FINISHED FILE

APNIC 62

OPEN POLICY MEETING 1 – POLICY SIG
SEPTEMBER 10, 2026
9:30 A.M. IST
MAIN HALL

Services provided by:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
719-941-9557
Www.captionfirst.com

This text, document, or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA: Namaste, good morning, everyone. A warm welcome to the Open Policy Meeting Session 1. Here at APNIC 62 Mumbai. My name is Bikram Shrestha. I'm the share for the Policy SIG. It is a privilege to be a part of this APNIC community. On behalf of our three Chairs, I have fellow co-Chair, Shaila Sharmin and Ching-Heng Ku. We would like to welcome you all in this Policy SIG session. First those who are remote, you're also welcome.

It is wonderful to see such a proud participation across the Asia-Pacific community. The Open Policy Meeting is the heart of the APNIC. Open, transparent, bottom-up and consistent policy for the policy procedure. The policies we create here is for IPv4, and IPv6, and the numbers that are managed in our Region. Most importantly, these policies are developed by you, the community. They're decided by the Policy SIG. We are not deciding by the Policy SIG Chairs and they're not ultimately handled by at APNIC Secretariat as well.

We will facilitate the open and balanced discussion, ensure different perspectives are heard and determine whether the Committee has reached consensus.

So we move on to the sessions. And we encourage everyone to participate. We have members, our fellow, newcomer simply attending your first policy meeting, your views are most

welcome.

You don't need to be a member of the APNIC to participate in the policy development process. If you support our Proposal, please tell us why. And if you oppose it, please explain why. And if you believe a Proposal could work with some modification, please tell us what changes you think would address your concern.

So some of us all know that, you know, we have just some housekeeping. Please use the microphone when contributing from the floors. So that both the room and from remote participation can hear you. So when we speak, please introduce yourself and we want to hear as many opinions as possible.

If you have not previously spoken. Please come in front of mic and be a part of this Policy SIG development process.

One particularly important reminder, this is for consensus not necessarily voting. A show of hand or other indicated support helps the Chair understanding the sense of the room. But it is not simply a numbered vote. We will listen carefully for the reasons for support, objections and then listen before determining whether the consensus consists.

We'll move this agenda. Today, we have a full session before noon. So we will begin with the process and the upon administration and APNIC policy update.

This morning, this session, we have three proposals, 169, 168 and 165. And we have only 90 minutes. So we will start with first NRO NC and SIG election procedure. I want to invite Thy Boskovic Manager community development programme at APNIC. Thy, please, the floor is yours.

>> THY BOSKOVIC: Good morning, I will go through the running procedures for the elections for the NRONC and SIG elections happening today.

There is one Seat available for the NRO NC as elected by an APNIC Representative who will serve a two-year term from 1 January next year. There are three Chair positions, cooperation, SIG that will serve a two year term from the announcement of the results. We have received only one nominee for the NRO SIG elections, co-Chair position no election will be held for the position.

Here are the key timelines today. Voting is currently open. And will close at 2:30 today, local time UTC plus 5.3. For the full election timeline, visit the APNIC 62 website.

So who can vote? Voting is conducted online through the Big Pulse system which you can access through the APNIC log-in. Each member is entitled to one vote, which can be cast by corporate contact or other contact with voting rights. If you are not a voting contact for your organisation, you can contact your corporate contact to provide you with that access level.

Even if you are not an APNIC member, in-person attendees are welcome to vote and entitled to one vote if they meet the following criteria on screen. That is registered and attended APNIC 62 in person. You need to check in at the registration desk by 10:00 a.m. today, do this ASAP if you haven't already. Having registered and attended at least one of the admitted past eight Conferences. This attendance can be in-person or online. You can still meet the requirement if you only attended online previously. If you need help casting your vote, contact the APNIC help desk or visit the services desk at the Conference for support.

Nominees. You can find all the nominees profiles and statements and a video if they provided one on the election web page. We encourage you to review these before voting.

I will introduce the nominees running for the NRO NC election. In the order of the three nominations received I would like to introduce the nominees to you. The first is Nicole Chan. The second is Param Vijay. The third is Gazib Kabir. There are three elections held for co-Chairs in policy, cooperation and routing SIG. For the co-Chair the nominees are Christopher Hawker and Ching-Heng Ku. For the Cooperation SIG the nominees are Kwan and de la Rosa. For the routing security SIG co-chair, the nominees are Kimura. And Jaje.

As mentioned before there will not be an election for the NIR SIG position. In accordance of the guidelines the Zhen Yu was named being the only one running for the position.

I wish everyone luck for the reaction.

The election has several roles. The first is the election Chair. The Chair oversees the election process, resolves disputes and declares the results. The election Chair for this NRONC and SIG elections is Dr. Sudha we have the election Officers that retrieve the votes in presence of the election ears. We have.

(Listing names) and scrutineers are receiving the results and will notify us of anomalies. There are RIR and ICANN and ISOC that are present at this meeting. We have John Sweeting and Ms. Amakran.

Complaints must be given an hour before the election results. The results will be given at approximately 4:30 today. This is the final reminder to cast your vote by 2:30. Thank you.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Are there any brief questions or point of clarification. Thank you, Thy Boskovic.

Okay. We move ahead with our SIG administrations. SIG administration, I would like to hand over my Fellow co-Chair, Ching-Heng Ku. Over to you.

>> CHING-HENG KU: Hello. Good morning, I will brief the Policy SIG to the administration.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : The slide for SIG administration, please.

>> CHING-HENG KU: Policy SIG Charter is to development policies which relate to the management and use of Internet number resources within the Asia-Pacific Region. This include policies for resource allocation, recovery and transfer and for resource registration within who is, reverse DNS RPKI and data services. There are two policy proposals that did not reach consensus at APNIC 61. They will be discussed in this meeting. There are seven policy proposals that we will be discussing Proposal 164, 165, 168, 169. 170, 171, and 172. The agenda item is 169, 168, and 165 will be discussed. We will give the Impact Assessment from the Secretariat.

The agenda for the second Open Policy Meeting with Shaila Sharmin SIG administration the Proposal 164, 171, 170, and 172. Will be discussed. And Dave will give the Impact Assessment.

And steps to the implementation for the Proposal. The Proposal will be submitted to the Secretariat. And it will be put on the mailing list for the discussion. And the Proposal need to make consensus at Policy SIG and the member meeting. After that, we'll attend the comment period and the EC endorsement. After that is additional comment period and finally implementation by the Secretariat.

The consensus means the general agreement taking into consideration comments on the mailing list and at the Open Policy Meeting. There are two kinds of objections. First is minor objection. This means some problems may occur for some members. The second is the major objection. It is will occur for parts of the community for the problems. If you have major objection, please be ready to present your reason.

Participants should work together to resolve objections. Besides, please remember the Code of Conduct.

And gauging consensus. The Chairs will consider the mailing list discussion, discussion at OPM, and discussion at AGM/AMM, and Zoom poll. The Zoom poll there is a registration constituencies attendees, and the separate account. And the constituencies call is executed the Zoom poll will be launched for the online attendees. Those leading will not participate in the consensus poll. For the development policy and guidelines, please see references on the website. That's all my presentations thank you.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Thank you co-Chair, Ching-Heng Ku. Next item is APNIC 62 policy implementation update. This is the implementation and status and matter related to today's discussions. Dave, please go ahead.

>> DAVE PHELAN: Thank you, Chair. This is a very quick

update on where we're at with policies that are currently under implementation. So prop 162 version 3 reached consensus that APNIC 60, technical implementation is complete, we're still waiting on some other bits and pieces around this. So mainly we're still waiting on a finalized AUA for who is and bulk who is users. We will work on the workflow for notification recurrent access and reassigning new log ins et cetera. The 166 the revocation of persistently nonfunctional RPKI certifications Authorities. We're waiting for this to be finalized. The escalation is in place. There is a 30-day email notification 50 days direct contact and 60 days is the reservation of the Delegation CA. To date we have only had to exercise this three times. It is not a major problem for us.

167 publish statisticals on directory service usage. It is flagged as complete, we have had issues on the data accuracy. The team are working, the author has been advised and we're working through that at the moment. I won't do questions unless you really want to ask me a question. Excellent, thank you.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Thank you, Dave. We will move into the main Proposal for part of today's Open Policy Meeting. Next will be our ... before we begin, I want to encourage everyone to approach the operational and policy perspective for the Proposal we're particularly interested in understanding does the Proposal solve a real problem? Are there unintended consequences? Is the Proposal clear and implementable? We begin with prop 169. Aligning the IPv4 with the Current IPv4 Delegation Policy. The Proposal will be presented remotely by Saima Nisar. I think she is online. If you can hear us she's remote. We invite Saima to present prop 169.

>> SAIMA NISAR: Hi, everybody. I want to confirm. Should I share my slides or will they be shared?

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : We can see your slide.

>> SAIMA NISAR: So I don't need to share the slides? That's good. I received the email, I thought maybe I needed to. That is good. Let me start. I need to open this. Sorry for the delay.

Good morning. I am Dr. Saima Nisar from Xiamen University Malaysia. Today, I'm going to present my first policy Proposal. Hopefully, it gets consensus. It is about aligning the IPv4 LIR Needs Assessment with the current IPv4 Delegation policy.

Before moving on, I would like to emphasize that the focus is specifically on updating the usage plan requirement so that the IPv4 Delegation will be assisted rather than relying on the fixed historical side. Okay.

So the problem statement is here. Basically the issue I am highlighting is in section 6.2.1. The current wording still refers to a fixed /23 usage plan reference. Under the current

framework, the IPv4 delegation assessed may be smaller. For example, /24. The written requirement may appear larger than the Delegation being assessed. This can create uncertainty for applicants, APNIC, NIRs and the community.

The problem is not the need for the assessment. The problem is only the size reference used in the usage plan requirement. We need to look at the two sections together. The first section is about 6.1, that the current Delegation is /24 and maximum total from remaining IPv4 is /23. 6.2.1LIRM demonstrate a detailed plan for the use of at least /23 within the year. You can see a smaller is assessed. A larger plan. This is the alignment issue. The Proposal is trying to address the issue.

Why does this matter? This matters for the reasons I mentioned. The first is clarity and second is fairness. Applicant should clearly understand what size they're expected to justify. The APNIC NIR should have the written rules to apply. It should be clear.

The policy should not depend on the informal interpretation. It should be the written text it is agreed should be different. The second one is from the fairness perspective. The smaller applicants should not pear to justify more than the Delegation being assessed.

So it will meet only the requirement.

At the same time, this Proposal does not weaken the IPv4 conservation. The assessment is intact and the weak or unsupported requests can still be reached.

So basically what is the objective? The objective is very simple and narrow. The Proposal is the fixed /23 usage plan reference with the wording tied to the IPv4 Delegation being assessed.

So basically this is a one-year usage plan requirement that it meets. So needs based is the IPv4 conservation principles remains. This Proposal does not reopen broader IPv4 Delegation, transfer or waiting list policy issue. It is only trying to correct the size in the usage plan requirement.

Next we have proposed policy change.

This is just here to explain what changed and what does not change. The change in the usage -- the change is that the usage plan size reference move from a fixed /23 to the Delegation being assessed.

So what does it mean by that? The applicant justify the size that is actually under assessment. It also makes the wording more flexible if Delegation limits change in the future.

But what does not change is very important. There is no change to the /24 minimum or the /23 maximum. There is no change on needs-based assessment. There is also no change to transfer the waiting list, routing RPKI, whois, RDAP or DNS. The Proposal

just changed the wording and not the entitlement.

Regarding the situation in other RIR. So other RIR. Include RIPE NCC and ARIN as a comparison point. So basically in APNIC Region. The eligible RIR is to see 1/24 from the list. The issue size is explicit. And fixed. In ARIN, the /24 automatically apply and the /22 is based on the request size.

I want to be careful here about this Proposal does not claim that the same thing exists in other RIR. It is specific about the internal alignment with the APNIC 127.

So the expected advantages are, it should be the clearer policy text so applicants can better understand what they need to distribute.

The viewers will have a clear wording to apply. The Proposal means the need assessment preserves for smaller, the applicant is that the Delegation be affixed. And it also better aligns the policy with the current minimum IPv4 framework.

Most importantly, it preserves the IPv4 conservation and does not create a new entitlement. The operational impact is expected to be low. Mainly involving the policy decks, guidance and so on.

Disadvantage, no major disadvantage have been identified yet. Here for the reference which are used. And moving on. Next slide.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA: Thank you. Thank you, Saima. Thank you for joining us remotely. I now invite for assessment from Secretariat. Dave, please.

>> DAVE PHELAN: I'm ready to go. Waiting for my slides to show up. This is the Secretariat Impact Assessment for prop 169V1. Will generally, this is a narrow wording change to align IPv4 needs assessment language with current delegation practices. Just requires documents to internal assessment notes, guidance and any applicant-facing materials that refer to the fixed /23 usage plan requirements. Basically we have to change text in 127 and that will be done as per the document editorial policy. The time to do all of that is probably around three months. The easiest one for the day.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Thank you very much. Now we'll go for community discussion. We'll now open the floor for the community discussion. Please, state your name and affiliation. Please go ahead.

>> ATTENDEE: Hello, my name is Geoffrey Bobby, I'm from communications. I looked at the objective on this Proposal. I am with the wording of the current Delegation parenthesis. I think it will help for future -- I mean maintenance issues. It will improve the clarity. But I do have a question for the Secretariat. Just a wording change, is the impact. Have Secretariat considered this one as a -- other than through the

development process? That would be better, I think. It is a simple wording change, no impact and came from very common sense. That's it.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA: Thank you.

>> DAVE PHELAN: Secretariat, common sense is not always common sense. I think it is best if the Proposal goes through eight community developed policy, it will be much clearer.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Thank you. Christopher?

>> ATTENDEE: Christopher Hawker speaking on behalf of Christopher Hawker. I support the Proposal, the wording and intent is very clear. I do believe it will help simplify Delegation policies. I do support this Proposal. Thank you.

>> ATTENDEE: Hi, I'm Jay. I'm with APNIC from Laos. I have comment and I do support this Proposal in terms of the principle because it is a smart version to access small IPv4. I would like to transfer the rule version for the future new member. To be clear, before the APNIC implementation. My question is for the Proposal is if we give more IPv4 to existing members now, how can we make sure that the new member view will have some that are reasonable in the future. Thank you.

>> DAVE PHELAN: I will jump in, Dave Phelan the Secretariat, that is out of scope of this Proposal. Feel free to come back when other proposals are discussing that.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA: Okay. Is there any questions from the floor? Does anyone currently experiencing the problem that prop 169 is attempting to address? Okay. We'll go for the -- okay. We'll go for the consensus. If there is not any further questions. So for the consensus, this Proposal has been discussed on the APNIC Policy SIG mailing list and today, Open Policy Meeting. The APNIC PDP requires consensus or general agreement on the Proposal before it can proceed. We'll call for the consensus. We will now make a consensus call. You will be given an opportunity now to indicate whether you strongly now support the Proposal, support the Proposal, neutral or if you object to the Proposal or strongly object to the Proposal? If you indicate you are strongly opposes to it, you are expected to explain the reason for your strong objection.

If you are participating online the Zoom poll will begin shortly. So we'll have a consensus. So if you strongly support the Proposal please put your hand up.

If you support the Proposal, please put your hand up.

If you are neutral about the Proposal, please put your hand up. If you are opposed to the Proposal, please put your hand up. If you strongly opposed the Proposal, please put your hand up. Okay. We'll have a confer with the Chair and we'll get back to you soon. Please bear with us.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : We have discussed with the Chairs and

on the Proposal, in consideration of this input, we believe that community has reached a consensus on the Proposal. As the Committee has, the next step is to take this Proposal to the AMM/AGM and seek continued consensus there. The Proposal will then be posted by to the mailing list for a four-week comment period. If required that period will be extended to eight weeks. We have a consensus on this prop. 169 aligning for the LIR needs assessment with current Delegation policy. So we have this consensus. So we move ahead with the next item. Thank you.

We also want to thank the author, Saima Nisar. Thank you for being a part of this policy. As you said, this is your first Proposal, we want to give congratulations.

>> SAIMA NISAR: Thank you so much for the whole community.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Next is the.

>> CHING-HENG KU: Next is Christopher Hawker to give the presentation of prop 168.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Good morning. This morning, I'll be presenting prop 168 version 4. An increase to the maximum IPv4 Delegations.

So the problem statement. New account holder applications for resources are currently plateauing. Meaning they're not increasing, they're not going up. They're remaining at the current level and some years actually decreased a little before coming back up. Meaning addresses can't be sitting in the poll not being used and effectively going to waste.

I'm sorry. There is an available pool for years while small Network Operators are required to obtain address space through market transfers or otherwise unfortunately have to lease address space.

I have been polling the Delegation stats from FTP APNIC.net to determine the rate. It is all public information to make sure it is updated by today.

>> The objective of the policy is to have those that hold up to /22 to receive additional Delegation to bring total holding up to 22. This is to benefit the smaller Network Operators. If you hold a 22 currently, or greater this Proposal does not affect you or your networks in any way.

The situation as it currently stands in other Regions. The maximum delegation you can apply for is the 22. In the RIPE NCC Region, the maximum is /24. In AFRINIC, it is /22. In LACNIC, the current maximum size that may be received is a 22.

The proposed policy solution, what we want to change. The section 6.1, minimum and maximum IPv4 Delegations. We want to change it from the current 23 to a 22. The conditions on who can request that additional address space. Any account holders that transferred space out of the account would be ineligible for addition space. Say they held three size 23s. If they reduce the

holdings to maximum 24, that would still be eligible to apply for additional space under the Proposal. Because they have already transferred space out.

The references to the available pool is what you have, and any other recovered address space not covered by 103/8. They are essentially treated as if they were from that pool. The temporary address space is excluded from the account holders current holdings. If they held a /24. If they held size 24, multihoming. And held a /24 for use in an exchange point. They would eligible to apply for three additional /24. Because our IRXP is withheld.

For the IPv4 Delegations, a waiting list will be created once the 103/8 pool has been exhausted. Section 11, IPv4 transfers. Address space delegated from the available pool cannot be transferred for five years from the date of the Delegation.

Sorry. That is a duplicate slide. Please disregard. Section 14.0, mergers and acquisitions, space delegated cannot be transferred from the date of the initial Delegation. If it is space to a transfer lock. It is not for the transfer if due to being under a different account with 4.0.

The new section 515 IPv4 to IPv6 transitioning. Under this Proposal the Secretary would be to contracted to reserve a slash 12 pool. We'll have those because they will save the account holders. It is for NAT64. And so on so forth. This will elevate once the available pool, and the reserve pool has been released into the pool and itself being exhausted.

So this as like a final reserve.

This cannot be transferred must be returned to the registry when no longer required. Once you successfully transitioned from IPv4 and you are IPv6 only, you must return that address base back to the Secretariat. Any address space can be recovered if not for the intended purpose. For example, if you apply for a 24 to use or tell the Secretariat, in the DNS 961, so on. Instead you assign it to eyeballs on the network. The Secretariat can't get it because you have used what was described.

Budgets and disadvantages. Now, the advantages in the Proposal is it makes space to other account holders, based on some of the calculations I have done. The current available would carry out to approximately 2035.

Which means that existing smaller networks must continue to leave space out. This policy helps them to avoid having to do that and I can apply it directly.

Some disadvantages identified out of this Proposal is that it is expected that there will be accelerated IPv4 exhaustion within the service Region.

We do knowledge special and accept it. There will be a

sudden rush on applications for new resources. If this does raise consensus we expect the Secretariat to be swamped with new application resources.

Impact on resource holders. We have not been able to identify any impact to current resource holders.

And here are the references for the policy that we have been able to produce. Thank you.

>> CHING-HENG KU: Thank you for the discussion. Dave, we give it to the Secretariat. Dave?

>> DAVE PHELAN: Thank you, Chairs. All right, this Impact Assessment was for prop 168 version 3. We're aware is that version 4 is being presented. It was presented after the initial CFV colonized. There are approximately 11,229 of the 24 in the available pool. That is down 11,988. And that means we need about three K times 24 to fulfill the need. Additional workload and anticipated delays for delegations. Reese's as per previous assessment will be used in calculation for visibility but not in the transfer policy. The additional section 515 will have a transition for new members. Note that the author has updated this because we have the timing issue with 5.1.1. We do still seek clarity. I don't recall seeing changes or how it interacts with the other sections, or IXP delegations, experimental policies, et cetera.

You have updated the language around available versus final slash 8. We need changes in APNIC 127 as per the document editorial policy.

There will be many system changes required to core registry and resource systems. The implementation time frame would be roughly nine months, subject to the call for editorial comment period.

>> CHING-HENG KU: Thanks, Dave. We go for the community discussion and we encourage you, if any of you support the objection for the Proposal Dave, Christopher presented the version 4 for this Proposal. There are many details in his Proposal. So we open mic and can you spread your support or opposed, the reason?

>> ATTENDEE: Hello, I'm Babir from Bangladesh. Do we have any evidence that the current level of 23 is actually even the legitimate IPv4 need?

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Can you clarify the question more?

>> ATTENDEE: Yeah, your Proposal is saying the current /23 is preventing the legitimate item. Do we have this kind of evidence?

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Do we have the evidence of need? I believe it is clear through the addressing of space. It is data

that is available only in who is. If you look at all of the records for the brokers and leasing providers.

>> ATTENDEE: The think the additional spaces you are talking about that should be demonstrated with the proper implementation plan.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: We'll take it on note.

>> Jonathan Brewer. I have points of presence in two locations and I want to also open in Christ Church. I can't do it. When I applied in 20 or 17 the most I could get is a 23. So that is what I have got. I'm out of addresses, can't open a new Panel Discussant.

I can go get some if the policy Proposal succeeded, I would rather to the latter.

>> Just a question. Consider a case that I already have a resource but all that resource I have from the market. That is a transfer resource. Whether it is eligible for it or not.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: If you hold larger than 22, you would be ineligible for the address space.

>> ATTENDEE: Even if 23?

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: If you hold an aggregate that is shorter, you would be ineligible for address space under this Proposal.

>> ATTENDEE: Thank you.

>> ATTENDEE: This is from JAPNIC. I also attended the other meeting. I shared the Japanese situation. This Proposal to change the /22. I think to have the voice in Japan, for the additional IPv4, we need to put on the body to the natural, to exhaust it. Also this is an individual questions. In section 11.0, IPv4 for transfers, this is a space held by an account holder, it cannot be transferred for five years. This is a long time for a prohibit to the transfers. The scale is change to the more big or more smaller. This is the stop to the floor. In the IPv4 market. And this is to shift to change the market, the market transfer to the I think. That's all. Thank you.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: If you can just clarify some of your remarks. Some of the concerns you had were regarding the length of time that space cannot be transferred for, is that correct?

At the moment, as it is implemented. There is already that five-year transfer look period. If the space is delegated, if you receive it today, you cannot transfer it for five years.

If you are requesting additional space, what it will do is reset the clock meaning any space can't be transferred for five years from the date of the most recent Delegation. You are requesting space, you should be able to transfer previously delegated space out of your account. That misses the purpose of applies for additional space. That opens up it is possibility of

fraudulent applications, come in, apply for additional space and sew the old space, transfer it out. They have a slash 23 and effectively made free money. That is why the lock resets that people.

>> Thank you.

>> I am Param speaking for myself. I'm trying to understand when this was made, giving us /24. The community are thought at that point in time, startups are coming, new businesses will try to come. It is very difficult to get off that version. That policy was made and that policy still stands, the reason is that still, we have got communities that are developing new businesses are coming. The whole purpose was to do a bit of handholding, so we could provide them this essential requirement and let them get their business started. Suppose we open up this policy, like what you have mentioned in your Proposal.

If you do that, I think we (audio skipping) which I think it gives. We will be over this in nine months.

So if you are over that nine months, I mean, the problem still exists. Yes we would have given 24 and 23 people a lot of address space. What about the other people that will come in? At this moment I think it is premature to do any changes in the current policy. Especially where the developing economies are concerned.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Just to address the comments and remarks. The policy or Proposal -- the policy is not policy yet. It does allow for the base to be delegated to new members to be used for 4 tow 6 transaction technologies. Which I believe will help alleviate some of the concerns.

>> ATTENDEE: (?) wearing my community hat. I support the spirit of this Proposal. It will help those that are really suffering.

The challenge I see in the issue from the Secretariat. Not all will get 23. After reserving for the IPv6 deployment, right? If it is so, maybe we will have the working list again for some members, if we need to get past. Creating complexity. Maybe your Secretariat can announce it is 23 if we use additional 24. That might be useful for the users, and we can have this slash 12. I don't know. Dave, can you put some light on that?

>> DAVE PHELAN: Dave Phelan, Secretariat. You may remember a few IEEEs ago is to left an additional 24. If I remember the comments at the time, there was thresholds about when to release and cut it back and everything else.

I think the community said no because it was too complex. That is my memory. Sunny is nodding, so he agreed.

The question then comes, you have just been dragging out the inevitable for another year. We wouldn't have enough

resources to satisfy everybody that is eligible even at a 24.

>> The way I say it, it is no matter which way you skin a cat. Not everybody is going to receive additional address votes. There are members -- I'm sorry. Some account holders that do miss out. Unfortunately it is what it is. There is nothing we can do to mitigate that unless they start accepting 25 and 26, which will never happen in our lifetime. So thank you.

>> ATTENDEE: Bhadrika from APNIC. I have some comments from Zoom they will share. There are three. Would you like me to address them consecutively?

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: If I can address one by one.

>> ATTENDEE: This is Liam Stephens. Hi, I initially supported the prop 168 version 3 in intent and content. I believe the exhaustion date is too short. Something else should be used to balance the exhaustion date somewhere between 12 months and nine years.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER. It will be difficult to manage that exhaustion level. It is a very complex process. If we can come up with something. Is it will take multiple OPMs to draft the document to allow for that management. This is to make it available today and not nine years. That is something I'm sure Liam would be aware of.

>> ATTENDEE: To Jonathan's comments on the requirement for more space how would he and every other member feel if the resources would not be available after 12 months? Correct me if I misunderstood the points on exhaustion. I believe having a poll that lasts another decade is not helping the cause of IPv6 transition.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: We need to allow for new networks to on bard in a 54 world. In order to do that, we need to make sure we have address space available to establish that upon IPv4 to IPv6 transmit technologies. That is why new account holders can request at a very least the small portion of what is left, to deploy IPv6 mostly networks.

I have a comment for Aftab. As per the Secretariat note. It is falling short, it will cause an issue like we had before in the waiting list.

There is no way to stop new resources from being leased out. If it is implemented the growth will be hampered. I support the idea and don't support the Proposal. It is too late for this Proposal now.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Look, we can't continue to drag it out longer than it has been. If we are going to move it forward with 6 we need to understand it is here to stay. It is dying, it is old, we need to move away from it. I can chat offline about it later on.

>> ATTENDEE: The second comment I'm one of the proposers

for the /24 additional allocation. It was impossible to will document. The same is applied to this Proposal. It doesn't make it simple.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: It allowed the 24 to be delegated to each member. Can someone confirm?

As was previously mentioned, it was will difficult and complex to implement a /24 to additional members. As I said before not everyone is going to be happen or is going to get additional address space. Unfortunately, that is a fact of life. Thank you.

>> ATTENDEE: Rajesh, in my personal capacity. I moved Proposal 53. With the size of minimum allocation from 21 to 22. At that time have anticipated that IPv4 will last a long time. With the minimum is reduced from 21 to 22. Further discussion and the last 22 reduced to 23. Looking at the present time. The requirement of the ISP. I strongly support the Proposal for back to slash 22. Cannot wait for the startups for a long time. The technology has to change. The technology should bring IPv6 immediately rather than going ahead to /20 the IPv4 for a long time.

One day the end has to come, why not as per the Secretariat. I strongly support /22 to be the minimum. Thank you.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Thank you for that. To agree with you there. We need to rip the Band-Aid off. We need to move forward. We need to continue, we can't keep dragging it out.

>> ATTENDEE: Saima had a question. What safeguard is there to stop those who shouldn't have it? Astia did reply there is a five-year restriction. Anything else to say.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Can you repeat the comment, please?

>> ATTENDEE: What safeguard is used to prevent members from requesting additional IPv4 space, mainly for transfer purposes?

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: That can't transfer except from the transfer of the most recent Delegation.

>> ATTENDEE: I have another comment from Liam.

(Overlapping conversations).

>> DAVE PHELAN: One second. I need to clarify something. It is not nine-month to exhaustion. That is the implementation time frame to start handing addresses out. It is roughly, if math is correct 12 months. You get an extra three months of life.

>> ATTENDEE: A response from Liam. Thanks, Christopher, I want you to persist with your intend. IPv4 is required for the IPv6 transition. Giving more like two to three years is sensible.
12 months is not long enough for the Region to transition.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: I think Liam may have missed the point. There is another. And there is more than enough in

reserve than we could ever decide what to do with it. All of that is account would for. Thank you for your comments.

>> TERRY SWEETSER: Well done on the policy Proposal. Terry Sweetser I'm under my own auspices on this one.

I have a question about how this interacts with people or members who will be applying for this additional dress space. How many have deployed IPv6? It concerns me bee could be encouraging members to deploy IPv4 when they should be working on getting the 6 into operation. In this MOP doesn't get past consensus. I would be in support of getting more space for transition.

Primarily because we already know in the best-case scenario, 80 to 90% of traffic can go over V6 in many investigations on the planet. Why are we encouraging people to use IPv4 in any way, shape or form. This is a request for information, what do you know about the prospective members that issue not deploying IPv6 but still want more of the address space.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Is that a comment or question?

>> It is interesting that we are trying to look forward. There is a runway. We know there is a demand. It will be a gold rush on the space once the policy succeeds. If you are asking for IPv6 where you are asking for IPv4. You would probably know better than I can if we can or not. It is something to consider if it doesn't reach consensus.

>> ATTENDEE: Either way I will --

>> CHING-HENG KU: This is the last question. You can explain your comment, and Christopher don't need to answer. We need to go to the next. Yes.

>> ATTENDEE: Can I? Chris, there is another comment from Aftab. There is no correlation between the availability of IPv4 versus the adoption in V6. We have ARIN and RIPE NCC as an example. The assumption that magically it will boost IPv6 adoption is a pipe dream. And one response from Liam, yes I missed the point on stage 12. Thanks.

>> CHING-HENG KU: The next one.

>> ATTENDEE: I am Ramesh. In my capacity I would like to comment that as for the Secretariat, this process itself will take nine months' time. Another 12 months for the exhaustion. For the safeguard of the newcomers or startups we have the implementation. So I strongly support the Proposal.

Let this get exhausted for 12 plus nine will months. We'll have the chance to get that 24 Delegation from the results output.

>> ATTENDEE: Rajesh Chharia. Why are we looking just towards the startup? Why are not all of the RIRs are not looking forward to take back the pool space which are lying unused into

the Universities. They're not using. We are discussing from a very long time that we should take those unused so that the IPv4 shortage can be answered.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: If I can address that one point. The Secretariat has done that through the historical resource recognition project. The name is similar. But they did go through the process.

>> CHING-HENG KU: I'm sorry we don't have much time.

>> ATTENDEE: This is moving fast. The startup will adopt IPv6 very soon. The same way in past we are discussing there is a shortage of oil but the electric vehicles and the hydrogen has answered that. Similarly IPv6 will get promoted with the startups. They don't have to rely only on the IPv4.

>> CHING-HENG KU: We take much time to discuss this Proposal. I think it has a larger impact for the IPv4 exhaustion in APNIC.

So after all of this discussion, we are going to do a consensus call for this Proposal 168. So it is open. You can use the Zoom poll. If you strongly support this Proposal, please put your hands up. Okay. Thanks. If you support this Proposal, please put your hands up. Okay. Thanks.

If you are neutral about this Proposal, please put your hand up. If you oppose this Proposal, put your hands up. Okay thanks. You strongly oppose this Proposal, please put your hands up. Thanks. We will check the online poll.

>> Can we have?

>> CHING-HENG KU: Okay. So wait a few minutes. There is a strongly opposed online. Would you explain your reason for strongly oppose?

>> ATTENDEE: That was Aftab, he said it is me so you know.

>> Thank you.

>> CHING-HENG KU: On this input, the community has not reached consensus on this Proposal. So the community has failed to reach consensus on the Proposal. The Chairs will send it back to the mailing list and also can consider all the discussion and where it can be appended or abandoned.

So we will put it there. Thanks, Christopher.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Thank you, Chris. Thank you, Christopher for really getting involved in Policy SIG and his contribution. We would like to thank Christopher for his contribution. Now we will go for the next agenda items.

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: Hello? Next, we have the Proposal 165 by Tomohiro Fujisaki and Hiroki Kawabata. This is the provisions for IPv4 Address Space to IPv6-only networks for Transitional Purpose. I would like to clarify that this Proposal is for information purposes only. So I invite Tomohiro Fujisaki to make presentation for the Proposal 165 version 4.

>> TOMOHIRO FUJISAKI: Good morning, I'm Tomohiro Fujisaki with Proposal 165 with Hiroki Kawabata-son. This is Proposal is Provision of IPv4 address space to IPv6 only for networks for transitional purposes.

This is simple. Actually we want to remove obstacles that can delay the implementation of the IPv6 only networks while continuing to protect APNIC's remaining IPv4 address pool. This is not about expanding v4 access, it is about providing a limited amount of IPv4 to support the transition to the IPv6 only networks.

This slide shows why this Proposal matters now. Internet is moving rapidly to the IPv6. And we are now seeing the emergence in mostly oppression models where IPv6 is the default protocol and IPv4 is only there to reserve this rate. We are seeing National initiatives that explicitly use IPv6 only in deployment. For example, Vietnam has published a National Roadmap targets very high IPv6 implement and gradual retirement of IPv4 over the next few years. This means the question is no longer whether IPv6 only networks will exist, but the question is how we help operators to build IPv4 only network.

However, with IPv6 only environment, there is still a huge remaining dependence on IPv4. These dependencies is what this Proposal addresses. Okay. To deploy the IPv6 only network, however some services still require the IPv4 connectivity. Examples include DNS servers, mail gateways, monitoring services, log-in assistance, and access to legacy services. These functions usually require only a very small amount of IPv4 address space. Yet under the current framework, obtaining that IPv4 space may still require the justification process, it is for the IPv4 network deployment and such small size request will not be upload.

As a result, very small 54 requirement can slow down much larger IPv6 deployment. This attempts to solve that problem.

Okay. This is the Proposal. The Proposal is very simple. An organisation with the initial allocation may request a single host /24 Delegation. The organisation submits the IPv6 only deployment Declaration describing -- I'm sorry. Deployment Declaration describing the IPv6 implement and the serves to the additional IPv4 support.

The maximum Delegation size is one IPv4/24. And the Delegation space is counted within the existing threshold limit. And when the retention requirement appears, the IPv4 space should be returned. This is the core of our Proposal.

And one concern about the APNIC Secretariat about how APNIC can verify it is being used for the intended purpose? The authors do not expect APNIC to hold continuous monitoring or technical audit. Instead, the Proposal uses the Declaration

based approach. Applicants provide an IPv6 only deployment Declaration. When necessary, APNIC may have the information, for example, the examples could include the implementation describing the implement evidence of what is capable, or it is that it is the service that it is operating.

I believe that this is the model that is there in the APNIC policy administration. And the goal is to keep implementation with it while still providing reasonable assurance that the policy is being used as intended.

Okay. An important question is the conservation of the remain IPv4. The Proposal include multiple safeguards. The maximum allocation is 1 IPv4 sustaining organisation. And second this is the final count in the /8 framework. It cannot be transferred or reassigned to another organisation. Fourth, APNIC may periodically request that the transition need remains. And finally, the Proposal include an automatic sunset provision. It is predefined successful example, six month. Or get this exhaustion.

This ensures that the significant remains protected for the future for the IPv4 use. Okay. This is the final slide.

To conclude, IPv6 only development is being increasingly important. However small dependencies on IPv4 is still needed. And they will stop with IPv6 deployment.

And our Proposal provides the carefully controlled mechanisms to address that issue.

This is the end of my presentation. So any questions or comments?

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: Thank you very much. We're now requesting the Secretariat for the Impact Assessment.

>> DAVE PHELAN: Just waiting for my slides. They should be here any second now. Okay? All right. This is the Secretariat impact analysis for prop 165 version 3. We are aware that V4 is being presented today. Due to time constraints we could not update our Impact Assessment. But I will have notes along the way.

This allows members that hold the IPv6 allocation request to the IPv6 only purposes. This is expected a limited number members. Only 1.2% hold only IPv6 and no IPv4. The registry systems need to link the registration and apply the provisions need to have the system for assessment and periodic review. This removes the responsibility but how can the Secretariat verify need? How should the Secretariat monitor the V4 for the network and no other purpose? This was answered in V4 via self-Declaration. That opens up even more questions. Permanently reassigned implied that there was some other form of reassignment. This appears to be addressed in version 4. Obviously, the proposed policy require a number of amendments to

APNIC 127. However, the specific implementation of such changes have not been made clear by the authors. There is clarification on the sunset mechanisms, which we have not looked at included in the exhaustion. The value and form of the community determined threshold. Process for EC determinations APNIC would need to define ow applicants in progress are handled if a sunset condition is triggered. Until such point as these clarifications are made we are unable to make a determination on implementation process and time frames.

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: Thank you, Dave. Now we open the mic for everyone for question and comment. Please state your name and affiliation.

>> TERRY SWEETSER: I'm Terry Sweetser speaking on behalf of myself. I want to raise two points. Firstly, I'm disappointed we're not voting on this today. This is actually a really good Proposal. I think this would actually work very positively for the IPv6 transition. The second is a technical point.

APNIC spends quite a large amount of money monitoring the use of IPv4 versus IPv6. There is a lot of data. There is surveillance on dual stack across the entire Region. I think it is feasible if some of the data used to this end would actually give the Secretariat a way of verifying that this Proposal had been implemented technically. It may lead to data being developed in that case, it would be possible to take to noncompliance as well. It is feasible that there is a technical monitoring solution for this Proposal.

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: Thank you, Terry. Next question? Please continue.

>> ATTENDEE: I support this Proposal. Oh, Param speaking for myself. I support this Proposal. As it incentivizes a transition to IPv6. The whole purpose of the Proposal is to incentivize, so it is a good Proposal.

However, keeping the Secretariat's points of view, I think it requires some more tweaking. It needs to be made more precise. I think you are good here. Thank you.

>> ATTENDEE: I'm babel from Bangladesh. I support this Proposal. It is very reasonable for IPv6 only network. Because you need to have the DNS 64 and this is reasonable for this scenario. I do have an example for a scenario. Just like one network is having IPv6 only network. But they need IPv4 for the servers only. What criteria it will be? For another example, suppose in network, to have their IPv4 network but they're claiming it is IPv6 only network. How this will maintain this type of criteria? It is totally operational judgment. So that Proposal should be clear for this barrier between the type of scenario. Otherwise this Proposal will be abused.

That's it. Thank you.

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: Thank you. Please continue.

>> ATTENDEE: You mention Vietnam in the slide. For the Proposal, I think that not only in Vietnam but also in other economies trying to promote IPv6 only. For example, India, Malaysia, China, U.S.

And also I think we can have some Proposal to promote IPv6. Honour the Proposal. I think so. Because we regard the technical, we move it and reduce site mostly and only.

I would like to support the Proposal and hopefully others will support as well.

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: Please continue.

>> ATTENDEE: I have a comment from Aftab, since 2025 in Japan, no member has requested IPv6 only. And in India, where this meeting is held, only two members have requested IPv6 only and no IPv4 in 2026 so far. While I understand the reason to support the policy to support IPv6 there is no evidence to back this idea. Anyone today can request for a /24 and /32 resources without this policy.

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: Next question, please.

>> ATTENDEE: Christopher Hawker for myself. Just a brief comment. If there are sunset conditions that should be put in place in this policy. I feel it should be black and white in policy. It shouldn't be left to the discretion of anybody or Group to make that determination. Long story short, don't leave it to the EC to decide when to sunset this condition. Put the conditions themselves into the policy and let the policy play out. Thanks.

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: Thank you, please continue.

>> ATTENDEE: I'm giving my opinions in my personal capacity. In this Proposal and the previous one we discussed today. One was the previous Proposal was talking about that they need more IPv4 addresses. In this Proposal, he's talking the same time like if IPv6 only to promote you need to provide support for the longer term of time.

So the already existing networks are having a lot of IP address. If they want to grow. Some of the two proposals looks different. In this Proposal he wants to introduce the friction so only those that want to work on IPv6 and have the criteria fulfillment if they fulfill the criteria, if I am wrong, please correct me. Then they will get there. /24. So more IPv6 only network can support it for the longer time, I think. And if we think about the context of already existing IPv6 networks, which grow more. So how we can solve this problem in the network and the proposals because I think the intent of the Proposal is to support one looks like they need more IPv4 and they're using other ways around to get IPv4. And this Proposal has intended also that for the longer period. IPv6 only network about it. I

think both the proposals should work together and I think the intent is both the proposals is good, actually. That is my observation. Thank you.

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: Thank you so much. We're not taking comments or systems right now. Because we're running out of time. Version 4 of the Proposal was posted to the mailing list. Relatively lately. The Secretariat has yet completed the assessment for version 4. We believe it would be better to allow more time to review and discuss the updated version. Thank you, Tomohiro Fujisaki for your Proposal and the long time work with Policy SIG. We will put this into mailing list again to allow the community to get more time on this. Thank you so much.

>> ATTENDEE: Thank you.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA: Thank you very much. Before closing, I would like to thank the Secretariat, Policy team and my Fellow co-Chair Ching-Heng and Saima. And thank you to everyone that is contributing to this system. I would like to adjourn this session. Thank you very much.

At 11:30 we will have another session. Thank you.

(Concluded).

This text, document or file is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.