

GeneRic Autonomic Signaling Protocol

draft-ietf-anima-grasp-10

**Brian Carpenter (editor)
Bing Liu (editor)
Carsten Bormann**

**IETF 98
March 2017**

Topics

- Main changes since draft-carpenter-anima-gdn-protocol-08 and IETF LC
- Status of prototype code / Hackathon
- Open issues
- Discussion, next steps

Main Changes (1)

- **draft-ietf-anima-grasp-09 (before IETF LC):**
 - Added F_NEG_DRY flag to specify a "dry run" objective
 - Changed M_FLOOD syntax to signal one locator per objective.
 - Clarifications and editorial improvements

Main Changes (2)

- **draft-ietf-anima-grasp-10 (after IETF LC):**
 - Specified that objective with no initial value should have its value field set to CBOR 'null'
 - Specified behavior on receiving unrecognized message type
 - Noted that UTF-8 names are matched byte-for-byte
 - Added guidance for Expert Reviewer of new objectives

Main Changes (3)

- **draft-ietf-anima-grasp-10 (after IETF LC):**
 - Editorial improvements, clarifications and minor text rearrangements
 - *Many thanks to Joel Halpern, Barry Leiba, and Charles E. Perkins for Last Call reviews*

Python prototype

- Updated for all recent changes
- Portable between Windows 7 and Linux
- Two demo ASAs to test negotiation, **Briggs.py** and **Gray.py**
- Toy ASA for prefix management, **pxm1.py**
- Also used to model usage for **-anima-bootstrapping-keyinfra**
- <https://www.cs.auckland.ac.nz/~brian/graspy/>

C prototype

- Wendong Wang, Xiangyang Gong
 - (Beijing University of Posts & Telecom)
with Huawei
- Updating to current GRASP

Hackathon

- Report on results

Open Issues (1)

63. Should encryption be MUST instead of SHOULD in Section 3.5.1 and Section 3.5.2.1?

Authors' suggestion: Yes, for consistency with requirements.

64. Should more security text be moved from the main text into the Security Considerations?

Authors' suggestion: No, for readability.

Open Issues (2)

65. Do we need to formally restrict Unicode characters allowed in objective names?

Authors' suggestion: No. That is a user interface problem, not a protocol problem.

66. Split requirements into separate document?

Authors' suggestion: No, according to WG deliverables.

67. Remove normative dependency on draft-greevenbosch-appsawg-cbor-cddl?

Authors' suggestion: Wait for AUTH48.

Discussion + next steps

