



APNIC 46 Policy Proposal Outcomes

Outcomes of Policy Proposals discussed at APNIC 46

An Open Policy Meeting at APNIC 46 in Nouméa, New Caledonia, considered the following proposals.

prop-118: No need policy in APNIC region

Version 2 of this proposal to remove the requirement to demonstrate need when transferring IPv4 addresses did not reach consensus. Speakers for and against the proposal could not come to an agreement. The Chair said, if the author wished to continue with the proposal, he should take into account all the comments received and adjust the proposal for early resubmission to allow more time for discussion on the mailing list.

prop-124: Clarification on IPv6 sub-assignments

This proposal to allow assignments to be sub-assigned did not reach consensus. The Chair noted that most of the participants were neutral about this and either did not indicate strong support or opposition to this proposal as they were probably not facing any problems currently. The Chair asked the author to provide further clarification if he wished to take this proposal forward.

prop-125: Validation of “abuse-mailbox” and other IRT emails

This proposal reached consensus at both the Policy SIG and later at the APNIC Member Meeting (AMM). During the discussion of prop-125, the community agreed with the intention of the proposed solution and asked the authors to simplify the proposed text, so everyone can understand it. The APNIC Secretariat will work with the authors to suggest a simplified version once it completes all the steps of the Policy Development Process (PDP). The APNIC Secretariat also made the community aware that this proposal will take six months to implement instead of the usual three months as it requires changes to the registration systems. This proposal just finished the final comment phase and is awaiting APNIC Executive Council (EC) endorsement.

prop-126: PDP Update

This proposal focuses on changing the current procedures of the PDP to increase community participation and allow an appeals process directly to the APNIC EC for proposals that did not reach consensus. Step one of the proposal was withdrawn from the consensus call, and Steps two and three did not go through the call to reach consensus. The Chair asked the author to return it to the mailing for further discussion with the community to improve the proposal.

Useful links

- Subscribe to the Policy Discussion mailing list:
 - <https://mailman.apnic.net/mailling-lists/sig-policy>
- Visit the APNIC 46 policy page:
 - <https://conference.apnic.net/46/policy/proposals>