



RIPE NCC
RIPE NETWORK COORDINATION CENTER

Report from the Charging Scheme Task Force 2024

Peter Hessler,
RIPE NCC Charging Scheme Task Force

Background



Following the last two charging scheme consultations with members, the Executive Board decided to form a Charging Scheme Task Force to make recommendation on key issues

The Board wanted to have a task force that represented the diversity of the membership to the extent possible

A call for volunteers was issued in July and the task force was established in August

<https://www.ripe.net/about-us/executive-board/minutes/2024/176th-executive-board-meeting-minutes/>

Objectives of the Task Force



The Task Force has the following objectives:

- Define the principles of a future Charging Scheme
- Propose an improved process for the annual Charging Scheme discussions and adoption

The Task Force will not discuss the RIPE NCC Budget or set any actual fees or prices.

Task Force Members



- Sébastien Brossier
- Alexandru Doszlop
- Ondřej Filip (Executive Board, TF Co-chair)
- Athina Fragkouli (RIPE NCC)
- Carlos Friaças
- Victor Bolaños Guerra
- Simon-Jan Haytink (RIPE NCC)
- Peter Hessler (TF Co-chair)
- Raymond Jetten (Executive Board)
- Alex de Joode
- Ivaylo Josifov
- Ulf Kieber
- Pavel Odintsov
- Cynthia Revström
- Piotr Strzyżewski (Executive Board)
- Alptekin Sünnetçi
- Clara Wade

Meetings Held



Meetings of the task force have taken place on:

- 27 August 2024
- 17 September 2024
- 23 October 2024
- 29 October 2024

The minutes of the meetings are published at:

<https://www.ripe.net/membership/mail/member-and-community-consultations/charging-scheme-task-force-2024/>

The meetings operate under Chatham House Rules.

Members are asked to comment on the minutes on members-discuss and provide their input on discussions



The task force decided to use the recommendations from the 2012 Charging Scheme Task Force as the basis for its discussions.

The RIPE NCC provided details on:

- Other RIR charging schemes, based on the information on their websites
- The tax ruling the RIPE NCC negotiated with the Dutch government
- The processes around legacy resource holders

The task force also took note of related discussions in the Address Policy Working Group on:

- Charging for PI
- Charging for IPv6



Differentiation in membership fees - larger members pay more than smaller members

The task force believes that this principle remains valid

Challenges:

- Tax implications
- Complexity of differentiating fees based on IP resource allocations

Clarifications:

- Under Dutch law, under the current legal structure, members cannot receive more than one vote regardless of fees paid



Differentiation based on category fees rather than individual fees

The task force generally supports the idea of a category-based model.



Membership fees cover all RIPE NCC services

The task force supports the principle that membership fees should cover all activities in the activity plan but remains open to further discussions on the treatment of specific services like transfers and for certain new projects which could require additional fees, subject to approval by the Board.



Sign-up fee

The task force believes that a sign-up fee should remain in place, although it should be to cover the administrative cost of signing up members rather than be a barrier to entry



Charging for IPv6

The consensus is that while the recommendation for 2012 to charge for IPv6 remains valid, the fee structure should be carefully designed to avoid disincentivising IPv6 deployment.

Charging for IPv6 should be approached in a way that supported and encouraged widespread IPv6 deployment, without creating financial hurdles for smaller organisations.

Discussions on how this should be achieved are ongoing.



Charging for independent resources (IPv4 PI, IPv6 PI and ASNs)

The group generally agrees that PI space should be charged separately, with no double charging.

Discussions regarding how ASNs should be charged and whether there should be differentiation based on PI assignment size are ongoing.

Work on Principles and Processes



Legacy space

Discussions around this topic are ongoing.



Charging based on period or specific date

There are no suggestions to change the current approach:

- prorated for allocations
- snapshot of PI/ASN holdings.



Charging based service portfolio and not on RIPE NCC workload

Discussions on this topic are ongoing.



Charging based on age of Internet number resources

The group agreed that including the length of time a member has held resources in the charging model added unnecessary complexity, and in today's market, the duration of resource ownership was no longer relevant.



We plan to submit a final report to the Executive Board by February 2025

The Board will then discuss the report and have a consultation with members

We would very much appreciate input, at this GM but also on the members-discuss list, from the membership on the work of the task force

- Are we progressing as you would expect?
- Do the conclusions we've reached match your expectations?
- Are there factors that we have not considered?



**Questions
& Comments**

