

RIPE



Policy proposal 2015-05 : "Revision of last /8 allocation criteria"

Radu-Adrian FEURDEAN
raduadrianfeurdean@coriolis.fr

Elvis Daniel VELEA (proposer - not present)
elvis@v4escrow.net



2015-05 : Context and Origins (1)

- “Last /8” allocation policy (ex. 2010-02) accepted in January 2011
- Application started in September 2012
- Everything was supposed to be OK



2015-05 : Context and Origins (1)

- “Last /8” allocation policy (ex. 2010-02) accepted in January 2011
- Application started in September 2012
- Everything was supposed to be OK

Except:

- allocation size decreased from min. /21 to exactly one /22
- no more PI assignments (then 2012-04 withdrawn)



2015-05 : Context and Origins (1)

- “Last /8” allocation policy (ex. 2010-02) accepted in January 2011
- Application started in September 2012
- Everything was supposed to be OK

Except :

- allocation size decreased from min. /21 to exactly one /22
- no more PI assignments (then 2012-04 withdrawn)

Then, as the time passed :

- 2013-03 (“no-need” - 02/2014), 2014-04 (no more minimum size - 08/2014).
- Transfers greatly facilitated (including 2014-03 - PI transfer)
- Scavengers started to appear/to be visible
- May.2014 : pool enlarged with recovered and re-allocated space from IANA (then 09/2014, then 03/2015 and 09/2015).
- Complications (multiple LIRs/company, M&A, ...)



2015-05 : Context and Origins (2)

Status in 2015 (3rd year into “last /8”):

- more than the equivalent of a /8 in the pool (situation lasted about 3 months for “available addresses”)
 - second biggest free pool (after AfriNIC)
 - most restrictive policy **for a given LIR** (not organisation)
 - still, the only RIR not applying needs check/requirement
 - transfers of “last /8” space - 398 to date (2015-01 may calm this down - at least for now)
 - multiple LIRs per company - used by some, abused by others, widely **NOT understood** or known by most.
 - IPv6 is still far from being usable for everybody (and no requirement to implement anywhere)
 - 1024 addresses is far from enough, CGN **DOES NOT** work well.
 - Big customers and those previously requesting PI are now pushed to become LIR (with zero knowledge about how things work)
- > **Desperate need for more than 1024 addresses**



2015-05 : Proposal

Basics :

- issue extra space periodically (v1 = every 18 months)
- add extra conditions for further allocations (v1 = no outbound transfers)

Feedback :

- lots of “last /8 is good the way it is”, “we want the pool to last as long as possible at all cost”
- a few “ok with this text”
- some more “ok, but with further conditions”
 - Working IPv6 implementation - good idea, how do we check it ?
 - Limit all the “further allocations” to a total of /X (proposed /12)
 - Only available for LIRs having max /X (/20 evoked). Some other are explicitly against such a limit.
 - “needs documentation” mentioned
 - mentions of some other things that would require a whole extra policy

2015-05 : Follow-up (??? or not ???)

Main question:

Is the current allocation policy still the thing it was intended to be 3-4 years ago ?

Other questions:

- Is the whole abuse and working around the policy worth inflicting long-time pain to new players ?
- Can't we get something better/less subject to abuse for the next years
- If 2015-05 is to continue (quite big IF), which of the following would make it more acceptable:
 - Working IPv6 implementation ?
 - Limit the total of "further allocations" (to something between a /10 and a /12 ? only to recovered space ?)
 - Only available for LIRs having max /X (/20 evoked).
 - Longer delay for further allocation - 24 months ?
 - Any other idea ?



Questions?

