



## ARIN Services Working Group

John Curran, President and CEO

January 2015

## Situation

- *We have had ARIN members and community participants seeking increased input into how ARIN determines its services.*
  - *Modifications to existing services*
  - *Creation of new services*
  - *Prioritization of ARIN services work*
- *Existing input mechanisms to ARIN services include:*
  - *ARIN Consultation and Suggestion Process (ACSP)*
  - *Feedback button on ARIN website*
  - *Open Microphone discussion at Public Policy and Member's Meetings*
  - *Direct in-person discussion with senior ARIN staff and Board*
  - *Email to various ARIN service accounts (or staff members directly)*
  - *Postings to mailing lists (PPML, NANOG, etc.)*
  - *Calls to ARIN helpdesk lines*
  - *Surveys (including post Meeting and Customer Satisfaction surveys)*

## Situation (cont.)

- *Staff works hard to process large amounts of feedback about ARIN services and distill that information into an proposed operating plan each year.*
- *While input is provided, relative prioritization can be quite challenging -*
  - *Fewer than 10 people typically respond to ACSP prioritization surveys (and those that do respond are almost always the same people who submitted suggestions)*
  - *None of the current input/feedback mechanisms (other than ACSP) have a formalized process for gathering input on ARIN services prioritization*
  - *Additional forms of input on prioritization could be added, but is likely to result in less clarity due to high potential for conflicting feedback from each form*

## Options Overview

1. **Status Quo** – Staff and Board continue to process feedback regarding ARIN services, determine the prioritization, and develop annual operating plan.
2. **Increase Visibility and Input into ARIN Services Prioritization** – Create an ARIN Services working group to consider potential ARIN service enhancements and develop community-consensus advice regarding appropriate priority while increasing transparency.



## Options

1. **Status Quo** – Staff and Board continue to process feedback regarding ARIN services, determine the prioritization, and develop annual operating plan.
- Proven model, although doesn't provide community with a clearly understood mechanism for prioritization (despite introduction of ACSP prioritization surveys)
  - Ongoing criticism from community participants when they feel they have little opportunity to influence prioritization decisions.
  - Status quo might be sufficient considering approval of engineering/development "surge" resources, which will help in reducing backlog of feature and enhancement requests

## Options

2. **Increase Visibility and Input into ARIN Services Prioritization** –  
*Create an ARIN Services working group to consider potential ARIN service enhancements and develop community-consensus advice regarding appropriate priority while increasing transparency.*
- *Community would have an straightforward process to provide prioritization advice to the organization*
  - *Would eliminate merit of claims that there is no effective way for the community to influence ARIN services priority*
  - *Staff refer suggestions for new features and major enhancements to ARIN Services WG with an estimated level of effort for prioritization*

## Considerations

- *Would need the community to truly express interest and support for concept; ARIN has previously has to close working groups due to inactivity -*
  - *Database Implementation Working Group - last post in 2004*
  - *IPv6 Working Group - last post in 2005*
- *Would only handle new feature and major enhancement prioritization –*
  - *Significant development could still be in the Operating Plan in front of the services working group output: Board directed development, development to support regulatory, legal, or compliance matters, development to support adopted policies, etc.*
  - *Minor improvements, bug fixes, etc. would continue to be worked by staff prioritization (e.g. items reported via “Feedback” button, etc.)*
- *Has proven to be effective in the RIPE community (see Additional Information at end of presentation for details)*
- *May help significantly in striking balance between different groups in the ARIN community*

**Discussion?**



## Additional Information - RIPE NCC Services WG

- *Origin*
  - *Created as a result of membership survey in 2002*
  - *Replaced older LIR Working Group*
- *Working group discusses (on mailing list and in-person sessions at RIPE meetings)*
  - *Performance of existing RIPE NCC services*
  - *The introduction of new services and tools*
  - *An ongoing evaluation of RIPE NCC activity plan*
- *Items stated as beyond the scope of working group*
  - *RIPE NCC budget and fee discussions*
  - *Membership matters (discussed separately at membership meeting)*
- *Working group structure*
  - *Mailing list and in-person sessions at RIPE meetings*
  - *Elected WG chair with 2-year term (up to 3 at a time as co-chairs and at least one chair steps down each year to allow others to be chair)*  
<https://ripe69.ripe.net/presentations/50-chair-selection.pdf>