

Developments in Internet Governance

Paul Rendek

Director of External Relations, RIPE NCC

RIPE NCC Roundtable Meeting

19 March 2013, Brussels

RIPE NCC and RIPE community involved in the process from early on

- Council Working Group on WCIT
- CEPT, Arab Group meetings
- RIPE Cooperation WG, RIPE NCC Roundtable Meetings
- Coordination with NRO and other I* partners

On-site RIPE NCC staff presence

- Plus RIR staff and community members on State

RIPE NCC goals going into WCIT-12

- Push for greater openness, transparency
- Ensure technical input could be made where appropriate
- Address specific concerns regarding proposals on
 - Interconnection models
 - Expansion of ITRs into spam/security issues
 - Management of Internet number resources

RIPE NCC perspective, 2013

- WCIT saw some opening up of ITU processes, but s not truly “multi-stakeholder environment”
- Clear disagreements between ITU Member States (including between many in RIPE NCC service region
- Need for the Internet community to engage public sector stakeholders (in ITU forums, but also elsewhere
- Concern in RIPE community regarding spam and security articles in revised ITRs

RIPE NCC perspective, 2013 (cont'd)

- The issues raised by the ETNO proposal did not amount to much in WCIT discussions
 - ...but issues regarding network infrastructure and payment models have not gone away (OECD, ITU Study Groups, etc.)

CEPT outreach to explain/defend positions

- Is this planned? Can the Internet community help?

CEPT report on WCIT?

Non-signatory Member States

What will be the EU role moving forward?

Will CEPT observers be renewed?

NRO contributing to the Informal Experts Group

- Cathy Handley (ARIN), Paul Wilson (APNIC)

Submissions from the NRO have focused on

- Ensuring accuracy in describing the current Internet, particularly in relation to IP address management
- Expressing the RIR communities' views regarding Internet governance arrangements, and the importance of multi-stakeholder participation
- Identifying effective capacity building and development strategies

Council Working Group on International Internet-Related Public Policy Issues (CWG-Internet)

- "...identify, study and develop matters related to international Internet-related public policy issues."
- Closed to non-Member State participants

Second meeting in January 2013

- Saudi Arabia submission, "Public policy statement on IPv4 transactions"
- RIPE NCC asked for comment by several Member States

Saudi document addressed five issues:

- A. Procedures governing the reclamation of unused legacy IPv4 addresses are developed;
- B. All IPv4 transactions are appropriately registered to ensure stable and accurate routing;
- C. IPv4 transfers are in blocks no smaller than /24 (256 addresses) to ensure no negative impact on Internet routing;
- D. A mechanism is developed for inter-region transfers of IPv4 addresses, and particularly legacy addresses from North America; and
- E. There is a reserve allocated to allow sufficient IPv4 addresses for new entrant ISPs during the undetermined period before IPv4 addresses can be taken out of service.

A. Procedures governing the reclamation of unused legacy IPv4 addresses are developed;

A global RIR policy for returned IPv4 address space in place since 2012.

- IPv4 addresses returned to IANA to date:
 - APNIC: 2.31 million
 - RIPE NCC: 1.31 million
 - ARIN: ~16 million (slightly less than a /8)

- Global Policy for post exhaustion IPv4 allocation mechanisms by the IANA
- <https://www.ripe.net/ripe/docs/ripe-529>

B. All IPv4 transactions are appropriately registered to ensure stable and accurate routing;

Public registration is necessary for LIRs to effectively make use of IPv4 address space acquired via a transfer

- In the RIPE NCC service region, this is the RIPE Database

Providing comprehensive, up-to-date registration is a foundational principle of the RIRs

C. IPv4 transfers are in blocks no smaller than /24 (256 addresses) to ensure no negative impact on Internet routing;

Current RIPE policy: transfer blocks no smaller than the minimum allocation size (/22) at the time of re-allocation

- Boundary evolved naturally in the networking community, may shift over time depending on commercial pressures, changing technology

D. A mechanism is developed for inter-region transfers of IPv4 addresses, and particularly legacy addresses from North America;

Current proposal under discussion in RIPE community to facilitate inter-RIR transfers

- Would interface with policies in ARIN and APNIC to allow transfer of registered blocks across those regions
- Currently open for discussion; RIPE NCC has provided community with Impact Analysis

E. There is a reserve allocated to allow sufficient IPv4 addresses for new entrant ISPs during the undetermined period before IPv4 addresses can be taken out of service.

Final /8 policy

- One /22 IPv4 allocation (1024 addresses) to each RIPE NCC member, regardless of the size of that member
- 16,384 /22 blocks in the final /8
- Ensure that any new networks can effectively connect to the IPv4 Internet

Online Consultation

- Closing 1 August 2013
- Number Resource Organization (NRO) will submit response on Issue 2:

Issue 2: Consultation on international public policy issues concerning IPv4 addresses.

The Council Working Group on International Internet-Related Public Policy Issues invites all stakeholders to provide input on international public policy issues related to **(a) unused legacy IPv4 addresses, and (b) inter-region transfers of IPv4 addresses.**

Positive first step toward multi-stakeholder model

WTSA-13, Dubai

- UAE proposal that the ITU begin the process of becoming a IP address registry [revision to Res. 64]
- Some support for investigating the situation
- Study Groups 2 & 3 will continue to look at these issues

Talk among some Middle East stakeholders of establishing an “Arab RIR”

Both RIPE NCC and AFRINIC have engaged their members in the region on this issue

Discussions in

- MENOG (March 2013)
- Arab Internet Governance Forum Open Consultation
- Further discussion at RIPE 66 (May 2013) and AFRINIC meeting

Identifying concerns or issues to be remedied by
a new RIR

Existing policy framework to establish new RIRs

- ICP-2: Criteria for Establishment of New Regional Internet Registries
- Requires support of the full community, including all other RIR communities
- ICP-2 was followed in the past to establish both LACNIC (2001) and AFRINIC (2005)

RIPE NCC concerns

- Lack of clarity on what issues this would fix
 - Lengthy establishment process will not address a range of issues in the short-term
- Significant resources to establish a new RIR, transfer of administrative control
 - Particularly from RIPE NCC and AFRINIC budgets
- Support for the plan to date has come predominantly from a single stakeholder group: government

What will WTPF produce?

What issues will be important in 2014?

- WTDC 14 and Plenipotentiary 2014

What are the public policy aspects of IP address management?

- How can we best address these aspects?