Fees and Services

John Curran

President and CEO

ARIN Fee Schedule Changes

Situation

- Fee Structure Review Panel completed and discharged
  - **Final Fee Structure Review Report released September 2014**
    https://www.arin.net/participate/acsp/community_consult/fee-structure-review.pdf
    (contains seven alternative directions for ARIN's long-term fee structure)
- **Face-to-face discussion of Fee Structure review report held during October 2014 Members Meeting in Baltimore**
- Online Community consultation held
  - **Opened 10 October 2014, closed on 9 December 2014.**
  - **51 posts by 18 people [arin-consult 27 posts and arin-discuss 24 post)**
- Two major consensus themes from discussion and consultation
  - **IPv4 Fairness: generally expressed that IPv4 fee categories should be lower for small address holders and larger for larger IPv4 address holders**
  - **IPv6 Support: we should encourage deployment with minimal IPv6 fees and avoid disincentives resulting in smaller IPv6 allocations or fee increases**
- No consensus supporting more innovative proposals (e.g. No IPv6 fees, flat fee per member or transaction, algorithmic, etc.)

ARIN Fee Schedule Changes

Next Steps

• ARIN Staff to work with ARIN Finance Committee to generate a specific proposal to address consensus points (IPv4 Fairness, IPv6 Support)

Open question - Should we model two different potential fee changes?

1. Default - Leaving ISP and End-User as distinct categories
2. "Fair Plus", i.e. eliminating ISP and End-User distinction
   (More work to do so, but some interest expressed…)

Thoughts?

Services Working Group

Situation

- *We have had ARIN members and community participants seeking increased input into how ARIN determines its services.*

  - **Modifications to existing services**
  - **Creation of new services**
  - **Prioritization of ARIN services work**

- *Existing input mechanisms to ARIN services include:*

  - **ARIN Consultation and Suggestion Process (ACSP)**
  - **Feedback button on ARIN website**
  - **Open Microphone discussion at Public Policy and Member's Meetings**
  - **Direct in-person discussion with senior ARIN staff and Board**
  - **Email to various ARIN service accounts (or staff members directly)**
  - **Postings to mailing lists (PPML, NANOG, etc.)**
  - **Calls to ARIN helpdesk lines**
  - **Surveys (including post Meeting and Customer Satisfaction surveys)**

Services Working Group

Situation (cont.)

- *Staff works hard to process large amounts of feedback about ARIN services and distill that information into an proposed operating plan each year.*

- *While input is provided, relative prioritization can be quite challenging -*
  - ***Fewer than 10 people typically respond to ACSP prioritization surveys (and those that do respond are almost always the same people who submitted suggestions)***
  - ***None of the current input/feedback mechanisms (other than ACSP) have a formalized process for gathering input on ARIN services prioritization***
  - ***Additional forms of input on prioritization could be added, but is likely to result in less clarity due to high potential for conflicting feedback from each form***

Services Working Group

Options Overview

1. ***Status Quo*** *– Staff and Board continue to process feedback regarding ARIN services, determine the prioritization, and develop annual operating plan.*

2. ***Increase Visibility and Input into ARIN Services Prioritization*** *– Create an ARIN Services working group to consider potential ARIN service enhancements and develop community-consensus advice regarding appropriate priority while increasing transparency.*

Services Working Group

Options

1. ***Status Quo*** *– Staff and Board continue to process feedback regarding ARIN services, determine the prioritization, and develop annual operating plan.*

- *Proven model, although doesn't provide community with a clearly understood mechanism for prioritization (despite introduction of ACSP prioritization surveys)*

- *Ongoing criticism from community participants when they feel they have little opportunity to influence prioritization decisions.*

- *Status quo might be sufficient considering approval of engineering/development "surge" resources, which will help in reducing backlog of feature and enhancement requests*

Services Working Group

Options

2. ***Increase Visibility and Input into ARIN Services Prioritization*** *–
    Create an ARIN Services working group to consider potential
    ARIN service enhancements and develop community-
    consensus advice regarding appropriate priority while
    increasing transparency.*

* *Community would have an straightforward process to provide
  prioritization advice to the organization*
* *Would provide very effective way for the community to
  influence ARIN services priority*
* *Would allow for community development of service
  specification documents (e.g. ARIN Reverse DNS service)*
* *Staff refer suggestions for new features and major
  enhancements to ARIN Services WG with an estimated level of
  effort for prioritization*

Services Working Group

Considerations

- *Would need the community to truly express interest and support for concept; ARIN has previously has to close working groups due to inactivity -*
    - *Database Implementation Working Group - last post in 2004*
    - *IPv6 Working Group - last post in 2005*
- *Would only handle new feature and major enhancement prioritization –*
    - *Significant development could still be in the Operating Plan in front of the services working group output: Board directed development, development to support regulatory, legal, or compliance matters, development to support adopted policies, etc.*
    - *Minor improvements, bug fixes, etc. would continue to be worked by staff prioritization (e.g. items reported via "Feedback" button, etc.)*
- *Has proven to be effective in the RIPE community*
- *May help significantly in striking balance between different groups in the ARIN community*
- *Would need to determine structure and operating model*

Discussion?