Report of
APNIC Community Consultation

Masato YAMANISHI

APNIC Community Consultation

- Date and Location
  - between 2:00pm and 5:20pm on Wed. 3 Mar. 2010
  - at KLCC in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

- The objective:
  - "IPv6 Address Management and ITU: Is an "additional parallel structure" required?"

- The number of participants
  - 160 people in person
  - 115 people via webcast
  - 20 people via an audio feed
  - 51 people via chat

Chairs and panelists

- Chair:
  - Masato Yamanishi (Softbank BB)

- Co-Chair:
  - Sharil Tarmizi (Malaysian Communications and Multimedia Commission)

- Panelist:
  - Xiaoya Yang (TSB, ITU)
  - Dr. Sureswaran Ramadass (NAv6)
  - Adiel Akplogan (AfriNIC)
  - Save Vocea (ICANN)

Presentations from panelists

- Xiaoya Yang
  - Some ITU members' concerns for IPV6 address distribution
  - Difficulties for developing countries to participate to the IP address management policy processes of the RIR system
  - Decision of ITU to study issues related to IP addressing and its activities

- Sureswaran Ramadass
  - Decription of proposed model to ITU
  - It's aim, pros, and cons
  - Relationship with existing RIR/NIR

Presentations from panelists (Cont.)

- Adiel Akplogan
  - The operation of AfriNIC, as the RIR serving the biggest concentration of developing countries in the world
  - AfriNIC's effort for limited government awareness of the Internet IP address management system
  - Participation of several regulatory authorities in AfriNIC's policy development process

- Save Vocea
  - Current distribution of IPv6 address
  - ICANN's support for the current system

High level summary of the discussion

- The Internet community and the RIRs need to build more awareness by governments of the current RIR processes.

- There needs to be a clear problem statement regarding the specific IPv6 addressing issues that ITU discussions are trying to address.

- There needs to be an investigation into the actual likelihood of an IPv6 address scarcity problem arising in the foreseeable future.

- IPv6 address allocation is equitable under the current address model: addresses are already readily available via RIRs and NIRs, and each RIR has equal sized IPv6 block.

High level summary of the discussion (Cont.)

- Economic problems associated with receiving addresses appear to be perception rather than reality.

- There is concern about the ability to keep policies in synchronization between the RIR system and CIR model.

- There is a desire by the Internet community to be able coordinate with the ITU in discussions relating to the Internet.

Community-endorsed Statement

Introduction

IP address management is fundamental to ongoing Internet stability. Over the past decade the Internet has become fundamental to the world's economy. The Internet is truly global. What happens in one part of the world affects the rest of the world. So changes in IP address management could affect billions of devices globally, irrespective of the country where they are located.

The importance of an open environment

The Internet has become what it is today because of the open, transparent, bottom-up process used to develop the Internet's protocols and management policies. Everyone is encouraged to participate.

RIR decision making has no barriers to participation. Anyone, including government, can have their say. This is made transparent by public archives of the decision making process, including mailing lists, video, and meeting transcripts.

Community-endorsed Statement (Cont.)

<u>Risks of introducing a parallel address management system</u>

The operational stability, security, and efficiency of the Internet relies on a single consistent address management framework. The introduction of "competing" address management systems is not desired by network operators, and carries the strong risk of fragmenting address management policies, of fragmenting the Internet itself, and of compromising the Internet's security and stability.

<u>Equitable distribution</u>

We note the equitable distribution of addresses is already in place in the current IPv6 management system and addresses are being deployed actively and effectively throughout the world at this time. Each RIR already has the same sized block to distribute to networks within their region.

This community believes there are no exhaustion issues associated with IPv6 and calls on recognised Industry experts to conduct a formal study into projections for IPv6 exhaustion to clarify this.

Community-endorsed Statement (Cont.)

Actions

1. The proposal for a parallel address management system involves significant risks and therefore requires a clear problem statement, complete explanation of its details, and a thorough risk analysis of its consequence. The NAv6 paper satisfies none of these requirements. Therefore, the NAv6 proposal, the paper itself cannot be considered as a substantial basis for discussion at the ITU IPv6 Group's work.

2. We ask the ITU's IPv6 Group follow the example of the Internet community and the IGF process and make its documents and records available publicly, so that all Internet stakeholders can participate in deliberations which could have global ramifications. We ask ITU Member States and Sector Members to recall the Tunis Agenda's call for a multi-stakeholder approach to Internet governance and call on the ITU to support the current multi-stakeholder system of address management.

Thank you