

# 2016-03 UPDATE

---

*“Locking down the Final /8 policy”, version 3*

# PREVIOUSLY ON THIS SHOW

---

- Version 1 - severe restrictions on usage and transfer of 'final / 8 space', no consensus
- Version 2 - Removed most of the restrictions, sufficient support to move to review phase
  - See Gerts excellent summary e-mail here:  
<https://www.ripe.net/ripe/mail/archives/address-policy-wg/2016-August/011700.html>
- Version 3 and impact analysis by RIPE NCC published on October 19th
- Around 90(!) e-mails on the list within that thread since then

# CHANGES BETWEEN V2 AND V3

---

- Clarifications:

- 5.3 Address Recycling

- Reformatted to bullets to make more readable

- 5.5 Transfers of Allocations

- Reformatted to a numbered list to clarify

- 7.0 Types of Address Space

- Align “ALLOCATED FINAL” definition with “ALLOCATED PA” definition

# IMPACT ANALYSIS

---

- See Marco's email here: <https://www.ripe.net/ripe/mail/archives/address-policy-wg/2016-October/011727.html>
- Impact of Policy on Registry and Addressing: Small
- Impact on Operations/Services:
  - Extra efforts required for educating LIRs on using sub allocations to prevent a potential drop in registration quality
- Implementation: Medium

# NEW CONCERNS RAISED SINCE THE IMPACT ANALYSIS

---

- Nick Hilliard:
  - Sympathetic to the idea but the proposed policy won't fix the problem
  - The speculation just moves to entire shelf companies
  - Unregistered transfers will increase and reduce the registry quality
- Elvis Velea:
  - Creates another color of IP addresses

# AND...

---

- A few voices of support
- Probably the sorriest collection of bile I've laid eyes on:
  - Ad-hom attacks
  - Assumptions of RIPE NCC or Executive Board interference
  - Godwin's Law
  - Claims of second class citizens
  - Chairs being accused of having hidden agendas

# FEEDBACK

---

- NEW concerns, feedback or suggestions welcome;
- Repeating the same argument over and over doesn't make it more valid;
- Let's hear it.

# THE END.

---

- I'm abandoning 2016-03, effective right now.
- Not because of a lack of consensus - that's for the chairs to decide
- Out of embarrassment for the "discussion" and how it is damaging our community's reputation
- If anyone else wants to pick up from here, be my guest, but I think we need to discuss the process for that first.