2014-04

Relaxing IPv6 Requirement for
Receiving Space from the Final /8

Organisational

- I have a strong opinion on this topic
- I will therefore abstain from any decisions (like determining consensus) related to 2014-04

The reason for this proposal

- We have one problematic sentence in our policy:
  - Allocations will only be made to LIRs if they have already received an IPv6 allocation from an upstream LIR or the RIPE NCC.

- There are organisations that have an IPv6 PI assignment before becoming an LIR

- Getting an IPv6 allocation means giving back the PI assignment and renumbering

Punishing the wrong people

- We're forcing organisations that already deployed IPv6 to renumber

- These are the people that the final /8 policy is supposed to help

Why did we add that requirement anyway?

- From 2010-02 (final /8 policy)
  - The proposal attempts to ensure that no organisation lacks real routable IPv4 address space during the coming transition to IPv6.

- The intent at the time was to make organisations aware that this was a special IPv4 allocation
  - The last IPv4 they will get from the NCC
  - Transition to IPv6 is necessary, focus on that

Possible solution 1

- The authors tried to expand the scope
  - Having IPv6 PI space is allowed as well

- But what about organisations that have IPv6 space from other RIRs?

- And shouldn't we also check if they are really using that IPv6 space?

- Etc…

RIPE

Better solution

- Remove that requirement completely
  - Having IPv6 prefix ≠ IPv6 deployment
  - IPv6 PA is now requested just to comply with policy
  - RIPE policy can't tell anyone how to run their network

  - Requirement doesn't really improve IPv6 deployment
  - But it is causing problems for people who are already deploying IPv6

IPv6 promotion

- If requirement doesn't actually improve IPv6 deployment then it just works as a little bit of IPv6 awareness / promotion

- RIPE NCC already doing great promoting IPv6

- If people think there is something lacking then that should be discussed in NCC Services WG

- But I think it shouldn't be part of Address Policy

Tomatoes?

RIPE