

IP Neo-colonialism: Geo-auditing RIR Address Registrations

Robert Beverly
CMAND
rbeverly@cmand.org

ABSTRACT

Allocation of the global IP address space is under the purview of IANA, who distributes management responsibility among five geographically distinct Regional Internet Registries (RIRs). Each RIR is empowered to bridge technical (e.g., address uniqueness and aggregatability) and policy (e.g., contact information and IP scarcity) requirements unique to their region. While different RIRs have different policies for out-of-region address use, little prior systematic analysis has studied *where* addresses are used post-allocation.

In this preliminary work, we e IPv4 prefix registrations across the five RIRs (50k total prefixes) and utilize the Atlas distributed active measurement infrastructure to geolocate prefixes at RIR-region granularity. We define a taxonomy of registration “geo-consistency” by comparing a prefixes’ inferred physical location to the allocating RIR’s coverage region as well as the registered organization’s location. We then apply this methodology and taxonomy to audit the geo-consistency of 10k random IPv4 prefix allocations within each RIR (50k total prefixes). While we find registry information to largely be consistent with our geolocation inferences, we show that some RIRs have a non-trivial fraction of prefixes that are used both outside of the RIR’s region and outside of the registered organization’s region. A better understanding of such discrepancies can increase transparency for the community and inform ongoing discussions over in-region address use and policy.

1 INTRODUCTION

To ensure the global uniqueness of public Internet Protocol (IP) addresses, the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) allocates large contiguous blocks of addresses to Regional Internet Registries (RIRs) who then further suballocate within their respective geographic region. In addition to this coordination, the RIRs strive to make allocations efficient such that the space is well-utilized; this is especially important in IPv4 where addresses are a scarce resource. Indeed, with the advent of IPv4 address exhaustion [23], IPv4 addresses have become a valuable commodity [22].

Assignments, allocations, and reassignments are governed by RIR policies that are designed to provide uniqueness, efficiency, and accountability. There are five RIRs, each of which serves a different geographical region of the world.

The purpose of regional delegation is explicitly codified by IANA: “RIRs are established and authorized by respective regional communities, and recognized by the IANA to serve and represent large geographical regions” [5].

While prior work has examined inter-RIR address transfers that are logged and public [18], there has been little systematic effort to understand the true physical location and region where addresses are advertised once allocated. Our goal is to: i) increase transparency and help the community better understand where addresses are being used; ii) quantify the extend to which registry information is accurate and can serve operational needs; and iii) inform ongoing discussion and debate over out-of-region address use and policy, e.g., [3, 12, 13, 26, 27].

Therefore, in this work we examine the IPv4 assignments of the five RIRs and characterize the countries and regions of the organizations to which addresses are given. We then use a distributed active measurement platform with multiple nodes in each region to perform region-granularity geolocation. We define a taxonomy of registration geo “consistency” by comparing a prefixes’ inferred physical location to the allocating RIR’s coverage region as well as the registered organization’s location. Our contributions include:

- (1) Macro-characterization of the registered IP addresses across the five RIRs, including prefix granularity, inter-regional registration, and pathologies.
- (2) A taxonomy of prefix registration geo-consistency.
- (3) An active measurement campaign to determine whether prefixes are used in a physical location consistent with the RIR’s region and registered organization’s country.
- (4) A case study of address registration inconsistency.
- (5) Public availability of code and measurement data without restriction to facilitate reproducibility.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. We provide background on IP address allocation and RIRs along with related work in §2. Next we characterize the prefix registration information in the RIRs in §3. We then present our methodology for geo-auditing IP allocations in §4 and preliminary results in §5. Finally, we conclude with suggestions for future research.

Table 1: NRO Comparative Policy Overview: membership and out-of-region policies across RIRs [21]

ARIN	<i>“To receive resources, ARIN requests organizations to verify that it plans on using the resources within the ARIN region”</i>
RIPE	<i>“The network that will be using the resources must have an active element located in the RIPE NCC service region”</i>
APNIC	<i>“permits account holders located within the APNIC service region to use APNIC-delegated resources out of region”</i>
LACNIC	<i>“requires organizations to be legally present and have network infrastructure in the LACNIC service region to apply for and receive resources”</i>
AFRINIC	<i>“requires organizations/persons to be legally present and the infrastructure from which the services are originating must be located in the AFRINIC service region”</i>

2 BACKGROUND

Internet Protocol (IP) addresses are fundamental to the Internet’s operation. The Internet numbers registry system has three primary goals for IP addresses: 1) allocation pool management; 2) hierarchical allocation; and 3) registration accuracy [9]. The IP address hierarchy is rooted in the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) which is managed by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) organization. RFC 1366 first proposed to geographically distribute the registry functionality [8]. Today IANA allocates large (i.e., /8), unique blocks of IP address space to the Regional Internet Registries (RIRs), of which there are currently five: ARIN (North America), RIPE (Europe), APNIC (Asia and Pacific), LACNIC (Latin America), or AFRINIC (Africa). This distribution affords autonomy to the different RIRs to consider region-specific geopolitical policies and constraints.

Each RIR maintains registration information, including for example the assigned organization, mailing address, and points of contact, for numbered resources (Figure 1 provides an example). Accurate registration information is important to the operation and management of the highly distributed and autonomous Internet. Registry information is exposed via a public directory service known as “whois [7]”.

Portions of address allocations are frequently assigned to end-users, e.g., an ISP’s customer. Registries such as ARIN require the reassignment of prefixes of /29 or more addresses to be registered via a directory services system such as Shared Whois (SWIP) within seven days [1, 28]. Thus, the registered prefixes are both frequently small and up-to-date.

2.1 Motivation

As noted in the ARIN Number Resource Policy Manual: “The primary role of RIRs is to manage and distribute public Internet address space within their respective regions” [5]. However, RIRs must balance efficient and equitable use of IP

NetHandle:	NET-104-148-63-0-1
OrgID:	C05266659
Parent:	NET-104-148-0-0-1
NetName:	WEB-OMEGA-DO-BRASIL
NetRange:	104.148.63.0 - 104.148.63.255
OrgID:	C05266659
OrgName:	Web Omega do Brasil
Street:	Rua do Xareu, qd 13, lote 20
City:	Goiania
State/Prov:	GO
Country:	BR

Figure 1: Example whois prefix registration record from ARIN. The corresponding OrgID record includes the organization’s country code (BR). Brazil is in the region of a different RIR, LACNIC.

addresses with the true need for addresses, as well as real-world operational constraints. Further, the different RIRs have *different* policies with respect to out-of-region address use; Table 1 summarizes pertinent policies from NRO’s Comparative Policy Overview [21].

ARIN, for instance, requires requests for address allocations to be motivated by need within their service region, however subsequent use outside of the region is permitted. APNIC explicitly allows out-of-region use without restriction. However, AFRINIC has a more restrictive policy that requires use in-region. Indeed, significant debate and even legal action has been the result of AFRINIC actions to enforce in-region address use [3, 12, 13, 26, 27].

In recognition of these complexities, we focus on increasing transparency by uncovering out-of-region address use that can only be uncovered via measurement. We further take a conservative view of out-of-region use by considering both the allocating RIR and the registered organization’s location, and identifying instances where registrations are geoinconsistent. Our goal is thus to help the community better understand where addresses are being used post-allocation, whether registration information is accurate and can serve operational needs, and inform ongoing discussion over in-region address use and policy.

2.2 Related Work

While the present work focuses on IPv4 addresses, the whois protocol is also used to register contact information for domain names, e.g., by domain name registrars for various portions of the DNS namespace. Significant prior work has examined domain names and their associated registration information. Liu et al. show that the domain name registry information does not follow a consistent schema, and devise robust parsing techniques using statistical models [17]. We similarly find idiosyncrasies in the conventions used by different RIRs, but with only five RIRs, are able to manage these complications using fairly straightforward rules.

Prior work shows that domain names are frequently used for abusive or malicious purposes and registration behavior can be indicative of such misuse [15]. Lauinger et al. analyze the re-registration of domain names after their expiration and show how attackers can leverage residual trust by capturing these expired domains [14]. More recently, Lu et al. dive into whois in the era of GDPR to better understand domain registration privacy [20]. Although these prior works all utilize whois registration data, they all focus on domain names rather than IP address block allocations.

The scarcity of IP addresses has created markets where addresses can be transferred and sold as a commodity. Livadariu analyzed transfers published by the RIRs to characterize the size of prefixes and their eventual use as evidenced in the global BGP table [18, 19]. In contrast, we focus on understanding the true location where addresses are used, and whether these locations are within or outside of the regions for which the corresponding registry is responsible. While unofficial “under-the-table” transfers where the correct location and registry information is not properly updated may explain some of the location inconsistencies we discover, we leave causal analysis to future work.

3 PREFIX REGISTRATION ANALYSIS

We use raw dumps of the IPv4 registration databases as of April, 2023 from all five RIRs using their “bulk whois” facility; this removes any dependence on the public whois interface and ensures that we obtain the complete data [4]. These data are flat text files containing records that consist of key-value pairs, e.g., “NetRange” and “OrgID” in Figure 1. Each RIR’s database has different schemas and idiosyncrasies, these include for example the address prefix representation, different key names, transferred prefixes, and prefixes from other RIRs. We parse each prefix allocation, skip prefixes the RIR does not manage (but still has listed in their database for completeness e.g., with a “not-managed-by” note), and map organization entries to prefixes. This organizational mapping allows us to tie a prefix registration’s “OrgID” to




Figure 2: Distribution of registered IPv4 prefixes per RIR as a function of prefix length.

the country of the registered organization corresponding to that identifier.

We ignore pathologies in the RIR data, the most common of which are circular references. For example, an RIR may list a prefix as transferred to a different RIR, while that RIR lists the same prefix as belonging to the original RIR. While these types of errors could be due to time differences in the data dumps, the “Updated” timestamps on the records suggest they are simply errors that we cannot resolve.

In total, we find over 8M prefix registrations across the five RIRs, representing a significantly more granular allocation than exists in the global BGP table. Note that our goal is not to compare RIR and BGP allocations, but rather to emphasize that prefixes within the RIRs are significantly more fine-grained. Figure 2 depicts the cumulative fraction of prefixes as a function of the prefix mask across the RIRs. We see that nearly 90% of the registered prefixes within ARIN, RIPE and APNIC have a prefix length of /25 or greater, suggesting active use of SWIP. In contrast, a larger proportion of registered prefixes within AFRINIC and LACNIC are larger (smaller mask).

3.1 Inter-region Registration

We note that it is not uncommon for a registry to allocate a prefix to an organization that is outside of the RIR’s region. For example, a prefix P belongs to an address block allocated to ARIN, but the registered organization within the ARIN database has a physical address in Great Britain. In this case, the organization’s country belongs to RIPE – a different RIR. Figure 1 provides one such example whois record.

Indeed, as part of an effort to ensure flexibility and efficient use of addresses, out of region registrations are permitted by RIR policies under certain conditions. For instance, the ARIN Number Resource Policy Manual (NRPM) [5] explicitly states that “ARIN registered resources may be used outside the ARIN service region... provided that the applicant has a real and substantial connection with the ARIN region.”




Figure 3: Inter-region registrations: proportions of prefixes (left) and addresses (right) allocated by an RIR to an organization with a physical address in a region for which a different RIR is responsible.

Table 2: RIR prefix registration macro-statistics

RIR	Prefixes (k)	Out-region Prefixes (k)	Addresses (/24s)	Out-Region Addresses (/24s)
ARIN	3,109.8	77.3 (2.5%)	5,491,682	128,546 (2.3%)
RIPE	3,556.7	29.8 (0.8%)	2,925,866	50,579 (1.7%)
APNIC	1,150.8	2.7 (0.2%)	9,136,159	14,327 (0.2%)
LACNIC	66.5	0.3 (0.5%)	251,088	651 (0.3%)
AFRINIC	148.5	21.1 (14.2%)	486,456	23,601 (4.9%)
Total:	8,032.3	131.3	18,291,251	217,705

Other RIRs have similar policies, and quantitatively define the requirements for out-of-region use (e.g., at least a /22 used in region and an in-region peering session).

Table 2 provides a macro-level analysis of the number of prefixes (in thousands) in each RIR, as well as the fraction of prefixes and addresses (in /24 equivalents) registered to out-of-region organizations. Note that the sum of all addresses across the RIRs is larger than the total IPv4 address space – this is due to overlap between prefixes within different RIRs. For example, AFRINIC is responsible for 154.0.0.0/8, however ARIN has a registered allocation of 154.1.0.0/16 (for the company Goldman Sachs).

ARIN has an appreciable fraction (2.5%) of prefixes with out-of-region registered organizations, and dominates in total volume of both out-of-region registered prefixes and addresses. Given the long history of ARIN and efforts to redistribute addresses, this finding is not wholly unsurprising.

However, AFRINIC is the most recently formed registry (2004). More than 14% of AFRINIC prefixes are allocated to out-of-region organizations, suggesting significant apparent involvement of organizations outside of Africa and possibly use of these resources outside of Africa (a hypothesis we

test in the next section). Similarly, AFRINIC leads in out-of-region registrations when accounting by total IP addresses (4.9%).

Figure 3 provides a Sankey diagram of the inter-region registration activity. Most of the out-of-region AFRINIC registrations are from organizations in Asia and America. Interestingly, approximately the same number of ARIN prefixes are allocated to European organizations as RIPE prefixes are allocated to American organizations.

4 PREFIX REGISTRATION GEO-AUDIT

Having examined the information available for prefixes in the RIRs, we next turn to validating the corresponding location information. Figure 4 provides an overview of the geo-audit methodology. There are three primary components to our methodology: 1) ingesting RIR prefixes into a database; 2) active ICMP probing, including selecting the origin vantage point and destination targets within prefixes; and 3) delay-based RIR inferences. Important supporting components of this high-level methodology include:

- **Mapping countries to RIRs:** As a first step, we require a mapping between countries, and their corresponding ISO country codes, to the responsible RIR. Using publicly available information for each registry, we manually map 244 different countries (including dependent territories with their own ISO code) to the five RIRs. ARIN, RIPE, APNIC, LACNIC, and AFRINIC are each currently responsible for 29, 73, 54, 31, and 57 countries respectively.
- **Prefix handling:** Throughout this work, we respect IP prefixes and their properties. We construct a radix trie on the registered prefixes such that we can perform longest prefix matching of an address to its corresponding registered prefix. Further, when computing statistics, we take




Figure 4: RIR Geo-audit methodology. ~8M prefixes are ingested into a database and, with a global IPv4 hitlist, used to drive the probing logic (what target and what vantage points). RIPE Atlas performs active probes used to make delay-based RIR inferences.




Figure 5: Regional prefix geolocation using RIPE Atlas nodes for active measurement. Three different nodes within each RIR’s region (total of 15 nodes) help infer whether a target prefix is within the assigned region. An additional five nodes in the country of the prefix’s registered organization seek to determine whether the registration is consistent with the RIR responsible for that country. If the inferred geolocation matches *either* the responsible RIR or the RIR of the organization, we call the registration “consistent.”

into account subnetting and prefix aggregation such that presented address statistics do not double or over count.

- **Target addresses:** To perform delay-based active IP geolocation, our method requires a responsive address within a prefix. We utilize the January 2023 data of a popular Internet-wide IPv4 hitlist for this purpose [2]. The hitlist includes a score for each address; to obtain address likely to respond, we filter the hitlist to only use address with a score above 99. We then longest-prefix map IPv4 hitlist addresses to their respective RIR prefix to generate candidate targets within fine-grained RIR prefixes for active probing.
- **Active Probing:** To perform delay-based IP geolocation, we require vantage points within the country where the prefix is registered. For this purpose, we utilize the rich coverage afforded by the RIPE Atlas project [6]. As of this writing, Atlas has over 43k “probes” (vantage points) with coverage in over 87% of all world countries [24]. Each

Atlas probe includes meta-data with its physical country location. We discuss limitations of latency-based IP geolocation and how we minimize their effects in §4.1.

- **Anycast:** A potential source of error in our geo-audit is anycast [25] wherein a prefix is advertised and reachable from multiple geographic regions. We therefore utilize the current state-of-the-art “AnyCatch” technique and public service [11]. AnyCatch runs its own anycast instance, and issues ICMP probes from different physical locations. If the target is itself not anycast, the ICMP responses should take the single shortest path back to a single instance in the AnyCatch network. However, if the target is anycast, the responses will return to different nodes within AnyCatch. We ignore and do not geo-audit any prefixes that are known to be anycast.

After identifying a likely responsive target within a prefix to geo-audit, we instruct Atlas to issue ICMP measurements from 20 different vantage points as depicted in Figure 5: three

Table 3: Our geo-audit results in one of five possible outcomes; the first two outcomes reflect *consistency* with the registered prefix, while the remaining three results indicate a form of *inconsistency*. We provide an example of each result scenario for clarity.

Result	Description	Example		
		RIR_{Reg}	RIR_{Org}	RIR_{Geo}
(FC) Fully Geo-consistent	Geolocates in RIR and organization’s region	ARIN	ARIN	ARIN
(OC) Organization Geo-consistent	Geolocates outside of RIR region, but within organization’s region	RIPE	ARIN	ARIN
(OI) Organization Geo-inconsistent	Geolocates in RIR’s region, but organization is out-of-region	ARIN	RIPE	ARIN
(RI) Registry Geo-inconsistent	RIR and organization’s region consistent, but geolocates out-of-region	ARIN	ARIN	RIPE
(FI) Fully Geo-inconsistent	RIR, organization, and geolocation all in different regions	ARIN	RIPE	APNIC




Figure 6: Classification: Given a prefix allocated by RIR_{Reg} , with an organization in RIR_{Org} , we determine the RIR corresponding to the prefixes’ inferred geolocation RIR_{Geo} (§4.1). We then compare the three RIR’s to classify the prefix as either: (FC) Fully Geo-consistent; (OC) Organization Geo-consistent; (OI) Organization Geo-inconsistent; (RI) Registry Geo-inconsistent; or (FI) Fully Geo-inconsistent.

(3) vantages within the region of each of the five (5) RIRs, and five (5) vantages within the country to which the prefix is registered. Each measurement is a one-off measurement, public, and tagged to preserve the measurement artifact. We then asynchronously fetch results from Atlas and insert them into our database.

4.1 Delay-based RIR Inference

As detailed previously in §3.1, the organization to which a prefix is allocated may have a mailing address outside of the RIR that manages the prefix’s supernet. For a prefix P allocated to organization Org by RIR_{Reg} , where the contact information for Org lists an address in country CC , we define three important audit values: RIR_{Reg} is the RIR in which the prefix is registered; RIR_{Org} is the RIR responsible for CC , and RIR_{Geo} is the RIR for P based on delay-based geolocation.

From the 20 different vantages, Atlas performs 3 ICMP echo requests to the target. Among the responses (up to 60 ICMP echo replies) we find the vantage returning the

minimum RTT to the target. We then set RIR_{Geo} according to the RIR responsible for the country in which this Atlas node is located. Note that while latency-based geolocation has been shown to be inaccurate for precision geolocation, conversely it provides a much higher degree of accuracy at the country-level [10]. In this work, we use latency-based geolocation at an even coarser granularity – continents and RIR regions. Further, we conservatively rely on latencies to show that resources are *not* in a particular RIR region.

4.2 Taxonomy of Prefix Registration Geo-Consistency

Given these three audit values, where each can be one of five different RIRs, there are five different possible inferences; table 3 summarizes these possibilities and provides an example for each. A “Fully Geo-consistent” result is one where the registered RIR, RIR of the organization’s country code, and the RIR of the nearest Atlas probe all match. A “Organization Geo-consistent” result is one where the prefix’s RIR is different than the RIR of the organization’s mailing address, but the inferred geolocation matches the organization’s country code RIR. These first two results indicate that the prefix is geo-consistent – i.e., that the audit passes.

The three remaining results show some form of unexpected inconsistency. For instance “Organization Geo-inconsistent” occurs when our inferred RIR geolocation matches the RIR of the prefix, but not the organization’s responsible RIR. Or, the inferred geolocation may indicate an RIR different from both the registered RIR and registered country code RIR, but the registrations belong to the same RIR, a result we term “Registry Geo-inconsistent.” Finally, if all three values are different, we term the result “Fully Geo-inconsistent.” Algorithm 1 in Appendix A provides the inference pseudocode in additional detail.

5 GEO-AUDIT RESULTS

In this preliminary work, we randomly select 10k prefixes from each of the five RIRs for geo-audit. Thus, we instruct Atlas to send 3M ICMP echo requests (50k x 20 vantages x 3 packets) over a 10 day period from May 7-17, 2023. For

Result	Prefixes
Fully Geo-consistent	42,270 (93.9%)
Organization Geo-consistent	1,001 (2.2%)
Organization Geo-inconsistent	120 (0.3%)
Registry Geo-inconsistent	1,527 (3.4%)
Fully Geo-inconsistent	114 (0.3%)
Anycast	18

Table 4: Aggregate Geo-audit Results

transparency and reproducibility, all 50k of our measurement result sets are publicly available from Atlas and easily found via the “neo-ip-20230517” tag. Each measurement’s meta-data encodes the RIR prefix, date, and other relevant information.

Among these 50k prefixes, we classify 44,936 according to the method of Figure 6 and taxonomy of Table 3. We ignore 18 prefixes that belonged to a known anycast network. For the remaining 5k prefixes, our active probing was unable to elicit enough responses (e.g., due to firewall filters blocking ICMP probes, or a non-responsive target in the hitlist) from the target to make a reliable inference. Table 4 presents the aggregate geo-audit results, while Figure 7 shows the per-RIR classification distribution.

We observe that, as a relative proportion of the prefixes audited, the registry information is largely consistent: overall 96.1% are either fully or organization geo-consistent. RIPE exhibits the most consistency (over 99.2%). APNIC and LACNIC are also highly consistent, while ARIN is measurably lower, but still mostly consistent (95.9%). Further, AFRINIC exhibits markedly less geo-consistency with only 81.3% of the prefixes we audit being fully consistent and more than 10% are inferred to reside outside of the region. AFRINIC also leads in fully geo-inconsistent prefixes (nearly 1%).

Delving into the inconsistencies, we find that the primary contributor (approximately 75%) to ARIN geo-consistencies are prefixes that our audit shows to be in Mexico. Conversely, over 50% of the LACNIC geo-inconsistencies are prefixes that are physically in the United States. The geolocation of geo-inconsistent AFRINIC prefixes is strongly dominated by Europe, but also with an appreciable number of prefixes that geolocate to ARIN and APNIC countries..

5.1 Case Study

As an example of registration inconsistency, we present just one instance discovered during our RIR geo-audit. As part of our measurements, our methodology selected a target address in the prefix 144.24.0.0/16. While IANA delegates responsibility for the /8 prefix to which this belongs to ARIN, the /16 was transferred to RIPE in 2004 as part of the Early




Figure 7: Per-RIR geo-audit results: Over 96% of classified prefixes are fully or organization consistent (FC and OC). RIPE is the most consistent, while AFRINIC the least with more than 10% registration inconsistent (RI). Further, AFRINIC leads in fully inconsistent (FI) prefixes.

Registration Transfer Project (ERX). The intent of ERX was to transfer management of address space registration that pre-dated the creation of the other regional registries to “the applicable RIR according to the region in which the resource holders reside.” [16]

The RIPE registration for this prefix lists the prefix description as “Oracle Corp UK,” with a mailing address in Great Britain, while the responsible organization is “Oracle Svendska AB,” with a mailing address in Sweden. Our probe logic instructed Atlas to send ICMP echo requests from 20 different vantage points on May 12, 2023. Because the registration lists a UK mailing address, the algorithm selected five Atlas probes in Great Britain. However, among the five responses to the Great Britain nodes the minimum RTT to the target was 129ms – a latency that would be surprisingly high if the target were also in Great Britain.

The logic further selected three probes in Kenya that produced a minimum RTT of 258ms, indicating that the target is likely not in Africa. Similarly, the logic chose Brazil to test for presence in the LACNIC region, and Korea for the APNIC region. It further sent probes from Germany to test whether it was anywhere in the RIPE region, however the German probes returned a minimum RTT of 149ms, a value even larger than found for the Great Britain probes. Last, our logic selected probes in Canada to test the ARIN region, which produced a minimum RTT of 71ms. Among the 20 probes the Canadian probe produced the lowest RTT. Upon further refinement, nodes in the US produced even smaller RTTs and we found via additional probing a minimum RTT of 14ms using a probe in the state of Arizona. Oracle runs a

Table 5: Per-RIR geo-audit results.

Result	RIR				
	ARIN	RIPE	APNIC	LACNIC	AFRINIC
Fully Geo-consistent	8,614 (94.7%)	8,883 (98.1%)	8,893 (98.1%)	8,641 (97.0%)	7,239 (81.3%)
Organization Geo-consistent	107 (1.2%)	96 (1.1%)	49 (0.5%)	71 (0.8%)	678 (7.6%)
Organization Geo-inconsistent	77 (0.8%)	22 (0.2%)	20 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)
Registry Geo-inconsistent	290 (3.2%)	39 (0.4%)	99 (1.1%)	189 (2.1%)	910 (10.2%)
Fully Geo-inconsistent	8 (0.1%)	18 (0.2%)	5 (0.1%)	4 (0.0%)	79 (0.9%)

hosting center in the Phoenix, AZ area, and we are confident that the prefix is neither physically present in Great Britain, Sweden, or Europe.

Per our audit rules, the algorithm labeled this prefix as “registry geo-inconsistent:” while the mailing addresses of the registrant are in Europe and therefore are under the purview of RIPE, the geo-location is elsewhere. It is unclear why this organization is using address space managed by RIPE and registered to the European branch of the company to number resources that are physically in the United States.

5.2 Limitations

There are several potential limitations with our methodology. First, we may be unable to find an ICMP-responsive target within a particular prefix, which prevents an active measurement location audit. Second, Atlas may have no probe vantages within the country where a prefix is registered. If we are unable to obtain in-country results, we conservatively make no audit determination.

Third, the reported location of the Atlas nodes may be incorrect. While Atlas introduces a small amount (1km) of error into the location of probes, this error will not materially affect our inferences. However, the probe may be in a physically incorrect location. We attempt to mitigate an erroneously located probe by requesting five different in-country probes; since we take the minimum RTT, a probe incorrectly listed as in-country will simply be ignored for the purposes of computing the region. Nonetheless, to ensure the reliability of our inferences, we performed a second “refinement” round of probing wherein we re-measured with different in-country probes those prefixes where we found geo inconsistencies. This second-round of probing did not alter our findings, hence we believe our geo-inferences to be largely correct.

Finally, we focus exclusively on IPv4 registrations and leave analysis of IPv6 to future work.

6 CONCLUSIONS

This work takes the first steps towards understanding the geographic allocation and use of IPv4 addresses. In future work,

we plan to geo-audit all ~8M prefix registrations and extend the survey to audit IPv6 allocations. The long history of RIRs and inter-RIR transfers suggests that the older RIRs may have an accumulation of inaccuracies, while AFRINIC’s legacy of colonialism and connectivity via Europe may in part explain some of the inconsistencies we see. This initial work seeks only to measure inconsistencies – going forward, we wish to engage with the RIRs to validate and better understand the causes for the inconsistencies we uncover

We hope these results can meaningfully contribute to the important policy and technical discussions surrounding IP address allocation, as well as highlight areas where RIRs may wish to work with their constituent membership to improve registration accuracy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank RIPE for maintaining the Atlas measurement infrastructure. John Curran, Thomas Krenc, Anita Nikolich, and Eric Rye provided invaluable early feedback.

REFERENCES

- [1] 1998. Shared WHOIS Project (SWIP). <https://ftp.ripe.net/ripe/inaddr/arin-templates/swipinstruction.txt>.
- [2] 2023. ISI Internet Census IPv4 Hitlist. <https://ant.isi.edu/datasets/all.html>.
- [3] AFRINIC. 2023. AFRINIC Litigation FAQ. <https://afrinic.net/litigation-faq>.
- [4] ARIN. 2023. Bulk Whois Data. <https://www.arin.net/reference/research/bulkwhois/>.
- [5] ARIN. 2023. Number Resource Policy Manual. <https://www.arin.net/participate/policy/nrpm/>.
- [6] Vaibhav Bajpai and Jürgen Schönwälder. 2015. A survey on internet performance measurement platforms and related standardization efforts. *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 17, 3 (2015), 1313–1341.
- [7] L. Daigle. 2004. *WHOIS Protocol Specification*. RFC 3912. IETF. <http://tools.ietf.org/rfc/rfc3912.txt>
- [8] E. Gerich. 1992. *Guidelines for Management of IP Address Space*. RFC 1366. IETF. <http://tools.ietf.org/rfc/rfc1366.txt>
- [9] R. Housley, J. Curran, G. Huston, and D. Conrad. 2013. *The Internet Numbers Registry System*. RFC 7020. IETF. <http://tools.ietf.org/rfc/rfc7020.txt>
- [10] B Huffaker, M Fomenkov, and k claffy. 2011. *Geocompare: a comparison of public and commercial geolocation databases - Technical Report*.

Technical Report. Cooperative Association for Internet Data Analysis (CAIDA). <https://doi.org/null>

- [11] Ben JoJo. 2023. AnyCatch. <https://github.com/benjojo/AnyCatch>.
- [12] Eddy Kayihura. 2022. Court Update - Cloud Innovation Ltd vs AFRINIC. <https://afrinic.net/20220215-court-update-cloud-innovation-ltd-vs-afrinic-scr-5c-30-21>.
- [13] Brian Krebs. 2019. The Great \$50M African IP Address Heist. <https://krebsonsecurity.com/2019/12/the-great-50m-african-ip-address-heist/>.
- [14] Tobias Lauinger, Kaan Onarlioglu, Abdelberi Chaabane, William Robertson, and Engin Kirda. 2016. WHOIS Lost in Translation: (Mis) Understanding Domain Name Expiration and Re-Registration. In *Proceedings of the 2016 Internet Measurement Conference*. 247–253.
- [15] Nektarios Leontiadis and Nicolas Christin. 2014. Empirically measuring WHOIS misuse. In *Computer Security-ESORICS 2014: 19th European Symposium on Research in Computer Security, Wroclaw, Poland, September 7-11, 2014. Proceedings, Part I 19*. Springer, 19–36.
- [16] Ginny Listman. 2002. Early Registration Transfer (ERX). https://www.arin.net/vault/participate/meetings/reports/ARIN_X/PDF/erx.pdf.
- [17] Suqi Liu, Ian Foster, Stefan Savage, Geoffrey M Voelker, and Lawrence K Saul. 2015. Who is. com? Learning to parse WHOIS records. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Internet Measurement Conference*. 369–380.
- [18] I Livadariu, A Dhamdhere, and A Elmokashfi. 2017. On IPv4 transfer markets: Analyzing reported transfers and inferring transfers in the wild. *Elsevier Computer Communications Journal* 111 (Oct 2017), 105–119.
- [19] I Livadariu, A Elmokashfi, A Dhamdhere, and k claffy. 2013. A First Look at IPv4 Transfer Markets. In *ACM SIGCOMM Conference on emerging Networking EXperiments and Technologies (CoNEXT)*. 7–12.
- [20] Chaoyi Lu, Baojun Liu, Yiming Zhang, Zhou Li, Fenglu Zhang, Haixin Duan, Ying Liu, Joann Qiongna Chen, Jinjin Liang, Zai Feng Zhang, et al. 2021. From WHOIS to WHOWAS: A Large-Scale Measurement Study of Domain Registration Privacy under the GDPR.. In *NDSS*.
- [21] NRO. 2023. Comparative Policy Overview. <https://www.nro.net/rir-comparative-policy-overview-2023-q2/>.
- [22] Lars Prehn, Franziska Lichtblau, and Anja Feldmann. 2020. When wells run dry: the 2020 IPv4 address market. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on emerging Networking EXperiments and Technologies*. 46–54.
- [23] Philipp Richter, Mark Allman, Randy Bush, and Vern Paxson. 2015. A primer on IPv4 scarcity. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review* 45, 2 (2015), 21–31.
- [24] RIPE NCC. 2023. RIPE Atlas. <https://atlas.ripe.net/results/maps/network-coverage/>.
- [25] Raffaele Sommese, Leandro Bertholdo, Gautam Akiwate, Mattijs Jonker, Roland van Rijswijk-Deij, Alberto Dainotti, KC Claffy, and Anna Sperotto. 2020. Manycast2: Using anycast to measure anycast. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference*. 456–463.
- [26] Jan Vermeulen. 2019. The big South African IP address heist. <https://mybroadband.co.za/news/internet/318205-the-big-south-african-ip-address-heist-how-millions-are-made-on-the-grey-market.html>.
- [27] Jan Vermeulen. 2021. Internet addresses worth R1.8 billion seized. <https://mybroadband.co.za/news/internet/405640-internet-addresses-worth-r1-8-billion-seized.html>.
- [28] C. Weider and R. Wright. 1993. *A Survey of Advanced Usages of X.500*. RFC 1491. IETF. <http://tools.ietf.org/rfc/rfc1491.txt>

A ALGORITHM

We provide pseudo-code for our geo-audit inference algorithm here for additional detail. The algorithm assumes a

database operation, `db_lookup`, (as described in our methodology) that performs a longest-prefix match on a prefix P to return the RIR to which it is registered. It further assumes (again, as described in our methodology) a lookup function, `rir_lookup`, between an ISO country code and the responsible RIR. Finally, we abstract the RIPE Atlas probing logic and assume a function that returns the set of ICMP RTTs as produced by our active measurements in the `atlas_results` function.

The algorithm returns one of six possible results: anycast (AC), Fully Geo-consistent (FC), Organization Geo-consistent (OC), Organization Geo-inconsistent (OI), Registry Geo-inconsistent (RI) or Fully Geo-inconsistent (FI). Section 4 details each step of our audit methodology, while Section 5 provides results from a 50k prefix RIR geo-audit.

Algorithm 1 GeoAudit(P)

```

if  $P \in \text{anycatch}$  then
    return( $AC$ )
 $RIR_{Reg} \leftarrow \text{db\_lookup}(P)$ 
 $CC \leftarrow \text{db\_lookup}(P)$ 
 $RIR_{Org} \leftarrow \text{rir\_lookup}(CC)$ 
 $RTT[] \leftarrow \text{atlas\_results}(target \in P)$ 
 $Probe_{min} = \arg\_min_k RTT[k] \forall k \in probes$ 
 $RIR_{Geo} \leftarrow \text{rir\_lookup}(Probe_{Min})$ 
if  $RIR_{Geo} = RIR_{Reg}$  then
    if  $RIR_{Geo} = RIR_{Org}$  then
        return( $FC$ )
    else
        return( $OI$ )
else
    if  $RIR_{Geo} = RIR_{Org}$  then
        return( $OC$ )
    else if  $RIR_{Reg} = RIR_{Org}$  then
        return( $RI$ )
    else
        return( $FI$ )

```
