

Recommended Draft Policy ARIN-2024-9: Remove Outdated Carveout for Community Networks

Alison Wood and Alicia Trotman



Problem Statement

Current Text (23 June 2024)

Sections 2.11 and 6.5.9 define Community Networks, and provide special dispensation for Community Networks to receive only a /40 of IPv6 space. When these sections were last materially updated in 2017 (ARIN-2017-8), the smallest allowed allocation to a normal ARIN LIR was a /36, so the Community Networks sections still provided value. In 2020 (ARIN-2020-3) however, the NRPM was amended such that any LIR may request to receive only a /40 for any reason. As such, the carveout for Community Networks to receive a /40 is no longer necessary, and potentially confusing.

Policy Statement

Retire Sections 2.11 and 6.5.9

Timetable for Implementation: Immediate.

Proposed Changes

- Retire sections 2.11 and 6.59 from the NRPM, effectively removing all reference to Community Networks.

AC Assessment of Conformance with the Principles of Internet Number Resource Policy

ARIN policy 2024-9 "Remove Outdated Carveout for Community Networks" is fair and impartial, technically sound and has the support of the community to move to recommended status. The policy, if adopted, will retire sections 2.11 and 6.5.9 regarding Community Networks from the NRPM as there is no longer any advantage to obtaining space as a community network, and qualifying for community space is in fact more difficult than without the community requirements.



Recommended Draft Policy ARIN-2024-9: Remove Outdated Carveout for Community Networks

Action	Date
Proposal	21 June 2024
Draft Policy	23 July 2024
Recommended Draft Policy	24 September 2024

Staff and Legal Review (15 September 2024)

Staff Understanding:

This policy intends to remove an outdated and unused policy specific to one very narrow segment of potential users. While the qualification requirements for Community Networks (6.5.9) differ from those outlined in the Initial Allocations and Subsequent Allocations sections (6.5.2.2 and 6.5.3), staff does not expect that this change would affect any potential Community Network.

Section 6.5.9 accommodates the anticipated tighter budgets of Community Networks by allowing a smaller allocation of a /40. However, section 6.5.2.2 also allows for a /40 allocation, so the same budgetary aid is being realized for smaller network operators, including Community Networks.



Staff and Legal Review

Additionally, section 6.5.9.1 requires community networks to demonstrate they meet the definition outlined in section 2.11. This may involve providing documentation, notarized affidavits, or other evidence.

In contrast, and paraphrasing, section 6.5.2.2 allows applicants to qualify by:

- Having, or are able to qualify for IPv4 under current policy
- Being, or committing to becoming, multihomed for IPv6
- Providing technical justification indicating why the allocation necessary

In staff's experience, organizations can generally meet the full text of the IPv6 requirements with relative ease under the first or second criteria. Since there is currently no requirement for community network operators to apply under the Community Networks policy, staff believes that removing this unused and potentially confusing policy may benefit prospective community network operators.



Staff and Legal Review

Implementable as Written?: Yes

Impact on ARIN Registry Operations and Services: None

Legal Review: No material legal issue

Implementation Timeframe Estimate: 3 months

Implementation Requirements:

- Staff Training
- Updates to public documentation
- Updates to internal procedures and guidelines

Proposal/Draft Policy Text Assessed: 23 July 2024

Community Feedback

In agreement "for sunseting this no-longer-needed policy section"



Policy Impact

This policy will remove confusing and outdated language regarding Community Networks. There will be no effect on current customers as the previous benefit of obtaining a /40 IPv6 network is available to all ARIN customers that request it.

Questions for the Community



Do you support this policy as written?