

RIPE



Policy Update

Marco Hogewoning
Paul Rendek



Current Open Policy Proposals

- 2011-02: Removal of multihomed requirement for IPv6 Provider Independent (PI) space
- 2011-04: Extension of the minimum size for IPv6 initial allocation
- 2011-05: Safeguarding future IXPs with IPv4 space
- 2011-06: Abuse Contact Management in RIPE Database

Important Note

- The RIPE NCC is neutral in policy discussions
 - Decision is made by the community, that is you!
 - Policy proposals can be discussed at meetings, but decisions are made on the mailing list
-
- Please also post your contributions to the mailing list



Safeguarding future IXPs with IPv4

- Proposer:
 - Andy Davidson, LONAP Ltd
- Status: discussion phase ended
- Summary: Reserve a portion of the final /8 to be assigned exclusively to Internet Exchanges.
Either to handle growth of existing IXPs or for newly emerging ones

Safeguarding future IXPs with IPv4 (2)

- IXPs are vital for the Internet
- Lot of emerging IXPs are in regions that already have insufficient address space
- RFC1918 space can not be used for this
- /16 reserved for this purpose
- Only for the peering LAN

Safeguarding future IXPs with IPv4 (3)

- Policy proposal was the outcome of a discussion in the EIX working group
- Widespread support already received from the community on the mailing list

Extension of the IPv6 Minimum Allocation

- Proposers:
 - Jan Zorz, Go6 Institute
 - Mark Townsley, Cisco Systems
 - Jordi Palet Martinez, Consulintel
- Status: Discussion phase ended
- Summary: Change the IPv6 minimum allocation size to a /29. Growing existing allocations to a /29 as well

Extension of the IPv6 Minimum Allocation (2)

- Current minimum allocation size is /32
- RIPE NCC allocates bigger blocks but only based on customer numbers and not based on the technology in use
- The way 6RD works is by mapping (part) of the IPv4 address in the IPv6 address
- For smaller providers this can result in only having one /64 per customer



Extension of the IPv6 Minimum Allocation (3)

- With IPv6 customers should not be restricted to a single subnet (/64) but should be able to receive a bigger IPv6 assignment
- The RIPE NCC already reserved a /29 for each /32 allocation made
- Makes deployment of 6RD easier and therefore encourages the transition to IPv6

Extension of the IPv6 Minimum Allocation (4)

- It is a waste of address space
- 6RD allows for the “masking” of a number of bits, there is no absolute need to use all 32 bits
- Being limited to a /64 will encourage people to abandon 6RD as soon as possible and move towards a truly native IPv6 solution that allows for bigger assignments

Removal of Multihomed Requirement

- Proposers:
 - Erik Bais, A2B Internet
 - Jordi Palet, Consulintel
- Status: Concluding phase ended, waiting decision working group chairs
- Summary: Remove the multihoming requirement for the assignment of IPv6 Provider Independent (PI) address space

Removal of PI Multihomed Requirement (2)

- Currently the requirements to get IPv6 PI are:
 - Demonstrate that you will be multihomed
 - Meet the contractual requirements for provider independent resources
- For IPv4 PI there is no requirement to be multihomed

Removal of PI Multihomed Requirement (3)

- There are a lot of business that have a need for IPv6 provider independent space but who do not want to become an LIR
- These business should not be forced in running their own AS and infrastructure just to become multihomed and get PI addresses
- Removing obstacles like this makes the deployment of IPv6 go faster

Removal of PI Multihomed Requirement (4)

- Growth of the routing table is a big concern, requirement to be multihomed is there to slow down the number of PI assignments. Without it things will get out of hand
- The Internet should be able to handle the additional prefixes
- If they all become LIR the problem stays

Introduction of Abuse-c

- Proposers:
 - Tobias Oetker, Abusix (outcome of task force)
- Status: New, open for discussion
- Summary: Introduce mandatory abuse-c to inetnum, inet6num and aut-num to reference a person or role handling abuse complaints.
Suggestion is to enforce by deregistration of resources which are not made compliant

Questions and Discussion

