

ANALYSIS OF MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR IPv4 BLOCK ALLOCATION

Introduction

This proposal seeks to establish new requirements for the initial allocation of IPv4 addresses to Internet Service Providers.

Currently, within the area covered by LACNIC, the minimum allocation is that of a /20, equivalent to 16 C-Classes (4096 IPv4 addresses). In keeping with the principle of Internet resources conservation, the existing requirements for approving the minimum allocation are closely related to the volume of the /20 established. Thus, the primary requirement for obtaining a portable IPv4 address block from LACNIC is that the ISP satisfies, among others, one of the following criteria:

- Multihomed ISP – Prove efficient usage of a /22 allocated by its own Internet Service Providers.
- Non-Multihomed ISP – Prove efficient usage of a /21 allocated by its Internet Service Provider.

The matter of reducing the requirements for initial IPv4 address allocation was already presented at LACNIC VI in Montevideo, Uruguay. The justification that was presented was the need to make IPv4 address resources more accessible to small and medium-sized ISPs within the region of Latin America and the Caribbean. A comparison of this policy in other regions was shown, highlighting the cases of APNIC and RIPE where, just as the minimum allocation size, these requirements have been reduced.

PROPOSAL

To reduce the minimum IPv4 address allocation for Internet Service Providers from a /20 to a /21 (8 C-Classes).

This /21 allocation would be an alternative policy for the current policy, already established for the /20, which would remain unmodified. That is to say, an ISP could, according to its needs, opt for the current policy or apply for a /21 under the following criteria.

- Prove usage or immediate necessity of a /23.
- Provide a detailed one-year usage plan for a /22
- Agree to renumber previously allocated space and return those IP addresses to their ISPs no later than 12 months after the allocation of the /21

This proposal does not distinguish between multihomed ISPs and non-multihomed ISPs.

RESULTS OF THE POLICY LIST DISCUSSIONS

This proposal only received expressions of support.