

**ARIN**  
**45**



***VIRTUAL MEETING***

**Draft Policy ARIN-2020-3: IPv6  
Nano-Allocations**

***Shepherds: Andrew Dul, Amy Potter***

# Problem Statement



- 3x small ISP who obtain the smallest IPv6 allocation get a fee increase from \$250 to \$500 per year for trying to deploy IPv6
- The fee issue creates a disincentive for these organizations to deploy IPv6 and is causing them to abandon their request for IPv6 resources
  - Recently 30 organizations have requested IPv6 24 have abandoned the request and 4 are still pending

# Fee Schedule



## Service Categories and Fees

Service Category	Fee	IPv4 Block Size	IPv6 Block Size
3X-Small*	\$250	/24 or smaller	/40 or smaller
2X-Small	\$500	Larger than /24, up to and including /22	Larger than /40, up to and including /36

This issue was noted to the AC in a recent staff policy experience report

# Draft Policy Text (1)



Replace the current 6.5.2(b) with the following:

b. In no case shall an LIR receive smaller than a /32 unless they specifically request a /36 or /40.

In order to be eligible for a /40, an ISP must meet the following requirements:

- \* Hold IPv4 direct allocations totaling a /24 or less (to include zero)
- \* Hold IPv4 reassignments/reallocations totaling a /22 or less (to include zero)

In no case shall an ISP receive more than a /16 initial allocation.

# Draft Policy Text (2)



Add 6.5.2(g) as follows:

g. An LIR that requests a smaller /36 or /40 allocation is entitled to expand the allocation to any nibble aligned size up to /32 at any time without renumbering or additional justification. /40 allocations shall be automatically upgraded to /36 if at any time said LIR's IPv4 direct allocations exceed a /24. Expansions up to and including a /32 are not considered subsequent allocations, however any expansions beyond /32 are considered subsequent allocations and must conform to section 6.5.3. Downgrades of any IPv6 allocation to less than a /36 are not permitted regardless of the ISP's current or former IPv4 number resource holdings.

# Staff and Legal Review



Two suggestions:

1. Change problem statement to more accurately describe current fee practices

From

“ARIN’s fee structure provides a graduated system wherein organizations pay based on the amount of number resources they consume.”

To

“ARIN’s ISP registration services fee structure has graduated fee categories based upon the total amount of number resources held within the ARIN registry.”

2. Section references should be 6.5.2.1 instead of 6.5.2

# Questions



- Do you support continuing to work on this draft policy?
- Any issues with incorporating ARIN staff's text suggestions?
- Are there any issues you think should be addressed in the text?

# Discussion