whether you need an ASN in order to decide how to send traffic, and we are ignoring the fact that ASNs are used to deliver traffic, but we are also looking at prefixes, and a lot of situations exist with cloud providers, with IPv6 providers, and a lot of situations with how the internet is evolving where it is useful to have an autonomous system even if you are a single home.

10

So, I think we'd to take this into consideration. This policy exists in other regions and has not harmed the internet. I don't see a reason to oppose it. Thank you.

SPEAKER:
Thank you very much, thank you, Jordi. You may take your seat. Oh, the next policy proposal is you too.

There is no consensus on there so it goes back to discussion.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
I would like to say something which I think is important. We have got very fruitful discussion here, but if we have these discussions in the list, probably, we avoid having this presentation or we come here with a more global consensus, so please, participate in the discussions in the list because we are wasting a lot of time.

SPEAKER:
Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER:
Next policy proposal is IPv4 Inter-RIR Legacy Resource Transfers. Jordi is proposing to deal with the same issue with two options.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Yes, let me explain a little bit the slides so people don't get confused. These are two different policy proposals trying to approach the same problem. Instead of doing two presentations, I think it is much easier to have a single slide set because there is only one sentence of difference between policy proposals that I'm going to use two colours for the first one, blue, for the second one, red, so we can see the difference between bad policy proposals.

So, the first of the policy proposals means basically that we will allow only transfer for resources directionally which are the reasons (inaudible), if those resources are in the sense of outgoing within AFRINIC. So, we can receive any kind of resources, but we will be able to transfer only to other regions, those resources which have legacy.

The other one is what I call comprehensive. It means we can transfer directionally any kind of resources. Obviously, we are speaking only about IPv6 here.

So, that is basically what I just explained. The text in blue means this is the first policy proposal for the scope of this presentation, which is only legacy resources going out from AFRINIC to other regions.

Basically, the reason for having these two proposals is because I understand that there is a lot of concern which any policy proposal… If we open the door, all the resources that we have in the region will go out.

So, I understand that concern and that is the reason why I am doing to policy proposals instead of just one.

So, giving the opportunity for everyone to consider that if they had this feeling, which I

believe is wrong, they can consider the situations.

Right now, all the other regions have already in place a policy proposal for transfers, and all those have no restrictions. The last one was approved in the last meeting. They have resisted having transfers for many years, three or four years, and there have been different sets of authors trying different ideas, and in the last meeting, it was approved, and two days ago, it was sent for the ratification of the board.

That was the last reason I didn't have this policy proposal. Not having sufficient resources in AFRINIC means that you are challenging the opportunity to create new business that will need resources. Right now, you still have resources but you are entering eight or nine months, maybe 10 months, in the next phase, to the number of resources that organisations within AFRINIC can get are smaller and smaller.

The fact that you don't have this policy proposal right now is not disallowing organisations to sell resources and of the table, and this is actually happening. I have not been able to find exact names of organisations or persons that do that, but I know by the fact that some organisations have got resources from here, and this is not something I am saying, it was confirmed by many people in the microphones in the last meeting.

This is happening and if you don't have a policy, you don't have control of that. I think that is really bad because one of the missions is to have accuracy, and in this way, you are not getting that resolved.

There was one additional point here, that when you start employing IPv6, one of the best ways of deploying IPv6 is using things like (inaudible), and that requires that you have a small block of IPv4. It may not be enough in terms of what you have right now. OK?

One of the difficulties of deploying IPv6 is that some people, instead of doing deployment, or in parallel to doing it, they start using (inaudible) When you have certain applications like online games, when they detect you have IPv4 blocks, they put blocks in the blacklist and do not remove it from the blacklist. Unless you do IPv6, the blocks become useless and you will need to change them find new ones.

This is becoming a real problem. You need to have the ability to get new addresses and they have going faster with IPv6 deployment, they may not need the IPv4 addresses.

Again, we have two proposals. The first one, number one, it is only allow transfer of legacy resources. The problem with this policy is that as a result, you will be able to transfer resources to and from (inaudible).

You will be to transfer only legacy incoming resources and you will not be able to get incoming resources.

The second one in red colour will allow all kinds of transfers. That is the basic difference between what policy proposals. The blue one, you are protecting yourself from all the resources to escape. If you believe that, I don't believe that.

You will get a limited number of resources especially and understand why it is important. Resources incoming will not be possible, with legacy transfers only.

The way I designed the policy proposals, if they reach consensus because the community thinks this is good, I am happy with the other one, the number two, number one. It is not a conflict in the PDP.

Again, I have three columns. A column in black, smaller letters, it is existing text for the intra policy transfers. We have already today a policy for transferring addresses within the region and instead of making a completely new policy I changed small bits of text to keep exactly the same meaning of the word we have today.

This policy can be done for intra- or inter. That is the changes. The only difference between policy proposal number one and two, I remove one specific paragraphs, the circle over there. It says in the inter case, with the resources located in AFRINIC, in the registry, only legacy resources can be transferred.

That is the only difference between the policy proposals. The idea is to keep the same text that we have for internal transfers but allow to choose between transferring from another country or transferring from another region.

I am not going to read the text, just explain again, this is just a basic meaning we have with internal councils today. You see there is no difference between what policy proposals, I have used it for some of the slides. Some presentations explain why I believe you should not have the internal fear to start this now.

If you reach consensus on this policy, the consensus means two or three, four weeks from now, and then the implementation can take maybe six, maybe eight, maybe 10 months from now.

It is not something that will happen immediately. That probably will match, more or less, with the time when you get into the next phase.

Now, some data. If you look at the registry, the number for legacy, in the case of AFRINIC you have two. The maximum risk, we are through policy number one, this is the maximum risk and existing policy today, if legacy is transfer it is not any more legacy.

Maybe some of those have been already transferred so they are not legacy any more. So probably the risk is smaller than that.

If you look at (inaudible) they had 75/8. That means they are able to transfer a lot of the space just looking at the legacy. Under the policy number one, you cannot receive anything from that, the policy proposal asks for reciprocity.

If you don't have matching proposals, they will not allow you to get their resources. If you look for policy proposal number one, number two, sorry, in AFRINIC we had 4/8, in addition to the two legacy ones. The maximum risk to get resources out of the region will be 6/8.

If you look at the rest of the picture, of course, it is nothing compared to what you can get from the other regimes.

Now, what has been going on in the different regions in terms of transfers, this is out of the picture of the moment, it has been the last four quarters reported by (inaudible).

If you look at what has happened, provided one year ago in the first quarter one, 5 million addresses. 16.5 million addresses. It only got 111 cases from APINIC.

The region providing resources, there is not any imbalance. Other regions… It is more advanced in terms of deployment. It has more legacy deployments, we do not need any more addresses, let's go out.

If you look at the next quarter, the numbers increase. Instead of 16.5 million it becomes… OK, so number, but 5.6 becomes 8.2. In the next quarter is from 8.8. And 16.6 million.

The last quarter, the first quarter of this year, it becomes 9.25 million addresses to write, 16.7 million.

It is 111 one year ago, now it is 126K. And, again, there is still some balance. It is almost the same in both directions. So those are the numbers. Those are facts about what is happening.

While we may believe if AFRINIC enters to this market, let's say, the situation will be different. While we believe the resources will be got from AFRINIC now. They are providing resources to the world, (unknown term), there is no sense to have the fear become a problem for the region.

Actually this will become a solution to keep growing and allow us to deploy IPv6 in a more effective way and less expensive this is if we do not go to things like 464 it becomes more expensive.

There are graphics, this is a graphic... It is only part of 2018, it is not complete. It shows the total number of addresses transferred.

If you try to match that with previous slides it is the same. It is a quarter of a year, a year ago. It goes up, down. The second slide, it basically says… September of last year, this is (inaudible) degrees in the addresses, they provide the addresses of the regions.

Because the transfer policies in general states that when you transfer addresses they lose the status of legacy, it means that we are cleaning up the legacy thing from all the world. We are getting that legacy space because that legacy base, 30 million of addresses, they are now in the system. It is good for all.

No legacy space is going to be there. Everything is very clear, transparent, under the policies of registries. They are not covered most of the time by policies. That is it, basically. Questions?

SPEAKER:
The floor is now open for questions and comments. First, a response from staff.

SPEAKER:
Member services. Just a clarification, we do not have (inaudible) as legacy status. There are addresses with legacy status. And…

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
You mean the data is not correct? I got that from the webpage.

SPEAKER:
I will have to have a conversation afterwards.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
I don't think that changes the picture I am trying to describe.

SPEAKER:
Jordi, 5.733 is in the current policy manual. OK? It is not in this text here. It does not appear under the conditions.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
I think that was because when I modified that text as something that makes the same function in this page. I am trying to remember what it was exactly. The nice thing of having the staff assessment, I can do this in advance.

Transfers…

SPEAKER:
5.733, entities must not have received a transfer. Resources from AFRINIC for the 12 months prior to the approval of the transfer request.

If it is removed it well, the removal of this, what we will have here is in the policy manual and section, the conditions for Soft Landing. In there it is mentioned that the organisation should show demonstrated needs for the next few months.

There are assignments from AFRINIC. Is it your intent to remove?

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Look at the next page. It must approve the need for the numbers following existing policies. This text is not more needed, you have other sections of the manual that refer to that.

My understanding is that it solves the problem, into the following point, you see for an organisation in another service region, the relevant criteria will depend on the relevant policies in the destination, so what I am saying is that, in the transfers policy, instead of having a specific text for every kind of transfer, we are accommodating to the existing rules in the case of AFRINIC, and the rest of the manuals, in other regions.

SPEAKER:
OK. The way we see this here, a new member can come to AFRINIC, be eligible for resources, and the soft landing phase 2… They can apply for (inaudible), so they are complying with a need for eight months, and within those eight months, they can still request for a transfer out of it.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Which I think is right. If they have more needs, why not?

SPEAKER:
Yes, but when they are coming for resources, they demonstrate eight months needed.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
They demonstrate for a specific period of time, but if they need more resources, why they cannot do a transfer?

SPEAKER:
If they need more resources, they can be under transfers. That is right. 5.7 says source entities. They are sourcing the resources to be transferred out to the recipient.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
OK. I need to think about that. I am sure I have thought about this point but I don't remember right now what it is. If we have the impact analysis, it would be much easier again.

SPEAKER:
Something else, the policy, when will it become effective? While AFRINIC is still in phase 1 of the soft landing, the current phase with a maximum is attached to a team that can be issued, or in phase 2, when the maximum is a slash 22.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
I am not stating anything about that, so in theory, if we keep this text, it will become effective when it becomes implemented, so is at the hands of the staff to match whatever you think is better. It is a possibility. Probably, you should not do that, but it will take a minimum of six or nine months to accommodate this policy because they visit a lot of interactions with the other registries, so that requires a lot of effort, and I believe that will be more or less the time when you enter in the next phase.

SPEAKER:
OK. I have something else. OK, so you have… The transfer policy. What we understand is that legacy IPv4 (inaudible), so does it mean that both legacy and non-legacy resources from the other can return..?

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Yes, but it is not allowed by (inaudible). We will only have outgoing resources to AFRINIC if they are legacy as well.

SPEAKER:
OK. 5.7.2.2 of your proposal says that source entities will not be eligible to receive any further address from AFRINIC for a period of 12 months. So, if the source is a legacy resource holder and they transfer the resources, does this mean they cannot become a AFRINIC member and get more resources?

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
I think they could. That is not a problem because they may need IPv6 or ASN, but obviously, they cannot get resources within 12 months.

SPEAKER:
In 12 months, can they become AFRINIC member?

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Why not?

SPEAKER:
And not IPv4?

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Yes.

SPEAKER:
Thank you for stop we are 9 minutes to the end of the discussion. You presented by proposals together, I believe. The microphone queue is now closed. Please keep your comments short, thank you.

SPEAKER:
I am from Togo. Once again, as a member of the working group, if you want to participate on the mailing list, you need to clarify your test because, what I am saying in your summary of the problem being addressed and what you have just stated, I think the intent is to fix the poll of AFRINIC, so it is not clearly put like that, and it is actually a violation of the current PDP. That is a recommendation.

Secondly, I am going to read a version of what was just stated. 5.7.2. IPv4 resources to be transferred. They must be from an existing members From a legacy resource group (inaudible), so we currently have precision for legacy resources to get into AFRINIC before pull to serve a region. I don't really see a need.

Resources will no longer be regarded as legacy resources. We have a solution already. So, it is fine.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
The point of… give me a second. It only allows you to do it inside the region, not inside.

SPEAKER:
Let me give a number about legacy resources. What we need, let's bring that resourcing inside the AFRINIC group. We can see the way forward, so my third point in the last point, we must stop saying that because a proposal has been implemented in other regions, it is supposed to be easy.

There is a process to get a policy right, so please, thank you.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
This is not meant to be a global policy. The policies in different regions are different, and I don't really believe in global policies in general. Global policies are useful to coordinate between the registries but not with different policies in different regions, which not always match exactly the same.

A global policy is exactly the same test in every region, and that is an impossible thing most of the time. If you change an article, it is not the same text anymore.

SPEAKER:
Thank you. This is Daniel. I have had the suspicion on the mailing list, and I am very happy you have done your homework, but if you go to what our forefathers came up with, (inaudible) is the growth of the internet within the region.

I believe we have reached the level with the utilisation of the resources, so those resources are for the Africa region where it is related to internet growth.

If the resources are transferred for the region, we are going to reach the period whereby we shall need the resources despite the fact that the IPv6 adoption is happening but the Africa adoption is still low.

Then, you mentioned about the impact analysis which looks at the issues of policy landings, and I think they've is a need for a review of the current resources.

In my personal capacity, I don't think this policy will improve the African community until we get an audit or a review of the current resources that are in the market, and that will help to calm down the issues of black market IPs, because you mentioned that some regions are used in IPs from the AFRINIC region.
So, I think you should call of the policy because it does not deliver the Africa region, and then also, I would ask for the members, if they can have a review of the resources because we, as Africa, we need these resources for the involvement of the region and the involvement of the infrastructure within Africa.

It is an economic thing. If we don't look at economics right now of the future of digitalisation, then it is going to affect African growth. Other regions are past the policy because they have reached a point whereby they need these addresses.

I believe that everyone who looks at these things, (inaudible). I understand your business model very well. It would be good to have a discussion on how you can create a stable translation of IPv6 addresses without interfering with the ball. I believe until Africa is ready for IPv6 adoption, we still have the utilisation of African resources which were designed in the region.

So, I don't believe it is legacy, whether it is delegated or not delegated, but…

SPEAKER:
Your point has been made, Daniel. Next, please.

SPEAKER:
We will take all the comments together before Jordi responds.

SPEAKER:
I am from Nigeria. After going through this policy, I want to start by commending the author for coming up with such a proposal. I think, as a region, we need this transfer to show that we are really serious about growing our internet community. I have a few comments, actually.

Since we are going to the second phase of IvP, it is high time we start planning on how to fully migrate to IPv6, but if we want to really look at that, we have to keep in mind, from a technical perspective, that you require IPv4 addresses in most cases to deploy IPv6. I'm trying to make this comment for those who really think that, right now, we don't need to receive addresses because we can put up with IPv6.

Now. We cannot deploy that without (inaudible), so even if we decide, for whatever reason, not to go with this policy, I just need to remind us that we will be left with basically two options.

The first, from a technical perspective, is to work with network translation. And any technical person knows there are many challenges that comes with using network address translation. I don't have to mention that here.

Then, the second option we should be left with is buying from the black market. It is easier if you deal with registered things like AFRINIC rather than getting it from the black market. In summary, it is a good proposal.

SPEAKER:
I'm having some challenges at least with the documents I have been reading. I think the problem statement is faulty, help me if you can. It says this proposal allows a solution, that is what it says. A solution to allow…

I'm not sure if it should have been brought here. This statement is not a problem statement, it is a statement of solution, I have challenges with the policy system. That is one.

The second concern I have about this document is it does use what I consider unsavoury language in section 2. It says this. The internal mechanism has not been established, it is leading the regime to discrimination and scarcity of addresses not only in RIR, in this market.

The discrimination must have existed before. A Soft Landing, why do you give it to us, it existed before. I have difficulties with this kind of description of what the problem is.

The last comment I can make, this kind of policy has been discussed multiple times. OK? That is what resulted in the Inter RIR. If there will be changes, the should be data supporting the need for it, what is new, that is the problem.

SPEAKER:
One-to-one consulting, I think it is absurd. The idea of legacy resources is not full fiction. There are not legacy resources, there were resources that were issues prior to the RIR system, we call that a legacy status. The moment any resources are transferred it should not have any special status, they should be subject to the same rules and regulations and fees as any other resource in whatever RIR lives in. We should discuss policy one out of hand, it makes no sense to me.

The major objection to policy wto that I am hearing, peoples concern it will not allow resources transferred into AFRINIC but take the AFRINIC pool and the AFRINIC. I don't think that is true but if it is the primary concern it will take a while to implement the policy if applied.

It is not bidirectional until it is exhausted or down to a particular level we decided no longer meaningful. It could be a criteria added to the policy which would allow it to move forward and reassure those who have that concern.

I think a policy like this is needed to facilitate the transfer of addresses into the AFRINIC region and I think the sooner a policy is adopted and the staff can start preparing for its implementation, the better it will be for the region. Thank you.

SPEAKER:
Next please.

SPEAKER:
I'm from Nigeria. I tend to agree with Daniel that the resources and AFRINIC are for Africa. But if the same resources are being sold on the table, this policy will help us retain it.

Secondly, it is a policy to help us manage this transfer legally, openly. And not only the table. No one is going to force you to transfer your resources if you need them. If you

are using them. If there are adjustments to be made to the wording or documents, let's do so. Let's come together and do that.

Perfect the document. This policy, we need it and so I support it.

SPEAKER:
OK, thank you.

SPEAKER:
Good morning, everybody. I am William.

SPEAKER:
Good morning, I see that we have translations. I will speak in French.

SPEAKER:
She will speak in French. OK.

SPEAKER:
Thank you, I am from Senegal. I would like to thank you, the person who did this proposal, I am happy to see many in this room, which shows Africa is developing, we have the internet here, and many things to share. We have new infrastructure is in place.

We have many resources which are there. And… Let us not be faster in such policies to take with it. African resources which we need. I did many things with IPv6 in Africa but we need our addresses, IPV addresses and tomorrow our (inaudible) the internet, which will start looking for IPV addresses.

As a member of AFRINIC, in that generation which is going to come today, which needs things in five years to come.

SPEAKER:
My name is William. Nigeria. I have no fear that if we implement this policy, or this proposal, that we will lose some resources to parts of the world. But nonetheless I believe that if this policy has been approved we stand to gain more from these arrangements. Thank you very much.

SPEAKER:
Thank you.

SPEAKER:
Hi, everyone, I am from Nigeria. First, I would like to say thank you. This would, to me, expand in Nigeria. And what we are fighting to hold back, it would be open, it won't be so black market for any bad intentions or anything.

Just to be straight forward I support this proposal 100%. Thank you.

SPEAKER:
Thank you, just so you are aware, we have eight and 8 minutes into the coffee break and there will be no extension. Go ahead.

SPEAKER:
My name is (inaudible). In your presentation, Jordi, you mentioned some IP used in

another region. It has already happened, the inter-area transfer. I don't think the way we solve the problem is to put in a policy. We already have another one with the review.

If people use it out of the vision, we should find a way to do the audit and not openly… To try to align with the black market. Thank you.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
If I can answer shortly that one.

SPEAKER:
I think you should wait. Go ahead.

SPEAKER:
Very well, I am going to speak in French. Thank you. Three of my items have been discussed but there is something very important, specifically for (inaudible).

The most important thing is the resources of AFRINIC are not to be sold. For the community according to our need. If you say that is OK, we have to create a policy to manage the legacy. It is a mistake.

This was not the money by policy. If people are selling under the tables so that is a concern. The resources along to AFRINIC. We should not transfer them. It should be done in the region, thank you.

SPEAKER:
Thank you. Alain?

ALAIN AINA:
Again, I've been listening to the previous speakers. As was said, we discussed this many times. There is nothing new, OK, we brought them again to discuss.

Looking at… OK, you may adopt it. Put a good call out. When you get implemented. What I would like us to do, let's do some data analysis. We're all talking about I believe, I believe.

We should not be… I believe, let's look at the analysis, the slides, only willing to do one way. The numbers, moving to (inaudible), why? Let's talk I believe, I believe, let's do data analysis. We have the transfer.

We have seen a transfer, so let's make decisions on data, rather than I believe, I believe.

SPEAKER:
Thank you for your input. I see you want to respond. Hold that thought for a moment. Are you making a comment very quickly?

SPEAKER:
I have a concern, because I think today if you want numbers in a certain country, you can't get the numbers, we have transfers, I do think you should let people say that without more detail.

Declare the reasons why you support. We really think that the numbers you need to

have you cannot get the entire transit. You can get the numbers, get it operated here. Why? Why can they not do that, there are members.

So… Let's hope and get real evidence.

(Applause)

SPEAKER:
One-to-one consulting, I will be as brief and quick as I can. I want to be clear that I am talking for myself and my perception of what is going on in the region are not officially representing the advisory council.

I believe that the reason the community has insisted on reciprocity is a sense of fairness. I do not believe that you will hear a giant sucking sound of resources going from Africa to the region. The people who would engage in that are doing it under the table already.

I do not think there is a real concern there. There is a sense of that. And policy should be equal and fair among the different RIRs and that is the reason for the reciprocity requirement. Thank you.

SPEAKER:
Thank you very much.

SPEAKER:
Can I respond quickly?

SPEAKER:
OK.

SPEAKER:
Some people said the existing policy is in place, that is not enough. That will work for a while, not for ever.

This is normal in PDP. This is not the correct time for a proposal, and later, this becomes the right time. Some people talk about doing this one way. If we try to do this, we will not be able to have transfers with other regions, and finally, my last point, there have been several pointers to the review policy. Even if we agree on the review policy, that will not solve the problem.

Maybe some employees, some AFRINIC members, are the ones selling the resources. OK?

Having a review will take two years, three years to review all the resources. How much will that cost? In that time, how will AFRINIC the evolved with the crew of internet penetration? It is wasting time. Thank you.

SPEAKER:
Thank you very much. Thank you for your active participation in this session. The coaches decide there is no sense of consensus for these to proceed, so it is sent back to the list for development, refinement, whatever the community chooses to do with it.

So, the issue and the policy proposals, to be clear.

Thank you, we have 13 minutes left of our coffee break. We will resume at 11. Thank you.

SPEAKER:
Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. It is now 11. If we could get the attention of those outside to come in.

Can we have the slide up, slide up. OK, thank you those of you who have come back in good time. We will now proceed with the next policy proposal on the docket, the Soft Landing update proposal.

We have Gregoire to present to you and then we will take contributions before a decision is made on how the proposal proceeds. Thank you, Gregoire, you are up.

SPEAKER:
OK. My name is Gregoire. I did policy with Alan Patrick. So we already present this policy on our last meeting in Tunisia.

So basically what this policy is trying to do is to try to fix some issues that exist in the Soft Landing policy. The Soft Landing policy, 12/8, in the following section, the other factors…

Can make the decision to use /8. So… We have two problems arising on this. First, if no policy is coming from the community to address /12, a decision can help or not help the community.

Currently, up until now, we don't have a policy covered by this one. The community will take the decision in its own interest.

In the current section, 4572, we have this section. AFRINIC will no longer meet any more requests for address space from /8 or any available address space.

The board may at its discretion and other factors added, the pools, which whatever may be available to AFRINIC at the time in the manner that is in the best interest of the community.

Our proposal is this, the new section is, 12, used by the time available space has been allocated. /12 will be returned to the AFRINIC pool for distribution and phase two of the Soft Landing policy.

I just want to add that we will have Soft Landing phase 2, so maybe at the end of this year, we do not know. Our proposal is we want to say, OK, this /12, have to go back and use the same policy that applies. Right now we don't have any policy.

We present the policy in the Tunisian meeting. We don't have a lot of input, that is why we sent it back. We did not get a lot of comment.

The only comment… We don't have enough content to update the proposal. Thank you.

SPEAKER:
Thank you, Gregoire. Now the floor is open for questions, comments, contributions on this. No feedback on the list, no feedback in the room? Any comments from staff?

Soft Landing update.

SPEAKER:
We think that we did an assessment on this, I think, in the first version. It has not changed. I don't think we had any issues with it then, I don't think we have any issues now.

SPEAKER:
OK, thank you, Gregoire. We will take a moment to confer. Microphones remain open for comment from the community.

Nobody understands the policy proposal. We are fine with it either way. OK. Please give a moment.

You may have a seat, Gregoire.

SPEAKER:
Shall I…

SPEAKER:
Yes, please.

SPEAKER:
I already expressed I support it.

SPEAKER:
Why do you support it? And who are you?

SPEAKER:
It is an adequate update for existing policy. And the issues we are addressing in the policy.

SPEAKER:
Thank you. Yes. In the absence of any issues with the proposed update to the text of the Soft Landing proposals, co-chairs have decided that the policy proposal be sent to the mailing lists for a last call period of a minimum of two weeks.

So it will be a period for those new to the process, a period in which people have the opportunity to make further comments regarding this at the end of the last call period. If there is no consensus to proceed as it is, co-chairs will send it to the board for ratification as policy, thank you very much, thank you to the authors are taking time to identify and propose solutions to what is observed to be problems in the policy manual.

Next we will have the IPv6 PI clarification proposal. Jordi Palet Martinez, thank you. And could staff please let the people outside know that the session has started?

SPEAKER:
Sorry about that. Morning, everyone.

SPEAKER:
This is about addressing, have to go forward. This is about addressing the problem that exists in policy were IPv6 that is issued to people, not announcing it, a very common example, people who are using it for internet exchange points as a general rule, you do

not want internet exchange gains addresses announced in the global routing table, there is no reason for people to be sending traffic to remote addresses on an exchange point other than abuse.

That is one clear situation. There is the use on private networks collections of private networks that are not necessarily directly attached to the internet or those addresses are not exported to the internet, they are connected to other systems that are, global unique addresses, they are useful in those circumstances.

It is a very, very simple change to the policy. The other thing we noticed in the process, the existing policy text refers to insights and there are some inflation of insight within news organisation and we tried to bring some clarity to that.

There are multisite organisations that fall into one of the three cases generally, there will be connected sites with PDP, they are operating in a single aggregate of 48 to advertise the upstreams maybe I'm not connected in the individual 48 advertised from each site.

There are hybrid possibilities between those two cases. This is the policy changes, it is quite simple. Instead of aiming at providing address to insights, we are providing the space to end-user organisations to use to number their insights.

The policy allows insights of end-user organisations to be assigned and provide changes. A few more changes, and insight in an organisation with one or more insights. We still require the deployment of the addresses, we don't require the advertising in the global routing table.

And some other text to clean up. I don't think I need to read the slides to you. These are some references to policies in the other regions. With that we should open the floor for discussion.

SPEAKER:
Thank you for the presentation, the floor is now open for discussion. Yes, please, go ahead.

SPEAKER:
Internet exchange, it is not a real change of policy, just an improvement of the text but I support it.

There is something I don't like the first slide, but I don't think you meant it. I support.

SPEAKER:
You what?

SPEAKER:
I'm in support of the proposal.

SPEAKER:
OK, anyone else?

SPEAKER:
It is not really an editorial change in the sense that you look at this text and you are an internet change, AFRINIC should claim the space to you after 12 months. So, actually, we are collecting a real problem that it would not be discovered before.

SPEAKER:
Yes, you are right.

SPEAKER:
OK.

SPEAKER:
Any other comments?

SPEAKER:
My name is (inaudible) from Nigeria. Good morning. I am from the federal University of Nigeria. I have two questions and possibly concerns. How long does it take for AFRINIC to decide it is long enough if you don't work past your IPv6, and secondly, where I am from, there is this gap between… It is easy to look at the block and go to the next thing. I believe AFRINIC should investigate first and probably see why the organisation with the block is not broadcasting. Thank you.

SPEAKER:
Thanks, Alan. The answer to the first part of your question as to how long, how long. You said it. The policy tells us three months, if it says two years, it is two years. In this case, the policy is 12 months, so this is what we take. We are not really that unreasonable. If during impairment nation the policies has 12 months, and within 12 months you have not implemented or announced, and we come to you with all these emails that say you are in breach of the policy and blah, blah, blah, that email would normally ask what is going on and if you are having challenges. If you are, we will listen to them, and if you plan to announce within the next few months, I don't think we can take the space back.

So, it all depends on how the discussion goes. If, for example, we contact you and don't hear back from you, as an example, chances are we will take it back.

SPEAKER:
Anyone else?

SPEAKER:
Something to point out is that what was just said, it is not being changed by this policy proposal. We are keeping that but we are giving one more opportunity in the sense that those organisations that don't need to announce the space can keep it. We are not changing that. We are not changing the actual 12 months that is already in the existing policy.

SPEAKER:
Yes, it just needs to be deployed and not necessarily announced. That is the change here.

SPEAKER:
Please, go ahead.

SPEAKER:
Thank you. I am from Nigeria.

SPEAKER:

Please, I would like people to introduce themselves to introduce name, organisation or affiliation and country. Just so that is clear.

SPEAKER:
OK, (inaudible) from the Department of computer science in federal University in Nigeria.

I just have one question. I have been following this proposal in the discussion mailing lists, and looking at section 6.8.4, it says rectifying the size of an initial assignment. Just one question with regard to that, you said here and organisation may submit a new plan for AFRINIC (inaudible), so the question is, if they are submitting a new request to AFRINIC, will that organisation be subjected to some kind of review?

Like, say, the first assignment, what have you done with it? Did you be purpose it did you sell it out or sublease? Do you have to carry out a release before you carry out this kind of request?

SPEAKER:
I will note that's the only change to the text in our proposal is changing it from an end site to an end user organisation. The purpose of that core within the policy is for organisations that made and addressing plan before they understood and they did it with IPv4. (inaudible), and they can come back to AFRINIC and say oopd, here is the original block and they need to be accommodated.

This is how it has been used to the best of my knowledge so far, and the only thing changing from existing policy is the fact that organisations have insights. I hope that clarifies.

SPEAKER:
(inaudible) member services. So, the way this policy has been implemented is what was just explained. If we have an organisation that requested for the minimum block at that time, and were they wanting to deploy, this is where they give us the IP address etc to show us that (inaudible)

The policy allows for the prefix to be taken back after 12 months. So, if we do a review initially, it may come up that the organisation could not deploy with the first allocation. So, they would be given the opportunity to justify for a bigger block, and then the policy would take over with us are allowing or registering that member of the assignment, and also, in monitoring whether it is being announced or not.

SPEAKER:
Thank you.

SPEAKER:
Yes, I agree. Thank you, Alaine, for the presentation. You may take a seat.

OK, reviewing the policy proposals so far and the response to the staff assessment which has been reflected in this, the decision of the coaches is to send this policy proposal to the mailing lists for a last call period. Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER:

The next policy proposal, again, it is Jordi Palet Martinez, and this is clarification on…
Sorry, this is provisions for resource hijacking. Sorry, I skipped past lunch. This is the
abuse contact policy update.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
This was presented in the last meeting if I recall correctly. Basically, the point of this
policy proposal is that, today, we have the IRT contact but it is not mandatory. Basically,
nobody is implementing it.

I recall from the starts that were mentioned by the previous analysis that there were two
or three people who had used it. It is a set of recommendations, but it is not a
mandatory policy, so it is not being used.

As a result, if you have a abuse, you are most of the time unable to find a specific
contact, to the idea of the policy is to make it mandatory. And to make sure that it is
correct, so it is responding.

There were some questions from the previous version. One of them was about… I was
adjusting in the previous version of the policy that, if somebody is not passing the
validation, they should get blocked by AFRINIC so they could not access certain
resources in order to revalidate the contact was updated.

I have removed that because there was concern that, legally, it could not be done, it
could affect voting etc, even if the lawyers said that it was possible to do that.

I decided not to go that deep, so I looked at the staff to decide what to do if there was
not validation in the sense of what resources they want to block if they want to block
something, but for sure, they need to be able to escalate the first validation failure to
other contacts to seek a correction.

I think this is a good way to have other parts of the policy manual as well as this one.
We take this from every specific policy and go for a general way to decide what is to be
done if somebody is not complying with policies.

This is just what I commented. It is quite a long policy, so I go to pass over the slides.

I don't have too many inputs from the list. I am also suggesting escalation process, so if
somebody is not getting the ballot a contact responding, they can say, hey, AFRINIC, is
this valid? Can you check?

Of course, this is an automated process, so most the time, validation should be
completely automated from the AFRINIC side. I also put an example that AFRINIC can
follow, but again, this is something they need to implement operations, and it is never
decision. It is just a suggestion, not part of the policy text, just to finish, exactly the
same text has been adopted in (inaudible), and the actual in fermentation is exactly the
same.

The policy has been discussed to try to improve the existing text, and (inaudible). We
have a validation process which is also automated, but it has a small failure from my
side, from my perspective, and that is, if I use the email from somebody else in the
abuse contact, it will pass a validation unless there is a real abuse case, then you would
realise that it is fake, so I don't like that, and I think it is necessary to correct that. I
submitted the same policy proposal to modify that failure in the existing policy.

I think that is it. Comments, questions?

SPEAKER:
The floor is now open for comments, questions, contributions. Please approach the microphone if you have any contributions.

Before that, we will hear from staff.

SPEAKER:
Jordi, this version was admitted quite close to this event, so we did not . Apart from one, we have the IRT, which we talked about. It can hold more information, our view it would be easier to get the IRT.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
This has been clarified in this version. I've had it on the mailing list. I am not saying… I'm saying the mandatory part, it is the mandatory part. The others are optional. You do not need to remove the IRT, you make an alias. This is the way it is being implemented. Exactly the same way.

So you don't need to change the IRT is that you have today. You just need to make an alias to the email, that is it. And make it mandatory.

So nobody needs to enter two emails, one IT, it is an alias. This is a pointer to the existing one, now it is mandatory.

SPEAKER:
Why can't we make it mandatory?

SPEAKER:
In most of the regions people look… IRT is not for the other regions. To make sure everybody is able to use abuse regardless of the region. It is not an operational implication in the sense that you are not removing it.

SPEAKER:
OK, next comment.

SPEAKER:
A couple of comments, I am not proposing a valid and regular update, abuse contact emails is necessary.

It should be automated, AFRINIC should develop a program to make sure all organisations have counter information.

We stop there. Every contract, different laws, AFRINIC as a registry should make sure everyone has counter information and it is valid, activated.

And we should not impose a punishment to members per se. One idea, if members refuse to set abuse contact information, we can put finance… Whatever they have.

It should be AFRINIC, to be a member in the first place. If they are not willing to be counted, and general information, I will tell them that. We will give them two months, X amount of time. If you don't comply with the policy, update abuse with specificity,

someone needs to be contacted.

And this kind of stuff, disproportional to contact. That is my comments.

SPEAKER:
Just to clarify what you commented, what points have been taken into consideration in this version, the validation we are doing, the contact is reachable and from that organisation, not someone else.

The other point is I remove any kind of action, it is up to the manual, staff, to take actions if any.

SPEAKER:
I think we should specify on the actions, we need to make sure everybody has information there. We should tell them if they are not willing to put abuse email there, put that email there.

If you don't follow all policies you need a way to react. I think it should be generic.

SPEAKER:
This is not a severe violation of policy. It is one little thing and we make sure everybody does it, I support that. We should be clear.

And there are clear guidelines. Thank you.

SPEAKER:
I have a question.

SPEAKER:
There is a comment.

SPEAKER:
Now it is my normal height. Thank you. My first remark is about the slide. Is there an argument for the proposal, just something…

SPEAKER:
It is just information. The reference is information, it is to have pointers to similar activities, and information. It is not to decide against or in favour.

SPEAKER:
I understand that. It is lingering there. I thought it was a matter of substance. It is not. My point is about the abuse contact.

Put an obligation on all members, all new members coming in to provide information about themselves which goes into it. If they do not do it, that would be something that blocks the system, it does not work well.

But there is an inbuilt in the RSA right now. They need somebody to comply. It is always possible to do at the end of the day.

We had a problem, the way you suggested it, it would deprive people of the right to vote because of the reality.

It is a good thing. Please, next time, for the region, we know how we do things, thank you.

SPEAKER:
Thank you.

(Applause)

SPEAKER:
OK, the question I have is for you. Why would the members refuse to put the abuse contact.

SPEAKER:
I don't know.

SPEAKER:
Use the finance… Why would a member refuse to put a contact?

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Some people do not want to be contacted. They don't want an abuse contact.

SPEAKER:
People don't want to use email for many reasons. It is not difficult doing bad things, you have large telecoms. You need to create new contact information, there are many factors why members do not co-operate. It is not necessarily with that intention.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
They may have gone out of the company. That is the reason for validation. They need to validate it.

SPEAKER:
OK. This is a main point. First, to follow… The first one is to follow a shock set. Jordi, why do we need this policy? To give the mandated power...

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
There is not a validation. I think automated validations are good, because that avoids additional ways to review resources that cost more money. Whatever it can do automated is good for all.

You pay once for developing the software and it is done. To automate it.

SPEAKER:
As you know, (inaudible).

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Automate as much as possible, of course.

SPEAKER:
We should not be talking about punishment. We start going there. If you remember, we provide some data. If you fail to do that, we shall find a way to convince you to do that.

For example, those who want to use it, they have the admin contact. When they able to vote. Maybe we find out.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
That is part of the proposal, it states if the contact fails it will be escalated to other contacts. That is the way.

SPEAKER:
Alain.

ALAIN AINA:
I am not convinced we need the policy, we have the RSA.

SPEAKER:
OK, thank you.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
If I can respond quickly. It is fine, for the review policy, we need to make it automated. Or as much as we can.

SPEAKER:
OK, got you. Alan wants to provide clarification.

SPEAKER:
This is Alan from AFRINIC. When I read a draft of this proposal I found it very confusing. I did not know whether it was trying to make it mandatory or IoT mandatory or to rename some objects in the database. I found it very confusing. I would love to have that clarified. Jordi, earlier you said something about making an alias. I don't think we have a mechanism for that in the database software.

I also don't understand how you think it would work. I think it is a valid use of the policy process to specify that failure to provide a working abuse contact with the working violation. That is in the realm of policy process.

The fields we use in the database, I would prefer it if you leave that to the technical people who implement the database.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
I think the way the policy is written allows you to do the implementation, so it is easier to you. I say this because looking for the correct text about that kind of inconsistency, I do not think you have a software that is too much different to what is working in other regions.

I think it will work and, in fact, what I have tried to address in this version, the previous impact analysis to resolve those issues. I'm not sure if you are referring to the last person for the previous one.

SPEAKER:
I'm not sure either. My memory is from the previous one. I don't know if that has changed. The proposal was specifying the fields, I thought it was taken out of scope.

SPEAKER:
Thank you for the comments.

SPEAKER:

Some of us are having difficulty with this thing called the proposal. It seems like a suggestion of a process. To make something already clearly defined.

There is a policy… Telling us how to do that administration is awkward. We are having some challenges with this. Just leave it to the staff to figure out how they are able to improve automation on the system and bring administrative issues to the policy realm.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Can I ask, are you doing any validation?

SPEAKER:
I am still here. I don't think it is about that.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
I think that is your question. It is that I am stating something that is already… It is not a policy. It is a policy to see the contact that must be validated politically, that has got the policies…

SPEAKER:
The context must be there. OK? You are saying it is automated.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
This is the contact must be there.

SPEAKER:
(inaudible)

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Now.

SPEAKER:
I don't know what issue you are trying to address. It says that you must make it valid and correct it. OK? All the time. If you have a process to make it more accurate, I think that is OK, but to make it a policy seems to me like we have a policy system and I feel uncomfortable.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
There is a question for the star. There is a specific idea to suggest to staff new ways to do things, and to make (inaudible), or it should be PDP.

SPEAKER:
OK, I will attempt to answer that. They are going to specify that information must be kept accurate, so I guess that implies that staff can go ahead to ensure the correctness of that by automating that things are mandatory or otherwise. I suppose that is what it implies.

The current policy in place now is explicit about the guidelines and that it is mandatory.

SPEAKER:
We need a policy.

SPEAKER:
There is information… (inaudible), and you can provide technical contacts and

demonstrators contacts but it is silent on this, so looking at it from this angle (inaudible), and whether it should be or not.

SPEAKER:
OK, next in line.

SPEAKER:
Pascal from Nigeria. This is one of the issues that we are having on the community. When you want to propose an event or best-known practices, we know there are investment practices, so I don't think it will be necessary for us to look at this for every problem we have.

Regarding the escalation time, issues decreased, so escalation time will increase. Is that what you are saying? I am saying it is possible that it might go the other way around and that it will imply that things will happen faster for the community, so I am not comfortable with that.

Normally, some people will definitely not… With some websites, there is an affinity to miss out contact information, so I think this results… I am not comfortable with it, basically.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
What I have done in the policy, I said that the escalation the lips of it, the time is 15 days for the first validation. If it fails, an additional 15 days for escalation, but that should be done twice a year, but in any case, I mentioned explicitly that, at the discretion of the staff, this can be changed at any time, so if the quality increases, the staff may believe that, instead of two validations per year, one is enough, or whatever, so I am not stating in the fact is that this should be harder and harder.

This is just a way to say that when it improves, you find a way to talk to the community.

SPEAKER:
I am not come to go with that, thank you.

SPEAKER:
Thank you, I would like to speak in French.

I am from Senegal. I would like to thank the presenter for the proposal. I am belonging to the network and I understand why we have to define the policy and know-how the staff… There is a rule that the data should be mandatory. Do we need to come here to spend two hours to discuss the definition of a policy?

I think you have to come to the basic. What is a policy? It should be global, it should be very flexible so we can implement it.

If we have to go through all the detail and the proposal, I don't know what the PDP is going to be, but I think we have two phases, the definition of the policy, and also, the limitation. That is the responsibility of this stuff, and this is the way you have to work. In my country, it is not accidental. Thank you.

I would also like to propose that we stop because otherwise we will spend the whole day here.

SPEAKER:
Thank you. Just to make it clear, we are having this drawnout discussion because we have saved some time on previous policy proposals and we don't want to shift the order of presentations because those who are following remotely and had planned to attend specific sessions based on the time on the agenda.

We will take comments before we move on to the next contributor.

SPEAKER:
Just to have some information and statistics about the IRT. Up to now, we have only 23 organisations that adapted the IRT, and when you look at the resources, the first response, the first line of response, is the abuse contact. Hnfortunately, there are only a few things that have adopted this because the policy for abuse that is ratified at the moment is optional. Thank you. That is just for information.

SPEAKER:
Thank you.

SPEAKER:
I am from Nigeria. I am not in support of this policy. The reason is, it as was just said, it is already in existence. Secondly, I need to remind us that AFRINIC is an internet Registry, not a police that goes after people.

So, we should focus on how to achieve the mission. Thank you.

SPEAKER:
Please go ahead.

SPEAKER:
Good morning, everybody. I would like to agree with what my colleague has said, Mr Pascal. AFRINIC is a registry and (inaudible), and we want to encourage every member to improve in businesses are not bring a policies for each issue, so I would like to close by saying I do not agree with this policy. Thank you.

SPEAKER:
My name is Gregoire. I want to remind us about (inaudible) because in the next session, we will be talking about policy, and in the mailing list, a lot of people are saying (inaudible), but if we go back to the review, we will see that the same people are saying no.

So, we have to be constant in our argument. Maybe we don't have the same idea for all the policy, so AFRINIC is not a policy, but (inaudible), thank you.

SPEAKER:
To answer that, just repeating, in this specific case, the numbers say it.

SPEAKER:
OK, the microphone queue is now closed.

SPEAKER:
I think (inaudible) when a new member is to give (inaudible), so you are asking us to change how we become members. I think the structure has the freedom to use what

kind of tool they want to use. Thank you.

SPEAKER:
This is not mandatory. That is why we only have 63.

SPEAKER:
I am from Togo. I think we are trying to deal with the idea that this is the way to go because, with partial intelligence, you may finish with some members trying to look at this contact, so think about it.

SPEAKER:
All right, thank you very much. Thank you, Jordi, for making the presentation put up it looks like you have and yourselves an early lunch.

The decision of the co-chairs on this is to send the policy proposal back to the mailing list for further discussion. There is no consensus to proceed with this. So, you can stretch your legs, get to the venue early so you can be back here at two o'clock.

Two o'clock sharp we will resume. Thank you all.

(break)

SPEAKER:
Wishing you all a beautiful lunch, but a quick announcement. With the vote… Attend tomorrow's meeting, within that meeting, you will vote not online but using paper ballots. You need to go to the member services right outside. Staff can verify you. If you have proxies, let them know so it can be verified. So it can… You can handover the equipment required to vote, whatever you voted for. This applies only to members. Let's not everybody go and queue up. It does not apply to you. Thank you.

MC:
Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for returning early. We will resume this session in five minutes.

OK, thank you. It is 2:01pm now. We will continue with the next policy proposal in the document reviewed by AFRINIC.

OK, so, please go ahead and present.

ARNAUD AMELINA:
I want to invite you to use your headsets because I want to speak in French.

TRANSLATION:
You are most welcome. We hope you had a good time for your lunch. We hope to have good discussions here. We are ready to have a good discussion and collaboration and we will reach an understanding.

The Internet social review has been discussed recently. It has been discussed for a long time and all of the discussions are good for policies and we are taking them all into consideration.

We are not going to repeat the broad sentiment. Many people had a view on it.

ARNAUD AMELINA:
It has been talked about several times.

TRANSLATION:
It is my pleasure for the newcomers to understand the sentiment which we have seen at the level of AFRINIC. There is an article which helps AFRINIC to conduct a review of all resources and their responsibility for their members.

I want to remind you that all the resources of AFRINIC are not for sale. All the resources of AFRINIC are communal - not for selling. They are put in place for the sake of the needs of AFRINIC.

The are not supposed to be sold. Thank you so much for your understanding. It is very important so that you can understand the broad sentiments.

This policy helps the article to guide the processes of all of the reviews which are done at the member level.

All of the reviews are conducted to ensure that all people, all individuals, AFRINIC will take care and, after the analysis of all this, they will decide if they can do or conduct a review.

You can see how this policy can be done and can address the questions and the problems. It is very clear in our policy that it is the last record that all of these resources can be removed.

It is very important to bring the member resources so they can comply with the contracts that we are having. This is very important.

Different changes have taken place from Tunisia. They are as follows.

We have made changes for version 6 and version 7. Changes have been made to the policies. In section 5.4, we have the proposition for the members and we have modified the section to make it more acceptable in relationship to what we had in the section before.

Apparently that section attracts many problems and we have not reinforced it. They have cut the resources and it will not the total resources and this can be taken into consideration in case of thought if the person...

It is not in the condition that we can think about the recovering of resources. You can see this at all the time we are receiving proposals which are correct.

If these proposals are going to encourage the advancement of the policy, we take care of it and put it into consideration.

We are not in line with our policies as AFRINIC. It is not that their policies are not interesting but we are not in the same line with politics and the philosophy of AFRINIC.

One person has ordered it to make it more clear. We decided to do a review. We decided many years ago to decide that a person who is not audited in the period and is being chosen and is being audited then now we have to do it again as random. It has got to be equal.

The condition in which this recovery of resources is going to be done, we talked about that in the section 13.4. This recover is going to look at the policies and the IP addresses which are not integrated.

We have made some changes to the section 13.25 and there are parts that we have added for precision, these last parts which I am showing you, on the basis of proposals that the members have given us from different steps on the mailing lists.

As we are seeing for this version we have received, we did not receive any statements, there are no comments, because they were all addressed in the first version in the policy proposal.

Thank you so much.

ARNAUD AMELINA:
The floor is now open for comments, questions, contributions. You want the floor?

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
(Speaks French)

ARNAUD AMELINA:
We have taken all the amendments into consideration. We are here not to say, "I oppose. I oppose."

We have got to approve on it. We do not want to just oppose. Thank you.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
Just a note of caution. You took a similar stance in the last meeting and it seemed you wanted to compel people to contribute. There has to be substance that will help us get to a point for either we are adopting something we can all of this we are discarding.

We should not try to bully.

ARNAUD AMELINA:
I am glad you agree with me. I will start with the first comment from there. You have got the floor.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you for the wonderful presentation. I would like some clarity. I don't understand the basic difference. I would like to comment by saying this policy will only lead to instability. Whenever a member has been found to violate the rules, how do you recover all of the resources? It is instability in the community.

AFRINIC does not have the resources for this. The policy is not good for the community. If we look at… If you go through the RBD mailing list, half of the community do not support this, so I would like the co-chairs and AFRINIC itself to consider the voice of the community regarding this proposal. I would like to end by saying I do not support this review policy. Thank you.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:

Thank you for this great proposal. It will look at our usage and the usage of our resources. However, my main concern, just like the other speaker, I don't know how AFRINIC will be able to enforce this between what we have and what we are proposing.

This is centred towards effective usage of our resources. Why not create more flexibility in order to prevent those who are actually the black marketeers. If we strengthen some of our policies, the (unknown term), that would minimise the process of black markets.

I'm not saying we want to legalise them, but in terms of regulations, the DSA, will be selling off the six months, if you don't deploy, we will revoke it. Now we need to come up with innovations, but we don't have the manpower to use such resources, we can create secondary markets.

We can look back into the previous presentation and see how we can bring in some other ingredients to it that will create more flexibility and encourage the usage of the resources. Thank you very much.

ARNAUD AMELINA:
Which market are you talking about, please?

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
The secondary market. If you say…

ARNAUD AMELINA:
AFRINIC resources are not for sale! Yes, but even though you say you are not selling, there is evidence that suggests and has shown that there are black markets.

ARNAUD AMELINA:
The markets are supervised by AFRINIC, so they are not black.

MC:
Next, please.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I share some of the concerns of the previous presenters, but the element for me that comes to the fore is that this policy about reviewing IP addresses that have already been allocated.

If they have already been allocated on the basis of an existing policy on IP address allocation and if the IP address allocation has been justified under an existing policy, is the fact that we are renewing it going to invalidate the justification under that policy.

Just by reviewing it does not create a framework where we can (inaudible). We should be getting to the crux of the issue of why were those resources issued for purposes that we did not agree to. Thank you.

SPEAKER:
(Inaudible) I will continue to oppose this policy. I won't repeat all of my arguments from the mailing list. You can go through the archives to analyse them. It's disingenuous to say my policies aren't in line with AFRINIC.

They have been substantiated repeatedly on the list. I really don't think this policy should move forward. The community has repeatedly said no to this. The authors have

made small changes and continue to ignore the objections of the community and ignore that this policy is not needed or supported by the majority of the community.

They use all sorts of creative language to claim it is invalid for us to object to the policy outright and if there is some requirement that the me towards consensus, but that's not the reality.

Is policy has failed to achieve consensus and is unlikely to. It is time to move on and abandon it.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
Good afternoon, everyone. We all know that AFRINIC is not a business or a profit-making organisation, but whether we agree or not, some of the ISPs are out to make a profit. Before, they will be allocated resources. They must pass through the RSP agreement. That is the registration service agreement. It makes them eligible to be assigned any IP address and resources.

Now, if they are found wanting or violating the RSA, what AFRINIC community needs to do is ask why? As a business, you will take some risks. If you have a allocation for hundred people and you are only catering for 80 and the business isn't coming up to what she wants, AFRINIC is supposed to ask the person and the person is supposed to suggest, tell AFRINIC, in time I will be able to meet up with the resources.

The person should be able to apply for more. Looking at the proposal and the RSA, as the first speaker has said it's exactly the same thing, so I don't see the need of this policy. It's like we like duplicating things. Please, let's forget this policy.

(Applause)

(Multiple speakers)

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I have gone through this policy proposal and commented during the mailing list discussion. I have a few issues here. Like the last speaker said this speaker here said, organisations go through the right processes to get resources.

Rather than waiting on utilisation and issues of resources, we should implement a better process of application. By application I mean before you assign an IP address and resources to someone, the process needs to be strengthened.

"We have assigned IP addresses to you. Why aren't you using them?" We had to put certain considerations into our policies for further development. Finally, this policy contradicts this whole idea of intra-resource transfer.

When I say intra-, we saw the last presentation, that is something that should be allowed in our region, for resource owners to be able to transfer to organisations that needed here.

In summary, I strongly oppose this and we should not discuss this any further. Thank you.

MC:
We will discuss for as long as the authors have the policy on the docket.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
My point is I'm not going to oppose this proposal advocated or supported. My point is to give a suggestion. This proposal needs to grow a little bit more. The authors of this proposal need to answer the points raised by the community to push it forward.

Another point, I'm suggesting to create a local community from the community that has seen from different regions of Africa and different sectors in Africa to help AFRINIC to do the review.

Another point is I think the process is not clear enough to how AFRINIC is going to do the review.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
Most of the things I wanted to say have been set by other speakers, but it is just ambiguous. Some things are clear. People still raise concerns and they are not addressed. There is a stand from one site that it has to be like this and I just wish it could be…

Some text has the medical issues, so I feel it should be reviewed more. Thank you.

MC
Have you read the policy?

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
She has at most of the things I wanted to say, but I wanted to add one thing on the aspect of the RSA and this policy. It is no different. If I obtain an IP address from AFRINIC, they are supposed to come to me and asked me my personal reasons rather than policing around.

You might have someone who wants to bring down your business and might go to AFRINIC.

They do not know the reason. I feel this policy is really not relevant.

MC:
OK.

ARNAUD AMELINA:
For clarification, can you please give me your point of view with terms of allocation of resources from AFRINIC?

MC:
Even I did not get that.

ARNAUD AMELINA:
I want to hear point of view with regard to allocation of resources from AFRINIC.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
What do you need? You have to be specific. I strongly don't support the policy.

ARNAUD AMELINA:
A clear question was asked to you about the allocation of resources from AFRINIC.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
I don't understand.

ARNAUD AMELINA:
You don't understand. You don't know what you are talking about. I don't understand the question myself.

(Multiple speakers)

MC:
If I gave you the floor, it should be in a manner that the person can understand and respond to you.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
The question I asked is very simple. (Speaks French)

TRANSLATION:
I wanted to understand how to know - how do you understand about the allocation of resources with AFRINIC? How do you understand the allocation of resources? If it is a process, how do you understand?

MC:
We can hold it aside. Next comment.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I thought I heard in an earlier statement that there is no consensus and I thought the person might have a usurping of power.

ARNAUD AMELINA:
That is not accurate. I had the person make the comment. I notice it. I did not respond because he said it was his opinion. He said it was his opinion and he is entitled to his opinion. Thank you, Sir.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
I heard the person took a position on consensus or not. I think that is your rule.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
What I stated was that this community has repeatedly come to know consensus around this policy in the past, historically.

I am repeating what the co-chairs have said multiple times and multiple meetings on this policy. I am sorry but that is what has been said.

ARNAUD AMELINA:
I disagree. It has happened twice. They are correct. We have data.

(Multiple speakers)

MC:
Can be have the next comment?

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
Good afternoon, everyone. I am Patrick from Uganda and I am a student at the University. My view to the motion, I do oppose it, even to the fact that AFRINIC, as a body responsible for allocating resources, should, in the first instance, ascertain whether the member will fully utilise the resources it is about to give through all the set criteria and process.

My other view is, if AFRINIC can't ascertain that the particular members going to use the specific resources, why assign them to the member?

If it passes that, don't you think it will bring confusion and disputes among the AFRINIC members? Thank you.

ARNAUD AMELINA:
Thank you.

MC:
We will take one more comment and allow the others to respond before we take the demeaning comments.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
Thank you very much. I appreciate what he said about the resources being free for AFRINIC members.

Whatever policing is passed on effects...it affects every Internet user up to the end user. When the ISPs are given as resources to users, there are some changes attached.

Is there any standard for the AFRINIC to show it is assigned to the ISPs...sorry, is there any standard for the charges that the ISPs are obliged to be as they assign the resources regarding costs?

As we know, the ISPs are aimed at getting money. If there are any standards then this helps to block the black markets.

The users will be able to understand. I wanted clarification about that. Thank you.

MC:
Who are requesting clarification from?

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
From you.

MC:
You can respond, authors.

TRANSLATION:
Thank you for the interventions. We are trying to give our opinion and it will be very convenient so now we will try to put together all of these questions in one answer so we are not going to remain on the same issue.

43

Many people...we are talking about...they say they are concerned about this issue.

If they have read the proposal, even ourselves, the energy is very clear in the policy. People are ignoring the statement and saying we have chosen...we have decided to write the proposal because we have found some weakness in the statement and that is why we have written the proposal, to strengthen the statement.

Some people are just talking about the weakness of the process. These people have not yet read the proposal. If they had read, they would be able to tell us clearly a paragraph that is not clear for them.

In this way, we can help them to understand. If you see the process is not clear without giving an explanation where you do not understand, it is difficult to guess where you have an issue of understanding in the proposal.

Many people were talking about the market. Left, right - I want to ask if there is a market in the region of AFRINIC.

ARNAUD AMELINA:
There is no such thing as a market, if that is what your question was.

TRANSLATION:
It is not coming from me. There is no market in the region of AFRINIC. It is very clear. Everybody now can put it in their mind that there is no market, no such market in our region.

Maybe you should reserve this issue for next time. I did not understand clearly the intervention of the person but I think he was talking about if we keep maintaining IPv4. We will not move forward IPv6.

Many of the slides are showing weakness and IPv6. These problems are not connected. I think I have understood and responded to the concerns of that person.

I am going to ask my colleagues Marcus to add more explanation.

MARCUS KG ADOMEY:
I have noticed that those supporting the proposal...those who are doing the submission, we heard them saying they wanted to improve and then suddenly saying, "I oppose." That is a contradiction.

Do you really want to oppose? Some of them did not read the proposal. They do not know what they are talking about.

If you don't mind, I can engage you on the LSA and the policy. I don't think I will go there. Please. Please, let's be constructive.

I want to progress in this community. Thank you.

(Applause)

TRANSLATION:
I would also like to clarify...to attract your attention...there is a process...the same

person will continue repeating the same thing until, in the end, you believe that he is saying.

This policy has been looked at twice. I don't want us to be influenced in one way or another way.

MARKUS KG ADOMEY:
Before...sorry, can I take more comments please?

SPEAKER:
All concerns are covered in the RSA and they have the right to recover and use resources. The process for review is not clear and it has already been reviewed at the time of allocation. Despite claims of change, the policy hasn't really changed. I therefore subject to this policy. That's the first one.

I would like to understand how Markus can… In direct contravention of the code of conduct.

MC:
Back to the floor.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I think the discussion on how the allocation process goes is very important. Some of the comments here show that people request numbers and with notification the numbers are allocated. So why is AFRINIC looking for a review?

AFRINIC have the right to review the allegations. It's important for people to know how the process works before commenting like that. The other thing I want to mention is people keep saying their own address, objection, etc.

Addressing an objection doesn't mean that we necessarily accommodate. This needs to be clarified. Supposing I say I oppose, I oppose, you need to address. We can, but it doesn't mean it will go the way you want it to go. We need to clarify.

My last point is I am glad (inaudible). We have a split in this community. Normally if you are following the rough consensus process, we are going to have a split like this. The good thing to do is show on the screen what are the issues because you have a split. Why are you saying these people and not these people?

Let's put aside the petty issue, see if we can agree and then go on, otherwise it will be difficult to say these people are of these people are. This is the way I think we should go.

MC:
Thank you for your contribution.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
Pascal here again. I have been following this for a couple of years. Marcus, the right statement you should have said to the young ones is that they can probably meet you later for proper training.

There is respect in Africa. You are an Anthony man and you are like a father to me. You know in Africa we always value respect, so I think you should mentor us. You have been

in the game for a long time. You would definitely train me better, but it is disrespectful what you said.

The last thing I'm going to say is some of the people here, including the authors of this proposal, during the abuse contact policy you said it is in the RSA. Why the double standards?

I am clearly just concerned with any proposal. I thought about the abuser contact policy. I am concerned with any policy that prevents the spreading of the Internet to the end of Africa. Thank you.

MC:
Thank you. The microphone queue is now closed.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
A clarification regarding the black market. Of course nobody will recognise officially that there is a black market, but there is. There are people selling resources besides the process. That is clarification.

TRANSLATION:
That confirms the necessary need for this policy. If you say the market is not there and you confirm that the black magic is there so I can see the importance of clarifying this issue.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
I explained this in several emails and again an email to days ago where I said this policy proposal has two parts. One part is resource recovery. I think it is good even if there is some text in the bylaws the RSA and so one that says usage and non-compliance with policies may bring if this is a repeated action by a member to recovery of resources. That will be one policy proposal.

I would say the first thing to do is to split this policy proposal into two parts. The other part is the one I mostly disagree with right now with the existing text which is the review.

I still believe in the RSA there is sufficient text that allows AFRINIC to do the review. I would agree that the text makes the review and automated process. I will also agree that it's possible today that any member that is suspecting that another member is misusing the resources, or for example, reselling them, it is communicated to the staff so they can take the decision on their own if they need to do a bigger audit.

But not stating all of the details in the policy with the text we have right now. Again, please split into two different parts. It will be easier to reach consensus in each part. The last thing I want to say is I asked several times, can you explain what you think is missing in the RSA? Just tell us why do you think we need a policy proposal? I have read many times the bylaws, the RSA, the policy proposal and I still don't see the need for all the text that you have in the policy proposal.

Sometimes we need more text to explain things better, but most of the things you are asking in the policy proposal now are not needed. Thank you.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
The goal of this proposal, is it to police for the we want to find a way of improving the usage of our resources? I need to be clear about these two things. Do we want to release all improve on utilisation.

If we want to improve utilisation, in my opinion, let's fall back to both inter-and intra-policies and see what we need to add for efficient usage of these resources. What is the clear objective? Is it to police or improve?

MC:
Thank you very much.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I think I can bring some help to Jordi. If there is a provision in the RSA, is there a need to do something in the policy manual? Since other AIR…

I'm going to read section 2.5. If the organisation does not voluntarily return resources as requested, they can be revoked to bring the organisation into overall compliance. That is just a portion of the whole item. The whole 12 sections are about resource reviews. I think we have in the room our guest who can help us as to whether they have a provision in RSA and they have booked that mechanism into the policing manual.

MC:
Thank you. We do have it in mind to take comments from other IRRs.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
I said I would agree with the policy for recovery, but that is half of this policy.

SPEAKER:
Since you are saying there is provision in RSA, there's no need to put it in the policy manual.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
maybe in this region is not needed, so that's why I've asked repeatedly, tell me why this is needed.

SPEAKER:
I step in? I'm the author of the original text. Speaking for myself, when I wrote that it was about putting limits on the ability and authority to conduct such reviews. It was far more far-reaching. It's not about giving them the ability to conduct the reviews, it was about limiting their ability in a manner that was detrimental.

SPEAKER:
So why did you amend it?

SPEAKER:
In their world is not under the PDP control. We amended policy because we have control of that.

SPEAKER:
So shall we suggest that it is removed in the (unknown term) region?

SPEAKER:

You can.

MC:
We will take proposals.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I am Luca from Nigeria. I will suggest what I feel is a partial solution. If you look at it from the economic aspect, we have the business cycle which means and downs in business. You have succession and depression.

Just because at some point in time I'm utilising 100% and then the utilisation drops, it doesn't necessarily mean that more resources should be revoked. Rather, you should try and encourage businesses. If you revoke the resources, it is simply pointing them towards the black market. These are certain things we need to consider.

I'm not saying it should entirely be thrown into the dustbin, but we should look at policies that should be able to help, not just the giants in the business, but even those who are coming up because as far as I am concerned, we are in an era of SMEs.

MC:
Will take the two remote comments.

SPEAKER:
"I think this policy is needed and the RSA must be amended." That is the first one. The second one, "Can be as close opposing to be very clear in pointing at what they disagree with and clearly state the possible solutions? I feel like this will keep going round in circles."

TRANSLATION:
Somebody said this was the goal, if we could take the time to read, we could find the answer in the concern because it is clearly stated that the goal is not to eliminate the resources.

If you can see what is black-and-white, the recovering of resources, that will be the last solution and time is given to members to be in conformity with the help of the personnel.

The recovery of the resources...if they took the time to read then they are not the one... The person against everybody assigned. Nobody contested.

AFRINIC has the authority to recover if the member is not in conformity. I am asking the members, the personnel of AFRINIC, to tell me how many years AFRINIC is in existence.

The second question, how many times have they made the revision of the membership? How many people have been audited? How many resources have been recovered? Thank you.

Please let the staff help us to understand before I can continue.

ARNAUD AMELINA:
I do not have the translator so I will do my best to answer. How many reviews have been there?

Usually reviews are done when we are evaluating the request for additional resources. That is when we do reviews.

Have we had any reviews that we have conducted outside of the normal process? If yes, how many?

SPEAKER:
Most of the reviews are done when the members come for additional resources. If I'm not mistaken, there was a review that was triggered for one member earlier this year or in 2018.

AFRINIC staff had to review that. They are not outside the scope of the additional resource request. There are no particular reviews that have been done.

TRANSLATION:
As you can see, AFRINIC is there for more than 15 years. Has been one of that started by AFRINIC outside the process of the acquisition of new resources and if you are against, why since 15 years that issue was just done once?

The resources are public. They are shared amongst us, among the community, and you think it is not normal to do the division to ensure that members receive resources so that they can conform with the rules.

Let us be serious with ourselves. We have got to be conscious with public resources. It is well stated that this policy is very important.

I want to repeat myself. We know that there is a black market in Africa for the resources. It is very important.

MARKUS KG ADOMEY:
Where about 40 minutes behind. All the time we saved has been lost. I can give you one minute.

Somebody said I was disrespectful. They should go back and read the proposal. Secondly, it has been suggested we are coming in and being mischievous.

When I react... I need to agree with the person.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I work at the Federal University in Nigeria. My first comment is based on systems thinking. I fail to see a model that will help with sustainable development in Africa.

Seeing the proposals presented here today is to punish and revoke resources. That is my first question.

For the second one, I believe ICT is a tool for development in Africa. Looking at the nooks and crannies, where we want technology is for local farmers and if we focus on infrastructure projects that will be harder to deploy and therefore take much more time.

If you say 12 months to review or after 12 months you're reporting anything, the time is too short. In the same time, we have to look at education.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
If it is given back to the resources to the end user, they can go back and complain to the policy. The argument that this policy, it will affect the African region, I don't think so.

I think we have a mechanism to recover the resources. I don't think that Africa will be behind if we adopt this policy.

Finally, we are playing a lot with our associates and we should be aware and understand what we are talking about.

This policy is now at its eighth version and we should be responsible for the decision and make a decision that will affect us.

DEWOLE AJAO:
Thank you.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
Good afternoon, everyone.

DEWOLE AJAO:
The microphone queue was closed several minutes ago.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
Afternoon, everyone. Over the years, there have been points raised about this policy. I have raised some myself.

I'm not here to support or oppose today but what I will say is that if those points raised were actually addressed then there will be no points here today because everything said here today was repeated points.

The points are valid because they have not been addressed yet.

On another point, if a child, a small baby is going to go near the fire, you tell baby the fire is going to burn them. You can let it burn them and they will not go back again.

The community is not ready for the policy. Why don't we have a break and with until they become mature enough and then there will be a solution. Thank you.

DEWOLE AJAO:
Noted.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I work for the regulator. I am French-speaking.

TRANSLATION:
I am surprised. It has been done since the beginning only once because when you are managing public resources then you have to control and see the resources are being managed properly.

I want to talk about the experience. We are managing resources like you. In the past, we have explained how it has been used and also we should talk about the projection of the use.

We can do this when the resources are not used. We have other people that can use. I am surprised to know that they are resources in the black market.

I have never had an organisation like this one where you can take resources and use them and put them on the black market. I am very surprised. Maybe we should have some audit.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I have one question to ask but before I ask my question, we should try to make this meeting more welcoming for everybody. Everybody has freedom of speech. I have one question and I just need a simple answer. My question is (inaudible) making policies? Does AFRINIC take into consideration when they are making policies, does it affect the end user positive or negatively.

SPEAKER:
It is the community who makes the policies. The policies would not be made behind you. Last, before I make a call for any of our friends from the other RIRs who are willing to share their experience.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
I want to address the comment about consensus. The status quo achieved consensus a long time ago, so there is no need for new consensus to preserve the status quo. You're asking us to change policy and that requires a new strong consensus. A change requires consensus and it doesn't have it.

The previous declarations of consensus, one was ruled out of order by the appeals committee and one was retracted by the co-chairs during the last call period and that period did not conclude.

The claims that this policy has achieved consensus twice before are questionable at best and this policy has not successfully achieved consensus in the community thus far. If it had, we would not still be talking about it.

DEWOLE AJAO:
It's not helpful for you to try and pre-empt the call from the co-chairs.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
I am clarifying my statement.

DEWOLE AJAO:
The microphone queue is close. I can see we will keep going back and forth on this. The declaration is the proposal is sent back to the mailing list for further discussion. Do you have a comment?

SPEAKER:
I'm from member services. We've heard discussions regarding contents of the registration services agreement. With an assisted review where AFRINIC staff work together with its members to ensure that contact information, for example, is accurate and complete and up-to-date.

For example there are some members who have resources. If we detect any issues regarding policy compliance, we do have non-compliance already identified for some. There are some issues that we have noted. We are planning in fact to bring it to the

members on their member portal in the future, but with the review conducted by staff to work with the member, especially in regard to the accuracy, completeness and comprehensiveness of the information in our registry. Is that something you would like stuff to entertain?

DEWOLE AJAO:
OK. It would be helpful to take these questions back to the mailing list so we can see contributions from that angle. Thank you very much. Yes, yes, if you do have a final comment.

SPEAKER:
We are open for sincere contributions. We are a community where we can't review what we are doing and this policy is meant to complement the RSA. No one should think that resources are being taken away. Even at that time if you are not compliant, you can go back when the need is there.

We are not stopping anyone to this policy to go out of business or punish any end user. Thank you.

TRANSLATION:
Just to add, I think him, but I have the impression that he made himself influenced and it's not the first time this is happening. He let himself be influenced.

If he thinks the policy is useful for the community, so it is up to him to think, so he should present the issue that must be tackled. The problem that was solved and doesn't want to be resolved. If we don't do that, decision will be taken under influence. You take a decision with emotion.

I'm sorry really to tell you this.

SPEAKER:
This is not about contributing to the policy discussion. I just want to say something about this specific policy. Three years now it has been coming backwards and forwards. I think something needs to be done. Something needs to be done differently probably to find a way out here.

Listening to the discussion I just have one question that was not asked. It may need attention for this community. Are we still believing in the need-based usage of these resources are not? That is the fundamental question related to this policy, I believe.

Answering that question will probably have the different people's peas to coalesce to that. If we go from that principle to allocate resources on a need basis, there are a lot of things that come from there. Some of the arguments today contradict and support it.

We need to find an answer. It's for the community, not the co-chair. We as a community need to decide if AFRINIC needs to go by the need basis of those resources. Secondly, from the policy point of view, there is a need to do something different. This has been going on for three years. Coming, going, it's a central point of the policy discussion.

We probably need to see what can be done differently to work on some kind of consensus. Thanks.

SPEAKER:

There was a request earlier from our colleagues from another area to share with each of their RIRs , there is a process to audit. To share what the processes.? It's a pleasure to be here. Is a fantastic room of people. We deal with the sets of issues slightly differently.

What we do represents what I would call a clear concern that resources are used in consistency with policies. In the first place the membership agreement that every member signs requires them to comply with policies in all times and the use of resources they receive from AFRINIC.

That is requirement and if they breach of the membership agreement can be cancelled and that automatically implies and result in withdrawal of the resources. That is one part of it. You have policies required by the membership agreement. If they are breached, the membership agreement is cancelled and the resources are recovered.

That doesn't happen arbitrarily. There is a clear process spelt out where if there is a suggestion of the breach, there is a notice to the member. There is the ability of the member to remedy the breach and an escalation to a resolution.

That process has resulted in a number of cases of the cancellation of membership and the recovery of resources where resources were clearly allocated on force pretenses, by false declarations from the members which resulted in the allocation is being made to them.

In some cases where members had transferred their resources to other parties. That is also regarded as a breach of policy because AFRINIC expects the resources to be used by the member consistently in the way that they declared in the first place.

That is one part. The other part is about reporting and that a different thing for us. If staff receive information or some allegation of anything in relation to our services or policies and those staff are able to investigate that, if they are able to make a judgement in full on whether the allegation deserves to be investigated.

If they believe it does, they can make the investigation if they like. It is a staff call as to whether or not the policy continues to be complied with in the first instance. If the staff action was to result in a proposal to cancel the membership, then like I said, that would go into a notice of appeal so it gives the chance for that case to be effectively escalating to the board level.

We also have another mechanism for any of our members to contact the board and EC directly on any matter they like. There will potentially be a report of the type you are talking about here that would come to us via the board.

I would suggest, although as far as I know it hasn't happened, it would be referred to staff for investigation if a complaint was regarded as being worth pursuing. I hope it's helpful. We are trying to achieve the same thing that you are trying to achieve here.

We have done it with the membership agreement primarily, but in any case, what we do really does emphasise and demonstrate that the community is concerned that resources continue to be used as they have been declared… As per the intent and as per the policies. I hope that helps. Thank you.

SPEAKER:

Thank you, Paul.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
And (unknown term) we have something similar to AFRINIC. We can have a review of resources, especially when members request more, or if there is a suspicion. There is an agreed process. It has not been necessary so far. We have been working on transparency for a long time.

There are many mechanisms where members and people from the community can communicate with different parts. There is the board of directors, they transparency committee. They can report to these bodies when they see something is not being done properly.

That is if something is not being done correctly in the community or within the organisation. I am talking as a board member and within our own capacity, there is a bigger picture that has to be considered.

The principles that were defined for resource allocation decades ago and the growth Internet, we need IP4, and especially with the resources that can be achieved through the policies, they are not enough...

Those organisations will find a way to get the resources. Anything that is done to restrict those is not going to work. It is going to create a bigger black market.

It is important to remember that the policies, the need-based things, people will do things in that way. It's important to see the big picture.

The only resources available to be put to better use are the legacy resources that were discussed in the transfer policy.

Basically, this community rejected a policy like that. The regions are getting the resources and not losing that much. It is a benefit for the region.

They have changed their mind and approved that kind of policy in the last policy forum in May and, basically, that is because the legacy resources are still there and no one is using them.

There are some companies that received the resources 10-20 years ago and don't even know that they have them and people are telling them that they have the resources and they're trying to find a way to make it available for everyone.

That is not going to happen in the AFRINIC region if there is not a policy that allows the region to get the resources. It is important to protect some of the resources of the region but more important to protect what the region will need in the next years, especially when you get to the next phase.

DEWOLE AJAO:
Thank you very much for the insights and I hope we can take some of the feedback into consideration as we move forward on the list. We are way behind schedule.

The next policy proposal is provisions for resource hijacking and after that will be clarification on temporary resource usage.

I can see an email from the author of that policy proposal announcing his withdrawal. We have got that time and someone else interested in the subject matter can pick that policy proposal up.

Provisions for resource hijacking.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Don't worry. This is my last policy proposal today. This is very complex. I knew we would have 20-30 minutes for this. I decided to make a short presentation.

I know not everybody has read it but I am trying to explain it as well as possible.

The idea of the policy proposal started in (unknown term) and the original title for the proposal there was different but it has been suggested to rename it but I think the title explains much better what the policy tries to do.

The original title is Hijacking of Resources is a Policy (unknown term) and what it means is that if somebody is getting resources and someone else is hijacking the resources, typically by means of PCP, this is a violation, and that is what we are trying to say.

We are trying to explain that this is a matter not of routing but respecting members and all of the members, including those from AFRINIC, they get their resources, and it has been explained, it is not you are getting the resources but getting the right to use those resources and in many of the documents at talks about exclusive right and this is of use because if you get an ASN or an IP address, you are the only one that can use it or provide it to your customer.

What happens if a member is using the resources of another member without his permission?

I think everybody understands clearly that this is wrong, right. This is what we are trying to state clearly with this policy proposal and the end goal is that if somebody is doing this repetitively, not just once, one mistake, not doing it by mistake, not proposed, that is a policy violation and that there is a policy violation then we can use the rules to say, "You are taking over the rights of other members so please stop it or you will get your membership cancelled."

That is it, basically. Again, just to restate what many people are discussing, not just in mailing list of AFRINIC, because we did not have much discussion about this policy proposal, but this is not about routing and we are not saying that AFRINIC should be the routing police or saying that fat fingers is a policy violation, it is not the objective, we are only looking for clearly intentional and continued cases of policy violation.

If you make a mistake, nothing happens. Another, nothing happens. If you are doing mistakes every day, you have a problem.

There are other tools that might help - they might not necessarily solve 100% of the problem but they may help improve the situation and avoid hijackings.

We have AFRINIC already working together with the other organisations in LPI and MANRS, an initiative mainly from ISOC and it is being looked at by many people and they are taking it seriously and that this away it goes.

If you keep doing it wrong and acting against your colleagues, your members, you are doing something broken, right.

I think this is my last slide. This is to give you a view of the process that we have designed within this policy proposal.

When there is... This will be notified if it has been provided sufficiently and the orange line that you see below is basically discarded because if there is a hijack but not sufficient data then there is nothing we can do, that is obvious.

In the policy proposal we have designed a group of experts that will be volunteers from the community and the group of experts will review the data and, depending on the result of the review, they can either discard, if it was an accidental hijack, or they can say, "We really need to conclude there is a nonaccidental hijack."

If there is one, if there are three, if they unanimously decided was nonaccidental and un-proposed, there will be a time for the hijacker or the suspected hijacker to provide objections and there will be time for the publication of the report.

If somebody else on the community can provide some input, "It was an accident because of this and this and this..." In those cases, if there is no response from the hijacker or a unanimous declaration and not an appeal then it will be ratified as a policy violation.

The policy proposal stops at that point. We are not with the policy proposal in a simple case taking any punishment option.

During all the processes, there are many steps for the report to be dismissed. We believe that this is beneficial for any suspected accused party. I will double check. Yes.

The last question I have is if we don't do this ourselves as a community, should we prefer that sooner or later lawyers, governments, regulators take part in this?

I believe that this community is working very well in self-regulation. We know that the PDP is not easy and it takes time to resolve things and when a policy proposal is in the list, everyone contributes, we come to the meeting with almost consensus or not consensus, a clear view is that of waiting to the last minute and avoiding small sentences like objecting to a policy proposal because one small sentence is not right, so we are right to go in this direction with the policy proposal.

Before it is submitted to the region, we have not done the official one but we are preparing it. That is it. Thank you. Questions? Comments? Tomatoes?

DEWOLE AJAO:
Thank you for your contribution. We can take questions very briefly. We are 12 minutes into the break.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I spend a lot of my time dealing with security -related stuff so I'm not unsympathetic to the problem. I think you are talking about it in the wrong room.

They say they are unique in the database and the system. You don't get anything that says they are unique in the zone. I think trying to shoehorn the definition of one into the other is really dangerous.

I don't really have anything against having some sort of community-based, panel-based review of how people are behaving out on the Internet but I think the further that is away from the RIL system, the better.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
I didn't have time. The panel of experts at the ones reviewing that.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
That is fine but I think it is the wrong situation for an RIL policy and what we need is for the registries is to signal what their members have indicated should be the correct use of their policy.

It is up to operators independently to choose whether to listen to that data and if we think as a community we need a stronger committee-based mechanism to enforce good behaviour then that is great and I can get behind that but it is not an RIL.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Sometimes we have to defend the rights of members and yes, it is registration, but, in the end, it is very close to what we do with the resource numbers, right.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
Maybe we can have the debate outside.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I have been following this proposal. From the first email you sent, and this was made. I'd like to think I was the first person to send comments. I'm glad to see, I want to believe is based on my suggestion that you have increased it. It was 4 weeks, the time for people to respond. I suggested six weeks.

With regards to hijacking activity, it's ideal that your proposal gives the suspected resource hijacker (inaudible). It's something you have addressed, but we have to make it clear, what is intentional hijack, my point is always about the technical perspective.

If we believe that BGP has that effect, it can be specific hijacking activity. So the administrators of the registries should be allowed to explain their activity, which might not be intentional.

I also want to point out some fundamental errors. You can correct me if I am wrong. RIRs are not responsible for giving out the right of use, right?

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
my perception is that somehow yes otherwise this policy does not make sense.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
That statement is correct. They cannot grant right of use.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
yes. When we get resources from an RIR, we have the right to use it. In parts of the document it says, exclusive rights. So it's only for you which means no other member can take over.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:

OK. If we agree they don't do that, there is a big misconception here because the right of use is granted by those… That is the ISP, so to say. So I think from this point I've raised, this proposal needs to be reviewed. If you want to put some of my points into consideration and if you are asking for my opinion, I would say I do not support it as it is right now.

DEWOLE AJAO:
OK. So you can continue the conversation. Yes, please?

TRANSLATION:
Some observation in relation with this policy. I don't think this policy was put into consideration by another policy review. When we do, we should be able to know if someone has put a prefix that does not belong to him.

My second observation is AFRINIC… On policy. I see what we have done and I hope on this principle if each member could protect his resources, your question would be solved. Thank you so much.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
there is always space for something. We can't escape that.

DEWOLE AJAO:
OK. Centre mic.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I am a member of the board. (Inaudible).

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
we don't know. It depends on the analysis.

DEWOLE AJAO:
Thank you all. The decision is to send this back to the RPD mailing list. There is no consensus to proceed. We are way behind time. You have eaten 20 minutes into the break. The next policy proposal should be on the docket, but the author has withdrawn the policy.

I think we should take a nine minute break and then we come back for the next policy proposal. This is the AFRINIC policy, the two sets of elections. Nine minutes. Please be back in the ring. Thank you.

(Break)

DEWOLE AJAO:
Thank you very much for coming back. I hope you enjoyed your nine-minute break.

If the staff could please help to get the people outside back in the room.

The next policy proposal that we will be discussing is AFRINIC policy development process base and Komi is presenting that.

Can we please ask the people outside to come in?

KOMI ELITCHA:

Thank you. My name is Komi Elitcha. Please have a seat. Can the doors be shut please?

OK. So, thank you to the community. I will present version 5 of the current proposal which is amending the current policy development process. That is version 5.

Again, hete is the program statement. The current process aiming to improve, I mean to develop the proposal in our region does not provision for proposal adoption and also there is no cut-off for duplication of proposals.

It also lacks clarity about programme statements and how we deal with proposal out of scope because the development process we are supposed to only discuss proposals which relate to managing Internet resources.

The current process lacks all of that. Finally, and most importantly, the consensus process for decision-making is not defined and it is usually an open door for interpretation, especially from an (unknown term) perspective.

Another point is the current process does not have provision for both adopting policies as per section 11.4 of the AFRINIC constitution of the process.

From the last meeting, we have noticed that we have invited proponents to cooperate. There was comment about improving the definition of last call and also to improve how we define consensus, and by consensus we mean draft consensus.

We also...we have also in version five tried to clarify the implementation after a policy proposal is ratified by the board.

We now give coaches after a face-to-face meeting a maximum of two weeks to inform the working group of the next step which is if the proposal is moving to the next phase, moving to the concluding phase or not. Is it going back to the discussion phase?

There is a complaint about completing proposals and provision for more information during impact analysis.

The documents are online. We have also updated the guidelines and procedurals of how the working group in practical terms is supposed to work about election.

In a case like now, there is only one chair - it is supposed to be two. We will look at how the working group can address those issues.

The main points, the provision for travel assistance for proposal initiators because travelling in our region can be very tricky so I think as co-authors we have thought it might be useful that in certain circumstances to allow or to support for people to come once the proposal has been made clear and explained more.

An appeal can be filed against the adoption phase. In the previous version, you can only appeal during the discussion phase and the discussion of coaches after the discussion phase.

Now, any member of the working group can go and appeal against the decision of the chair about adopting a proposal or not.

After the review phase, if the proposal has gained enough support from the working

group, chairs shall initiate as soon as possible, no later than two weeks after the face-to-face meeting, the last call for comment.

During the last call for comment, any major objection must be addressed adequately and fully for the determination of consensus.

Now I am going to try to show a kind of chart to describe the proposal.

OK, from the beginning then, the first summit proposal, any person, any member of the working group who has subscribed to the mailing list can send the proposal to the chairs at the address that you can see on the board.

The chairs are supposed to evaluate the program statement to see if the program statement is really addressing an issue and if it is OK then the staff will move on to assigning a unique number to the proposal.

If the chairs find the program statement is not accurate or is duplicating an existing policy then they should try to discuss with the initiators either to withdraw depending on the situation or to amend the program statement to make it very clear for the working group to make process.

Initiators are free to collaborate or not, so we call that phase of the process the adoption phase. Please.

Now, just in case the proposal got adopted by the chairs and the working group collaboratively, the content of the proposal shall be discussed on the mailing list and chairs have the responsibility to frequently provide to the working group a summary of the discussion and comments.

Initiators also have, in good faith, the responsibility to improve the proposal according to the feedback coming from the working group. This is the discussion phase which lasts a minimum of four weeks.

After the discussion phase, chairs shall tell the working group, if there is enough support from the working group, to move the proposal one step forward.

If the answer is yes, then good, chairs shall ask AFRINIC staff to provide or propose staff and legal analysis.

In case the proposal has not gained enough support from the mailing list and from the working group, the proposal can move either back to the discussion phase or can be withdrawn.

Also, if there is no progress after a certain amount of time around the discussion as no solution is found then we can go to a situation of withdrawal or rejection.

At the review phase, which lasts a maximum of four weeks, the intent is to consolidate the proposal as written. In the format, the initiators are expected to adapt it as needed based on the feedback from the working group.

Only at this stage can we consider the working group mutually with chairs, they can consider the proposal to be ready.

At the public policy meeting, if in a maximum of two weeks after the meeting the chairs informally working group can move again to the concluding phase. If no, there is still a door for initiators to go back to the discussion phase or to withdraw.

At the conclusion phase, which also recall the last call, OK, chairs shall initiate the last proceeding on the mailing list and, at this stage, we expect the working group to bring something new.

This stage we should not be discussing obsolete objections. At the concluding phase any major addressed objection shall push the proposal back and if the result is no major unaddressed objections, expect to declare processes and send reports and recommendations to the board for ratification.

Afterthe proposal is active and implemented by staff. I've tried to go through the whole process with the various options. So we are open for comments and questions.

DEWOLE AJAO:
Thank you. The floor is now open for comments, questions and contributions. You go first.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I will speak in French.

TRANSLATION:
Thank you. I'm from Tunisia. I am planning to support this policy because I had a time in the appeal committee and all the consensus we did through the review we had an appeal and will be wanting to (unknown term), we have many problems with PDP.

There were some issues with proposition, proposals. We need some clarification as what will help with the bills. I need this policy.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
I already indicated in the list that I am opposing this policy proposal. I have sent a couple of times emails regarding specific points. First and the most important point from my perspective is that one of the problems that we have in basically all the registries and this one as well in the PDPs is there is a lack of contribution.

People believe or understand that PDP is complex and this policy proposal is making it much more complex, the PDP. I think that will not facilitate the participation of people, but the other way around.

I think it will be a big mistake to adopt this PDP. The other point is the discussions and so on that you are having in this proposal come from the right. I stated this several times… This microphone is out of battery or what?

There is a big difference that makes it impossible to adopt it in any other region because in (unknown term) it's meant for only taking the decision and consensus in the mailing list. So in (unknown term) all the decisions are taken in the mailing list.

When you try to use that concept here, it doesn't work. This microphone is not working. Do you have a battery or a replacement microphone? I will try to continue.

That is the major concern I have. It can't work because even if you state in the policy

proposal that it will consider the input and considerations of the mailing list, the timing does not allow for it.

There is no way you can actually try to accommodate that. For example, one of the inputs I provided six months ago or something like that is it takes the chairs two weeks to make a decision. It was adopted in the previous version, but is not in this one.

SPEAKER:
No. Let me help you. After a face-to-face meeting, we no longer talk about consensus. The chair has two weeks to make a decision.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
maybe I'm confused, or made a mistake. I don't think it is the battery…

The other thing is I radically disagree with not having the facility to have multiple competing proposals. A very good demonstration that that is useful has been this morning.

The way the PDP works, and there is no way to sort it out, is having the possibility to actually present totally to the community so they can make a decision. Moving that capability is really, really bad.

I believe also there is also the appeal process that must be started by several members of the community, not just one, right? So that is also a really broken thing. It may be possible that the single member of the community is right and others are not just against that, but not stating it. It happens.

Most people have an opinion on a policy proposal and they don't go to the list to say, so it may happen perfectly. The last thing, in this version, or this policy proposal, there is a lot of micromanagement from the work of the chairs and I think they should freedom for example, I don't agree either that they should decide on the scope of the problem statement before accepting a proposal.

I think it is up to the community to decide on the way to decide is how a policy proposal that reaches or doesn't reach consensus. That is it basically..

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
You talk about having support to move forward, but the definition of enough support is…
I don't know what is enough support. There was a lot of complexity that is unnecessary.
I agree that the current PDP called use more clarity, but converting it to one of such complexity is not necessary. I support it as it is written.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
Before I make my questions, I would like to comment on questions that are still common. It's like doing a lot of nothing, but lots of questions. The kind of person who believes in a decision, they should make it rather than not making a decision at all.

My question would be on where this proposal says frequent consensus, in the working operations of policy proposals are made through rough consensus unless specified otherwise. I want to know what are the conditions to specify the rough consensus?

KOMI ELITCHA:
The argument here is that we are functioning as a working group. So as a working group

we must agree, OK? We must agree on which basis are we going to move forward. So there is provision for that just in case the working group as a whole in the current situation can agree that here we should deal not in rough consensus mode, I mean. You get my point?

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I do, and it's more confusing. Why don't you make this rough consensus for every decision? Number two, you suggested there should be a show of hands, but not as a vote. At what stage would that coming?

KOMI ELITCHA:
At the face-to-face meeting, of course. The idea is if the proposal is (inaudible) in the face-to-face meeting, it means there was a lot of discussion on the mailing list and the show of hands is not a vote, it's to evaluate the agreement or support.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
And is the support is in the majority, it moves to the final vote?

KOMI ELITCHA:
That is not automatic. We give shares some kind of mechanism to assess the support on nonsupport in the room, but the final decision comes down to the chair.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
Perfect. I in support of that because rough consensus is vague. Thank you.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
My comment is on our policy processes. It's OK for our policies to look like any other, but we should suspect that being the youngest of the (unknown term) we should work out which one and that in some way into policy process. I noticed that Jordi likes the right one, but he doesn't want us to like it either.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
Let me clarify. I like it because it works in the meeting. What I think is wrong is to take a process that is designed for only the mailing list and try to accommodate that for the mailing list and meetings.

I think you break it. I tried to make it a mailing list only process. In the end we adopted a process which is mailing list and meeting, but it's not like the right one. It's quite good. Never mind. It's perfectly fine to have different processes, but trying to copy one process for a different region, not realising it from a different working perspective, it breaks it.

People contributing in the mailing list, you will see that the timing does not match.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
We are taking that part and adding our own local part.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
We need more community participation and making it more complex is against that.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:

Not necessarily. People are not participating because the process is cumbersome.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
In my opinion, I don't agree.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
Exactly. That is the point. Since I am here, let me influence the decision. Thank you very much.

KOMI ELITCHA:
Thank you.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I would like to speak in French please.

TRANSLATION:
I would like first of all to thank those who brought this proposal because we are in a community where consensus is important. We know that we are young and we want to construct.

To construct, we need to do it with consensus. Going in line with the proposal, in the beginning, we had a group trying to validate that we have to judge if we can continue discussing the proposal. That was the idea.

We had to see if this proposal is relevant before engaging in discussion.

The second item, I am not an argument with Jordi because we have to cope with things and take what is good somewhere and put some of our touch, because we are African, so we want to come together and look at one another in the eyes instead of discussion in a line.

The discussions are made in English and are excluding many people who are not able to understand the impact, the legal impact, the economic impact, the social and cultural impact of these policies.

There is an exclusion. If we limit it so that all the discussion is done in English then we are excluding the stakeholders who are not working in that way. That is the case of some governments.

When they are taking decisions, there are some in pop console nation but when it is about taking the decision and the working group then after the consensus what is missing in AFRINIC that we should participant, all of us should participant.

I salute the proposal. It is not perfect but we need to take some decisions and as we are moving there will be adjusting.

We can adopt this and move forward.

(Applause)

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I am a researcher in telecommunications and I would like to comment on the presentation. It has been a wonderful presentation.

However, like I recently passed in Tunisia, first of all, we must understand the problem of the current PDB process. There are problems, no doubt about that. We must find solutions.

I feel that this proposal that Komi is coming forward with, probably another proposal would have been a better solution. It is too complex.

That is especially given the fact that we want to make things easier. At the moment, just a few people are contributing to the PDP process because of some reasons.

You are seeing a high number of people contributing on nobody contributing and there are different situations.

We are trying to adopt a process that has been adopted in Ripe - I have been a member of Ripe and is easier to have consensus on the mailing list with Ripe than in AFRINIC.

I understand that there are some of these things. Have we addressed the problem of the current PDP process? The answer is no. I think that this proposal can be better.

Where to contribute to the proposal to make it better. I don't think it is solving the existing problem which is, as humans, we do not trust each other or relate to each other and if we do not solve that in the first instance in the policies will not be correct.

KOMI ELITCHA:
Thank you. Go ahead.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I have a question, if you can help me out. We just finished discussing the proposal policy that has been on for 2-3 years, if I stand to be corrected.

We have not come to a consensus, a good consensus, still. There has been no permanent decision on that policy for three years.

Tell me, how does this proposal solve it?

SPEAKER:
Thank you. Komi, allow me to take this one. Can you point out to which proposal you were stating?

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
The Internet resource review.

SPEAKER:
My question to you is, what is the issue you have found during the three-year discussion and, regarding the problems did, does it fit in? That is the question.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
You are asking me the question that I asked you to answer. My question is clear. We have had a particular policy for so long and we've not come to a conclusion about it.

You proposed the policy - tell me how this policy can solve that.

TRANSLATION:
Please keep calm. It is not complicated.

SPEAKER:
Can you take your headset please? I want to speak in French.

TRANSLATION:
It is very simple. If we can read the statement of the policy, it is putting a procedure in which is now putting the proposal through a filter, a very clear process.

People are now contributing and it is open. When the program statement is not in line to the problem we are supposed to solve, this policy is going to die at the beginning.

The policy can look very important to the community but the statement must be very clear and the resolution is necessary. It is now just continuing the process so discussing and defining the major problem with the contribution of the people which is missing in this process.

They look like people which are not active so they are not really owning the process, they are supervising.

This policy is resolving that issue. This is enabling, was the policy is accepted and now we have a new proposal that we are presenting, it is clear that the policy should be continued and it will continue was the main issues are resolved.

These small issues will incorporate - it is a kind of consensus in the routine. The minus problem, when they are resolved, they will continue with the process.

If you took the time to read it, find out that the problem has been already solved.

SPEAKER:
I have tried to give you a hand. Regarding the Internet sources review, the microphone is now closed.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
Excuse me.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
Do I look like a baby?

(Multiple speakers)

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
Please explain.

SPEAKER:
We kept hearing that we don't need this policy because it is already fixing the areas blah, blah, blah...

Normally we have the adoption phase here in version 5 and there is provision for them to accept the proposal of there is room for discussion.

If it was on the table 2 years ago, probably would have done with this. Either we accept

it as a working group to discuss the proposal or not.

If the proponents are not happy, they can appeal. Does this solve the problem?

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
I don't understand.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
I want to remind, because I have got to the microphone, be aware about the policy before the discussion.

Some people still not understand why the need this kind of policy and we will ask a question, we will ask you to explain again what is wrong with your statement.

I will invite the author to give some clarification about the current issue that we have with the PDP. Thank you.

KOMI ELITCHA:
Next, please.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
My name is William and I am from Nigeria. I strongly oppose the policy. I want to, in a nutshell, state that if we implement this policy, it will take a long time before you can get it perfect.

Moreover, the policy is complex sky I think we should stick to what we have.

DEWOLE AJAO:
OK, next.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
Why can't we now go from basic peer review process? If there is a possibility that we can roughly work out a to another discussion before we make a decision.

DEWOLE AJAO:
Come again?

SPEAKER:
Please, can you slow down. For the discussion phase we have a four week minimum. We agree we are proposing to be a minimum of four weeks. As a Mac so at what point do you come to a conclusion?

KOMI ELITCHA:
After the discussion phase, you have the review phase that lasts a maximum of four weeks. After four weeks you go to the (unknown term) phase. So there are steps.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
So from the starting point of endpoints, what is the estimated period?

KOMI ELITCHA:
There is an option. It might not move in a straight line, it might go back and forth.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:

Yes, it is the back and forth.

KOMI ELITCHA:
We are saying there is a time limit. If you match, it's good, if you discuss again, it's up to you. At a certain point we can recommend you to drop down your proposal.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
What is that point?

KOMI ELITCHA:
Let's scroll again. At the discussion phase, for instance… Let's scroll down, please. After the duration, the time limits, let's say four weeks. Chairs tell us do we have support to move the proposal or what? If it is good, then fine. If not, you have an option there. Here is the link.

You go back to the mailing list, the discussion mailing list, or you withdraw.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
That doesn't answer it. Let me make it clear. Assuming you are an editor. You send out the paper, is reviewed and sent back. As an editor, it should be a maximum time. It is the end time that will obviously solve having a proposal endlessly coming back for review.

KOMI ELITCHA:
What you are suggesting is to give a time limit for a number of times the proposal should be discussed.! Yes, because you can have a proposal for 20 years.

KOMI ELITCHA:
OK. Noted.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
Item 3.1 and 3.2. How many are minor and major? From my point of view is a number between one and three and another that is a major objection. Please, can you clarify how many for each one?

DEWOLE AJAO:
A them to respond to that now.

KOMI ELITCHA:
Yes. We the working group elect chairs that have enough experience to decide what is major and what is minor. In case, and it is not final, in case there is disagreement about the result of what the chairs have declared as major or minor, you go to appeal. That is easy.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
Excuse me, it will depend on the culture's opinion. For example, the co-chair…

KOMI ELITCHA:
What we are trying to do as a working group is to set some kind of guideline.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
And the guidelines are good but it is better to be…

KOMI ELITCHA:
Do you have suggestions for improvement?

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
Yes. The minor objection is between one and three. The major objection is more than three.

SPEAKER:
How can we validate that?

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
The number of what? If 1-3 object, it's minor. If it's more than that, it is major.

KOMI ELITCHA:
Is not about the number of objections. Next please.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I want to ask a couple of questions. We need a definition of what consensus is. From my definition, it's to reach a point whereby you reach an agreement where everyone can actually agree with that. That is my own definition of consensus and that is what I understand about consensus. That is number one.

Number two, the problem with the current process and you and I know very well it is intimidation and name-calling and it is the same thing we are doing today. That is the problem with the current process.

We leave the substance and go after the personality. We have sold that, we are still going back to the same thing. Thank you.

KOMI ELITCHA:
I have a question for you as well. My question is what is the language of discussion on the mailing list face-to-face?

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
English.

KOMI ELITCHA:
No. Can you help? What is the language on the mailing list and face-to-face?

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
The word consensus is an English word.

KOMI ELITCHA:
So what is the relevance? The microphone is close. Carry on, quickly.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
I hear there is a need for definition. We have been doing this since 2005. There is a definition of rough consensus that is used by all the RIRs. It is 72-82. In this community we use rough consensus.

That rough consensus is the path, not the consensus, that's why we don't vote. What we are discussing a policy, we have a list of objections and we have to address them. In the rough consensus you have addressed the main issue.

I want this community to read the document and we are doing rough consensus, not full consensus. This is not our intention. We took it from ITF and others. We have documents.

DEWOLE AJAO:
Jordi, one comment from you.

JORDI PALET MARTINEZ:
someone was suggesting we should limit the number of consensus. It is wrong. It happens in the registry community, ITF, everywhere. Maybe the proposal doesn't have a place in the community for a couple of years, but things change and people can accommodate their views depending on that.

KOMI ELITCHA:
There are some questions. I think Jordi stated that the process is complex. Do we agree? We're not trying to fix complexity, we are trying to fix something wrong in the current process.

Can you show my first slide, please? The first one. So here you are saying that the current CPM does not have provision for proposal adoption. It lacks clarity about problem statements, out of scope, proposal out of scope and that is not defined clearly for moving the proposal. That is a problem we are trying to solve.

Maybe you disagree with the problem statement. If you do, tell us and we will correct. That is the first point. Then you mention that the process is discussed on the mailing list. Are you trying to say that the AFRINIC community is not capable of discussion proposal on the mailing list or are you saying it is easier for AFRINIC community to come here, to travel here to discuss the proposal? What we are trying to do here is to mature the proposal on the mailing list. So what do you disagree with? Is it impossible?

DEWOLE AJAO:
This is dragging, guys. It is nice to see us all engaging here. It be nice to take this energy online and continue to engage. Thank you very much. Anything else?

KOMI ELITCHA:
About the proposal, it is useful, and maybe next time he will demonstrate it to us. Also, for an appeal to be valid, it needs at least two supporters. That is an objection and if anybody can agree and you have not got the two people who agree I don't think it is relevant, actually.

Also, when...having enough support is not clear, I think that was his objection. There is provision for appeal. Just do their job but if a member of the community is not happy then there is provision to appeal.

That is it. Thank you.

DEWOLE AJAO:
Thank you very much. You may take your seats. Thank you to everyone who has contributed. The decision is to send the policy proposal back to the mailing list for the discussion.

There is no consensus to proceed with this. That brings us to the end of the policy

proposal discussions for today.

Before I carry out my final task as coach here, we will have elections for the new coaches as well as the ASOC representatives. I will hand you over to the committee.

ERNEST BYARUHANGA:
Thank you very much. I think some of the speakers had taken a lot of punches. Thank you very much. We have two elections coming up.

The first one is to elect two coaches of the policy development working group and you guys are the policy development working group and the coaches are the guys who said they are, minus me, that is Dewole, and Sami who is assisting remotely from Sudan.

Dewole's term is ending today. Sami's term ended at the last meeting but he could not be replaced then and now his seat is up for election.

The first part of the presentation will be from the chair of the committee who will take a few minutes to tell us. Over to you, Serge.

SERGE-PARFAIT GOMA:
Hello, everyone. We will start the session for the election. I hope you have enjoyed the discussion. I will speak in French. I will let people put their headsets in.

TRANSLATION:
What I was saying in English, were going to start the presentation and will look at the election of the (inaudible) and the French we say Presidente, and we will have the election in the room.

Our term started in 2017. They nominated four people - your humble servant to us here. We had the candidate who was here, one from Cameroon, the representative of the board.

To make the work in the right way, we have some responsibilities. We want to give you the picture, the image of how we worked and how we focused and proposal.

In the election this year, we have to cover C6 for the election for the board which will be taking place tomorrow.

We also have an election for the co-chair which will be done now. The election will be done right away and, at the end, we will have the election for the governor for tomorrow.

Today we have a couple of elections and tomorrow we will have the remaining elections.

We have almost 700 men in a period of 4-5 months so if you consider that June was a half month, so we spend around 60 hours of a meeting for each weekend.

The process was also involving some corrections. We communicate enough already and the staff were already working in social media and we are trying to explain the importance of the election and how to organise it and especially the possibility about the candidates.

One of the elements that was given as an indicator - it is not the good word in English,

to translate from French, we are trying not to translate literally, but our goal, it was to be sure that the people, we are not going to have just a robot who is going the postulate and then later on we find out that is not a human, just a robot as teh co-chair.

The new term, we wanted to come back to the community to get their reaction. The timeline was very short. We started a kind of consultation to have the feedback and a special question about the candidacy, especially those who are complaining that the time was very short to bring the information.

After this consultation, we changed what was pertinent to bring back. Those who are following the process...there was some upgrading and updating.

I am trying to make a focus. I am trying to show you this image. It was not really an easy roadmap to what is hard to find a solution.

I want to to thank the community and asked them to give us some guidelines. Believe me, sometimes you have to find a consensus, as we tried.

That is what we are expected to do. After doing all of this, the goal, it is now to elect. We had two vacant posts. We had to explain and they gave their candidacy and you had to renew the candidacy so the result that we found, there were eight members in total.

You can see the images and we are honoured to give this work back to you. We are going to bring them here so they have the opportunity to express themselves.

It will be just two minutes. It is not going to be enough so that they can talk from the heart. You will have the opportunity to listen to them and to ask them questions.

This will enable us to conclude the first step before the election. I would also like to tell you that we have candidates who are not here but we have had time to communicate with them so we will not break the ritual.

When the candidate is not there, he can send a video, or maybe send a message to the people were going to elect them.

We have a candidate who sends back the document and another one who asks as to explain.

It will help everyone to be sure what we have done. I am going to start calling the candidate. Komi Elitcha, is he in the hall. Good morning. Uncomfortable? We have the right to smile, even though it is an election. You can explain why you want to be… I'm going to do that.

KOMI ELITCHA:
I was a AFRINIC fellow and I'm from Togo. When it comes to PDP, policy development process, I have offered two proposals. One has passed rough consensus and is currently implemented. We mentioned it during the day. The other one is the PDP piece.

I've mentioned I speak both French and English. I do my best, although I'm not native English, to understand comments and forge discussion. My main motivation is to serve AFRINIC community emphasises the the Policy Development Working Group.

I stated in the current process I would like us as a community and as a working group

especially to stick to principles, three principles. Openness, transparency and fairness. So that is my last word. Thank you.

TRANSLATION:
Thank you very much, Komi. You have two minutes.

The committee of election. So, everybody, everybody can come, present their candidacy, so you can ask them questions. All of them can come. I consider that it is accepted. The second candidate.

SPEAKER:
Good evening, everyone. I would like to probably announce on the floor, I haven't influence the chair that I will be between my candidacy. It's after careful thought and consultation with community members that we need to strengthen our processes and not make things messier.

In other words I want to wish for the candidate contesting all the election all the best in the election a the best man win. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

TRANSLATION:
We also help to thank our friends. This is now the courage to move forward. Our candidate is going to ask one of the members here who is going to talk on his behalf. If he is in the wall, please move forward.

I hope you are also… He contacted you. I am not the one who is validating, so it is the committee. I'm just respecting the process. I am not the one to validate.

SPEAKER:
Kindly request that impossible and if he allows (unknown term) his statement. Can we proceed? Please make it two minutes maximum. Yes, please.

SPEAKER:
People have come to the microphone in person or send videos. I don't know, maybe this is the first time we are being confronted with such a process one particular candidate is requesting one member of the community, have got it right? To read a statement. Not to speak on his behalf. To read a statement from him.

Now, I thought they should have included the election committee. If the election committee has been made aware of this request, they would have rejected it or approved it. Since we don't have that kind of information emanating from the committee, the gentleman did not contact you to tell the community about it, it's only now that we are aware.

In terms of the precedent we have, I would such a procedure is as unusual and irregular in terms of how we run elections here. In my personal opinion, this person should not be allowed.

But since we are a community and consensus is that what we use and the way we conduct ourselves, maybe if you want to put it to the community, but legally I won't stand for this.

SPEAKER:
Thank you Ashok. Serge, please continue with the next candidate.

QUESTION FROM FLOOR:
Did Ashok come to the floor as Counsel for AFRINIC to explain his personal standing? This group sitting here will determine the way they want to do it. Do not take that away.

SPEAKER:
I do not speak unless I stand in my status of legal counsel. Secondly, to advise the immunity, we have a provision in our community that is if there is anything that comes to the community that needs to be determined and hasn't been determined earlier, a something in an election process happens and the community wishes to do with it, they can deal with it and eventually it will be used as a precedent for the forthcoming election.

SPEAKER:
For Mr Mark Elkins, can he connect through Zoom? He is sick and has flu and could not come. He is asking for your authorisation for that.

TRANSLATION:
We will try to move forwards. We will try to connect to him, but we will call the other candidate to give time.

We are going to ask the staff if they can also show the video of Mr Sami because he could not make the trip to Kampala.

SPEAKER:
(Speaks French)

Thank you very much.

TRANSLATION:
Mr Mark has signed a statement that (unknown term) is going to read on his behalf.

SPEAKER:
I reading his speech on behalf of the election committee. 20 years ago, he met the doctor in San Jose. We were discussing the possibility of creating an African agency.

Mark first got involved in 2008. He has served in a total of seven (unknown term) and became a board member in '09.

SPEAKER:
We cannot have the statement read. We expected he was going to speak to was on the Zoom.

SPEAKER:
He cannot speak on the Zoom. He just communicated. Let's just read it and get it over with.

SPEAKER:
Next year we would have 50 statements to read.

SPEAKER:
By interest, a show of hands, who thinks we should read the statement and who thinks we shouldn't.

SPEAKER:
I have a concern, what is the concern?

SPEAKER:
That every candidate has to be in attendance in person over the practice. If they want to change the practice, there is provision in the bylaws which allows it if the community agrees to it by consensus.

My fear, and I'm here to advise the community, next time, we will have two days of PDP because there could be 50 statements to read.

The requirement to be present in person or by video link - he needs to convince the people.

SPEAKER:
If I may, Mr chair.

ERNEST BYARUHANGA:
Go ahead.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
I don't understand the concern. The candidates have to be nominated. I don't think the nominating committee would pass 50 candidates so it would not be possible.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
Yes. I still stand to see it is the community that would take the decision. When the video was introduced, there was no video before. We have accepted the video.

It is a peculiar situation. Let the community look at the merits and the side. I don't think it is right to advise that there will be a problem in 20 years time when we have not gotten there. Whatever the problem is, let's deal with it now.

Someone has stated a reason why he cannot be here. I have says plane could not fly. Anything could have happened. Let's be real and deal with the issue instead of looking for the shortest way out.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
There is nothing within the procedure that says someone should read a statement in proxy. I have tried as much as possible to read every real within this election.

I also understand that they could have recorded video and send it to us early enough. If you are reading in proxy for him, it probably does send, it says to me that emotionally or psychologically that you are campaigning for him.

In my own opinion, if you cannot send the statement to the entire community then why should he send it to an individual in proxy? What is hidden about the statement?

It is a community approach. In my own opinion, I would strongly advise that, while I cannot object, I do not have the right to object, I would strongly advise as to tread a

path of caution and not set an unnecessary precedent.

ERNEST BYARUHANGA:
One last remark please.

COMMENT FROM FLOOR:
Hello. I think I would like to appeal to you to please listen to your council, and don't listen to people who are not directly from here, listen to your council.

Many things taken casually can come back and bite you. Changing procedures on the fly is the most dangerous thing you can do. It is happening quickly and you don't get the chance to think through it.

I will ask you to listen to your council and do only what your council says because the organisation is constantly under threat of legal this, legal that. If you want to play safe, follow your council.

(Applause)

ERNEST BYARUHANGA:
OK, so, I think this is what we should be doing, as I have been advised, the bylaws are clear, this was a change that we did to make a call on.

Without wasting any more time, it should be a quick yes or no and then we will continue. I trust that he has read the bylaws and understands them.

It is a yes or no question and then we can proceed.

Mark (unknown term) have requested and we agreed that his statement be read by somebody else because he could not get. Who is in support that the statement be read by someone else? Can I see your hands?

Leave your hands high please. In support. If you want the statement to be read out by somebody else, your hands up high.

Keep your hand high. Nice and high. Your hands high. Do we have a count? Do we have a final count?

Do we have a final count? A few seconds for a final count.

So, who thinks the statement should not be read to the meeting? Keep your hands high. Who thinks no. Do I see somebody who has voted twice?

(Laughter)

The staff are still counting. Keep your hands high please.

OK. A few seconds and we will have the final count. Still keep your hands high. We have the final count. 51 for Mark's statement to be read and 116 for it to not be read.

We will proceed.

(Applause)

TRANSLATION:
We're going to continue in the election. We're going to continue in the procedure. We are calling the next candidate, if he is in the hall.

Are you in the hall?

SPEAKER:
My name is Moses and I'm a Ugandan. I am standing here because I believe that the community needs a better representation. As I said, my name is Moses, I'm a communications engineer with over 12 years of experience.

(Applause)

I have worked with MTM, Orange, ISP, in this country and other countries in Africa. I have worked in Rwanda for one year. I worked in Zambia for one year and I have worked in many other countries in the space of technology and IT.

Many of you have been asking why are you standing? I want to answer that question right now. I am standing because (inaudible). Thanks to AFRINIC policies that allows people like you and I to stand and represent your community. Every one of you has a voice. Vote for me because I am well suited than any other candidate here.

SPEAKER:
Can you come up? Why are you running?

TRANSLATION:
We are now calling the next candidate from Nigeria. If he is in the hall, please present yourself. One, two…

If you can help us to have two minutes. Beyond two minutes I will stop the microphone. Switch off the microphone.

SPEAKER:
Hello. I'm based in Nigeria. In my country any time anybody asks me where are you from, I say I am from the capital. They say nobody comes from the capital and I say that while I come from the capital because your city and tribe (inaudible).

I am no longer from the capital, I am from Africa. No matter what your race, culture, or background, as long as you stand to progress Africa and make the Internet stable in Africa, I think I will be your man to sit around the table. My stand will always be that of the community. Thank you very much.

TRANSLATION:
Thank you very much. Now we are calling Anthony Ugba. If he is in the hall, Mr Anthony Ugba?

SPEAKER:
Good evening, everybody. I'm Nigerian and I'm a telecoms engineer. I've been in the industry for nine years. Currently I work with Ericsson. On the side I run a software development IT company. I offered to involve myself and volunteered to serve as a coach here with AFRINIC because I believe the community and the policies that AFRINIC produces are vital to Africa.

The policies we make are critical. I'm here to represent every young person because the youths are the engine rooms that drive ICT, that tried everything we talk about and I believe a young person deserves a seat here so that when we discussed we can talk freely and not act as it we are being intimidated, as some highlighted during the discussions about the mailing list. That's why I'm here.

SPEAKER:
We are going to call our last candidate. Mr Abdul Karim Oyalede.

SPEAKER:
Thank you very much. My name is Abdul Karim. I'm from Nigeria. I hold a PhD in communications engineering. I am currently head of the two Vice chairs representing Africa at the ITC you advisory group. I am a senior lecturer and a postdoctoral researcher where I am working on cost-effective communication development.

My reason for contesting for this position is because I feel I have gained a lot from this community. This is a way of me giving back. I want to say, as I stand before you today, I for everybody and at the same time, I'm for nobody. Thank you.

(Applause)

TRANSLATION:
Thank you very much. This is the sample of our candidates. So we want the questions to be short. The questions should be addressed to the candidates. We are going to listen. So you will be having one minute to respond.

Now the microphone is open for questions.

SPEAKER:
(Speaks French)

SPEAKER:
Do we have some questions? If we don't have questions…

TRANSLATION:
You didn't explain. You just talked about you have worked here and there, but you don't know what you are saying. What is your question? We heard about his travelling. What is he going to do? What is your project?

SPEAKER:
He has told us a variety of the things that he does. I'm worried whether he will get time to perform, according to his tight schedule.

SPEAKER:
One of the reasons I withdrew…

SPEAKER:
We want specific questions.

SPEAKER:

Candidates, right now without having any consultation. Please, I need them to have the microphone. How many usable IP addresses can you find in /31?

SPEAKER:
These are simple questions. All of those on that seat must know the simple concerns and must be able to know how to get a single consensus.

(Multiple speakers)

TRANSLATION:
We had to respect the protocol otherwise everybody… Everyone has to be short and accurate.

SPEAKER:
We have a process. Let's respect the chair. Thank you.

DEWOLE AJAO:
Please visit.

TRANSLATION:
I thank the board. My question is simple and short. I am asking the question to all the candidates. What was the experience on PDP? How many times have they posted? How many times have they participated and contributed in a policy?

How many times have they contributed in a policy or an ongoing policy? You need to live this experience to be able to manage this process.

We are going to let the gentleman ask a question and then go to the left.

SPEAKER:
We are not writing exams. We are here to present reasons why people are opting for those persons. We should limit those questions to finding their capabilities, not technical exam questions. Thank you very much.

SPEAKER:
Mine is not a question, but a comment.

SPEAKER:
If you don't have a question, we are running out of time.