

2013-03 status update



RIPE 67
ATHENS / GREECE

Tore Anderson
tore@redpill-linpro.com
Redpill Linpro AS
RIPE67, Greece, October 2013

What's happened since RIPE66?

- Impact Analysis published by the RIPE NCC
- Initial Review Phase completed (after an extension)
- Proposal amended based on constructive feedback from WG
 - Amendments written in collaboration with the RIPE NCC to ensure no confusion or misinterpretation with regards to their meaning/intention
- New Impact Analysis and Review Phase, currently ongoing

Amendment 1: Retain «Fairness» goal

- Initial proposal removed the entire paragraph below from policy, the current version removes only the ~~red/strikethrough~~ text:
 - *Public IPv4 address space must be fairly distributed to the End Users operating networks. ~~To maximise the lifetime of the public IPv4 address space, addresses must be distributed according to need, and stockpiling must be prevented.~~*
- Beneficial for external relations: No ambiguity or confusion regarding the RIPE Community's desire that IPv4 addresses should be put to use in operational networks
- Instructs LIRs to behave fairly, and ensures the door is kept open for a precise definition of «fairness» to be established by the WG in the future

Amendment 2: Allocation criteria

- Require that LIRs that want to obtain an allocation from the NCC (its one-and-only «last /8» /22) must use it for making assignments...
 - ...which in turn must be done ***fairly*** and only to ***End Users operating networks*** (cf. the previous slide)
- Makes it clear that starting a new LIR just in order to to obtain a /22 and immediately sell it on the «IPv4 market» is **not** sanctioned behaviour
- By extension, this also applies to the allocation transfer policy:
 - «*Re-allocated blocks are no different from the allocations made directly by the RIPE NCC and so they must be used by the receiving LIR according to the policies described in this document.*»
- **Beneficial to external relations**: Avoids any confusion or malicious misrepresentation of the NCC's «business model» as «selling IPv4»

Amendment 3: IXP assignment criteria

- Clarifies the criteria for when an IXP qualifies for a larger than minimum sized assignment (i.e., /23 or /22) for use on its peering LAN
 - The definition was accidentally removed in previous versions
- The IXP must demonstrate that the utilisation of the requested assignment must be at least 50% one year from the assignment date
- Upholds the status quo only - no change from current NCC practice

What's next?

- The proposal's supporting notes were written for (and by!) the LIR hostmaster, focusing mostly on the practical removal of «need bureaucracy» in the interaction between the LIRs and their End Users
- They will be rewritten to focus on communicating the intended outcome and the reasoning
 - Aids the RIPE NCC External Relations team in better explaining the change
 - «No Need» nickname will be dropped
 - Malcolm Hutty joins as co-author
- The proposed policy text will remain unchanged
- New Impact Analysis and Review Phase required

Questions?