

RIPE NCC, ITU and Internet Governance

Paul Rendek

Director of External Relations, RIPE NCC

RIPE NCC South East Europe Regional Meeting



The ITU and WCIT

ITU = International Telecommunication Union
WCIT = World Conference on International
Telecommunications

- What is the role of the ITU in Internet governance?
- What role do governments play more generally?
- How to ensure Internet governance processes are truly “multi-stakeholder”?

Going into WCIT

- RIPE NCC and RIPE community contributed to:
 - 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 at WCIT
 - Plus RIR staff and community members on State delegations

WCIT Goals

- 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

WCIT Outcomes

- WCIT saw some opening up of ITU processes, but still 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
- “ETNO proposal” (re. infrastructure payment models) did not gain much traction

WTPF

WTPF = World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum
14-16 May 2013

- RIRs have contributed to preparation (Informal Experts Group)
- Submission responding to IEG Opinions (input to the WTPF):
 - Accurate reflection of current IP address situation
 - Importance of multi-stakeholder participation
 - Effective capacity building and development strategies

WTPF

WTPF = World Telecommunication/ICT Policy Forum
14-16 May 2013

- RIR input to the WTPF-13:
 - <http://www.nro.net/news/rir-wtpf-13>

CWG-Internet

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 was asked for comment by several Member States

CWG-Internet

- 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.*

CWG-Internet

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>

CWG-Internet

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 a foundational principle of the RIRs

CWG-Internet

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

CWG-Internet

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
- Policy for Inter-RIR Transfers of IPv4 Address Space
- <https://www.ripe.net/ripe/policies/proposals/2012-02>

CWG-Internet

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
- Section 5.6 Use of last /8 for PA Allocations, RIPE IPv4 Address Allocation and Assignment Policy
- <http://www.ripe.net/ripe/docs/ripe-553#----use-of-last-8-for-pa-allocations>

Open questions

- How can the SEE community engage in these discussions?
- How can we promote multi-stakeholder Internet governance?
- What happens after WTPF-13?
- What IS the role of the ITU moving forward?