

# Evolution of the RIPE Policy Development Process

**Author: Niall O'Reilly**

**Document ID: ripe-761**

**Date: April 2021**

---

## Executive Summary

The RIPE Policy Development Process is a significant element of RIPE governance.

The author has reviewed successive versions of the documentation of this process in order to make himself familiar with it, and now shares this review to facilitate discussion and possible future work.

The author proposes the following recommendations.

1. To clarify or omit the identification of the RIPE Chair as “author and owner” of the process.
2. To clarify how the process should be amended.
3. To restore explicit exclusion of the RIPE Chair from the initial stage of the appeal procedure.
4. To create a non-exhaustive list of categories of individual having an obligation to be recused from the initial stage of the appeal procedure.

The author is currently Vice-Chair of RIPE; he presents this review and the recommendations it contains as input to community discussion.

## Acknowledgements

The author is very grateful to Mirjam Kühne for continued encouragement and helpful criticism during this work; and especially to Angela Dall'Ara, Bijal Sanghani, Daniel Karrenberg, Denis Walker, Kurtis Lindqvist, Marco Schmidt, and Sander Steffann who each very kindly took time to review this document.

The author is also grateful for comments from the RIPE Working Group chairs at their [meeting of 22 January 2021](#).

Responsibility for the content of this review, and for any errors or omissions, is entirely the author's.

## Introduction

The RIPE Policy Development Process (PDP) is important both for articulating RIPE Community requirements and for communicating these requirements formally to the RIPE NCC and/or others who may be responsible for implementing policy. The process has been revised a number of times since its introduction in order either to present it more clearly or to streamline the process.

Mirjam Kühne and the author took office as RIPE Chair and Vice-Chair respectively on 1 September 2020, and had to give attention almost immediately to the first ever exercise of the Appeal Procedure in the PDP. We needed to refresh our understanding of the PDP, and found it useful to review the history of this process. This review is recorded here.

The author has tried to identify the significant features of the Policy Development Process, to note when they were introduced and how they evolved, and to recommend some very few changes or clarifications which may be opportune. He does not intend these recommendations as proposed amendments to the PDP, but rather as input for a review of the Policy Development Process in the RIPE Community.

This review contains

- A table showing the chronological evolution of the RIPE Policy Development Process through successive definitions of this process,
- A section-by-section analysis of the text, and
- A summary of recommendations.

Concurrently with this review, two other related activities have been started. Mirjam Kühne and the RIPE NCC's Policy Officer, Angela Dall'Ara have been working to review the recent experience of [operating the Appeal Procedure](#). Denis Walker has initiated a discussion of the PDP among the RIPE Working Group chairs, in which a number of them have engaged.

## Chronological evolution of process

Early on, development of policy in the RIPE Community was almost uniquely an activity of the RIPE Address Policy Working Group (APWG) or of its predecessor, the LIR Working Group, where the Co-chairs developed a practice for managing policy proposals in this working group.

Documentation of this process was begun by Hans Petter Holen, then Co-Chair of the RIPE Address Policy Working Group, and mentioned in his [email to the RIPE APWG](#) in August 2003.

At RIPE 47 (Amsterdam, Jan 2004), [an initial proposal](#) for a policy development process was made, and it was decided to "Form a task force to write a policy development process proposal." A [plan of work for this task force](#) was presented at RIPE 48 (Amsterdam, May 2004) and Hans Petter Holen issued a [call for volunteers](#) soon afterwards.

The [work of this task force](#) led to presentation of a revised proposal ([slides](#), [video segment](#)) at RIPE 49 (Manchester, Sep 2004), and publication, just before RIPE 51, of a new RIPE Document [ripe-350](#) specifying the agreed process.

Revisions to the process were subsequently published as [ripe-428](#), [ripe-470](#), [ripe-500](#), [ripe-614](#), [ripe-642](#), and [ripe-710](#).

Some provisions of the process were updated more than once; in the following table, the most recent material revision is shown in the column headed “Status”.

| Provision or significant event                                 | Reference & Date                 | Status                           |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Agreed: more formal process needed                             | RIPE 46, 2003-09                 |                                  |
| Initial proposal for process                                   | RIPE 47, 2004-01                 |                                  |
| Task force: decision to set up                                 | RIPE 47                          |                                  |
| Task force: plan of work                                       | RIPE 48, 2004-04                 |                                  |
| Task force: call for volunteers                                | 2004-05-11                       |                                  |
| Revised proposal for process                                   | RIPE 49, 2004-09                 | Proposal                         |
| Draft PDP published for comment ( <a href="#">ripe-list</a> )  | 2004-12-22                       | Draft                            |
| <a href="#">Last call on draft PDP document</a>                | 2005-04-28                       | Closed 2005-05-10                |
| <b><a href="#">Document ripe-350 announced (ripe-list)</a></b> | 2005-09-01                       | Policy in effect                 |
| <a href="#">Document ripe-350 announced (policy-announce)</a>  | 2005-09-01                       | Policy in effect                 |
| Scope to include all common practices                          | <a href="#">ripe-350</a> 2005-09 | Updated <a href="#">ripe-470</a> |
| Principles: openness, transparency, consensus                  | <a href="#">ripe-350</a>         | Current                          |
| Dedicated mailing list for announcements                       | <a href="#">ripe-350</a>         | Updated <a href="#">ripe-428</a> |
| Each successive amendment to be published                      | <a href="#">ripe-350</a>         | Current                          |
| Multi-stage process with timelines                             | <a href="#">ripe-350</a>         | Current                          |
| Standard timelines for respective phases                       | <a href="#">ripe-350</a>         | Updated <a href="#">ripe-710</a> |
| Iteration allowed for certain stages                           | <a href="#">ripe-350</a>         | Current                          |
| Option to withdraw proposal, absent consensus                  | <a href="#">ripe-350</a>         | Current                          |
| Process administered by RIPE NCC                               | <a href="#">ripe-350</a>         | Updated <a href="#">ripe-500</a> |
| Implementation by RIPE NCC or (later) others                   | <a href="#">ripe-350</a>         | Updated <a href="#">ripe-470</a> |
| Details of process: stages and transitions                     | <a href="#">ripe-350</a>         | Updated <a href="#">ripe-470</a> |
| Process flow diagram (Appendix A)                              | <a href="#">ripe-350</a>         | Updated <a href="#">ripe-470</a> |
| Standard template (Appendix B)                                 | <a href="#">ripe-350</a>         | Updated <a href="#">ripe-470</a> |
| Usual submission path  | <a href="#">ripe-350</a>         | Current                          |
| Process managed by relevant Chair                              | <a href="#">ripe-350</a>         | Current                          |
| Chairs of all WGs (WGCC) to call consensus                     | <a href="#">ripe-350</a>         | Removed <a href="#">ripe-614</a> |

|   |                  |                   |
|---|------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Appeals process presented</b>                        | RIPE 55, 2007-10 | Proposal          |
| <a href="#">New edition ripe-428 (policy-announce)</a>  | 2008-02-19       | Announcement      |
| <a href="#">New edition ripe-428 (ripe-list)</a>        | 2008-02-19       | Announcement      |
| Potential for, and handling of, disputes                | ripe-428 2008-02 | Current           |
| Dispute resolution and appeal procedure                 | ripe-428         | Updated ripe-614  |
| Definition: Appealable action                           | ripe-428         | Current           |
| Definition: WG Chairs' Collective (WGCC)                | ripe-428         | Removed ripe-614  |
| Appeal to WGCC of WG Chair decision                     | ripe-428         | Current           |
| WGCC to decide appeal by vote                           | ripe-428         | Updated ripe-614  |
| Appeal: recusal of relevant WG chairs                   | ripe-428         | Updated ripe-614  |
| Final appeal to RIPE Chair of WGCC decision             | ripe-428         | Current           |
| <br>  |                  |                   |
| <b><a href="#">New edition ripe-470 (ripe-list)</a></b> | 2009-05-20       | Announcement      |
| Purpose of document declared                            | ripe-470 2009-05 | Current           |
| List of common practices reorganized                    | ripe-470         | Current           |
| Scope restricted to "Policy"                            | ripe-470         | Current           |
| Principles: requirement to document                     | ripe-470         | Current           |
| Policies to be documented in RIPE Document Store        | ripe-470         | Current           |
| Process not used for implementation procedures          | ripe-470         | Current           |
| Implementation by RIPE NCC, LIR, or End User            | ripe-470         | Current           |
| Implementation procedures must conform to policy        | ripe-470         | Current           |
| RIPE NCC practices and procedures excluded              | ripe-470         | Current           |
| <br>  |                  |                   |
| <b><a href="#">New edition ripe-500 (ripe-list)</a></b> | 2010-09-20       | Announcement      |
| <a href="#">New edition ripe-500 (policy-announce)</a>  | 2010-09-20       | Announcement      |
| Potential for implementation problems recognized        | ripe-500 2010-09 | Current           |
| RIPE NCC EB to notify problems, suggest remedy          | ripe-500         | Current           |
| RIPE NCC impact analysis defined                        | ripe-500         | Current           |
| <br>  |                  |                   |
| <b><a href="#">WGCC consensus on new edition</a></b>    | RIPE 68, 2014-05 | Consensus in WGCC |
| RIPE Chair to be author and owner of document           | ripe-614 2014-07 | Current           |
| Relevant WG Chair(s) to call consensus                  | ripe-614         | Current           |
| Dispute resolution moved inline from appendix           | ripe-614         | Current           |
| Dispute resolution text simplified                      | ripe-614         | Current           |
| WGCC to decide appeal by consensus                      | ripe-614         | Current           |
| Appeal: recusal of interested parties                   | ripe-614         | Current           |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>New edition ripe-642 (ripe-list)</b><br>Editorial changes only   | 2015-03-30<br>ripe-642 2015-03                             | Announcement   |
| <b>Proposal 2018-04 "PDP Clarification"</b><br>Consensus declared for 2018-04 (ripe-list)<br>New edition ripe-710 (policy-announce)<br>WG Chair may extend Review Phase | 2018-04-26<br>2018-09-24<br>2018-09-26<br>ripe-710 2018-09 | Proposal in PDP<br>Consensus in PDP<br>Announcement<br>Current |

## Section-by-section analysis

The order in which the sections are presented here follows the order in which the detail for each topic first appears in the most recent edition of the source document specifying the RIPE Policy Development Process; this order may differ from that used in earlier editions.

The detail describing a single topic may sometimes be spread over a number of sections of the source document. In such a case, where it has seemed opportune, material from the different relevant sections is presented together.

### Introduction

#### Purpose, authorship, and ownership of document

- **ripe-350**: purpose left implicit
- **ripe-470**: purpose declared in introduction
- **ripe-614**: RIPE Chair identified as author and owner

#### Text

- **ripe-470**:

This document describes the RIPE Policy Development Process (RIPE PDP), outlining how policies relating to the operation of the Internet are developed by and for the RIPE community.

- **ripe-614 — ripe-710**:

This document describes the RIPE Policy Development Process (RIPE PDP), outlining how policies relating to the operation of the Internet are developed by and for the RIPE community. The RIPE Chair is the author and owner of this document.

#### Observation and recommendation

It is unclear what is intended or achieved by identifying the RIPE Chair as author and owner of the current definition of the RIPE Policy Development Process.

It is recommended either to clarify or to omit this identification.

One [suggestion for doing this](#) has already been made by the RIPE Working Group chairs, as follows:

The PDP document is owned by the community. Changes to the PDP are discussed on RIPE List. After consensus is reached, changes are made to the PDP and a new RIPE Document is published. The RIPE Chair is the final arbiter of this process.

The author mentions this suggestion here to inform, rather than to shape, the expected forthcoming review of the Policy Development Process in the RIPE Community.

## Scope

- **ripe-350:** include all common practices
- **ripe-470:** list of common practices reorganized
- **ripe-470:** scope restricted to “Policy”
- **ripe-470:** process not used for implementation procedures
- **ripe-470:** RIPE NCC business practices and procedures excluded

The initial scope of the RIPE PDP, specified in **ripe-350** included a wide variety of “common practices”. Exclusions from this scope were introduced in **ripe-470**.

The expression “*implementation procedures*” as used in the list above is intended simply as a more compact equivalent to what appears in the text as “*specific administrative or technical procedures established in order for a policy to be applied*”.

## Text

- **ripe-350:**

Since its creation in 1989, RIPE has from time to time agreed on common practices. These common practices may come in different forms and/or under different names:

- best common practice (or BCP),
- recommendations to the community,
- requests to the RIPE NCC,
- recommendations to the RIPE NCC,
- or just policy.

In this document they are all called ‘Policy’.

- **ripe-470 — ripe-710:**

Since its creation in 1989, RIPE has been a forum for people to decide on common practices. These common practices may come in different forms and/or under different names:

- best common practice (BCP)
- recommendations and guidelines to the community
- recommendations and guidelines to the RIPE NCC
- policy

This document refers solely to “Policy”.

[...]

The policies referred to in this document are those developed through the bottom-up RIPE PDP. This document does not describe the specific administrative or technical procedures established in order for a policy to be applied. Depending on the specifics of a policy, procedures can be set by the Local Internet Registries (LIRs), End Users and the RIPE NCC as required. These procedures must conform to all policies that are in place.

RIPE Policies are also separate from RIPE NCC business practices and procedures. Business practices and procedures that the RIPE NCC follows are defined and governed by the RIPE NCC Executive Board and approved by the RIPE NCC membership.

### *Observation and recommendation*

In no edition of the definition of the RIPE Policy Development Process is this definition itself clearly placed within or outside the scope of the process. In other words, the question of whether the process to be used to amend the Policy Development Process is precisely this process itself, or some other, appears to be an open question.

In fact, of the six revisions made to date to the Policy Development Process, only the latest one (ripe-710) has been prepared using this Process itself.

Views held in the RIPE Community on whether the Process falls within its own scope include both “obviously” and “not at all”.

It is recommended to consider updating the definition of the RIPE Policy Development Process to give clarity on the process to be used for amending the process itself.

### **Principles: openness, transparency, consensus, documentation**

- **ripe-350:** three principles: openness, transparency, consensus
- **ripe-470:** requirement added for documentation in RIPE Document Store

### *Text*

- **ripe-350:**

The process that results in a policy has a few important and fundamental principles:

- a. it is open to all. Everyone interested in the well-being of the Internet may propose a policy, and take part in the discussions.
- b. it is transparent. All discussions and results are documented and freely available to all.
- c. conclusions are reached by consensus.

- **ripe-470 — ripe-710:**

The process that results in the creation of a policy has some important and fundamental principles:

- a. It is open to all and follows an established, bottom-up process of collaboration. Everyone interested in the well-being of the Internet may propose a policy and take part in the discussions that follow on from the proposal.
- b. It is transparent. All discussions and resulting actions are documented and freely available to all.
- c. Conclusions are reached by consensus.

- d. All policies are documented within RIPE Documents and placed in the RIPE Document Store.

### Implementation and potential problems for NCC

- **ripe-470:** Implementation by RIPE NCC, LIR, or End-User
- **ripe-470:** Implementation procedures must conform to policy
- **ripe-500:** Potential for implementation or operational problems recognized; RIPE NCC Executive Board to notify such problems and suggest or recommend remedy.

#### Text

- **ripe-470 — ripe-710:**

*The policies referred to in this document [...].* Depending on the specifics of a policy, procedures can be set by the Local Internet Registries (LIRs), End Users and the RIPE NCC as required. These procedures must conform to all policies that are in place.

- **ripe-500 — ripe-710:**

If a policy proposal would bring implementation and/or operational problems for the RIPE NCC if accepted, the RIPE NCC Executive Board is tasked to notify the RIPE community accordingly as well as to make necessary suggestions and recommendations about possible changes to the proposal.

### The Process

#### Multi-stage iterative process

- **ripe-350:** description of stages of process
- **ripe-470:** rephrased more concisely

#### Text

- **ripe-350 — ripe-428:**

In the process of developing a policy, several distinct phases are identified:

1. Creating a Proposal
2. Discussion Phase
3. Review Phase
4. Concluding Phase

- **ripe-470 — ripe-710:**

The process of developing a policy has four distinct phases:

1. Creating a Proposal
2. Discussion Phase
3. Review Phase
4. Concluding Phase

### Timelines for each stage

- **ripe-350**: default timelines and proposal-specific variation
- **ripe-428**: editorial change
- **ripe-470**: editorial change
- **ripe-614**: editorial change

### Text

Minor intermediate editorial changes are not shown.

- **ripe-350**

Each of these phases are detailed below.

In the descriptions below, timelines are mentioned. They are proposed deadlines for the various proposal phases. stages. Individual proposals may choose to vary these, however the actual timescales must be documented.

- **ripe-614 — ripe-710**

These four phases are detailed below with timelines. They are proposed deadlines for the various stages. These may be varied for individual proposals, but the actual timescales must be documented.

### Justification of changes and objections

- **ripe-470**: changes and objections to be justified

### Text

- **ripe-470 — ripe-710**

In all phases of the RIPE PDP, suggestions for changes to the proposal and objections regarding the proposal must be justified with supporting arguments.

### Process administered by RIPE NCC

#### General description

- **ripe-350**: general description of administrative support role of RIPE NCC
- **ripe-470**: detail added to general description
- **ripe-500**: impact analysis introduced to general description
- **ripe-642**: editorial changes to general description

#### Publication and tracking

- **ripe-350**: publication and tracking activity specified
- **ripe-428**: editorial change to publication and tracking specification
- **ripe-470**: explanations added for tracking status of proposal

### *Successive versions*

- **ripe-470:** include each version of a proposal in archive

### *RIPE NCC impact analysis*

- **ripe-500:** requirement introduced for impact analysis

### *Text (general description of administrative support role)*

The following extracts appear in the source documents under the heading “2. Process”.

- **ripe-350:**

In this process, the RIPE NCC (the RIPE community’s secretariat) gives administrative support, such as:

- administering proposals
- publication on relevant web pages
- tracking deadlines

- **ripe-470:**

In this process, the RIPE NCC (the RIPE community’s secretariat) gives administrative support by:

- publishing proposals and related discussions on relevant webpages
- tracking deadlines
- making announcements to the RIPE community
- providing assistance in drafting policy proposals if requested
- providing relevant facts, statistics and an assessment of the work involved in the implementation of a policy

- **ripe-500:**

In this process, the RIPE NCC (the RIPE community’s secretariat) gives administrative support by:

- publishing proposals and related discussions on relevant webpages
- tracking deadlines
- making announcements to the RIPE community
- providing assistance in drafting policy proposals if requested
- providing relevant facts and statistics
- publishing an impact analysis that points to the possible effects of the proposed policy and the work that would be involved in its implementation.

- **ripe-642 — ripe-710:**

In this process, the RIPE NCC (the RIPE community's secretariat) gives administrative support by:

- Publishing proposals and related discussions on relevant webpages
- Tracking deadlines
- Making announcements to the RIPE community
- Providing assistance in drafting policy proposals if requested
- Providing relevant facts and statistics
- Publishing an impact analysis that points to the possible effects of the proposed policy and the work that would be involved in its implementation.

*Text (details of publication and tracking tasks)*

The following extracts appear in the source documents under the heading “2.1 Creating a Proposal”.

- **ripe-350:**

The RIPE NCC identifies proposals with a number and publishes them in the appropriate section of the relevant working groups web pages.

The page will indicate the version history and status of proposals:

- Open for Discussion;
- Agreed or
- Withdrawn.

The RIPE NCC will also maintain a web page with an overview of all outstanding policy proposals.

- **ripe-428:**

The RIPE NCC identifies each proposal with a number and publishes them on a dedicated webpage. This web page contains the version history and the status of all proposals. A proposal can have the following status:

- Open for Discussion
- Accepted
- Withdrawn

- **ripe-470 — ripe-710:**

The RIPE NCC gives each proposal its own unique identifier and publishes it on a dedicated RIPE webpage. This webpage contains the version history and the status of all proposals. A proposal can have one of the following statuses at any given time:

- **Open for Discussion:** Meaning that the proposal is still being discussed within the RIPE PDP.

- **Accepted:** Meaning that the RIPE community accepted the proposal after all stages of the RIPE PDP were completed.
- **Withdrawn:** Meaning that the proposal is withdrawn either by the proposer or by the WG chairs at one of the decision-making points.

#### *Text (archival of successive versions)*

The following extracts appear in the source documents under the heading “2.2 Discussion Phase”.

- **ripe-470 — ripe-710:**

Each version of the proposal is publicly archived to transparently show the history of changes to the proposal.

#### *Text (RIPE NCC impact analysis)*

- **ripe-500 — ripe-710:**

The RIPE NCC will also conduct and publish an impact analysis about the proposal before it can be moved to the Review Phase. The goal of this analysis is to provide relevant supporting information to facilitate the discussions about the proposal and provide some projections about the possible impact if it were to be accepted. This analysis will contain the following points:

- The RIPE NCC’s understanding of the proposed policy
- Impact on the registry and addressing systems (including Internet resource consumption, aggregation and fragmentation)
- Impact on RIPE NCC operations/services
- Legal impact

#### **Process flow illustrated by diagram**

The evolution of the diagram itself is shown separately in [another section below](#).

- **ripe-350:** text refers to flow diagram in Appendix A

#### *Text*

- **ripe-350 — ripe-710:**

The process flow is illustrated in a diagram, attached as Appendix A.

#### **Potential for, and handling of, disputes**

- **ripe-428:** potential for dispute recognized
- **ripe-428:** approach declared for resolution
- **ripe-470:** editorial changes

### Text

- **ripe-428**

There are a number of points in the PDP at which disputes could arise. The PDP is designed so that compromises can be made and genuine consensus achieved; however, there are times when even the most reasonable and knowledgeable people are unable to agree. To achieve the goals of openness and fairness, such conflicts must be resolved through a process of open review and discussion.

- **ripe-470 — ripe-710**

There are a number of points in the PDP at which disputes could arise. The PDP is designed so that compromises can be made and genuine consensus achieved. However, there are times when even the most reasonable and knowledgeable people are unable to agree on the decisions made at the end of any PDP phase. To achieve the goals of openness, transparency and fairness, such conflicts must be resolved through a process of open review and discussion.

### Creating a proposal; use of standard template

The evolution of the template itself is shown separately in [another section below](#).

- **ripe-350**: text refers to template in Appendix B
- **ripe-350**: purpose of template declared
- **ripe-428**: editorial change in reference to Appendix B

### Text

- **ripe-350**:

Discussions may be started by anyone at any time. Participants are welcome to discuss broad ideas as well as make detailed policy proposals. Proposals are made using a Policy Proposal template [TEMPLATE Appendix B].

The template forms a structure for the proposal. It details the reason for the proposal and any perceived consequences of the proposal.

- **ripe-428 — ripe-710**:

Discussions may be started by anyone at any time. Participants are welcome to discuss broad ideas as well as to make detailed policy proposals. Proposals are made using the Policy Proposal template, attached as Appendix B.

The template forms a structure for the proposal. It details the reason for the proposal and any perceived consequences of the proposal.

## Usual submission path

- **ripe-350:** submission via Chair of relevant WG or via RIPE Chair

### Text

- **ripe-350:**

A proposal is usually submitted via the Chair of the relevant RIPE Working Group or via the RIPE Chair.

- **ripe-428:**

A proposal is usually submitted via the Chair of the relevant RIPE working group. If the proposer<sup>[ii]</sup> is not certain which working group is appropriate for discussion of the proposal, they can send the proposal to the RIPE Chair at [policy-proposal@ripe.net](mailto:policy-proposal@ripe.net).

- **ripe-470 — ripe-710:**

A proposal is discussed publicly in the relevant RIPE Working Group (WG). The proposal is usually submitted via the chair of that WG. If the proposer is not certain which WG is appropriate for discussion of the proposal, they can send the proposal to the RIPE Chair at [policy-proposal@ripe.net](mailto:policy-proposal@ripe.net). In some cases, a proposal may need more than one WG's input. In such cases, before the proposal is published, the relevant WG chairs will discuss the situation and decide the WG most suited to discussion of the proposal. Necessary announcements will be made to the other WG(s) so they can follow the discussions.

## Process managed by relevant Chair

Administrative support by the RIPE NCC is covered earlier, [above](#).

- **ripe-350:** WG Chair to manage process
- **ripe-428:** Proposer to consult with WG Chair on whether to proceed to review
- **ripe-428:** Proposer to decide whether to proceed
- **ripe-428:** Proposer to communicate decision to WG Chair within time limit
- **ripe-428:** WG Chair may withdraw proposal for lack of timely communication
- **ripe-428:** Editorial changes
- **ripe-470:** Decision to proceed to review requires agreement of WG Chair
- **ripe-470:** Editorial changes
- **ripe-614:** WG Chair now responsible for calling concluding consensus
- **ripe-710:** WG Chair may extend Review Phase
- **ripe-710:** Editorial changes

*Text*

- **ripe-350:**

2.2 Discussion Phase.

[...]

The Working Group chair will set a limited time period for the discussion phase, not usually less than four weeks.

2.3 Review Phase

Following the conclusion of the discussion phase, the RIPE Working Group Chair determines whether the working group has reached consensus.

[...]

2.4 Concluding Phase

When the RIPE Working Group Chair determines that the working group has reached a consensus, s/he moves the proposal to a Last Call for Comments.

- **ripe-428:**

2.2 Discussion Phase

[...]

The working group chair will set a limited time period for the discussion phase, which is usually not less than four weeks.

At the end of the Discussion Phase, the proposer, in consultation with the working group chair, should decide if the proposal will move to the next phase (Review Phase). This should be done no more than four weeks after the end of the Discussion Phase. If the proposer does not communicate this decision to the working group chair within four weeks, the working group chair can withdraw the proposal due to a lack of response from the proposer.

[...]

2.3 Review Phase

[...]

At the end of the Review Phase, the working group chair determines whether the working group has reached consensus.

[...]

If the working group chair determines that the working group has reached consensus at the end of the Review Phase, the Chair moves the proposal to a Last Call for Comments.

- **ripe-470 — ripe-500:**

## 2.2 Discussion Phase

[...]

Once a proposal is submitted [...]. The WG chair sets the period for the Discussion Phase and this is at least four weeks.

At the end of the Discussion Phase, the proposer, with the agreement of the WG chair, decides whether the proposal will move to the next phase (Review Phase) or if it should be withdrawn from the RIPE PDP, depending on the feedback received. This should be done no more than four weeks after the end of the Discussion Phase. If the proposer does not communicate this decision to the WG chair within four weeks, the WG chair can withdraw the proposal due to lack of response from the proposer.

[...]

If the suggested comments and changes are not so significant to require a new Discussion Phase, the proposer and WG chair can decide to move the proposal to the next phase (Review Phase) with a new version of the proposal incorporating the necessary edits.

[...]

## 2.3 Review Phase

[...]

At the end of the Review Phase, the WG chair determines whether the WG has reached rough consensus. If the WG chair decides that consensus has not been reached, then the WG chair can withdraw the proposal. Alternatively, the WG chair can send the proposal back to the Discussion Phase if the proposer is willing to continue to author the proposal and make the necessary changes to the proposal according to the feedback received from the community. The WG chair can also decide to have the draft RIPE Document edited and start a new Review Phase with a new version of the proposal.

## 2.4 Concluding Phase

If the WG chair determines that the WG has reached consensus at the end of the Review Phase, the WG chair moves the proposal to a “Last Call for Comments” and the Concluding Phase starts.

- **ripe-614 — ripe-710:**

The Concluding Phase is redefined, giving responsibility for the concluding consensus call to the WG Chair; previously, the WGCC was responsible for this call. This change enables a uniform progression for the Appeals Procedure:

- Decision by WG Chair;
- Appeal of WG Chair’s Decision to Working Group Chairs’ Collective;
- Final appeal of collective decision to RIPE Chair.

Text retained unchanged from the previous version is not repeated here.

## 2.4 Concluding Phase

If the WG chair determines that the WG has reached consensus at the end of the Review Phase, the WG chair moves the proposal to a “Last Call for Comments” and the Concluding Phase starts.

[...]

At the end of the Last Call period, the WG chair will evaluate the feedback received during this period and decide whether consensus has been achieved. If there is no feedback from the community at this stage, this is likely to be regarded as consensus and it will mean the previous call of rough consensus from the WG chair at the end of the Review Phase still holds.

If consensus has been achieved, the RIPE NCC will announce the decision of the WG chair and, if necessary, implement the policy.

If consensus has not been achieved, the WG chair can decide to either withdraw the proposal or send it back to one of the previous phases. The proposer (or anyone else) is free to return the proposal to the WG for further discussion after a withdrawal.

- **ripe-710:**

The Review Phase is redefined to allow this phase to be extended.

Text retained unchanged from the previous version is not repeated here.

## 2.3 Review Phase

[...]

At the end of the Review Phase, the WG chair determines whether the WG has reached rough consensus. If the WG chair decides that consensus has not been reached, then the WG chair can withdraw the proposal. Alternatively, the WG chair can:

- a. Send the proposal back to the Discussion Phase if the proposer is willing to continue to author the proposal and make the necessary changes to the proposal according to the feedback received from the community.
- b. Decide to have the draft RIPE Document edited and start a new Review Phase with a new version of the proposal.
- c. If not enough community input was received, extend the Review Phase for a maximum of four additional weeks.

[...]

## Process detail for discussion phase

- **ripe-350:** New proposal to be announced on dedicated mailing list
- **ripe-350:** Any amendment to be published, with changes highlighted
- **ripe-428:** Requirement to send new proposal to relevant WG mailing list
- **ripe-428:** Multiple iterations of Discussion Phase may occur
- **ripe-428:** Draft RIPE Document to be prepared within four weeks
- **ripe-470:** Requirement to send new proposal to relevant WG list removed
- **ripe-470:** New version of proposal for each iteration of Discussion Phase
- **ripe-470:** Each version of proposal to be archived for transparent history
- **ripe-470:** Requirements clarified for draft RIPE Document

## Text

- **ripe-350:**

### 2.2 Discussion Phase.

Once a proposal has been submitted it will be announced on a dedicated mailing list to which anybody can subscribe: <[policy-announce@ripe.net](mailto:policy-announce@ripe.net)>. This announcement will also indicate where discussion on this proposal will take place. Usually this will be the relevant working group mailing list.

Where discussion leads to an amendment of a proposal, an amended proposal will be published highlighting the changes. If there is significant comment and change suggested there may be multiple iterations of this process. Each published revision of a proposal will contain a history of changes to document this process.

- **ripe-428:**

### 2.2 Discussion Phase

Once a proposal has been submitted, it will be announced on the Policy Announce Mailing List ([policy-announce@ripe.net](mailto:policy-announce@ripe.net)), which anybody can subscribe to. This announcement will also indicate where discussion on this proposal will take place, usually the relevant working group mailing list. The proposal will also be sent to the relevant working group mailing list.

If significant comments or changes are suggested, there may be multiple iterations of this phase. Each published revision of a proposal will contain a history of changes to document this process.

[...]

If the proposer decides to take the proposal to the next phase (Review Phase), the draft RIPE Document should be prepared within four weeks.

- **ripe-470 — ripe-710:**

## 2.2 Discussion Phase

Once a proposal is submitted, it is announced on the Policy Announce Mailing List ([policy-announce@ripe.net](mailto:policy-announce@ripe.net)), which anyone can subscribe to. This announcement also indicates where discussion on the proposal will take place. This is usually sent to the relevant WG mailing list.

[...]

If significant comments or changes are suggested during the Discussion Phase, the proposer will edit the proposal and the new version of the proposal will be published. A new Discussion Phase will then start for the new version of the proposal.

[...]

Each version of the proposal is publicly archived to transparently show the history of changes to the proposal.

If the proposer decides to take the proposal to the next phase, the draft RIPE Document should be prepared within four weeks. A policy proposal can result in the modification of an existing RIPE Document or can result in publication of a completely new RIPE Document. If the proposal is a modification of an existing policy or it is a new policy that needs to be documented in an existing RIPE Document, then a draft RIPE Document clearly pointing to the changes to the existing document will be published. If the proposal requires a completely new RIPE Document to be published, the draft should be produced before the proposal can be moved to the Review Phase.

### Process detail for review phase

- **ripe-350:** Alternatives to review: withdrawal or new round of discussion
- **ripe-350:** Time period for review phase: no more than four weeks
- **ripe-428:** Text added, setting out purpose of Review Phase
- **ripe-428:** Editorial changes
- **ripe-470:** Explanation of purpose extended
- **ripe-500:** Reference to Impact Analysis added to explanation of purpose

### Text

- **ripe-350:**

## 2.3 Review Phase

Following the conclusion of the discussion phase, [...]. If consensus has not been reached, then the proposer may decide to withdraw the proposal. Alternatively, a new round of discussion and documentation may occur.

The review phase will have a limited time period, but not more than four weeks.

- **ripe-428:**

### 2.3 Review Phase

The purpose of this phase is to review the draft RIPE Document compiled at the end of the Discussion Phase. During the Review Phase, discussion of the proposal can continue while also focusing on the draft RIPE Document.

At the end of the Review Phase, [...]. If consensus has not been reached, then the proposer may decide to withdraw the proposal. Alternatively, the proposal may return to the Discussion Phase, which can result in new documentation.

The Review Phase should last for a maximum of four weeks.

- **ripe-470:**

### 2.3 Review Phase

The purpose of the Review phase is to review the full draft RIPE Document compiled at the end of the Discussion Phase so that the final documentation the proposal will lead to and all modifications made to that document are transparent to the community. During the Review Phase, discussion of the proposal can continue and within the context of the proposal, further modifications can still be suggested regarding the draft RIPE Document. The Review Phase should last for a maximum of four weeks.

- **ripe-500 — ripe-710:**

### 2.3 Review Phase

The purpose of the Review phase is to review the full draft RIPE Document compiled at the end of the Discussion Phase so that the final documentation the proposal will lead to and all modifications made to that document are transparent to the community. During the Review Phase, discussion of the proposal can continue, also in the light of the impact analysis that is published at the beginning of this phase, and within the context of the proposal, further modifications can still be suggested regarding the draft RIPE Document. The Review Phase should last for a maximum of four weeks.

## Process detail for concluding phase

- **ripe-350:** Concluding Phase comprises Last Call and decision on consensus
- **ripe-350:** Duration specified for Last Call period
- **ripe-350:** Working group chairs together to make final decision on consensus
- **ripe-350:** RIPE NCC responsible for announcement and implementation
- **ripe-350:** Proposal may be returned to WG for further discussion
- **ripe-428:** Clarified: mailing lists where announcement is to be made
- **ripe-428:** Suggestions for final changes, objections allowed
- **ripe-428:** Editorial changes
- **ripe-470:** Text added to set out purpose of Last Call period

- **ripe-470:** Editorial changes
- **ripe-614:** Chair of relevant WG to make final decision on consensus

#### Text

- **ripe-350:**

##### 2.4 Concluding Phase

When the RIPE Working Group Chair determines that the working group has reached a consensus, s/he moves the proposal to a Last Call for Comments. The Last Call announcement is posted to the working group mailing list, the Last Call announcements mailing list and Chairs of all working groups. At the end of the Last Call period, the working group chairs will decide together whether a consensus has been achieved.

The last call period will last four weeks.

If a consensus has been achieved, the RIPE NCC will announce the decision of the RIPE Working Group Chairs and implement the policy, if needed.

If consensus has not been achieved the proposer (or anyone else) is free to return the proposal to the working group for further discussion.

- **ripe-428:**

##### 2.4 Concluding Phase

If the working group chair determines that the working group has reached consensus at the end of the Review Phase, the Chair moves the proposal to a Last Call for Comments. The Last Call announcement is posted to the working group mailing list and to the Policy Announce Mailing List ([policy-announce@ripe.net](mailto:policy-announce@ripe.net)). Suggestions for any final changes or objections to the proposal can be sent to the working group mailing list during this phase.

The Last Call period lasts four weeks.

At the end of the Last Call period, the RIPE working group chairs will decide as a group whether consensus has been achieved. If there is no feedback from the community at this stage, this will likely be regarded as consensus.

If consensus has been achieved, the RIPE NCC will announce the decision of the RIPE working group chairs and, if necessary, implement the policy.

If consensus has not been achieved, the proposer (or anyone else) is free to return the proposal to the working group for further discussion.

- **ripe-470 — ripe-500:**

#### 2.4 Concluding Phase

If the WG chair determines that the WG has reached consensus at the end of the Review Phase, the WG chair moves the proposal to a “Last Call for Comments” and the Concluding Phase starts. The Last Call period lasts four weeks. The Last Call announcement is also posted to the WG mailing list and to the Policy Announce Mailing List ([policy-announce@ripe.net](mailto:policy-announce@ripe.net)).

The purpose of this Last Call period is to provide the community with a final opportunity to comment on the proposal. This is mainly intended for those who missed the previous two phases and want to oppose the proposal. It gives time to the community after the relevant WG chair declares rough consensus at the end of the Review Phase so that suggestions for any final changes or objections to the proposal can be sent to the WG mailing list. At this stage, objections need to be justified just as in the other phases for them to be taken into account.

At the end of the Last Call period, all RIPE WG chairs as a group will evaluate the feedback received during this period and decide whether consensus has been achieved. If there is no feedback from the community at this stage, this is likely to be regarded as consensus and it will mean the previous call of rough consensus from the relevant WG chair at the end of the Review Phase still holds.

If consensus has been achieved, the RIPE NCC will announce the decision of the RIPE WG chairs and, if necessary, implement the policy.

If consensus has not been achieved, the RIPE WG chairs can decide to either withdraw the proposal or send it back to one of the previous phases. The proposer (or anyone else) is free to return the proposal to the WG for further discussion.

- **ripe-614 — ripe-710:**

#### 2.4 Concluding Phase

If the WG chair determines that the WG has reached consensus at the end of the Review Phase, the WG chair moves the proposal to a “Last Call for Comments” and the Concluding Phase starts. The Last Call period lasts four weeks. The Last Call announcement is also posted to the WG mailing list and to the Policy Announce Mailing List ([policy-announce@ripe.net](mailto:policy-announce@ripe.net)).

The purpose of this Last Call period is to provide the community with a final opportunity to comment on the proposal. This is mainly intended for those who missed the previous two phases and want to oppose the proposal. It gives time to the community after the relevant WG chair declares rough consensus at the end of the Review Phase so that suggestions for any final changes or objections to the proposal can be sent to the WG mailing list. At this stage, objections need to be justified just as in the other phases for them to be taken into account.

At the end of the Last Call period, the WG chair will evaluate the feedback received during this period and decide whether consensus has been achieved. If there is no

feedback from the community at this stage, this is likely to be regarded as consensus and it will mean the previous call of rough consensus from the WG chair at the end of the Review Phase still holds.

If consensus has been achieved, the RIPE NCC will announce the decision of the WG chair and, if necessary, implement the policy.

If consensus has not been achieved, the WG chair can decide to either withdraw the proposal or send it back to one of the previous phases. The proposer (or anyone else) is free to return the proposal to the WG for further discussion after a withdrawal.

## Dispute resolution and appeal procedure

- **ripe-428:** procedure defined in [Appendix C](#)
- **ripe-500:** [Appendix C](#): not materially different from previous editions
- **ripe-614:** [Sections 3 and 4](#): new definition of procedure, simplified, rephrased considerably and moved inline
- **ripe-710:** [Sections 3 and 4](#): latest edition: not materially different from previous edition

The text is too long to cite verbatim. Extracts are cited below for analysis of specific provisions.

### Terminology: Appealable Action

- **ripe-428:** defined in introduction to [Appendix C](#)
- **ripe-614:** rephrased considerably and moved inline

### Text

- **ripe-428** ([Appendix C: Introduction](#)) — **ripe-500:**

In each of the situations described in [Section 3](#) of this appendix, the action being appealed is the decision to declare consensus or lack of consensus. One cannot appeal the merits of the policy proposal itself or its technical, political or legal grounds.

- **ripe-614 — ripe-710:**

#### 3.1 Discussion Phase

During the Discussion Phase, anyone who has a complaint or other concern about the policy proposal or how it is being handled in the WG should first raise the matter with the chair of that WG. If the dispute cannot be resolved with the WG chair, the Appeals Procedure can be invoked.

#### 3.2 Review & Concluding Phases

At these stages of the process – i.e. after the WG chair has declared initial consensus or the proposal is in Last Call – complaints should not be about the policy proposal itself unless there are exceptional extenuating circumstances.

Anyone who believes that the proposal has not been handled correctly or that the WG chair has made an incorrect determination of consensus should first raise the matter with the WG chair. If the dispute cannot be resolved with the WG chair, the Appeals Procedure can be invoked.

## Terminology: WG Chairs' Collective (WGCC)

- **ripe-350:** term not yet defined: phrase “*Chairs of all working groups*” is used
- **ripe-428:** term defined, along with contrasting “*Working Group Chair(s)*”
- **ripe-470:** scope of WGCC definition restricted to this document
- **ripe-614:** WGCC definition removed, but use of term retained

A separate RIPE document entitled [RIPE WG Chair Collective - Definition and Tasks](#) was published in November 2020.

The [RIPE Working Group Chair Job Description and Procedures](#) (Nov 2017) and its [previous version](#) (Dec 2011) refer to the collective role of the RIPE WG chairs in the Policy Development Process, without defining the term.

### Text

- **ripe-428:**

#### 2.1 Working Group Chairs Collective

The term “working group chairs collective” refers to the chairs and co- chairs of all current RIPE working groups, not including the current RIPE Chair .

#### 2.2 Working Group Chair(s)

The term “working group chair(s)” refers to the current chair and co- chairs of a working group.

- **ripe-470 — ripe-500:**

#### 2.1 Working Group Chairs Collective

For the purpose of this document, the term “working group chairs collective” refers to the chairs and co-chairs of all current RIPE Working Groups, not including the current RIPE Chair.

#### 2.2 Working Group Chair(s)

For the purpose of this document, the term “working group chair(s)” refers to the current chair and co-chairs of a working group.

### Observation and recommendation

It is convenient to define the Working Group Chairs' Collective (WGCC) in a dedicated document, as this allows the WGCC to be given other roles in addition to its function as an appeal board in the RIPE Policy Development Process. However, for the purposes of this process, the exclusion of the current RIPE Chair from the WGCC seems strongly desirable whenever the WGCC has to make a decision which may later be appealed to the RIPE Chair.

It is recommended to consider updating the definition of the Policy Development Process so that the current RIPE Chair is again explicitly excluded from the WGCC in such a situation.

## Appeal to WGCC of WG Chair decision

- **ripe-428:** Decision by WG Chair after Discussion or Review Phase appealable to WGCC
- **ripe-614:** Decision by WG Chair after all phases uniformly appealable to WGCC

Initially, according to ripe-428, the WG Chair was made responsible for a decision on consensus only at the end of the Discussion and Review Phases. The WGCC was made responsible for the decision on consensus at the end of the Concluding Phase.

In ripe-614, responsibility for the decision on consensus at the end of the Concluding Phase was transferred to the WG Chair, whose decision could then be appealed to the WGCC.

### Text

- **ripe-428:**

The same initial stage of the appeal procedure is defined for both phases where an appeal to the WGCC is allowed.

#### 3.1 Discussion Phase

[...]

If the dispute cannot be resolved with the working group chair(s), the matter shall be brought to the attention of the working group chairs collective, which will vote for or against upholding the decision made by the working-group chair(s). The relevant working group chairs shall recuse themselves from any related discussion within the working group chairs collective.

#### 3.2 Review Phase

[above text is repeated]

For the **Discussion Phase only**, the decision of the WGCC on appeal was defined as final.

#### 3.1 Discussion Phase

[...]

The decision by the working group chairs collective shall be final in relation to the appeal. However, the matter can always be brought back to the working group for consideration.

- **ripe-614 — ripe-710:**

A uniform, two-stage appeal process replaces the earlier definition.

If a grievance cannot be resolved with the chair of the WG the matter can be brought to the attention of the Working Group Chairs Collective (WGCC). Anyone may submit an appeal. This must be submitted to the relevant WG mailing list(s) and to the Policy Announce Mailing List ([policy-announce@ripe.net](mailto:policy-announce@ripe.net)). The appeal will also be published by the RIPE NCC at appropriate locations on the RIPE web site. Any appeal should include a detailed and specific description of the issues and clearly explain why the

appeal was submitted. An appeal must be submitted no later than four weeks after the appealable action has occurred.

#### Appeal: recusal of relevant WG Chairs

- **ripe-428:** explicit recusal of relevant WG Chairs
- **ripe-614:** implicit recusal of relevant WG Chairs among “interested parties”

#### Text

- **ripe-428:**

*If the dispute cannot be resolved with the working group chair(s), the matter shall be brought to the attention of the working group chairs collective, which will vote for or against upholding the decision made by the working-group chair(s). The relevant working group chairs shall recuse themselves from any related discussion within the working group chairs collective.*

- **ripe-614 — ripe-710:**

*The WGCC will decide by consensus whether to uphold or reject appeals which have been submitted. The decision of the WGCC should be reached no later than four weeks of an appeal being made. Interested parties shall recuse themselves from any discussion or decision within the WGCC relating to the appeal.*

#### Observation and recommendation

Experience with operation of the appeal process, although so far limited to a single case, has made it clear that simply requiring “interested parties” to recuse themselves leaves doubt as to how broad the scope of this requirement is. In particular, doubt has arisen as to whether its scope includes respectively

- the chairs of the relevant RIPE working group, and/or
- anyone who has already participated in discussion on the proposal.

It is recommended to consider updating the definition of the Policy Development Process by inserting a non-exhaustive list of categories of individuals who must be considered to have an obligation to recuse themselves from taking part in the appellate function of the WGCC.

#### Appeal: mode of decision by WGCC

- **ripe-428:** WGCC to decide appeal by vote
- **ripe-614:** WGCC to decide appeal by consensus

#### Text

- **ripe-428:**

*If the dispute cannot be resolved with the working group chair(s), the matter shall be brought to the attention of the working group chairs collective, which will vote for or against upholding the decision made by the working-group chair(s).*

- **ripe-614 — ripe-710:**

The WGCC will decide by consensus whether to uphold or reject appeals which have been submitted. *The decision of the WGCC should be reached no later than four weeks of an appeal being made.*

#### Final appeal to RIPE Chair of WGCC decision

- **ripe-428:** Decision by WGCC after Review or Concluding Phase appealable to RIPE Chair
- **ripe-428:** Decision of RIPE Chair on appeal to be final
- **ripe-614:** Decision by WGCC after any phase appealable to RIPE Chair

Ripe-428 provided for any appeal from a decision of the WGCC to be decided by the RIPE Chair, with no further appeal. Such an appealable decision would be either a decision on initial appeal (as mentioned above) or, prior to ripe-614, determination of consensus at the end of the Concluding Phase.

#### Text

- **ripe-428:**

##### 3.2 Review Phase

[...]

If the dispute cannot be resolved by the decision of the working group chairs collective, the issue should be brought to the RIPE Chair. The decision of the RIPE Chair will be final

##### 3.3 Concluding Phase

If a community member believes that the working group chairs collective has erred in their judgement regarding consensus in the concluding phase last call, she or he should bring the issue first to the attention of the RIPE Chair. The decision of the RIPE Chair will be final.

- **ripe-614:**

In this edition of the PDP, the appeal procedure was made uniform for all phases of the process.

If the dispute cannot be resolved by the decision of the WGCC, the issue should be brought to the RIPE Chair. The decision of the RIPE Chair will be final.

## Appendix A: Process flow diagram

- **ripe-350:** diagram introduced
- **ripe-428:** re-captioned
- **ripe-470:** redrawn for clarity
- **ripe-500:** rescaled

### Content:

The text and graphic content of Appendix A simply illustrates material already reviewed; it is cited by reference above, rather than included in line.

## Appendix B: Standard Template

- **ripe-350:** template introduced
- **ripe-428:** editorial change to heading
- **ripe-470:** options changed for item 8 (Policy term)
- **ripe-470:** editorial change for item 10a

### Text:

- **ripe-350:**

[TEMPLATE Appendix B]

1. Number (assigned by the RIPE NCC)
2. Policy Proposal Name:
3. Author
  - a. name:
  - b. e-mail:
  - c. organisation:
4. Proposal Version:
5. Submission Date:
6. Suggested RIPE WG for discussion and publication:
7. Proposal type:
  - a. new, modify, or delete.
8. Policy term:
  - a. temporary, permanent, or renewable.
9. Summary of proposal
10. Policy text
  - a. Current (if modify):
  - b. New:
11. Rationale:
  - a. Arguments supporting the proposal
  - b. Arguments opposing the proposal

- **ripe-428:**

Except for a new heading, the text of Appendix B from ripe-350 was retained.

Appendix B: Policy Proposal Template

1. Number (assigned by the RIPE NCC) [...]

- **ripe-470 — ripe-710:**

Appendix B: Policy Proposal Template

1. Number (assigned by the RIPE NCC)
2. Policy Proposal Name:
3. Author Details
  - a. name:
  - b. email:
  - c. organisation:
4. Proposal Version (assigned by the RIPE NCC):
5. Submission Date:
6. Suggested RIPE WG for discussion and publication:
7. Proposal Type:
  - a. new, modification or deletion
8. Policy Term:
  - a. Temporary (time period)
  - b. Indefinite
9. Summary of Proposal
10. Policy Text
  - a. Current Policy Text (if modification):
  - b. New Policy Text:
11. Rationale:
  - a. Arguments supporting the proposal
  - b. Arguments opposing the proposal

## Summary of Recommendations

For convenience, the four recommendations, presented already above in the context of the relevant section of text, are summarized here.

1. Consider updating the definition of the Policy Development Process [either to clarify or to omit the identification of the RIPE Chair](#) as author and owner of current definition of the RIPE Policy Development Process.
2. Consider updating the definition of the RIPE Policy Development Process to give clarity on the [process to be used for amending the process itself](#).
3. Consider updating the definition of the Policy Development Process so that the current RIPE Chair is again [explicitly excluded from the WGCC in any situation where the WGCC has to make a decision which may later be appealed to the RIPE Chair](#).
4. Consider updating the definition of the Policy Development Process by inserting a [non-exhaustive list of categories of individuals who must be considered to have an obligation to recuse themselves](#) from taking part in the appellate function of the Working Group Chairs' Collective.