

# 2007-14 Resource Review

Owen DeLong

Stephen Sprunk

ARIN XXII

Los Angeles, California, October 2008

# What's with the updates?

- ✦ Attempted to publish revised policy ~30 days before meeting.
- ✦ Feedback from staff and legal received much closer to meeting
- ✦ Worked with staff/legal to revise language
- ✦ Applied the final diff to older version of source
- ✦ Fixed Tuesday and sent out final correct result of same diff applied to correct source.

# Why THIS policy?

- ✦ Clarify ARIN ability to review resources
- ✦ Prevent potential abuse (ARIN or Resource Holder)
- ✦ Set expectations on both sides
- ✦ Prepare for greater scrutiny as IPv4 free pool dwindles
- ✦ Intended to apply to all ARIN managed resources, not just IPv4.

# PPML

- ✦ Almost all PPML and prior meeting feedback has been incorporated in the current revision.
- ✦ Rationale section has been completely rewritten to address a number of perception issues that were raised.
- ✦ This proposal clarifies ARIN's existing authority and places some additional limitations on that authority. It does not create new authority for ARIN to conduct reviews.

# Legal Concerns

- ✦ Authors have incorporated counsel's recommended verbiage into section 8 in a last-minute revision.
- ✦ Change paragraph 7 as follows:
  7. In case of a return under sections 4-6, ARIN shall continue to provide services for the resource(s) while their return or revocation is pending, except any maintenance fees assessed during that period shall be calculated as if the return or revocation was complete.
- ✦ All other issues with legal have been reconciled to the best of authors' understanding.

# Staff Concerns (1 of 2)

- ✦ Section 2c
  - ✦ Intended to be more restrictive on ARIN than current RSA. Suggest RSA be revised accordingly. Should be possible to uniformly apply policy with more restrictive criteria.
- ✦ Section 3
  - ✦ Revised based on recommendations from staff to better express true intent. Also included in last minute revision.

# Staff Concerns (2 of 2)

- ✦ “Single Aggregate Block”
  - ✦ Intended to reflect the goal of returned and retained space being as aggregable as possible.
  - ✦ Ideally one CIDR prefix, but, where that is not possible, a contiguous range of addresses expressible in the smallest practical number of prefixes.
  - ✦ Intent to optimize what is returned for efficient reuse.

# Questions?

- ✦ Respect?
- ✦ Tomatoes?
- ✦ Other comments?