

**Subject: Appeal against the extended last call consensus  
determination on the proposal: "Abuse Contact Policy Update -  
AFPUB-2018-GEN-001-DRAFT07"**

Dear Appeal Committee, please find this appeal against the confirmation of consensus on the proposal "Abuse Contact Policy Update AFPUB-2018-GEN-001-DRAFT07" made by the PDWG co-chairs at the end of the extended last call on 14 Jan 2022 .

**b. Date of the appeal.**

January 14 2022

**c. Name and email address of complainant.**

Mathanya Ramaboea (mathanyawork@gmail.com)

**d. Names of three (3) persons, other than the complainant, who support the appeal and who participated in the discussions**

1. Rachel Tubog
2. Oluwabunmi Egbeyemi
3. Elvis Ibeanusi

**e. Date of the decision made by the co-chairs**

January 14, 2022

**f. Reference to an announcement of decision which is being appealed**

<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2022/014137.html>

**g. Evidence of a failed attempt to resolve the disagreement through discussion:**

The following links to the emails in the RPD archives demonstrate a strong chain of arguments

from multiple community members showing opposition to this policy, which are considered valid objections for declaring non-consensus in this proposal, both before and after the decision.

### **1.Elvis Ibeanusi**

i. (Fri Jan 7 13:04:52 UTC 2022)

<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2022/014102.html>

ii. (Mon Jun 7 10:53:11 UTC 2021)

<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2021/013233.html>

### **2.Rachel Tubog**

i. (Sun Jan 9 14:05:37 UTC 2022)

<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2022/014111.html>

### **3.Oluwabunmi Egbeyemi**

i. (Sun Jan 9 15:37:39 UTC 2022)

<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2022/014112.html>

### **4.Mathanya Ramaboea**

i. (Fri Jan 7 14:21:10 UTC 2022)

<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2022/014103.html>

### **5.Aziz Halim**

i. (Mon Jun 7 16:33:46 UTC 2021)

<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2021/013236.html>

### **6.Meryem Dayday**

i. (Mon Jun 7 21:35:44 UTC 2021)

<https://lists.afrinic.net/pipermail/rpd/2021/013241.html>

#### **h. Detailed appeal submission:**

Despite the declaration of the co-chairs, no consensus actually exists within the community. According to the CPM, if consensus is not reached, the concerned policy cannot be ratified.

Besides the failure to address numerous concerns and multiple attempts to hand-wave these objections away, nothing has been done to substantively address them by updating the actual policy proposal. Below are the issues that have not been fully addressed:

- 1) AFRINIC's existing abuse contact information policy is sufficient and well-engineered. To emphasize and clarify our opinion, the existence of two channels of abuse contacts is merely efficient, because the automated mailbox can manage recurrent and frequent complaints, by providing automatic solutions and direct answers already incorporated in its database.
  
- 2) Given that the period is different for people to respond to abuses, that is considered a stretching on AFRINIC itself because the concept of abuse is undefined and differs from one jurisdiction to another. Secondly, it is complicated for people to respond to these abuses within the given timelines.
  
- 3) Since the RSA is compulsory, and abuse contact is already incorporated in the RSA, the purpose of this new policy remains unnecessary and pointless.
  
- 4) According to the policy proposal, it is implied that network-holders must provide AFRINIC with their confidential data even though they already showed technical needs during the application process, which is completely invasive and unnecessary.
  
- 5) The RIR is merely a registration service which serves the purpose of book keeping. One of the major unaddressed objections that this policy faces is that it is overstepping its limits and boundaries by requiring people to have a valid mailbox and forcing them to deal with abuse. RFC2142 is just a suggestion which should not be interpreted otherwise and "abuse" definition differs from one country to another and from one jurisdiction to another. It is not in AFRINIC's

mandate to decide or dictate how network-holders manage their abuse mailbox. They have the liberty to choose the adequate actions to be taken. To sum up, this policy contradicts with internet values, as it makes AFRINIC play the role of a central government.

5) Implementing this policy means that AFRINIC will start managing people's network, which is a serious act of overstepping the policy process of this community, especially that the ICP2 does not give AFRINIC the mandate and the right to manage people's networks. AFRINIC could just get members to publish their mailbox without the need of being intrusive and overstepping what is not in their scope.

6) By forcing people to reply as a way to validate abuse mailbox will only incur cost for members and AFRINIC because a good network will deal with abuse properly with or without AFRINIC's forceful validation; a bad network might be forced to reply but this won't change the fact that they will not deal with abuse properly. In other words, this cannot improve network operation in a meaningful way.

**i. evidence of attempting to resolve the issue:**

An email has been sent to the co-chairs as an attempt to resolve the issue on Jan 10, 2022.

Also, despite the chairs' announcement of consensus in the meeting, myself and several other community members have raised new concerns whereas the chairs simply regarded them as "old concerns". The concerns have been mentioned by the author/chair indeed, but they are not fully resolved nor addressed. An evidence of this is the continuous disagreement on the proposal during and after the last call period. This shouldn't have appeared if the issues had really been resolved.

**List of additional materials the complainant will rely on, if any**

All necessary evidence and supporting documentation are presented above.

We humbly ask you to find that the above objections and concerns raised during both the discussion, and the last call, as well as those coming after the erroneous declaration of consensus:

1. Are valid
2. Have not been fully addressed
3. Require changes in the policy proposal to be addressed

Assuming that you agree with us on the above three points, we believe there is no valid choice other than to vacate the consensus declaration and return the proposal to the list for further discussion and refinement.

Respectfully submitted,

Mathanya Ramaboea  
mathanyawork@gmail.com