Draft Policy ARIN-2019-4:
Allow Inter-Regional IPv6 Resource Transfers

Shepherds: David Farmer & Joe Provo

Problem Statement

There is an operational need to allow RIR transfers of IPv6 resources between RIRs with an equivalent transfer policy. ARIN's RPKI Trust Anchor (TA) is measurably less widely deployed than TAs from other RIRs. As a consequence, RPKI ROAs published through ARIN offer less value. Operators seeking to extract the most value from their investment in IPv6 would benefit from the ability to transfer IPv6 resources to RIRs with more widely deployed RPKI Trust Anchors.

Policy Statement

Change the first sentence in section 8.4 from:

"Inter-regional transfers of IPv4 number resources and ASNs may take place only via RIRs who agree to the transfer and share reciprocal, compatible needs-based policies."

To:

"Inter-regional transfers of Internet number resources may take place only via RIRs who agree to the transfer and share reciprocal, compatible needs-based policies."

Some Discussion So Far

- Wouldn't it make more sense to increase the deployment of RPKI in the ARIN region

- I would prefer to allow each IPv6 block assigned to a RIR to remain 100% under the control of that RIR.

- This policy seems nice, it'll remove the weird (and unnecessary I think) distinction between address families.

- I think we should treat v6 the same as v4, resource is resource.

Additional Use-Cases

- The current Problem Statement focuses exclusively on RPKI issues

- Other Use-Cases have been discussed
  - An organizations may wish to consolidate or manage the entirety of their resources, including IPv6, via a single RIR.
  - An organization may wish to move its resources, including IPv6, to more accurately reflect where their resources are now in use.

Issues with the Policy Statement

- The current text modifies Section 8.4 Inter-RIR Transfers to Specified Recipients
  - Effectively adding IPv6 to IPv4 and ASNs
  - As a result IPv6 resources could be transferred to a different organization outside the ARIN region
  - However since 8.3 isn't modified also, the same could not be done within the ARIN region

IPv6 Specified Transfers

- There seems to be significant opposition to IPv6 Specified Transfers
  - both within the ARIN region and Inter-RIR basis
  - Further, there has been limited discussion of any use-cases where IPv6 Specified Transfers are necessary
- Maybe only allow IPv6 transfers to effectively the same organization

IPv6 Transfers to Same Org

- IPv6 transfers are allowed within the ARIN region using section 8.2
  - effectively allowing IPv6 transfers to the same but not to a different organization
- Maybe add Inter-RIR to section 8.2
  - instead of adding IPv6 to section 8.4

Proposed Alternate Policy Text

Add "Relocations" to the title of section 8.2;

8.2 Mergers, Acquisitions, Reorganizations, and Relocations

Add the following to the end of the text for section 8.2;

"OR

The resources are being transferred to or from the administration of another RIR in the name of the current registrant or an organization under common control with the current registrant."

IPv6 transfers in Other RIRs

- AFRINIC   IPv6 allowed for M&A in region, AFPUB-2018-GEN-003 changes this

- APNIC   IPv6 allowed for M&A in region, Prop-130 changes this

- LACNIC   IPv6 allowed for M&A in region LAC-2019-3 changes this

- RIPE   IPv6 allowed for M&A and to other Orgs, both in region and Inter-RIR

Questions (1 of 2)

- Should the other use-case be added to the problem statement?

- Are there additional use-cases that should be added too?

- Are there use-cases for transfers to different organization?

Questions (2 of 2)

- Should IPv6 transfers be limited to effectively the same organization?
  - Or should they be allowed to Specified Organizations as well?
- Do you support the Proposed Alternate Policy text?
  - Other suggestion?

???

Thank you.

Any Questions?

Discussion