Policy Discussion 2011-5

Proposal Auth: Chris Donley
Shephards: S.Hughes/C.Morrow

2011-5: History of Proposal

Formal introduction on PPML	3 February 2011
Original policy proposal	ARIN-prop-127
Draft Policy -	3 February 2011 (with staff assessment)
Additional staff assessment	14 February 2011

2011-5: Proposal Text

(Updates 4.10 of the NRPM)
"A second contiguous /10 IPv4 block will be reserved to facilitate IPv4 address extension. This block will not be allocated or assigned to any single organization, but is to be shared by Service Providers for internal use for IPv4 address extension deployments until connected networks fully support IPv6. Examples of such needs include: IPv4 addresses between home gateways and NAT444 translators."

<https://www.arin.net/policy/proposals/2011_5.html>

2011-5: Policy Summary

- Create a reserved single /10 for service providers to use internally
- Address space from this block is NOT to be routed globally (ie: across provider boundaries)
- To be used for transitional technologies and/or internal addressing needs at Service Providers, ie: cable-modem management, Carrier Grade NAT deployments.
- Ideally this avoids duplication of effort in Service Provider address space requests
- Provides space for NAT activities that does not overlap with existing private address space (RFC1918)
- IAB/IETF potentially must be consulted upon ratification

2011-5: Status at other RIRs

Not being discussed formally in other regions

2011-5: Staff Assessment

Staff Comments:
- ARIN is to be the registrant of this block.
- It is not clear if nameservices would be required
  - PTR support

Implementation/Resource Impact:
- Minimal expected impact
  - Updated guidelines for Staff
  - Training for Staff

2011-5: PPML Discussion

Long and varied discussion...
- +100 posts, +20 people
- 3 clearly for the proposal, 1 undecided, 96 posts about which slice of 1918 consumers actually use.

Select Quotes:

Draft Policy 2011-5: Shared Transition Space for IPv4 Address Extension]
*   "Should ARIN go counter to the IETF's determination not to create an ISP-local address space?"
*   No one is waiting for this proposal before they go request the space they need. And, the proposal doesn't stop requests for private use.

Comments/Questions?

(on 2011-5 only please)