FINISHED FILE

APNIC 62

OPEN POLICY MEETING 2 – POLICY SIG
SEPTEMBER 10, 2026
MAIN HALL
11:30 A.M. IST

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.

(Captioner standing by)

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA: Good morning, once again. Ready to start. If you are outside please take your Seat. We are going to start. Good morning, once again, welcome to Open Policy Meeting Session 2. We would like to invite you to participate more in this discussion Forum. For those who are joining this first meeting, my name is Bikram Shrestha. And I have the privilege of serving as the Chair of APNIC Policy SIG. And joining me are my Fellow co-Chairs, Shaila Sharmin and Ching-Heng Ku. On behalf of the Policy SIG Chairs, we warmly welcome everyone in here. APNIC 62.

So our first Open Policy Meeting this morning, we focused on IPv4 policy and IPv4 to IPv6 issues.

In this second session we will focus more on IPv6 allocations, address planning, contact accountability and definition of Internet abuse involving IP address. Without further ado we will go ahead. Before I begin, I want to briefly remind everyone of the principles that guide our discussions.

The policy development process is open, transparent, bottom-up and consistency based. The policies discussed here are developed by the community. The Chair doesn't say or Chair doesn't enforce. So we are the facilitator for this process.

The APNIC Secretariat does not decide on the policy on

behalf of the community. The APNIC Committee developed the policy. Our responsibility is only the facilitating role we are playing of balance and discussions. Make sure different perspectives are heard. Identify sustainable consensus and concern and determine whether community consensus is existing.

We therefore encourage everyone to be part of this peer review process. If you support our Proposal, please tell us why. If you oppose a Proposal please explain why. For some of the housekeeping, we remind you if you are going to the mic please state your name and affiliation so the remote participants can clearly listen to your version.

Going to our agenda, the second session. First of all, I would like to will request my co-Chair, Shaila Sharmin for the SIG administration. Please, Saima share your presentation for the SIG administration. Thank you.

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: Hello welcome back for the second session of OPM. I'm Shaila Sharmin as co-Chair and Ching-Heng Ku as co-Chair and Bikram Shrestha as co-Chair. The Policy SIG Charter is to Policy SIG Charter to develop policies which relate to management and the use of Internet number resources within the Asia-Pacific Region. This include policies for resource allocation, recovery and transfer and this is for whois, RPKI and DNS.

I am going through the SIG administration. We will have four more Proposal for this session and also the APNIC Secretariat will go through the Impact Assessment.

So these are the steps for implementation. If you are interested in joining the Policy SIG, first subscribe to the mailing list. That is the easiest way to be involved. For a policy to submit, you have to first submit a Proposal, and that is posted into the mailing list for further discussion from the community.

There, in the policy's sake, if it reaches consensus at the Policy SIG session, again, it has to reach consensus at member meeting. From there, there is a comment positive which will lead us to the EC endorsement. There is a certain period for editorial comment. From there, it will go to the implementation phase. The policy may take longer or shorter time for the implementation. It depends in the Secretariat and how much complex the policy is.

So for the consensus decision-making, it is a general agreement taking into consideration comments on the mailing list and in the OPM.

So if you have -- this is not a voting. If you have any objection or if you object to a Proposal, then it is a minor objection. If you strongly oppose for a Proposal, that is major objection, and if you strongly oppose for a Proposal, then we

will request you to come and explain why you don't want the Proposal to go on. There is some other option like neutrally agree and strongly agree. Participants if there is like -- if you don't come to the agreement, that we're expecting all of the participants, all of the community to come together to resolve an objection.

This is the link for Code of Conduct. You can go through it.

For gauging consensus, Chairs will consider the mailing list discussion, the OPM and AGM/AMM and we'll consider the Zoom poll. To give your consensus with the Zoom poll, all registered Conference attendees can access without creating a separate account. When the consensus call is executed, the Zoom tool will be launched for online attendees.

Also to remind, RIR, ICANN and PJS Secretariat staff do not participate in the consensus call. Those are the references. That is all from me. Thank you so much. Over to you, Bikram.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Thank you, Shaila. We will move to the next agenda item. Next will be prop 164. The allocation of IPv6 resources longer than /32 with a nibble boundary alignment. I will request Christopher Hawker for his presentation. Christopher, thank you.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Thank you very much. Christopher Hawker again. There we go. Christopher Hawker again, for the sec time, hopefully the last.

This Proposal prop 164 version 6 is for allocations for IPv6 resources longer than a 32 with a nibble boundary alignment. Reducing the floor of the IPv6. This was written by myself and the co-author Lou Thompson.

The issue that we've seen is the longest IPv6 allocation size is 32. Small Network Operators as a result are required to take a location source. That is what they determined to be their network. Assignments only get one assignment IP assignment. There is only one for that parent Delegation. You can't create subrecords depending on who is in there.

The objective of the policy change is to reduce the allocation size from 32 to 40. Which will reduce the number of resources an account holder has to request. And helps account holders maintain more accurate records. If they determine it only a /36 because a micro operator might be in the economy. They determine 36 is suitable for them. Then they don't have to request a 32.

The situation. ARIN allows for 36 and 40 allocations under 66.5.2.1 of the number resource policy manual. LACNIC, RIPE NCC and AFRINIC policies list 32 as the minimum allocation size.

The full text for the proposed policy is there. If you want to read verbatim it is on the website, this is a summary of the

changes. To update APNIC 127 the Internet number resource policies. 4.2.3.1, it would require the update RIR of the relevant details. Section 8.1, minimum IPv6 allocation. It would change the wording to reflect that 40 is the longest allocation side. 8.1.1 returning excess IPv6 allocations. It would require the holdings to shrink holdings by keeping the first 36 or 40 and returning others space. 8.2.1 account holders with existing IPv4 space. Just text change to shown that the 40 is the longest eligible allocation size. Number new 8.2.3, reservation of IPv6 space for future expansion. This change is designed to codify into policy the current operational practice of the Secretariat for the sparse allocations, I should say. It stipulates the size of the allocations. What to do if no /28 is available.

Going back to the first two points. The changes are proposed to sparse allocate a /28 or reserve up to /28. So if a member requests 36 for example, the Secretariat would carve out a /28 block so there will be continuous allocations, so the networks don't have to renumber if they request any further resources. Point four, what to do if no space is available but reservations do exist.

The Secretariat would release any reserved space from sparse Delegations back into the pool for re-delegation. To make it available again.

8.3.1 existing IPv6 address resource holders. These allow existing account holders to expand their Delegation of between /40 and /33 up to /32 without requiring additional justification as long as section 8.2.2 criteria is met. And how delegations will be made if contiguous space is not available. It provides guidance on what to do. If a member wants to go from 36 to a /32, but that extra contiguous space is not available.

New section, 8.4 is the size of IPv6 allocations. This is the nibble boundary alignment of conditions for the initial and subsequent Delegations.

Now, advantages and disadvantages of the Proposal. It would allow an account holder to maintain accurate records for longer prefixes from a Delegation in the Whois Database. Another advantage that is not listed is a member only has to request the resources they require. They don't have to take more than what they need.

Disadvantages, we have not been able to identify any at this time.

Impact on resource holders. I have not been able to identify any potential or impacts to holders. None were identified. We reference several sections of the Internet number resource policies in drafting this Proposal. And Dave will now come up and do his Secretariat Impact Assessment.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Yes next is Impact Assessment. Dave,

please.

>> DAVE PHELAN: I regret taking my jacket off. It is now cold. This was version 5. Version 6 has been published and is in the mail for discussion. This Proposal is giving allocation from 32 to 40. As a Proposal, it also introduces explicit sparse allocation language allowing certain larger IPv6 address holders to use reserved space.

We use a sparse Delegation algorithm and Proposal may require us to describe reservations in a way that we currently do not do.

Few registry operational issues. Some is in the update. Suitable 28 not available. Reservations are required for existing allocations. How do we handle them if it is not available? This is addressed in the current revision. And whether explicit reservations are needed given APNIC's sparse allocation model. APNIC procedures need to be updated for smaller IPv6 allocations. Nibble boundary sizing, return of excess IPv6 address spaces and explicit reservation process. We require changes to the back end registry systems for nibble size allocation starting at /40. It is the update of the guidance, internal staff guidance and procedures, and processes for reducing existing allocations. And clarify our sparse allocation reservation handling.

Props 164 and 170, which is coming up shortly, both reach consensus. We would have to do additional work around drafting to 94 we don't have conflicts in the policies. Changes in APNIC 127 would be processed per the policy. Implementation time frame would be roughly nine months, after the call for the period.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Thank you, Dave. Now we will open the floor for community discussions. Please state your name and affiliation.

>> ATTENDEE: Hello, my name is Babir, from Bangladesh. I have three queries. Actually this is convincing. That is really good. But it seems like we are solving one problem by changing lots of policies almost four or five changes in the policies. Does it necessary to change all of them for the solving the problem? That is my last question.

I would like to have the clarification as you are saying no known advantage or there is no known impact. So can you share any clarification on this?

>> DAVE PHELAN: Just to address your first point. I will address them one at a time. The first point in making changes to make one big change. A lot of the text is simple just rewording. You know, like updating policy text to go from a 32 to a 40.

In some cases where we go from a /40 and adding in sparse allocations, some were raised that if a member requested a /36, it would cause problems if they needed to increase the side of

holdings, where, say for example, they couldn't expand the current holding. They would then have to request a different block from the Secretariat. And have to remember their entire network at a great time and fiscal cost to them. Whereas the sparse allocations Lou them to expand on what they have. They don't have to renumber the entire network.

>> ATTENDEE: All right. We mention that there is -- we don't know that the /28 of the same block is still available or not. Is that right?

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: I don't have on hand how many Delegations larger than 28 have been made. We have to come back separately on that.

>> DAVE PHELAN: Sorry. Just to interrupt. Sorry. The way sparse allocation algorithm works, we have a block. We then carve the block up in half every time we do a Delegation. It is cut in half, quarter, and eighths. So on, so forth. We last year received a second /12, that was to address a /17 request from the member.

So at the moment the plan is to take the big allocations out of the second block and leave the current block with clarifications. That helps with some of that.

>> Would it be better if we have any analysis for the current IPv6 blocks, help us to understand the current scenario. Also, because I was -- the reservation will be changed. There will be some operational impact. Also we want to share this analysis. Thank you.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: When you say operational changes required. When you said there would be operational impact, what do you mean by that? Like, for example, if a Network Operator has a /32.

>> ATTENDEE: I'm sorry. It is not operational impact for the network. I'm telling about operational impact for the APNIC.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: That is APNIC's problem not ours to deal with.

>> ATTENDEE: I'm Sherrell. I'm providing the comments in my personal capacity. So what I understand from the Proposal is intended to address the concern that some organisation may not need a full 32 and smaller allocation can provide more accurate allocation and registry needs.

Is the operational need near smaller allocation or simply the concern is unused IPv6 space may be allocated unnecessarily.

There is the level, I think, February the primary concern is the resource efficiency, could be instead allocate the currently required small block with the surrounding address space. In fact, I think this prop 164 have already proposed the mechanism for the future expansions.

If you need the 40, they could allocate /32 for the future

growth. This is the allocation while still providing a clear growth path. Where the fundamental is done through fee structure, rather than changing the minimum allocation policy.

The reservation mechanism is (?) in the minimum location. Therefore, unless there is a clear operational requirement beyond these concerns, I would be a little hesitant releasing the millions as a tool /40.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: I'm sorry, that is a lot to take on and respond to right away. In the last part, where you are referring to the operational requirement. Obviously for a member -- at the moment as per the Proposal, if someone wants to take longer than a 32, they can do so. But they can't create subrecords, which means they can't maintain more accurate information. So for example, you have an enterprise network, they may have half a dozen sites. They may deem /40 is suitable. The organisation that requires resources from APNIC would cover all of the sites that they operate in. So they stop Delegations that say the first 48 is used in location A.

The second is used in state B. The third is in country C, so on so forth. This is designed to help our Network Operators understand better where the space is actually being used.

>> ATTENDEE: (?) I understand management would be easier as you explained. The only instance is like, what is it like someone is requiring like /40 and paying for /32 initially. Is this going to address that part also? Like, because the other person is why to pay for increase. The price will be reduced also?

(Overlapping conversations).

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: I can't comment as to how it will impact the fee schedule. Because discussing the fee schedule is outside of the scope of the Policy SIG.

>> ATTENDEE: I'm Tim Helder from APNIC with the comment from Zoom Aftab says I support this Proposal.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Thank you, I appreciate it.

>> ATTENDEE: (?) from APNIC and also from the JPS meeting. This is a question. This budget Proposal is not focused on the conservation. Using IPv6, right?

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: This Proposal is not focused on conservation, it is focused on accurate registry records.

>> ATTENDEE: If you need 36 or 40. You can apply to the allocation too. So 32 is that enough -- better too big than too small.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: That requires account holders to take on more address space than what they need just to maintain more accurate information.

To me, that component doesn't make sense and others in this

room would agree.

>> ATTENDEE: What about the location (?) The accurate assignment information is really important.

But the allocation is -- it is the better I think.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: There could be a difference in the allocation versus assignment. I'm sure someone from the Secretariat will correct me if I get it wrong. An assignment is made to an end user network for their internal use. An allocation is made the -- there is a -- network operators for subdelegation to their end customers and further down the line. Someone could use /32 and use it for their internal use. Is it not accurate in the reason that they're providing to the Secretariat?

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Yeah, please, go ahead.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: If they request address space for their internal network use, they should request an assignment, not allocation. If someone is asking for a space for their customers, they should be asking for an allocation. Hopefully that answers that.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA: Okay. We will follow the appropriate consensus process. We had lots of feedback and content. We will go for the process we have the consensus. I will make the call, you will be given an opportunity now to indicate whether you are strong support the Proposal, support the Proposal, neutral, if you oppose or object to the Proposal or strongly object to the Proposal.

If you indicate that you strongly oppose to the Proposal, then you will be expected to explain the reason for your strong objection.

If you are participating online, the Zoom poll will be shortly there. I will go for the consensus. If you strongly support the Proposal, please put your hand up.

Thank you. If you support the Proposal, please put your hand up. Thank you. If you are neutral about the Proposal please put your hand up. Thank you. If you opposed to the Proposal, please put your hand up. Thank you. If you are strongly opposed to the Proposal, please put your hand up.

So for strongly opposed, you need to have, you know.

>> Like I said earlier if the Proposal intent is to give the space for -- like for the future growth. The only concern is that the people who will be booking applying for the applicant is applying for the IP resources for the birthday or something. If there is a fee there is the pricing. That person will take a think mostly the slash -- it will create much confusion if there is no clarity on that. That is why it is there. Thank you.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Can I address that? As I explained, that is outside of the scope of the policy development process.

That is brought by the Secretariat, about the 8 today and Secretariat I should say.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Zoom poll is here. Strongly support. So in Zoom also there is a strongly opposed. Can you please raise your hand and go ahead with your reason? From remote? Strongly opposed, we need to address. Are strongly oppose? From Zoom again, there is no answer. I would like to know, do you have still strong opposition? Yeah. Yeah.

>> ATTENDEE: Yes because I think these things need to be clarified. If I am supporting something and if I'm not getting benefit out of it. If I apply for the less number of resources and prices, I'm paying the same thing. Simple logic, still opposed.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: You can look at the member calculator on the website. You can see what each would cost and that would answer your question. A strong objection based on a lack of understanding of the structure isn't relevant.

>> ATTENDEE: I agree with you. I agree with you. If anyone can separate provide -- like if the price would be lower. Because right now, I think this is all that is available. Can anyone explain what is the price if we do something like that? In IPv6. That is okay. I will remove my strong objection.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: I defer to the APNIC to answer that question.

>> ATTENDEE: The difference between 32 and 40 is about $1,000.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: That answers the question. You are better financially taking your 36 over 32. Does that address your strong objection?

>> ATTENDEE: Yes.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Thank you.

>> ATTENDEE: Tim from the APNIC Secretariat, nobody on Zoom is moving forward to claim that strong objection.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA: Thank you. Is there any other? Otherwise, we will have the Chair ... so we'll discuss with Chair. Then get back to you. Please bear with us. (Discussion off microphone)

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Okay. As we confer with co-Chair, still there is strong not support. I mean oppose. And there is oppose also. But as per the comments, it is related to the Secretariat. So we also want it clear in a day to come. On considerations of this input we believe that the community has not reached a consensus on the Proposal.

So as the Committee has failed to reach the consensus on this Proposal, the Chair will send this back to the mailing list and the author to consider whether it can be omitted or should be omitted. We will get back again in the email. And then we

will have a consensus next meeting. Thank you.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Sorry. Just briefly. I'm a little ensure as to where the objections come from. The one strong objection on the Zoom poll no one claimed it. So that can't be taken into consideration. The other strong objection was resolved. And from what I could see in the room, there was quite a decent amount of support for the Proposal. Can I get clarification from the Chairs as to how they determined that the Proposal didn't reach consensus?

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Yeah, we said that, you know, we will have next round. Really appreciate your effort.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Sorry. That doesn't answer the question. How did the Chairs determine that consensus was not reached when there was good support in the room and online.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : We appreciate it. From the Chair perspective we have to be clear and balanced. One day to come we will have this prop and during that time, probably the Committee will have the consensus.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: I can appreciate what you are saying. The one strong objection in the Zoom poll was not responded to. It cannot be considered. The strong objection in the room was addressed. That can't be considered as a strong objection. I'm uncertain as to why that is still being taken into consideration. When it is already addressed. It is not a moot point.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Thank you, Chris, thank you for your contribution. Thank you. We'll go for the next agenda item, please.

>> ATTENDEE: Couple more comments. Aftab said if the strong opposition doesn't share the opinion then it is not counted and Saima agrees. Thank you.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Sending mailing list back is not harming for us. We will consider.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: My concern here is that there was very minimum if any objection to the Proposal. The Proposal from what I could see did have good support behind it. The two strong objections had been resolved. So therefore, the Chairs cannot take them into determination when determining consensus. So why are you still taking them into consideration?

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : We'll answer together.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: I as a member and author I have the right to request an answer. Your making --

>> ATTENDEE: Christopher if I could have -- if you see also a Committee member. They're the Chairs. It is not all of the issues. Not all the people supported. So I think sending it to the mail list is a better idea. Maybe we will get more views and more clarity. Maybe we explain to everyone. I'm not against or

for the Proposal. Let's have the discussion closed. But we have the opportunity to discuss and bring it forward in the next meeting maybe. Let's move forward.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Something else to consider. Can we recall the consensus?

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : You want to have another consensus call?

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Is that permitted under the policies? Is there anything that prevents that from happening?

>> DAVE PHELAN: There is nothing that says it can't happen, but I don't think it has ever happened before. At the end of the day, it is the discretion of the Chairs and the rest of the community here.

>> ATTENDEE: I will jump in with discussions from the chat. Aftab and Saima say they think it should be a consensus recall. And Aftab says it has happened before.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : We will have a consensus call with everyone. As I already shared the consensus call is from the community and we already shared that a Chair's role is balanced. Not in favor or. That is the consensus call. I am going to call consensus. If you strongly support the Proposal, please put your hands up. Strongly support. Okay.

If you support the Proposal please put your hands up. Okay. Thank you. If you are neutral about the Proposal, please put your hands up. Okay. Thank you. If you are opposed to the Proposal, please put your hand up. Thank you. If you strongly oppose to the Proposal, please put your hands up. Thank you. Thank you very much. Again, we'll have a confer with my team. Please bear with us.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA: Thank you. Still, on consideration of the input, we believe that the community has not raised a consensus on the Proposal. There is no harm to go back to the email list because we still need to be more clear on it. And then only we move ahead. As the community has failed to raise a consensus on the Proposal, the Chair will send it back to the mailing list and the author to consider whether it can be amended or should be amended. So we'll go to the next agenda item.

The next agenda item will be prop 171. Operational accountability for abuse contacts in sub allocated address space.

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: Next is Proposal 171 from Tsung-Yi Yu. We would like to invite Tsung-Yi Yu to make the presentation.

>> TSUNG-YI YU: Hi, this is about the operational accountability for abuse contacts in sub allocated address space. The APNIC regard requires IRT abuse contacts to be reachable and periodically validated in Proposal 125. In

suballocation, the registered contact may not be the operators that actually affected the network. The email can be successfully delivered, but it may not know the correct person. This is the status of the RIR. As we can see it RIR is already require the contact validation but don't have in the Proposal about the policy about operational accountability. And APNIC is trying -- APNIC right now, we are proposing it.

So the key destination is the reachability does not mean accountability. A working mailbox does not mean there is necessarily effective operational path to the person who can investigate and act, for example. I know some ISP must have sub allocation to IP address to their customer. So if it is something like the abuse they need to contact the interest person or technical issue they need to contact the person that maintain their IP address. They cannot make contact with.

Our proposed policy solution is when address space is used by downstream organisation, the upstream holder must ensure a reliable operational path from the registered abuse IRT contact to the party that can actually investigate and resolve the report.

So the abuse report line would be like the registered abuse IRT contact and reliable operational path and then the responsible downstream operator. And Resolution.

So how can the requirement be met. I have three models. The first is direct downstream contact. Which means they need to register and figure out. And then it is the centralized upstream handling, for APNIC and if there is an ISP which makes a lot of sub allocation but they could receive their abuse email and centralized forwards to the contact.

And then the third one is other effective arrangement. If an option -- if other model can be acceptable it is responsible and correct the issue.

Be clear about approximate what it does not do. The Proposal does not require every downstream customer's contact details to be published. Because they might have a privacy issue. But it does not require every specific abuse handling model change the existing IRT validation cycle. It is not for APNIC to be police. Ha-ha.

So this is the advantage and disadvantages. The benefit is stronger operational accountability. And cost is some additional process and administrative work. APNIC may need to provide clear operational guidelines.

This is the final. The Proposal 171 is not making APNIC police abuse. It is about making the existing abuse contact system operational meaningful. Not just reachable, but actionable. Thank you.

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: Thank you so much. I'm requesting the

APNIC Secretariat to go through the Impact Assessment.

>> DAVE PHELAN: Hi, again. There we go. All right. Secretariat impact analysis for prop 172V1. Oh, this is the wrong policy development process. This is the wrong impact. I'm at the wrong slide. Back at 164. Sorry, everybody. Here we go. All right. APNIC understands the Proposal are requiring upstream holder to ensure there is a reliable operational path from the registered abuse or IRT contact to the party able to investigate and act on the abuse reports from sub delegated address space. The APNIC Secretariat has notes that the issue may already be addressed under the current IRT policy. Members can create individual IRT objects and customer for customers you can check the contact request.

The proposals does not specify the minimum size for sub-Delegations. It could be a granular level for large organisations. This is the multiple contacts can apply to a single address. The proposed policy would add a new pel to APNIC 127. This would require upstream holder to ensure that abuse reports can reach the party when it is delegated.

Upstream holders already remain responsible for the downstream abuse contact is not reachable. The current does not require for them to be responsible how abuse reports are handled after received.

These could be interpreted as applying some level of enforcement even though the Proposal States it does not give APNIC any enforcement roles. It is to provide good operational practice, rather than create any new enforcement obligations for APNIC.

There are a number of clarifications required in this assessment that need to be resolved before an implementation can be determined. Other than the changes to APNIC 127. Until such point as we have the clarifications made. We are unable to make a determination on the implementation process or time frame at this stage.

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: Thank you, Dave. We will open the mic for questions and comments to Tsung-Yi Yu. State your name and affiliation.

>> ATTENDEE: My name is Joe. I am in support of the Proposal. I have a few questions. Like if you go like and maintain -- it only abuse contact. Please correct me if I am wrong. Then the problem is a lot of time they will forget to update. For the current policy, the Secretariat explained, the top of the hierarchy. So if you are going down and not maintaining the correct and providing the email and end up emailing only that person and email is not working or maybe they change the reallocated to someone else. Maintaining that abuse will be. Does that part resolve? Second thing is that to do

that, you can do one thing. Provide the mean, the holder. With that, if someone wants to also provide that person also, they can be the same. The mean block all together complained. To fasten the process, that is the intent the person was using down the stream. You will also get the abuse complaint. That can be me or anyone in this room. That can be. Thank you.

>> TSUNG-YI YU: I think APNIC already (audio skipping) they email. So if an email was mentioned by the (audio skipping) customer. The LIR member needs to read that. (Audio skipping) email. Did I answer your question? (Chuckling).

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: Okay, we have next question. Chris, please continue.

>> ATTENDEE: Christopher Hawker, let's pretend for a minute that I run a large transit provider in Southeast Asia. I Delegate address space to my customer. I create records and objects for that customer. And their IRT address becomes invalid. Now, what incentive is there for them to maintain an up-to-date and accurate record? At the moment, the way I understand it, I could be wrong, if an IRT becomes invalid, the resource could holders account is locked so they have to update the records which could impact my other customers where I can't do anything else in the account because of actions of one of my customers.

>> TSUNG-YI YU: Thank you for the question. I think it should be advised by APNIC. My suggestion is cancel your contract because can't follow the rule.

>> ATTENDEE: I can simplify it if you want.

>> DAVE PHELAN: Yes, currently, the case is if you have a delegated IRT contact for a sub-Delegation and they fail validation, your account will be locked.

>> ATTENDEE: Okay. So that might be something we have to address and might be something outside of the scope of this Proposal. We'll talk.

>> TSUNG-YI YU THANKS.

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: The next question.

>> ATTENDEE: I'm Babir from telecommunication Bangladesh. I like to have this kind of security and those things. It improved our internal securities. And obviously I'm running the last minute and sending this to my customers. So that will be easy to list to my customer. This is to be -- you are stating the APNIC will develop the guidance. In consult with community.

So I mean, should we keep the key implementation criteria to the Secretariat. I mean, that is the key implementation criteria. That should be -- I mean, included in the policy. Because I don't know how APNIC Secretariat will consult with the community without the Policy SIG. That should be the operational challenges. Bee should know that how it would be implemented.

Thank you.

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: We don't have a comment online. Is there anyone else that has a comment or question to Tsung-Yi Yu? Please continue.

>> ATTENDEE: Do I turn it on? Kenny Huang speaking in my personal capacity. It is not about support or objection to this Proposal. We're just trying to clarify. When we do have abuse contact validation every six months in addition to the other IR. They usually do it every year, within other information, I am curious. If request to suballocation can have abuse contact and who is the owner to be in charge of the validation? Is APNIC going to have validation obligation or the account holder should do the validation? Thank you.

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: Thank you, Kenny. Any other question? Do you have anything to say?

>> TSUNG-YI YU: I suggest the account owner should allocate the email. APNIC system can do, but the account owner should be the follow-up.

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: If there is no other comment or question, then I will go for the consensus call. And this policy Proposal has been discussed on the APNIC Policy SIG mailing list and today's OPM. We request the community to reach consensus or general agreement on the Proposal before it will proceed. I will make a consensus call, and you indicate whether you strongly support the Proposal, support the Proposal, neutral, oppose or strongly oppose the Proposal. If you indicate you strong lie oppose to the Proposal, you -- strongly oppose the Proposal, you will be expected to come forward and explain why you strongly oppose it.

If you are online, write it down. Or you can also speak. If you strongly support the Proposal, please put your hand up. Strongly support the Proposal, put your hand up. If you support the Proposal, please put your hand up. If you are neutral to this Proposal, please put your hand up. If you oppose to the Proposal, please put your hand up. If you strongly oppose to the Proposal please put your hand up.

Okay. So I will discuss with my co-Chairs and come back. (Discussion off microphone)

>> SHAILA SHARMIN: Thanks for waiting. I have conferred with my Chairs and co-Chairs. We have noted the community comments and have noted the Zoom poll and also the discussion in the room and all the hands up. After considering it, the next step in the PDP is to take the Proposal -- okay. In consideration of this input we believe that the community has not reached to the consensus on this Proposal. And as the community has failed to reach the consensus on this Proposal, the Chairs will send it back to the mailing list and the author

to consider whether it can be amended or should be abandoned.

So we have discussed and we are sending it back to the mailing list. So that the community can have more time to comment and make if they have questions, so you can come with another version into our next OPM. Thank you very much. Thank you, Tsung-Yi Yu.

It is really good to see a policy Fellow come forward and proposing a Proposal. Thank you so much.

>> CHING-HENG KU: We move to the next part of the Proposal. It is Proposal 170. It is presented by Haisheng Yu. You have made the preparation so you can go ahead.

>> HAISHENG YU: Hi, I'm Haisheng Yu, from CNNIC. I'm presenting prop 170, from China Mobile. The title is nibble boundary alignment from IPv6 allocations. This is from practical IPv6 experience. Although IPv6 provides a large address space, the way we allocate many prefixes has an impact. Today I will introduce the policy gap and explain why it is alignment and the proposed mechanism and discuss safeguards in the expected impact.

First, I will give the problem statement. The current policy has supported the IPv6 environment. However, there is currently no clear agenda to request the binary alignment when the alignment is operationally important. Under current policy, section 8.1 the minimal allocation and the based documented requirements. Subsequent locations normally follow one beat. This is reasonable. But they can produce prefixes such as 21, 26, 27 and so on.

There are varied IPv6 prefixes. But they may create additional for the management, customer assignment planning. The templates, security policies. Automation system and the future expansion.

So the objective of the proposed 170 is not to replace the APNIC's needs based model. The Proposal produce an optional mechanism. When you request an alignment and provide sufficient operational justification, APNIC can allocate the smallest nibble alignment block for the requirement. The key thing is that the alignment happens after need assessment, not before.

The Proposal does not provide unconditional right to bandwidth the additional address space.

ARIN provides the clear example of the allocation practice. ARIN defines it as 4-byte defined to mask. And on the boundaries while determining the needs base evaluation. Others also provide examples. For example, RIPE NCC allocate and keep addressing plenty usable and understandable and to align the DNS reverse. It would align with the nibble boundary. With the 690. The ARIN policy States IPv6 allocation is late on the boundaries.

Our proposed solution is include three focused change.

First, section 8 for the alignment. The alignment demands proof.

Second, initial locations should use alignment when expressly requested. And supported by the validated requirement.

Third, subsequent allocation keeps 1 byte as the default but provide an optional aligned expansion path when justified. The Proposal is intentional. And the preserve existing policy principles.

Here it gives the allocation. The allocation shows two passes. The original pass continues unchanged. The applicants that don't request alignment continues the process. The Proposal of 170 path allows requestors to request the alignment. The master provider supporting evidence after normal assessment to look at the requirement, APNIC connects with the smallest block. The approach operational needs and resource stewardship.

Here there is alignment demand proof. The requiring of technical evidence applicants should explain why a small line location or reservation cannot meet operational requirements from day 1. The evidence may include reverse planning, automation requirements. Aggregation, and segmentation and customer models. The purpose to make it reviewable and transparent.

Here we give examples for automation and troubleshooting. Operators can explain the resources as ideas, as we did in the security to have the boundaries. This is how this follows the delegation and why the prefix create additional managing complexity. Can't explain why the long aligned prefix provides better operational networks.

Here is a simple example for the IPv6 reverse DNS. This is based on it being more nimble. It represents 4 bytes. The prefix matches the IPv6 and IRPA hierarchy. This makes it easier. The Proposal is not about the converting address it is about reducing unnecessary complexity in not just scaled IPv6 operations. You can notice that here the reverse DNS. You can see examples. This is complex. For example, for the 60/35, it should use two. /36 to describe the IPv6 reverse DNS. Here's as a scope and manage the Proposal, 170 do not rewrite the IPv6 policy. Do not change the 32 minimal location. The radio requirements. Utilization threshold. The sparse framework. And we need it dominant. It also does not affect IP basis assignment near section 9. The resources do not need to renumber, return or resize existing allocations.

The main benefit is operational clarity. The boundary can simplify the operation, the policy, routing security, logging or future expansion. However the Proposal also recognized possible consensus. It is not yours. That is the calculated requirement. APNIC and the system may need updates. Therefore, safeguards are essential.

The impact assignment shows that in there it is manageable. This is protected. New allocations continue to follow the current ability and needs based assessment. APNIC address registration system and get to know tours and guidance. This Proposal is continued improvement rather than fundamental policy change.

In summary, Proposal 170 creates optional and can -- with the alignment, the request is simple. Request alignment. Provide the technical evidence. Complete an assessment and there is a block that satisfied the requirement. The benefit include easier automation. Simple reverse DNS management. This will improve network operations. Thank you for your attention. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss Proposal 170 with the community. I welcome feedback from operators. Thank you.

>> CHING-HENG KU: We will give to Dave to give the Impact Assessment.

>> DAVE PHELAN: We understand it creates an additional mechanism and needs have been validated under an existing needs base assessment. Though changes to the current minimum IPv6. It doesn't have requirements unless the expansion of existing allocation cannot be met due to overlapping allocations.

Registry systems and internal tools to submit the allocation outcomes in the boundaries preserve the existing needs based seam. The Secretariat suggest the definitions listed in the Proposal are moved to section 2 along with other document definitions. That should be prop 164. Both reach consensus. Drafting should be required to ensure we don't have conflict but we will be okay. Changes need to be processed as per the editorial policy. Because the Board didn't reach consensus in this meeting.

>> CHING-HENG KU: Thanks, it is a new location not related. There are needs for realignment. We welcome onsite or online with an expert that could also propose your idea for this Proposal. We will go to the community discussion. We open the floor.

>> ATTENDEE: I'm Li Haijun from China Mobile. Part of this Proposal as a telecom operator, we are exerting the operation of our network's operation, however, certain aspect of IPv6 such as planning, configuration and troubleshooting still require manual intervention. The next boundary alignment needs to improve our operational efficiency.

And reduce the time to resolve the issues. That's my comment. Thank you.

>> CHING-HENG KU: Maybe we take the questions and then let Haisheng Yu respond to that.

>> ATTENDEE: Christopher Hawker. To be honest, I'm puzzled by this Proposal. I will explain why. Correct me if I'm wrong.

If a member wants to go from example from 30 to 29, which is a one-bit increment based on the requirements being met. But if they want to go from a 30 to 28, which is a two-bit increase, that they need to provide justification. Is that a fire understanding?

>> HAISHENG YU: In fact, if you want to -- the 30 to 29. It is the personal pass. It can be accepted by the APNIC policy now. If you want to request 30 to 28. It cannot be -- the policy now from APNIC cannot meet the requirement.

I think you should use some descriptions or something else to emit the requirement. It is not very clear. We want to make that boundary to be clarified. That is our Proposal.

>> CHRISTOPHER HAWKER: Okay. Section 8.22 of the resource policy, it says LIR may request an exception to the rule when it has demonstrated need for assignment that is larger than the amount of remaining space. It is it announcing the existing IPv6 allocation can demonstrate a need or requirement for discrete networks. It requires the additional allocation for technical reasons such as the IPv4 to IPv6 transaction technologies. It can demonstrate other reasons except in certain circumstance or in accordance with the applicable provisions. There are currently provisions in place that allow for members to apply for additional space beyond a single one-bit increase.

So again, I'm not certain what this Proposal is trying to address.

>> CHING-HENG KU: Thanks, Christopher. I suggest maybe we collect more questions and you can answer later. Okay? That's fine?

>> ATTENDEE: Hi, Mark Schmitt. I don't have an opinion about the Proposal, I would like to give clarification on reference that you gave to right reach. In IPv6 right reach we don't have any nibble boundary requirement. That document is 738. The Document 690 is the best practice of the document. It talks about the IPv6 assignments up to 48. We talk about the boundary, but there is no nibble boundary reference requirement from the RIPE IPv6 policy. As a clarification.

>> CHING-HENG KU: Thank you, Mark. Yes.

>> ATTENDEE: I am (?). I'm speaking in my personal capacity. Thank you for your presentation. I understand the benefit but ... it is because the consumption is the bigger issue.

>> ATTENDEE: Good morning, it is still the morning. This is Hugh ling speaking on behalf of myself. I appreciate the Proposal. I need some clarification. As you mentioned in the Proposal, some evidence to be provided to justify the need for the alignment. Are you expected a certain criteria to support the alignment? Also, is there a point that we can say the

alignment requirement is producing two big difference between the real requirement and the allocation? Because it did result in a larger allocation. The question is wondering, if you say it is a point to not justify getting the alignment. The difference in the reality and the alignment needed one is too big.

>> HAISHENG YU: Thanks for the questions. Different IP providers might have different requirement. The alignment for a pro is different.

I think we should give these to the APNIC securities.

And I -- for the grandma's operational problems, 6 -- the routing security problems and something else.

If you approach you will need that. And the APNIC securities considering that that is sufficient, you should meet the requirement. Data is our --

>> CHING-HENG KU: There are comments online.

>> ATTENDEE: I have an online comment. I strongly support the Proposal. It can make IPv6 planning and for the SR6 deployment especially for hierarchical location.

>> ATTENDEE: Hello, I'm Babir from telecommunication Bangladesh.

I have a question. Do you have any changes for the nibble boundary? Is there any change of fees or something?

>> HAISHENG YU: I cannot understand your question.

>> ATTENDEE: Suppose I am having currently. As nibble alignment, I would need 44. The piece is not the same? I would pay additional --

>> DAVE PHELAN: Dave Phelan Secretariat. This is it allocations not assignments. So there is no fee question here.

>> ATTENDEE: Yeah. That is why my question is. It is actually forcing the members to provide their additional fees.

You will have the alignment for the operational purpose. It is not necessary to have the assignment from Pacific to solve this operational purpose. You are having a 38 from APNIC. Bistill you can use 40 in your network for the operational challenge and operational issues. You can use the nibble boundary in your network. There is no issue with the newer boundary. APNIC allocation I mentioned all should be based on the requirement. Okay? All should be based on what is the expectation, what is the user requirement? And this should be aligned with the proper documentation that it cost a member. Need this level of address block and it is provided. So that should be our main concern.

>> HAISHENG YU: Yeah, I understand your concern. In fact we have conversation about that.

>> CHING-HENG KU: We have consensus call.

>> HAISHENG YU: Maybe I can show some ... here we have some fingers that will conclude the problem. One thing, here is ARIN

compared with other IRs. With ARIN it is for huge average location size. It is only 12% higher than the other on the binary. Do not take so many addresses. And we do not waste addresses. It is your requirement. We don't focus to your requestor as a nibble boundary. It is optional. If you don't use nibble boundary, it is aligned problems.

The way to also think about it is in APNIC. In fact we collect data from that. We note that if APNIC get the IP ... the address from the 2. It is 2022. And ARIN, you get the 12. That is from 2019. Yeah, yeah. Here is the master. In Israel. The Colombia growth is quickly.

(Overlapping conversations).

>> CHING-HENG KU: This detailed information should be put on the mailing list for people to understand the background. Most current attendees can see this picture, and all of the statistics. They need long the knowledge and information. Anytime, because of the time now, we need to go to the final consensus call. Okay. 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. Please put your hands up if you are neutral about the Proposal.

If you oppose this Proposal, please put your hands up. And you are strongly opposed to this Proposal, please put your hands up. Please can we take some time?

(Discussion off microphone)

>> CHING-HENG KU: Okay. After the discussion with all the Chairs, this Proposal reach consensus. And the next step is the PDP to take the Proposal to the AGM/AMM to seek continued consensus. Is to go back to the mailing list for a four-week comment period. And that period is possibly extended to eight weeks. Thank you very much.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : We made the consensus. Thank you very much. Good.

Next Proposal 172, defining Internet abuse through IP addresses. Please. Alban Kwan for his presentation.

>> ALBAN KWAN: I thought mine would be most controversial. Chris stole that crown. I will be quick. This is about what finding the IP address means. The problem statement is simple. I would say because of time. We have the IRT content but we don't know what abuse means. That basically means we don't know what abuse is so how would we do that? There is a deeper statement is there itself. This is going to the role and responsibility of APNIC itself. Who are we? How do we get the power from? What it would take to take that power away?

There is a number of ways to understand this. The keywords that is used is actually stewardship. We are a steward of the Internet resources. What does steward mean? If we are

distributing the resources and they can be misused. We are being a good steward. That is a deeper level of the problem statement. I would not go through all of the things because of time. But the objective I think is simple. It is to make a simple definition and then continue how to discuss abuses.

The definition is this, the Internet builds, and the IP address or set of addresses, registered to or held by an APNIC account holder to conduct or facilitate, attempt to cause or create a material risk or technical harm to the security, ability, or trust of the Internet that the resource holder has the practical and operational ability to address.

It is a handful. And the definition actually have a list of nonexclusive category of abuse. It is noted meant to be everything, but at least we give positive example of what that means.

In this category, it is no doubt. If there is a limit to it. This is one of the comments from the Japanese community through the mailing list as well.

The definition actually also include safeguards. We don't want to step outside of our responsibility as well. We will go through the safeguard quickly. The first of all, the protection and operation era, if you don't know about the mistake, it is not our responsibility if it is just an error.

The other thing that is important to understand is within the definition, we also are extremely clear about the adjudication responsibility. That is not APNIC. Our responsibility in APNIC is merely to make sure that the resource holder responds to abuse. And if we disagree with the result, that is not our responsibility. That is not -- the good faith, reliance protection is basically into the IG thing. Like a section 230 protection, if they actually respond to the abuse report, regardless of how they resolve the case, you are immune from liability at least from APNIC boundary. APNIC is explicitly not the indicator of the abuse. Our responsibility is to make sure the resource holder responds. Who decides? You receive from the resource holder. The resource holder if they respond to it in good faith. They're not liable basically.

I will skip this and skip this as well.

I think Dave would say something on the impact as well.

So I will skip this in light of time.

Other thing I want to address is within the Proposal we acknowledge that there are a number of things we need to discuss. I don't think this is within the boundary of the Proposal. I would say that there are resource holder, it is a mere conduit. Now do you find it reliable. It is best in a Working Group, not the policy itself.

The definition of hosting me. Things like that. Things that

may change throughout time. This is probably best in the Working Group tow discuss as well. I would actually stop here so we can have a little bit of discussion as well. Dave?

>> CHING-HENG KU: Yeah, Dave, please.

>> DAVE PHELAN: I will make this pretty quick. We have an extensive Impact Assessment published on this already. There is already a version 2 on the list. Some of this has already been addressed. So the main concern coming from the Secretariat is that we currently have, you know, a volume of unvalidated email. This number does not take into account how many will validate during the next 30 days on the time period. We don't have the power to adjudicate or abuse, but it says APNIC holds responsibility for holding it accountable. It is unsure how to do both without the enforcement role. It is the abuse of the IP addresses, I believe some of this language is tidied up. Unlawful conduct, I believe you removed that term. Also jurisdictional changes. Some of this has been addressed. This is a very extensive Impact Assessment.

To keep things moving along, you should have read it by now. The definition is intended to serve foundation for future policy Proposal. This means it makes it our problem to adjudicate.

We can't do anything on this at the moment. It is as we're all away, this is not going for a consensus call today, it is purely so you can have discussion about this.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Thank you, Dave. We'll have three comments or questions, then we'll conclude.

>> ATTENDEE: Thank you, I'm Jill, I will speak in my own capacity. First, I think maybe now that the Proposal is a little too ambitious. Maybe I cannot agree for now. But I want to appreciate the Proposal. This is the time to have this discussion. This actually remind me the discussion of ICANN in 2019. On the DNS. I think now, it is a lot of progress in that direction. So I think I don't see any reason why the community don't start to have this kind of discussion.

So I think I also want to concur with the suggestion. I think it is -- we really need to have more awareness building this event and the capacity building. Maybe more data to share. So we can discuss more about what is the good practice for this? Thank you.

>> ATTENDEE: Hello, I'm from the coordination center. first of all, this is my first time to join the policy meeting. So I will talk about this Proposal first. When you think about the IP addresses, how they have used for the activity. I think as a prospective coordination center, this is important to distinguish between simply observing the suspect activity from the IP address and having sufficient technical evidence to say

that the IP address is actually conducting or facilitating the abuse. At JPCC we see so many from the overall organisation and the researchers. Outside of Japan. And affected organisation as well.

We see that base evolving, particularly in Japan. This is an example for phishing. Maybe the phishing website. If the address is only receiving the effort.

We do look at whether it is the address. It is accessible. And what content is being served. Whether the page is paginating or the organization. The content is a selection there. And it is observed. That kind of information we receive and what criteria we are investigating and determine is the IP address is abused by ourselves. The amount for independent and also the scan is very important issue nowadays.

But just scanning is somehow the security did the research on their own. Something like that kind of thing is happening nowadays. So many things.

So what I say is I think the important question for the prop 172 is not only what is IP address but also what level of the technical evidence is needed to determine the IP address was used for the obvious activity?

And the information in the IP address, (?) that information is important to determine that IP address is indeed used for the activity.

And also I'm sorry. I know there is not enough time. But IP address itself, I mean, the IP address itself is not inherently abusive, it may be dynamically shared with customers and a compromised device.

Rather than saying this IP address is obvious, it is more accurate to say it is observed being used for the activity at a particular time and based on available technical evidence. So for this reason, should provide --

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Please wrap up.

>> ATTENDEE: I'm sorry about that. I think for my point, is that in the future accountability mechanism considered in the future on the RIR could indeed focus on whether it is supported by the efficient technical evidence being handled responsibly by the resource holder.

So this separation may be helping us discuss --

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : Thank you for the comments, wonderful comments. Next from online?

>> ATTENDEE: Hi, this is Tim from APNIC.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA : And last is Chris.

>> ATTENDEE: Great work. Not over yet. I'll shirr my opinion on this in detail on the mailing list. This is hard topic, should be addressed and requires more in depth discussion. The Proposal has ignited discussion but requires

more time and deliberation. This is a topic for birds of a feather at the next meeting.

>> ATTENDEE: Christopher Hawker here. I support -- I agree with this in spirit. It is definitely a discussion that needs to be had and should be had. However I note in point 1 of the problem statement it says there is no definition of what abuse is. It is outside of the Regional registries and better suited for the IETF. That is my 2 cents.

>> HAISHENG YU: I appreciate the product. If the process is more important than itself, this is probably one of it. The one thing that I hoped to have more comment on is what should be in the policy and should be in the Working Group. In my own opinion, there are a number of things that shouldn't be put on the policy document that shouldn't be changing all the time. Anything that may move throughout time should be in the best practice document or some sort of things like that. That is why we deliberately leave that out. Establish a baseline for discussion. Then we can move to a Working Group and have discussion on a lot of the things we discussed. Especially the Sacco comment.

>> BIKRAM SHRESTHA: Thank you. I appreciate your effort. Asia-Pacific is certainly diverse and our policy will be strong when the diversity is preserved in our discussions.

On behalf of co-Chairs, this Proposal will be discussed further. Thank you.

On behalf of co-Chairs, we want to have conclude the open meeting -- Open Policy Meeting 2 of the APNIC 62 Mumbai.

Thank you very much. I look forward to continuing the discussions. Thank you for your time. 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.