Overview of Policy Proposals

Policy SIG

Thursday 4 March 2010

Proposals under Discussion

- Prop-077: Proposal to supplement transfer policy of historical IPv4 addresses

- Prop-078: IPv6 deployment criteria for IPv4 final /8 delegations

- Prop-079: Abuse contact information

- Prop-080: Removal of IPv4 prefix exchange policy

- Prop-081: Eligibility for assignments from the final /8

- Prop-082: Removing aggregation criteria for IPv6 initial allocations

- Prop-083: Alternative criteria for subsequent IPv6 allocations

Prop-077: Proposal to supplement transfer policy of historical IPv4 addresses

Problems this proposal aims to address:

- Historical IPv4 transfer policy was designed to encourage address holders with no relationship with APNIC to bring their historical resources into the current policy framework.

- But new policy for transfer of current space (was Prop-050) and allocations direct from APNIC require justification.

Prop-077: Proposal to supplement transfer policy of historical IPv4 addresses

Proposed solution:

- Recipients of historical IPv4 address transfers must justify the need for those resources according to:

    – Prop-050 justification criteria OR

    – existing IPv4 allocation criteria (if transfer policy for current IPv4 addresses not adopted)

Prop-077: Proposal to supplement transfer policy of historical IPv4 addresses

- Returned to authors for further consideration
  - Authors deferring further action on this proposal pending experience with new policy for transfers between APNIC account holders (was Prop-050).

Prop-078: IPv6 deployment criteria for IPv4 final /8 delegations

Problem this proposal aims to address:

- Allocations from the "final /8" may be used to without restriction other than justification, and recipients are not required to prepare for transition to IPv6

Prop-078: IPv6 deployment criteria for IPv4 final /8 delegations

Proposed solution:

- To get space from the final /8:

- The account holder must demonstrate either:

  – an IPv6 transition plan, OR

  – IPv6 deployment needs, especially the needs for IPv6 to IPv4 internetworking.

- The account holder must have either:

  – existing IPv6 addresses, OR

  – a valid application for IPv6 addresses.

Prop-079: Abuse contact information

Problem this proposal aims to address:

- There is no formal, consistent way to provide details in the APNIC whois Database of where to send abuse reports.

Prop-079: Abuse contact information

Proposed solution:

- Make it mandatory to include a reference to an IRT object in inetnum, inet6num and aut-num objects.

- Have a mandatory abuse-mailbox field in the IRT object.

- Delete abuse-mailbox fields in all objects without IRT and delete the trouble field everywhere starting 2011.

Prop-080: Removal of IPv4 prefix exchange policy

Problem this proposal aims to address:

- Under the historical prefix exchange policy, networks can exchange three or more noncontiguous prefixes for a single larger prefix without having to justify use of the addresses.

- In the lead-up to IPv4 exhaustion, it will become harder and harder to find large enough unallocated blocks to swap for the noncontiguous blocks.

Prop-080: Removal of IPv4 prefix exchange policy

Proposed solution:

- Remove the historical prefix exchange policy.

Prop-081: Eligibility for assignments from the final /8

Problem this proposal aims to address:

- Under the current final /8 policy, only *allocations* can be made, i.e. space for LIRs to further delegate to customers
- No *assignments* can be made, i.e. space for end sites, IXen, critical infrastructure

Prop-081: Eligibility for assignments from the final /8

Proposed solution:

- Allow each account holder receive one assignment under the final /8 policy.

- If an account holder already has an allocation from the final /8, the account holder is not eligible for an assignment.

Prop-082: Removing aggregation criteria for IPv6 initial allocations

Problem this proposal aims to address:

- The initial IPv6 address allocation criteria requires that LIRs aggregate their block, but the new kickstart policy does not require aggregation, nor does the subsequent allocation criteria.

Prop-082: Removing aggregation criteria for IPv6 initial allocations

Proposed solution:

- Remove the requirement to aggregate initial IPv6 allocations.

Prop-083: Alternative criteria for subsequent IPv6 allocations

Problem this proposal aims to address:

- An APNIC account holder with an existing /32 IPv6 allocation (or larger) is unable to deaggregate that allocation into routes smaller than a /32 due to the community practice of 'filter blocking' or 'bogon lists' associated with RIR blocks which are known to have a minimum allocation size of /32.

- This prevents an LIR wanting to build a network in separate locations and provide IPv6 connectivity to deaggregate their initial /32 allocation for this purpose.

Prop-083: Alternative criteria for subsequent IPv6 allocations

Proposed solution:

- Permit current APNIC account holders with networks in multiple locations but without a connecting infrastructure to obtain IPv6 resources for each location.