RIPE Address Policy Working Group

Nov 17, 2010
RIPE 61, Rome

WG Chairs: Gert Döring, & Sander Steffann

please remember: this session is webcast

APWG overall Agenda

- A. administrative matters

- B. current policy topics in all regions, presentation

- C. document cosmetic surgeries project, presentation

- D. "rough edges of the current policies", from NCC RS

- E. "rough edges of the current policies", from other fora

- G. discussion of open policy proposals / not PI related

- H. discussion of open policy proposals / PI related

- I. "rough edges of the current policies", IPv6 PI related

- T. discussion of open policy proposals / IPv4 + Certificates

- Y. Open Policy Hour, Z. AOB

APWG Agenda - Wednesday

- A. administrative matters
  - thanking the scribe
  - approving the minutes from RIPE 60 (Prague)
  - agenda bashing

- B. current policy topics - Emilio Madaio

  - RIPE policy and PDP update

  - Worldwide Look by Topic

- C. document cosmetic surgeries project - Emilio Madaio

  - update on current status

  - how to go forward?

APWG Agenda - Wednesday (2)

- D. rough edges of the current policies, Alex Le Heux
  - feedback from day-to-day NCC registration services work
  - bring up operational issues that the WG might not be aware

- E. more rough edges of the current policies, AP WG chairs
  - utilization threshold in the current IPv6 PA policy docs
  - "end site" definition clarification

- *coffee break*

APWG Agenda - Wednesday (3)

- G. discussion of open policy proposals, not PI related
  - 2010-01 Temporary Internet Number Assignment Policy - Nick Hilliard

- H. discussion of open policy proposals, PI related
  - 2006-05 IPv4 PI Assignment Size - Nick Hilliard
  - 2010-07 Ambiguity cleanup on IPv6 Address Space Policy (for IXPs) - Sergi Polischuk

- I. even more rough edges of the current policies
  - on 2010-07: definition of "openness" in the IPv6 IXP policy
  - generic IPv6 PI discussion - background info, real-world check

- *lunch break, end of wednesday's APWG meeting*

APWG Agenda - Thursday

- welcome back

- T. discussion of open policy proposals
  - 2010-05 Global Policy for the IPv4 Allocation by the IANA post exhaustion (Jason Schiller et al)
  - 2010-02 Allocations from the last /8 (P. Smith, A. Bidron)
  - 2008-08 Initial Certification Policy for PA Space Holders (Nigel Titley, CA TF - version 2 update)

- Y. Open Policy Hour
  - Martin Hannigan / Jason Schiller: on Inter-RIR transfers

- AOB

Agenda Bashing

- do you want to see anything changed?

- is something missing?

Minutes from RIPE 60 (Prague)

- have been circulated on the mailing list

- no comments so far

- more feedback? Any inaccuracies that need correcting?

B. current policy topics

- presentation by Emilio Madaio

C. document cosmetic surgeries project

- presentation by Emilio Madaio

before entering the discussions...

- 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

- please speak your name, so the scribes can properly attribute what you said

- the session is webcast, so people that couldn't come to Rome can still be participate

- remote feedback can be provided by IRC

D. rough edges of the current policies / NCC RS

- presentation by Alex le Heux on transfer policies

- . . . and potentially other stuff that came up

- discussion whether we want/need to do anything about it

E. more rough edges of the current policies

- interpretation of "utilization threshold" in the IPv6 PA policy (Gert Döring)
  - came up on ipv6-ops@lists.cluenet.de mailing list
  - `http://lists.cluenet.de/pipermail/ipv6-ops/2010-August/003834.html`

- what is an "end site" (Sander Steffann)
  - came up in personal discussions with IPv6 users
  - loosely related to 2005-04

utilization threshold

- IPv6 utilization criteria for subsequent allocation to ISPs seems to be somewhat unclear

```
5.2.1. Subsequent allocation criteria

Subsequent allocation will be provided when an organisation (i.e.
ISP/LIR) satisfies the evaluation threshold of past address utilisation
in terms of the number of sites in units of /56 assignments.


5.4.1. Assignment address space size

End Users are assigned an End Site assignment from their LIR or ISP. The
size of the assignment is a local decision for the LIR or ISP to make,
using a minimum value of a /64 (only one subnet is anticipated for the
End Site).
```

- people read: "don't give out /48s because utilization is measured in one-/56-per-site"

utilization threshold (2)

- people read: "don't give out /48s because utilization is measured in one-/56-per-site"

- that's not what it says(!), and not what the NCC RS applies(!)
  - if ISP assigns a /56, RS counts it as "one /56"
  - if ISP assigns a /48, RS counts it as "256 /56s"
  - **no actual problem here**, just confusion

- proposed clarification text by Arno Meulenkamp:

  ```
  Subsequent allocation will be provided when an organisation
  (i.e. ISP/LIR) satisfies the evaluation threshold of past
  address utilisation in terms of assigned address space in
  units of /56 blocks.
  ```

- do we need a *formal* PDP, or just document cleanup?

end site definition

- hand over to Sander Steffann

coffee break!

• please be back at 11:00

RIPE Address Policy Working Group

Nov 17, 2009 / 11:00-12:30
RIPE 61, Rome

WG Chairs: Gert Döring, & Sander Steffann

please remember: this session is webcast

Agenda for APWG Part II

- G. discussion of open policy proposals, not PI related

  – 2010-01 Temporary Internet Number Assignment Policy - Nick Hilliard

- H. discussion of open policy proposals, PI related

  – 2006-05 IPv4 PI Assignment Size - Nick Hilliard

  – 2010-07 Ambiguity cleanup on IPv6 Address Space Policy (for IXPs) - Sergi Polischuk

- I. even more rough edges of the current policies

  – on 2010-07: definition of "openness" in the IPv6 IXP policy

  – generic IPv6 PI discussion - background info, real-world check

- *lunch break, end of wednesday's APWG meeting*

Let's enter the discussions

- 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

- please speak your name, so the scribes can properly attribute what you said

- the session is webcast, so people that couldn't come to Rome can still be participate

- remote feedback can be provided by IRC

open policy proposals

- 2010-01 Temporary Internet Number Assignment Policies
  - Nick Hilliard

- 2006-05 IPv4 PI Assignment Size
  - Nick Hilliard

- 2010-07 Ambiguity cleanup on IPv6 (IXP) Address Space Policy
  - Sergi Polischuk

widening the scope of 2010-07

- what do we want the IPv6 Address Space Policy for exchange points (IXP) to be?

- original authors of the document are not in agreement what the meaning of the word "open" is in ripe-451:

```
2.0 Definition

An Internet Exchange Point is defined as a physical network
infrastructure (layer 2) operated by a single entity whose purpose is to
facilitate the exchange of Internet traffic between ISPs.

There must be a minimum of three ISPs connected and there must be a
clear *and open* policy for others to join.
```

- WG needs to find out what we think the policy should be

- then: either formalize change via PDP, or just clarify document language via "cosmetic surgery" project

returning to IPv6 PI discussion

- IPv4 PI policy and IPv6 PI policy are not fully in-line

  - IPv6 PI policy doesn't permit "transit network" assignment

  - you can run an DSL network on IPv4 PI, but not on IPv6 PI

  - IPv4 PI doesn't require "multihoming", IPv6 PI *does*

- ambiguity on border between "my network" (PI OK) and "customer network" (PI not OK)

  - for hosting / datacenter providers

- do we want this changed? if yes, how?

- background info from Alex Le Heux from the RIPE NCC RS

Thanks!

- thanks for your input

- thanks for your help in forming policies in the RIPE region

- . . . enjoy your lunch!

- . . . and we hope to see you back tomorrow, 09:00 (!!)