2008-3
Community Networks IPv6 Assignment

ARIN XXIII   San Antonio, TX
28-Apr-2008

presented by Lea Roberts

A bit of history for 2008-3

- Originally submitted in early 2008
  - Authors' intent was to obtain IPv6 at a reduced rate
  - Justified by non-profit nature of community networks
  - Desired for stable address space for internal structure
    - Perceived abundance of address space in IPv6
- The fee related language was removed
  - Authors told about ARIN Suggestion process (ACSP)
- This is the third ARIN meeting for discussion
  - Support/opposition about evenly split previously
  - First time had large show of hands for continued work
    - That question not asked last time

What are community networks?

- The best known are a co-operative group of users
  - Members set-up connectivity among themselves
    - Usually using wireless links in a metro area
  - Share external connectivity
    - Which may move around dynamically
  - Provide members with low cost internet access
  - Special case: emergency response
- Additional potential beneficiaries of this policy
  - Caribbean Region
    - University linked networks for delivering distant education
  - Rural areas
    - Where little or no alternative network infrastructure exists

Why an IPv6 assignment?

- For a stable internal address structure
  - Members (and their links) come and go
- For experimentation
  - Working with leading edge network software
    - Community network members tend to technically aware
    - Could experiment with IPv6 only translation software
  - Potential to participate in Loc/ID split tests
- For local route exchange
  - Potential for local exchange peering
  - Not necessarily global DFZ
    - But would be happy to have full connectivity

Changes this time

- Clean-up in response to previous staff comments
    - Had been too late for those changes last time
- Added that the criteria can be relaxed (by ARIN)
    - For rural networks
    - For networks in the Caribbean region
- Further update after most recent staff comments
    - All cases of "allocation" changed to "assignment"

No consensus in Advisory Council

- The AC remains almost evenly split on this policy
  - Concern over creating a special class of assignees
    - Community networks should meet the same criteria as others
  - Criteria as written allow entirely too much budget
    - The cost for PI IPv6 is not very significant
  - Concern over routing table growth
  - Belief that the policy would be gamed
    - Pseudo-community networks created to obtain resources
  - Some feel community networks are worthy
- This became clear too late for this meeting
- Close vote on whether to present this version

Possible new direction for 2008-3?

- This proposal has had limited support up to now
  - And some intense and vocal opposition...
- Could pare back 2008-3 to just add the definition
  - i.e. "Community Network" would be defined in NRPM
    - response to ACSP was that a NRPM definition was needed
  - Specifically (from the Draft Policy)
    - Retain new section 2.8 with perhaps % and $$$ changes
    - Add 6.5.9.1 as 2.8.1 (removing "for ..... assignment" phrase)
- No special access to resources
  - Community networks would have to qualify as others
  - Could still be granted some fee relief

Questions??
Comments?
Or even better suggestions!