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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)
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
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
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
Considerations

- Would need the community to truly express interest and support for concept; ARIN has previously had 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?