

AfriNIC-IPv6 as a criteria in IPv4 Soft Landing - AFPUB-2026-v6-001-DRAFT02

IPv6 as a criteria in IPv4 Soft Landing			
ID:	AF PUB-2026-v6-001-DRAFT02	Date Submitted:	14 nd June 2026
Author:	Jordi Palet Martinez jordi.palet at theipv6company.com The IPv6 Company	Version:	2.0
Obsoletes:		Amends:	CPM

1. Summary of the problem being addressed by this proposal

Current deployment of IPv6 in AFRINIC service region is very low compared with other parts of the world, despite the continuous efforts undertaken by AFRINIC.

Data from APNIC Labs:

- Average IPv6 World capability 44% (including Africa)
 - 37%-51% depending on the region, about 50 countries exceed 50%)
- Africa IPv6 World capability 6%
 - Only 8 countries exceed 20%, 15 countries 10-19%, 15 countries below 1%

At the same time, AFRINIC is under the Soft Landing policy, Phase 2 since 2020 and since then, 3 million IPv4 addresses have been recovered.

The Soft Landing policy restricts the requests of IPv4 addresses, and despite that, it has not clearly proven an increase of the IPv6 deployment, so it looks like further measures need to be enforced towards giving a strong push on that direction, aligned with the Soft Landing policy.

Community discussions often come back to the same question: Should we mandate IPv6 deployment for new IPv4 requests? It seems there is no plausible reason for not doing so.

1. Summary of how this proposal addresses the problem

This proposal adds a paragraph to the existing Soft Landing policy in order to enforce IPv6 deployment for those requesting new IPv4 resources, regardless of being an initial or subsequent request.

3. Proposal

Amend article 5.4.4 of the CPM, as follows:

Current	Proposed
5.4.4 For any LIR or End User requesting IPv4 address space during the Exhaustion	5.4.4 For any LIR or End User requesting IPv4 address space during the Exhaustion

There is no explicit limit on the number of times an organization may request additional IPv4 address space during the Exhaustion Period.

There is no explicit limit on the number of times an organization may request additional IPv4 address space during the Exhaustion Period.

Any IPv4 request must be done with a simultaneous IPv6 request if the requesting party does not already have IPv6 space.

Regardless of if the IPv6 requests was already done previously or simultaneously with the IPv4 request, the relevant allocation/assignment criteria conditions must be met.

In addition, a coherent IPv6 deployment and addressing plan, must be presented clearly showing how will be met:

1. 6.5.1.1.3 and 6.5.1.1.4, in the case of LIRs.
2. 6.8.2.2.d, in the case of end-users.

The IPv6 deployment plan must show the actual IPv4 top-25 traffic destinations of that network. For each of those external destinations that are IPv6-enabled, the following minimum IPv6 % will be considered as compliant:

	• 25% in a maximum of 12 months. • 50% in a maximum of 24 months. • 75% in a maximum of 48 months. In case of networks hosting any kind of services, applications or contents, will be considered as compliant when matching the following % of AAAA RRs available and IPv6 reachable from Internet: • 25% in a maximum of 12 months. • 75% in a maximum of 24 months. • 95% in a maximum of 48 months. Failure to comply with the IPv6 deployment plan according to the relevant criteria, constitutes a policy violation.
--	---

4. Revision History

Date	Details
22 nd May 2026	Version 1: AFPUB-2026-v6-001-DRAFT01 Initial Draft Posted to RPD
14 th June 2026	Version 2: AFPUB-2026-v6-001-DRAFT02 Updated following RPD discussion

5. References

In other regions, all IPv4 addresses have been exhausted and it seems that the equivalent to the soft-landing is not any more an issue, because most of the existing members only can access IPv4 addresses via transfers. Some of them have waiting lists,

ARIN has a dedicated IPv4 pool (NRPM 4.10.) to facilitate IPv6 deployment, which only can be used for specific IPv6 deployment needs.

In LACNIC, a request for IPv4 must be accompanied by an IPv6 request (if it was not already done for that member). This was already part of the IPv4 policy even before the equivalent to the “Soft Landing” policy.

There are some other exceptions, like for example the mandatory deployment of IPv6 in IXPs.