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Recent changes to draft-carpenter-anima-asa-guidelines

- None
- Very little feedback
- That's why we need to discuss the ecosystem
Why do we need an ecosystem?

• A deployable autonomic network needs more than an ACP and GRASP:
  • It must achieve management goals that the NOC cannot achieve manually
    – Requires a library of ASAs (and of GRASP objective definitions)
    – Requires tools to deploy and oversee ASAs
We have some documents...

- RFC7575 (Autonomic Networking: Definitions and Design Goals)
- draft-ietf-anima-reference-model (RFC queue)
- draft-ietf-anima-grasp-api
- draft-carpenter-anima-asa-guidelines
- draft-ciavaglia-anima-coordination
- draft-peloso-anima-autonomic-function
- RFC8368 (ACP for Stable Connectivity of OAM)
...but no clear WG goals

• What ecosystem issues can the IETF tackle?
  – Missing standards?
  – Operational guidance
  – Implementation guidance?

• What ecosystem issues are out of scope for the IETF?
  – And who should be encouraged to deal with them?
Other IETF Work

• NETCONF and YANG in an AN?
  – NETCONF over ACP?
  – NETCONF over GRASP?

• Use MUDs for authorization in an AN?

• Concrete examples:
  – draft-ietf-opsawg-model-automation-framework
  – draft-claise-opsawg-service-assurance-architecture
Discussion + next steps

• Comments? Questions?