

Monthly Summary of Policy-Related Discussions – March 2025

Date: 01/04/2025

Comments: Informational Document

Lists and fora summarised include:

- [AC-DISCUSS \(Address Council Coordination\) Mailing List](#)
- [RIPE Policy Announce Mailing List](#)
 - The discussion phase ended for proposal 2024-02
 - A suggestion for a new proposal was posted
- [RIPE Address Policy Working Group Mailing List](#)
 - The discussion phase ended for proposal 2024-02
 - Candidates' names published for a third APWG Co-Chair
- [AFRINIC Policy Mailing List](#)
- [APNIC Policy Mailing List](#)
- [ARIN Policy Mailing List](#)
 - Two revised policy proposals under discussion
- [LACNIC Policy Mailing List](#)
 - Candidates' names published for 2025 PDP Co-Chairs

AC-DISCUSS (Address Council Coordination) Mailing List

15+ messages in March 2025

Meetings Management:

[ASO AC Teleconference, 5 February 2025](#)

[Minutes](#)

[ASO AC Teleconference, 19 March 2025](#)

[Reminder, Draft Agenda, Minutes](#)

[ASO AC Teleconference, 2 April 2025](#)

[Draft Agenda](#)

Other Topics:

[ICANN blog post of NRO summary report](#)

On 6 March 2025, Carlos Reyes informed the group that Andrew McConachie published a [blog](#) on the ICANN website about the summary report of the NRO questionnaire on the proposed principles to update ICP-2.

RIPE

Policy Proposals Summary

Discussion Phase

[2024-02 "IPv6 Initial Allocations /28"](#)

This proposal aims to change the initial IPv6 allocation size from /29 to /28.

Working Group: [Address Policy WG](#)

Discussion Phase: Start: 27 February 2025 - End: 28 March 2025

ML Discussion:

On 10 March 2025, Leo Vegoda, APWG Co-Chair, invited the group to comment on the proposal that did not receive any feedback until that day.

One person supported the proposal, another suggested rewording the sentences to explain that each organisation can extend only one allocation up to /28. A further clarification was provided, explaining that a RIPE NCC member can have multiple LIR accounts.

Discussion Phase Ended - Awaiting new version from proposers

[2024-01 "Revised IPv6 PI Assignment Policy"](#)

This proposal aims to define End Sites and requirements for "IPv6 PI Assignments" and "Assignments from IPv6 Allocations", clarify permitted use cases, and introduce IPv6 PI issuance at the nibble boundary and new principles for aggregation and registration.

Working Group: [Address Policy WG](#)

Discussion Phase: Ended: 22 November 2024

ML Discussion:

[Status of 2024-01 Revised IPv6 PI Assignment Policy?](#)

On 12 March 2025, Jori Vanneste asked about the status of the proposal, wondering if it should have been withdrawn, provided no action was taken in four weeks after the end of the discussion phase. Angela Dall'Ara, RIPE NCC Policy Officer, clarified that according to the RIPE PDP, the APWG Chairs were not required to withdraw proposal 2024-01, as the author agreed with them within four weeks of the end of the Discussion phase that he would draft a new version and there's no deadline for submitting a new version for a new Discussion phase.

The four-week deadline applies to the submission of the policy draft in case the proposal advances to the Review phase.

RIPE Policy Announce Mailing List

0 messages in March 2025

RIPE Address Policy Working Group (APWG) Mailing List

10+ messages in March 2025

[2024-02 "IPv6 Initial Allocations /28"](#)

See the discussion under the Policy Summary section above.

[2024-01 "Revised IPv6 PI Assignment Policy"](#)

See the discussion under the Policy Summary section above.

[DRAFT ASN assignment criteria revisited](#)

On 27 March 2025, Urban Suhadolnik posted a **suggestion for a proposal** he co-authored with Tobias Fiebig. The proposal aims to remove the multihoming requirement for receiving an AS number.

ML Discussion:

Randy Bush did not find the wording clear and disagreed with requesting the RIPE NCC to check on AS usage based on RPSL language. Tobias replied that the reference to RPSL has been present in the current policy since 2010 and that changing that would broaden the proposal's scope. Randy did not see the reason for a new proposal if this wording was supposed to remain. Tobias replied that he wanted to change only one thing at a time, hence only removing the multihoming requirement. Randy still found the wording too complex and not providing a clear guidance to the RIPE NCC for checking compliance.

Michele Neylon thought that the proposal as written was limiting the justification for an AS to the routing policy, excluding the possibility to announce the same prefix from multiple ASes. Tobias thought the text was not prohibiting MOAS and asked him whether this should be explicitly allowed.

Andy Davidson asked the RIPE NCC to provide some data on how many ASN request tickets are turned down. Marco Schmidt, RIPE NCC Registration Services manager, replied that in 2024, the RIPE NCC received 2,563 ASN requests and issued 2,205 ASNs. However, there are a few factors to consider:

- Not all requests received in 2024 were approved within the same year, and some ASNs assigned in 2024 were for requests submitted in the previous year. However, these effects likely balance out.
- More importantly, the RIPE NCC very rarely turns down requests. Instead, requesters often abandon their requests when asked for additional information. This can be due to policy-related reasons, compliance issues (e.g., missing registration papers), or simply a change of mind. Since many requesters have stopped responding, the exact reasons are not known to the RIPE NCC.
- The difference of around 350 between requests and ASN assignments should not be misinterpreted as the number of requests actively turned down by the RIPE NCC. Andy then doubted the need for a new policy, thinking the current one served the purpose well. Tobias reminded him of the goal of removing the multihoming requirement, which he found outdated.

Other topics:

New Address Policy WG Co-Chair Nomination Announcement

On 27 March 2025, Alex le Heux, APWG Co-Chair, announced the candidate for the open Address Policy WG co-chair seat: Franziska Lichtblau. The Working Group will make its selection during the Address Policy WG session at RIPE 90 in Lisbon.

AFRINIC Policy Mailing List

0 messages in March 2025

Policy Proposals Summary

Consensus reached:

[AFPUB-2019-GEN-006-DRAFT03, RPKI ROAs for Unallocated and Unassigned AFRINIC Address Space](#) - Awaiting Implementation

[AFPUB-2020-GEN-006-DRAFT02, AFRINIC Number Resources Transfer Policy](#) - Awaiting Ratification

[AFPUB-2021-GEN-003-DRAFT02, Policy Compliance Dashboard](#) - Awaiting Ratification

[AFPUB-2018-GEN-001-DRAFT07, Abuse Contact Policy Update](#) - Awaiting Ratification

APNIC Policy Mailing List

15+ messages in March 2025

Policy Proposals Summary

Did not reach consensus at APNIC 59

ML Announcements:

On 6 March 2025, the APNIC Policy SIG Chairs announced that the following two proposals **did not reach consensus** at APNIC 59. They returned these proposals to the authors for further discussion with the community and invited them to submit a new version based on the community's feedback.

[prop-162-v002: WHOIS Privacy](#)

This proposal suggests eliminating the unnecessary publication of APNIC member organisation contact details in the APNIC bulk* WHOIS data. People with a legitimate need for these contact details can use a service provided by APNIC to obtain them.

* The access to APNIC bulk WHOIS data is currently [regulated](#) by its Acceptable Usage Policy.

ML Discussion:

On 4 March 2025, Tobias Knecht, CEO of Abusix, strongly opposed the policy proposal. He argued that Contact Objects, like IRT, abuse-c, and ORG, are nonpersonal objects and should not include any PII but be used and treated as role objects, to avoid privacy issues. He provided three use cases that would break if this proposal would find consensus:

"1.) Abuse Reporting:

We run the Abuse Contact DB (<https://abusix.com/docs/abuse-contact-db/abuse-contact-db-overview/>), translating an IP into the responsible abuse contact email addresses. Bulk data maintains this database. We see millions of queries daily.

Internally, we are also using this data to report abusive behavior. The volume is north of a million per day as well. Using Whois for this will put more load on the existing systems. On top of that, to my knowledge, the Whois server's rate limit will make high-volume querying impossible.

2.) We and other companies use abuse@ addresses to identify and cluster issues from the same "Network Owner," which is sometimes only covered by a properly maintained abuse@ since ASNs are occasionally incomplete. This is especially true in leased IP space. This issue is even bigger than what I described in point 1. Imagine

attributing logfiles with abuse@ addresses using whois. --> Volume is enormous, and rate limits will make it impossible.

3.) Threat Hunting and Threat Research. Identifying a problematic resource and finding patterns through contact information to identify more resources is a common practice in the industry. However, this would not be possible if this proposal reached a consensus.

LACNIC is the only RIR not providing bulk data today, which is a big issue. Compared to other regions, the chances of taking down a problematic resource in the LACNIC region are very low.”

On 4 March 2025, David Farmer suggested implementing a coordinated approach by RIRs to allow access to the totality of the global Whois information to organizations or individuals with accounts from the other RIRs. He informed the list that there are several examples of federated authentication systems (e.g. InCommon and eduGAIN), Two people liked the idea, and one of them doubted the feasibility. On 18 March 2025, Vivek Nigam, informed the list that APNIC contacted the 453 users with Whois bulk access; they received five replies, of which only three confirmed an impact in case the proposal would be implemented.

[*prop-163: Enhancing WHOIS Transparency and Efficiency Through Referral Server Implementation*](#)

This proposal suggests implementing WHOIS Referral Server support so that transferred resource queries (e.g., ASN or IP addresses) are automatically redirected to the appropriate RIR database, NIR allocations can be easily accessed using a hierarchical system, and downstream allocation data can be accessible, enhancing transparency and traceability.

ML Discussion:

On 6 March 2025, the APNIC Policy SIG Chairs announced that the author would submit a new version for discussion.

Abandoned

[*prop-160-v002: Change IPv6 Initial assignment to /44 for Organizations Eligible for multihoming*](#)

This proposal advocates for changing the initial assignments of IPv6 address blocks to /44 from /48 for organisations that are eligible for multihoming assignments under the current APNIC policies.

ML Announcement:

On 6 March 2025, the APNIC Policy SIG Chairs announced that this proposal did not reach consensus at APNIC 58, nor was it submitted to discuss at APNIC 59 OPM.

The Chairs **abandoned this proposal** and asked the author to submit a new proposal with all the feedback and comments received from the community to date if the author wanted to discuss it again at the next Open Policy Meeting.

Other topics:

[*Changes to Nomination Criteria for SIG Chair/Co-Chair Positions*](#)

On 6 March 2025, APNIC announced that the [proposal](#) to change the [current APNIC SIG Guidelines](#) that was discussed at APNIC 59 on 25 February 2025 at a Joint SIG session **did**

not reach consensus. The proposal is limiting eligibility to one candidate per “Corporate Group” and is modifying the procedure for the election of the SIG Chair Position. The Joint SIG Chairs returned this proposal to the author/s for further discussion with the community and invited the author/s to submit a revised version based on the community's feedback and comments at the Meeting.

Policy Proposal Idea - Longer IPv6 Allocations

On 9 March 2025, Christopher Hawker asked for feedback on his idea for a policy proposal to be presented at APNIC 60. The main suggested changes were:

1. Allowing for IPv6 allocations longer than a /32 to be made provided that it is made on a nibble boundary (/36, /40 or /44).
2. For a member to be eligible to receive a /40 or /44 IPv6 allocation, they must be holding no shorter than a /24 IPv4 allocation.
3. For a member to be eligible to receive a /36 IPv6 allocation, they must be holding no shorter than a /23 IPv4 allocation.

The identified issues that this proposal will attempt to address are:

1. Allow members to make sub-assignments for internal network use (i.e. different areas and divisions within the same member organisation), allowing them to maintain more accurate Whois records (e.g. if a member has a /36, they may update Whois records to reflect that a /40 is being used for their core network, another /40 for customer services, an additional /40 for their corporate network, and so on).
2. Allows members to make sub-assignments to their customers and maintain accurate Whois records.

ARIN Policy Mailing List

35+ messages in March 2025

Policy Proposals Summary

Implemented

ML Announcement:

On 4 March 2025, ARIN announced that the following proposals had been implemented. A new version of the ARIN Number Resource Policy Manual (NRPM) has been published on the ARIN website. **NRPM version 2025.1** is effective 4 March 2025 and supersedes the previous version.

ARIN-2022-12: Direct Assignment Language Update

The goal of this proposal was to update the language as direct assignments are no longer used in ARIN databases after ARIN's fee harmonisation.

ARIN-2023-7: Clarification of NRPM Sections 4.5 and 6.11 Multiple Discrete Networks

The goal of this proposal was to align Sections 4.5 and 6.11 of the NRPM with the style guide used for the remainder of the document and to improve readability

ARIN-2024-2: WHOIS Data Requirements Policy for Non-Personal Information

This proposal attempted to clarify and codify ARIN's existing practice regarding organisation contact data collection and display in WHOIS.

ARIN-2024-9: Remove outdated carveout for Community Networks

This proposal aimed to retire Sections 2.11 and 6.5.9, stating the carveout for Community Networks to receive a /40, which is no longer necessary and potentially confusing as in 2020 (ARIN-2020-3) the NRPM was amended such that any LIR may request to receive only a /40 for any reason.

Draft Policies:

ARIN-2023-8: Reduce 4.18 Maximum Allocation

The goal of this proposal is to reduce the current IPv4 maximum allocation size from a /22 to a /24. This would only allow IPv4 allocation requests from organisations that have never received IPv4 address space directly from ARIN other than for special use.

The proposal would also prevent multiple requests from the same organisation by setting the maximum holding of IPv4 space received directly from ARIN to a /24. Waiting list recipients would have to demonstrate the need for a /24 on an operating network. This proposal removes the restriction that stops entities from joining the waiting list if they have recently conducted resource transfers.

ARIN-2024-5: Rewrite of NRPM Section 4.4 Micro-Allocation

This proposal seeks to improve technical soundness, respect the privilege of a dedicated pool for Critical Infrastructure (CI) and to more closely observe conservation principles using clear, minimal and enforceable requirements, underscoring the value of routability of assigned prefixes as required.

ML Announcement:

On 6 and 18 March 2025, ARIN announced that this proposal had been **revised** and asked for feedback on the new text. The second update was the result of ARIN's Staff & Legal review, which recommended these modifications:

- Removing the mention of 8.2 transfers as the only valid transfer, as this is covered by the prohibitions in sections 8.3 and 8.4.
- Updating wording in 4.4 clarifying that allocations must continue to meet justification requirements going forward.
- Referencing Section 4.2.41 in Section 4.4.3, instead of duplicating its text.
- Typo fixes.

ML Discussion:

On 18 March 2025, John Santos suggested adding an explicit provision that 4.4 space may ***ONLY*** be used for CII to avoid ambiguity. He questioned that Section 4.4.2 may create a chicken and egg problem: A TLD operator must be "a currently active zone operator" to apply for 4.4 space, but they can't become an active zone operator until they have acquired the IP addresses.

On 20 March 2025, Martin Hannigan suggested adding "*Requesting number resources from ARIN using this policy is voluntary*" to make clear that an individual or entity can use addresses they already have. He also suggested clarifying "CII includes Internet Exchanges, IANA-authorized root servers, TLD operators that offer domain-level DNS services to outside parties, ARIN, and IANA." to read "CII includes Internet

Exchange Points, IANA-authorized root and TLD operators, ARIN, and IANA.” as there’s a lack of explanation about *“TLD operators that offer domain-level DNS services to outside parties, ARIN, and IANA”*. He saw no point in changing 4.4 without the explicit cover of the community asking ARIN to ensure an IXP can “prove” they are operating in the region and on an actual piece of hardware consistent with operating an IXP that networks physically peer across.

Tyler O’Meara agreed that *“TLD operators that offer domain-level DNS services to outside parties”* is confusing and suggested the following wording:

“ARIN will reserve a /15 equivalent of IPv4 address space for the operation of Critical Internet Infrastructure (CII) within the ARIN service area. Allocations from this pool will be no smaller than a /24. Sparse allocation will be used whenever practical. CII includes Internet Exchanges, IANA authorized Root DNS Servers, and authoritative TLD DNS servers. Additionally, ARIN and IANA will also be eligible under this section.”

[*ARIN-2024-7: Addition of Definitions for General and Special Purpose IP Addresses*](#)

This proposal adds definitions of Special Purpose IPv4 Address, General Purpose IPv4 Address, Special Purpose IPv6 Address, and General Purpose IPv6 Address to Section 2 and does not change the content of the policy manual.

ML Discussion:

On 17 March 2025, Kaitlyn Pellak, shepherd of the proposal, asked for feedback again on the suggestion to change the wording, using “defined” purposes as “special” and “reserved” are already used in other contexts. She asked the community whether this is a policy the AC should continue to work on. One participant suggested abandoning the proposal arguing that it would not solve any current or potential issues and it would create some complications.

[*ARIN-2024-10: Registration Requirements and Timing of Requirements With Retirement of Section 4.2.3.7.2*](#)

This proposal aims to modernise the registration-related policies in Section 4 by introducing language that is meant to remind ISPs of the importance of registration when feasible for the benefit of the community. It removes the reference to SWIP and prolongs the registration time from seven to 14 days.

ML Discussion:

On 4 and 17 March 2025, Alicia Trotman and Lily Edinam Botsyoe, shepherds of the proposal, asked for feedback.

[*ARIN-2024-11: IPv4 Transition Efficiency Reallocation Policy \(ITERP\)*](#)

This proposal aims to allow ISPs to reassign a /29 or /28 for their direct downstream customers for IPv6 transition only. ARIN reserves the right to validate any downstream allocations from ISPs to direct customers. Anyone wishing to perform a reassignment of a 4.10 allocation must be approved through ARIN and meet all the policy’s justification requirements.

[*ARIN-2025-1: Clarify ISP and LIR Definitions and References to Address Ambiguity in NRPM Text*](#)

This proposal adds clarity by creating an explicit definition for ISP and LIR, removing ambiguous wording and clarifying the usage of the term LIR.

ML Announcement:

On 19 March 2025, ARIN announced that this proposal had been **revised** and asked for feedback on the new text. The main changes were:

- correction from "(LIR/ISP)s" pluralization to "LIRs/ISPs"
- removed the text "The term LIR originates from and is in more common use in other RIR regions."

On 27 March 2025, ARIN announced that this proposal had been **revised** and asked for feedback on the new text. Summary of changes from the previous revision:

- "(ISP)" was added to the section title "2.18 Internet Service Provider (ISP)"
- The previous Draft Policy text included proposed modifications to the following sections:

6.5.9. Community Network Allocations

6.5.9.2. Allocation Size

6.5.9.3. Reassignments by Community Networks

NRPM 2025.1 was implemented on 4 March, which included the deprecation of 6.5.9 Community Networks, so the proposed modifications to the above sections were removed from the Policy Statement.

ML Discussion:

After the first revision, Martin Hannigan asked for a redline version. Kat Hunter responded that many in the community have email set to plain text only and hence for the benefit of the entire community they try to not send unreadable emails by adding redline; meanwhile there's been discussion on redlining with the Comms team at ARIN from the AC to work on options, which involves some additional work by ARIN staff and potentially a suggestion to make improvements to the policy section.

[*ARIN-2025-2: Clarify 8.5.1 Registration Services Agreement*](#)

This proposal aims to remove references to ARIN business practices regarding signing a new RSA when receiving transferred resources in the NRPM.

ML Discussion:

On 4 March 2025, Gus Reese, shepherd of the proposal, asked for feedback. One participant supported the proposal.

[*ARIN-2025-3: Change Section 9 Out Of Region Use Minimum Criteria*](#)

This proposal aims to reduce from /22 to /24 the minimum in region IPv4 usage required to justify out of region usage.

ML Announcement:

On 25 March 2025, ARIN announced that the ARIN Advisory Council (AC) accepted "ARIN-prop-341: Change Section 9 Out of Region Use Minimum Criteria" as Draft Policy and asked for comments.

ML Discussion:

Scott Leibrand supported the proposal. Tyler O'Meara suggested removing the minimum usage requirement, arguing that the "*real and substantial connection*" requirement in Section 9 should suffice to prohibit meaningless shell corporations.

New Proposals:

[*ARIN-prop-341: NRPM section 9, out of region use*](#)

This proposal aims to lower the minimum in region usage for IPv4, to justify additional number resources, from /22 to /24.

ML Announcements:

[*Advisory Council Meeting Results – 20 March 2025*](#)

The Advisory Council met on 20 March 2025.

The AC has **advanced the following to Draft Policy status:**

[*ARIN-prop-341: NRPM section 9, out of region use*](#)

The AC is continuing to work on:

Draft Policies:

[*ARIN-2023-8: Reduce 4.18 Maximum Allocation*](#)

[*ARIN-2024-5: Rewrite of NRPM Section 4.4 Micro-Allocation*](#)

[*ARIN-2024-7: Addition of Definitions for General and Special Purpose IP Addresses*](#)

[*ARIN-2024-10: Registration Requirements and Timing of Requirements With Retirement of Section 4.2.3.7.2*](#)

[*ARIN-2024-11: IPv4 Transition Efficiency Reallocation Policy \(ITERP\)*](#)

[*ARIN-2025-1: Clarify ISP and LIR Definitions and References to Address Ambiguity in NRPM Text*](#)

[*ARIN-2025-2: Clarify 8.5.1 Registration Services Agreement*](#)

LACNIC Policy Mailing List

10+ messages in March 2025

Policy Proposals Summary

Awaiting Implementation

[*LAC-2024-4 - Log of Allocations from the Pool of IPv4 Addresses Reserved for Critical Infrastructure*](#)

This proposal seeks to publish a log of micro-assignments, recoveries, or returns from the pool of IPv4 addresses reserved for critical infrastructure as a way to mitigate potential requests from fake IXPs that may have bypassed the controls implemented by LACNIC under the Policy Manual.

ML Announcement:

On 12 March 2025, LACNIC announced that the proposal will be implemented by April 2025.

Under Discussion

[*LAC-2023-7: Temporary Transfers*](#)

This proposal suggests a change to allow temporary transfers.

ML Announcement:

On 12 March 2025, LACNIC announced that the proposal had been **updated to version 4**.

ML Discussion:

Three participants disagreed with the publication of the end date of the temporary transfer and doubted whether this policy would conflict with the current sub-assignment solution. Jordi Palet, the proposer, confirmed the importance of publishing the end date for transparency and that the proposed policy would not impact that, as it only gives additional clarification.

Hernan also wondered whether LACNIC should get involved in checking that a contract between third parties is fulfilled. Jordi Palet, the proposer, confirmed that the contract is only between parties, and no LACNIC involvement should be there. One of the articles mentions that the temporary transfer can be revoked in case of abuse of the resources, and there were questions about whether this only regards the contractual agreement between the parties or if this will require any involvement of LACNIC in checking the contract. Jordi confirmed that there is no obligation on LACNIC to check.

Did not reach consensus

The authors may submit a new version of the proposal based on the comments and suggestions received or withdraw it.

LAC-2024-3: Use of the resources by third parties authorized by recipients

This proposal aims to provide clarity and guidance on the authorisation of third-party utilisation. It adds a new section and amends existing provisions that were seen as controversial and conflicting. Similarly to proposal [LAC-2023-7: Temporary Transfers](#), it allows temporary sharing and distribution of IPv4 addresses among the community utilising existing LACNIC systems for transparency.

LAC-2024-2: Appeal Procedure

This proposal aims to better specify the appeals procedure in the current PDP, including the creation of an impartial Appeals Committee.

LAC-2024-1: Introduction of Proposal in the PDP

This proposal aims to align the PDP with the step-by-step procedure for sending new proposals or their updated versions and clarify the tasks of staff and moderators in this regard. It also addresses the field limit length in the form used to submit a proposal.

LAC-2023-4: Legacy Resources Management

This proposal aims to incorporate a specific section related to minimum compliance in the case of legacy resources, as well as their possible recovery in the event of non-compliance.

Other topics:

2025 Elections to Elect a PDP Co-Chair

On 10 March 2025, LACNIC announced the opening of the period for the nomination of candidates to serve as co-chair of the Policy Development Process (PDP).

Two reminders were sent on 17 and 21 March 2025.

The deadline to apply was 24 March 2025; on that day, LACNIC announced the closure of the nomination period.

Candidates Running in the 2025 PDP Co-Chair

On 27 March 2025, LACNIC announced the valid candidates and published the [link](#) for their biographical information:

- * Marcela Orbiscay
- * Tomás Lynch
- * Oscar González

Deadline for submitting questions to candidates: 4 April 2025

Deadline for submitting complaints: 2 April 2025
