



**RIPE  
NCC**

## **Ambiguous ‘Shoulds’ - Language Clarification Policy Proposals**

---

Andrea Cima  
Registration Services Manager  
RIPE NCC

- Jan Žorž shared a story about the use of ambiguous ‘shoulds’ in policies
- The result was a discussion whether this was also a problem for the RIPE community
- “Use RFC 2119 definitions of language in RIPE policy documents”?
- RIPE NCC staff tasked to find all ambiguous ‘shoulds’ in the current policy documents

- Jan Žorž and Marco Schmidt reported on the ambiguous ‘shoulds’ in RIPE policy documents
- RIPE Address Policy Working Group feedback:
  - Need to discuss and fix ambiguities where necessary
  - Through the Policy Development Process (PDP)
  - Handle each policy document separately

“SHOULD: This word, or the adjective "RECOMMENDED", mean that there may exist valid reasons in particular circumstances to ignore a particular item, but the full implications must be understood and carefully weighed before choosing a different course.”

“MUST: This word, or the terms "REQUIRED" or "SHALL", mean that the definition is an absolute requirement of the specification.”

<https://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2119.txt>

Language Clarification in “IPv4 Address Allocation and Assignment Policies for the RIPE NCC Service Region”

## *3.1 Confidentiality*

*Internet Registries (IRs) have a duty of confidentiality to their registrants. Information passed to an IR must be securely stored and **must** not be distributed wider than necessary within the IR. [...]*”

## 5.4 Sub-allocations

*[...] LIRs wishing to convert their allocations to PA status **must** contact the RIPE NCC by email at [lir-help@ripe.net](mailto:lir-help@ripe.net).*

*[...]*

## 7.0 Types of Address Space

*[...] Clear contractual arrangements are mandatory for PA space. End Users requesting PA space **must** be given this or a similar warning: Assignment of this IP space [...]*

## 7.0 Types of Address Space

*LIR-PARTITIONED PA: This allows an LIR to document distribution and delegate management of allocated space within their organisation. Address space with a status of “LIR-PARTITIONED” is not considered used. When the addresses are used, a more specific **inetnum must** be registered.*

*LIR-PARTITIONED PI: This allows an LIR to document distribution and delegate management of allocated space within their organisation. Address space with a status of “LIR-PARTITIONED” is not considered used. When the addresses are used, a more specific **inetnum must** be registered. [...]”*

Language Clarification in “Contractual Requirements for Provider Independent Resource Holders in the RIPE NCC Service Region”

## *2.0 Contractual Responsibilities of End Users and LIRs*

*The preferred model of the RIPE community is for End Users to have a contractual relationship with a sponsoring LIR instead of directly with the RIPE NCC. The details of any such contracts are outside the scope of this document.*

*However, at the minimum, all contracts **must** include: [...]”*



## Language Clarification in “IPv6 Address Space Policy For Internet Exchange Points”

### *2.0 Definition*

*There must be a minimum of three ISPs connected and there must be a clear and open policy for others to join. Addresses needed for other purposes (e.g. additional services provided to the members) **must** be acquired through the appropriate means (e.g. an upstream ISP).*

## Language Clarification in “IPv6 Addresses for Internet Root Servers In The RIPE Region”

### *Abstract*

*It is not associated with the organisation(s) that operate the root server at a particular point in time and these organisations **must** not use the address space to provide any services not related to the root server.*

Language Clarification for “Allocating/Assigning Resources to the RIPE NCC”

## *2.0 RIPE NCC as a Resource Holder*

*The RIPE NCC as a resource holder **must** fulfil the same basic requirements also expected of normal LIRs*

