

# APNIC Open Address Policy Meeting

Special Interest Group Session

March 2nd, Korea, Seoul



## Problem Definition

Should it be mandatory to use name-based web hosting where technically feasible?



# Motivation and Background

- Rapid growth of web hosting
  - "Virtual web" or "virtual domain" services now common

- Impact on free pool
  - Potential to rapidly affect rates of IP address consumption



## Motivation and Background

- Implementations of hosting
  - Name based hosting
    - Single IP address assigned to physical server that hosts several virtual hosts
  - IP based hosting
    - Single unique IP address assigned to each virtual host



# Motivation and Background

- Name based hosting
  - Conserves address space
  - Requires
    - Support of "Host:" headers in HTTP requests eg. HTTP1.1 compliant browsers, and some earlier versions eg. IE3+, Netscape 2.0+
  - Technical exceptions
    - SSL certificates
    - Virtual ftp domains with anonymous login
    - Others?



#### **Current Status**

- APNIC
  - IP based hosting
    - Use of > /22 requires submission of URL and IP address list OR registration in APNIC database
    - Use of < /22 verification in infrastructure</li>
  - Name-based hosting
    - Verification in infrastructure (APNIC-065)
  - APNIC does not require name-based hosting, but strongly encourages it



### Current Status

#### ARIN

- Both IP and name-based hosting
  - List of IP addresses and corresponding URL

#### RIPE NCC

- Similar to APNIC but
  - Need to renumber to name-based when capable browsers widely deployed
  - After community feedback considering to promote name-based hosting as requirement



- Most APNIC members
  - Do name-based hosting
  - Rarely use more than a /22 for IP based
- Limitation for name-based
  - E-commerce/SSL increase
    - May change with new HTTP/1.1 upgrades to TLS
    - draft-ietf-tls-http-upgrade-05.txt
  - E-commerce is increasing with virtually hosted sites



#### Recommendations

- Monitor
  - Growth of IP-based hosting and SSL usage
  - Technical developments through community feedback
- No change
  - Name-based hosting not mandatory
  - May need to redefine current policy regarding acceptable threshold (/22)