

2007-14



*Resource Review Process*

*ARIN Public Policy Conference, Fall, 2007*

*Stephen Sprunk and Owen DeLong*



# Motivation

.....



# Motivation

---

- ❖ At a previous meeting, a statement was made by one or more ARIN representatives that they did not believe policy supported revocation of non-compliant or abandoned resource delegations.



# Motivation

---

- ❖ At a previous meeting, a statement was made by one or more ARIN representatives that they did not believe policy supported revocation of non-compliant or abandoned resource delegations.
- ❖ This policy is intended to clarify that ability and to also provide proper protections to prevent abuse by ARIN or others in the process.



# Spirit of the Policy

---



# Spirit of the Policy

---

- ❖ This policy is intended to help recover disused or abandoned address space.



# Spirit of the Policy

---

- ❖ This policy is intended to help recover disused or abandoned address space.
- ❖ This policy is not intended to create an automatic annual audit of every resource or resource holder.



# Spirit of the Policy

---

- ❖ This policy is intended to help recover disused or abandoned address space.
- ❖ This policy is not intended to create an automatic annual audit of every resource or resource holder.
- ❖ Legacy exemption does not apply to resources not in use.



# Staff Comments

.....



# Staff Comments

---

❖ Reconciling with RSA



# Staff Comments

---

- ❖ Reconciling with RSA
  - Difference is intentional.



# Staff Comments

---

- ❖ Reconciling with RSA
  - Difference is intentional.
  - Intent is to create safeguards for a fair process.



# Staff Comments

---

- ❖ Reconciling with RSA
  - Difference is intentional.
  - Intent is to create safeguards for a fair process.
- ❖ Meaning of term “review”



# Staff Comments

---

- ❖ Reconciling with RSA
  - Difference is intentional.
  - Intent is to create safeguards for a fair process.
- ❖ Meaning of term “review”
  - Intent is any significant review of an organizations resources which could result in action under this policy.



# Staff Comments (cont.)

.....



# Staff Comments (cont.)

---

## ❖ Compliance



# Staff Comments (cont.)

---

## ❖ Compliance

- Staff interpretation is consistent with authors' intent. Compliance means compliance with current policy at the time of review.



# Staff Comments (cont.)

---

## ❖ Compliance

- Staff interpretation is consistent with authors' intent. Compliance means compliance with current policy at the time of review.

## ❖ Aggregate Block



# Staff Comments (cont.)

---

## ❖ Compliance

- Staff interpretation is consistent with authors' intent. Compliance means compliance with current policy at the time of review.

## ❖ Aggregate Block

- Attempts to minimize fragmentation of returned space while allowing as much flexibility as possible to develop amicable solutions.



# Staff Comments (last one!)

.....



# Staff Comments (last one!)

---

❖ Hold Time



# Staff Comments (last one!)

---

## ❖ Hold Time

- Six months to renumber doesn't affect how long ARIN holds a block after it is returned.



# Staff Comments (last one!)

---

## ❖ Hold Time

- Six months to renumber doesn't affect how long ARIN holds a block after it is returned.
- ARIN can grant extensions under proposed policy if organizations require longer periods.



# PPML Comments

PPML Comments



# PPML Comments

---

- ❖ Seems to be consensus that some form of reclamation is good.



# PPML Comments

---

- ❖ Seems to be consensus that some form of reclamation is good.
  - Reduced abuse potential



# PPML Comments

---

- ❖ Seems to be consensus that some form of reclamation is good.
  - Reduced abuse potential
  - May be useful for redistribution



# PPML Comments

---

- ❖ Seems to be consensus that some form of reclamation is good.
  - Reduced abuse potential
  - May be useful for redistribution
  - Probably won't significantly affect IPv4 runout date.



# PPML Comments

---

- ❖ Seems to be consensus that some form of reclamation is good.
  - Reduced abuse potential
  - May be useful for redistribution
  - Probably won't significantly affect IPv4 runout date.
- ❖ Seems to be consensus that some defined process would be a “good thing”<sup>tm</sup>.



# PPML Comments

---

- ❖ Seems to be consensus that some form of reclamation is good.
  - Reduced abuse potential
  - May be useful for redistribution
  - Probably won't significantly affect IPv4 runout date.
- ❖ Seems to be consensus that some defined process would be a “good thing”<sup>tm</sup>.
- ❖ Review standard should be no more stringent than existing standard applied for additional resource request.



# PPML Comments (cont.)

PPML Comments (cont.)



# PPML Comments (cont.)

---

- ❖ Where did 12 months come from?



# PPML Comments (cont.)

---

- ❖ Where did 12 months come from?
  - This number is somewhat arbitrary, but, when list was asked what other number was good, no replies were posted or received.



2007-14



*Resource Review Process*

*ARIN Public Policy Conference, Fall, 2007*

*Owen DeLong and Stephen Sprunk*