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Topics

- Main changes since draft-carpenter-anima-gdn-protocol-08 and IETF LC
- Status of prototype code / Hackathon
- Open issues
- Discussion, next steps
Main Changes (1)

- draft-ietf-anima-grasp-09 (before IETF LC):
  - Added F_NEG_DRY flag to specify a "dry run" objective
  - Changed M_FLOOD syntax to signal one locator per objective.
  - Clarifications and editorial improvements
Main Changes (2)

- draft-ietf-anima-grasp-10 (after IETF LC):
  - Specified that objective with no initial value should have its value field set to CBOR 'null'
  - Specified behavior on receiving unrecognized message type
  - Noted that UTF-8 names are matched byte-for-byte
  - Added guidance for Expert Reviewer of new objectives
Main Changes (3)

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

- Updated for all recent changes
- Portable between Windows 7 and Linux
- Two demo ASAs to test negotiation, `Briggs.py` and `Gray.py`
- Toy ASA for prefix management, `pfxml.py`
- Also used to model usage for `-anima-bootstrapping-keyinfra`
- [https://www.cs.auckland.ac.nz/~brian/graspy/](https://www.cs.auckland.ac.nz/~brian/graspy/)
C prototype

• Wendong Wang, Xiangyang Gong
  – (Beijing University of Posts & Telecom) with Huawei

• Updating to current GRASP
Hackathon

- Report on results
Open Issues (1)

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

Authors’ suggestion: Yes, for consistency with requirements.

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

Authors’ suggestion: No, for readability.
Open Issues (2)

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

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

66. Split requirements into separate document?

Authors’ suggestion: No, according to WG deliverables.

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

Authors’ suggestion: Wait for AUTH48.
Discussion + next steps