Draft Policy 2012-2 IPv6 Subsequent Allocations Utilization Requirement

22-25 April 2012 • Vancouver, BC

### 2012-2 - History

- 1. Origin: ARIN-prop-159 (Nov 2011)
- 2. AC Shepherds: Heather Schiller, Cathy Aronson
- 3. AC selected as Draft Policy (Feb 2012)
- 4. Current version: 22 February 2012
- 5. Text and assessment online & in Discussion Guide

https://www.arin.net/policy/proposals/2012\_2.html

# 2012-2 – Summary

- This policy would allow an ISP to qualify for additional IPv6 space when they can show:
  - Utilization of 75% of their total address space,
  - 90% utilization of a single serving site, or

or

 75% of their IPv6 allocation is subnetted, and each subnet has at least 1 customer or infrastructure assignment.



### 2012-2 – Status at other RIRs

No similar proposals/discussions.



# 2012-2 – Staff Assessment

### Staff Comments: Issues/Concerns?

- Effectively allows an operator to qualify for IPv6 addresses at any time, because it's trivial to subnet out 75% of an allocation and use at least a tiny portion of each.
- Another option would be to simplify the IPv6 additional allocation policy to allow an operator to qualify for more IPv6 addresses when they can show a need for them.
- The author's original rationale stated that the expectation would be for ARIN to use its discretion to weed out unreasonable requests, but there is no policy basis for doing so. Nothing in this text gives staff any basis for rejecting any subnet size. If ARIN is to review requests to determine if technically reasonable, than some criteria or guidance must be provided within the policy text.
- Implementation: Resource Impact? Minimal (3 mos.)

- Updated guidelines and staff training

## 2012-2 – Legal Assessment

• This policy does not create significant legal issues.



# 2012-2 – PPML Discussion

### 4 posts by 3 people (1 in favor and 0 against)

- "I'm in favor of a pro-forma approval of an ISP's second IPv6 request so long as it is not outrageously sized (for "outrage" in the bigger than /24 category). Time enough to make tight IPv6 allocation rules when we have the experience which goes with half of the packets on the Internet moving with IPv6."

#### Earlier discussion of proposal: 14 posts by 6 people

- "If there is a reasonable way to get a reasonableness standard incorporated into the policy, I would support that. But I also support the proposal as-is. I think it gives enough guidance to staff to make the right decision..."

XX

Draft Policy 2012-2 IPv6 Subsequent Allocations Utilization Requirement

22-25 April 2012 • Vancouver, BC