

ANIMA WG  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: December 8, 2018

T. Eckert, Ed.  
Huawei  
M. Behringer, Ed.

S. Bjarnason  
Arbor Networks  
June 6, 2018

**An Autonomic Control Plane (ACP)**  
**draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-14**

**Abstract**

Autonomic functions need a control plane to communicate, which depends on some addressing and routing. This Autonomic Management and Control Plane should ideally be self-managing, and as independent as possible of configuration. This document defines such a plane and calls it the "Autonomic Control Plane", with the primary use as a control plane for autonomic functions. It also serves as a "virtual out-of-band channel" for Operations Administration and Management (OAM) communications over a network that is secure and reliable even when the network is not configured, or misconfigured.

**Status of This Memo**

This Internet-Draft is submitted in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts. The list of current Internet-Drafts is at <https://datatracker.ietf.org/drafts/current/>.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

This Internet-Draft will expire on December 8, 2018.

**Copyright Notice**

Copyright (c) 2018 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents

(<https://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

## Table of Contents

|                         |   |                    |
|-------------------------|---|--------------------|
| <a href="#">1.</a>      | <a href="#">Introduction</a>  | <a href="#">4</a>  |
| <a href="#">1.1.</a>    | <a href="#">Applicability and Scope</a>                                       | <a href="#">7</a>  |
| <a href="#">2.</a>      | <a href="#">Acronyms and Terminology</a>                                      | <a href="#">8</a>  |
| <a href="#">3.</a>      | <a href="#">Use Cases for an Autonomic Control Plane</a>                      | <a href="#">13</a> |
| <a href="#">3.1.</a>    | <a href="#">An Infrastructure for Autonomic Functions</a>                     | <a href="#">13</a> |
| <a href="#">3.2.</a>    | <a href="#">Secure Bootstrap over a not configured Network</a>                | <a href="#">13</a> |
| <a href="#">3.3.</a>    | <a href="#">Data-Plane Independent Permanent Reachability</a>                 | <a href="#">14</a> |
| <a href="#">4.</a>      | <a href="#">Requirements</a>  | <a href="#">15</a> |
| <a href="#">5.</a>      | <a href="#">Overview</a>  | <a href="#">16</a> |
| <a href="#">6.</a>      | <a href="#">Self-Creation of an Autonomic Control Plane (ACP) (Normative)</a> | <a href="#">17</a> |
| <a href="#">6.1.</a>    | <a href="#">ACP Domain, Certificate and Network</a>                           | <a href="#">17</a> |
| <a href="#">6.1.1.</a>  | <a href="#">Certificate Domain Information Field</a>                          | <a href="#">19</a> |
| <a href="#">6.1.2.</a>  | <a href="#">ACP domain membership check</a>                                   | <a href="#">21</a> |
| <a href="#">6.1.3.</a>  | <a href="#">Certificate Maintenance</a>                                       | <a href="#">22</a> |
| <a href="#">6.2.</a>    | <a href="#">ACP Adjacency Table</a>   | <a href="#">27</a> |
| <a href="#">6.3.</a>    | <a href="#">Neighbor Discovery with DULL GRASP</a>                            | <a href="#">27</a> |
| <a href="#">6.4.</a>    | <a href="#">Candidate ACP Neighbor Selection</a>                              | <a href="#">30</a> |
| <a href="#">6.5.</a>    | <a href="#">Channel Selection</a>   | <a href="#">31</a> |
| <a href="#">6.6.</a>    | <a href="#">Candidate ACP Neighbor verification</a>                           | <a href="#">33</a> |
| <a href="#">6.7.</a>    | <a href="#">Security Association protocols</a>                                | <a href="#">33</a> |
| <a href="#">6.7.1.</a>  | <a href="#">ACP via IKEv2</a>   | <a href="#">33</a> |
| <a href="#">6.7.2.</a>  | <a href="#">ACP via DTLS</a>  | <a href="#">34</a> |
| <a href="#">6.7.3.</a>  | <a href="#">ACP Secure Channel Requirements</a>                               | <a href="#">35</a> |
| <a href="#">6.8.</a>    | <a href="#">GRASP in the ACP</a>  | <a href="#">35</a> |
| <a href="#">6.8.1.</a>  | <a href="#">GRASP as a core service of the ACP</a>                            | <a href="#">35</a> |
| <a href="#">6.8.2.</a>  | <a href="#">ACP as the Security and Transport substrate for GRASP</a>         | <a href="#">36</a> |
| <a href="#">6.9.</a>    | <a href="#">Context Separation</a>  | <a href="#">39</a> |
| <a href="#">6.10.</a>   | <a href="#">Addressing inside the ACP</a>                                     | <a href="#">39</a> |
| <a href="#">6.10.1.</a> | <a href="#">Fundamental Concepts of Autonomic Addressing</a>                  | <a href="#">40</a> |
| <a href="#">6.10.2.</a> | <a href="#">The ACP Addressing Base Scheme</a>                                | <a href="#">41</a> |
| <a href="#">6.10.3.</a> | <a href="#">ACP Zone Addressing Sub-Scheme</a>                                | <a href="#">42</a> |
| <a href="#">6.10.4.</a> | <a href="#">ACP Manual Addressing Sub-Scheme</a>                              | <a href="#">44</a> |
| <a href="#">6.10.5.</a> | <a href="#">ACP Vlong Addressing Sub-Scheme</a>                               | <a href="#">46</a> |
| <a href="#">6.10.6.</a> | <a href="#">Other ACP Addressing Sub-Schemes</a>                              | <a href="#">47</a> |
| <a href="#">6.10.7.</a> | <a href="#">ACP Registrars</a>  | <a href="#">47</a> |
| <a href="#">6.11.</a>   | <a href="#">Routing in the ACP</a>  | <a href="#">50</a> |
| <a href="#">6.11.1.</a> | <a href="#">RPL Profile</a>   | <a href="#">51</a> |
| <a href="#">6.12.</a>   | <a href="#">General ACP Considerations</a>                                    | <a href="#">54</a> |



|         |  |    |
|---------|--|----|
| 6.12.1. | Performance . . . . .                                    | 55 |
| 6.12.2. | Addressing of Secure Channels in the Data-Plane . .      | 55 |
| 6.12.3. | MTU . . . . .  | 55 |
| 6.12.4. | Multiple links between nodes . . . . .                   | 56 |
| 6.12.5. | ACP interfaces . . . . .                                 | 56 |
| 7.      | ACP support on L2 switches/ports (Normative) . . . . .   | 59 |
| 7.1.    | Why . . . . .  | 59 |
| 7.2.    | How (per L2 port DULL GRASP) . . . . .                   | 60 |
| 8.      | Support for Non-ACP Components (Normative) . . . . .     | 62 |
| 8.1.    | ACP Connect . . . . .                                    | 62 |
| 8.1.1.  | Non-ACP Controller / NMS system . . . . .                | 62 |
| 8.1.2.  | Software Components . . . . .                            | 64 |
| 8.1.3.  | Auto Configuration . . . . .                             | 65 |
| 8.1.4.  | Combined ACP/Data-Plane Interface (VRF Select) . . .     | 66 |
| 8.1.5.  | Use of GRASP . . . . .                                   | 67 |
| 8.2.    | ACP through Non-ACP L3 Clouds (Remote ACP neighbors) . . | 68 |
| 8.2.1.  | Configured Remote ACP neighbor . . . . .                 | 68 |
| 8.2.2.  | Tunneled Remote ACP Neighbor . . . . .                   | 70 |
| 8.2.3.  | Summary . . . . .  | 70 |
| 9.      | Benefits (Informative) . . . . .                         | 70 |
| 9.1.    | Self-Healing Properties . . . . .                        | 70 |
| 9.2.    | Self-Protection Properties . . . . .                     | 72 |
| 9.2.1.  | From the outside . . . . .                               | 72 |
| 9.2.2.  | From the inside . . . . .                                | 73 |
| 9.3.    | The Administrator View . . . . .                         | 73 |
| 10.     | Further Considerations (Informative) . . . . .           | 74 |
| 10.1.   | BRSKI Bootstrap (ANI) . . . . .                          | 74 |
| 10.2.   | ACP (and BRSKI) Diagnostics . . . . .                    | 75 |
| 10.3.   | ACP Registrar Considerations . . . . .                   | 80 |
| 10.3.1. | Registrar interactions . . . . .                         | 80 |
| 10.3.2. | Registrar Parameter . . . . .                            | 81 |
| 10.3.3. | Certificate renewal and limitations . . . . .            | 82 |
| 10.3.4. | ACP Registrars with sub-CA . . . . .                     | 83 |
| 10.3.5. | Centralized Policy Control . . . . .                     | 83 |
| 10.4.   | Address Space Considerations . . . . .                   | 84 |
| 10.5.   | Enabling and disabling ACP/ANI . . . . .                 | 85 |
| 10.5.1. | Filtering for non-ACP/ANI packets . . . . .              | 85 |
| 10.5.2. | Admin Down State . . . . .                               | 86 |
| 10.5.3. | Interface level ACP/ANI enable . . . . .                 | 88 |
| 10.5.4. | Which interfaces to auto-enable? . . . . .               | 89 |
| 10.5.5. | Node Level ACP/ANI enable . . . . .                      | 90 |
| 10.5.6. | Undoing ANI/ACP enable . . . . .                         | 92 |
| 10.5.7. | Summary . . . . .  | 92 |
| 10.6.   | ACP Neighbor discovery protocol selection . . . . .      | 92 |
| 10.6.1. | LLDP . . . . .   | 93 |
| 10.6.2. | mDNS and L2 support . . . . .                            | 93 |
| 10.6.3. | Why DULL GRASP . . . . .                                 | 93 |
| 10.7.   | Choice of routing protocol (RPL) . . . . .               | 94 |



|                        |  |                     |
|------------------------|--|---------------------|
| <a href="#">10.8.</a>  | ACP Information Distribution and multicast . . . . .                       | <a href="#">95</a>  |
| <a href="#">10.9.</a>  | Extending ACP channel negotiation (via GRASP) . . . . .                    | <a href="#">96</a>  |
| <a href="#">10.10.</a> | CAs, domains and routing subdomains . . . . .                              | <a href="#">98</a>  |
| <a href="#">10.11.</a> | Adopting ACP concepts for other environments . . . . .                     | <a href="#">99</a>  |
| <a href="#">11.</a>    | Security Considerations . . . . .  | <a href="#">101</a> |
| <a href="#">12.</a>    | IANA Considerations . . . . .  | <a href="#">103</a> |
| <a href="#">13.</a>    | Acknowledgements . . . . .   | <a href="#">103</a> |
| <a href="#">14.</a>    | Change log [RFC Editor: Please remove] . . . . .                           | <a href="#">104</a> |
| <a href="#">14.1.</a>  | Initial version . . . . .  | <a href="#">104</a> |
| <a href="#">14.2.</a>  | <a href="#">draft-behringer-anima-autonomic-control-plane-00</a> . . . . . | <a href="#">104</a> |
| <a href="#">14.3.</a>  | <a href="#">draft-behringer-anima-autonomic-control-plane-01</a> . . . . . | <a href="#">104</a> |
| <a href="#">14.4.</a>  | <a href="#">draft-behringer-anima-autonomic-control-plane-02</a> . . . . . | <a href="#">104</a> |
| <a href="#">14.5.</a>  | <a href="#">draft-behringer-anima-autonomic-control-plane-03</a> . . . . . | <a href="#">104</a> |
| <a href="#">14.6.</a>  | <a href="#">draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-00</a> . . . . .      | <a href="#">105</a> |
| <a href="#">14.7.</a>  | <a href="#">draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-01</a> . . . . .      | <a href="#">105</a> |
| <a href="#">14.8.</a>  | <a href="#">draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-02</a> . . . . .      | <a href="#">106</a> |
| <a href="#">14.9.</a>  | <a href="#">draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-03</a> . . . . .      | <a href="#">106</a> |
| <a href="#">14.10.</a> | <a href="#">draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-04</a> . . . . .      | <a href="#">106</a> |
| <a href="#">14.11.</a> | <a href="#">draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-05</a> . . . . .      | <a href="#">107</a> |
| <a href="#">14.12.</a> | <a href="#">draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-06</a> . . . . .      | <a href="#">107</a> |
| <a href="#">14.13.</a> | <a href="#">draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-07</a> . . . . .      | <a href="#">108</a> |
| <a href="#">14.14.</a> | <a href="#">draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-08</a> . . . . .      | <a href="#">109</a> |
| <a href="#">14.15.</a> | <a href="#">draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-09</a> . . . . .      | <a href="#">111</a> |
| <a href="#">14.16.</a> | <a href="#">draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-10</a> . . . . .      | <a href="#">113</a> |
| <a href="#">14.17.</a> | <a href="#">draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-11</a> . . . . .      | <a href="#">115</a> |
| <a href="#">14.18.</a> | <a href="#">draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-12</a> . . . . .      | <a href="#">115</a> |
| <a href="#">14.19.</a> | <a href="#">draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-13</a> . . . . .      | <a href="#">116</a> |
| <a href="#">14.20.</a> | <a href="#">draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-14</a> . . . . .      | <a href="#">118</a> |
| <a href="#">14.21.</a> | wish-list . . . . .  | <a href="#">122</a> |
| <a href="#">15.</a>    | References . . . . .   | <a href="#">122</a> |
| <a href="#">15.1.</a>  | Normative References . . . . .   | <a href="#">122</a> |
| <a href="#">15.2.</a>  | Informative References . . . . .   | <a href="#">125</a> |
|                        | Authors' Addresses . . . . .   | <a href="#">129</a> |

## **1. Introduction**

Autonomic Networking is a concept of self-management: Autonomic functions self-configure, and negotiate parameters and settings across the network. [RFC7575] defines the fundamental ideas and design goals of Autonomic Networking. A gap analysis of Autonomic Networking is given in [RFC7576]. The reference architecture for Autonomic Networking in the IETF is specified in the document [I-D.ietf-anima-reference-model]

Autonomic functions need an autonomically built communications infrastructure. This infrastructure needs to be secure, resilient and re-usable by all autonomic functions. Section 5 of [RFC7575] introduces that infrastructure and calls it the Autonomic Control



Plane (ACP). More descriptively it would be the "Autonomic communications infrastructure for Management and Control". For naming consistency with that prior document, this document continues to use the name ACP though.

Today, the management and control plane of networks typically uses the global routing table, which is dependent on correct configuration and routing. Misconfigurations or routing problems can therefore disrupt management and control channels. Traditionally, an out-of-band network has been used to avoid or allow recovery from such problems, or personnel are sent on site to access devices through console ports (craft ports). However, both options are expensive.

In increasingly automated networks either centralized management systems or distributed autonomic service agents in the network require a control plane which is independent of the configuration of the network they manage, to avoid impacting their own operations through the configuration actions they take.

This document describes a modular design for a self-forming, self-managing and self-protecting Autonomic Control Plane (ACP), which is a virtual in-band network designed to be as independent as possible of configuration, addressing and routing problems. The details how this achieved are defined in [Section 6](#). The ACP is designed to remain operational even in the presence of configuration errors, addressing or routing issues, or where policy could inadvertently affect connectivity of both data packets or control packets.

This document uses the term "Data-Plane" to refer to anything in the network nodes that is not the ACP, and therefore considered to be dependent on (mis-)configuration. This Data-Plane includes both the traditional forwarding-plane, as well as any pre-existing control-plane, such as routing protocols that establish routing tables for the forwarding plane.

The Autonomic Control Plane serves several purposes at the same time:

1. Autonomic functions communicate over the ACP. The ACP therefore supports directly Autonomic Networking functions, as described in [\[I-D.ietf-anima-reference-model\]](#). For example, Generic Autonomic Signaling Protocol (GRASP - [\[I-D.ietf-anima-grasp\]](#)) runs securely inside the ACP and depends on the ACP as its "security and transport substrate".
2. A controller or network management system can use it to securely bootstrap network devices in remote locations, even if the network in between is not yet configured; no Data-Plane dependent bootstrap configuration is required. An example of such a secure





bootstrap process is described in  
[\[I-D.ietf-anima-bootstrapping-keyinfra\]](#)

3. An operator can use it to log into remote devices, even if the network is misconfigured or not configured.

This document describes these purposes as use cases for the ACP in [Section 3](#), it defines the requirements in [Section 4](#). [Section 5](#) gives an overview how the ACP is constructed, and in [Section 6](#) the process is defined in detail. [Section 7](#) defines how to support ACP on L2 switches. [Section 8](#) explains how non-ACP nodes and networks can be integrated.

The following sections are non-normative: [Section 9](#) reviews benefits of the ACP (after all the details have been defined), [Section 10](#) provides additional explanations and describes additional details or future work possibilities that were considered not to be appropriate for standardization in this document but nevertheless assumed to be helpful for candidate adopters of the ACP.

The ACP provides secure IPv6 connectivity, therefore it can not only be used as the secure connectivity for self-management as required for the ACP in [\[RFC7575\]](#), but it can also be used as the secure connectivity for traditional (centralized) management. The ACP can be implemented and operated without any other components of autonomic networks, except for the GRASP protocol which it leverages.

The document "Using Autonomic Control Plane for Stable Connectivity of Network OAM" [\[RFC8368\]](#) describes how the ACP alone can be used to provide secure and stable connectivity for autonomic and non-autonomic Operations Administration and Management (OAM) applications. That document also explains how existing management solutions can leverage the ACP in parallel with traditional management models, when to use the ACP and how to integrate with potentially IPv4 only OAM backends.

Combining ACP with Bootstrapping Remote Secure Key Infrastructures (BRSKI), see [\[I-D.ietf-anima-bootstrapping-keyinfra\]](#)) results in the "Autonomic Network Infrastructure" as defined in [\[I-D.ietf-anima-reference-model\]](#), which provides autonomic connectivity (from ACP) with fully secure zero-touch (automated) bootstrap from BRSKI. The ANI itself does not constitute an Autonomic Network, but it allows the building of more or less autonomic networks on top of it - using either centralized, Software Defined Networking (SDN) (see [\[RFC7426\]](#)), style automation or distributed automation via Autonomic Service Agents (ASA) / Autonomic Functions (AF) - or a mixture of both. See [\[I-D.ietf-anima-reference-model\]](#) for more information.



### **1.1. Applicability and Scope**

Please see the following Terminology section ([Section 2](#)) for explanations of terms used in this section.

The design of the ACP as defined in this document is considered to be applicable to all types of "professionally managed" networks: Service Provider, Local Area Network (LAN), Metro(politan networks), Wide Area Network (WAN), Enterprise Information Technology (IT) and Operational Technology (OT) networks. The ACP can operate equally on layer 3 equipment and on layer 2 equipment such as bridges (see [Section 7](#)). The encryption mechanism used by the ACP is defined to be negotiable, therefore it can be extended to environments with different encryption protocol preferences. The minimum implementation requirements in this document attempt to achieve maximum interoperability by requiring support for few options: IPsec, DTLS - depending on type of device.

The implementation footprint of the ACP consists of Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) code for the ACP certificate, the GRASP protocol, UDP, TCP and TLS (for security and reliability of GRASP), the ACP secure channel protocol used (such as IPsec or DTLS), and an instance of IPv6 packet forwarding and routing via the RPL routing protocol ([\[RFC6550\]](#)) that is separate from routing and forwarding for the Data-Plane (user traffic).

The ACP uses only IPv6 to avoid complexity of dual-stack ACP operations (IPv6/IPv4). Nevertheless, it can without any changes be integrated into even otherwise IPv4-only network devices. The Data-Plane itself would not need to change, it could continue to be IPv4 only. For such IPv4 only devices, the IPv6 protocol itself would be additional implementation footprint only used for the ACP.

The protocol choices of the ACP are primarily based on wide use and support in networks and devices, well understood security properties and required scalability. The ACP design is an attempt to produce the lowest risk combination of existing technologies and protocols to build a widely applicable operational network management solution:

RPL was chosen because it requires a smaller routing table footprint in large networks compared to other routing protocols with an autonomically configured single area. The deployment experience of large scale Internet of Things (IoT) networks serves as the basis for wide deployment experience with RPL. The profile chosen for RPL in the ACP does not not leverage any RPL specific forwarding plane features (IPv6 extension headers), making its implementation a pure control plane software requirement.



GRASP is the only completely novel protocol used in the ACP, and this choice was necessary because there is no existing suitable protocol to provide the necessary functions to the ACP, so GRASP was developed to fill that gap.

The ACP design can be applicable to (cpu, memory) constrained devices and (bitrate, reliability) constrained networks, but this document does not attempt to define the most constrained type of devices or networks to which the ACP is applicable. RPL and DTLS are two protocol choices already making ACP more applicable to constrained environments. See [Section 10.11](#) for discussions about how variations of the ACP could be defined in the future to better meet different expectations from those on which the current design is based.

## 2. Acronyms and Terminology

In the rest of the document we will refer to systems using the ACP as "nodes". Typically such a node is a physical (network equipment) device, but it can equally be some virtualized system. Therefore, we do not refer to them as devices unless the context specifically calls for a physical system.

This document introduces or uses the following terms (sorted alphabetically). Terms introduced are explained on first use, so this list is for reference only.

ACP: "Autonomic Control Plane". The Autonomic Function as defined in this document. It provides secure zero-touch (automated) transitive (network wide) IPv6 connectivity for all nodes in the same ACP domain as well as a GRASP instance running across this ACP IPv6 connectivity. The ACP is primarily meant to be used as a component of the ANI to enable Autonomic Networks but it can equally be used in simple ANI networks (with no other Autonomic Functions) or completely by itself.

ACP address: An IPv6 address assigned to the ACP node. It is stored in the domain information field of the ->"ACP domain certificate" ().

ACP address range/set: The ACP address may imply a range or set of addresses that the node can assign for different purposes. This address range/set is derived by the node from the format of the ACP address called the "addressing sub-scheme".

ACP connect interface: An interface on an ACP node providing access to the ACP for non ACP capable nodes without using an ACP secure channel. See [Section 8.1.1](#).



ACP domain: The ACP domain is the set of nodes with ->"ACP domain certificates" that allow them to authenticate each other as members of the ACP domain. See also [Section 6.1.2](#).

ACP (ANI/AN) Domain Certificate: A provisioned [[RFC5280](#)] certificate (LDevID) carrying the domain information field which is used by the ACP to learn its address in the ACP and to derive and cryptographically assert its membership in the ACP domain.

domain information (field): An rfc822Name information element (e.g., field) in the domain certificate in which the ACP relevant information is encoded: the domain name and the ACP address.

ACP Loopback interface: The Loopback interface in the ACP VRF that has the ACP address assigned to it.

ACP network: The ACP network constitutes all the nodes that have access to the ACP. It is the set of active and transitively connected nodes of an ACP domain plus all nodes that get access to the ACP of that domain via ACP edge nodes.

ACP (ULA) prefix(es): The /48 IPv6 address prefixes used across the ACP. In the normal/simple case, the ACP has one ULA prefix, see [Section 6.10](#). The ACP routing table may include multiple ULA prefixes if the "rsub" option is used to create addresses from more than one ULA prefix. See [Section 6.1.1](#). The ACP may also include non-ULA prefixes if those are configured on ACP connect interfaces. See [Section 8.1.1](#).

ACP secure channel: A security association established hop-by-hop between adjacent ACP nodes to carry traffic of the ACP VRF separated from Data-Plane traffic in-band over the same links as the Data-Plane.

ACP secure channel protocol: The protocol used to build an ACP secure channel, e.g., Internet Key Exchange Protocol version 2 (IKEv2) with IPsec or Datagram Transport Layer Security (DTLS).

ACP virtual interface: An interface in the ACP VRF mapped to one or more ACP secure channels. See [Section 6.12.5](#).

AN "Autonomic Network": A network according to [[I-D.ietf-anima-reference-model](#)]. Its main components are ANI, Autonomic Functions and Intent.

(AN) Domain Name: An FQDN (Fully Qualified Domain Name) in the domain information field of the Domain Certificate. See [Section 6.1.1](#).





ANI (nodes/network): "Autonomic Network Infrastructure". The ANI is the infrastructure to enable Autonomic Networks. It includes ACP, BRSKI and GRASP. Every Autonomic Network includes the ANI, but not every ANI network needs to include autonomic functions beyond the ANI (nor intent). An ANI network without further autonomic functions can for example support secure zero-touch (automated) bootstrap and stable connectivity for SDN networks - see [[RFC8368](#)].

ANIMA: "Autonomic Networking Integrated Model and Approach". ACP, BRSKI and GRASP are products of the IETF ANIMA working group.

ASA: "Autonomic Service Agent". Autonomic software modules running on an ANI device. The components making up the ANI (BRSKI, ACP, GRASP) are also described as ASAs.

Autonomic Function: A function/service in an Autonomic Network (AN) composed of one or more ASA across one or more ANI nodes.

BRSKI: "Bootstrapping Remote Secure Key Infrastructures" ([[I-D.ietf-anima-bootstrapping-keyinfra](#)]). A protocol extending EST to enable secure zero-touch bootstrap in conjunction with ACP. ANI nodes use ACP, BRSKI and GRASP.

Data-Plane: The counterpoint to the ACP VRF in an ACP node: all routing and forwarding in the node other than the ACP VRF. In a simple ACP or ANI node, the Data-Plane is typically provisioned non-autonomic, for example manually (including across the ACP) or via SDN controllers. In a fully Autonomic Network node, the Data-Plane is managed autonomically via Autonomic Functions and Intent. Note that other (non-ANIMA) RFC use the Data-Plane to refer to what is better called the forwarding plane. This is not the way the term is used in this document!

device: A physical system, or physical node.

Enrollment: The process where a node presents identification (for example through keying material such as the private key of an LDevID) to a network and acquires a network specific identity and trust anchor such as an LDevID.

EST: "Enrollment over Secure Transport" ([[RFC7030](#)]). IETF standard protocol for enrollment of a node with an LDevID. BRSKI is based on EST.

GRASP: "Generic Autonomic Signaling Protocol". An extensible signaling protocol required by the ACP for ACP neighbor discovery. The ACP also provides the "security and transport substrate" for



the "ACP instance of GRASP". This instance of GRASP runs across the ACP secure channels to support BRSKI and other future Autonomic Functions. See [[I-D.ietf-anima-grasp](#)].

**IDeVID:** An "Initial Device IDentity" X.509 certificate installed by the vendor on new equipment. Contains information that establishes the identity of the node in the context of its vendor/manufacturer such as device model/type and serial number. See [[AR8021](#)]. IDeVID can not be used for the ACP because they are not provisioned by the owner of the network, so they can not directly indicate an ACP domain they belong to.

**in-band (management):** The type of management used predominantly in IP based networks, not leveraging an ->"out-of-band network" (). In in-band management, access to the managed equipment depends on the configuration of this equipment itself: interface, addressing, forwarding, routing, policy, security, management. This dependency makes in-band management fragile because the configuration actions performed may break in-band management connectivity. Breakage can not only be unintentional, it can simply be an unavoidable side effect of being unable to create configuration schemes where in-band management connectivity configuration is unaffected by Data-Plane configuration. See also ->"(virtual) out-of-band network" ().

**Intent:** Policy language of an autonomic network according to [[I-D.ietf-anima-reference-model](#)].

**Loopback interface:** The conventional name for an internal IP interface to which addresses may be assigned, but which transmits no external traffic.

**LDeVID:** A "Local Device IDentity" is an X.509 certificate installed during "enrollment". The Domain Certificate used by the ACP is an LDeVID. See [[AR8021](#)].

**MIC:** "Manufacturer Installed Certificate". Another word not used in this document to describe an IDeVID.

**native interface:** Interfaces existing on a node without configuration of the already running node. On physical nodes these are usually physical interfaces. On virtual nodes their equivalent.

**node:** A system, e.g., supporting the ACP according to this document. Can be virtual or physical. Physical nodes are called devices.



**Node-ID:** The identifier of an ACP node inside that ACP. It is the last 64 (see [Section 6.10.3](#)) or 78 bit (see `xref target="Vlong"/>`) of the ACP address.

**(virtual) out-of-band network:** An out-of-band network is a secondary network used to manage a primary network. The equipment of the primary network is connected to the out-of-band network via dedicated management ports on the primary network equipment. Serial (console) management ports are most common, higher end network equipment also has ethernet ports dedicated only for management. An out-of-band network provides management access to the primary network independent of the configuration state of the primary network. One of the goals of the ACP is to provide this benefit of out-of-band networks virtually on the primary network equipment. The ACP VRF acts as a virtual out of band network device providing configuration independent management access. The ACP secure channels are the virtual links of the ACP virtual out-of-band network, meant to be operating independent of the configuration of the primary network. See also `->"in-band (management)"` ().

**RPL:** "IPv6 Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks". The routing protocol used in the ACP. See [[RFC6550](#)].

**MASA (service):** "Manufacturer Authorized Signing Authority". A vendor/manufacturer or delegated cloud service on the Internet used as part of the BRSKI protocol.

**(ACP/ANI/BRSKI) Registrar:** An ACP registrar is an entity (software and/or person) that is orchestrating the enrollment of ACP nodes with the ACP domain certificate. ANI nodes use BRSKI, so ANI registrars are also called BRSKI registrars. For non-ANI ACP nodes, the registrar mechanisms are undefined by this document. See [Section 6.10.7](#). Renewal and other maintenance (such as revocation) of ACP domain certificates may be performed by other entities than registrars. EST must be supported for ACP domain certificate renewal (see [Section 6.1.3](#)). BRSKI is an extension of EST, so ANI/BRSKI registrars can easily support ACP domain certificate renewal in addition to initial enrollment.

**sUDI:** "secured Unique Device Identifier". Another term not used in this document to refer to an IDevID.

**UDI:** "Unique Device Identifier". In the context of this document unsecured identity information of a node typically consisting of at least device model/type and serial number, often in a vendor specific format. See sUDI and LDevID.



ULA: (Global ID prefix) A "Unique Local Address" (ULA) is an IPv6 address in the block fc00::/7, defined in [RFC4193]. It is the approximate IPv6 counterpart of the IPv4 private address ([RFC1918]). The ULA Global ID prefix are the first 48 bit of a ULA address. In this document it is abbreviated as "ULA prefix".

(ACP) VRF: The ACP is modeled in this document as a "Virtual Routing and Forwarding" instance (VRF). This means that it is based on a "virtual router" consisting of a separate IPv6 forwarding table to which the ACP virtual interfaces are attached and an associated separate IPv6 routing table. Unlike the VRFs on MPLS/VPN-PE ([RFC4364]) or LISP XTR ([RFC6830]), the ACP VRF does not have any special "core facing" functionality or routing/mapping protocols shared across multiple VRFs. In vendor products a VRF such as the ACP-VRF may also be referred to as a so called VRF-lite.

(ACP) Zone: An ACP zone is a connected region of the ACP where nodes derive from their non-aggregatable ACP address (identifier address) an aggregatable ACP zone address (locator address). See the definition of the ACP Zone Addressing Sub-Scheme (Section 6.10.3). The complete definition of zones is subject to future work because this document does not describe the routing protocols details for aggregation of ACP zone addresses, but only their addressing scheme.

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "NOT RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC8174] when they appear in ALL CAPS. When these words are not in ALL CAPS (such as "should" or "Should"), they have their usual English meanings, and are not to be interpreted as [RFC8174] key words.

### **3. Use Cases for an Autonomic Control Plane**

#### **3.1. An Infrastructure for Autonomic Functions**

Autonomic Functions need a stable infrastructure to run on, and all autonomic functions should use the same infrastructure to minimize the complexity of the network. This way, there is only need for a single discovery mechanism, a single security mechanism, and other processes that distributed functions require.

#### **3.2. Secure Bootstrap over a not configured Network**

Today, bootstrapping a new node typically requires all nodes between a controlling node such as an SDN controller ("Software Defined Networking", see [RFC7426]) and the new node to be completely and





correctly addressed, configured and secured. Bootstrapping and configuration of a network happens in rings around the controller - configuring each ring of devices before the next one can be bootstrapped. Without console access (for example through an out-of-band network) it is not possible today to make devices securely reachable before having configured the entire network leading up to them.

With the ACP, secure bootstrap of new devices can happen without requiring any configuration such as the transit connectivity to bootstrap further devices. A new device can automatically be bootstrapped in a secure fashion and be deployed with a domain certificate. This does not require any configuration on intermediate nodes, because they can communicate zero-touch and securely through the ACP.

### **3.3. Data-Plane Independent Permanent Reachability**

Today, most critical control plane protocols and network management protocols are using the Data-Plane (global routing table) of the network. This leads to undesirable dependencies between control and management plane on one side and the Data-Plane on the other: Only if the Data-Plane is operational, will the other planes work as expected.

Data-Plane connectivity can be affected by errors and faults, for example misconfigurations that make AAA (Authentication, Authorization and Accounting) servers unreachable or can lock an administrator out of a device; routing or addressing issues can make a device unreachable; shutting down interfaces over which a current management session is running can lock an admin irreversibly out of the device. Traditionally only console access can help recover from such issues.

Data-Plane dependencies also affect applications in a Network Operations Center (NOC) such as SDN controller applications: Certain network changes are today hard to operate, because the change itself may affect reachability of the devices. Examples are address or mask changes, routing changes, or security policies. Today such changes require precise hop-by-hop planning.

The ACP provides reachability that is independent of the Data-Plane (except for the dependency discussed in [Section 6.12.2](#) which can be removed through future work), which allows the control plane and management plane to operate more robustly:

- o For management plane protocols, the ACP provides the functionality of a Virtual out of Band (VooB) channel, by providing connectivity



to all nodes regardless of their configuration or global routing table.

- o For control plane protocols, the ACP allows their operation even when the Data-Plane is temporarily faulty, or during transitional events, such as routing changes, which may affect the control plane at least temporarily. This is specifically important for autonomic service agents, which could affect Data-Plane connectivity.

The document "Using Autonomic Control Plane for Stable Connectivity of Network OAM" [[RFC8368](#)] explains this use case for the ACP in significantly more detail and explains how the ACP can be used in practical network operations.

#### **4. Requirements**

The Autonomic Control Plane has the following requirements:

- ACP1: The ACP SHOULD provide robust connectivity: As far as possible, it should be independent of configured addressing, configuration and routing. Requirements 2 and 3 build on this requirement, but also have value on their own.
- ACP2: The ACP MUST have a separate address space from the Data-Plane. Reason: traceability, debug-ability, separation from Data-Plane, security (can block easily at edge).
- ACP3: The ACP MUST use autonomically managed address space. Reason: easy bootstrap and setup ("autonomic"); robustness (admin can't mess things up so easily). This document suggests using ULA addressing for this purpose ("Unique Local Address", see [[RFC4193](#)]).
- ACP4: The ACP MUST be generic. Usable by all the functions and protocols of the ANI. Clients of the ACP MUST NOT be tied to a particular application or transport protocol.
- ACP5: The ACP MUST provide security: Messages coming through the ACP MUST be authenticated to be from a trusted node, and SHOULD (very strong SHOULD) be encrypted.

Explanation for ACP4: In a fully autonomic network (AN), newly written ASA could potentially all communicate exclusively via GRASP with each other, and if that was assumed to be the only requirement against the ACP, it would not need to provide IPv6 layer connectivity between nodes, but only GRASP connectivity. Nevertheless, because ACP also intends to support non-AN networks, it is crucial to



support IPv6 layer connectivity across the ACP to support any transport and application layer protocols.

The eACP operates hop-by-hop, because this interaction can be built on IPv6 link local addressing, which is autonomic, and has no dependency on configuration (requirement 1). It may be necessary to have ACP connectivity across non-ACP nodes, for example to link ACP nodes over the general Internet. This is possible, but introduces a dependency against stable/resilient routing over the non-ACP hops (see [Section 8.2](#)).

## 5. Overview

The Autonomic Control Plane is constructed in the following way (for details, see [Section 6](#)):

1. An ACP node creates a Virtual Routing and Forwarding (VRF) instance, or a similar virtual context.
2. It determines, following a policy, a candidate peer list. This is the list of nodes to which it should establish an Autonomic Control Plane. Default policy is: To all link-layer adjacent nodes supporting ACP.
3. For each node in the candidate peer list, it authenticates that node and negotiates a mutually acceptable channel type.
4. For each node in the candidate peer list, it then establishes a secure tunnel of the negotiated type. The resulting tunnels are then placed into the previously set up VRF. This creates an overlay network with hop-by-hop tunnels.
5. Inside the ACP VRF, each node assigns its ULA IPv6 address to a Loopback interface assigned to the ACP VRF.
6. Each node runs a lightweight routing protocol, to announce reachability of the virtual addresses inside the ACP (see [Section 6.12.5](#)).

Note:

- o Non-autonomic NMS ("Network Management Systems") or SDN controllers have to be explicitly configured for connection into the ACP.
- o Connecting over non-ACP Layer-3 clouds requires explicit configuration. See [Section 8.2](#). This may be automated in the future through auto discovery mechanisms across L3.



- o None of the above operations (except explicit configured ones) are reflected in the configuration of the node.

The following figure illustrates the ACP.




Figure 1: ACP VRF and secure channels

The resulting overlay network is normally based exclusively on hop-by-hop tunnels. This is because addressing used on links is IPv6 link local addressing, which does not require any prior set-up. This way the ACP can be built even if there is no configuration on the node, or if the Data-Plane has issues such as addressing or routing problems.

## 6. Self-Creation of an Autonomic Control Plane (ACP) (Normative)

This section describes the components and steps to set up an Autonomic Control Plane (ACP), and highlights the key properties which make it "indestructible" against many inadvertent changes to the Data-Plane, for example caused by misconfigurations.

An ACP node can be a router, switch, controller, NMS host, or any other IP capable node. Initially, it must have its ACP domain certificate, as well as an (empty) ACP Adjacency Table (described in [Section 6.2](#)). It then can start to discover ACP neighbors and build the ACP. This is described step by step in the following sections:

### 6.1. ACP Domain, Certificate and Network

The ACP relies on group security. An ACP domain is a group of nodes that trust each other to participate in ACP operations. To establish trust, each ACP member requires keying material: An ACP node **MUST** have a certificate (LDevID) and a Trust Anchor (TA) consisting of a





certificate (chain) used to sign the LDevID of all ACP domain members. The LDevID is used to cryptographically authenticate the membership of its owner node in the ACP domain to other ACP domain members, the TA is used to authenticate the ACP domain membership of other nodes (see [Section 6.1.2](#)).

The LDevID is called the ACP domain certificate, the TA is the Certificate Authority (CA) of the ACP domain.

The ACP does not mandate specific mechanisms by which this keying material is provisioned into the ACP node, it only requires the Domain information field as specified in [Section 6.1.1](#) in its domain certificate as well as those of candidate ACP peers. See [Section 10.1](#) for more information about enrollment or provisioning options.

This document uses the term ACP in many places where the Autonomic Networking reference documents [[RFC7575](#)] and [[I-D.ietf-anima-reference-model](#)] use the word autonomic. This is done because those reference documents consider (only) fully autonomic networks and nodes, but support of ACP does not require support for other components of autonomic networks. Therefore the word autonomic might be misleading to operators interested in only the ACP:

[RFC7575] defines the term "Autonomic Domain" as a collection of autonomic nodes. ACP nodes do not need to be fully autonomic, but when they are, then the ACP domain is an autonomic domain. Likewise, [[I-D.ietf-anima-reference-model](#)] defines the term "Domain Certificate" as the certificate used in an autonomic domain. The ACP domain certificate is that domain certificate when ACP nodes are (fully) autonomic nodes. Finally, this document uses the term ACP network to refer to the network created by active ACP nodes in an ACP domain. The ACP network itself can extend beyond ACP nodes through the mechanisms described in [Section 8.1](#)).

The ACP domain certificate can and should be used for any authentication between ACP nodes where the required security is domain membership. [Section 6.1.2](#) defines this "ACP domain membership check". The uses of this check that are standardized in this document are for the establishment of ACP secure channels ([Section 6.6](#)) and for ACP GRASP ([Section 6.8.2](#)). Other uses are subject to future work, but it is recommended that it is the default security check for any end-to-end connections between ASA. It is equally useable by other functions such as legacy OAM functions.



### 6.1.1. Certificate Domain Information Field

Information about the domain MUST be encoded in the domain certificate in a subjectAltName / rfc822Name field according to the following ABNF definition ([RFC5234](#)):

[RFC Editor: Please substitute SELF in all occurrences of rfcSELF in this document with the RFC number assigned to this document and remove this comment line]

```
domain-information = local-part "@" domain
local-part = key [ "." local-info ]
key = "rfcSELF"
local-info = [ acp-address ] [ "+" rsub extensions ]
ACP-address = 32hex-dig
hex-dig = DIGIT / "a" / "b" / "c" / "d" / "e" / "f"
rsub = [ domain-name ] ; empty if not used
domain = domain-name
routing-subdomain = [ rsub "." ] domain
domain-name = ; <domain> ; as of RFC 1034, section 3.5
extensions = *( "+" extension )
extension = ; future definition.
           ; Must fit RFC5322 simple dot-atom format.
```

Example:

```
domain-information = rfcSELF+fd89b714f3db00000200000064000000
                    +area51.research@acp.example.com
routing-subdomain = area51.research.acp.example.com
```

Figure 2: ACP Domain Information Field ABNF

"ACP-address" MUST be the ACP address of the node. It is optional to support variations of the ACP mechanisms, for example other means for nodes to assign ACP addresses to themselves. Such methods are subject to future work though.

Note: "ACP-address" cannot use standard IPv6 address formats because it must match the simple dot-atom format of [RFC5322](#). ":" are not allowed in that format.

"domain" is used to indicate the ACP Domain across which all ACP nodes trust each other and are willing to build ACP channel to each other. See [Section 6.1.2](#). Domain SHOULD be the FQDN of a domain owned by the operator assigning the certificate. This is a simple method to ensure that the domain is globally unique and collision of ACP addresses would therefore only happen due to ULA hash collisions. If the operator does not own any FQDN, it should choose a string in FQDN format that intends to be equally unique.



"routing-subdomain" is the autonomic subdomain that is used to calculate the hash for the ULA Global ID of the ACP address of the node. "rsub" is optional; its syntax is defined in this document, but its semantics are for further study. Understanding the benefits of using rsub may depend on the results of future work on enhancing routing for the ACP. When "rsub" is not used, "routing-subdomain" is the same as "domain". "rsub" needs to be in the "local-part"; it could not syntactically be separated from "domain-name" if "domain" is just a domain name. It also makes it easier for domain name to be a valid e-mail target.

The optional "extensions" field is used for future extensions to this specification. It MUST be ignored if present and not understood.

In this specification, the "acp-address" field is REQUIRED, but future variations (see [Section 10.11](#)) may use local information to derive the ACP address. In this case, "acp-address" could be empty. Such a variation would be indicated by an appropriate "extension". If "acp-address" is empty, and "rsub" is empty too, the "local-part" will have the format "rfcSELF + + extension(s)". The two plus characters are necessary so the node can unambiguously parse that both "acp-address" and "rsub" are empty.

Note that the maximum size of "domain-information" is 254 characters and the maximum size of node-info is 64 characters according to [\[RFC5280\]](#) that is referring to [\[RFC2821\]](#) (superseded by [\[RFC5321\]](#)).

The subjectAltName / rfc822Name encoding of the ACP domain name and ACP address is used for the following reasons:

- o It should be possible to share the LDevID with other uses beside the ACP. Therefore, the information element required for the ACP should be encoded so that it minimizes the possibility of creating incompatibilities with such other uses.
- o The information for the ACP should not cause incompatibilities with any pre-existing ASN.1 software. This eliminates the introduction of a novel information element because that could require extensions to such pre-existing ASN.1 parsers.
- o subjectAltName / rfc822Name is a pre-existing element that must be supported by all existing ASN.1 parsers for LDevID.
- o The element required for the ACP should not be misinterpreted by any other uses of the LDevID. If the element used for the ACP is interpreted by other uses, the impact should be benign.



- o Using an IP address format encoding could result in non-benign misinterpretation of the domain information field; other uses unaware of the ACP could try to do something with the ACP address that would fail to work correctly. For example, the address could be interpreted to be an address of the node which does not belong to the ACP VRF.
- o At minimum, both the AN domain name and the non-domain name derived part of the ACP address need to be encoded in one or more appropriate fields of the certificate, so there are not many alternatives with pre-existing fields where the only possible conflicts would likely be beneficial.
- o rfc822Name encoding is quite flexible. We choose to encode the full ACP address AND the domain name with sub part into a single rfc822Name information element it, so that it is easier to examine/use the "domain information field".
- o The format of the rfc822Name is chosen so that an operator can set up a mailbox called rfcSELF@<domain> that would receive emails sent towards the rfc822Name of any node inside a domain. This is possible because in many modern mail systems, components behind a "+" character are considered part of a single mailbox. In other words, it is not necessary to set up a separate mailbox for every ACP node, but only one for the whole domain.
- o In result, if any unexpected use of the ACP addressing information in a certificate happens, it is benign and detectable: it would be mail to that mailbox.

See [section 4.2.1.6 of \[RFC5280\]](#) for details on the subjectAltName field.

#### **6.1.2. ACP domain membership check**

The following points constitute the ACP domain membership check:

- o The peer certificate is valid as proven by the security associations protocol exchange.
- o The peer's certificate is signed by one of the trust anchors associated with the ACP domain certificate.
- o If the node certificates indicates a Certificate Revocation List (CRL) Distribution Point (CDP) ([\[RFC5280\], section 4.2.1.13](#)) or Online Certificate Status Protocol (OCSP) responder ([\[RFC5280\], section 4.2.2.1](#)), then the peer's certificate must be valid according to those criteria: An OCSP check for the peers





certificate across the ACP must succeed or the peer certificate must not be listed in the CRL retrieved from the CDP.

- o The peers certificate has a syntactically valid domain information field (subjectAltName / rfc822Name) and the domain name in that peers domain information field is the same as in this ACP node certificate. Note that future Intent rules may modify this. See [Section 10.10](#).

### **6.1.3. Certificate Maintenance**

ACP nodes MUST support certificate renewal via EST ("Enrollment over Secure Transport", see [\[RFC7030\]](#)) and MAY support other mechanisms. An ACP network MUST have at least one ACP node supporting EST server functionality across the ACP so that EST renewal is useable.

ACP nodes SHOULD be able to remember the EST server from which they last renewed their ACP domain certificate and SHOULD provide the ability for this remembered EST server to also be set by the ACP Registrar (see [Section 6.10.7](#)) that initially enrolled the ACP device with its ACP domain certificate. When BRSKI (see [\[I-D.ietf-anima-bootstrapping-keyinfra\]](#)) is used, the ACP address of the BRSKI registrar from the BRSKI TLS connection SHOULD be remembered and used for the next renewal via EST if that registrar also announces itself as an EST server via GRASP (see next section) on its ACP address.

#### **6.1.3.1. GRASP objective for EST server**

ACP nodes that are EST servers MUST announce their service via GRASP in the ACP through M\_FLOOD messages. See [\[I-D.ietf-anima-grasp\]](#), section 2.8.11 for the definition of this message type:

Example:

```
[M_FLOOD, 12340815, h'fd89b714f3db0000200000064000001', 210000,
  ["SRV.est", 4, 255 ],
  [O_IPv6_LOCATOR,
    h'fd89b714f3db0000200000064000001', TCP, 80]
]
```

Figure 3: GRASP SRV.est example

The formal definition of the objective in Concise data definition language (CDDL) (see [\[I-D.ietf-cbor-cddl\]](#)) is as follows:



```
flood-message = [M_FLOOD, session-id, initiator, ttl,
                 +[objective, (locator-option / [])]]

objective = ["SRV.est", objective-flags, loop-count,
            objective-value]

objective-flags = sync-only ; as in GRASP spec
sync-only = 4 ; M_FLOOD only requires synchronization
loop-count = 255 ; recommended
objective-value = ; Not used (yet)
```

Figure 4: GRASP SRV.est definition

The objective value "SRV.est" indicates that the objective is an [\[RFC7030\]](#) compliant EST server because "est" is an [\[RFC6335\]](#) registered service name for [\[RFC7030\]](#). Future backward compatible extensions/alternatives to [\[RFC7030\]](#) may be indicated through objective-value. Future non-backward compatible certificate renewal options must use a different objective-name.

The M\_FLOOD message MUST be sent periodically. The default SHOULD be 60 seconds, the value SHOULD be operator configurable. The frequency of sending MUST be such that the aggregate amount of periodic M\_FLOODs from all flooding sources causes only negligible traffic across the ACP. The ttl parameter SHOULD be 3.5 times the period so that up to three consecutive messages can be dropped before considering an announcement expired. In the example above, the ttl is 210000 msec, 3.5 times 60 seconds. When a service announcer using these parameters unexpectedly dies immediately after sending the M\_FLOOD, receivers would consider it expired 210 seconds later. When a receiver tries to connect to this dead service before this timeout, it will experience a failing connection and use that as an indication that the service is dead and select another instance of the same service instead.

#### [6.1.3.2](#). Renewal

When performing renewal, the node SHOULD attempt to connect to the remembered EST server. If that fails, it SHOULD attempt to connect to an EST server learned via GRASP. The server with which certificate renewal succeeds SHOULD be remembered for the next renewal.

Remembering the last renewal server and preferring it provides stickiness which can help diagnostics. It also provides some protection against off-path compromised ACP members announcing bogus information into GRASP.



Renewal of certificates SHOULD start after less than 50% of the domain certificate lifetime so that network operations has ample time to investigate and resolve any problems that causes a node to not renew its domain certificate in time - and to allow prolonged periods of running parts of a network disconnected from any CA.

#### **6.1.3.3. Certificate Revocation Lists (CRLs)**

The ACP node SHOULD support Certificate Revocation Lists (CRL) via HTTPs from one or more CRL Distribution Points (CDPs). The CDP(s) MUST be indicated in the Domain Certificate when used. If the CDP URL uses an IPv6 address (ULA address when using the addressing rules specified in this document), the ACP node will connect to the CDP via the ACP. If the CDP URL uses an IPv4 address (ULA address when using the addressing rules specified in this document), the ACP node will connect to the CDP via the ACP. If the CDP uses a domain name, the ACP node will connect to the CDP via the Data-Plane.

It is common to use domain names for CDP(s), but there is no requirement for the ACP to support DNS. Any DNS lookup in the Data-Plane is not only a possible security issue, but it would also not indicate whether the resolved address is meant to be reachable across the ACP. Therefore, the use of an IPv6 address versus the use of a DNS name doubles as an indicator whether or not to reach the CDP via the ACP.

A CDP can be reachable across the ACP either by running it on a node with ACP or by connecting its node via an ACP connect interface (see [Section 8.1](#)). The CDP SHOULD use an ACP domain certificate for its HTTPs connections. The connecting ACP node SHOULD verify that the CDP certificate used during the HTTPs connection has the same ACP address as indicated in the CDP URL of the nodes ACP domain certificate

#### **6.1.3.4. Lifetimes**

Certificate lifetime may be set to shorter lifetimes than customary (1 year) because certificate renewal is fully automated via ACP and EST. The primary limiting factor for shorter certificate lifetimes is load on the EST server(s) and CA. It is therefore recommended that ACP domain certificates are managed via a CA chain where the assigning CA has enough performance to manage short lived certificates. See also [Section 10.3.4](#) for discussion about an example setup achieving this.

When certificate lifetimes are sufficiently short, such as few hours, certificate revocation may not be necessary, allowing to simplify the overall certificate maintenance infrastructure.



See [Section 10.1](#) for further optimizations of certificate maintenance when BRSKI can be used ("Bootstrapping Remote Secure Key Infrastructures", see [[I-D.ietf-anima-bootstrapping-keyinfra](#)]).

#### **6.1.3.5. Re-enrollment**

An ACP node may determine that its ACP domain certificate has expired, for example because the ACP node was powered down or disconnected longer than its certificate lifetime. In this case, the ACP node SHOULD convert to a role of a re-enrolling candidate ACP node.

In this role, the node does maintain the trust anchor and certificate chain associated with its ACP domain certificate exclusively for the purpose of re-enrollment, and attempts (or waits) to get re-enrolled with a new ACP certificate. The details depend on the mechanisms/protocols used by the ACP registrars.

Please refer to [Section 6.10.7](#) for explanations about ACP registrars and vouchers as used in the following text.

When BRSKI is used (aka: on ACP nodes that are ANI nodes), the re-enrolling candidate ACP node would attempt to enroll like a candidate ACP node (BRSKI pledge), but instead of using the ACP nodes IDevID, it SHOULD first attempt to use its ACP domain certificate in the BRSKI TLS authentication. The BRSKI registrar MAY honor this certificate beyond its expiration date purely for the purpose of re-enrollment. Using the ACP nodes domain certificate allows the BRSKI registrar to learn that nodes ACP domain information field, so that the BRSKI registrar can re-assign the same ACP address information to the ACP node in the new ACP domain certificate.

If the BRSKI registrar denies the use of the old ACP domain certificate, the re-enrolling candidate ACP node MUST re-attempt re-enrollment using its IDevID as defined in BRSKI during the TLS connection setup.

Both when the BRSKI connection is attempted with the old ACP domain certificate or the IDevID, the re-enrolling candidate ACP node SHOULD authenticate the BRSKI registrar during TLS connection setup based on its existing trust anchor/certificate chain information associated with its old ACP certificate. The re-enrolling candidate ACP node SHOULD only request a voucher from the BRSKI registrar when this authentication fails during TLS connection setup.

When other mechanisms than BRSKI are used for ACP domain certificate enrollment, the principles of the re-enrolling candidate ACP node are the same. The re-enrolling candidate ACP node attempts to





authenticate any ACP registrar peers during re-enrollment protocol/mechanisms via its existing certificate chain/trust anchor and provides its existing ACP domain certificate and other identification (such as the IDevID) as necessary to the registrar.

Maintaining existing trust anchor information is especially important when enrollment mechanisms are used that unlike BRSKI do not leverage a voucher mechanism to authenticate the ACP registrar and where therefore the injection of certificate failures could otherwise make the ACP node easily attackable remotely.

When using BRSKI or other protocol/mechanisms supporting vouchers, maintaining existing trust anchor information allows for re-enrollment of expired ACP certificates to be more lightweight, especially in environments where repeated acquisition of vouchers during the lifetime of ACP nodes may be operationally expensive or otherwise undesirable.

#### **6.1.3.6. Failing Certificates**

An ACP domain certificate is called failing in this document, if/when the ACP node can determine that it was revoked (or explicitly not renewed), or in the absence of such explicit local diagnostics, when the ACP node fails to connect to other ACP nodes in the same ACP domain using its ACP certificate. For connection failures to determine the ACP domain certificate as the culprit, the peer should pass the domain membership check ([Section 6.1.2](#)) and other reasons for the connection failure can be excluded because of the connection error diagnostics.

This type of failure can happen during setup/refresh of a secure ACP channel connections or any other use of the ACP domain certificate, such as for the TLS connection to an EST server for the renewal of the ACP domain certificate.

Example reasons for failing certificates that the ACP node can only discover through connection failure are that the domain certificate or any of its signing certificates could have been revoked or may have expired, but the ACP node can not self-diagnose this condition directly. Revocation information or clock synchronization may only be available across the ACP, but the ACP node can not build ACP secure channels because ACP peers reject the ACP node's domain certificate.

ACP nodes SHOULD support the option to determine whether its ACP certificate is failing, and when it does, put itself into the role of a re-enrolling candidate ACP node as explained above ([Section 6.1.3.5](#)).



## **6.2. ACP Adjacency Table**

To know to which nodes to establish an ACP channel, every ACP node maintains an adjacency table. The adjacency table contains information about adjacent ACP nodes, at a minimum: Node-ID (identifier of the node inside the ACP, see [Section 6.10.3](#) and [Section 6.10.5](#)), interface on which neighbor was discovered (by GRASP as explained below), link-local IPv6 address of neighbor on that interface, certificate (including domain information field). An ACP node MUST maintain this adjacency table up to date. This table is used to determine to which neighbor an ACP connection is established.

Where the next ACP node is not directly adjacent (i.e., not on a link connected to this node), the information in the adjacency table can be supplemented by configuration. For example, the Node-ID and IP address could be configured.

The adjacency table MAY contain information about the validity and trust of the adjacent ACP node's certificate. However, subsequent steps MUST always start with authenticating the peer.

The adjacency table contains information about adjacent ACP nodes in general, independently of their domain and trust status. The next step determines to which of those ACP nodes an ACP connection should be established.

Interaction between ACP and other autonomic elements like GRASP (see below) or ASAs should be via an API that allows (appropriately access controlled) read/write access to the ACP Adjacency Table. Specification of such an API is subject to future work.

## **6.3. Neighbor Discovery with DULL GRASP**

[RFC Editor: GRASP draft is in RFC editor queue, waiting for dependencies, including ACP. Please ensure that references to I-D.ietf-anima-grasp that include section number references (throughout this document) will be updated in case any last-minute changes in GRASP would make those section references change.]

DULL GRASP is a limited subset of GRASP intended to operate across an insecure link-local scope. See section 2.5.2 of [\[I-D.ietf-anima-grasp\]](#) for its formal definition. The ACP uses one instance of DULL GRASP for every L2 interface of the ACP node to discover link level adjacent candidate ACP neighbors. Unless modified by policy as noted earlier ([Section 5](#) bullet point 2.), native interfaces (e.g., physical interfaces on physical nodes) SHOULD be initialized automatically enough, so that ACP discovery can be performed and any native interfaces with ACP neighbors can then be



brought into the ACP even if the interface is otherwise not configured. Reception of packets on such otherwise not configured interfaces MUST be limited so that at first only IPv6 State Less Address Auto Configuration (SLAAC - [[RFC4862](#)]) and DULL GRASP work and then only the following ACP secure channel setup packets - but not any other unnecessary traffic (e.g., no other link-local IPv6 transport stack responders for example).

Note that the use of the IPv6 link-local multicast address (ALL\_GRASP\_NEIGHBORS) implies the need to use Multicast Listener Discovery Version 2 (MLDv2, see [[RFC3810](#)]) to announce the desire to receive packets for that address. Otherwise DULL GRASP could fail to operate correctly in the presence of MLD snooping, non-ACP enabled L2 switches - because those would stop forwarding DULL GRASP packets. Switches not supporting MLD snooping simply need to operate as pure L2 bridges for IPv6 multicast packets for DULL GRASP to work.

ACP discovery SHOULD NOT be enabled by default on non-native interfaces. In particular, ACP discovery MUST NOT run inside the ACP across ACP virtual interfaces. See [Section 10.5](#) for further, non-normative suggestions on how to enable/disable ACP at node and interface level. See [Section 8.2.2](#) for more details about tunnels (typical non-native interfaces). See [Section 7](#) for how ACP should be extended on devices operating (also) as L2 bridges.

Note: If an ACP node also implements BRSKI to enroll its ACP domain certificate (see [Section 10.1](#) for a summary), then the above considerations also apply to GRASP discovery for BRSKI. Each DULL instance of GRASP set up for ACP is then also used for the discovery of a bootstrap proxy via BRSKI when the node does not have a domain certificate. Discovery of ACP neighbors happens only when the node does have the certificate. The node therefore never needs to discover both a bootstrap proxy and ACP neighbor at the same time.

An ACP node announces itself to potential ACP peers by use of the "AN\_ACP" objective. This is a synchronization objective intended to be flooded on a single link using the GRASP Flood Synchronization (M\_FLOOD) message. In accordance with the design of the Flood message, a locator consisting of a specific link-local IP address, IP protocol number and port number will be distributed with the flooded objective. An example of the message is informally:



Example:

```
[M_FLOOD, 12340815, h'fe80000000000000c0011001FEEF0000, 210000,
  ["AN_ACP", 4, 1, "IKEv2" ],
  [O_IPv6_LOCATOR,
    h'fe80000000000000c0011001FEEF0000, UDP, 15000]
  ["AN_ACP", 4, 1, "DTLS" ],
  [O_IPv6_LOCATOR,
    h'fe80000000000000c0011001FEEF0000, UDP, 17000]
]
```

Figure 5: GRASP AN\_ACP example

The formal CDDL definition is:

```
flood-message = [M_FLOOD, session-id, initiator, ttl,
  +[objective, (locator-option / [])]]

objective = ["AN_ACP", objective-flags, loop-count,
  objective-value]

objective-flags = sync-only ; as in the GRASP specification
sync-only = 4 ; M_FLOOD only requires synchronization
loop-count = 1 ; limit to link-local operation
objective-value = method
method = "IKEv2" / "DTLS" ; or future methods
```

Figure 6: GRASP AN\_ACP definition

The objective-flags field is set to indicate synchronization.

The loop-count is fixed at 1 since this is a link-local operation.

In the above example the RECOMMENDED period of sending of the objective is 60 seconds. The indicated ttl of 210000 msec means that the objective would be cached by ACP nodes even when two out of three messages are dropped in transit.

The session-id is a random number used for loop prevention (distinguishing a message from a prior instance of the same message). In DULL this field is irrelevant but must still be set according to the GRASP specification.

The originator MUST be the IPv6 link local address of the originating ACP node on the sending interface.

The 'objective-value' parameter is a string indicating the secure channel protocol available at the specified or implied locator.





The locator-option is optional and only required when the secure channel protocol is not offered at a well-defined port number, or if there is no well-defined port number.

"IKEv2" is the abbreviation for "Internet Key Exchange protocol version 2", as defined in [[RFC7296](#)]. It is the main protocol used by the Internet IP security architecture ("IPsec", see [[RFC4301](#)]). We therefore use the term "IKEv2" and not "IPsec" in the GRASP definitions and example above. "IKEv2" has a well-defined port number 500, but in the above example, the candidate ACP neighbor is offering ACP secure channel negotiation via IKEv2 on port 15000 (for the sake of creating a non-standard example).

If a locator is included, it MUST be an O\_IPv6\_LOCATOR, and the IPv6 address MUST be the same as the initiator address (these are DULL requirements to minimize third party DoS attacks).

The secure channel methods defined in this document use the objective values of "IKEv2" and "DTLS". There is no distinction between IKEv2 native and GRE-IKEv2 because this is purely negotiated via IKEv2.

A node that supports more than one secure channel protocol method needs to flood multiple versions of the "AN\_ACP" objective so that each method can be accompanied by its own locator-option. This can use a single GRASP M\_FLOOD message as shown in Figure 5.

Note that a node serving both as an ACP node and BRSKI Join Proxy may choose to distribute the "AN\_ACP" objective and the respective BRSKI in the same M\_FLOOD message, since GRASP allows multiple objectives in one message. This may be impractical though if ACP and BRSKI operations are implemented via separate software modules / ASAs.

The result of the discovery is the IPv6 link-local address of the neighbor as well as its supported secure channel protocols (and non-standard port they are running on). It is stored in the ACP Adjacency Table, see [Section 6.2](#) which then drives the further building of the ACP to that neighbor.

#### **[6.4.](#) Candidate ACP Neighbor Selection**

An ACP node must determine to which other ACP nodes in the adjacency table it should build an ACP connection. This is based on the information in the ACP Adjacency table.

The ACP is by default established exclusively between nodes in the same domain. This includes all routing subdomains. [Section 10.10](#) explains how ACP connections across multiple routing subdomains are special.



Future extensions to this document including Intent can change this default behavior. Examples include:

- o Build the ACP across all domains that have a common parent domain. For example ACP nodes with domain "example.com", nodes of "example.com", "access.example.com", "core.example.com" and "city.core.example.com" could all establish one single ACP.
- o ACP connections across domains with different Certificate Authorities (CA) could establish a common ACP by installing the alternate domains' CA into the trusted anchor store. This is an executive management action that could easily be accomplished through the control channel created by the ACP.

Since Intent is transported over the ACP, the first ACP connection a node establishes is always following the default behavior. See [Section 10.10](#) for more details.

The result of the candidate ACP neighbor selection process is a list of adjacent or configured autonomic neighbors to which an ACP channel should be established. The next step begins that channel establishment.

### **6.5. Channel Selection**

To avoid attacks, initial discovery of candidate ACP peers cannot include any non-protected negotiation. To avoid re-inventing and validating security association mechanisms, the next step after discovering the address of a candidate neighbor can only be to try first to establish a security association with that neighbor using a well-known security association method.

At this time in the lifecycle of ACP nodes, it is unclear whether it is feasible to even decide on a single MTI (mandatory to implement) security association protocol across all ACP nodes.

From the use-cases it seems clear that not all type of ACP nodes can or need to connect directly to each other or are able to support or prefer all possible mechanisms. For example, code space limited IoT devices may only support DTLS ("datagram Transport Layer Security version 1.2", see [[RFC6347](#)]) because that code exists already on them for end-to-end security, but low-end in-ceiling L2 switches may only want to support Media Access Control Security (MacSec, see 802.1AE ([[MACSEC](#)])) because that is also supported in their chips. Only a flexible gateway device may need to support both of these mechanisms and potentially more.



To support extensible secure channel protocol selection without a single common MTI protocol, ACP nodes must try all the ACP secure channel protocols it supports and that are feasible because the candidate ACP neighbor also announced them via its AN\_ACP GRASP parameters (these are called the "feasible" ACP secure channel protocols).

To ensure that the selection of the secure channel protocols always succeeds in a predictable fashion without blocking, the following rules apply:

- o An ACP node may choose to attempt initiate the different feasible ACP secure channel protocols it supports according to its local policies sequentially or in parallel, but it MUST support acting as a responder to all of them in parallel.
- o Once the first secure channel protocol succeeds, the two peers know each other's certificates because they must be used by all secure channel protocols for mutual authentication. The node with the lower Node-ID in the ACP address becomes Bob, the one with the higher Node-ID in the certificate Alice.
- o Bob becomes passive, he does not attempt to further initiate ACP secure channel protocols with Alice and does not consider it to be an error when Alice closes secure channels. Alice becomes the active party, continues to attempt setting up secure channel protocols with Bob until she arrives at the best one from her view that also works with Bob.

For example, originally Bob could have been the initiator of one ACP secure channel protocol that Bob prefers and the security association succeeded. The roles of Bob and Alice are then assigned. At this stage, the protocol may not even have completed negotiating a common security profile. The protocol could for example be IPsec via IKEv2 ("IP security", see [[RFC4301](#)] and "Internet Key Exchange protocol version 2", see [[RFC7296](#)]). It is now up to Alice to decide how to proceed. Even if the IPsec connection from Bob succeeded, Alice might prefer another secure protocol over IPsec (e.g., FOOBAR), and try to set that up with Bob. If that preference of Alice succeeds, she would close the IPsec connection. If no better protocol attempt succeeds, she would keep the IPsec connection.

All this negotiation is in the context of an "L2 interface". Alice and Bob will build ACP connections to each other on every "L2 interface" that they both connect to. An autonomic node must not assume that neighbors with the same L2 or link-local IPv6 addresses on different L2 interfaces are the same node. This can only be



determined after examining the certificate after a successful security association attempt.

### **6.6. Candidate ACP Neighbor verification**

Independent of the security association protocol chosen, candidate ACP neighbors need to be authenticated based on their domain certificate. This implies that any secure channel protocol MUST support certificate based authentication that can support the ACP domain membership check as defined in [Section 6.1.2](#). If it fails, the connection attempt is aborted and an error logged. Attempts to reconnect MUST be throttled. The RECOMMENDED default is exponential backoff with a minimum delay of 10 seconds and a maximum delay of 640 seconds.

### **6.7. Security Association protocols**

The following sections define the security association protocols that we consider to be important and feasible to specify in this document:

#### **6.7.1. ACP via IKEv2**

An ACP node announces its ability to support IKEv2 as the ACP secure channel protocol in GRASP as "IKEv2".

##### **6.7.1.1. Native IPsec**

To run ACP via IPsec natively, no further IANA assignments/definitions are required. An ACP node that is supporting native IPsec MUST use IPsec security setup via IKEv2, tunnel mode, local and peer link-local IPv6 addresses used for encapsulation. It MUST then support ESP with AES256 for encryption and SHA256 hash and MUST NOT permit weaker crypto options.

In terms of IKEv2, this means the initiator will offer to support IPsec tunnel mode with next protocol equal 41 (IPv6).

IPsec tunnel mode is required because the ACP will route/forward packets received from any other ACP node across the ACP secure channels, and not only its own generated ACP packets. With IPsec transport mode, it would only be possible to send packets originated by the ACP node itself.

ESP is used because ACP mandates the use of encryption for ACP secure channels.





#### **6.7.1.2. IPsec with GRE encapsulation**

In network devices it is often more common to implement high performance virtual interfaces on top of GRE encapsulation than on top of a "native" IPsec association (without any other encapsulation than those defined by IPsec). On those devices it may be beneficial to run the ACP secure channel on top of GRE protected by the IPsec association.

To run ACP via GRE/IPsec, no further IANA assignments/definitions are required. An ACP node that is supporting ACP via GRE/IPsec MUST then support IPsec security setup via IKEv2, IPsec transport mode, local and peer link-local IPv6 addresses used for encapsulation, ESP with AES256 encryption and SHA256 hash.

When GRE is used, transport mode is sufficient because the routed ACP packets are not "tunneled" by IPsec but rather by GRE: IPsec only has to deal with the GRE/IP packet which always uses the local and peer link-local IPv6 addresses and is therefore applicable to transport mode.

ESP is used because ACP mandates the use of encryption for ACP secure channels.

In terms of IKEv2 negotiation, this means the initiator must offer to support IPsec transport mode with next protocol equal to GRE (47) followed by the offer for native IPsec as described above (because that option is mandatory to support).

If IKEv2 initiator and responder support GRE, it will be selected. The version of GRE to be used must be according to [\[RFC7676\]](#).

#### **6.7.2. ACP via DTLS**

We define the use of ACP via DTLS in the assumption that it is likely the first transport encryption code basis supported in some classes of constrained devices.

To run ACP via UDP and DTLS v1.2 [\[RFC6347\]](#) a locally assigned UDP port is used that is announced as a parameter in the GRASP AN\_ACP objective to candidate neighbors. All ACP nodes supporting DTLS as a secure channel protocol MUST support AES256 encryption and MUST NOT permit weaker crypto options.

There is no additional session setup or other security association besides this simple DTLS setup. As soon as the DTLS session is functional, the ACP peers will exchange ACP IPv6 packets as the payload of the DTLS transport connection. Any DTLS defined security



association mechanisms such as re-keying are used as they would be for any transport application relying solely on DTLS.

### **6.7.3. ACP Secure Channel Requirements**

A baseline ACP node MUST support IPsec natively and MAY support IPsec via GRE. A constrained ACP node that can not support IPsec MUST support DTLS. ACP nodes connecting constrained areas with baseline areas MUST therefore support IPsec and DTLS.

ACP nodes need to specify in documentation the set of secure ACP mechanisms they support.

An ACP secure channel MUST immediately be terminated when the lifetime of any certificate in the chain used to authenticate the neighbor expires or becomes revoked. Note that this is not standard behavior in secure channel protocols such as IPsec because the certificate authentication only influences the setup of the secure channel in these protocols.

## **6.8. GRASP in the ACP**

### **6.8.1. GRASP as a core service of the ACP**

The ACP MUST run an instance of GRASP inside of it. It is a key part of the ACP services. The function in GRASP that makes it fundamental as a service of the ACP is the ability to provide ACP wide service discovery (using objectives in GRASP).

ACP provides IP unicast routing via the RPL routing protocol (see [Section 6.11](#)).

The ACP does not use IP multicast routing nor does it provide generic IP multicast services (the handling of GRASP link-local multicast messages is explained in [Section 6.8.2](#)). Instead, the ACP provides service discovery via the objective discovery/announcement and negotiation mechanisms of the ACP GRASP instance (services are a form of objectives). These mechanisms use hop-by-hop reliable flooding of GRASP messages for both service discovery (GRASP M\_DISCOVERY messages) and service announcement (GRASP M\_FLOOD messages).

See [Section 10.8](#) for more discussion about this design choice of the ACP and considerations for possible future variations.



### 6.8.2. ACP as the Security and Transport substrate for GRASP


In the terminology of GRASP ([[I-D.ietf-anima-grasp](#)]), the ACP is the security and transport substrate for the GRASP instance run inside the ACP ("ACP GRASP").

This means that the ACP is responsible for ensuring that this instance of GRASP is only sending messages across the ACP GRASP virtual interfaces. Whenever the ACP adds or deletes such an interface because of new ACP secure channels or loss thereof, the ACP needs to indicate this to the ACP instance of GRASP. The ACP exists also in the absence of any active ACP neighbors. It is created when the node has a domain certificate, and continues to exist even if all of its neighbors cease operation.

In this case ASAs using GRASP running on the same node would still need to be able to discover each other's objectives. When the ACP does not exist, ASAs leveraging the ACP instance of GRASP via APIs MUST still be able to operate, and MUST be able to understand that there is no ACP and that therefore the ACP instance of GRASP can not operate.

The way ACP acts as the security and transport substrate for GRASP is visualized in the following picture:

[RFC Editor: please try to put the following picture on a single page and remove this note. We cannot figure out how to do this with XML. The picture does fit on a single page.]











expected to be TLS for connections from/to the ACP address (e.g., global scope address(es)) and TCP for connections from/to link-local addresses on the ACP virtual interfaces. The latter ones are only used for flooding of GRASP messages.

#### **6.8.2.1. Discussion**

TCP encapsulation for GRASP M\_DISCOVERY and M\_FLOOD link local messages is used because these messages are flooded across potentially many hops to all ACP nodes and a single link with even temporary packet loss issues (e.g., WiFi/Powerline link) can reduce the probability for loss free transmission so much that applications would want to increase the frequency with which they send these messages. Such shorter periodic retransmission of datagrams would result in more traffic and processing overhead in the ACP than the hop-by-hop reliable retransmission mechanism by TCP and duplicate elimination by GRASP.

TLS is mandated for GRASP non-link-local unicast because the ACP secure channel mandatory authentication and encryption protects only against attacks from the outside but not against attacks from the inside: Compromised ACP members that have (not yet) been detected and removed (e.g., via domain certificate revocation / expiry).

If GRASP peer connections would just use TCP, compromised ACP members could simply eavesdrop passively on GRASP peer connections for whom they are on-path ("Man In The Middle" - MITM). Or intercept and modify them. With TLS, it is not possible to completely eliminate problems with compromised ACP members, but attacks are a lot more complex:

Eavesdropping/spoofing by a compromised ACP node is still possible because in the model of the ACP and GRASP, the provider and consumer of an objective have initially no unique information (such as an identity) about the other side which would allow them to distinguish a benevolent from a compromised peer. The compromised ACP node would simply announce the objective as well, potentially filter the original objective in GRASP when it is a MITM and act as an application level proxy. This of course requires that the compromised ACP node understand the semantics of the GRASP negotiation to an extent that allows it to proxy it without being detected, but in an ACP environment this is quite likely public knowledge or even standardized.

The GRASP TLS connections are run like any other ACP traffic through the ACP secure channels. This leads to double authentication/encryption. Future work optimizations could avoid this but it is unclear how beneficial/feasible this is:



- o The security considerations for GRASP change against attacks from non-ACP (e.g., "outside") nodes: TLS is subject to reset attacks while secure channel protocols may be not (e.g., IPsec is not).
- o The secure channel method may leverage hardware acceleration and there may be little or no gain in eliminating it.
- o The GRASP TLS connections need to implement any additional security options that are required for secure channels. For example the closing of connections when the peers certificate has expired.

### **6.9. Context Separation**

The ACP is in a separate context from the normal Data-Plane of the node. This context includes the ACP channels' IPv6 forwarding and routing as well as any required higher layer ACP functions.

In classical network system, a dedicated so called Virtual routing and forwarding instance (VRF) is one logical implementation option for the ACP. If possible by the systems software architecture, separation options that minimize shared components are preferred, such as a logical container or virtual machine instance. The context for the ACP needs to be established automatically during bootstrap of a node. As much as possible it should be protected from being modified unintentionally by ("Data-Plane") configuration.

Context separation improves security, because the ACP is not reachable from the global routing table. Also, configuration errors from the Data-Plane setup do not affect the ACP.

### **6.10. Addressing inside the ACP**

The channels explained above typically only establish communication between two adjacent nodes. In order for communication to happen across multiple hops, the autonomic control plane requires ACP network wide valid addresses and routing. Each ACP node must create a Loopback interface with an ACP network wide unique address inside the ACP context (as explained in in [Section 6.9](#)). This address may be used also in other virtual contexts.

With the algorithm introduced here, all ACP nodes in the same routing subdomain have the same /48 ULA prefix. Conversely, ULA global IDs from different domains are unlikely to clash, such that two ACP networks can be merged, as long as the policy allows that merge. See also [Section 9.1](#) for a discussion on merging domains.



Links inside the ACP only use link-local IPv6 addressing, such that each nodes ACP only requires one routable virtual address.

#### **6.10.1. Fundamental Concepts of Autonomic Addressing**

- o Usage: Autonomic addresses are exclusively used for self-management functions inside a trusted domain. They are not used for user traffic. Communications with entities outside the trusted domain use another address space, for example normally managed routable address space (called "Data-Plane" in this document).
- o Separation: Autonomic address space is used separately from user address space and other address realms. This supports the robustness requirement.
- o Loopback-only: Only ACP Loopback interfaces (and potentially those configured for "ACP connect", see [Section 8.1](#)) carry routable address(es); all other interfaces (called ACP virtual interfaces) only use IPv6 link local addresses. The usage of IPv6 link local addressing is discussed in [[RFC7404](#)].
- o Use-ULA: For Loopback interfaces of ACP nodes, we use Unique Local Addresses (ULA), as defined in [[RFC4193](#)] with L=1 (as defined in [section 3.1 of \[RFC4193\]](#)). Note that the random hash for ACP Loopback addresses uses the definition in [Section 6.10.2](#) and not the one of [[RFC4193](#)] [section 3.2.2](#).
- o No external connectivity: They do not provide access to the Internet. If a node requires further reaching connectivity, it should use another, traditionally managed address scheme in parallel.
- o Addresses in the ACP are permanent, and do not support temporary addresses as defined in [[RFC4941](#)].
- o Addresses in the ACP are not considered sensitive on privacy grounds because ACP nodes are not expected to be end-user devices. Therefore, ACP addresses do not need to be pseudo-random as discussed in [[RFC7721](#)]. Because they are not propagated to untrusted (non ACP) nodes and stay within a domain (of trust), we also consider them not to be subject to scanning attacks.

The ACP is based exclusively on IPv6 addressing, for a variety of reasons:









- o Type: This field allows different address sub-schemes. This addresses the "upgradability" requirement. Assignment of types for this field will be maintained by IANA.

The sub-scheme may imply a range or set of addresses assigned to the node, this is called the ACP address range/set and explained in each sub-scheme.

Please refer to [Section 6.10.7](#) and [Section 10.4](#) for further explanations why the following Sub-Addressing schemes are used and why multiple are necessary.

### **6.10.3. ACP Zone Addressing Sub-Scheme**

The sub-scheme defined here is defined by the Type value 00b (zero) in the base scheme and 0 in the Z bit.




Figure 9: ACP Zone Addressing Sub-Scheme

The fields are defined as follows:

- o Zone-ID: If set to all zero bits: The Node-ID bits are used as an identifier (as opposed to a locator). This results in a non-hierarchical, flat addressing scheme. Any other value indicates a zone. See [Section 6.10.3.1](#) on how this field is used in detail.
- o Z: MUST be 0.
- o Node-ID: A unique value for each node.

The 64 bit Node-ID is derived and composed as follows:

- o Registrar-ID (48 bit): A number unique inside the domain that identifies the ACP registrar which assigned the Node-ID to the node. A MAC address of the ACP registrar can be used for this purpose.
- o Node-Number: A number which is unique for a given ACP registrar, to identify the node. This can be a sequentially assigned number.



- o V (1 bit): Virtualization bit: 0: Indicates the ACP itself ("ACP node base system"); 1: Indicates the optional "host" context on the ACP node (see below).

In the ACP Zone Addressing Sub-Scheme, the ACP address in the certificate has Zone-ID and V fields as all zero bits. The ACP address set includes addresses with any Zone-ID value and any V value.

The "Node-ID" itself is unique in a domain (i.e., the Zone-ID is not required for uniqueness). Therefore, a node can be addressed either as part of a flat hierarchy (Zone-ID = 0), or with an aggregation scheme (any other Zone-ID). An address with Zone-ID = 0 is an identifier, with a Zone-ID != 0 it is a locator. See [Section 6.10.3.1](#) for more details.

The Virtual bit in this sub-scheme allows the easy addition of the ACP as a component to existing systems without causing problems in the port number space between the services in the ACP and the existing system. V:0 is the ACP router (autonomic node base system), V:1 is the host with pre-existing transport endpoints on it that could collide with the transport endpoints used by the ACP router. The ACP host could for example have a p2p virtual interface with the V:0 address as its router into the ACP. Depending on the software design of ASAs, which is outside the scope of this specification, they may use the V:0 or V:1 address.

The location of the V bit(s) at the end of the address allows the announcement of a single prefix for each ACP node. For example, in a network with 20,000 ACP nodes, this avoids 20,000 additional routes in the routing table.

#### **6.10.3.1. Usage of the Zone-ID Field**

The Zone-ID allows for the introduction of structure in the addressing scheme.

Zone-ID = 0 is the default addressing scheme in an ACP domain. Every ACP node with a Zone Addressing Sub-Scheme address MUST respond to its ACP address with Zone-ID = 0. Used on its own this leads to a non-hierarchical address scheme, which is suitable for networks up to a certain size. Zone-ID = 0 addresses act as identifiers for the nodes, and aggregation of these addresses in the ACP routing table is not possible.

If aggregation is required, the 13 bit Zone-ID value allows for up to 8191 zones. The allocation of Zone-ID's may either happen



automatically through a to-be-defined algorithm; or it could be configured and maintained explicitly.

If a node learns through a future autonomic method or through configuration that it is part of a zone, it MUST also respond to its ACP address with that Zone-ID. In this case the ACP Loopback is configured with two ACP addresses: One for Zone-ID = 0 and one for the assigned Zone-ID. This method allows for a smooth transition between a flat addressing scheme and an hierarchical one.

A node knowing it is in a zone MUST also use that Zone-ID != 0 address in GRASP locator fields. This eliminates the use of the identifier address (Zone-ID = 0) in forwarding and the need for network wide reachability of those non-aggregatable identifier addresses. Zone-ID != 0 addresses are assumed to be aggregatable in routing/forwarding based on how they are allocated in the ACP topology (subject to future work).

Note: Theoretically, the 13 bits for the Zone-ID would allow also for two levels of zones, introducing a sub-hierarchy. We do not think this is required at this point, but a new type could be used in the future to support such a scheme.

Note: The Zone-ID is one method to introduce structure or hierarchy into the ACP. Another way is the use of the routing subdomain field in the ACP that leads to multiple /48 Global IDs within an ACP domain. This gives future work two options to consider.

Note: Zones and Zone-ID as defined here are not related to [\[RFC4007\]](#) zones or zone\_id. ACP zone addresses are not scoped (reachable only from within an [RFC4007](#) zone) but reachable across the whole ACP. An [RFC4007](#) zone\_id is a zone index that has only local significance on a node, whereas an ACP Zone-ID is an identifier for an ACP zone that is unique across that ACP.

#### **6.10.4. ACP Manual Addressing Sub-Scheme**

The sub-scheme defined here is defined by the Type value 00b (zero) in the base scheme and 1 in the Z bit.






Figure 10: ACP Manual Addressing Sub-Scheme

The fields are defined as follows:

- o Subnet-ID: Configured subnet identifier.
- o Z: MUST be 1.
- o Interface Identifier.

This sub-scheme is meant for "manual" allocation to subnets where the other addressing schemes cannot be used. The primary use case is for assignment to ACP connect subnets (see [Section 8.1.1](#)).

"Manual" means that allocations of the Subnet-ID need to be done today with pre-existing, non-autonomic mechanisms. Every subnet that uses this addressing sub-scheme needs to use a unique Subnet-ID (unless some anycast setup is done). Future work may define mechanisms for auto-coordination between ACP nodes and auto-allocation of Subnet-IDs between them.

The Z bit field was added to distinguish Zone addressing and manual addressing sub-schemes without requiring one more bit in the base scheme and therefore allowing for the Vlong scheme (described below) to have one more bit available.

Manual addressing sub-scheme addresses SHOULD only be used in domain certificates assigned to nodes that cannot fully participate in the automatic establishment of ACP secure channels or ACP routing. The intended use are nodes connecting to the ACP via an ACP edge node and ACP connect interfaces (see [Section 8.1](#)) - such as legacy NOC equipment. They would not use their domain certificate for ACP secure channel creation and therefore do not need to participate in ACP routing either. They would use the certificate for authentication of any transport services. The value of the Interface Identifier is left for future definitions.





#### 6.10.5. ACP Vlong Addressing Sub-Scheme

The sub-scheme defined here is defined by the Type value 01b (one) in the base scheme.




Figure 11: ACP Vlong Addressing Sub-Scheme

This addressing scheme foregoes the Zone-ID field to allow for larger, flatter routed networks (e.g., as in IoT) with 8421376 Node-Numbers ( $2^{23}+2^{15}$ ). It also allows for up to  $2^{16}$  (i.e. 65536) different virtualized addresses within a node, which could be used to address individual software components in an ACP node.

The fields are the same as in the Zone-ID sub-scheme with the following refinements:

- o V: Virtualization bit: Values 0 and 1 are assigned in the same way as in the Zone-ID sub-scheme.
- o Registrar-ID: To maximize Node-Number and V, the Registrar-ID is reduced to 46 bits. This still permits the use of the MAC address of an ACP registrar by removing the V and U bits from the 48 bits of a MAC address (those two bits are never unique, so they cannot be used to distinguish MAC addresses).
- o If the first bit of the "Node-Number" is "1", then the Node-Number is 16 bit long and the V field is 16 bit long. Otherwise the Node-Number is 24 bit long and the V field is 8 bit long.

"0" bit Node-Numbers are intended to be used for "general purpose" ACP nodes that would potentially have a limited number (< 256) of clients (ASA/Autonomic Functions or legacy services) of the ACP that require separate V(irtual) addresses. "1" bit Node-Numbers are intended for ACP nodes that are ACP edge nodes (see [Section 8.1.1](#)) or that have a large number of clients requiring separate V(irtual) addresses. For example large SDN controllers with container modular software architecture (see [Section 8.1.2](#)).



In the Vlong addressing sub-scheme, the ACP address in the certificate has all V field bits as zero. The ACP address set for the node includes any V value.

#### **6.10.6. Other ACP Addressing Sub-Schemes**

Before further addressing sub-schemes are defined, experience with the schemes defined here should be collected. The schemes defined in this document have been devised to allow hopefully sufficiently flexible setup of ACPs for a variety of situation. These reasons also lead to the fairly liberal use of address space: The Zone Addressing Sub-Scheme is intended to enable optimized routing in large networks by reserving bits for Zone-ID's. The Vlong addressing sub-scheme enables the allocation of 8/16 bit of addresses inside individual ACP nodes. Both address spaces allow distributed, uncoordinated allocation of node addresses by reserving bits for the registrar-ID field in the address.

IANA is asked need to assign a new "type" for each new addressing sub-scheme. With the current allocations, only 2 more schemes are possible, so the last addressing scheme should consider making provisions provision for further extensions (e.g., by reserving bits from it for further extensions).

#### **6.10.7. ACP Registrars**

The ACP address prefix is assigned to the ACP node during enrollment/provisioning of the ACP domain certificate to the ACP node. It is intended to persist unchanged through the lifetime of the ACP node.

Because of the ACP addressing sub-schemes explained above, ACP nodes for a single ACP domain can be enrolled by multiple distributed and uncoordinated entities called ACP registrars. These ACP registrars are responsible to enroll ACP domain certificates and associated trust anchor(s) to candidate ACP nodes and are also responsible that an ACP domain information field is included in the ACP domain certificate.

##### **6.10.7.1. Use of BRSKI or other Mechanism/Protocols**

Any protocols or mechanisms may be used as ACP registrars, as long as the resulting ACP certificate and trust anchors allow to perform the ACP domain membership described in [Section 6.1.2](#) with other ACP domain members, and meet the ACP addressing requirements for its ACP domain information field as described further below in this section.

An ACP registrar could be a person deciding whether to enroll a candidate ACP node and then orchestrating the enrollment of the ACP



certificate and associated trust anchor, using command line or web based commands on the candidate ACP node and trust anchor to generate and sign the ACP domain certificate and configure certificate and trust anchors onto the node.

The only currently defined protocol for ACP registrars is BRSKI ([[I-D.ietf-anima-bootstrapping-keyinfra](#)]). When BRSKI is used, the ACP nodes are called ANI nodes, and the ACP registrars are called BRSKI or ANI registrars. The BRSKI specification does not define the handling of the ACP domain information field because the rules do not depend on BRSKI but apply equally to any protocols/mechanisms an ACP registrar may use.

#### **6.10.7.2. Unique Address/Prefix allocation**

ACP registrars MUST NOT allocate ACP address prefixes to ACP nodes via the ACP domain information field that would collide with the ACP address prefixes of other ACP nodes in the same ACP domain. This includes both prefixes allocated by the same ACP registrar to different ACP nodes as well as prefixes allocated by other ACP registrars for the same ACP domain.

For this purpose, an ACP registrar MUST have one or more unique 46 bit identifiers called Registrar-IDs used to allocate ACP address prefixes. The lower 46 bits of a EUI-48 MAC addresses are globally unique 46 bit identifiers, so ACP registrars with known unique EUI-48 MAC addresses can use these as Registrar-IDs. Registrar-IDs do not need to be globally unique but only unique across the set of ACP registrars for an ACP domain, so other means to assign unique Registrar-IDs to ACP registrars can be used, such as configuration on the ACP registrars.

When the candidate ACP device (called Pledge in BRSKI) is to be enrolled into an ACP domain, the ACP registrar needs to allocate a unique ACP address to the node and ensure that the ACP certificate gets a domain information field ([Section 6.1.1](#)) with the appropriate information - ACP domain-name, ACP-address, and so on. If the ACP registrar uses BRSKI, it signals the ACP information field to the Pledge via the EST /csraddr command (see [[I-D.ietf-anima-bootstrapping-keyinfra](#)], section 5.8.2 - "EST CSR Attributes").

[RFC editor: please update reference to [section 5.8.2](#) accordingly with latest BRSKI draft at time of publishing, or RFC]



### **6.10.7.3. Addressing Sub-Scheme Policies**

The ACP registrar selects for the candidate ACP node a unique address prefix from an appropriate ACP addressing sub-scheme, either a zone addressing sub-scheme prefix (see [Section 6.10.3](#)), or a Vlong addressing sub-scheme prefix (see [Section 6.10.5](#)). The assigned ACP address prefix encoded in the domain information field of the ACP domain certificate indicates to the ACP node its ACP address information. The sub-addressing scheme indicates the prefix length: /126 for zone address sub-scheme, /120 or /112 for Vlong address sub-scheme. The first address of the prefix is the ACP address, all other addresses in the prefix are for other uses by the ACP node as described in the zone and Vlong addressing sub scheme sections. The ACP address prefix itself is then signaled by the ACP node into the ACP routing protocol (see [Section 6.11](#)) to establish IPv6 reachability across the ACP.

The choice of addressing sub-scheme and prefix-length in the Vlong address sub-scheme is subject to ACP registrar policy. It could be an ACP domain wide policy, or a per ACP node or per ACP node type policy. For example, in BRSKI, the ACP registrar is aware of the IDevID of the candidate ACP node, which contains a serialNumber that is typically indicating the nodes vendor and device type and can be used to drive a policy selecting an appropriate addressing sub-scheme for the (class of) node(s).

ACP registrars SHOULD default to allocate ACP zone sub-address scheme addresses with Subnet-ID 0. Allocation and use of zone sub-addresses with Subnet-ID != 0 is outside the scope of this specification because it would need to go along with rules for extending ACP routing to multiple zones, which is outside the scope of this specification.

ACP registrars that can use the IDevID of a candidate ACP device SHOULD be able to choose the zone vs. Vlong sub-address scheme for ACP nodes based on the serialNumber of the IDevID, for example by the PID (Product Identifier) part which identifies the product type, or the complete serialNumber.

In a simple allocation scheme, an ACP registrar remembers persistently across reboots for its currently used Registrar-ID and for each addressing scheme (zone with Subnet-ID 0, Vlong with /112, Vlong with /120), the next Node-Number available for allocation and increases it after successful enrollment to an ACP node. In this simple allocation scheme, the ACP registrar would not recycle ACP address prefixes from no longer used ACP nodes.





#### **[6.10.7.4.](#) Address/Prefix Persistence**

When an ACP domain certificate is renewed or rekeyed via EST or other mechanisms, the ACP address/prefix in the ACP domain information field **MUST** be maintained unless security issues or violations of the unique address assignment requirements exist or are suspected by the ACP registrar. Even when the renewing/rekeying ACP registrar is not the same as the one that enrolled the prior ACP certificate. See [Section 10.3.4](#) for an example. ACP address information **SHOULD** also be maintained even after an ACP certificate did expire or failed. See [Section 6.1.3.5](#) and [Section 6.1.3.6](#).

#### **[6.10.7.5.](#) Further Details**

[Section 10.3](#) discusses further non-normative details of ACP registrars: What interactions registrars need, what parameters they require, certificate renewal and limitations, use of sub-CAs on registrars and centralized policy control.

### **[6.11.](#) Routing in the ACP**

Once ULA address are set up all autonomic entities should run a routing protocol within the autonomic control plane context. This routing protocol distributes the ULA created in the previous section for reachability. The use of the autonomic control plane specific context eliminates the probable clash with the global routing table and also secures the ACP from interference from the configuration mismatch or incorrect routing updates.

The establishment of the routing plane and its parameters are automatic and strictly within the confines of the autonomic control plane. Therefore, no explicit configuration is required.

All routing updates are automatically secured in transit as the channels of the autonomic control plane are by default secured, and this routing runs only inside the ACP.

The routing protocol inside the ACP is RPL ([\[RFC6550\]](#)). See [Section 10.7](#) for more details on the choice of RPL.

RPL adjacencies are set up across all ACP channels in the same domain including all its routing subdomains. See [Section 10.10](#) for more details.



### **6.11.1. RPL Profile**

The following is a description of the RPL profile that ACP nodes need to support by default. The format of this section is derived from [draft-ietf-roll-applicability-template](#).

#### **6.11.1.1. Summary**

In summary, the profile chosen for RPL is one that expects a fairly reliable network reasonably fast links so that RPL convergence will be triggered immediately upon recognition of link failure/recovery.

The key limitation of the chosen profile is that it is designed to not require any Data-Plane artifacts (such as [\[RFC6553\]](#)). While the senders/receivers of ACP packets can be legacy NOC devices connected via ACP connect (see [Section 8.1.1](#) to the ACP, their connectivity can be handled as non-RPL-aware leafs (or "Internet") according to the Data-Plane architecture explained in [\[I-D.ietf-roll-useofrplinfo\]](#). This non-artifact profile is largely driven by the desire to avoid introducing the required Hop-by-Hop headers into the ACP forwarding plane, especially to support devices with silicon forwarding planes that can not support insertion/removal of these headers in silicon.

In this profile choice, RPL has no Data-Plane artifacts. A simple destination prefix based upon the routing table is used. A consequence of supporting only a single instanceID that is containing one Destination Oriented Directed Acyclic Graph (DODAG), the ACP will only accommodate only a single class of routing table and cannot create optimized routing paths to accomplish latency or energy goals.

Consider a network that has multiple NOCs in different locations. Only one NOC will become the DODAG root. Other NOCs will have to send traffic through the DODAG (tree) rooted in the primary NOC. Depending on topology, this can be an annoyance from a latency point of view, but it does not represent a single point of failure, as the DODAG can reconfigure itself when it detects data plane forwarding failures.

The lack of RPL Packet Information (RPI, the IPv6 header for RPL defined by [\[RFC6553\]](#)), means that the Data-Plane will have no rank value that can be used to detect loops. As a result, traffic may loop until the TTL of the packet reaches zero. This the same behavior as that of other IGPs that do not have the Data-Plane options as RPL.

Since links in the ACP are assumed to be mostly reliable (or have link layer protection against loss) and because there is no stretch



according to [Section 6.11.1.7](#), loops should be exceedingly rare though.

There are a variety of mechanisms possible in RPL to further avoid temporary loops: DODAG Information Objects (DIOs) SHOULD be sent 2...3 times to inform children when losing the last parent. The technique in [\[RFC6550\] section 8.2.2.6](#). (Detaching) SHOULD be favored over that in [section 8.2.2.5](#)., (Poisoning) because it allows local connectivity. Nodes SHOULD select more than one parent, at least 3 if possible, and send Destination Advertisement Objects (DAO)s to all of them in parallel.

Additionally, failed ACP tunnels will be detected by IKEv2 Dead Peer Detection (which can function as a replacement for a Low-power and Lossy Networks' (LLN's) Expected Transmission Count (ETX). A failure of an ACP tunnel should signal the RPL control plane to pick a different parent.

Future Extensions to this RPL profile can provide optimality for multiple NOCs. This requires utilizing Data-Plane artifact including IPinIP encap/decap on ACP routers and processing of IPv6 RPI headers. Alternatively, (Src,Dst) routing table entries could be used. A decision for the preferred technology would have to be done when such extension is defined.

#### [6.11.1.2](#). RPL Instances

Single RPL instance. Default RPLInstanceID = 0.

#### [6.11.1.3](#). Storing vs. Non-Storing Mode

RPL Mode of Operations (MOP): MUST support mode 2 - "Storing Mode of Operations with no multicast support". Implementations MAY support mode 3 ("... with multicast support" as that is a superset of mode 2). Note: Root indicates mode in DIO flow.

#### [6.11.1.4](#). DAO Policy

Proactive, aggressive DAO state maintenance:

- o Use K-flag in unsolicited DAO indicating change from previous information (to require DAO-ACK).
- o Retry such DAO DAO-RETRIES(3) times with DAO- ACK\_TIME\_OUT(256ms) in between.



#### **6.11.1.5. Path Metric**

Hopcount.

#### **6.11.1.6. Objective Function**

Objective Function (OF): Use OF0 [[RFC6552](#)]. No use of metric containers.

rank\_factor: Derived from link speed:  $\leq 100\text{Mbps}$ :  
LOW\_SPEED\_FACTOR(5), else HIGH\_SPEED\_FACTOR(1)

#### **6.11.1.7. DODAG Repair**

Global Repair: we assume stable links and ranks (metrics), so no need to periodically rebuild DODAG. DODAG version only incremented under catastrophic events (e.g., administrative action).

Local Repair: As soon as link breakage is detected, send No-Path DAO for all the targets that were reachable only via this link. As soon as link repair is detected, validate if this link provides you a better parent. If so, compute your new rank, and send new DIO that advertises your new rank. Then send a DAO with a new path sequence about yourself.

stretch\_rank: none provided ("not stretched").

Data Path Validation: Not used.

Trickle: Not used.

#### **6.11.1.8. Multicast**

Not used yet but possible because of the selected mode of operations.

#### **6.11.1.9. Security**

[RFC6550] security not used, substituted by ACP security.

#### **6.11.1.10. P2P communications**

Not used.

#### **6.11.1.11. IPv6 address configuration**

Every ACP node (RPL node) announces an IPv6 prefix covering the address(es) used in the ACP node. The prefix length depends on the chosen addressing sub-scheme of the ACP address provisioned into the





certificate of the ACP node, e.g., /127 for Zone Addressing Sub-Scheme or /112 or /120 for Vlong addressing sub-scheme. See [Section 6.10](#) for more details.

Every ACP node MUST install a black hole (aka null) route for whatever ACP address space that it advertises (i.e.: the /96 or /127). This is avoid routing loops for addresses that an ACP node has not (yet) used.

#### **[6.11.1.12](#). Administrative parameters**

Administrative Preference ([[RFC6550](#)], 3.2.6 - to become root):  
Indicated in DODAGPreference field of DIO message.

- o Explicit configured "root": 0b100
- o ACP registrar (Default): 0b011
- o ACP-connect (non-registrar): 0b010
- o Default: 0b001.

#### **[6.11.1.13](#). RPL Data-Plane artifacts**

RPI (RPL Packet Information [[RFC6553](#)]): Not used as there is only a single instance, and data path validation is not being used.

SRH (RPL Source Routing - [RFC6552](#)): Not used. Storing mode is being used.

#### **[6.11.1.14](#). Unknown Destinations**

Because RPL minimizes the size of the routing and forwarding table, prefixes reachable through the same interface as the RPL root are not known on every ACP node. Therefore traffic to unknown destination addresses can only be discovered at the RPL root. The RPL root SHOULD have attach safe mechanisms to operationally discover and log such packets.

### **[6.12](#). General ACP Considerations**

Since channels are by default established between adjacent neighbors, the resulting overlay network does hop by hop encryption. Each node decrypts incoming traffic from the ACP, and encrypts outgoing traffic to its neighbors in the ACP. Routing is discussed in [Section 6.11](#).



### **6.12.1. Performance**

There are no performance requirements against ACP implementations defined in this document because the performance requirements depend on the intended use case. It is expected that full autonomic node with a wide range of ASA can require high forwarding plane performance in the ACP, for example for telemetry, but that determination is for future work. Implementations of ACP to solely support traditional/SDN style use cases can benefit from ACP at lower performance, especially if the ACP is used only for critical operations, e.g., when the Data-Plane is not available. See [\[RFC8368\]](#) for more details.

### **6.12.2. Addressing of Secure Channels in the Data-Plane**

In order to be independent of the Data-Plane configuration of global IPv6 subnet addresses (that may not exist when the ACP is brought up), Link-local secure channels MUST use IPv6 link local addresses between adjacent neighbors. The fully autonomic mechanisms in this document only specify these link-local secure channels. [Section 8.2](#) specifies extensions in which secure channels are tunnels. For those, this requirement does not apply.

The Link-local secure channels specified in this document therefore depend on basic IPv6 link-local functionality to be auto-enabled by the ACP and prohibiting the Data-Plane from disabling it. The ACP also depends on being able to operate the secure channel protocol (e.g., IPsec / DTLS) across IPv6 link-local addresses, something that may be an uncommon profile. Functionally, these are the only interactions with the Data-Plane that the ACP needs to have.

To mitigate these interactions with the Data-Plane, extensions to this document may specify additional layer 2 or layer encapsulations for ACP secure channels as well as other protocols to auto-discover peer endpoints for such encapsulations (e.g., tunneling across L3 or use of L2 only encapsulations).

### **6.12.3. MTU**

The MTU for ACP secure channels must be derived locally from the underlying link MTU minus the secure channel encapsulation overhead.

ACP secure Channel protocols do not need to perform MTU discovery because they are built across L2 adjacencies - the MTU on both sides connecting to the L2 connection are assumed to be consistent. Extensions to ACP where the ACP is for example tunneled need to consider how to guarantee MTU consistency. This is an issue of tunnels, not an issue of running the ACP across a tunnel. Transport



stacks running across ACP can perform normal PMTUD (Path MTU Discovery). Because the ACP is meant to be prioritize reliability over performance, they MAY opt to only expect IPv6 minimum MTU (1280) to avoid running into PMTUD implementation bugs or underlying link MTU mismatch problems.

#### **6.12.4. Multiple links between nodes**

If two nodes are connected via several links, the ACP SHOULD be established across every link, but it is possible to establish the ACP only on a sub-set of links. Having an ACP channel on every link has a number of advantages, for example it allows for a faster failover in case of link failure, and it reflects the physical topology more closely. Using a subset of links (for example, a single link), reduces resource consumption on the node, because state needs to be kept per ACP channel. The negotiation scheme explained in [Section 6.5](#) allows Alice (the node with the higher ACP address) to drop all but the desired ACP channels to Bob - and Bob will not re-try to build these secure channels from his side unless Alice shows up with a previously unknown GRASP announcement (e.g., on a different link or with a different address announced in GRASP).

#### **6.12.5. ACP interfaces**

The ACP VRF has conceptually two type of interfaces: The "ACP Loopback interface(s)" to which the ACP ULA address(es) are assigned and the "ACP virtual interfaces" that are mapped to the ACP secure channels.

The term "Loopback interface" was introduced initially to refer to an internal interface on a node that would allow IP traffic between transport endpoints on the node in the absence or failure of any or all external interfaces, see [\[RFC4291\] section 2.5.3](#).

Even though Loopback interfaces were originally designed to hold only Loopback addresses not reachable from outside the node, these interfaces are also commonly used today to hold addresses reachable from the outside. They are meant to be reachable independent of any external interface being operational, and therefore to be more resilient. These addresses on Loopback interfaces can be thought of as "node addresses" instead of "interface addresses", and that is what ACP address(es) are. This construct makes it therefore possible to address ACP nodes with a well-defined set of addresses independent of the number of external interfaces.

For these reason, the ACP (ULA) address(es) are assigned to Loopback interface(s).



ACP secure channels, e.g., IPsec, DTLS or other future security associations with neighboring ACP nodes can be mapped to ACP virtual interfaces in different ways:

ACP point-to-point virtual interface:

Each ACP secure channel is mapped into a separate point-to-point ACP virtual interface. If a physical subnet has more than two ACP capable nodes (in the same domain), this implementation approach will lead to a full mesh of ACP virtual interfaces between them.

ACP multi-access virtual interface:

In a more advanced implementation approach, the ACP will construct a single multi-access ACP virtual interface for all ACP secure channels to ACP capable nodes reachable across the same underlying (physical) subnet. IPv6 link-local multicast packets sent into an ACP multi-access virtual interface are replicated to every ACP secure channel mapped into the ACP multicast-access virtual interface. IPv6 unicast packets sent into an ACP multi-access virtual interface are sent to the ACP secure channel that belongs to the ACP neighbor that is the next-hop in the ACP forwarding table entry used to reach the packets destination address.

There is no requirement for all ACP nodes on the same multi-access subnet to use the same type of ACP virtual interface. This is purely a node local decision.

ACP nodes MUST perform standard IPv6 operations across ACP virtual interfaces including SLAAC (Stateless Address Auto-Configuration) - [[RFC4862](#)] to assign their IPv6 link local address on the ACP virtual interface and ND (Neighbor Discovery - [[RFC4861](#)]) to discover which IPv6 link-local neighbor address belongs to which ACP secure channel mapped to the ACP virtual interface. This is independent of whether the ACP virtual interface is point-to-point or multi-access.

"Optimistic Duplicate Address Detection (DAD)" according to [[RFC4429](#)] is RECOMMENDED because the likelihood for duplicates between ACP nodes is highly improbable as long as the address can be formed from a globally unique local assigned identifier (e.g., EUI-48/EUI-64, see below).

ACP nodes MAY reduce the amount of link-local IPv6 multicast packets from ND by learning the IPv6 link-local neighbor address to ACP secure channel mapping from other messages such as the source address of IPv6 link-local multicast RPL messages - and therefore forego the need to send Neighbor Solicitation messages.





The ACP virtual interface IPv6 link local address can be derived from any appropriate local mechanism such as node local EUI-48 or EUI-64 ("EUI" stands for "Extended Unique Identifier"). It MUST NOT depend on something that is attackable from the Data-Plane such as the IPv6 link-local address of the underlying physical interface, which can be attacked by SLAAC, or parameters of the secure channel encapsulation header that may not be protected by the secure channel mechanism.

The link-layer address of an ACP virtual interface is the address used for the underlying interface across which the secure tunnels are built, typically Ethernet addresses. Because unicast IPv6 packets sent to an ACP virtual interface are not sent to a link-layer destination address but rather an ACP secure channel, the link-layer address fields SHOULD be ignored on reception and instead the ACP secure channel from which the message was received should be remembered.

Multi-access ACP virtual interfaces are preferable implementations when the underlying interface is a (broadcast) multi-access subnet because they do reflect the presence of the underlying multi-access subnet into the virtual interfaces of the ACP. This makes it for example simpler to build services with topology awareness inside the ACP VRF in the same way as they could have been built running natively on the multi-access interfaces.

Consider also the impact of point-to-point vs. multi-access virtual interface on the efficiency of flooding via link local multicasted messages:

Assume a LAN with three ACP neighbors, Alice, Bob and Carol. Alice's ACP GRASP wants to send a link-local GRASP multicast message to Bob and Carol. If Alice's ACP emulates the LAN as one point-to-point virtual interface to Bob and one to Carol, The sending applications itself will send two copies, if Alice's ACP emulates a LAN, GRASP will send one packet and the ACP will replicate it. The result is the same. The difference happens when Bob and Carol receive their packet. If they use ACP point-to-point virtual interfaces, their GRASP instance would forward the packet from Alice to each other as part of the GRASP flooding procedure. These packets are unnecessary and would be discarded by GRASP on receipt as duplicates (by use of the GRASP Session ID). If Bob and Charly's ACP would emulate a multi-access virtual interface, then this would not happen, because GRASPs flooding procedure does not replicate back packets to the interface that they were received from.

Note that link-local GRASP multicast messages are not sent directly as IPv6 link-local multicast UDP messages into ACP virtual interfaces, but instead into ACP GRASP virtual interfaces, that are



layered on top of ACP virtual interfaces to add TCP reliability to link-local multicast GRASP messages. Nevertheless, these ACP GRASP virtual interfaces perform the same replication of message and, therefore, result in the same impact on flooding. See [Section 6.8.2](#) for more details.

RPL does support operations and correct routing table construction across non-broadcast multi-access (NBMA) subnets. This is common when using many radio technologies. When such NBMA subnets are used, they **MUST NOT** be represented as ACP multi-access virtual interfaces because the replication of IPv6 link-local multicast messages will not reach all NBMA subnet neighbors. In result, GRASP message flooding would fail. Instead, each ACP secure channel across such an interface **MUST** be represented as a ACP point-to-point virtual interface. These requirements can be avoided by coupling the ACP flooding mechanism for GRASP messages directly to RPL (flood GRASP across DODAG), but such an enhancement is subject for future work.

Care must also be taken when creating multi-access ACP virtual interfaces across ACP secure channels between ACP nodes in different domains or routing subdomains. The policies to be negotiated may be described as peer-to-peer policies in which case it is easier to create ACP point-to-point virtual interfaces for these secure channels.

## [7. ACP support on L2 switches/ports \(Normative\)](#)

### [7.1. Why](#)




Figure 12: Topology with L2 ACP switches

Consider a large L2 LAN with ANrtr1...ANrtrN connected via some topology of L2 switches. Examples include large enterprise campus networks with an L2 core, IoT networks or broadband aggregation networks which often have even a multi-level L2 switched topology.

If the discovery protocol used for the ACP is operating at the subnet level, every ACP router will see all other ACP routers on the LAN as neighbors and a full mesh of ACP channels will be built. If some or all of the AN switches are autonomic with the same discovery protocol, then the full mesh would include those switches as well.



A full mesh of ACP connections like this can create fundamental scale challenges. The number of security associations of the secure channel protocols will likely not scale arbitrarily, especially when they leverage platform accelerated encryption/decryption. Likewise, any other ACP operations (such as routing) need to scale to the number of direct ACP neighbors. An ACP router with just 4 physical interfaces might be deployed into a LAN with hundreds of neighbors connected via switches. Introducing such a new unpredictable scaling factor requirement makes it harder to support the ACP on arbitrary platforms and in arbitrary deployments.

Predictable scaling requirements for ACP neighbors can most easily be achieved if in topologies like these, ACP capable L2 switches can ensure that discovery messages terminate on them so that neighboring ACP routers and switches will only find the physically connected ACP L2 switches as their candidate ACP neighbors. With such a discovery mechanism in place, the ACP and its security associations will only need to scale to the number of physical interfaces instead of a potentially much larger number of "LAN-connected" neighbors. And the ACP topology will follow directly the physical topology, something which can then also be leveraged in management operations or by ASAs.

In the example above, consider ANswitch1 and ANswitchM are ACP capable, and ANswitch2 is not ACP capable. The desired ACP topology is that ANrtr1 and ANrtrM only have an ACP connection to ANswitch1, and that ANswitch1, ANrtr2, ANrtrN have a full mesh of ACP connection amongst each other. ANswitch1 also has an ACP connection with ANswitchM and ANswitchM has ACP connections to anything else behind it.

## **7.2. How (per L2 port DULL GRASP)**

To support ACP on L2 switches or L2 switched ports of an L3 device, it is necessary to make those L2 ports look like L3 interfaces for the ACP implementation. This primarily involves the creation of a separate DULL GRASP instance/domain on every such L2 port. Because GRASP has a dedicated link-local IPv6 multicast address (ALL\_GRASP\_NEIGHBORS), it is sufficient that all packets for this address are being extracted at the port level and passed to that DULL GRASP instance. Likewise the IPv6 link-local multicast packets sent by that DULL GRASP instance need to be sent only towards the L2 port for this DULL GRASP instance.

If the device with L2 ports is supporting per L2 port ACP DULL GRASP as well as MLD snooping ([[RFC4541](#)]), then MLD snooping must be changed to never forward packets for ALL\_GRASP\_NEIGHBORS because that would cause the problem that per L2 port ACP DULL GRASP is meant to overcome (forwarding DULL GRASP packets across L2 ports).



The rest of ACP operations can operate in the same way as in L3 devices: Assume for example that the device is an L3/L2 hybrid device where L3 interfaces are assigned to VLANs and each VLAN has potentially multiple ports. DULL GRASP is run as described individually on each L2 port. When it discovers a candidate ACP neighbor, it passes its IPv6 link-local address and supported secure channel protocols to the ACP secure channel negotiation that can be bound to the L3 (VLAN) interface. It will simply use link-local IPv6 multicast packets to the candidate ACP neighbor. Once a secure channel is established to such a neighbor, the virtual interface to which this secure channel is mapped should then actually be the L2 port and not the L3 interface to best map the actual physical topology into the ACP virtual interfaces. See [Section 6.12.5](#) for more details about how to map secure channels into ACP virtual interfaces. Note that a single L2 port can still have multiple ACP neighbors if it connects for example to multiple ACP neighbors via a non-ACP enabled switch. The per L2 port ACP virtual interface can therefore still be a multi-access virtual LAN.

For example, in the above picture, ANswitch1 would run separate DULL GRASP instances on its ports to ANrtr1, ANswitch2 and ANswitchI, even though all those three ports may be in the data plane in the same (V)LAN and perform L2 switching between these ports, ANswitch1 would perform ACP L3 routing between them.

The description in the previous paragraph was specifically meant to illustrate that on hybrid L3/L2 devices that are common in enterprise, IoT and broadband aggregation, there is only the GRASP packet extraction (by Ethernet address) and GRASP link-local multicast per L2-port packet injection that has to consider L2 ports at the hardware forwarding level. The remaining operations are purely ACP control plane and setup of secure channels across the L3 interface. This hopefully makes support for per-L2 port ACP on those hybrid devices easy.

This L2/L3 optimized approach is subject to "address stealing", e.g., where a device on one port uses addresses of a device on another port. This is a generic issue in L2 LANs and switches often already have some form of "port security" to prohibit this. They rely on NDP or DHCP learning of which port/MAC-address and IPv6 address belong together and block duplicates. This type of function needs to be enabled to prohibit DoS attacks. Likewise the GRASP DULL instance needs to ensure that the IPv6 address in the locator-option matches the source IPv6 address of the DULL GRASP packet.

In devices without such a mix of L2 port/interfaces and L3 interfaces (to terminate any transport layer connections), implementation details will differ. Logically most simply every L2 port is





considered and used as a separate L3 subnet for all ACP operations. The fact that the ACP only requires IPv6 link-local unicast and multicast should make support for it on any type of L2 devices as simple as possible, but the need to support secure channel protocols may be a limiting factor to supporting ACP on such devices. Future options such as MacSec could improve that situation.

A generic issue with ACP in L2 switched networks is the interaction with the Spanning Tree Protocol. Ideally, the ACP should be built also across ports that are blocked in STP so that the ACP does not depend on STP and can continue to run unaffected across STP topology changes (where re-convergence can be quite slow). The above described simple implementation options are not sufficient for this. Instead they would simply have the ACP run across the active STP topology and the ACP would equally be interrupted and re-converge with STP changes.

## **8. Support for Non-ACP Components (Normative)**

### **8.1. ACP Connect**

#### **8.1.1. Non-ACP Controller / NMS system**

The Autonomic Control Plane can be used by management systems, such as controllers or network management system (NMS) hosts (henceforth called simply "NMS hosts"), to connect to devices (or other type of nodes) through it. For this, an NMS host must have access to the ACP. The ACP is a self-protecting overlay network, which allows by default access only to trusted, autonomic systems. Therefore, a traditional, non-ACP NMS system does not have access to the ACP by default, just like any other external node.

If the NMS host is not autonomic, i.e., it does not support autonomic negotiation of the ACP, then it can be brought into the ACP by explicit configuration. To support connections to adjacent non-ACP nodes, an ACP node must support "ACP connect" (sometimes also called "autonomic connect"):

"ACP connect" is a function on an autonomic node that is called an "ACP edge node". With "ACP connect", interfaces on the node can be configured to be put into the ACP VRF. The ACP is then accessible to other (NOC) systems on such an interface without those systems having to support any ACP discovery or ACP channel setup. This is also called "native" access to the ACP because to those (NOC) systems the interface looks like a normal network interface (without any encryption/novel-signaling).



The ACP connect interface must be (auto-)configured with an IPv6 address prefix. Is prefix SHOULD be covered by one of the (ULA) prefix(es) used in the ACP. If using non-autonomic configuration, it SHOULD use the ACP Manual Addressing Sub-Scheme ([Section 6.10.4](#)). It SHOULD NOT use a prefix that is also routed outside the ACP so that the addresses clearly indicate whether it is used inside the ACP or not.



The prefix of ACP connect subnets MUST be distributed by the ACP edge node into the ACP routing protocol (RPL). The NMS hosts MUST connect to prefixes in the ACP routing table via its ACP connect interface. In the simple case where the ACP uses only one ULA prefix and all ACP connect subnets have prefixes covered by that ULA prefix, NMS hosts can rely on [\[RFC6724\]](#) - The NMS host will select the ACP connect interface because any ACP destination address is best matched by the address on the ACP connect interface. If the NMS hosts ACP connect interface uses another prefix or if the ACP uses multiple ULA prefixes, then the NMS hosts require (static) routes towards the ACP interface.

ACP Edge Nodes MUST only forward IPv6 packets received from an ACP connect interface into the ACP that has an IPv6 address from the ACP prefix assigned to this interface (sometimes called "RPF filtering"). This MAY be changed through administrative measures.

To limit the security impact of ACP connect, nodes supporting it SHOULD implement a security mechanism to allow configuration/use of ACP connect interfaces only on nodes explicitly targeted to be deployed with it (such as those physically secure locations like a NOC). For example, the certificate of such node could include an extension required to permit configuration of ACP connect interfaces. This prohibits that a random ACP node with easy physical access that is not meant to run ACP connect could start leaking the ACP when it becomes compromised and the intruder configures ACP connect on it. The full workflow including the mechanism by which an ACP registrar would select which node to give such a certificate to is subject to future work.

#### **[8.1.2.](#) Software Components**

The ACP connect mechanism be only be used to connect physically external systems (NMS hosts) to the ACP but also other applications, containers or virtual machines. In fact, one possible way to eliminate the security issue of the external ACP connect interface is to collocate an ACP edge node and an NMS host by making one a virtual machine or container inside the other; and therefore converting the unprotected external ACP subnet into an internal virtual subnet in a single device. This would ultimately result in a fully ACP enabled NMS host with minimum impact to the NMS hosts software architecture. This approach is not limited to NMS hosts but could equally be applied to devices consisting of one or more VNF (virtual network functions): An internal virtual subnet connecting out-of-band management interfaces of the VNFs to an ACP edge router VNF.

The core requirement is that the software components need to have a network stack that permits access to the ACP and optionally also the



Data-Plane. Like in the physical setup for NMS hosts this can be realized via two internal virtual subnets. One that is connecting to the ACP (which could be a container or virtual machine by itself), and one (or more) connecting into the Data-Plane.

This "internal" use of ACP connect approach should not be considered to be a "workaround" because in this case it is possible to build a correct security model: It is not necessary to rely on unprovable external physical security mechanisms as in the case of external NMS hosts. Instead, the orchestration of the ACP, the virtual subnets and the software components can be done by trusted software that could be considered to be part of the ANI (or even an extended ACP). This software component is responsible for ensuring that only trusted software components will get access to that virtual subnet and that only even more trusted software components will get access to both the ACP virtual subnet and the Data-Plane (because those ACP users could leak traffic between ACP and Data-Plane). This trust could be established for example through cryptographic means such as signed software packages. The specification of these mechanisms is subject to future work.

Note that ASA (Autonomic Software Agents) could also be software components as described in this section, but further details of ASAs are subject to future work.

### **8.1.3. Auto Configuration**

ACP edge nodes, NMS hosts and software components that as described in the previous section are meant to be composed via virtual interfaces SHOULD support on the ACP connect subnet Stateless Address Autoconfiguration (SLAAC - [[RFC4862](#)]) and route auto configuration according to [[RFC4191](#)].

The ACP edge node acts as the router on the ACP connect subnet, providing the (auto-)configured prefix for the ACP connect subnet to NMS hosts and/or software components. The ACP edge node uses route prefix option of [RFC4191](#) to announce the default route (::/) with a lifetime of 0 and aggregated prefixes for routes in the ACP routing table with normal lifetimes. This will ensure that the ACP edge node does not become a default router, but that the NMS hosts and software components will route the prefixes used in the ACP to the ACP edge node.

Aggregated prefix means that the ACP edge node needs to only announce the /48 ULA prefixes used in the ACP but none of the actual /64 (Manual Addressing Sub-Scheme), /127 (ACP Zone Addressing Sub-Scheme), /112 or /120 (Vlong Addressing Sub-Scheme) routes of actual ACP nodes. If ACP interfaces are configured with non ULA prefixes,





then those prefixes cannot be aggregated without further configured policy on the ACP edge node. This explains the above recommendation to use ACP ULA prefix covered prefixes for ACP connect interfaces: They allow for a shorter list of prefixes to be signaled via [RFC4191](#) to NMS hosts and software components.

The ACP edge nodes that have a Vlong ACP address MAY allocate a subset of their /112 or /120 address prefix to ACP connect interface(s) to eliminate the need to non-autonomically configure/provision the address prefixes for such ACP connect interfaces.

#### [8.1.4.](#) Combined ACP/Data-Plane Interface (VRF Select)




Figure 14: VRF select

Using two physical and/or virtual subnets (and therefore interfaces) into NMS Hosts (as per [Section 8.1.1](#)) or Software (as per [Section 8.1.2](#)) may be seen as additional complexity, for example with legacy NMS Hosts that support only one IP interface.

To provide a single subnet into both ACP and Data-Plane, the ACP Edge node needs to de-multiplex packets from NMS hosts into ACP VRF and Data-Plane. This is sometimes called "VRF select". If the ACP VRF has no overlapping IPv6 addresses with the Data-Plane (as it should), then this function can use the IPv6 Destination address. The problem is Source Address Selection on the NMS Host(s) according to [RFC6724](#).

Consider the simple case: The ACP uses only one ULA prefix, the ACP IPv6 prefix for the Combined ACP and Data-Plane interface is covered by that ULA prefix. The ACP edge node announces both the ACP IPv6 prefix and one (or more) prefixes for the Data-Plane. Without



further policy configurations on the NMS Host(s), it may select its ACP address as a source address for Data-Plane ULA destinations because of Rule 8 of [RFC6724](#). The ACP edge node can pass on the packet to the Data-Plane, but the ACP source address should not be used for Data-Plane traffic, and return traffic may fail.

If the ACP carries multiple ULA prefixes or non-ULA ACP connect prefixes, then the correct source address selection becomes even more problematic.

With separate ACP connect and Data-Plane subnets and [RFC4191](#) prefix announcements that are to be routed across the ACP connect interface, [RFC6724](#) source address selection Rule 5 (use address of outgoing interface) will be used, so that above problems do not occur, even in more complex cases of multiple ULA and non-ULA prefixes in the ACP routing table.

To achieve the same behavior with a Combined ACP and Data-Plane interface, the ACP Edge Node needs to behave as two separate routers on the interface: One link-local IPv6 address/router for its ACP reachability, and one link-local IPv6 address/router for its Data-Plane reachability. The Router Advertisements for both are as described above ([Section 8.1.3](#)): For the ACP, the ACP prefix is announced together with [RFC4191](#) option for the prefixes routed across the ACP and lifetime=0 to disqualify this next-hop as a default router. For the Data-Plane, the Data-Plane prefix(es) are announced together with whatever default router parameters are used for the Data-Plane.

In result, [RFC6724](#) source address selection Rule 5.5 may result in the same correct source address selection behavior of NMS hosts without further configuration on it as the separate ACP connect and Data-Plane interfaces. As described in the text for Rule 5.5, this is only a may, because IPv6 hosts are not required to track next-hop information. If an NMS Host does not do this, then separate ACP connect and Data-Plane interfaces are the preferable method of attachment. Hosts implementing [[RFC8028](#)] should (instead of may) implement [[RFC6724](#)] Rule 5.5, so it is preferred for hosts to support [[RFC8028](#)].

ACP edge nodes MAY support the Combined ACP and Data-Plane interface.

#### **8.1.5. Use of GRASP**

GRASP can and should be possible to use across ACP connect interfaces, especially in the architectural correct solution when it is used as a mechanism to connect Software (e.g., ASA or legacy NMS applications) to the ACP. Given how the ACP is the security and



transport substrate for GRASP, the trustworthiness of nodes/software allowed to participate in the ACP GRASP domain is one of the main reasons why the ACP section describes no solution with non-ACP routers participating in the ACP routing table.

ACP connect interfaces can be dealt with in the GRASP ACP domain like any other ACP interface assuming that any physical ACP connect interface is physically protected from attacks and that the connected Software or NMS Hosts are equally trusted as that on other ACP nodes. ACP edge nodes SHOULD have options to filter GRASP messages in and out of ACP connect interfaces (permit/deny) and MAY have more fine-grained filtering (e.g., based on IPv6 address of originator or objective).

When using "Combined ACP and Data-Plane Interfaces", care must be taken that only GRASP messages intended for the ACP GRASP domain received from Software or NMS Hosts are forwarded by ACP edge nodes. Currently there is no definition for a GRASP security and transport substrate beside the ACP, so there is no definition how such Software/NMS Host could participate in two separate GRASP Domains across the same subnet (ACP and Data-Plane domains). At current it is assumed that all GRASP packets on a Combined ACP and Data-Plane interface belong to the GRASP ACP Domain. They must all use the ACP IPv6 addresses of the Software/NMS Hosts. The link-local IPv6 addresses of Software/NMS Hosts (used for GRASP M\_DISCOVERY and M\_FLOOD messages) are also assumed to belong to the ACP address space.

## **8.2. ACP through Non-ACP L3 Clouds (Remote ACP neighbors)**

Not all nodes in a network may support the ACP. If non-ACP Layer-2 devices are between ACP nodes, the ACP will work across it since it is IP based. However, the autonomic discovery of ACP neighbors via DULL GRASP is only intended to work across L2 connections, so it is not sufficient to autonomically create ACP connections across non-ACP Layer-3 devices.

### **8.2.1. Configured Remote ACP neighbor**

On the ACP node, remote ACP neighbors are configured explicitly. The parameters of such a "connection" are described in the following ABNF. Future work could transform this into a YANG ([[RFC7950](#)]) data model.



```
connection = [ method , local-addr, remote-addr, ?pmtu ]
method      = [ "IKEv2" , ?port ]
method /= [ "DTLS",      port ]
local-addr  = [ address , ?vrf  ]
remote-addr = [ address ]
address = ("any" | ipv4-address | ipv6-address )
vrf = tstr ; Name of a VRF on this node with local-address
```

ABNF for parameters of explicitly configured remote ACP neighbors

Explicit configuration of a remote-peer according to this ABNF provides all the information to build a secure channel without requiring a tunnel to that peer and running DULL GRASP inside of it.

The configuration includes the parameters otherwise signaled via DULL GRASP: local address, remote (peer) locator and method. The differences over DULL GRASP local neighbor discovery and secure channel creation are as follows:

- o The local and remote address can be IPv4 or IPv6 and are typically global scope addresses.
- o The vrf across which the connection is built (and in which local-addr exists) can to be specified. If vrf is not specified, it is the default vrf on the node. In DULL GRASP the VRF is implied by the interface across which DULL GRASP operates.
- o If local address is "any", the local address used when initiating a secure channel connection is decided by source address selection ([\[RFC6724\]](#) for IPv6). As a responder, the connection listens on all addresses of the node in the selected vrf.
- o Configuration of port is only required for methods where no defaults exist (e.g., "DTLS").
- o If remote address is "any", the connection is only a responder. It is a "hub" that can be used by multiple remote peers to connect simultaneously - without having to know or configure their addresses. Example: Hub site for remote "spoke" sites reachable over the Internet.
- o Pmtu should be configurable to overcome issues/limitations of Path MTU Discovery (PMTUD).
- o IKEv2/IPsec to remote peers should support the optional NAT Traversal (NAT-T) procedures.





### **8.2.2. Tunneled Remote ACP Neighbor**

An IPinIP, GRE or other form of pre-existing tunnel is configured between two remote ACP peers and the virtual interfaces representing the tunnel are configured to "ACP enable". This will enable IPv6 link local addresses and DULL on this tunnel. In result, the tunnel is used for normal "L2 adjacent" candidate ACP neighbor discovery with DULL and secure channel setup procedures described in this document.

Tunneled Remote ACP Neighbor requires two encapsulations: the configured tunnel and the secure channel inside of that tunnel. This makes it in general less desirable than Configured Remote ACP Neighbor. Benefits of tunnels are that it may be easier to implement because there is no change to the ACP functionality - just running it over a virtual (tunnel) interface instead of only native interfaces. The tunnel itself may also provide PMTUD while the secure channel method may not. Or the tunnel mechanism is permitted/possible through some firewall while the secure channel method may not.

### **8.2.3. Summary**

Configured/Tunneled Remote ACP neighbors are less "indestructible" than L2 adjacent ACP neighbors based on link local addressing, since they depend on more correct Data-Plane operations, such as routing and global addressing.

Nevertheless, these options may be crucial to incrementally deploy the ACP, especially if it is meant to connect islands across the Internet. Implementations SHOULD support at least Tunneled Remote ACP Neighbors via GRE tunnels - which is likely the most common router-to-router tunneling protocol in use today.

Future work could envisage an option where the edge nodes of the L3 cloud is configured to automatically forward ACP discovery messages to the right exit point. This optimization is not considered in this document.

## **9. Benefits (Informative)**

### **9.1. Self-Healing Properties**

The ACP is self-healing:

- o New neighbors will automatically join the ACP after successful validation and will become reachable using their unique ULA address across the ACP.



- o When any changes happen in the topology, the routing protocol used in the ACP will automatically adapt to the changes and will continue to provide reachability to all nodes.
- o If the domain certificate of an existing ACP node gets revoked, it will automatically be denied access to the ACP as its domain certificate will be validated against a Certificate Revocation List during authentication. Since the revocation check is only done at the establishment of a new security association, existing ones are not automatically torn down. If an immediate disconnect is required, existing sessions to a freshly revoked node can be re-set.

The ACP can also sustain network partitions and mergers. Practically all ACP operations are link local, where a network partition has no impact. Nodes authenticate each other using the domain certificates to establish the ACP locally. Addressing inside the ACP remains unchanged, and the routing protocol inside both parts of the ACP will lead to two working (although partitioned) ACPs.

There are few central dependencies: A certificate revocation list (CRL) may not be available during a network partition; a suitable policy to not immediately disconnect neighbors when no CRL is available can address this issue. Also, an ACP registrar or Certificate Authority might not be available during a partition. This may delay renewal of certificates that are to expire in the future, and it may prevent the enrollment of new nodes during the partition.

Highly resilient ACP designs can be built by using ACP registrars with embedded sub-CA, as outlined in [Section 10.3.4](#). As long a partition is left with one or more of such ACP registrars, it can continue to enroll new candidate ACP nodes as long as the ACP registrars sub-CA certificate does not expire. Because the ACP addressing relies on unique Registrar-IDs, a later re-merge of partitions will also not cause problems with ACP addresses assigned during partitioning.

After a network partition, a re-merge will just establish the previous status, certificates can be renewed, the CRL is available, and new nodes can be enrolled everywhere. Since all nodes use the same trust anchor, a re-merge will be smooth.

Merging two networks with different trust anchors requires the trust anchors to mutually trust each other (for example, by cross-signing). As long as the domain names are different, the addressing will not overlap (see [Section 6.10](#)).



It is also highly desirable for implementation of the ACP to be able to run it over interfaces that are administratively down. If this is not feasible, then it might instead be possible to request explicit operator override upon administrative actions that would administratively bring down an interface across which the ACP is running. Especially if bringing down the ACP is known to disconnect the operator from the node. For example any such down administrative action could perform a dependency check to see if the transport connection across which this action is performed is affected by the down action (with default RPL routing used, packet forwarding will be symmetric, so this is actually possible to check).

## **9.2. Self-Protection Properties**

### **9.2.1. From the outside**

As explained in [Section 6](#), the ACP is based on secure channels built between nodes that have mutually authenticated each other with their domain certificates. The channels themselves are protected using standard encryption technologies like DTLS or IPsec which provide additional authentication during channel establishment, data integrity and data confidentiality protection of data inside the ACP and in addition, provide replay protection.

An attacker will not be able to join the ACP unless having a valid domain certificate, also packet injection and sniffing traffic will not be possible due to the security provided by the encryption protocol.

The ACP also serves as protection (through authentication and encryption) for protocols relevant to OAM that may not have secured protocol stack options or where implementation or deployment of those options fails on some vendor/product/customer limitations. This includes protocols such as SNMP, NTP/PTP, DNS, DHCP, syslog, Radius/Diameter/TACACS, IPFIX/Netflow - just to name a few. Protection via the ACP secure hop-by-hop channels for these protocols is meant to be only a stopgap though: The ultimate goal is for these and other protocols to use end-to-end encryption utilizing the domain certificate and rely on the ACP secure channels primarily for zero-touch reliable connectivity, but not primarily for security.

The remaining attack vector would be to attack the underlying ACP protocols themselves, either via directed attacks or by denial-of-service attacks. However, as the ACP is built using link-local IPv6 address, remote attacks are impossible. The ULA addresses are only reachable inside the ACP context, therefore, unreachable from the Data-Plane. Also, the ACP protocols should be implemented to be



attack resistant and not consume unnecessary resources even while under attack.

#### **9.2.2. From the inside**

The security model of the ACP is based on trusting all members of the group of nodes that do receive an ACP domain certificate for the same domain. Attacks from the inside by a compromised group member are therefore the biggest challenge.

Group members must be protected against attackers so that there is no easy way to compromise them, or use them as a proxy for attacking other devices across the ACP. For example, management plane functions (transport ports) should only be reachable from the ACP but not the Data-Plane. Especially for those management plane functions that have no good protection by themselves because they do not have secure end-to-end transport and to whom ACP does not only provides automatic reliable connectivity but also protection against attacks. Protection across all potential attack vectors is typically easier to do in devices whose software is designed from the ground up with security in mind than with legacy software based systems where the ACP is added on as another feature.

As explained above, traffic across the ACP SHOULD still be end-to-end encrypted whenever possible. This includes traffic such as GRASP, EST and BRSKI inside the ACP. This minimizes man in the middle attacks by compromised ACP group members. Such attackers cannot eavesdrop or modify communications, they can just filter them (which is unavoidable by any means).

Further security can be achieved by constraining communication patterns inside the ACP, for example through roles that could be encoded into the domain certificates. This is subject for future work.

#### **9.3. The Administrator View**

An ACP is self-forming, self-managing and self-protecting, therefore has minimal dependencies on the administrator of the network. Specifically, since it is independent of configuration, there is no scope for configuration errors on the ACP itself. The administrator may have the option to enable or disable the entire approach, but detailed configuration is not possible. This means that the ACP must not be reflected in the running configuration of nodes, except a possible on/off switch.

While configuration is not possible, an administrator must have full visibility of the ACP and all its parameters, to be able to do





trouble-shooting. Therefore, an ACP must support all show and debug options, as for any other network function. Specifically, a network management system or controller must be able to discover the ACP, and monitor its health. This visibility of ACP operations must clearly be separated from visibility of Data-Plane so automated systems will never have to deal with ACP aspect unless they explicitly desire to do so.

Since an ACP is self-protecting, a node not supporting the ACP, or without a valid domain certificate cannot connect to it. This means that by default a traditional controller or network management system cannot connect to an ACP. See [Section 8.1.1](#) for more details on how to connect an NMS host into the ACP.

## **[10.](#) Further Considerations (Informative)**

The following sections cover topics that are beyond the primary scope of this document (e.g., bootstrap), that explain decisions made in this document (e.g.: choice of GRASP) or that explain desirable extensions or implementation details for the ACP that are not considered to be appropriate to standardize in this document.

### **[10.1.](#) BRSKI Bootstrap (ANI)**

[I-D.ietf-anima-bootstrapping-keyinfra] (BRSKI) describes how nodes with an IDevID certificate can securely and zero-touch enroll with a domain certificate (LDevID) to support the ACP. BRSKI also leverages the ACP to enable zero-touch bootstrap of new nodes across networks without any configuration requirements across the transit nodes (e.g., no DHCP/DNS forwarding/server setup). This includes otherwise not configured networks as described in [Section 3.2](#). Therefore BRSKI in conjunction with ACP provides for a secure and zero-touch management solution for complete networks. Nodes supporting such an infrastructure (BRSKI and ACP) are called ANI nodes (Autonomic Networking Infrastructure), see [[I-D.ietf-anima-reference-model](#)]. Nodes that do not support an IDevID but only an (insecure) vendor specific Unique Device Identifier (UDI) or nodes whose manufacturer does not support a MASA could use some future security reduced version of BRSKI.

When BRSKI is used to provision a domain certificate (which is called enrollment), the BRSKI registrar (acting as an enhanced EST server) must include the subjectAltName / rfc822Name encoded ACP address and domain name to the enrolling node (called pledge) via its response to the pledges EST CSR Attribute request that is mandatory in BRSKI.

The Certificate Authority in an ACP network must not change the subjectAltName / rfc822Name in the certificate. The ACP nodes can



therefore find their ACP address and domain using this field in the domain certificate, both for themselves, as well as for other nodes.

The use of BRSKI in conjunction with the ACP can also help to further simplify maintenance and renewal of domain certificates. Instead of relying on CRL, the lifetime of certificates can be made extremely small, for example in the order of hours. When a node fails to connect to the ACP within its certificate lifetime, it cannot connect to the ACP to renew its certificate across it (using just EST), but it can still renew its certificate as an "enrolled/expired pledge" via the BRSKI bootstrap proxy. This requires only that the BRSKI registrar honors expired domain certificates and that the pledge first attempts to perform TLS authentication for BRSKI bootstrap with its expired domain certificate - and only reverts to its IDevID when this fails. This mechanism could also render CRLs unnecessary because the BRSKI registrar in conjunction with the CA would not renew revoked certificates - only a "Do-not-renew" list would be necessary on BRSKI registrars/CA.

In the absence of BRSKI or less secure variants thereof, provisioning of certificates may involve one or more touches or non-standardized automation. Node vendors usually support provisioning of certificates into nodes via PKCS#7 (see [[RFC2315](#)]) and may support this provisioning through vendor specific models via Netconf ([[RFC6241](#)]). If such nodes also support Netconf Zero-Touch ([[I-D.ietf-netconf-zerotouch](#)]) then this can be combined to zero-touch provisioning of domain certificates into nodes. Unless there are equivalent integration of Netconf connections across the ACP as there is in BRSKI, this combination would not support zero-touch bootstrap across a not configured network though.

## **10.2. ACP (and BRSKI) Diagnostics**

Even though ACP and ANI in general are taking out many manual configuration mistakes through their automation, it is important to provide good diagnostics for them.

The basic diagnostics is support of (yang) data models representing the complete (auto-)configuration and operational state of all components: BRSKI, GRASP, ACP and the infrastructure used by them: TLS/DTLS, IPsec, certificates, trust anchors, time, VRF and so on. While necessary, this is not sufficient:

Simply representing the state of components does not allow operators to quickly take action - unless they do understand how to interpret the data, and that can mean a requirement for deep understanding of all components and how they interact in the ACP/ANI.



Diagnostic supports should help to quickly answer the questions operators are expected to ask, such as "is the ACP working correctly?", or "why is there no ACP connection to a known neighboring node?"

In current network management approaches, the logic to answer these questions is most often built as centralized diagnostics software that leverages the above mentioned data models. While this approach is feasible for components utilizing the ANI, it is not sufficient to diagnose the ANI itself:

- o Developing the logic to identify common issues requires operational experience with the components of the ANI. Letting each management system define its own analysis is inefficient. As much as possible, future work should attempt to standardize data models that support common error diagnostic.
- o When the ANI is not operating correctly, it may not be possible to run diagnostics from remote because of missing connectivity. The ANI should therefore have diagnostic capabilities available locally on the nodes themselves.
- o Certain operations are difficult or impossible to monitor in real-time, such as initial bootstrap issues in a network location where no capabilities exist to attach local diagnostics. Therefore it is important to also define means of capturing (logging) diagnostics locally for later retrieval. Ideally, these captures are also non-volatile so that they can survive extended power-off conditions - for example when a device that fails to be brought up zero-touch is being sent back for diagnostics at a more appropriate location.

The most simple form of diagnostics answering questions like the above is to represent the relevant information sequentially in dependency order, so that the first non-expected/non-operational item is the most likely root cause. Or just log/highlight that item. For example:

Q: Is ACP operational to accept neighbor connections:

- o Check if any potentially necessary configuration to make ACP/ANI operational are correct (see [Section 10.5](#) for a discussion of such commands).
- o Does the system time look reasonable, or could it be the default system time after clock chip battery failure (certificate checks depend on reasonable notion of time).



- o Does the node have keying material - domain certificate, trust anchors.
- o If no keying material and ANI is supported/enabled, check the state of BRSKI (not detailed in this example).
- o Check the validity of the domain certificate:
  - \* Does the certificate authenticate against the trust anchor?
  - \* Has it been revoked?
  - \* Was the last scheduled attempt to retrieve a CRL successful (e.g., do we know that our CRL information is up to date)?
  - \* Is the certificate valid: validity start time in the past, expiration time in the future?
  - \* Does the certificate have a correctly formatted ACP information field?
- o Was the ACP VRF successfully created?
- o Is ACP enabled on one or more interfaces that are up and running?

If all this looks good, the ACP should be running locally "fine" - but we did not check any ACP neighbor relationships.

Question: why does the node not create a working ACP connection to a neighbor on an interface?

- o Is the interface physically up? Does it have an IPv6 link-local address?
- o Is it enabled for ACP?
- o Do we successfully send DULL GRASP messages to the interface (link layer errors)?
- o Do we receive DULL GRASP messages on the interface? If not, some intervening L2 equipment performing bad MLD snooping could have caused problems. Provide e.g., diagnostics of the MLD querier IPv6 and MAC address.
- o Do we see the ACP objective in any DULL GRASP message from that interface? Diagnose the supported secure channel methods.





- o Do we know the MAC address of the neighbor with the ACP objective?  
If not, diagnose SLAAC/ND state.
- o When did we last attempt to build an ACP secure channel to the neighbor?
- o If it failed, why:
  - \* Did the neighbor close the connection on us or did we close the connection on it because the domain certificate membership failed?
  - \* If the neighbor closed the connection on us, provide any error diagnostics from the secure channel protocol.
  - \* If we failed the attempt, display our local reason:
    - + There was no common secure channel protocol supported by the two neighbors (this could not happen on nodes supporting this specification because it mandates common support for IPsec).
    - + The ACP domain certificate membership check ([Section 6.1.2](#)) fails:
      - The neighbors certificate does not have the required trust anchor. Provide diagnostics which trust anchor it has (can identify whom the device belongs to).
      - The neighbors certificate does not have the same domain (or no domain at all). Diagnose domain-name and potentially other cert info.
      - The neighbors certificate has been revoked or could not be authenticated by OCSP.
      - The neighbors certificate has expired - or is not yet valid.
  - \* Any other connection issues in e.g., IKEv2 / IPsec, DTLS?.

Question: Is the ACP operating correctly across its secure channels?

- o Are there one or more active ACP neighbors with secure channels?
- o Is the RPL routing protocol for the ACP running?
- o Is there a default route to the root in the ACP routing table?



- o Is there for each direct ACP neighbor not reachable over the ACP virtual interface to the root a route in the ACP routing table?
- o Is ACP GRASP running?
- o Is at least one SRV.est objective cached (to support certificate renewal)?
- o Is there at least one BRSKI registrar objective cached (in case BRSKI is supported)
- o Is BRSKI proxy operating normally on all interfaces where ACP is operating?
- o ...

These lists are not necessarily complete, but illustrate the principle and show that there are variety of issues ranging from normal operational causes (a neighbor in another ACP domain) over problems in the credentials management (certificate lifetimes), explicit security actions (revocation) or unexpected connectivity issues (intervening L2 equipment).

The items so far are illustrating how the ANI operations can be diagnosed with passive observation of the operational state of its components including historic/cached/counted events. This is not necessary sufficient to provide good enough diagnostics overall:

The components of ACP and BRSKI are designed with security in mind but they do not attempt to provide diagnostics for building the network itself. Consider two examples:

1. BRSKI does not allow for a neighboring device to identify the pledges certificate (IDevID). Only the selected BRSKI registrar can do this, but it may be difficult to disseminate information about undesired pledges from those BRSKI registrars to locations/nodes where information about those pledges is desired.
2. The Link Layer Discovery Protocol (LLDP, [[LLDP](#)]) disseminates information about nodes to their immediate neighbors, such as node model/type/software and interface name/number of the connection. This information is often helpful or even necessary in network diagnostics. It can equally considered to be too insecure to make this information available unprotected to all possible neighbors.

An "interested adjacent party" can always determine the IDevID of a BRSKI pledge by behaving like a BRSKI proxy/registrar. Therefore the



IDevID of a BRSKI pledge is not meant to be protected - it just has to be queried and is not signaled unsolicited (as it would be in LLDP) so that other observers on the same subnet can determine who is an "interested adjacent party".

Desirable options for additional diagnostics subject to future work include:

1. Determine if LLDP should be a recommended functionality for ANI devices to improve diagnostics, and if so, which information elements it should signal (insecure).
2. In alternative to LLDP, A DULL GRASP diagnostics objective could be defined to carry these information elements.
3. The IDevID of BRSKI pledges should be included in the selected insecure diagnostics option.
4. A richer set of diagnostics information should be made available via the secured ACP channels, using either single-hop GRASP or network wide "topology discovery" mechanisms.

### **10.3. ACP Registrar Considerations**

As described in [Section 6.10.7](#), the ACP addressing mechanism is designed to enable lightweight, distributed and uncoordinated ACP registrars that are providing ACP address prefixes to candidate ACP nodes by enrolling them with an ACP domain certificate into an ACP domain via any appropriate mechanism/protocol, automated or not.

This section discusses informatively more details and options for ACP registrars.

#### **10.3.1. Registrar interactions**

This section summarizes and discusses the interactions with other entities required by an ACP registrar.

In a simple instance of an ACP network, no central NOC component beside a trust anchor (root CA) is required. One or more uncoordinated acting ACP registrar can be set up, performing the following interactions:

To orchestrate enrolling a candidate ACP node autonomically, the ACP registrar can rely on the ACP and use Proxies to reach the candidate ACP node, therefore allowing minimum pre-existing (auto-)configured network services on the candidate ACP node. BRSKI defines the BRSKI proxy, a design that can be adopted for various protocols that



Pledges/candidate ACP nodes could want to use, for example BRSKI over CoAP (Constrained Application Protocol), or proxying of Netconf.

To reach a trust anchor unaware of the ACP, the ACP registrar would use the Data-Plane. ACP and Data-Plane in an ACP registrar could (and by default should be) completely isolated from each other at the network level. Only applications like the ACP registrar would need the ability for their transport stacks to access both.

In non autonomic enrollment options, the data plane between a ACP registrar and the candidate ACP node needs to be configured first. This includes the ACP registrar and the candidate ACP node. Then any appropriate set of protocols can be used between ACP registrar and candidate ACP node to discover the other side, and then connect and enroll (configure) the candidate ACP node with an ACP domain certificate. Netconf ZeroTouch ([\[I-D.ietf-netconf-zerotouch\]](#)) is an example protocol that could be used for this. BRSKI using optional discovery mechanisms is equally a possibility for candidate ACP nodes attempting to be enrolled across non-ACP networks, such as the Internet.

When candidate ACP nodes have secure bootstrap, like BRSKI Pledges, they will not trust to be configured/enrolled across the network, unless being presented with a voucher (see [\[RFC8366\]](#)) authorizing the network to take possession of the node. An ACP registrar will then need a method to retrieve such a voucher, either offline, or online from a MASA (Manufacturer Authorized Signing Authority). BRSKI and Netconf ZeroTouch are two protocols that include capabilities to present the voucher to the candidate ACP node.

An ACP registrar could operate EST for ACP certificate renewal and/or act as a CRL Distribution point. A node performing these services does not need to support performing (initial) enrollment, but it does require the same above described connectivity as an ACP registrar: via the ACP to ACP nodes and via the Data-Plane to the trust anchor and other sources of CRL information.

### **[10.3.2. Registrar Parameter](#)**

The interactions of an ACP registrar outlined [Section 6.10.7](#) and [Section 10.3.1](#) above depend on the following parameters:

- A URL to the trust anchor (root CA) and credentials so that the ACP registrar can let the trust anchor sign candidate ACP member certificates.

- The ACP domain-name.





The Registrar-ID to use. This could default to a MAC address of the ACP registrar.

For recovery, the next-useable Node-IDs for zone (Zone-ID=0) sub-addressing scheme, for Vlong /112 and for Vlong /1120 sub-addressing scheme. These IDs would only need to be provisioned after recovering from a crash. Some other mechanism would be required to remember these IDs in a backup location or to recover them from the set of currently known ACP nodes.

Policies if candidate ACP nodes should receive a domain certificate or not, for example based on the devices LDevID as in BRSKI. The ACP registrar may have a whitelist or blacklist of devices serialNumbers from their LDevID.

Policies what type of address prefix to assign to a candidate ACP devices, based on likely the same information.

For BRSKI or other mechanisms using vouchers: Parameters to determine how to retrieve vouchers for specific type of secure bootstrap candidate ACP nodes (such as MASA URLs), unless this information is automatically learned such as from the LDevID of candidate ACP nodes (as defined in BRSKI).

#### **10.3.3. Certificate renewal and limitations**

When an ACP node renews/rekeys its certificate, it may end up doing so via a different registrar (e.g., EST server) than the one it originally received its ACP domain certificate from, for example because that original ACP registrar is gone. The ACP registrar through which the renewal/rekeying is performed would by default trust the ACP domain information from the ACP nodes current ACP domain certificate and maintain this information so that the ACP node maintains its ACP address prefix. In EST renewal/rekeying, the ACP nodes current ACP domain certificate is signaled during the TLS handshake.

This simple scenario has two limitations:

1. The ACP registrars can not directly assign certificates to nodes and therefore needs an "online" connection to the trust anchor (root CA).
2. Recovery from a compromised ACP registrar is difficult. When an ACP registrar is compromised, it can insert for example conflicting ACP domain information and create thereby an attack against other ACP nodes through the ACP routing protocol.



Even when such a malicious ACP registrar is detected, resolving the problem may be difficult because it would require identifying all the wrong ACP domain certificates assigned via the ACP registrar after it was compromised. And without additional centralized tracking of assigned certificates there is no way to do this - assuming one can not retrieve this information from the .

#### **10.3.4. ACP Registrars with sub-CA**

In situations, where either of the above two limitations are an issue, ACP registrars could also be sub-CAs. This removes the need for connectivity to a root-CA whenever an ACP node is enrolled, and reduces the need for connectivity of such an ACP registrar to a root-CA to only those times when it needs to renew its own certificate. The ACP registrar would also now use its own (sub-CA) certificate to enroll and sign the ACP nodes certificates, and therefore it is only necessary to revoke a compromised ACP registrar's sub-CA certificate. Or let it expire and not renew it, when the certificate of the sub-CA is appropriately short-lived.

As the ACP domain membership check verifies a peer ACP node's ACP domain certificate trust chain, it will also verify the signing certificate which is the compromised/revoked sub-CA certificate. Therefore ACP domain membership for an ACP node enrolled from a compromised ACP registrar will fail.

ACP nodes enrolled by a compromised ACP registrar would automatically fail to establish ACP channels and ACP domain certificate renewal via EST and therefore revert to their role as a candidate ACP members and attempt to get a new ACP domain certificate from an ACP registrar - for example via BRSKI. In result, ACP registrars that have an associated sub-CA makes isolating and resolving issues with compromised registrars easier.

Note that ACP registrars with sub-CA functionality also can control the lifetime of ACP domain certificates easier and therefore also be used as a tool to introduce short lived certificates and not rely on CRL, whereas the certificates for the sub-CAs themselves could be longer lived and subject to CRL.

#### **10.3.5. Centralized Policy Control**

When using multiple, uncoordinated ACP registrars, several advanced operations are potentially more complex than with a single, resilient policy control backend, for example including but not limited to:

Which candidate ACP node is permitted or not permitted into an ACP domain. This may not be a decision to be taken upfront, so that a



per-serialNumber policy can be loaded into every ACP registrar. Instead, it may better be decided in real-time including potentially a human decision in a NOC.

Tracking of all enrolled ACP nodes and their certificate information. For example in support of revoking individual ACP nodes certificates.

More flexible policies what type of address prefix or even what specific address prefix to assign to a candidate ACP node.

These and other operations could be introduced more easily by introducing a centralized Policy Management System (PMS) and modifying ACP registrar behavior so that it queries the PMS for any policy decision occurring during the candidate ACP node enrollment process and/or the ACP node certificate renewal process. For example, which ACP address prefix to assign. Likewise the ACP registrar would report any relevant state change information to the PMS as well, for example when a certificate was successfully enrolled onto a candidate ACP node. Such an ACP registrar PMS interface definition is subject to future work.

#### **10.4. Address Space Considerations**

This document defines the Zone, Vlong and Manual sub address schemes primarily to support address prefix assignment via distributed, potentially uncoordinated ACP registrars as defined in [Section 6.10.7](#). This costs 48/46 bit identifier so that these ACP registrar can assign non-conflicting address prefixes. This design does not leave enough bits to simultaneously support a large number of nodes (Node-ID) plus a large prefix of local addresses for every node plus a large enough set of bits to identify a routing Zone. In result, Zone, Vlong 8/16 attempt to support all features, but in via separate prefixes.

In networks that always expect to rely on a centralized PMS as described above ([Section 10.3.5](#)), the 48/46 bits for the Registrar-ID could be saved. Such variations of the ACP addressing mechanisms could be introduced through future work in different ways. If the prefix rfcSELF in the ACP information field was changed, incompatible ACP variations could be created where every design aspect of the ACP could be changed. Including all addressing choices. If instead a new addressing sub-type would be defined, it could be a backward compatible extension of this ACP specification. Information such as the size of a zone-prefix and the length of the prefix assigned to the ACP node itself could be encoded via the extension field of the ACP domain information.



Note that an explicitly defined "Manual" addressing sub-scheme is always beneficial to provide an easy way for ACP nodes to prohibit incorrect manual configuration of any non-"Manual" ACP address spaces and therefore ensure that "Manual" operations will never impact correct routing for any non-"Manual" ACP addresses assigned via ACP domain certificates.

### **10.5. Enabling and disabling ACP/ANI**

Both ACP and BRSKI require interfaces to be operational enough to support sending/receiving their packets. In node types where interfaces are by default (e.g., without operator configuration) enabled, such as most L2 switches, this would be less of a change in behavior than in most L3 devices (e.g.: routers), where interfaces are by default disabled. In almost all network devices it is common though for configuration to change interfaces to a physically disabled state and that would break the ACP.

In this section, we discuss a suggested operational model to enable/disable interfaces and nodes for ACP/ANI in a way that minimizes the risk of operator action to break the ACP in this way, and that also minimizes operator surprise when ACP/ANI becomes supported in node software.

#### **10.5.1. Filtering for non-ACP/ANI packets**

Whenever this document refers to enabling an interface for ACP (or BRSKI), it only requires to permit the interface to send/receive packets necessary to operate ACP (or BRSKI) - but not any other Data-Plane packets. Unless the Data-Plane is explicitly configured/enabled, all packets not required for ACP/BRSKI should be filtered on input and output:

Both BRSKI and ACP require link-local only IPv6 operations on interfaces and DULL GRASP. IPv6 link-local operations means the minimum signaling to auto-assign an IPv6 link-local address and talk to neighbors via their link-local address: SLAAC (Stateless Address Auto-Configuration - [[RFC4862](#)]) and ND (Neighbor Discovery - [[RFC4861](#)]). When the device is a BRSKI pledge, it may also require TCP/TLS connections to BRSKI proxies on the interface. When the device has keying material, and the ACP is running, it requires DULL GRASP packets and packets necessary for the secure-channel mechanism it supports, e.g., IKEv2 and IPsec ESP packets or DTLS packets to the IPv6 link-local address of an ACP neighbor on the interface. It also requires TCP/TLS packets for its BRSKI proxy functionality, if it does support BRSKI.





### **10.5.2. Admin Down State**

Interfaces on most network equipment have at least two states: "up" and "down". These may have product specific names. "down" for example could be called "shutdown" and "up" could be called "no shutdown". The "down" state disables all interface operations down to the physical level. The "up" state enables the interface enough for all possible L2/L3 services to operate on top of it and it may also auto-enable some subset of them. More commonly, the operations of various L2/L3 services is controlled via additional node-wide or interface level options, but they all become only active when the interface is not "down". Therefore an easy way to ensure that all L2/L3 operations on an interface are inactive is to put the interface into "down" state. The fact that this also physically shuts down the interface is in many cases just a side effect, but it may be important in other cases (see below).

To provide ACP/ANI resilience against operators configuring interfaces to "down" state, this document recommends to separate the "down" state of interfaces into an "admin down" state where the physical layer is kept running and ACP/ANI can use the interface and a "physical down" state. Any existing "down" configurations would map to "admin down". In "admin down", any existing L2/L3 services of the Data-Plane should see no difference to "physical down" state. To ensure that no Data-Plane packets could be sent/received, packet filtering could be established automatically as described above in [Section 10.5.1](#).

As necessary (see discussion below) new configuration options could be introduced to issue "physical down". The options should be provided with additional checks to minimize the risk of issuing them in a way that breaks the ACP without automatic restoration. For example they could be denied to be issued from a control connection (netconf/ssh) that goes across the interface itself ("do not disconnect yourself"). Or they could be performed only temporary and only be made permanent with additional later reconfirmation.

In the following sub-sections important aspects to the introduction of "admin down" state are discussed.

#### **10.5.2.1. Security**

Interfaces are physically brought down (or left in default down state) as a form of security. "Admin down" state as described above provides also a high level of security because it only permits ACP/ANI operations which are both well secured. Ultimately, it is subject to security review for the deployment whether "admin down" is a feasible replacement for "physical down".



The need to trust into the security of ACP/ANI operations need to be weighed against the operational benefits of permitting this: Consider the typical example of a CPE (customer premises equipment) with no on-site network expert. User ports are in physical down state unless explicitly configured not to be. In a misconfiguration situation, the uplink connection is incorrectly plugged into such a user port. The device is disconnected from the network and therefore no diagnostics from the network side is possible anymore. Alternatively, all ports default to "admin down". The ACP (but not the Data-Plane) would still automatically form. Diagnostics from the network side is possible and operator reaction could include to either make this port the operational uplink port or to instruct re-cabling. Security wise, only ACP/ANI could be attacked, all other functions are filtered on interfaces in "admin down" state.

#### **10.5.2.2. Fast state propagation and Diagnostics**

"Physical down" state propagates on many interface types (e.g., Ethernet) to the other side. This can trigger fast L2/L3 protocol reaction on the other side and "admin down" would not have the same (fast) result.

Bringing interfaces to "physical down" state is to the best of our knowledge always a result of operator action, but today, never the result of (autonomic) L2/L3 services running on the nodes. Therefore one option is to change the operator action to not rely on link-state propagation anymore. This may not be possible when both sides are under different operator control, but in that case it is unlikely that the ACP is running across the link and actually putting the interface into "physical down" state may still be a good option.

Ideally, fast physical state propagation is replaced by fast software driven state propagation. For example a DULL GRASP "admin-state" objective could be used to auto configure a Bidirectional Forwarding Protocol (BFD, [[RFC5880](#)]) session between the two sides of the link that would be used to propagate the "up" vs. admin down state.

Triggering physical down state may also be used as a mean of diagnosing cabling in the absence of easier methods. It is more complex than automated neighbor diagnostics because it requires coordinated remote access to both (likely) sides of a link to determine whether up/down toggling will cause the same reaction on the remote side.

See [Section 10.2](#) for a discussion about how LLDP and/or diagnostics via GRASP could be used to provide neighbor diagnostics, and therefore hopefully eliminating the need for "physical down" for neighbor diagnostics - as long as both neighbors support ACP/ANI.



#### **10.5.2.3. Low Level Link Diagnostics**

"Physical down" is performed to diagnose low-level interface behavior when higher layer services (e.g., IPv6) are not working. Especially Ethernet links are subject to a wide variety of possible wrong configuration/cablings if they do not support automatic selection of variable parameters such as speed (10/100/1000 Mbps), crossover (Auto-MDIX) and connector (fiber, copper - when interfaces have multiple but can only enable one at a time). The need for low level link diagnostic can therefore be minimized by using fully auto configuring links.

In addition to "Physical down", low level diagnostics of Ethernet or other interfaces also involve the creation of other states on interfaces, such as physical Loopback (internal and/or external) or bringing down all packet transmissions for reflection/cable-length measurements. Any of these options would disrupt ACP as well.

In cases where such low-level diagnostics of an operational link is desired but where the link could be a single point of failure for the ACP, ASA on both nodes of the link could perform a negotiated diagnostics that automatically terminates in a predetermined manner without dependence on external input ensuring the link will become operational again.

#### **10.5.2.4. Power Consumption**

Power consumption of "physical down" interfaces may be significantly lower than those in "admin down" state, for example on long range fiber interfaces. Assuming reasonable clocks on devices, mechanisms for infrequent periodic probing could allow to automatically establish ACP connectivity across such links. Bring up interfaces for 5 seconds to probe if there is an ACP neighbor on the remote end every 500 seconds = 1% power consumption.

#### **10.5.3. Interface level ACP/ANI enable**

The interface level configuration option "ACP enable" enables ACP operations on an interface, starting with ACP neighbor discovery via DULL GRAP. The interface level configuration option "ANI enable" on nodes supporting BRSKI and ACP starts with BRSKI pledge operations when there is no domain certificate on the node. On ACP/BRSKI nodes, "ACP enable" may not need to be supported, but only "ANI enable". Unless overridden by global configuration options (see later), "ACP/ANI enable" will result in "down" state on an interface to behave as "admin down".



#### **10.5.4. Which interfaces to auto-enable?**

([Section 6.3](#)) requires that "ACP enable" is automatically set on native interfaces, but not on non-native interfaces (reminder: a native interface is one that exists without operator configuration action such as physical interfaces in physical devices).

Ideally, ACP enable is set automatically on all interfaces that provide access to additional connectivity that allows to reach more nodes of the ACP domain. The best set of interfaces necessary to achieve this is not possible to determine automatically. Native interfaces are the best automatic approximation.

Consider an ACP domain of ACP nodes transitively connected via native interfaces. A Data-Plane tunnel between two of these nodes that are non-adjacent is created and "ACP enable" is set for that tunnel. ACP RPL sees this tunnel as just as a single hop. Routes in the ACP would use this hop as an attractive path element to connect regions adjacent to the tunnel nodes. In result, the actual hop-by-hop paths used by traffic in the ACP can become worse. In addition, correct forwarding in the ACP now depends on correct Data-Plane forwarding config including QoS, filtering and other security on the Data-Plane path across which this tunnel runs. This is the main issue why "ACP/ANI enable" should not be set automatically on non-native interfaces.

If the tunnel would connect two previously disjoint ACP regions, then it likely would be useful for the ACP. A Data-Plane tunnel could also run across nodes without ACP and provide additional connectivity for an already connected ACP network. The benefit of this additional ACP redundancy has to be weighed against the problems of relying on the Data-Plane. If a tunnel connects two separate ACP regions: how many tunnels should be created to connect these ACP regions reliably enough? Between which nodes? These are all standard tunneled network design questions not specific to the ACP, and there are no generic fully automated answers.

Instead of automatically setting "ACP enable" on these type of interfaces, the decision needs to be based on the use purpose of the non-native interface and "ACP enable" needs to be set in conjunction with the mechanism through which the non-native interface is created/configured.

In addition to explicit setting of "ACP/ANI enable", non-native interfaces also need to support configuration of the ACP RPL cost of the link - to avoid the problems of attracting too much traffic to the link as described above.





Even native interfaces may not be able to automatically perform BRSKI or ACP because they may require additional operator input to become operational. Example include DSL interfaces requiring PPPoE credentials or mobile interfaces requiring credentials from a SIM card. Whatever mechanism is used to provide the necessary config to the device to enable the interface can also be expanded to decide on whether or not to set "ACP/ANI enable".

The goal of automatically setting "ACP/ANI enable" on interfaces (native or not) is to eliminate unnecessary "touches" to the node to make its operation as much as possible "zero-touch" with respect to ACP/ANI. If there are "unavoidable touches" such a creating/configuring a non-native interface or provisioning credentials for a native interface, then "ACP/ANI enable" should be added as an option to that "touch". If a wrong "touch" is easily fixed (not creating another high-cost touch), then the default should be not to enable ANI/ACP, and if it is potentially expensive or slow to fix (e.g., parameters on SIM card shipped to remote location), then the default should be to enable ACP/ANI.

#### **10.5.5. Node Level ACP/ANI enable**

A node level command "ACP/ANI enable [up-if-only]" enables ACP or ANI on the node (ANI = ACP + BRSKI). Without this command set, any interface level "ACP/ANI enable" is ignored. Once set, ACP/ANI will operate interface where "ACP/ANI enable" is set. Setting of interface level "ACP/ANI enable" is either automatic (default) or explicit through operator action as described in the previous section.

If the option "up-if-only" is selected, the behavior of "down" interfaces is unchanged, and ACP/ANI will only operate on interfaces where "ACP/ANI enable" is set and that are "up". When it is not set, then "down" state of interfaces with "ACP/ANI enable" is modified to behave as "admin down".

##### **10.5.5.1. Brownfield nodes**

A "brownfield" node is one that already has a configured Data-Plane.

Executing global "ACP/ANI enable [up-if-only]" on each node is the only command necessary to create an ACP across a network of brownfield nodes once all the nodes have a domain certificate. When BRSKI is used ("ANI enable"), provisioning of the certificates only requires set-up of a single BRSKI registrar node which could also implement a CA for the network. This is the most simple way to introduce ACP/ANI into existing (== brownfield) networks.



The need to explicitly enable ACP/ANI is especially important in brownfield nodes because otherwise software updates may introduce support for ACP/ANI: Automatic enablement of ACP/ANI in networks where the operator does not only not want ACP/ANI but where he likely never even heard of it could be quite irritating to him. Especially when "down" behavior is changed to "admin down".

Automatically setting "ANI enable" on brownfield nodes where the operator is unaware of it could also be a critical security issue depending on the vouchers used by BRSKI on these nodes. An attacker could claim to be the owner of these devices and create an ACP that the attacker has access/control over. In network where the operator explicitly wants to enable the ANI this could not happen, because he would create a BRSKI registrar that would discover attack attempts. Nodes requiring "ownership vouchers" would not be subject to that attack. See [[I-D.ietf-anima-bootstrapping-keyinfra](#)] for more details. Note that a global "ACP enable" alone is not subject to these type of attacks, because it always depends on some other mechanism first to provision domain certificates into the device.

#### **10.5.5.2. Greenfield nodes**

A "greenfield" node is one that did not have any prior configuration.

For greenfield nodes, only "ANI enable" is relevant. If another mechanism than BRSKI is used to (zero-touch) bootstrap a node, then it is up to that mechanism to provision domain certificates and to set global "ACP enable" as desired.

Nodes supporting full ANI functionality set "ANI enable" automatically when they decide that they are greenfield, e.g., that they are powering on from factory condition. They will then put all native interfaces into "admin down" state and start to perform BRSKI pledge functionality - and once a domain certificate is enrolled they automatically enable ACP.

Attempts for BRSKI pledge operations in greenfield state should terminate automatically when another method of configuring the node is used. Methods that indicate some form of physical possession of the device such as configuration via the serial console could lead to immediate termination of BRSKI, while other parallel auto configuration methods subject to remote attacks might lead to BRSKI termination only after they were successful. Details of this may vary widely over different type of nodes. When BRSKI pledge operation terminates, this will automatically unset "ANI enable" and should terminate any temporarily needed state on the device to perform BRSKI - DULL GRASP, BRSKI pledge and any IPv6 configuration on interfaces.



#### **10.5.6. Undoing ANI/ACP enable**

Disabling ANI/ACP by undoing "ACP/ANI enable" is a risk for the reliable operations of the ACP if it can be executed by mistake or unauthorized. This behavior could be influenced through some additional property in the certificate (e.g., in the domain information extension field) subject to future work: In an ANI deployment intended for convenience, disabling it could be allowed without further constraints. In an ANI deployment considered to be critical more checks would be required. One very controlled option would be to not permit these commands unless the domain certificate has been revoked or is denied renewal. Configuring this option would be a parameter on the BRSKI registrar(s). As long as the node did not receive a domain certificate, undoing "ANI/ACP enable" should not have any additional constraints.

#### **10.5.7. Summary**

Node-wide "ACP/ANI enable [up-if-only]" commands enable the operation of ACP/ANI. This is only auto-enabled on ANI greenfield devices, otherwise it must be configured explicitly.

If the option "up-if-only" is not selected, interfaces enabled for ACP/ANI interpret "down" state as "admin down" and not "physical down". In "admin-down" all non-ACP/ANI packets are filtered, but the physical layer is kept running to permit ACP/ANI to operate.

(New) commands that result in physical interruption ("physical down", "loopback") of ACP/ANI enabled interfaces should be built to protect continuance or reestablishment of ACP as much as possible.

Interface level "ACP/ANI enable" control per-interface operations. It is enabled by default on native interfaces and has to be configured explicitly on other interfaces.

Disabling "ACP/ANI enable" global and per-interface should have additional checks to minimize undesired breakage of ACP. The degree of control could be a domain wide parameter in the domain certificates.

### **10.6. ACP Neighbor discovery protocol selection**

This section discusses why GRASP DULL was chosen as the discovery protocol for L2 adjacent candidate ACP neighbors. The contenders considered were GRASP, mDNS or LLDP.



### **10.6.1. LLDP**

LLDP and Cisco's earlier Cisco Discovery Protocol (CDP) are example of L2 discovery protocols that terminate their messages on L2 ports. If those protocols would be chosen for ACP neighbor discovery, ACP neighbor discovery would therefore also terminate on L2 ports. This would prevent ACP construction over non-ACP capable but LLDP or CDP enabled L2 switches. LLDP has extensions using different MAC addresses and this could have been an option for ACP discovery as well, but the additional required IEEE standardization and definition of a profile for such a modified instance of LLDP seemed to be more work than the benefit of "reusing the existing protocol" LLDP for this very simple purpose.

### **10.6.2. mDNS and L2 support**

Multicast DNS (mDNS) [[RFC6762](#)] with DNS Service Discovery (DNS-SD) Resource Records (RRs) as defined in [[RFC6763](#)] is a key contender as an ACP discovery protocol. because it relies on link-local IP multicast, it does operates at the subnet level, and is also found in L2 switches. The authors of this document are not aware of mDNS implementation that terminate their mDNS messages on L2 ports instead of the subnet level. If mDNS was used as the ACP discovery mechanism on an ACP capable (L3)/L2 switch as outlined in [Section 7](#), then this would be necessary to implement. It is likely that termination of mDNS messages could only be applied to all mDNS messages from such a port, which would then make it necessary to software forward any non-ACP related mDNS messages to maintain prior non-ACP mDNS functionality. Adding support for ACP into such L2 switches with mDNS could therefore create regression problems for prior mDNS functionality on those nodes. With low performance of software forwarding in many L2 switches, this could also make the ACP risky to support on such L2 switches.

### **10.6.3. Why DULL GRASP**

LLDP was not considered because of the above mentioned issues. mDNS was not selected because of the above L2 mDNS considerations and because of the following additional points:

If mDNS was not already existing in a node, it would be more work to implement than DULL GRASP, and if an existing implementation of mDNS was used, it would likely be more code space than a separate implementation of DULL GRASP or a shared implementation of DULL GRASP and GRASP in the ACP.





### **10.7. Choice of routing protocol (RPL)**

This section motivates why RPL - "IPv6 Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks ([\[RFC6550\]](#)) was chosen as the default (and in this specification only) routing protocol for the ACP. The choice and above explained profile was derived from a pre-standard implementation of ACP that was successfully deployed in operational networks.

Requirements for routing in the ACP are:

- o Self-management: The ACP must build automatically, without human intervention. Therefore routing protocol must also work completely automatically. RPL is a simple, self-managing protocol, which does not require zones or areas; it is also self-configuring, since configuration is carried as part of the protocol (see [Section 6.7.6 of \[RFC6550\]](#)).
- o Scale: The ACP builds over an entire domain, which could be a large enterprise or service provider network. The routing protocol must therefore support domains of 100,000 nodes or more, ideally without the need for zoning or separation into areas. RPL has this scale property. This is based on extensive use of default routing. RPL also has other scalability improvements, such as selecting only a subset of peers instead of all possible ones, and trickle support for information synchronization.
- o Low resource consumption: The ACP supports traditional network infrastructure, thus runs in addition to traditional protocols. The ACP, and specifically the routing protocol must have low resource consumption both in terms of memory and CPU requirements. Specifically, at edge nodes, where memory and CPU are scarce, consumption should be minimal. RPL builds a destination-oriented directed acyclic graph (DODAG), where the main resource consumption is at the root of the DODAG. The closer to the edge of the network, the less state needs to be maintained. This adapts nicely to the typical network design. Also, all changes below a common parent node are kept below that parent node.
- o Support for unstructured address space: In the Autonomic Networking Infrastructure, node addresses are identifiers, and may not be assigned in a topological way. Also, nodes may move topologically, without changing their address. Therefore, the routing protocol must support completely unstructured address space. RPL is specifically made for mobile ad-hoc networks, with no assumptions on topologically aligned addressing.



- o Modularity: To keep the initial implementation small, yet allow later for more complex methods, it is highly desirable that the routing protocol has a simple base functionality, but can import new functional modules if needed. RPL has this property with the concept of "objective function", which is a plugin to modify routing behavior.
- o Extensibility: Since the Autonomic Networking Infrastructure is a new concept, it is likely that changes in the way of operation will happen over time. RPL allows for new objective functions to be introduced later, which allow changes to the way the routing protocol creates the DAGs.
- o Multi-topology support: It may become necessary in the future to support more than one DODAG for different purposes, using different objective functions. RPL allow for the creation of several parallel DODAGs, should this be required. This could be used to create different topologies to reach different roots.
- o No need for path optimization: RPL does not necessarily compute the optimal path between any two nodes. However, the ACP does not require this today, since it carries mainly non-delay-sensitive feedback loops. It is possible that different optimization schemes become necessary in the future, but RPL can be expanded (see point "Extensibility" above).

#### **10.8. ACP Information Distribution and multicast**

IP multicast is not used by the ACP because the ANI (Autonomic Networking Infrastructure) itself does not require IP multicast but only service announcement/discovery. Using IP multicast for that would have made it necessary to develop a zero-touch auto configuring solution for ASM (Any Source Multicast - the original form of IP multicast defined in [\[RFC1112\]](#)), which would be quite complex and difficult to justify. One aspect of complexity where no attempt at a solution has been described in IETF documents is the automatic-selection of routers that should be PIM Sparse Mode (PIM-SM) Rendezvous Points (RPs) (see [\[RFC7761\]](#)). The other aspects of complexity are the implementation of MLD ([\[RFC4604\]](#)), PIM-SM and Anycast-RP (see [\[RFC4610\]](#)). If those implementations already exist in a product, then they would be very likely tied to accelerated forwarding which consumes hardware resources, and that in return is difficult to justify as a cost of performing only service discovery.

Some future ASA may need high performance in-network data replication. That is the case when the use of IP multicast is justified. Such an ASA can then use service discovery from ACP GRASP, and then they do not need ASM but only SSM (Source Specific



Multicast, see [[RFC4607](#)]) for the IP multicast replication. SSM itself can simply be enabled in the Data-Plane (or even in an update to the ACP) without any other configuration than just enabling it on all nodes and only requires a simpler version of MLD (see [[RFC5790](#)]).

LSP (Link State Protocol) based IGP routing protocols typically have a mechanism to flood information, and such a mechanism could be used to flood GRASP objectives by defining them to be information of that IGP. This would be a possible optimization in future variations of the ACP that do use an LSP routing protocol. Note though that such a mechanism would not work easily for GRASP M\_DISCOVERY messages which are intelligently (constrained) flooded not across the whole ACP, but only up to a node where a responder is found. We do expect that many future services in ASA will have only few consuming ASA, and for those cases, M\_DISCOVERY is the more efficient method than flooding across the whole domain.

Because the ACP uses RPL, one desirable future extension is to use RPLs existing notion of loop-free distribution trees (DODAG) to make GRASPs flooding more efficient both for M\_FLOOD and M\_DISCOVERY) See [Section 6.12.5](#) how this will be specifically beneficial when using NBMA interfaces. This is not currently specified in this document because it is not quite clear yet what exactly the implications are to make GRASP flooding depend on RPL DODAG convergence and how difficult it would be to let GRASP flooding access the DODAG information.

#### **[10.9](#). Extending ACP channel negotiation (via GRASP)**

The mechanism described in the normative part of this document to support multiple different ACP secure channel protocols without a single network wide MTI protocol is important to allow extending secure ACP channel protocols beyond what is specified in this document, but it will run into problem if it would be used for multiple protocols:

The need to potentially have multiple of these security associations even temporarily run in parallel to determine which of them works best does not support the most lightweight implementation options.

The simple policy of letting one side (Alice) decide what is best may not lead to the mutual best result.

The two limitations can easier be solved if the solution was more modular and as few as possible initial secure channel negotiation protocols would be used, and these protocols would then take on the responsibility to support more flexible objectives to negotiate the mutually preferred ACP security channel protocol.



IKEv2 is the IETF standard protocol to negotiate network security associations. It is meant to be extensible, but it is unclear whether it would be feasible to extend IKEv2 to support possible future requirements for ACP secure channel negotiation:

Consider the simple case where the use of native IPsec vs. IPsec via GRE is to be negotiated and the objective is the maximum throughput. Both sides would indicate some agreed upon performance metric and the preferred encapsulation is the one with the higher performance of the slower side. IKEv2 does not support negotiation with this objective.

Consider DTLS and some form of MacSec are to be added as negotiation options - and the performance objective should work across all IPsec, dDTLS and MacSec options. In the case of MacSEC, the negotiation would also need to determine a key for the peering. It is unclear if it would be even appropriate to consider extending the scope of negotiation in IKEv2 to those cases. Even if feasible to define, it is unclear if implementations of IKEv2 would be eager to adopt those type of extension given the long cycles of security testing that necessarily goes along with core security protocols such as IKEv2 implementations.

A more modular alternative to extending IKEv2 could be to layer a modular negotiation mechanism on top of the multitude of existing or possible future secure channel protocols. For this, GRASP over TLS could be considered as a first ACP secure channel negotiation protocol. The following are initial considerations for such an approach. A full specification is subject to a separate document:

To explicitly allow negotiation of the ACP channel protocol, GRASP over a TLS connection using the GRASP\_LISTEN\_PORT and the nodes and peers link-local IPv6 address is used. When Alice and Bob support GRASP negotiation, they do prefer it over any other non-explicitly negotiated security association protocol and should wait trying any non-negotiated ACP channel protocol until after it is clear that GRASP/TLS will not work to the peer.

When Alice and Bob successfully establish the GRASP/TLS session, they will negotiate the channel mechanism to use using objectives such as performance and perceived quality of the security. After agreeing on a channel mechanism, Alice and Bob start the selected Channel protocol. Once the secure channel protocol is successfully running, the GRASP/TLS connection can be kept alive or timed out as long as the selected channel protocol has a secure association between Alice and Bob. When it terminates, it needs to be re-negotiated via GRASP/TLS.

Notes:





- o Negotiation of a channel type may require IANA assignments of code points.
- o TLS is subject to reset attacks, which IKEv2 is not. Normally, ACP connections (as specified in this document) will be over link-local addresses so the attack surface for this one issue in TCP should be reduced (note that this may not be true when ACP is tunneled as described in [Section 8.2.2](#)).
- o GRASP packets received inside a TLS connection established for GRASP/TLS ACP negotiation are assigned to a separate GRASP domain unique to that TLS connection.

#### **10.10. CAs, domains and routing subdomains**

There is a wide range of setting up different ACP solution by appropriately using CAs and the domain and rsub elements in the domain information field of the domain certificate. We summarize these options here as they have been explained in different parts of the document in before and discuss possible and desirable extensions:

An ACP domain is the set of all ACP nodes using certificates from the same CA using the same domain field. GRASP inside the ACP is run across all transitively connected ACP nodes in a domain.

The rsub element in the domain information field permits the use of addresses from different ULA prefixes. One use case is to create multiple networks that initially may be separated, but where it should be possible to connect them without further extensions to ACP when necessary.

Another use case for routing subdomains is as the starting point for structuring routing inside an ACP. For example, different routing subdomains could run different routing protocols or different instances of RPL and auto-aggregation / distribution of routes could be done across inter routing subdomain ACP channels based on negotiation (e.g., via GRASP). This is subject for further work.

RPL scales very well. It is not necessary to use multiple routing subdomains to scale ACP domains in a way it would be possible if other routing protocols were used. They exist only as options for the above mentioned reasons.

If different ACP domains are to be created that should not allow to connect to each other by default, these ACP domains simply need to have different domain elements in the domain information field. These domain elements can be arbitrary, including subdomains of one another: Domains "example.com" and "research.example.com" are



separate domains if both are domain elements in the domain information element of certificates.

It is not necessary to have a separate CA for different ACP domains: an operator can use a single CA to sign certificates for multiple ACP domains that are not allowed to connect to each other because the checks for ACP adjacencies includes comparison of the domain part.

If multiple independent networks choose the same domain name but had their own CA, these would not form a single ACP domain because of CA mismatch. Therefore there is no problem in choosing domain names that are potentially also used by others. Nevertheless it is highly recommended to use domain names that one can have high probability to be unique. It is recommended to use domain names that start with a DNS domain names owned by the assigning organization and unique within it. For example "acp.example.com" if you own "example.com".

Future extensions, primarily through intent can create more flexible options how to build ACP domains.

Intent could modify the ACP connection check to permit connections between different domains.

If different domains use the same CA one would change the ACP setup to permit for the ACP to be established between the two ACP nodes, but no routing nor ACP GRASP to be built across this adjacency. The main difference over routing subdomains is to not permit for the ACP GRASP instance to be built across the adjacency. Instead, one would only build a point to point GRASP instance between those peers to negotiate what type of exchanges are desired across that connection. This would include routing negotiation, how much GRASP information to transit and what Data-Plane forwarding should be done. This approach could also allow for Intent to only be injected into the network from one side and propagate via this GRASP connection.

If different domains have different CAs, they should start to trust each other by intent injected into both domains that would add the other domains CA as a trust point during the ACP connection setup - and then following up with the previous point of inter-domain connections across domains with the same CA (e.g., GRASP negotiation).

#### **10.11. Adopting ACP concepts for other environments**

The ACP as specified in this document is very explicit about the choice of options to allow interoperable implementations. The choices made may not be the best for all environments, but the concepts used by the ACP can be used to build derived solutions:



The ACP specifies the use of ULA and deriving its prefix from the domain name so that no address allocation is required to deploy the ACP. The ACP will equally work not using ULA but any other /50 IPv6 prefix. This prefix could simply be a configuration of the ACP registrars (for example when using BRSKI) to enroll the domain certificates - instead of the ACP registrar deriving the /50 ULA prefix from the AN domain name.

Some solutions may already have an auto-addressing scheme, for example derived from existing unique device identifiers (e.g., MAC addresses). In those cases it may not be desirable to assign addresses to devices via the ACP address information field in the way described in this document. The certificate may simply serve to identify the ACP domain, and the address field could be empty/unused. The only fix required in the remaining way the ACP operate is to define another element in the domain certificate for the two peers to decide who is Alice and who is Bob during secure channel building. Note though that future work may leverage the acp address to authenticate "ownership" of the address by the device. If the address used by a device is derived from some pre-existing permanent local ID (such as MAC address), then it would be useful to store that address in the certificate using the format of the access address information field or in a similar way.

The ACP is defined as a separate VRF because it intends to support well managed networks with a wide variety of configurations. Therefore, reliable, configuration-indestructible connectivity cannot be achieved from the Data-Plane itself. In solutions where all transit connectivity impacting functions are fully automated (including security), indestructible and resilient, it would be possible to eliminate the need for the ACP to be a separate VRF. Consider the most simple example system in which there is no separate Data-Plane, but the ACP is the Data-Plane. Add BRSKI, and it becomes a fully autonomic network - except that it does not support automatic addressing for user equipment. This gap can then be closed for example by adding a solution derived from [\[I-D.ietf-anima-prefix-management\]](#).

TCP/TLS as the protocols to provide reliability and security to GRASP in the ACP may not be the preferred choice in constrained networks. For example, CoAP/DTLS (Constrained Application Protocol) may be preferred where they are already used, allowing to reduce the additional code space footprint for the ACP on those devices. Because the transport for GRASP is not only hop-by-hop, but end-to-end across the ACP, this would require the definition of an incompatible variant of the ACP. Non-constrained devices could support both variants (the ACP as defined here, and one using CoAP/



DTLS for GRASP), and the variant used in a deployment could be chosen for example through a parameter of the domain certificate.

The routing protocol chosen by the ACP design (RPL) does explicitly not optimize for shortest paths and fastest convergence. Variations of the ACP may want to use a different routing protocol or introduce more advanced RPL profiles.

Variations such as what routing protocol to use, or whether to instantiate an ACP in a VRF or (as suggested above) as the actual Data-Plane, can be automatically chosen in implementations built to support multiple options by deriving them from future parameters in the certificate. Parameters in certificates should be limited to those that would not need to be changed more often than certificates would need to be updated anyhow; Or by ensuring that these parameters can be provisioned before the variation of an ACP is activated in a node. Using BRSKI, this could be done for example as additional follow-up signaling directly after the certificate enrollment, still leveraging the BRSKI TLS connection and therefore not introducing any additional connectivity requirements.

Last but not least, secure channel protocols including their encapsulation are easily added to ACP solutions. Secure channels may even be replaced by simple neighbor authentication to create simplified ACP variations for environments where no real security is required but just protection against non-malicious misconfiguration. Or for environments where all traffic is known or forced to be end-to-end protected and other means for infrastructure protection are used. Any future network OAM should always use end-to-end security anyhow and can leverage the domain certificates and is therefore not dependent on security to be provided for by ACP secure channels.

## **11. Security Considerations**

An ACP is self-protecting and there is no need to apply configuration to make it secure. Its security therefore does not depend on configuration.

However, the security of the ACP depends on a number of other factors:

- o The usage of domain certificates depends on a valid supporting PKI infrastructure. If the chain of trust of this PKI infrastructure is compromised, the security of the ACP is also compromised. This is typically under the control of the network administrator.
- o Security can be compromised by implementation errors (bugs), as in all products.





There is no prevention of source-address spoofing inside the ACP. This implies that if an attacker gains access to the ACP, it can spoof all addresses inside the ACP and fake messages from any other node.

Fundamentally, security depends on correct operation, implementation and architecture. Autonomic approaches such as the ACP largely eliminate the dependency on correct operation; implementation and architectural mistakes are still possible, as in all networking technologies.

Many details of ACP are designed with security in mind and discussed elsewhere in the document:

IPv6 addresses used by nodes in the ACP are covered as part of the nodes domain certificate as described in [Section 6.1.1](#). This allows even verification of ownership of a peers IPv6 address when using a connection authenticated with the domain certificate.

The ACP acts as a security (and transport) substrate for GRASP inside the ACP such that GRASP is not only protected by attacks from the outside, but also by attacks from compromised inside attackers - by relying not only on hop-by-hop security of ACP secure channels, but adding end-to-end security for those GRASP messages. See [Section 6.8.2](#).

ACP provides for secure, resilient zero-touch discovery of EST servers for certificate renewal. See [Section 6.1.3](#).

ACP provides extensible, auto-configuring hop-by-hop protection of the ACP infrastructure via the negotiation of hop-by-hop secure channel protocols. See [Section 6.5](#) and [Section 10.9](#).

The ACP is designed to minimize attacks from the outside by minimizing its dependency against any non-ACP operations on a node. The only dependency in the specification in this document is the need to share link-local addresses for the ACP secure channel encapsulation with the Data-Plane. See [Section 6.12.2](#).

In combination with BRSKI, ACP enables a resilient, fully zero-touch network solution for short-lived certificates that can be renewed or re-enrolled even after unintentional expiry (e.g., because of interrupted connectivity). See [Section 10.1](#).



## **12. IANA Considerations**

This document defines the "Autonomic Control Plane".

The IANA is requested to register the value "AN\_ACP" (without quotes) to the GRASP Objectives Names Table in the GRASP Parameter Registry. The specification for this value is this document, [Section 6.3](#).

The IANA is requested to register the value "SRV.est" (without quotes) to the GRASP Objectives Names Table in the GRASP Parameter Registry. The specification for this value is this document, [Section 6.1.3](#).

Note that the objective format "SRV.<service-name>" is intended to be used for any <service-name> that is an [\[RFC6335\]](#) registered service name. This is a proposed update to the GRASP registry subject to future work and only mentioned here for informational purposes to explain the unique format of the objective name.

The IANA is requested to create an ACP Parameter Registry with currently one registry table - the "ACP Address Type" table.

"ACP Address Type" Table. The value in this table are numeric values 0...3 paired with a name (string). Future values MUST be assigned using the Standards Action policy defined by [\[RFC8126\]](#). The following initial values are assigned by this document:

- 0: ACP Zone Addressing Sub-Scheme (ACP RFC Figure 9) / ACP Manual Addressing Sub-Scheme (ACP RFC [Section 6.10.4](#))
- 1: ACP Vlong Addressing Sub-Scheme (ACP RFC [Section 6.10.5](#))

## **13. Acknowledgements**

This work originated from an Autonomic Networking project at Cisco Systems, which started in early 2010. Many people contributed to this project and the idea of the Autonomic Control Plane, amongst which (in alphabetical order): Ignas Bagdonas, Parag Bhide, Balaji BL, Alex Clemm, Yves Hertoghs, Bruno Klauser, Max Pritikin, Michael Richardson, Ravi Kumar Vadapalli.

Special thanks to Brian Carpenter, Elwyn Davies, Joel Halpern and Sheng Jiang for their thorough reviews and to Pascal Thubert and Michael Richardson to provide the details for the recommendations of the use of RPL in the ACP.

Further input, review or suggestions were received from: Rene Struik, Brian Carpenter, Benoit Claise, William Atwood and Yongkang Zhang.



## **14. Change log [RFC Editor: Please remove]**

### **14.1. Initial version**

First version of this document: [draft-behringer-autonomic-control-plane](#)

### **14.2. [draft-behringer-anima-autonomic-control-plane-00](#)**

Initial version of the anima document; only minor edits.

### **14.3. [draft-behringer-anima-autonomic-control-plane-01](#)**

- o Clarified that the ACP should be based on, and support only IPv6.
- o Clarified in intro that ACP is for both, between devices, as well as for access from a central entity, such as an NMS.
- o Added a section on how to connect an NMS system.
- o Clarified the hop-by-hop crypto nature of the ACP.
- o Added several references to GDNP as a candidate protocol.
- o Added a discussion on network split and merge. Although, this should probably go into the certificate management story longer term.

### **14.4. [draft-behringer-anima-autonomic-control-plane-02](#)**

Addresses (numerous) comments from Brian Carpenter. See mailing list for details. The most important changes are:

- o Introduced a new section "overview", to ease the understanding of the approach.
- o Merged the previous "problem statement" and "use case" sections into a mostly re-written "use cases" section, since they were overlapping.
- o Clarified the relationship with [draft-ietf-anima-stable-connectivity](#)

### **14.5. [draft-behringer-anima-autonomic-control-plane-03](#)**

- o Took out requirement for IPv6 --> that's in the reference doc.
- o Added requirement section.



- o Changed focus: more focus on autonomic functions, not only virtual out-of-band. This goes a bit throughout the document, starting with a changed abstract and intro.

#### [14.6. draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-00](#)

No changes; re-submitted as WG document.

#### [14.7. draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-01](#)

- o Added some paragraphs in addressing section on "why IPv6 only", to reflect the discussion on the list.
- o Moved the Data-Plane ACP out of the main document, into an appendix. The focus is now the virtually separated ACP, since it has significant advantages, and isn't much harder to do.
- o Changed the self-creation algorithm: Part of the initial steps go into the reference document. This document now assumes an adjacency table, and domain certificate. How those get onto the device is outside scope for this document.
- o Created a new [section 6](#) "workarounds for non-autonomic nodes", and put the previous controller section (5.9) into this new section. Now, [section 5](#) is "autonomic only", and [section 6](#) explains what to do with non-autonomic stuff. Much cleaner now.
- o Added an appendix explaining the choice of RPL as a routing protocol.
- o Formalised the creation process a bit more. Now, we create a "candidate peer list" from the adjacency table, and form the ACP with those candidates. Also it explains now better that policy (Intent) can influence the peer selection. ([section 4](#) and 5)
- o Introduce a section for the capability negotiation protocol ([section 7](#)). This needs to be worked out in more detail. This will likely be based on GRASP.
- o Introduce a new parameter: ACP tunnel type. And defines it in the IANA considerations section. Suggest GRE protected with IPSec transport mode as the default tunnel type.
- o Updated links, lots of small edits.





#### [14.8. draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-02](#)

- o Added explicitly text for the ACP channel negotiation.
- o Merged [draft-behringer-anima-autonomic-addressing-02](#) into this document, as suggested by WG chairs.

#### [14.9. draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-03](#)

- o Changed Neighbor discovery protocol from GRASP to mDNS. Bootstrap protocol team decided to go with mDNS to discover bootstrap proxy, and ACP should be consistent with this. Reasons to go with mDNS in bootstrap were a) Bootstrap should be reuseable also outside of full anima solutions and introduce as few as possible new elements. mDNS was considered well-known and very-likely even pre-existing in low-end devices (IoT). b) Using GRASP both for the insecure neighbor discovery and secure ACP operations raises the risk of introducing security issues through implementation issues/non-isolation between those two instances of GRASP.
- o Shortened the section on GRASP instances, because with mDNS being used for discovery, there is no insecure GRASP session any longer, simplifying the GRASP considerations.
- o Added certificate requirements for ANIMA in [section 5.1.1](#), specifically how the ANIMA information is encoded in subjectAltName.
- o Deleted the appendix on "ACP without separation", as originally planned, and the paragraph in the main text referring to it.
- o Deleted one sub-addressing scheme, focusing on a single scheme now.
- o Included information on how ANIMA information must be encoded in the domain certificate in section "preconditions".
- o Editorial changes, updated draft references, etc.

#### [14.10. draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-04](#)

Changed discovery of ACP neighbor back from mDNS to GRASP after revisiting the L2 problem. Described problem in discovery section itself to justify. Added text to explain how ACP discovery relates to BRSKY (bootstrap) discovery and pointed to Michael Richardsons draft detailing it. Removed appendix section that contained the original explanations why GRASP would be useful (current text is meant to be better).



#### 14.11. [draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-05](#)

- o [Section 5.3](#) (candidate ACP neighbor selection): Add that Intent can override only AFTER an initial default ACP establishment.
- o [Section 6.10.1](#) (addressing): State that addresses in the ACP are permanent, and do not support temporary addresses as defined in [RFC4941](#).
- o Modified [Section 6.3](#) to point to the GRASP objective defined in [draft-carpenter-anima-ani-objectives](#). (and added that reference)
- o [Section 6.10.2](#): changed from MD5 for calculating the first 40 bits to SHA256; reason is MD5 should not be used any more.
- o Added address sub-scheme to the IANA section.
- o Made the routing section more prescriptive.
- o Clarified in [Section 8.1.1](#) the ACP Connect port, and defined that term "ACP Connect".
- o [Section 8.2](#): Added some thoughts (from mcr) on how traversing a L3 cloud could be automated.
- o Added a CRL check in [Section 6.7](#).
- o Added a note on the possibility of source-address spoofing into the security considerations section.
- o Other editorial changes, including those proposed by Michael Richardson on 30 Nov 2016 (see ANIMA list).

#### 14.12. [draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-06](#)

- o Added proposed RPL profile.
- o detailed DTLS profile - DTLS with any additional negotiation/signaling channel.
- o Fixed up text for ACP/GRE encap. Removed text claiming its incompatible with non-GRE IPsec and detailed it.
- o Added text to suggest admin down interfaces should still run ACP.



#### 14.13. draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-07

- o Changed author association.
- o Improved ACP connect section (after confusion about term came up in the stable connectivity draft review). Added picture, defined complete terminology.
- o Moved ACP channel negotiation from normative section to appendix because it can in the timeline of this document not be fully specified to be implementable. Aka: work for future document. That work would also need to include analysing IKEv2 and describing the difference of a proposed GRASP/TLS solution to it.
- o Removed IANA request to allocate registry for GRASP/TLS. This would come with future draft (see above).
- o Gave the name "ACP information field" to the field in the certificate carrying the ACP address and domain name.
- o Changed the rules for mutual authentication of certificates to rely on the domain in the ACP information field of the certificate instead of the OU in the certificate. Also renewed the text pointing out that the ACP information field in the certificate is meant to be in a form that it does not disturb other uses of the certificate. As long as the ACP expected to rely on a common OU across all certificates in a domain, this was not really true: Other uses of the certificates might require different OUs for different areas/type of devices. With the rules in this draft version, the ACP authentication does not rely on any other fields in the certificate.
- o Added an extension field to the ACP information field so that in the future additional fields like a subdomain could be inserted. An example using such a subdomain field was added to the pre-existing text suggesting sub-domains. This approach is necessary so that there can be a single (main) domain in the ACP information field, because that is used for mutual authentication of the certificate. Also clarified that only the register(s) SHOULD/MUST use that the ACP address was generated from the domain name - so that we can easier extend change this in extensions.
- o Took the text for the GRASP discovery of ACP neighbors from Brians grasp-ani-objectives draft. Alas, that draft was behind the latest GRASP draft, so i had to overhaul. The mayor change is to describe in the ACP draft the whole format of the M\_FLOOD message (and not only the actual objective). This should make it a lot easier to read (without having to go back and forth to the GRASP



RFC/draft). It was also necessary because the locator in the M\_FLOOD messages has an important role and its not coded inside the objective. The specification of how to format the M\_FLOOD message should now be complete, the text may be some duplicate with the DULL specification in GRASP, but no contradiction.

- o One of the main outcomes of reworking the GRASP section was the notion that GRASP announces both the candidate peers IPv6 link local address but also the support ACP security protocol including the port it is running on. In the past we shied away from using this information because it is not secured, but i think the additional attack vectors possible by using this information are negligible: If an attacker on an L2 subnet can fake another devices GRASP message then it can already provide a similar amount of attack by purely faking the link-local address.
- o Removed the section on discovery and BRSKI. This can be revived in the BRSKI document, but it seems mood given how we did remove mDNS from the latest BRSKI document (aka: this section discussed discrepancies between GRASP and mDNS discovery which should not exist anymore with latest BRSKI.
- o Tried to resolve the EDNOTE about CRL vs. OCSP by pointing out we do not specify which one is to be used but that the ACP should be used to reach the URL included in the certificate to get to the CRL storage or OCSP server.
- o Changed ACP via IPsec to ACP via IKEv2 and restructured the sections to make IPsec native and IPsec via GRE subsections.
- o No need for any assigned DTLS port if ACP is run across DTLS because it is signaled via GRASP.

#### **14.14. draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-08**

Modified mentioning of BRSKI to make it consistent with current (07/2017) target for BRSKI: MASA and IDevID are mandatory. Devices with only insecure UDI would need a security reduced variant of BRSKI. Also added mentioning of Netconf Zero-Touch. Made BRSKI non-normative for ACP because wrt. ACP it is just one option how the domain certificate can be provisioned. Instead, BRSKI is mandatory when a device implements ANI which is ACP+BRSKI.

Enhanced text for ACP across tunnels to describe two options: one across configured tunnels (GRE, IPinIP etc) a more efficient one via directed DULL.





Moved description of BRSKI to appendix to emphasize that BRSKI is not a (normative) dependency of GRASP, enhanced text to indicate other options how Domain Certificates can be provisioned.

Added terminology section.

Separated references into normative and non-normative.

Enhanced section about ACP via "tunnels". Defined an option to run ACP secure channel without an outer tunnel, discussed PMTU, benefits of tunneling, potential of using this with BRSKI, made ACP via GREP a SHOULD requirement.

Moved appendix sections up before IANA section because there were concerns about appendices to be too far on the bottom to be read. Added (Informative) / (Normative) to section titles to clarify which sections are informative and which are normative

Moved explanation of ACP with L2 from precondition to separate section before workarounds, made it instructive enough to explain how to implement ACP on L2 ports for L3/L2 switches and made this part of normative requirement (L2/L3 switches SHOULD support this).

Rewrote section "GRASP in the ACP" to define GRASP in ACP as mandatory (and why), and define the ACP as security and transport substrate to GRASP in ACP. And how it works.

Enhanced "self-protection" properties section: protect legacy management protocols. Security in ACP is for protection from outside and those legacy protocols. Otherwise need end-to-end encryption also inside ACP, e.g., with domain certificate.

Enhanced initial domain certificate section to include requirements for maintenance (renewal/revocation) of certificates. Added explanation to BRSKI informative section how to handle very short lived certificates (renewal via BRSKI with expired cert).

Modified the encoding of the ACP address to better fit [RFC822](#) simple local-parts (":" as required by [RFC5952](#) are not permitted in simple dot-atoms according to [RFC5322](#). Removed reference to [RFC5952](#) as it is now not needed anymore.

Introduced a sub-domain field in the ACP information in the certificate to allow defining such subdomains with depending on future Intent definitions. It also makes it clear what the "main domain" is. Scheme is called "routing subdomain" to have a unique name.



Added V8 (now called Vlong) addressing sub-scheme according to suggestion from mcr in his mail from 30 Nov 2016 (<https://mailarchive.ietf.org/arch/msg/anima/nZpEphrTqDCBdzsKMpaIn2gsIzI>). Also modified the explanation of the single V bit in the first sub-scheme now renamed to Zone sub-scheme to distinguish it.

#### **14.15. draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-09**

Added reference to [RFC4191](#) and explained how it should be used on ACP edge routers to allow auto configuration of routing by NMS hosts. This came after review of stable connectivity draft where ACP connect is being referred to.

V8 addressing Sub-Scheme was modified to allow not only /8 device-local address space but also /16. This was in response to the possible need to have maybe as much as  $2^{12}$  local addresses for future encaps in BRSKI like IPinIP. It also would allow fully autonomic address assignment for ACP connect interfaces from this local address space (on an ACP edge device), subject to approval of the implied update to [rfc4291](#)/rfc4193 (IID length). Changed name to Vlong addressing sub-scheme.

Added text in response to Brian Carpenters review of [draft-ietf-anima-stable-connectivity-04](#).

- o The stable connectivity draft was vaguely describing ACP connect behavior that is better standardized in this ACP draft.
- o Added new ACP "Manual" addressing sub-scheme with /64 subnets for use with ACP connect interfaces. Being covered by the ACP ULA prefix, these subnets do not require additional routing entries for NMS hosts. They also are fully 64-bit IID length compliant and therefore not subject to 4191bis considerations. And they avoid that operators manually assign prefixes from the ACP ULA prefixes that might later be assigned autonomously.
- o ACP connect auto-configuration: Defined that ACP edge devices, NMS hosts should use [RFC4191](#) to automatically learn ACP prefixes. This is especially necessary when the ACP uses multiple ULA prefixes (via e.g., the rsub domain certificate option), or if ACP connect subinterfaces use manually configured prefixes NOT covered by the ACP ULA prefixes.
- o Explained how [rfc6724](#) is (only) sufficient when the NMS host has a separate ACP connect and Data-Plane interface. But not when there is a single interface.



- o Added a separate subsection to talk about "software" instead of "NMS hosts" connecting to the ACP via the "ACP connect" method. The reason is to point out that the "ACP connect" method is not only a workaround (for NMS hosts), but an actual desirable long term architectural component to modularily build software (e.g., ASA or OAM for VNF) into ACP devices.
- o Added a section to define how to run ACP connect across the same interface as the Data-Plane. This turns out to be quite challenging because we only want to rely on existing standards for the network stack in the NMS host/software and only define what features the ACP edge device needs.
- o Added section about use of GRASP over ACP connect.
- o Added text to indicate packet processing/filtering for security: filter incorrect packets arriving on ACP connect interfaces, diagnose on RPL root packets to incorrect destination address (not in ACP connect section, but because of it).
- o Reaffirm security goal of ACP: Do not permit non-ACP routers into ACP routing domain.

Made this ACP document be an update to [RFC4291](#) and [RFC4193](#). At the core, some of the ACP addressing sub-schemes do effectively not use 64-bit IIDs as required by [RFC4191](#) and debated in rfc4191bis. During 6man in prague, it was suggested that all documents that do not do this should be classified as such updates. Add a rather long section that summarizes the relevant parts of ACP addressing and usage and. Aka: This section is meant to be the primary review section for readers interested in these changes (e.g., 6man WG.).

Added changes from Michael Richardsons review <https://github.com/anima-wg/autonomic-control-plane/pull/3/commits>, textual and:

- o ACP discovery inside ACP is bad \*doh\*!.
- o Better CA trust and revocation sentences.
- o More details about RPL behavior in ACP.
- o black hole route to avoid loops in RPL.

Added requirement to terminate ACP channels upon cert expiry/revocation.

Added fixes from 08-mcr-review-reply.txt (on github):



- o AN Domain Names are FQDNs.
- o Fixed bit length of schemes, numerical writing of bits (00b/01b).
- o Lets use US american english.

#### 14.16. [draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-10](#)

Used the term routing subdomain more consistently where previously only subdomain was used. Clarified use of routing subdomain in creation of ULA "global ID" addressing prefix.

6.7.1.\* Changed native IPsec encapsulation to tunnel mode (necessary), explained why. Added notion that ESP is used, added explanations why tunnel/transport mode in native vs. GRE cases.

6.10.3/6.10.5 Added term "ACP address range/set" to be able to better explain how the address in the ACP certificate is actually the base address (lowest address) of a range/set that is available to the device.

6.10.4 Added note that manual address sub-scheme addresses must not be used within domain certificates (only for explicit configuration).

6.12.5 Refined explanation of how ACP virtual interfaces work (p2p and multipoint). Did seek for pre-existing RFCs that explain how to build a multi-access interface on top of a full mesh of p2p connections (6man WG, anima WG mailing lists), but could not find any prior work that had a succinct explanation. So wrote up an explanation here. Added hopefully all necessary and sufficient details how to map ACP unicast packets to ACP secure channel, how to deal with ND packet details. Added verbage for ACP not to assign the virtual interface link-local address from the underlying interface. Addd note that GRAP link-local messages are treated specially but logically the same. Added paragraph about NBMA interfaces.

remaining changes from Brian Carpenters review. See Github file [draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane/08-carpenter-review-reply.tx](#) for more detailst:

Added multiple new RFC references for terms/technologies used.

Fixed verbage in several places.

2. (terminology) Added 802.1AR as reference.

2. Fixed up definition of ULA.





6.1.1 Changed definition of ACP information in cert into ABNF format. Added warning about maximum size of ACP address field due to domain-name limitations.

6.2 Mentioned API requirement between ACP and clients leveraging adjacency table.

6.3 Fixed TTL in GRASP example: msec, not hop-count!.

6.8.2 MAYOR: expanded security/transport substrate text:

Introduced term ACP GRASP virtual interface to explain how GRASP link-local multicast messages are encapsulated and replicated to neighbors. Explain how ACP knows when to use TLS vs. TCP (TCP only for link-local address (sockets). Introduced "ladder" picture to visualize stack.

6.8.2.1 Expanded discussion/explanation of security model. TLS for GRASP unicast connections across ACP is double encryption (plus underlying ACP secure channel), but highly necessary to avoid very simple man-in-the-middle attacks by compromised ACP members on-path. Ultimately, this is done to ensure that any apps using GRASP can get full end-to-end secrecy for information sent across GRASP. But for publically known ASA services, even this will not provide 100% security (this is discussed). Also why double encryption is the better/easier solution than trying to optimize this.

6.10.1 Added discussion about pseudo-random addressing, scanning-attacks (not an issue for ACP).

6.12.2 New performance requirements section added.

6.10.1 Added notion to first experiment with existing addressing schemes before defining new ones - we should be flexible enough.

6.3/7.2 clarified the interactions between MLD and DULL GRASP and specified what needs to be done (e.g., in 2 switches doing ACP per L2 port).

12. Added explanations and cross-references to various security aspects of ACP discussed elsewhere in the document.

13. Added IANA requirements.

Added [RFC2119](#) boilerplate.



#### [14.17. draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-11](#)

Same text as -10 Unfortunately when uploading -10 .xml/.txt to datatracker, a wrong version of .txt got uploaded, only the .xml was correct. This impacts the -10 html version on datatracker and the PDF versions as well. Because rfcdiff also compares the .txt version, this -11 version was created so that one can compare changes from -09 and changes to the next version (-12).

#### [14.18. draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-12](#)

Sheng Jiang's extensive review. Thanks! See Github file [draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane/09-sheng-review-reply.txt](#) for more details. Many of the larger changes listed below were inspired by the review.

Removed the claim that the document is updating [RFC4291](#), RFC4193 and the section detailing it. Done on suggestion of Michael Richardson - just try to describe use of addressing in a way that would not suggest a need claim update to architecture.

Terminology cleanup:

- o Replaced "device" with "node" in text. Kept "device" only when referring to "physical node". Added definitions for those words. Includes changes of derived terms, especially in addressing: "Node-ID" and "Node-Number" in the addressing details.
- o Replaced term "autonomic FOOBAR" with "acp FOOBAR" as wherever appropriate: "autonomic" would imply that the node would need to support more than the ACP, but that is not correct in most of the cases. Wanted to make sure that implementers know they only need to support/implement ACP - unless stated otherwise. Includes "AN->ACP node", "AN->ACP adjacency table" and so on.

1 Added explanation in the introduction about relationship between ACP, BRSKI, ANI and Autonomic Networks.

6.1.1 Improved terminology and features of the certificate information field. Now called domain information field instead of ACP information field. The acp-address field in the domain information field is now optional, enabling easier introduction of various future options.

6.1.2 Moved ACP domainer membership check from [section 6.6](#) to (ACP secure channels setup) here because it is not only used for ACP secure channel setup.



6.1.3 Fix text about certificate renewal after discussion with Max Pritikin/Michael Richardson/Brian Carpenter:

- o Version 10 erroneously assumed that the certificate itself could store a URL for renewal, but that is only possible for CRL URLs. Text now only refers to "remembered EST server" without implying that this is stored in the certificate.
- o Objective for [RFC7030](#)/EST domain certificate renewal was changed to "SRV.est" See also IANA section for explanation.
- o Removed detail of distance based service selection. This can be better done in future work because it would require a lot more detail for a good DNS-SD compatible approach.
- o Removed detail about trying to create more security by using ACP address from certificate of peer. After rethinking, this does not seem to buy additional security.

6.10 Added reference to 6.12.5 in initial use of "loopback interface" in [section 6.10](#) in result of email discussion michaelR/michaelB.

10.2 Introduced informational section (diagnostics) because of operational experience - ACP/ANI undeployable without at least diagnostics like this.

10.3 Introduced informational section (enabling/disabling) ACP. Important to discuss this for security reasons (e.g., why to never auto-enable ANI on brownfield devices), for implementers and to answer ongoing questions during WG meetings about how to deal with shutdown interface.

10.8 Added informational section discussing possible future variations of the ACP for potential adopters that cannot directly use the complete solution described in this document unmodified.

#### **[14.19. draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-13](#)**

Swap author list (with permission).

6.1.1. Eliminate blank lines in definition by making it a picture (reformatting only).

6.10.3.1 New paragraph: Explained how nodes using Zone-ID != 0 need to use Zone-ID != 0 in GRASP so that we can avoid routing/forwarding of Zone-ID = 0 prefixes.



Rest of feedback from review of -12, see  
<https://raw.githubusercontent.com/anima-wg/autonomic-control-plane/master/draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane/12-feedback-reply.txt>

Review from Brian Carpenter:

various: Autonomous -> autonomic(ally) in all remaining occurrences.

various: changed "manual (configured)" to "explicitly (configured)" to not exclude the option of (SDN controller) automatic configuration (no humans involved).

1. Fixed reference to [section 9](#).

2. Added definition of loopback interface == internal interface. After discuss on WG mailing lists, including 6man.

6.1.2 Defined CDP/OCSP and pointed to [RFC5280](#) for them.

6.1.3 Removed "EST-TLS", no objective value needed or beneficial, added explanation paragraph why.

6.2 Added to adjacency table the interface that a neighbor is discovered on.

6.3 Simplified CDDL syntax: Only one method per AN\_ACP objective (because of locators). Example with two objectives in GRASP message.

6.8.1 Added note about link-local GRASP multicast message to avoid confusion.

8.1.4 Added [RFC8028](#) as recommended on hosts to better support VRF-select with ACP.

8.2.1 Rewrote and Simplified CDDL for configured remote peer and explanations. Removed pattern option for remote peer. Not important enough to be mandated.

Review thread started by William Atwood:

2. Refined definition of VRF (vs. MPLS/VPN, LISP, VRF-LITE).

2. Refined definition of ACP (ACP includes ACP GRASP instance).

2. Added explanation for "zones" to terminology section and into Zone Addressing Sub Scheme section, relating it to [RFC4007](#) zones (from Brian Carpenter).





4. Fixed text for ACP4 requirement (Clients of the ACP must not be tied to specific protocol.).

5. Fixed step 4. with proposed text.

6.1.1 Included suggested explanation for rsub semantics.

6.1.3 must->MUST for at least one EST server in ACP network to autonomically renew certs.

6.7.2 normative: AND MUST NOT (permit weaker crypto options.

6.7.1.1 also included text denying weaker IPsec profile options.

6.8.2 Fixed description how to build ACP GRASP virtual interfaces. Added text that ACP continues to exist in absence of ACP neighbors.

various: Make sure all "zone" words are used consistently.

6.10.2/various: fixed 40 bit [RFC4193](#) ULA prefix in all examples to 89b714f3db (thanks MichaelR).

6.10.1 Removed comment about assigned ULA addressing. Decision not to use it now ancient history of WG decision making process, not worth nothing anymore in the RFC.

Review from Yongkang Zhang:

6.10.5 Fixed length of Node-Numbers in ACP Vlong Addressing Sub-Scheme.

#### **14.20. [draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane-14](#)**

Disclaimer: All new text introduced by this revision provides only additional explanations/ details based on received reviews and analysis by the authors. No changes to behavior already specified in prior revisions.

Joel Halpern, review part 3:

Define/explain "ACP registrar" in reply to Joel Halpern review part 3, resolving primarily 2 documentation issues::

1. Unclear how much ACP depends on BRSKI. ACP document was referring unqualified to registrars and Registrar-ID in the addressing section without explaining what a registrar is, leading to the assumption it must be a BRSKI Registrar.



2. Unclear how the ACP addresses in ACP domain certificates are assigned because the BRSKI document does not define this, but refers to this ACP document.

Wrt. 1: ACP does NOT depend on BRSKI registrars, instead ANY appropriate automated or manual mechanism can be used to enroll ACP nodes with ACP domain certificates. This revision calls defines such mechanisms the "ACP registrar" and defines requirements. this is non-normative, because it does not define specific mechanisms that need to be support. In ANI devices, ACP Registrars are BRSKI Registrars. In non-ANI ACP networks, the registrar may simply be a person using CLI/web-interfaces to provision domain certificates and set the ACP address correctly in the ACP domain certificate.

Wrt. 2.: The BRSKI document does rightfully not define how the ACP address assignment and creation of the ACP domain information field has to work because this is independent of BRSKI and needs to follow the same rules whatever protocol/mechanisms are used to implement an ACP Registrar. Another set of protocols that could be used instead of BRSKI is Netconf/Netconf-Call-Home, but such an alternative ACP Registrar solution would need to be specified in it's own document.

Additional text/sections had to be added to detail important conditions so that automatic certificate maintenance for ACP nodes (with BRSKI or other mechanisms) can be done in a way that as good as possible maintains ACP address information of ACP nodes across the nodes lifetime because that ACP address is intended as an identifier of the ACP node.

Summary of sections added:

6.1.3.5/6.1.3.6 (normative): re-enrollment of ACP nodes after certificate expiry/failure in a way that allows to maintain as much as possible ACP address information.

6.10.7 (normative): defines "ACP Registrar" including requirements and how it can perform ACP address assignment.

10.3 (informative): details / examples about registrars to help implementers and operators understand easier how they operate, and provide suggestion of models that a likely very useful (sub-CA and/or centralized policy management).

10.4 (informative): Explains the need for the multiple address sub-spaces defined in response to discuss with Joel.

Other changes:



Updated references ([RFC8366](#), [RFC8368](#)).

Introduced sub-section headings for 6.1.3 (certificate maintenance) because section became too long with newly added sub-sections. Also some small text fixups/remove of duplicate text.

Gen-ART review, Elwyn Davies:

[RFC Editor: how can i raise the issue of problematic cross references of terms in the terminology section - rendering is problematic. ].

4. added explanation for ACP4 (finally).

6.1.1 Simplified text in bullet list explaining [rfc822](#) encoding.

6.1.3 refined second paragraph defining remembering of previous EST server and explaining how to do this with BRSKI.

9.1 Added paragraph outlining the benefit of the sub-CA Registrar option for supporting partitioned networks.

Roughly 100 more nits/minor fixes throughout the document. See: <https://raw.githubusercontent.com/anima-wg/autonomic-control-plane/master/draft-ietf-anima-autonomic-control-plane/13-elwynd-reply.txt>

Joel Halpern, review part 2:

6.1.1: added note about "+ +" format in address field when acp-address and rsub are empty.

6.5.10 - clarified text about V bit in Vlong addressing scheme.

6.10.3/6.10.4 - moved the Z bit field up front (directly after base scheme) and indicated more explicitly Z is part of selecting of the sub-addressing scheme.

Refined text about reaching CRL Distribution Point, explain why address as indicator to use ACP.

Note from Brian Carpenter: RFC Editor note for section reference into GRASP.

IOT directorate review from Pascal Thubert:

Various Nits/typos.



TBD: Punted wish for mentioning RFC reference titles to RFC editor for now.

1. Added [section 1.1](#) - applicability, discussing protocol choices re. applicability to constrained devices (or not). Added notion of TCP/TLS vs CoAP/DTLS to [section 10.4](#) in support of this.

2. Added in-band / out-of-band into terminology.

5. Referenced [section 8.2](#) for remote ACP channel configuration.

6.3 made M\_FLOOD periods RECOMMENDED (less guesswork)

6.7.x Clarified conditional nature of MUST for the profile details of IPsec parameters (aka: only 6.7.3 defines actual MUST for nodes, prior notions only define the requirements for IPsec profiles IF IPsec is supported).

6.8.1 Moved discussion about IP multicast, IGP, RPL for GRASP into a new subsection in the informative part ([section 10](#)) to tighten up text in normative part.

6.10.1 added another reference to stable-connectivity for interop with IPv4 management.

6.10.1 removed mentioning of ULA-Random, term was used in email discuss of ULA with L=1, but term actually not defined in [rfc4193](#), so mentioning it is just confusing/redundant. Also added note about the random hash being defined in this document, not using SHA1 from [rfc4193](#).

6.11.1.1 added suggested text about mechanisms to further reduce opportunities for loop during reconvergence (active signaling options from [RFC6550](#)).

6.11.1.3 made mode 2 MUST and mode 2 MAY (RPL MOP - mode of operations). Removes ambiguity.

6.12.5 Added recommendation for [RFC4429](#) (optimistic DAD).

Nits from Benjamin Kaduk: dTLS -> DTLS:

Review from Joel Halpern:

1. swapped order of "purposes" for ACP to match order in [section 3](#).

1. Added notion about manageability of ACP going beyond [RFC7575](#) (before discussion of stable connectivity).





2. Changed definition of Intent to be same as reference model (policy language instead of API).

6.1.1 changed BNF specification so that a local-part without acp-address (for future extensions) would not be rfcSELF.+rsub but simpler rfcSELF+rsub. Added explanation why rsub is in local-part.

Tried to eliminate unnecessary references to VRF to minimize assumption how system is designed.

6.1.3 Explained how to make CDP reachable via ACP.

6.7.2 Made it clearer that constrained devices MUST support DTLS if they can not support IPsec.

6.8.2.1 clarified first paragraph (TCP retransmissions lightweight).

6.11.1 fixed up RPL profile text - to remove "VRF". Text was also buggy. mentioned control plane, but its a forwarding/silicon issue to have these header.

6.12.5 Clarified how link-local ACP channel address can be derived, and how not.

8.2.1 Fixed up text to distinguish between configuration and model describing parameters of the configuration (spec only provides parameter model).

Various Nits.

## [14.21.](#) wish-list

From -13 review from Pascal Thubert: Picture to show dual-NOC routing limitation.

[RFC Editor: Question: Is it possible to change the first occurrences of [RFCxxxx] references to "rfcxxx title" [RFCxxxx]? the XML2RFC format does not seem to offer such a format, but i did not want to duplicate 50 first references to be duplicate - one reference for title mentioning and one for RFC number.]

## [15.](#) References

### [15.1.](#) Normative References



[I-D.ietf-anima-grasp]

Bormann, C., Carpenter, B., and B. Liu, "A Generic Autonomic Signaling Protocol (GRASP)", [draft-ietf-anima-grasp-15](#) (work in progress), July 2017.

[I-D.ietf-cbor-cddl]

Birkholz, H., Vigano, C., and C. Bormann, "Concise data definition language (CDDL): a notational convention to express CBOR data structures", [draft-ietf-cbor-cddl-02](#) (work in progress), February 2018.

[RFC1034] Mockapetris, P., "Domain names - concepts and facilities", STD 13, [RFC 1034](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC1034, November 1987, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1034>>.

[RFC3810] Vida, R., Ed. and L. Costa, Ed., "Multicast Listener Discovery Version 2 (MLDv2) for IPv6", [RFC 3810](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC3810, June 2004, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3810>>.

[RFC4191] Draves, R. and D. Thaler, "Default Router Preferences and More-Specific Routes", [RFC 4191](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4191, November 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4191>>.

[RFC4193] Hinden, R. and B. Haberman, "Unique Local IPv6 Unicast Addresses", [RFC 4193](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4193, October 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4193>>.

[RFC4291] Hinden, R. and S. Deering, "IP Version 6 Addressing Architecture", [RFC 4291](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4291, February 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4291>>.

[RFC4301] Kent, S. and K. Seo, "Security Architecture for the Internet Protocol", [RFC 4301](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4301, December 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4301>>.

[RFC4861] Narten, T., Nordmark, E., Simpson, W., and H. Soliman, "Neighbor Discovery for IP version 6 (IPv6)", [RFC 4861](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4861, September 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4861>>.

[RFC4862] Thomson, S., Narten, T., and T. Jinmei, "IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration", [RFC 4862](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4862, September 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4862>>.



- [RFC5234] Crocker, D., Ed. and P. Overell, "Augmented BNF for Syntax Specifications: ABNF", STD 68, [RFC 5234](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5234, January 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5234>>.
- [RFC5246] Dierks, T. and E. Rescorla, "The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.2", [RFC 5246](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5246, August 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5246>>.
- [RFC5280] Cooper, D., Santesson, S., Farrell, S., Boeyen, S., Housley, R., and W. Polk, "Internet X.509 Public Key Infrastructure Certificate and Certificate Revocation List (CRL) Profile", [RFC 5280](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5280, May 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5280>>.
- [RFC5322] Resnick, P., Ed., "Internet Message Format", [RFC 5322](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5322, October 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5322>>.
- [RFC6347] Rescorla, E. and N. Modadugu, "Datagram Transport Layer Security Version 1.2", [RFC 6347](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6347, January 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6347>>.
- [RFC6550] Winter, T., Ed., Thubert, P., Ed., Brandt, A., Hui, J., Kelsey, R., Levis, P., Pister, K., Struik, R., Vasseur, JP., and R. Alexander, "RPL: IPv6 Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks", [RFC 6550](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6550, March 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6550>>.
- [RFC6552] Thubert, P., Ed., "Objective Function Zero for the Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks (RPL)", [RFC 6552](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6552, March 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6552>>.
- [RFC6553] Hui, J. and JP. Vasseur, "The Routing Protocol for Low-Power and Lossy Networks (RPL) Option for Carrying RPL Information in Data-Plane Datagrams", [RFC 6553](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6553, March 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6553>>.
- [RFC7030] Pritikin, M., Ed., Yee, P., Ed., and D. Harkins, Ed., "Enrollment over Secure Transport", [RFC 7030](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7030, October 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7030>>.



- [RFC7296] Kaufman, C., Hoffman, P., Nir, Y., Eronen, P., and T. Kivinen, "Internet Key Exchange Protocol Version 2 (IKEv2)", STD 79, [RFC 7296](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7296, October 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7296>>.
- [RFC7676] Pignataro, C., Bonica, R., and S. Krishnan, "IPv6 Support for Generic Routing Encapsulation (GRE)", [RFC 7676](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7676, October 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7676>>.
- [RFC8174] Leiba, B., "Ambiguity of Uppercase vs Lowercase in [RFC 2119](#) Key Words", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 8174](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8174, May 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8174>>.

## **15.2. Informative References**

- [AR8021] IEEE SA-Standards Board, "IEEE Standard for Local and metropolitan area networks - Secure Device Identity", December 2009, <<http://standards.ieee.org/findstds/standard/802.1AR-2009.html>>.
- [I-D.ietf-anima-bootstrapping-keyinfra] Pritikin, M., Richardson, M., Behringer, M., Bjarnason, S., and K. Watsen, "Bootstrapping Remote Secure Key Infrastructures (BRSKI)", [draft-ietf-anima-bootstrapping-keyinfra-15](#) (work in progress), April 2018.
- [I-D.ietf-anima-prefix-management] Jiang, S., Du, Z., Carpenter, B., and Q. Sun, "Autonomic IPv6 Edge Prefix Management in Large-scale Networks", [draft-ietf-anima-prefix-management-07](#) (work in progress), December 2017.
- [I-D.ietf-anima-reference-model] Behringer, M., Carpenter, B., Eckert, T., Ciavaglia, L., and J. Nobre, "A Reference Model for Autonomic Networking", [draft-ietf-anima-reference-model-06](#) (work in progress), February 2018.
- [I-D.ietf-netconf-zerotouch] Watsen, K., Abrahamsson, M., and I. Farrer, "Zero Touch Provisioning for Networking Devices", [draft-ietf-netconf-zerotouch-21](#) (work in progress), March 2018.
- [I-D.ietf-roll-applicability-template] Richardson, M., "ROLL Applicability Statement Template", [draft-ietf-roll-applicability-template-09](#) (work in progress), May 2016.





- [I-D.ietf-roll-useofrplinfo]  
Robles, I., Richardson, M., and P. Thubert, "When to use [RFC 6553](#), 6554 and IPv6-in-IPv6", [draft-ietf-roll-useofrplinfo-23](#) (work in progress), May 2018.
- [LLDP] IEEE SA-Standards Board, "IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks: Station and Media Access Control Connectivity Discovery", June 2016, <https://standards.ieee.org/findstds/standard/802.1AB-2016.html>.
- [MACSEC] IEEE SA-Standards Board, "IEEE Standard for Local and Metropolitan Area Networks: Media Access Control (MAC) Security", June 2006, <https://standards.ieee.org/findstds/standard/802.1AE-2006.html>.
- [RFC1112] Deering, S., "Host extensions for IP multicasting", STD 5, [RFC 1112](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC1112, August 1989, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1112>.
- [RFC1918] Rekhter, Y., Moskowitz, B., Karrenberg, D., de Groot, G., and E. Lear, "Address Allocation for Private Internets", [BCP 5](#), [RFC 1918](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC1918, February 1996, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1918>.
- [RFC2315] Kaliski, B., "PKCS #7: Cryptographic Message Syntax Version 1.5", [RFC 2315](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2315, March 1998, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2315>.
- [RFC2821] Klensin, J., Ed., "Simple Mail Transfer Protocol", [RFC 2821](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC2821, April 2001, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2821>.
- [RFC4007] Deering, S., Haberman, B., Jinmei, T., Nordmark, E., and B. Zill, "IPv6 Scoped Address Architecture", [RFC 4007](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4007, March 2005, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4007>.
- [RFC4364] Rosen, E. and Y. Rekhter, "BGP/MPLS IP Virtual Private Networks (VPNs)", [RFC 4364](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4364, February 2006, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4364>.
- [RFC4429] Moore, N., "Optimistic Duplicate Address Detection (DAD) for IPv6", [RFC 4429](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4429, April 2006, <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4429>.



- [RFC4541] Christensen, M., Kimball, K., and F. Solensky, "Considerations for Internet Group Management Protocol (IGMP) and Multicast Listener Discovery (MLD) Snooping Switches", [RFC 4541](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4541, May 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4541>>.
- [RFC4604] Holbrook, H., Cain, B., and B. Haberman, "Using Internet Group Management Protocol Version 3 (IGMPv3) and Multicast Listener Discovery Protocol Version 2 (MLDv2) for Source-Specific Multicast", [RFC 4604](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4604, August 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4604>>.
- [RFC4607] Holbrook, H. and B. Cain, "Source-Specific Multicast for IP", [RFC 4607](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4607, August 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4607>>.
- [RFC4610] Farinacci, D. and Y. Cai, "Anycast-RP Using Protocol Independent Multicast (PIM)", [RFC 4610](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4610, August 2006, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4610>>.
- [RFC4941] Narten, T., Draves, R., and S. Krishnan, "Privacy Extensions for Stateless Address Autoconfiguration in IPv6", [RFC 4941](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC4941, September 2007, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4941>>.
- [RFC5321] Klensin, J., "Simple Mail Transfer Protocol", [RFC 5321](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5321, October 2008, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5321>>.
- [RFC5790] Liu, H., Cao, W., and H. Asaeda, "Lightweight Internet Group Management Protocol Version 3 (IGMPv3) and Multicast Listener Discovery Version 2 (MLDv2) Protocols", [RFC 5790](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5790, February 2010, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5790>>.
- [RFC5880] Katz, D. and D. Ward, "Bidirectional Forwarding Detection (BFD)", [RFC 5880](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC5880, June 2010, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc5880>>.
- [RFC6241] Enns, R., Ed., Bjorklund, M., Ed., Schoenwaelder, J., Ed., and A. Bierman, Ed., "Network Configuration Protocol (NETCONF)", [RFC 6241](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6241, June 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6241>>.



- [RFC6335] Cotton, M., Eggert, L., Touch, J., Westerlund, M., and S. Cheshire, "Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) Procedures for the Management of the Service Name and Transport Protocol Port Number Registry", [BCP 165](#), [RFC 6335](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6335, August 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6335>>.
- [RFC6724] Thaler, D., Ed., Draves, R., Matsumoto, A., and T. Chown, "Default Address Selection for Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6)", [RFC 6724](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6724, September 2012, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6724>>.
- [RFC6762] Cheshire, S. and M. Krochmal, "Multicast DNS", [RFC 6762](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6762, February 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6762>>.
- [RFC6763] Cheshire, S. and M. Krochmal, "DNS-Based Service Discovery", [RFC 6763](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6763, February 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6763>>.
- [RFC6830] Farinacci, D., Fuller, V., Meyer, D., and D. Lewis, "The Locator/ID Separation Protocol (LISP)", [RFC 6830](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC6830, January 2013, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6830>>.
- [RFC7404] Behringer, M. and E. Vyncke, "Using Only Link-Local Addressing inside an IPv6 Network", [RFC 7404](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7404, November 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7404>>.
- [RFC7426] Haleplidis, E., Ed., Pentikousis, K., Ed., Denazis, S., Hadi Salim, J., Meyer, D., and O. Koufopavlou, "Software-Defined Networking (SDN): Layers and Architecture Terminology", [RFC 7426](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7426, January 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7426>>.
- [RFC7575] Behringer, M., Pritikin, M., Bjarnason, S., Clemm, A., Carpenter, B., Jiang, S., and L. Ciavaglia, "Autonomic Networking: Definitions and Design Goals", [RFC 7575](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7575, June 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7575>>.
- [RFC7576] Jiang, S., Carpenter, B., and M. Behringer, "General Gap Analysis for Autonomic Networking", [RFC 7576](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7576, June 2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7576>>.



- [RFC7721] Cooper, A., Gont, F., and D. Thaler, "Security and Privacy Considerations for IPv6 Address Generation Mechanisms", [RFC 7721](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7721, March 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7721>>.
- [RFC7761] Fenner, B., Handley, M., Holbrook, H., Kouvelas, I., Parekh, R., Zhang, Z., and L. Zheng, "Protocol Independent Multicast - Sparse Mode (PIM-SM): Protocol Specification (Revised)", STD 83, [RFC 7761](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7761, March 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7761>>.
- [RFC7950] Bjorklund, M., Ed., "The YANG 1.1 Data Modeling Language", [RFC 7950](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC7950, August 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7950>>.
- [RFC8028] Baker, F. and B. Carpenter, "First-Hop Router Selection by Hosts in a Multi-Prefix Network", [RFC 8028](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8028, November 2016, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8028>>.
- [RFC8126] Cotton, M., Leiba, B., and T. Narten, "Guidelines for Writing an IANA Considerations Section in RFCs", [BCP 26](#), [RFC 8126](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8126, June 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8126>>.
- [RFC8366] Watsen, K., Richardson, M., Pritikin, M., and T. Eckert, "A Voucher Artifact for Bootstrapping Protocols", [RFC 8366](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8366, May 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8366>>.
- [RFC8368] Eckert, T., Ed. and M. Behringer, "Using an Autonomic Control Plane for Stable Connectivity of Network Operations, Administration, and Maintenance (OAM)", [RFC 8368](#), DOI 10.17487/RFC8368, May 2018, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8368>>.

#### Authors' Addresses

Toerless Eckert (editor)  
Huawei USA - Futurewei Technologies Inc.  
2330 Central Expy  
Santa Clara 95050  
USA

Email: tte+ietf@cs.fau.de





Michael H. Behringer (editor)

Email: michael.h.behringer@gmail.com

Steinthor Bjarnason  
Arbor Networks  
2727 South State Street, Suite 200  
Ann Arbor MI 48104  
United States

Email: sbjarnason@arbor.net