

RIPE

Interpretation of policy language

Jan Žorž

Completely random member of Internet community, no hats 😊



Sharing the story

- Afrinic meeting in Zambia this year
- Address Policy WG meeting

- The text that provoked this presentation:

“The LIR should also plan to announce the allocation as a single aggregated block in the inter-domain routing system within twelve months.”

RFC2119

- MUST

- This word, or the terms "REQUIRED" or "SHALL", mean that the definition is an absolute requirement of the specification.

- SHOULD

- This word, or the adjective "RECOMMENDED", mean that there may exist valid reasons in particular circumstances to ignore a particular item, but the full implications must be understood and carefully weighed before choosing a different course.



What is the RFCs practice?

- The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119.

There is more

- Other terms/words aren't clearly defined as well
 - End User
 - End Site
 - Etc.

Questions:

- Is this not a problem and we do nothing?
- Should we interpret “should” as a “must”?
- Should we adopt the RFC2119 specification in the policy text?
- Should we include other recurring terms/words?

Questions?

