



Member Update

April 2006

www.ripe.net

Information bulletin for the members of the RIPE NCC

The RIPE NCC Member Update is intended for LIR contacts.

If you are not the right person to receive this update, please forward it to the appropriate colleague.

How to contact the RIPE NCC

Postal Address:

RIPE NCC
P.O. Box 10096
1001 EB Amsterdam
The Netherlands

Phone: +31 20 535 4444
Fax: +31 20 535 4445

General Queries

ncc@ripe.net

Registration Services

hostmaster@ripe.net
lir-help@ripe.net

Training Courses

training@ripe.net

New LIR

new-lir@ripe.net

Billing Department

billing@ripe.net

Whois Database

ripe-dbm@ripe.net

RIPE Meeting

meeting@ripe.net

Feedback

feedback@ripe.net

This publication is available online at:
<http://www.ripe.net/membership/newsletter/>

RIPE NCC to Review Secondary DNS Service to Top-Level Domains (TLDs)

Since its inception in 1992, the RIPE NCC has provided free-of-charge secondary DNS name service to any Top-Level Domain (TLD) that requests it. The membership of the RIPE NCC provides funding for this service because the stability of the DNS is important for everyone using the Internet.

In recent years, the environment in which this service is provided has changed. Some TLDs have become quite large and many TLD operators have become stable and well-funded organisations in their own right. The operational requirements for secondary name servers have become more complex and costly, especially when considering increased load and recent Denial of Service (DoS) attacks on such servers. At the same time, commercial offerings of DNS server operations have become available.

In the light of these changes, it is no longer appropriate to provide a free of charge secondary DNS service for all TLDs. The RIPE NCC membership is in favour of a careful and selective phasing-out of this service. There are two reasons for this: firstly, the RIPE NCC should not operate in competition to multiple commercial offerings; secondly, the RIPE NCC membership should not pay for services which a TLD operator can easily afford based on the registration fees it receives. However, the RIPE NCC membership has also expressed that the stability of the DNS is of paramount concern and that it is willing

to continue funding this service for smaller TLDs that would have difficulty obtaining, and paying for, commercial DNS services.

In order to implement the wishes of the membership, the RIPE NCC will contact TLD operators and discuss whether it would be appropriate to move their secondary DNS name service from the RIPE NCC to another provider. We ask all administrators of larger TLDs that receive secondary name service from the RIPE NCC to consider whether they can safely move this service to another provider. Rather than establish formal rules we appeal to all concerned to make responsible decisions, as is usual in the RIPE community. We will be happy to provide guidance and advice in each individual case.

The RIPE NCC is not considering providing the secondary DNS name service for a fee since this would be in competition with commercial offerings. We will continue to provide the service free of charge to TLDs that need it. In all cases where a move of secondary DNS name service has been agreed, there will be ample time for TLD operators to make alternative arrangements. The stability of the DNS will be our foremost concern.

If you have any questions about this matter, please do not hesitate to contact Andrei Robachevsky, Chief Technical Officer, RIPE NCC at: ncc@ripe.net. ■

WSIS 2005: RIPE NCC Reaction and Future Plans

Axel Pawlik, Managing Director, RIPE NCC

In the last issue of Member Update (September 2005), we featured an article by my colleague, Raúl Echeberría, Executive Director of LACNIC. He wrote about the report from the Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG), which the UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan, had convened in 2004 as a result of the Geneva phase of the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS). I'd like to give an overview of the outcome of the Tunis phase of the WSIS as well as

its conclusion. Further, I'll look ahead to what we can expect in 2006.

During 2005, no agreement was reached on the sensitive issues around "Internet Governance". All stakeholders came together, once more, before the summit itself, for a preparatory meeting in Tunis. Several long days and nights were spent trying to find a compromise. The expectation from the drafting

>> continued on page 2

Table of Contents

RIPE NCC to Review Secondary DNS Service to TLDs	1	Current RIPE Policy Developments	5
WSIS 2005: RIPE NCC Reaction and Future Plans	1-2	RIPE NCC Regional Meetings	6
Where to now for the Information Society?	2-3	RIPE Meetings	7
RIPE NCC E-Learning Centre	4	RIPE NCC General Meetings	7
RIPE NCC Activity Plan and Budget	4	RIPE NCC Training Courses	8
RIPE NCC Roundtable Meeting February 2006	5	Conference Calendar	8
Policy Development in 2005	5		

groups was very high, and the pressure was on. Rumours that the summit might actually fail were abundant. However, during the last evening of drafting, the text of the *“Tunis Agenda for the Information Society”* and the *“Tunis Commitment”* were agreed upon. Both documents, together with the output of the Geneva phase, are available at: <http://www.itu.int/wsis/>

A point of specific interest for the Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) and their members was reflected in Paragraph 38 of the Tunis Agenda:

“38. We call for the reinforcement of specialised regional Internet resource management institutions to guarantee the national interest and rights of countries in that particular region to manage their own Internet resources, while maintaining global coordination in this area.”

It is very gratifying to read this call for the reinforcement of what must be the RIR system. This reflects the determined efforts made by the RIRs, and all our partners in Internet technical coordination, to communicate the effectiveness of the current RIR system. The outcome of the WSIS could have had a serious impact on the bottom-up, industry self-regulatory processes that have underpinned the Internet since its inception. It was therefore essential that the RIRs and our industry partners actively participated in these discussions and worked together to represent the needs of the RIR members and the Internet community as a whole.

However, the reference to countries managing their “own Internet resources” in Paragraph 38 does give cause for concern. It brings to mind the proposal from the Director of the ITU Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU-T), Houlin Zhao, to set up a parallel registry system to allocate IP addresses on a national basis. As you may remember, the RIPE NCC was active in responding to this proposal, creating a public response to the ITU memorandum. The response detailed the flaws of the proposal and the negative impact it would have on Internet operations.

We asked for our members to make their views about this known, and it was encouraging to see the strong membership support for the RIPE NCC’s position on this matter: the view that the open, bottom-up system works. The support from our members helped our argument against the proposal of a parallel registry system for allocating IP addresses on a national basis. But, as you can see, this misconceived proposal is still in the minds of some people and therefore remains a threat.

It is difficult to imagine how the two sides of Paragraph 38 might be re-united. We, of course, prefer it to be in our favour overall. Other parts of the Tunis Agenda call for “improved coordination”:

“37. We seek to improve the coordination of the activities of international and inter-governmental organisations and other institutions concerned with Internet governance and the exchange of information among themselves. A multi-stakeholder approach should be adopted, as far as possible, at all levels.”

The requirement to adopt a multi-stakeholder approach is extremely important for the inclusion of non-governmental participants. We are glad that this is stated clearly. On the other hand, the meanings and implications of “improving coordination” are open.

You can already see that the topic of Internet governance is not yet closed. And indeed, an important outcome of the WSIS is the establishment of an Internet Governance Forum (IGF), which was recommended in the report of the WGIG last year:

“67. We agree, inter alia, to invite the UN Secretary-General to convene a new forum for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue.”

Preparations for this are underway already, with a first event likely to be hosted in Athens in the third quarter of 2006. As you might imagine, jostling for position has already begun. Because of this, and to continue to influence opinions in favour of the RIPE NCC and its members, I will continue to attend meetings and conferences relating to the WSIS. This began at the end of February 2005 when I went to Geneva to participate in the WSIS follow-up process.

The RIPE NCC needs your continued support in this matter. I urge you to talk to the public affairs officers within your organisation to ensure that they are aware of the situation, and able to influence your respective governments and regulators. Continuing its outreach to this part of the Internet community, and to discuss Internet management issues relevant to governments, regulators and industry partners, the RIPE NCC hosted another Roundtable Meeting in February 2006. More details about this meeting can be found on page 5.

I will, of course, provide more information about the outcome of this third Roundtable Meeting at the next RIPE Meeting, RIPE 52, in Istanbul, 24-28 April 2006. I look forward to seeing you there. ■

The view from the Summit: Where to now for the Information Society?



This is an abridged version of an article written by Samantha Dickinson, APNIC Technical Editor, that originally appeared in APNIC’s newsletter in December 2005.

When Phase II of the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) came to a close on 18 November 2005, much of the world’s media announced that, particularly in the area of Internet governance, WSIS had changed nothing. *“ICANN’s rule unchanged”*, *“USA still in charge of the Internet”*, the headlines read. But the real outcomes are more complex. This article examines what the WSIS recommendations on Internet governance mean for the technical Internet community.

The Internet governance scope widens

In the early days of WSIS, much discussion of Internet governance revolved around domain names, root DNS servers, and IP addresses. But one positive outcome from WSIS Phase II is the official acknowledgement that Internet governance covers more than these few issues. The hope that this will lead to more balanced Internet governance discussions in the future is reflected in paragraph 58 of the Tunis Agenda, which recognises:

“other significant public policy issues such as, inter alia, critical Internet

resources, the security and safety of the Internet, and developmental aspects and issues pertaining to the use of the Internet.”

However, this statement also implies that domain names and IP addressing fall into area of public policy. Earlier in the Tunis Agenda, it states:

“Policy authority for Internet-related public policy issues is the sovereign right of States”.

The document also makes specific statements about public policy development in relation to ccTLDs and gTLDs, but – critically for the addressing community – it is less clear about public policy issues related to IP addresses, calling for:

“the reinforcement of specialised regional Internet resource management institutions to guarantee the national interest and rights of countries in that particular region to manage their own Internet resources, while maintaining global coordination in this area.”

The Number Resource Organization (NRO) interprets this as clear support for the current Regional Internet Registry (RIR) system with its established open processes. But where exactly do governments, post-WSIS, fit within those processes? The Tunis Agenda certainly strengthens governments’ roles in developing future Internet public

policy, and since the Agenda also considers IP addressing to be within the public policy sphere, it appears that some governments will be more actively involved in the RIRs in future. In words of the Agenda, there is a need to develop an “enhanced cooperation model”; however, at this stage it is far from clear just what that model will look like.

Internet Governance Forum

The most detailed Internet governance recommendation outlined in the Tunis Agenda is the formation of a multi-stakeholder Internet Governance Forum (IGF), to be convened by the UN Secretary-General before the middle of 2006. The IGF is to discuss public policy issues related to Internet governance and facilitate discussion of issues that have not yet found a home elsewhere.

While the detail remains to be seen, the IGF could be a productive way for governments, civil society, the private sector, and international organisations to make progress on Internet issues that cut across stakeholder boundaries. The Tunis Agenda is careful to state that existing structures and processes of Internet governance will be used by the IGF, not replaced. Since the WSIS process began, some of the Internet’s established stakeholders have been concerned about dilution of existing bottom-up processes in future Internet governance systems. The Agenda’s assurance that the IGF is a non-threatening forum, in which all can contribute and grow, may encourage existing stakeholders to contribute openly.

A number of speakers in the programme of Parallel Events at WSIS made the observation that, between the two phases of WSIS, a greater dialogue had developed between the many stakeholders in Internet governance. This was demonstrated at WSIS Phase II, where government delegations actively sought out the opinions of non-government participants to gain a broader understanding of issues. For example, the Civil Society’s Internet governance caucus was asked for its opinion by a number of governance delegations during last minute PrepCom-3 discussions. In addition, many speakers at the Parallel Events programme observed that there had been a substantial rise in the breadth and quality of understanding of Internet governance issues by various stakeholder groups. If the IGF is able to take advantage of better-informed and more active stakeholders, the forum may ultimately lead to truly responsive and cooperative Internet governance systems.

However, it is also possible that the IGF will not produce any positive concrete outcomes. The Tunis Agenda makes it clear that the IGF is to be an advisory body only, with no power to enforce any recommendations it makes. Since the roles of the stakeholders in the forum are not clear in the Agenda, it is possible that the forum will have a similar format to the PrepCom, where civil society and the private sector were often relegated to observer status and only official state delegations had real input into the drafting of the outcomes. If this is the case, the IGF may fall victim to wider international politics, preventing anything of real substance coming out of the forum.

Such nation-based politicking was evident at WSIS, where the Internet governance statements in the Tunis Agenda were hailed as a triumph, although no concrete targets for Internet governance were agreed upon. Instead, the difficulty of overcoming political differences between the 174 national delegations at WSIS meant it was an achievement simply to agree to keep discussing Internet governance



WSIS Phase II was held in the Kram Palexpo conference centre in Tunis.



Axel Pawlik, Managing Director, RIPE NCC, at the Internet Pavilion during WSIS.

The Tunis Agenda and technical Internet operations

The Tunis Agenda divides Internet governance into two main areas:

- 1) **public policy**, which is the main focus of the Agenda and the primary responsibility of governments, and
- 2) **day-to-day technical operation of the Internet**, which it leaves largely in the hands of the private and civil sectors.

On first impressions, the Internet’s technical community may see this as a sign that it can continue its operations in the knowledge it will not be hindered by government involvement. The Agenda certainly has been interpreted by many to mean that ICANN has now finally gained international approval for its role in the technical administration of the Internet.

However, on closer examination, it becomes evident that many public policy issues do have an impact on the day-to-day technical running of the Internet. For example, if the IGF were to make recommendations on stopping spam globally, and these recommendations were then passed as resolutions at the UN, this potentially could lead to pressure for changes in protocols such as email. Such protocol changes would need to be developed and standardised through bodies such as the IETF, then deployed throughout the Internet.

While the Internet traditionally has operated from a bottom-up technical development process, the Tunis Agenda could result in future technical development being driven, instead, by top-down public policy. This may have significant implications. A complaint sometimes expressed about technical bodies such as ICANN, the IETF, and the RIRs is that these bodies have historically avoided becoming involved in finding solutions for major global problems, such as spam, by stating that such issues are outside the limited technical scope of the organisations. While participants of technical bodies understand there is a need to conserve the bodies’ limited resources, it has been more difficult for the world’s non-technical majority to understand why such bodies cannot solve problems that affect most Internet users.

A top-down public policy approach, as recommended by the Tunis Agenda, combined with a bottom-up technical implementation could perhaps result in a more robust Internet; Internet protocols may be more effective at both the level of network administration and at the level of global security and usability. On the other hand, many fear that top-down enforcement of non-technical concerns could lead to a politicisation of Internet’s core technologies, to the detriment of network health.

The role of the technical community in future Internet governance discussions

During the first phase of WSIS, some elements of the technical Internet community did not play a large role in the discussions. This was partly because it was not yet clear how prominent Internet governance discussions would be at WSIS and partly because the technical Internet community did not immediately foresee the full potential for WSIS discussions to impact on operational issues. Representatives from organisations such as the RIRs and ICANN were present at WSIS Phase I, but attended more as observers than active participants. However, by the second phase of WSIS, there was greater participation by the technical community and, in fact, many from the community were registered as part of official government delegations.

LACNIC CEO and NRO EC member, Raul Echeberria was an advisor to

the Uruguay delegation. In addition, a number of Internet organisations, including the Number Resource Organization (NRO), the Internet Society (ISOC), and ICANN, worked together on the Internet Pavilion, a stand at the WSIS side event, the ICT4all exhibition. At this stand, members of the Internet's technical community were available throughout WSIS to answer technical questions from WSIS attendees. The Internet Pavilion was visited by a number of representatives from government delegations and the world's media, as well as from civil society and the private sector.

In the post-WSIS world, it is important that the technical Internet community continues to play an active role in Internet governance both the day-to-day Internet operations and in the development of public policy. However, to do this, the technical community needs to continue to learn the ways of diplomacy. Traditionally, the technical community has placed a lot of value on establishing the knowledge level and worthiness of new entrants to the community before engaging them in meaningful discussion. To a large degree, this attitude changed during the WSIS process as the technical community began to engage with less tech-savvy stakeholders in Internet governance.

This newer, more inclusive approach continues to be essential in forums such as the IGF. The technical Internet community must continue to actively work to educate non-technical stakeholders about technical issues and to engage in public policy discussions. Otherwise, silence from the technical community may be mistaken for tacit approval. It is not the governments' responsibility to learn the intricacies of the technical operations of the Internet, but the technical Internet community's responsibility to help governments understand how their public policy interacts with the technical running of the Internet.

It is also important that the technical community understand the framework within which future Internet governance will develop. While the IGF may be a useful venue for airing important Internet governance issues, the IGF itself will be subject to the higher-level political intrigues. For example, since the US Government has made its distrust of the UN and the ITU well known, if the IGF were ever to recommend a move to a centralised UN-based Internet governance system, it would be very hard to achieve even if the rest of the world was in favour of it. To the technical Internet community, whose main desire is to get on with the job of keeping the Internet running, such high-level political wrangling may seem pointless. But it will not go away and it will be important for all stakeholders to build an understanding of how to work within this paradigm.

In summary, while WSIS has not resulted in any concrete changes to future Internet governance, it has signalled that the Internet governance discussions have finally matured, that the stakeholders now have a greater understanding of the issues, and that Internet governance issues are so complex, they cannot be resolved overnight. Internet governance discussions will continue, probably without any major structural changes to Internet governance bodies, for at least the next five years.

The Internet governance changes that develop at the end of that time will be dependent on what the stakeholders contribute to forums such as the IGF. Therefore, it is important that technical Internet community continues to engage in Internet governance discussions. The technical community can do this on many levels: lobbying governments, participating as everyday citizens within civil society, working with the business community, as well as continuing to work within specific technical frameworks in organisations such as the RIRs, ISOC, and the IETF. ■

RIPE NCC E-Learning Centre



The RIPE NCC continues to make efforts to extend our training activities to a wider audience, particularly those who are unable to attend our courses due to geographical, financial, scheduling or other constraints.

The RIPE NCC E-Learning Centre was launched in November 2005 to give both members and non-members free access to a variety of online courses.

There are currently courses available on creating and updating objects in the RIPE Whois Database, the Number Resource Organization (NRO) and the history of the Regional Internet Registries (RIRs). The next module to be published will provide online training on the RIPE Policy Development Process (PDP), explaining how this process functions and how to participate in it. The RIPE PDP E-Learning module will also

explain how the PDP can be used to create new policies, modify existing policies and direct the RIPE NCC to start new activities.

Following feedback from our members and the RIPE community, we plan to develop more courses for the E-Learning Centre throughout 2006. The modules planned for 2006 include:

- DNS for LIRs
- Advanced RIPE Whois Database
- RIPE NCC Billing and Charging Scheme
- IP Address Management

More information about the RIPE NCC E-Learning Centre is available at: <https://e-learning.ripe.net/>

If you have any questions or feedback about the RIPE NCC E-Learning Centre, please e-mail: e-learning@ripe.net ■

RIPE NCC Activity Plan and Budget 2006

The RIPE NCC Activity Plan and Budget for 2006 was approved by the RIPE NCC Executive Board at the end of 2005.

The RIPE NCC Activity Plan is available at: <http://www.ripe.net/ripe/docs/ripe-365.html>

The RIPE NCC Budget is available at: <http://www.ripe.net/ripe/docs/ripe-364.html> ■

RIPE NCC Roundtable Meeting February 2006



The February 2006 RIPE NCC Roundtable Meeting took place on Tuesday, 7 February 2006, in Amsterdam, the Netherlands. The meeting brought together over 30 participants from 15 countries within the RIPE NCC service region and included discussions on:

- Current proposals in the RIPE Policy Development Process (PDP)
- IP address distribution statistics
- IPv6 allocation policies
- Internet Routing Security

During 2005, the RIPE NCC organised a series of Roundtable Meetings for governments, regulators and industry partners. These meetings enabled high-level discussions on Internet management and provided attendees with an overview of the main technical elements of Internet coordination. The meetings also encouraged governments and regulators to recognise, and to participate in, the activities of the RIPE community.

The Roundtable Meetings have received positive feedback, with participants reporting that the topics discussed helped them better understand:

- The interests of the RIPE community
- The work of the RIPE NCC
- The open policy development process used by the RIPE community

Presentations from the February 2006 meeting are available at: <http://www.ripe.net/meetings/roundtable/feb2006/presentations/>

Information on previous Roundtable Meetings is available at: <http://www.ripe.net/meetings/roundtable/index.html>

If you have any comments or questions, or if you would like to suggest government or regulator contacts who you think should be invited to future RIPE NCC Roundtable Meetings, please contact: roundtable@ripe.net



Attendees at the RIPE NCC Roundtable Meeting in February 2006 in Amsterdam.

Policy Development in 2005

The RIPE community has always had an open and transparent policy development process based on consensus. In 2004 and 2005, the process was improved and is now formally documented in RIPE 350 ("Policy Development Process in RIPE"). The document, which makes clear how everyone can participate in policy development, can be found at: <http://www.ripe.net/ripe/docs/pdp.html>

The RIPE Policy Development Process (PDP) is used to request the RIPE NCC to take action, to make a recommendation to the community or to develop a Best Current Practice (BCP) document. It is also used to develop policies for the distribution of Internet number resources, such as IP addresses and Autonomous System Numbers (ASNs). It is important to have clearly defined and agreed policies for the distribution of Internet number resources because the pools of IP addresses and ASNs are finite.

While regional policies are important, the RIPE PDP is also used as part of the global policy development process. When global policies are proposed, they are discussed in all five Regional Internet Registry (RIR) regions. If all five regions reach consensus on the same proposal, the proposal is then passed to the ICANN board for ratification as a global policy.

In 2005, AfriNIC was officially established as an RIR. This was the

culmination of several years work on the part of the Internet community in Africa and the RIRs. AfriNIC received official recognition on 7 April 2005. As a direct result of this, the RIPE community was able to cancel its special minimum allocation policy for network operators in Africa.

The proposals discussed by the RIPE community in 2005 included:

- A proposal for the RIPE NCC to monitor multicast connectivity using test-traffic boxes
- A global policy proposal on how to allocate IPv6 address space to RIRs
- Changes to the way IPv4 address space should be allocated
- Changes to the criteria for allocating IPv6 address space
- Special allocations for anycasting DNS servers
- A timetable for the introduction of 32-bit AS Numbers

Most of the policy proposals made in 2005 are still being actively discussed. Details of the proposals and their status are available at: <http://www.ripe.net/ripe/policies/proposals/>

If you are interested in knowing what is being discussed, but do not want to follow all discussions, please subscribe to the low-traffic, policy-announce@ripe.net mailing list. This 'announcement only' list is used to let people know when a proposal has been made or its status has changed. Subscribe to policy-announce@ripe.net at: <http://www.ripe.net/mailman/listinfo/policy-announce>

Current RIPE Policy Developments

Name	Number	Submission Date	Current Phase	Current Status	Phase Ends	Action By	Suggested Working Group
Proposal to Amend the IPv6 Assignment and Utilisation Requirement Policy	2005-08	5 October 2005	Discussion	OPEN FOR DISCUSSION (Awaiting Decision from Proposer)	TBD	Kurtis Lindqvist	Address Policy
Summary: To amend the RIPE IPv6 address allocation policies regarding the definition of the default size of End Site allocations, the threshold value for End Site allocation efficiency, and the method of calculation of the End Site allocation efficiency metric.							
Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Policy for Allocation of IPv6 Blocks to Regional Internet Registries	2005-09	4 October 2005	Discussion	OPEN FOR DISCUSSION (Awaiting Decision from Proposer)	TBD	Hans Petter Holen	Address Policy
Summary: The proposal is to have a policy governing the allocation of IPv6 address space from the IANA to the Regional Internet Registries (RIRs).							
Consumer Broadband Monitoring Feasibility	2005-10	18 October 2005	Discussion	OPEN FOR DISCUSSION (Awaiting Decision from Proposer)	TBD	Alex Tudor	Test Traffic
Summary: This is a proposal to have the RIPE NCC, as a neutral body, develop a way of measuring performance for consumer broadband networks. The proposal requests funding for a limited deployment prototype with the purpose of assessing industry and consumer acceptance, functional requirements and technical issues.							

Snapshot of RIPE policy proposals. The full list is available at: <http://www.ripe.net/ripe/policies/proposals/>

RIPE NCC Regional Meetings

The RIPE NCC Regional Meetings enable the RIPE NCC to get direct feedback from its membership about region-specific issues. The meetings bring RIPE NCC members from a specific region closer to the RIPE community and encourage their participation in RIPE Meetings, RIPE Working Groups and the policy-making process.

The RIPE NCC Regional Meetings are part of the continued RIPE NCC efforts to encourage feedback from the regional community and to provide a clear overview of how all stakeholders participate in regional and global policy processes.

RIPE NCC IP Resource Analysts are also present at Regional Meet-



ings so that attendees can ask questions about RIPE NCC membership and can discuss any IP address related issues affecting their business.

The RIPE NCC has held Regional Meetings in:

- Dubai (December 2003)
- Moscow (June 2004 and September 2005)
- Nairobi (July 2004)
- Qatar (January 2006)

More information about RIPE NCC Regional Meetings is available at: <http://www.ripe.net/meetings/regional/index.html>

RIPE NCC Regional Meeting
MOSCOW
15-16 SEPTEMBER, 2005



RIPE NCC Regional Meeting Moscow 2005

The RIPE NCC Regional Meeting, Moscow, 2005 took place 15-16 September 2005 at the Marriott Grand Hotel in Moscow.

This was the second RIPE NCC Regional Meeting to be held in Moscow. The first was held 16-18 June 2004. The success of the 2004 meeting and the level of interest shown on the meeting's follow-up mailing list prompted a return by the RIPE NCC to the region.

The September 2005 meeting was well attended, with around 100 people from across the region discussing general industry topics as well as issues of local interest. In addition to outlining the changes that were made to the RIPE NCC billing administration following feedback at the previous Regional Meeting in Moscow, the meeting included presentations on the policy development process and management of IP address space in the region.

The RIPE NCC provided training seminars on Routing Registry and DNS Security (DNSSEC), and there were demonstrations of services that can help with detailed analysis of network behaviour.

Presentations from the meeting can be found at: <http://www.ripe.net/meetings/regional/moscow-2005/presentations/index.html>



Attendees at the RIPE NCC Regional Meeting Moscow 2005.

RIPE NCC Regional Meeting
DOHA, QATAR
17-18 JANUARY 2006



RIPE NCC الاجتماع الاقليمي
الدوحة - قطر
2006 يناير 17 - 18

RIPE NCC Regional Meeting Qatar 2006

The RIPE NCC Regional Meeting, in Doha, Qatar, was held 17 – 18 January 2006. Attracting more than 75 attendees from 11 countries, the meeting provided a chance for Internet Service Providers (ISPs), regulators and government representatives to discuss local topics related to IP networking.

In addition to providing a clear overview of the policy development process and management of IP address space in the region, the meeting covered a range of IP networking topics. There was particular focus on key issues emerging from the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) as well as recent developments in Internet security and routing. The RIPE NCC provided training seminars on Routing Registry and DNS Security (DNSSEC), and there were demonstrations of services that can help with detailed analysis of network behaviour.

Presentations from the meeting can be found at: <http://www.ripe.net/meetings/regional/qatar-2006/presentations/index.html>



Paul Rendek, the RIPE NCC's Head of Member Services and Communications, talking with attendees in Qatar.



RIPE Meetings

10 - 14 October 2005
Amsterdam, the Netherlands



RIPE 51

The RIPE 51 Meeting took place from 10 - 14 October 2005 at the Hotel Krasnapolsky, Amsterdam, the Netherlands. There were 320 attendees.

The RIPE 51 Meeting Report, including a summary of the action points and highlights from all RIPE Working Group sessions, is available at:
<http://www.ripe.net/ripe/meetings/ripe-51/report.html>

Minutes from all the sessions that took place at RIPE 51 are available at:
<http://www.ripe.net/ripe/meetings/ripe-51/minutes/index.html>

All the Plenary and Working Group presentations from RIPE 51 can be viewed at:
<http://www.ripe.net/ripe/meetings/ripe-51/presentations/index.html>



Attendees at the RIPE 51 Meeting in Amsterdam 2005.

24 - 28 April 2006
Istanbul, Turkey



RIPE 52

The RIPE 52 Meeting will take place from 24 - 28 April 2006 at the Ceylan InterContinental Hotel in Istanbul, Turkey.

More information about the upcoming RIPE 52 Meeting is available at:
<http://www.ripe.net/ripe/meetings/ripe-52/index.html>



RIPE NCC General Meetings

RIPE NCC General Meeting October 2005

The RIPE NCC General Meeting (GM) October 2005 was held on Thursday, 13 October 2005 adjacent to the RIPE 51 Meeting at the Krasnapolsky Hotel in Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

The RIPE NCC members at the GM unanimously approved the Charging Scheme 2006.

This document is available at:
<http://www.ripe.net/ripe/docs/ripe-360.html>

The presentations given at the GM can be found at:
<http://www.ripe.net/membership/gm/gm-october2005/presentations/>

The minutes from the GM are available at:
<http://www.ripe.net/membership/gm/gm-october2005/minutes.html>

RIPE NCC General Meeting April 2006

The next RIPE NCC General Meeting will be held adjacent to the RIPE 52 Meeting in Istanbul, Turkey, and will take place on Wednesday, 26 April 2006.

More information about RIPE NCC General Meetings is available at:
<http://www.ripe.net/membership/gm/>

RIPE NCC Training Courses

LIR Training Courses

Helsinki, Finland

Friday, 31 March 2006

Amsterdam, Netherlands

Friday, 7 April 2006

London, United Kingdom

Friday, 7 April 2006

Istanbul, Turkey

Friday, 21 April 2006

Valletta, Malta

Thursday, 4 May 2006

Minsk, Belarus

Friday, 5 May 2006

Amsterdam, Netherlands

Wednesday, 10 May 2006

Gibraltar, Gibraltar

Friday, 12 May 2006

Moscow, Russian Federation

Thursday, 18 May 2006

Barcelona, Spain

Friday, 26 May 2006

Almaty, Kazakhstan

Friday, 2 June 2006

Rome, Italy

Friday, 9 June 2006

Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Monday, 12 June 2006

Paris, France

Friday, 16 June 2006

Munich, Germany

Friday, 23 June 2006

Tallinn, Estonia

Friday, 30 June 2006

DNSSEC Training Courses

London, United Kingdom

Monday, 10 April 2006

Amsterdam, Netherlands

Thursday, 11 May 2006

Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Tuesday, 13 June 2006

Munich, Germany

Thursday, 22 June 2006

Routing Registry Training Courses

London, United Kingdom

Tuesday, 11 April 2006

Valletta, Malta

Friday, 5 May 2006

Amsterdam, Netherlands

Friday, 12 May 2006

Moscow, Russian Federation

Friday, 19 May 2006

Conference Calendar

Conferences and meetings that may be of interest to RIPE NCC members: March - September 2006.

27 – 31 March 2006

ICANN

Wellington, New Zealand

<http://www.icann.org/meetings/>

9 – 12 April 2006

ARIN XVII

Montreal, Canada

<http://www.arin.net/meetings/index.html>

10 – 14 April 2006

Southeastern Europe Broadband

Belgrade, Serbia and Montenegro

<http://seebb2006.tninternational.com/>

11 – 12 April 2006

Arabcom 2006

Dubai, U.A.E.

<http://www.arabcom.com/index.htm>

12 – 14 April 2006

Global IPv6 Summit 2006

Beijing, China

<http://www.ipv6.net.cn/2006/en/index.asp>

24 – 28 April 2006

RIPE 52

Istanbul, Turkey

<http://www.ripe.net/ripe/meetings/ripe-52/>

7 – 15 May 2006

AfNOG

Nairobi, Kenya

<http://www.afnog.org/afnog2006/>

16 – 17 May 2006

AfriNIC 4

Nairobi, Kenya

<http://www.afrinic.net/meeting/>

19 – 23 May 2006

PACNOG 2

Venue TBD

<http://www.pacnog.org/>

22 – 26 May 2006

LACNIC IX

Guatemala City, Guatemala

<http://lacnic.net/en/eventos/>

26 – 30 June 2006

ICANN Meeting

Marrakesh, Morocco

<http://www.icann.org/meetings/>

Date TBD, June 2006

NANOG 37

Venue TBD

<http://www.nanog.org/future.html>

7 July 2006

ISOC Advisory Council Meeting

IETF 66 Meeting location

<http://www.isoc.org/orgs/ac.shtml>

9 – 14 July 2006

IETF 66

Venue TBD

<http://www.ietf.org/meetings/Omtg-sites.txt>

27 July – 4 August 2006

SANOG 8

Karachi, Pakistan

<http://www.sanog.org/future.htm>

21 – 26 August 2006

PICISOC

Apia, Samoa

<http://www.picisoc.org/tiki-index.php?page=PacINET+2006>

11 – 15 September 2006

SIGCOMM 2006

Pisa, Italy

<http://www.acm.org/sigs/sigcomm/sigcomm2006/>

18 – 21 September 2006

O'Reilly European Open Source Convention

Brussels, Belgium

<http://conferences.oreillynet.com/euos2006/>

If you are interested in having a RIPE NCC speaker at one of your own events or conferences, please contact speaker@ripe.net.