

Aligning IPv4 LIR Needs Assessment with Current IPv4 Delegation Policy

Updating the Usage-Plan Requirement to Reflect the IPv4 Delegation being Assessed

Saima Nisar

Problem statement

- Section 6.2.1 still uses a fixed /23 usage-plan reference.
- Under the current framework, the IPv4 delegation being assessed may be smaller, such as /24.
- The written requirement may therefore appear larger than the delegation being assessed.
- This creates avoidable uncertainty for applicants, APNIC, NIRs, and the community.

The problem is the size reference in the usage-plan requirement, not the need for assessment itself.

Current policy context

Section 6.1

- Current minimum IPv4 delegation: /24
- Maximum total from remaining IPv4 pool: /23

Section 6.2.1

- LIR must demonstrate a detailed plan for use of at least a /23 within one year

Result: a smaller request may appear to be assessed against a larger fixed usage plan.

Why this matters?

Policy clarity

- Applicants should understand what size they must justify.
- NIRs and APNIC should apply a clear written rule.
- Policy should not rely only on informal interpretation.

Fairness and conservation

- Smaller applicants should not appear to justify more than the delegation being assessed.
- Needs assessment and IPv4 conservation remain intact.
- Weak or unsupported requests can still be rejected.

Objective

- Replace the fixed /23 usage-plan reference with wording tied to the IPv4 delegation being assessed.
- Keep the one-year usage-plan requirement.
- Keep needs-based assessment and IPv4 conservation principles unchanged.
- Avoid reopening broader IPv4 delegation, transfer, or waiting-list policy issues.

Proposed policy change

Changes

- The usage-plan size reference changes from fixed /23 to the delegation being assessed.
- Section 6.2.1 becomes more flexible if delegation limits change in future.
- Applicants justify the size under assessment.

Does not change

- No change to /24 minimum or /23 maximum.
- No change to needs-based assessment.
- No change to transfers, waiting list, routing, RPKI, WHOIS, RDAP, or DNS.

Situation in other RIRs

RIPE NCC

- Verified: eligible LIRs may receive exactly one /24 from the waiting list. The issue size is explicit and fixed.

ARIN

- Verified: an initial /24 may qualify automatically; larger requests up to /22 require a utilization plan for the request size specified.

APNIC-specific issue

- This proposal does not claim the same wording mismatch exists in other RIRs. The issue is internal alignment within APNIC-127.

Expected Advantages

- Clearer policy text for new LIR applicants and reviewers
- More proportionate needs assessment for smaller delegations.
- Better alignment with the current remaining IPv4 pool framework.
- Preserves IPv4 conservation and does not create new entitlement.
- Low operational impact: primarily policy text, guidance, and forms.

Expected Disadvantages

- None Identified.

References

- APNIC Internet Number Resource Policies, APNIC-127, Sections 6.1 and 6.2.1.
<https://www.apnic.net/community/policy/resources>
- RIPE NCC IPv4 Waiting List.
<https://www.ripe.net/manage-ips-and-asns/ipv4/ipv4-waiting-list/>
- ARIN Number Resource Policy Manual, Section 4.2.2.
<https://www.arin.net/participate/policy/nrpm/>

Questions?

Thank you