



RIPE ADDRESS POLICY WORKING GROUP

RIPE 60 - Prague
Wednesday 09:00-10:30

Working group chairs: Gert Döring & Sander Steffann

Please remember: this session is webcasted



OVERALL AGENDA

- A. Administrative matters
- B. Current Policy Topics - Filiz Yilmaz
- C. New Proposals since RIPE 59
- K. Document Cosmetic Surgeries Project - Filiz Yilmaz
- L. “Authorship of RIPE Policy Documents” - Filiz Yilmaz
- M. Report on the ITU plans to become RIR - Axel Pawlik



OVERALL AGENDA

N. Differences between IPv4 PI and IPv6 PI

O. The need for a Registration Policy - Rob Blokzijl

T. Discussion of open policy proposals

Y. Open Policy Hour

Z. A.O.B.



AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, 09:00-10:30

A. Administrative Matters

B. Current Policy Topics - Filiz Yilmaz

- overview of concluded proposals
- overview of withdrawn proposals
- common policy topics in all regions



AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, 09:00-10:30

C. New Proposals since RIPE 59

- 2010-01: Temporary Internet Number Assignment Policy (Nick Hilliard)
- 2010-02: Allocations from the last /8 (Philip Smith & Alain Bidron)
- 2010-03: Global Policy State in RIPE PDP (Dave Wilson)



A: ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- Thanking the scribe
- Agenda Bashing
 - Do you want to see anything changed?
 - Is something missing?



A: ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

- Approving the minutes from RIPE 59 (Lisbon)
 - The minutes have been circulated on the mailing list
 - No comments so far
 - More feedback?
 - Any inaccuracies that need correcting?



B: CURRENT POLICY TOPICS

Presentation by
Filiz Yilmaz



DISCUSSION GUIDELINES

- No decisions are made here(!). This is to get feedback to the proposers and to get a feel for the Working Group's opinions
- Consensus based process based on the open mailing list
- Please remember to speak into the microphone and please speak your name so the scribes can properly attribute what you said
- The session is webcast, so people who couldn't come to Prague can still participate
- Remote feedback can be provided by Jabber



C: NEW PROPOSALS

2010-01: TEMPORARY INTERNET NUMBER
ASSIGNMENT POLICY (NICK HILLIARD)

Presentation by
Nick Hilliard



C: NEW PROPOSALS

2010-02: ALLOCATIONS FROM THE LAST /8 (PHILIP SMITH & ALAIN BIDRON)

Presentation by
Alain Bidron



C: NEW PROPOSALS

2010-03: GLOBAL POLICY STATE IN RIPE PDP (DAVE WILSON)

- This proposal modifies the RIPE Policy Development Process to create a new state that is specific to **global policies**. This state is "**Accepted pending consensus in other RIR communities.**" This allows a global policy to be further discussed in the event that modifications are made in other RIR communities after it was already accepted in RIPE.



COFFEE BREAK

The RIPE Address Policy Working Group
session will continue at 11:00



RIPE ADDRESS POLICY WORKING GROUP

RIPE 60 - Prague
Wednesday | 11:00-12:30

Working group chairs: Gert Döring & Sander Steffann

Please remember: this session is webcasted



AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, 11:00-12:30

- K. Document Cosmetic Surgeries Project - Filiz Yilmaz
- L. "Authorship of RIPE Policy Documents" - Filiz Yilmaz
- M. Report on the ITU plans to become RIR - Presentation has been moved to the Cooperation Working Group
- N. Differences between IPv4 PI and IPv6 PI
- O. The need for a Registration Policy - Rob Blokzijl



K: DOCUMENT COSMETIC SURGERIES PROJECT

Presentation by
Filiz Yilmaz



L: "AUTHORSHIP OF RIPE POLICY DOCUMENTS"

Presentation by
Filiz Yilmaz



N: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN IPV4 PI AND IPV6 PI

- Problem brought up by NCC Registration Services (Alex Le Heux) at RIPE 59 in Lisbon
- What should IPv6 PI be used for?
 - Data center operators and their customers?
 - The "IPv4 loophole"
 - Customer access links are considered infrastructure (and thus, single-address customers with NAT can be numbered from IPv4 PI, but not from IPv6 PI)



N: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN IPV4 PI AND IPV6 PI

Presentation by
Alex Le Heux



N: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN IPV4 PI AND IPV6 PI

- Problem brought up by NCC Registration Services (Alex Le Heux) at RIPE 59 in Lisbon
- What should IPv6 PI be used for?
 - Data center operators and their customers?
 - The "IPv4 loophole"
 - Customer access links are considered infrastructure (and thus, single-address customers with NAT can be numbered from IPv4 PI, but not from IPv6 PI)



O: THE NEED FOR A REGISTRATION POLICY

Presentation by
Rob Blokzijl



LUNCH

The RIPE Address Policy Working Group session will continue tomorrow at 14:00



RIPE ADDRESS POLICY WORKING GROUP

RIPE 60 - Prague
Thursday 14:00-15:30

Working group chairs: Gert Döring & Sander Steffann

Please remember: this session is webcasted



AGENDA

THURSDAY, 14:00-15:30

T. Discussion of open policy proposals

- 2006-05: PI Assignment Size
- 2008-07: Ensuring Efficient Use of Historical IPv4 Resources
- 2008-08: Initial Certification Policy for PA Space Holders
- 2009-01: Global Policy for the allocation of IPv4 blocks to RIRs - Nigel Titley



AGENDA

THURSDAY, 14:00-15:30

Y. Open Policy Hour

- Wording Cleanup regarding 80% rule for PA allocations - Gert Döring
- Impact of the 80% rule - Remco van Mook

Z. A.O.B.



DISCUSSION GUIDELINES

- No decisions are made here(!). This is to get feedback to the proposers and to get a feel for the Working Group's opinions
- Consensus based process based on the open mailing list
- Please remember to speak into the microphone and please speak your name so the scribes can properly attribute what you said
- The session is webcast, so people who couldn't come to Prague can still participate
- Remote feedback can be provided by Jabber



T: PROPOSAL 2006-05

PI ASSIGNMENT SIZE

- This proposal has existed for a long time
- Partly because being put on hold for 2007-01
- No active proposer at this time
- We were about to drop it, but ...
... this issue came up 2 times since RIPE 59
- We want to give the community the possibility to pick this up



T: PROPOSAL 2008-07

ENSURING EFFICIENT USE OF HISTORICAL IPV4 RESOURCES

- History:
 - Version 1: October 2008
 - Version 2: June 2009
“historical address resources” » “all address resources they hold, not just those they have received from the RIPE NCC”
 - Version 3: July 2009
Add the same rule for initial allocations



T: PROPOSAL 2008-08

INITIAL CERTIFICATION POLICY FOR PA SPACE HOLDERS

Presentation by the
Certification Task Force



T: PROPOSAL 2009-01

GLOBAL POLICY FOR THE ALLOCATION OF IPV4 BLOCKS TO RIRS

Presentation by
Nigel Titley



Y: OPEN POLICY HOUR

WORDING CLEANUP REGARDING
80% RULE FOR PA ALLOCATIONS

This was first presented at RIPE 59 in Lisbon

IPv4 Additional Allocations

- Policy text:
 - 5.3 - An LIR may receive an additional allocation when about eighty percent (80%) of ***all the address space*** currently allocated to it...
 - 5.4 - LIRs are still required to demonstrate about 80% usage for ***all their allocations***.



IPv4 Additional Allocations

Current RS interpretation:

All allocations must be around 80% usage

Some leniency applies



Y: OPEN POLICY HOUR

WORDING CLEANUP REGARDING 80% RULE FOR PA ALLOCATIONS

- Problem: ambiguity regarding 80% utilization in RIPE-484/RIPE-492
- Section 5.4 can be interpreted as:
 - "if a LIR holds multiple allocations, every **single** of them needs to be filled by 80% to qualify for a new allocation"
- Section 5.3 can be interpreted as
 - "if a LIR holds multiple allocations, the **grand total** of them needs to be filled by 80% to qualify for a new allocation"



Y: OPEN POLICY HOUR

WORDING CLEANUP REGARDING 80% RULE FOR PA ALLOCATIONS

- Brought question to the mailing list Feb 26, 2010
 - A few voices stated "go for interpretation 2": "80% of the grand total".
 - No voice for "interpretation 1" or "keep the document as it is"
 - Nick Hilliard brought up question about usefulness of "80% rule" in general
 - Gert Döring pointed out that he wrote what is now section 5.4, and the intention was to **emphasize** the 80% rule in 5.3, not to create ambiguity.



Y: OPEN POLICY HOUR

WORDING CLEANUP REGARDING
80% RULE FOR PA ALLOCATIONS

- Propose to change the policy document.
- Aim: remove ambiguity.
- Don't change anything else right now.



Y: OPEN POLICY HOUR

WORDING CLEANUP REGARDING 80% RULE FOR PA ALLOCATIONS

- Old Text (in section 5.4):
 - "The RIPE NCC considers sub-allocated space as 'used' when evaluating requests from the LIR for an additional IPv4 allocation. ***LIRs are still required to demonstrate about 80% usage for all their allocations.***"
- New Text:
 - "The RIPE NCC considers sub-allocated space as 'used' when evaluating requests from the LIR for an additional IPv4 allocation."



Y: OPEN POLICY HOUR

WORDING CLEANUP REGARDING
80% RULE FOR PA ALLOCATIONS

What do you think?



Y: OPEN POLICY HOUR

IMPACT OF THE 80% RULE

Presentation by
Remco van Mook



Z: A.O.B.

Any Other Business?



THANKS!

- Thank you for your input
- Thank you for your help in forming policies in the RIPE region
- We hope to see you back on the mailing list and at RIPE 61