



ONTARIO
TORONTO
18-21.APR.2010

Rework of IPv6 assignment criteria

Draft Policy 2010-8

2010-8 - History

Origin (Proposal 107)	14 January 2010
Draft Policy	23 February 2010
Revised/Current Version	5 April 2010

AC Shepherds:

David Farmer

Scott Leibrand

2010-8 – Summary

(Rework of IPv6 assignment criteria)

- End-users (including private networks) may request a /48 for each site in their network.
- Criteria:
 - Be multi-homed, or
 - Have existing IPv4 assignment, or
 - Provide technical justification and a 1, 2, and 5 year plan

2010-8 – Status at other RIRs

(Rework of IPv6 assignment criteria)

- **Draft policy is unique to ARIN**
- **Current policy (for a /48):**
 1. **AfriNIC**

Qualify per IPv4 policy [sic], have a plan
 2. **APNIC**

Automatic if multihomed with IPv4 space. Else, plan to multihome
 3. **LACNIC**

Automatic if organization has IPv4 space. Else, have a plan and route the aggregate
 4. **RIPE NCC**

Multihome and sign the contract

2010-8 – Staff Assessment

Legal: Liability Risk?	No
Staff Comments: Issues/Concerns? <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The policy adds very specific criteria for assigning a site more than a /48. This makes it easier to understand and provides the necessary details that have been missing from the current policy (Staff understands that this policy allows an organization to define what a site is).2. 6.5.8.2 relaxes the current qualification criteria for a /48 per site and opens up the policy to pretty much everyone. This should significantly increase the number of assignments ARIN makes each year.	Yes
Implementation: Resource Impact?	Minimal

Assessment available:

- Discussion Guide
- <http://lists.arin.net/pipermail/arin-ppml/2010-February/016712.html>

2010-8 – PPML Discussion

- **Earlier proposal discussion**
- **24 posts by 7 People**
- **2 in favor, 1 against**
- “I just want enough address space to number all my facilities in their own /48 without having to do the ARIN dance every time I add a new one.”
- “[2010-7] is superior to and incompatible with [this] proposal. I strongly prefer [2010-7].”
- “I'm concerned about assignments to non-connected networks where qualification is based on the promise that they won't ever connect to the Internet and therefore won't introduce a route into the IPv6 backbone.”



ONTARIO
TORONTO
18-21.APR.2010

Rework of IPv6 assignment criteria

Draft Policy 2010-8