R45: IPv4 PI Task Force - Results?

- The PI policy is fundamentally broken: RIPE should not assign prefixes that are unusable for routing (/29s and such)!
- If the PI policy is changed ("minimum assignment: /24"), make sure that the "new LIR initial allocation size" and the PA policy are adapted accordingly.
- Provocative statment: do we need routeable PI at all (except for IXPs and the DNS root)? Maybe the whole *concept* of routeable PI is broken? (No consensus to do away with PI, though).
- $\Rightarrow$ how to go ahead now?

after R45: refinement of problem statement

- one major problem seems to be the PA (!) allocation policy:
- new startup LIRs can't get a PA allocation (due to not being able to prove /22 utilization)
- new LIRs *could* use Sub-Allocations, but LIRs want to be independent of any upstream ISP
- $\Rightarrow$ LIRs use PI space for themselves and their customers to get started
- in the end, we have multiple PI networks plus a PA in the routing table
- $\Rightarrow$ no addresses saved, multiple routing entries wasted, plus LIR encouraged to lie to RIPE

PA and PI policy reworking proposal

- Reduce minimum PA allocation from a /20 to a /21
- Remove the requirement to show an immediate need for 25% of the allocated address space (a /23 in this case)
- No longer assign PI (Portable) address space to End Users
- End Users requiring a portable address block could become a LIR and receive a /21 allocation.

PA policy part

- Reduce minimum PA allocation from a /20 to a /21
- Remove the requirement to show an immediate need for 25% of the allocated address space (a /23 in this case)
- Benefits:
  - new LIRs can easily get PA address space, and do not need to use PI as a stopgap measure
  - likely to save on routing table entries
- Drawbacks:
  - potentially wasting address space (for very small LIRs)
  - filters need to be adapted
- majority of comments received: **positive**

PI policy part

- No longer assign PI (Portable) address space to End Users
- End Users requiring a portable address block could become an LIR and receive a /21 allocation.
- Benefits:
  - cost of PI at RIPE NCC is paid by those requesting it?
  - discourage use of PI?
- Drawbacks:
  - customers won't like it
  - overhead and cost for LIR establishment is quite high
- majority of comments received: **sceptical**

comments on PI policy proposal

- PI is here to stay - ISPs are *service* providers, so give customers what they want
- PI setup is a one-time effort, so should be charged a one-time fee plus a small recurring maintenance fee (not a full-sized LIR yearly fee).
- there is a need for PA-like address space (that can be subdivided) for low-money non-commercial organizations. Should be requestable via an established LIR for low cost.
- there's a documentation problem with PI-'partitions' today

what next?

- consensus on PA policy changes?
- no consensus on PI changes ⇒ Back to PI-TF? APWG-List?
- suggestions and new ideas wanted!