1) GROUP'S DECISION AS TO WHETHER OR NOT THERE SHOULD BE AN ALLOCATION WINDOW POLICY.

This group agrees with the existence of an allocation window policy that is applicable only to Ipv4 allocations.

Likewise, we consider that Ipv4 numbering space is becoming scarcer every day, and therefore this policy should tend to be less flexible and promote the use of protocols such as Network Address Translation (NAT) that allow a more efficient usage of IP numbering space.

2) PROPOSAL ON WHICH THE GROUP REACHED CONSENSUS

This workgroup did not reach any consensus.

3) ASPECTS ON WHICH THE GROUP DID NOT REACH CONSENSUS

a. To what type of Ipv4 blocks should this policy be applicable: This policy shall only be applicable to Ipv4 numbering blocks that have been allocated by LACNIC.

b. The allocation window policy must include control of Ipv4 numbering block allocation by means of using the Network Address Translation (NAT) protocol. It is publicly known that, years ago when it was realized that IP numbering space was becoming scarce due to Internet's growth rate, IETF began working on a series of alternatives, one of which was Network Address Translation (NAT), which would focus on the creation of a work environment where there would be a much more efficient use of IP numbering space (through the use of private numbering resources when working within the same network and through translation of private numbering to public numbering when exchanging information with other networks connected through Internet) and also to simplify the transition from the Ipv4 to the Ipv6 numbering plan, plan that is the result of the problem of the scarcity of IP numbering among other reasons.

Finally, due to the fact that NAT is a protocol created by IETF with the specified aim of making Ipv4 numbering usage more efficient, and considering that LACNIC is responsible for administering Ipv4 numbering resources within the region, it should promote the use of this protocol in its allocation policies. Therefore, the easiest way to do this is controlling that beneficiaries receiving IP block allocations from LACNIC use this protocol when reallocating the IP numbering space they have been allocated.

c. What Ipv4 block sizes shall be analyzed under the allocation window policy?
In relation to this issue the proposal is to reduce to /25 the IP block size that requires LACNIC's approval before being reallocated.

Currently it is required that /23 IP block allocations made by beneficiaries of Ipv4 block allocations must be approved by LACNIC before they become effective. This means that allocations greater than or equal to 2 class C networks require LACNIC's approval. However, experience shows that very few users actually justify the allocation of an IP block this size from an ISP within the region.

Another issue that must be considered is that currently in practice ISPs, in order to reallocate their IP numbering, subnet them in /25, /26, /27, /28, /29, /30 and /32 blocks, with most of their allocations grouped about allocations ranging in size from /26 to /32 blocks.

Finally, we believe that allocations greater than /25 are generally made by ISPs that have large amounts of IP blocks, and sometimes these organizations are not aware of the scarcity of IP numbering space because for them it is very abundant, or by ISPs that because of user pressure or market pressure are forced to make allocations of this size, transforming the IP numbering resource into added value for their commercial products.

Consequently, in order to make the policy more effective, window size must be reduced to /25, whereby all IP blocks with a size equivalent to one half of a class C network(128 IP numbers)must require prior approval on the part of LACNIC before they can be reallocated.

d. Future allocation of IP blocks and compliance with the allocation window policy
The proposal indicates that for future allocations the applicant shall regularize their situation by requesting LACNIC's approval of all existing suballocations of IP blocks longer than or equal to /25.
Once this revision is complete, the applicant may receive from LACNIC an approval or a non-approval for a maximum of five cases presented before being considered a valid candidate for a new allocation.

e. Publishing IP blocks assigned within the framework of the allocation window policy on LACNIC's WHOIS database. All IP block allocations made under the allocation window policy shall be published in LACNIC's WHOIS database.

f. Variable size of the allocation window.
The proposed policy does not consider variable size, furthermore, managing a fixed window size is considered more transparent and effective.

4) PROPOSED STRATEGY

The proposed strategy is that those issues on which the group did not reach consensus be revised at the forum in order to determine whether they are approved or not.

5) REPORTING MEMBER IN SANTIAGO (CHILE)

The group's reporting member is yet to be determined.