

Policy Proposal 2007-6

IPv4 PI minimum size
change



Policy Proposal 2007-6 History

Introduced on PPML	15 FEB 07
Designated Formal Proposal	16 FEB 07
First PPM Discussion	ARIN XIX
Last Revision	Not Revised

Proposal Text In Meeting Packet
http://www.arin.net/policy/2007_6.html

Policy Proposal 2007-6

Description

- Reduces the minimum assignment for multihomed end-users from /22 to /24.

AC Shepherds

- ⇒ Alec Peterson
- ⇒ Lea Roberts

Policy Proposal 2007-6 Legal Assessment*

Liability Risk: None

* April 2007

Policy Proposal 2007-6

Staff Comments*

- There is very little qualification criteria which could lead to policy abuse by spammers. These entities could create many different accounts over time as their existing space gets blacklisted or becomes otherwise unusable.
- This could significantly increase the number of requests for ARIN services thereby requiring additional Registration Services Department and Financial Services Department staff.
- Policy applies only to end users which could be perceived as unfair to ISPs. This could also lead to potential abuse of the policy if ISPs apply as end users for single /24 IPv4 address block.

* April 2007

Policy Proposal 2007-6

Staff Comments (cont.)

- It is unclear exactly how an organization can qualify for a /24 IPv4 address block under this policy. It appears that NRPM section 4.3.3, Utilization rate, requires 25% immediate, 50% within 1 year, would be the justification criteria. However, NRPM section 4.2.3.6, Reassignments to multihomed downstream customers, indicates that an ISP can reassign a /24 IPv4 address block without regard to planned host counts as long as the customer is multi-homed. The question here is does this policy allow ARIN to qualify a requestor for a /24 based solely on multi-homing or should host counts also be taken into account?

Policy Proposal 2007-6

Staff Comments (cont.)

- The policy does not address requests for more than one /24 IPv4 address block for multiple sites.
- NRPM Section 4.4, Micro-allocation, should remain as is since it is a policy section essential for micro-allocation for critical infrastructure related requests.
- NRPM Change – Modifies section 4.3.2.2

Policy Proposal 2007-6 Implementation Assessment*

- **Resource Impact: Minimum**
- **Implementation: 90 days After BoT Ratification**
- **Implementation Requirements:**
 - ⇒ Registration Software Change
 - ⇒ Guidelines Change
 - ⇒ Staff Training

* April 2007

Policy Proposal 2007-6

PPML Discussion

- 5 for, 2 against

- Comments:

Posts	People
18	11

- ⇒ "...if a user only needs a /24 meaning that's enough for their addressing needs and they can get someone to route it, then why waste 75%?"
- ⇒ "I don't think the reasons for this proposal outweigh potential spam issues or a run on IPv4 space..."
- ⇒ "...discontinuing "class C" assignments was intended to overcome late-90's router memory limitations. Is that still a significant issue?"

Policy Proposal 2007-6

http://www.arin.net/policy/2007_6.html