

RIPE

Update about the “SHOULDs Analysing Project” in RIPE Policy Documents

“Should” we use the RFC 2119 Defined Language in RIPE Policy Documents?

Jan Žorž, Random Member of the RIPE Community



What Happened at RIPE 67 in Athens?

- Innocently shared the story that happened to me at the AFRINIC APWG in Zambia about usage of ambiguous SHOULDs in the policy
- Result was a discussion if this is also a problem for RIPE community
- The last question was: “should we use RFC 2119 definitions of language in RIPE policy documents”?

What happened at RIPE 67 in Athens?

- Feedback from the audience was: we must, we must not, we absolutely should (?) 😊
- Gert asked RIPE NCC staff if they could find all ambiguous SHOULDs in our current policy documents
- ...and Marco is here to share his findings



RIPE
NCC

Ambiguous "Shoulds" in RIPE Policies: the RIPE NCC's Findings

Marco Schmidt
Policy Development Officer

“SHOULD This word, or the adjective "RECOMMENDED", mean that there may exist valid reasons in particular circumstances to ignore a particular item, but the full implications must be understood and carefully weighed before choosing a different course.”

“MUST This word, or the terms "REQUIRED" or "SHALL", mean that the definition is an absolute requirement of the specification.”

<https://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc2119.txt>

“IPv4 Address Allocation and Assignment Policies for the RIPE NCC Service Region”

3.1 Confidentiality

*“Internet Registries (IRs) have a duty of confidentiality to their registrants. Information passed to an IR must be securely stored and **should** not be distributed wider than necessary within the IR. When necessary, the information may be passed to a higher-level IR under the same conditions of confidentiality.”*

<http://www.ripe.net/ripe/docs/ripe-606#31>

5.4 Sub-allocations

“Sub-allocations are intended to aid the goal of routing aggregation and can only be made from allocations with a status of "ALLOCATED PA". LIRs holding "ALLOCATED PI" or "ALLOCATED UNSPECIFIED" allocations may be able to convert them to PA allocations if there are no ASSIGNED PI networks within it.

[...]

*LIRs wishing to convert their allocations to PA status **should** contact the RIPE NCC by email at lir-help@ripe.net. [...]*”

<https://www.ripe.net/ripe/docs/ripe-606#54>

7.0 Types of Address Space

*“[...] Clear contractual arrangements are mandatory for PA space. End Users requesting PA space **should** be given this or a similar warning:*

Assignment of this IP space is valid as long as the criteria for the original assignment are met [...]”

<http://www.ripe.net/ripe/docs/ripe-606#7>

7.0 Types of Address Space

*“LIR-PARTITIONED PA: This allows an LIR to document distribution and delegate management of allocated space within their organisation. Address space with a status of LIR-PARTITIONED is not considered used. When the addresses are used, a more specific inetnum **should** be registered.*

*LIR-PARTITIONED PI: This allows an LIR to document distribution and delegate management of allocated space within their organisation. Address space with a status of LIR-PARTITIONED is not considered used. When the addresses are used, a more specific inetnum **should** be registered.”*

<http://www.ripe.net/ripe/docs/ripe-606#7>

4

“IPv6 Address Allocation and Assignment Policy”

7.1 IPv6 Provider Independent (PI) Assignments for LIRs

“[...] Where an LIR has an IPv6 allocation, the LIR must demonstrate the unique routing requirements for the PI assignment.

The LIR must return the IPv6 PI assignment within a period of six months if the original criteria on which the assignment was based are no longer valid.

*If an organisation already received a PI assignment before becoming an LIR, the PI assignment **should** be returned upon receiving an IPv6 allocation if there are no specific routing requirements to justify both.”*

http://www.ripe.net/ripe/docs/ripe-589#IPv6_PI_Assignments_LIR

5

“IPv6 Address Space Policy For Internet Exchange Points”

2.0 Definition

*“There must be a minimum of three ISPs connected and there must be a clear and open policy for others to join. Addresses needed for other purposes (e.g. additional services provided to the members) **should** be acquired through the appropriate means (e.g. an upstream ISP).”*

<http://www.ripe.net/ripe/docs/ripe-606#54>

“IPv6 Addresses for Internet Root Servers In The RIPE Region”

Abstract

*“It is not associated with the organisation(s) that operate the root server at a particular point in time and these organisations **should** not use the address space to provide any services not related to the root server.”*

<http://www.ripe.net/ripe/docs/ripe-233>

7

“Contractual Requirements for Provider Independent Resource Holders in the RIPE NCC Service Region”

2.0 Contractual Responsibilities of End Users and LIRs

*“The preferred model of the RIPE community is for End Users to have contractual relationship with a sponsoring LIR instead of directly with the RIPE NCC. The details of any such contracts are outside the scope of this document. However, at the minimum, all contracts **should** include: [...]”*

<https://www.ripe.net/ripe/docs/ripe-452#20>

“Allocating/Assigning Resources to the RIPE NCC”

2.0 RIPE NCC as a Resource Holder

*“The RIPE NCC as a resource holder **should** fulfil the same basic requirements also expected of normal LIRs, such as returning unused resources.”*

<http://www.ripe.net/ripe/docs/ripe-476>

Solution? Feedback? Next steps?

- All the hard work from RIPE NCC staff is highly appreciated, but we need to find the answer how to proceed
- We might define this as a non-issue and do something else instead...
--- or ---
- We could realize that we need to fix the possible ambiguity to have better policy documents

If “We Don’t Care” is Selected, then...

exit (1)

If Action of Fixing it is Selected...

- We need to find a procedure to change the documents and decide which SHOULDs are in reality ambiguous
- Changing SHOULDs to MUSTs might make the policy more strict
- Consensus from community on which and how
- Maybe some similar procedure as “Cosmetic Surgery Project”? Maybe “Language Clarification Project”?

Questions?