

GROW  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Standards Track  
Expires: 15 November 2025

S. Romijn  
Reliably Coded  
J. Snijders  
Fastly  
E. Shryane  
RIPE NCC  
S. Konstantaras  
AMS-IX  
14 May 2025

Near Real Time Mirroring (NRTM) version 4  
draft-ietf-grow-nrtm-v4-07

## Abstract

This document specifies a one-way synchronization protocol for Internet Routing Registry (IRR) records, called Near Real Time Mirroring version 4 (NRTMv4). The protocol allows instances of IRR database servers to mirror IRR records, specified in the Routing Policy Specification Language (RPSL), between each other.

## Requirements Language

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 BCP 14 [RFC2119] [RFC8174] when, and only when, they appear in all capitals, as shown here.

## 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 15 November 2025.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2025 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

**Commenté [MB1]:** After reading the spec, I think that we need to add some text about how we expect protocol maintenance to be undertaken in the future: for example,  
•Do we expect defining new attributes/values while keeping the same protocol version?  
•When it makes sense to bump the version?

**Commenté [MB2]:** Can we indicate that it is HTTPS-based?

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 Revised BSD License text as described in Section 4.e of the Trust Legal Provisions and are provided without warranty as described in the Revised BSD License.

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction . . . . .	3
2. Informal overview . . . . .	3
3. Mirror server use . . . . .	5
3.1. Key Configuration . . . . .	5
3.2. Snapshot Initialization . . . . .	5
3.3. Publishing updates . . . . .	6
3.3.1. Delta Files . . . . .	6
3.3.2. Snapshot Files . . . . .	7
3.3.3. Update Notification File . . . . .	7
3.3.4. Publication Policy Restrictions . . . . .	8
4. Mirror client use . . . . .	8
4.1. Client Configuration . . . . .	8
4.2. Initialization from snapshot . . . . .	8
4.3. Processing Delta Files . . . . .	9
4.4. Signature and Staleness Verification . . . . .	10
4.5. Policy Restrictions . . . . .	10
5. Update Notification File . . . . .	11
5.1. Purpose . . . . .	11
5.2. Cache concerns . . . . .	11
5.3. Payload format and validation . . . . .	11
5.4. Encoding and signature . . . . .	14
6. Snapshot File . . . . .	14
6.1. Purpose . . . . .	14
6.2. Cache Concerns . . . . .	14
6.3. File format and validation . . . . .	14
7. Delta File . . . . .	15
7.1. Purpose . . . . .	15
7.2. Cache Concerns . . . . .	16
7.3. File format and validation . . . . .	16
8. Operational Considerations . . . . .	17
8.1. IRR object Validation . . . . .	17
8.2. Intermediate mirror instances . . . . .	18
8.3. Reading from local files . . . . .	19
8.4. Public key rotation . . . . .	19
9. Security Considerations . . . . .	20
10. Acknowledgments . . . . .	20
11. Normative References . . . . .	20
12. Informative References . . . . .	22
Authors' Addresses . . . . .	22

### 1. Introduction

The Internet Routing Registry (IRR) consists of several IRR Databases, each storing objects in the Routing Policy Specification Language (RPSL). About a dozen larger IRR Databases are well known and widely used, operated by different ~~organisations~~organizations, like such as RIRs and some large network operators. IRR objects serve many purposes,

**Commenté [MB3]:** Consider adding some few sentence to motivate/justify why this is important for the global routing operations.

**Commenté [MB4]:** Add an authoritative reference.

ranging from manual research by operators to automated network configuration and filtering.

Most of these ~~well-known~~ IRR Databases mirror IRR objects from some others, so that queries run against these instances provide a comprehensive view. Some **parties** also mirror IRR Databases to private IRR server instances, to reduce latency ~~when replying to in~~ queries, analyze IRR objects, or other purposes.

NRTM version 4 (NRTMv4) is a protocol for IRR mirroring, designed to address issues in existing IRR Database mirroring protocols. In NRTMv4, IRR Databases publish their records on an HTTPS endpoint, with periodic Snapshot Files and regular Delta Files. Signing allows integrity checks. By only generating files once and publishing them over HTTPS, scalability is ~~dramatically~~ improved. ~~NRTMv4~~ ~~it~~ borrows ~~some~~ concepts ~~in from~~ [RFC8182], as there are overlaps between the two protocols.

Of earlier NRTM versions, ~~particularly~~ NRTMv3 [NRTMv3] was widely deployed, although there is no formal specification. ~~Some~~ comparisons are ~~made-provided~~ in Section 9.

## 2. ~~Informal Overview~~

In NRTMv4, a mirror server is an instance of IRR Database software that has a database of IRR objects and publishes them to allow mirroring by others. This can be retrieved by mirror clients, which then load the IRR objects into their local storage.

Publication consists of three different files:

- \* A single Update Notification File. ~~—: S~~~~This~~ specifies the current IRR Database version and locations of the Snapshot File and Delta Files. It is signed to allow verification of the authenticity of the Update Notification File.
- \* A single active Snapshot File. ~~—: This e~~Contains all published IRR objects at a particular version. The mirror server periodically generates a new snapshot.
- \* Zero or more Delta Files. ~~—: These e~~Contain the changes between two database versions ~~— numbers~~.

The Update Notification File MUST be in the JSON Web Signature [RFC7515] format, where the payload is in the JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) format [RFC8259]. The Snapshot File and Delta Files MUST be in the JSON Text Sequences [RFC7464] format, so that each object in large files can be parsed independently. All files MUST use UTF-8 encoding ~~[[STD63]~~ and MAY be compressed with GZIP [RFC1952].

Mirror clients initially retrieve the small Update Notification File and a Snapshot File, from which they initialize their local copy of the Database. After that, mirror clients only retrieve the Update Notification File periodically to determine whether there are any

a mis en forme : Surlignage

Commenté [MB5]: Add a reference.

Commenté [MB6]: Unless we provide a public record where such improvement is formally assessed.

Commenté [MB7]: We may provide examples to illustrate what we meant by «Some».

Commenté [MB8]: Maybe consider having an appendix with an updated list of items (reworded) discussed in Slide#3 of <https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/113/materials/slides-113-grow-nrtmv4-00>

Commenté [MB9]: Please add a terminology section with a brief description of main terms used in the spec.

Commenté [MB10]: A figure with key element would be useful to digest the procedure.

Commenté [MB11]: Not introduced yet that objects/mirrors have version. May introduce that first.

Commenté [MB12]: Please check

Commenté [MB13]: Do we need to say this?

Commenté [MB14]: Can we point to the section where this is further discussed? If not, may be add some guidance.

a mis en forme : Surlignage

changes, and then retrieve only the relevant Delta Files (if any), if any.

This minimizes data transfer. Deltas have sequential versions.

Mirror clients are configured with the URL of an Update Notification File, name of the IRR Database, and a public signing key. This public key is used to verify the Update Notification File, which in turn contains hashes of all the Snapshot and Delta Files.

Upon initialization, the mirror server generates a session identifier ~~(ID-session id)~~ for the

Database ~~(Section 3.2)~~. This allows long term caching and used by the client to

determine that the Delta Files continue to form a full set of changes allowing an update to the latest version. If the mirror server loses partial history, or the mirror client starts mirroring from a different server, the session identifier ~~session ID~~ change will force a full reload from the latest Snapshot File, ensuring there are no accidental mirroring gaps.

Mirror servers can use caching to reduce their load, particularly because snapshots and deltas are immutable for a given session identifier ~~session ID~~ and version number. These are also the largest files. Update Notification Files may not be cached for longer than one minute, but are fairly small.

Note that in NRTMv4, a ~~contiguous~~ version numbers is ~~are~~ used for the Database version and Delta Files. This is different and unrelated to the serial in NRTMv3. NRTMv3 serials refer to a single change to a single object, whereas an NRTMv4 version refers to one delta, possibly containing multiple changes to multiple objects. NRTMv3 serials can also contain gaps, NRTMv4 versions may not.

### 3. Mirror ~~S~~server Use

#### 3.1. Key Configuration

When enabling NRTMv4 publication for an IRR Database, the operator MUST generate and configure a private Elliptic Curve JSON Web Key [RFC7517]. The operator then provides this public key, the name of the IRR Database, and publication URL of the Update Notification File to any operators of mirror clients. The published public key MUST be encoded in PEM. The process for providing this is not in the scope of this protocol, but a typical case is publication on the operator's known website. Key rotation is described in Section 8.4.

It is RECOMMENDED that implementations provide easily accessible tools for operators to generate new signing keys to enter into their configuration and assist with key rotation. It is also RECOMMENDED ~~that All-all~~ configuration options ~~SHOULD beare~~ clearly named to indicate that they are private keys.

#### 3.2. Snapshot Initialization

A mirror server MUST follow the initialization steps upon the first

**Commenté [MB15]:** Link with the attribute name defined in the main spec.

**Commenté [MB16]:** Add ref to where more details are provided. Otherwise, this will open the question about how this is generated, etc.

Please add refs for other similar parts in the overview.

a mis en forme : Surlignage

**Commenté [MB17]:** Please add an authoritative reference + expand.

Privacy-Enhanced Mail (PEM) [RFC1421]?

**Commenté [MB18]:** For consistency with the previous sentence, but more importantly this is about how an implem exposes its config knobs

export for an IRR Database by that mirror server, or if the server lost history and ~~can not~~cannot reliably produce a continuous set of deltas from a previous state.

In other words, either the mirror server guarantees that clients following the deltas have a correct and complete view, or ~~MUST~~must reinitialize, which will force clients to reinitialize as well.

Initialization consists of these actions:

- \* The mirror server MUST generate a new ~~session identifier~~session ID. This MUST be a ~~random v4~~Universally Unique Identifier version 4 (UUIDv4) (Section 5.4 of [RFC4122][RFC9562]) and MUST be the same across all client sessions. The ~~session identifier~~ session ID is unique to the IRR Database, so an instance that serves multiple IRR Databases, will create a separate ~~session identifier~~ session ID for each.
- \* The server MUST generate a snapshot for version number one. This may contain an empty array of objects if the IRR Database is currently empty.
- \* The server MUST generate a new Update Notification File with the new ~~session identifier~~session ID, a reference to the new snapshot, and no deltas.

Note that a publication, and its associated ~~session identifiers~~ session IDs and versions, always relates to a single specific IRR Database, even if multiple databases are published from one instance. For example, a mirror server publishing NRTMv4 for RIPE and RIPE-NONAUTH, will generate two Update Notification Files, referring two Snapshot Files, and two sets of Delta Files each with contiguous version numbers - all completely independent to each other, with different session IDs/identifiers, potentially at different times. This applies even if the same IRR server instance produces both.

### 3.3. Publishing ~~updates~~Updates

After creating the initialization files, the mirror server processes updates by publishing Delta Files and, periodically, a new Snapshot File.

#### 3.3.1. Delta Files

Changes to IRR objects MUST be recorded in Delta Files. One Delta File can contain multiple changes.

Updates are generated as follows:

- \* A mirror server MUST publish a Delta File approximately every minute, if there have been changes to IRR objects in that time frame.
- \* If a mirror server is lagging in production of Delta Files, such

**Commenté [MB19]:** As this about restating the previous MUST: «In other words, ..»

If the normative language is needed here, then please reword the full sentence to make that clear.

**Commenté [MB20]:** This was obsoleted by rfc9562

**Commenté [MB21]:** I wonder whether can cite examples with other RIRs as well?

**Commenté [MB22]:** Is this needed?

as after an initialization or server downtime, it MUST generate one larger "catch up" Delta File, rather than individual Delta Files for every ~~one~~one-minute window.

- \* A new Delta File MUST be generated with a new version, one greater than the last Delta File version, or one greater than the last Snapshot File version if there were no prior deltas at all.
- \* The Delta File MUST include all changes that happened during the time frame, in the order in which they occurred. If multiple changes have occurred within the time frame that would cancel each other out, like an addition and immediate deletion of the same object, the mirror server MUST still include all these changes.

\* The URL where the Delta File is published MUST contain the session ID and version number to allow it to be indefinitely cached. It MUST also contain a random value that ~~can not~~cannot be predicted before publication, to counter negative caching issues.

- \* After generating a new Delta File, a mirror server SHOULD remove all Delta Files older than 24 hours.
- \* The Update Notification File MUST be updated to include the new Delta File and update the database version.
- \* Note that, as Delta Files always contain changes compared to a previous state, there can never be a Delta File with version 1.

### 3.3.2. Snapshot Files

Snapshot Files after initialization are generated as follows:

- \* The mirror server MUST generate a new Snapshot File between once per hour and once per day, if there have been changes to the IRR objects.
- \* The version number of the new snapshot MUST be equal to the last Delta File version.
- \* If there have been no changes to the IRR objects since the last snapshot, the mirror server MUST NOT generate a new snapshot.
- \* The URL where the Snapshot File is published MUST contain the session ID and version number to allow it to be indefinitely cached. It MUST also contain a random value that ~~can not~~cannot be predicted before publication, to counter negative caching issues.
- \* The Update Notification File MUST be updated to include the new snapshot, if one was generated.
- \* Snapshot generation may take some time, and in that time newer changes may occur that are not part of the snapshot in progress.

**Commenté [MB23]:** Can we say under which conditions it can leave them for a long period? What would be the implications if not followed?

**Commenté [MB24]:** Is this controlled by configuration?

**Commenté [MB25]:** I would put this one as the first bullet item.

The mirror server SHOULD continue to produce Delta Files during this window, which means that the server MAY publish a Snapshot File with a version number older than the most recent Delta File at the time of publication.

**Commenté [MB26]:** This is simply a consequence of the SHOULD right before.

### 3.3.3. Update Notification File

The Update Notification File MUST be updated when a new Delta or Snapshot File is published and, even if there have been no changes, at least every 24 hours.

### 3.3.4. Publication Policy Restrictions

A mirror server MAY have a policy that restricts the publication of certain IRR objects or attributes, or modifies these before publication. Typical scenarios for this include preventing the distribution of certain personal data or password hashes, or excluding objects which do not meet validation rules like RPKI consistency. It is RECOMMENDED to modify objects in such a way that this change is evident to humans reading the object text, for example, for example by adding remark lines or comments.

**Commenté [MB27]:** Expand and add a reference.

Mirror servers are RECOMMENDED to remove password hashes from the auth lines in mntner objects, as they have little use beyond the authoritative server, and their publication may be a security risk.

**Commenté [MB28]:** Add a reference to rfc2622#section-3.1

If a mirror server has a policy that restricts or modifies object publication, this MUST be applied consistently to Snapshot Files and Delta Files from the moment the policy is enacted or modified.

**Commenté [MB29]:** Maybe move this sentence to Operational Considerations or Security Considerations.

## 4. Mirror Client Use

### 4.1. Client Configuration

Mirror clients are configured with the name of the IRR Database, the URL of the Update Notification File, and the public key currently used for signing the Update Notification File. Key rotation is described in Section 8.4.

### 4.2. Initialization from ~~snapshot~~Snapshot

Clients MUST initialize from a Snapshot File when initially configured or if they are not able to update their local data from the provided Delta Files:

- \* The client MUST retrieve the Update Notification File.
- \* The client MUST verify that the source attribute in the Update Notification File matches the configured IRR Database name.
- \* The client MUST retrieve the Snapshot File and load the objects into its local storage.
- \* The mirror client MUST verify that the hash of the Snapshot File matches the hash in the Update Notification File that referenced it. If the Snapshot File was compressed with GZIP, the hash MUST

match the compressed data. In case of a mismatch of this hash, the file MUST be rejected.

\* The client MUST record the ~~session\_id~~session identifier and version of the loaded Snapshot File.

Commenté [MB30]: As the attribute session\_id is not defined yet

#### 4.3. Processing Delta Files

If a mirror client has previously initialized from a snapshot:

- \* The client MUST retrieve the Update Notification File.
- \* The client MUST verify that the source attribute in the Update Notification File matches the configured IRR Database name.
- \* The client MUST verify that the session Identifier matches the previously known session Identifier. If this does not match, the client MUST reinitialize from the snapshot.
- \* The client MUST verify that the Update Notification File version is the same or higher than the client's current most recent version. If not, the Update Notification File MUST be rejected. It is RECOMMENDED for the client to distinguish between an Update Notification File that is a single version older, and a much older version, in any status messages. The former can occur from time to time in ~~synchronisations~~synchronization issues, the latter is more likely a faulty implementation.
- \* The client MUST verify that the Update Notification File contains one contiguous set of Delta File versions after the client's current most recent version up to the latest version in the Update Notification File. If the Delta File versions are not contiguous, the Update Notification File MUST be rejected. If the available Delta File versions do not range from the client's most recent version plus one, the client MUST reinitialize from the snapshot.
- \* The mirror client MUST verify that the hashes of each Delta and Snapshot File have not changed compared to previous entries seen for the same file type and version. If a newer Update Notification File contains a different hash for a specific file, this indicates a misconfiguration in the server and the client MUST reject the Update Notification File. The client can do this by recording the files referenced by the previous valid Update Notification File and comparing the overlapping entries with the retrieved Update Notification File.
- \* The client MUST retrieve all Delta Files for versions since the client's last known version, if there are any.
- \* The mirror client MUST verify that the hash of each newly downloaded Delta File matches the hash in the Update Notification File that referenced it. If the Delta File was compressed with GZIP, the hash MUST match the compressed file. In case of a mismatch of this hash, the Delta File MUST be rejected.



- \* The client MUST process all changes in the Delta Files in order: lowest Delta File version number first, and in the order of the changes list in the Delta File.
- \* The client MUST update its records of the most recent version to the version of the Update Notification File.

If the Update Notification File or one of the Delta Files is rejected, the mirror client MUST NOT process any newer Deltas than those that are valid and have been successfully verified. If some Delta Files are rejected, it MAY process the valid Delta Files, but MUST NOT skip over any rejected Delta Files while doing so. Additionally, the changes in a specific Delta File MUST be processed either completely, or not at all, i.e., i.e. a Delta File must never be partially processed.

#### 4.4. Signature and Staleness Verification

Every time a mirror client retrieves a new version of the Update Notification File, it MUST verify the included signature. The signature MUST be valid for the configured public key for the contents of the Update Notification File. If the signature does not match, the mirror client MUST reject the Update Notification File, unless a key rotation is in progress as described in Section 8.4.

A mirror client can use the generation timestamp in the Update Notification File to check whether the file is stale, as the mirror server must update this file at least every 24 hours. If the generation timestamp is more than 24 hours ago, the file is stale and the mirror client SHOULD warn the operator in log messages or other alerting, but MAY continue to process it otherwise.

**Commenté [MB31]:** Add a pointer to the appropriate section where the key is discussed.

**Commenté [MB32]:** Should we say some words about time synchronization?

#### 4.5. Policy Restrictions

A mirror client MAY have a policy that restricts the processing of objects to certain object classes, or other limitations on which objects it processes.

If a mirror client has a policy that restricts object processing, this MUST be applied consistently to Snapshot Files and Delta Files from the moment the policy is enacted or modified.

### 5. Update Notification File

#### 5.1. Purpose

The Update Notification File is generated by the mirror server and used by mirror clients to discover whether any changes exist between the state of the IRR mirror server and of the mirror client. It also describes the location of the Snapshot File and incremental Delta Files. Finally, the generation timestamp can be used to detect whether the file is stale.

The mirror server MUST generate a new Update Notification File every time there are new deltas or snapshots and, even if there have been no changes, at least every 24 hours.

5.2. Cache Concerns

A mirror server may use caching infrastructure to cache the Update Notification File and reduce the load of **HTTPS requests**.

However, since this file is used by mirror clients to determine whether any updates are available, the mirror server SHOULD ensure that this file is not cached for longer than one minute. An exception to this rule is that it is better to serve a stale Update Notification File rather than no Update Notification File.

5.3. Payload Format and Validation

An ~~example~~ payload of an Update Notification File is provided in Figure X+.

```
{
  "nrtm_version": 4,
  "timestamp": "20252-0112-01T15:00:00Z",
  "type": "notification",
  "next_signing_key": "bnJ0..bXY0",
  "source": "EXAMPLE",
  "session_id": "ca128382-78d9-41d1-8927-1ecef15275be",
  "version": 4,
  "snapshot": {
    "version": 3,
    "url": "ca128382-78d9-41d1-8927-1ecef15275be/nrtm-
snapshot.2.047595d0fae972fbed0c51b4a41c7a349e0c47bb.json.gz",
    "hash": "9a..86"
  },
  "deltas": [
    {
      "version": 2,
      "url": "ca128382-78d9-41d1-8927-1ecef15275be/nrtm-
delta.1.784a2a65aba22e001fd25a1b9e8544e058fbc703.json",
      "hash": "62..a2"
    },
    {
      "version": 3,
      "url": "ca128382-78d9-41d1-8927-1ecef15275be/nrtm-
delta.2.0f681f07cfab5611f3681bf030ec9f6fa3442fb0.json",
      "hash": "25..9a"
    },
    {
      "version": 4,
      "url": "ca128382-78d9-41d1-8927-1ecef15275be/nrtm-
delta.3.d9c194acbb2cb0d4088c9d8a25d5871cdd802c79.json",
      "hash": "b4..13"
    }
  ],
  "metadata": {}
}
```

Figure X: PLEASE ADD TITLE

Note: hash and key values in this example are shortened because of formatting.

a mis en forme : Surlignage

Commenté [MB33]: --DISCUSS: Consider adding a statement about unknown attributes: these are ignored, I guess but the file can still be used.

(Update after reading Ops cons): May be adding a pointer to that section would suffice here.

Commenté [MB34]: --DISCUSS: Before presenting an example, we should provide the schema first and attributes description.

Commenté [MB35]: Maybe fold per RFC 8792: Handling Long Lines in Content of Internet-Drafts and RFCs

If you are using md, this is built-in using include-fold.

Commenté [MB36]: Refresh the date to be consistent with the RFC publication date.

Commenté [MB37]: What are supported «types»? Can these be tracked in an IANA registry?

Commenté [MB38]: Position the example after the attribute description.

The following validation rules MUST be observed when creating or parsing Update Notification Files:

- \* The nrtm\_version MUST be 4.
- \* The timestamp MUST be an [RFC3339] timestamp with the time-offset set to "Z".
- \* The type MUST be "notification".
- \* The optional field next\_signing\_key is used for in-band key rotation. If present, it MUST be an Elliptic Curve JWK [RFC7517] public key encoded in PEM, which matches the private key the mirror server will start using to sign the Update Notification File in the near future. Key rotation is described in Section 8.4. If there is no next signing key, this key MUST be omitted.
- \* The source MUST be a valid IRR object name [RFC2622].
- \* The session\_id attribute MUST be a random-v4-UUIDv4 [RFC4122] unique to this session for this source.
- \* The version MUST be an unsigned positive integer and be equal to the highest version of the deltas and snapshot.
- \* The file MUST contain exactly one snapshot.
- \* The file MAY contain one or more deltas.
- \* The deltas MUST have a sequential contiguous set of version numbers.
- \* Each snapshot and delta element MUST have a version, URL and hash attribute. The URL must be relative to the path of the Update Notification File. For example, if the Update Notification File example above is published on "https://example.com/nrtm/update-notification-file.json", the full URL for the referred snapshot is https://example.com/nrtm/ca128382-78d9-41d1-8927-1ecef15275be/nrtm-snapshot.2.047595d0fae972fbed0c51b4a41c7a349e0c47bb.json.gz. If the snapshot or delta file was compressed with GZIP, the filename MUST end in ".gz". and the hash MUST match the compressed data.
- \* The hash attribute in snapshot and delta elements MUST be the hexadecimal encoding of the SHA-256 hash [SHS] of the referenced file. The mirror client MUST verify this hash when the file is retrieved and reject the file if the hash does not match.
- \* The metadata key MAY be present, used for metadata produced by the server to aid in tracing and debugging. This can contain information like the name of the host on which the file was generated or the name and version of the software used. Each mirror server may choose which fields to include, or choose to not include any metadata. The mirror server SHOULD not cause excessive size increases by adding extensive metadata in the

**Commenté [MB39]:** Consider adding an explicit statement to indicate the behavior when a required key is missing or validation errors are encountered.

**Commenté [MB40]:** The normative language is redundant with this part:

When enabling NRTMv4 publication for an IRR Database, the operator MUST generate and configure a private Elliptic Curve JSON Web Key [RFC7517]. The operator then provides this public key, the name of the IRR Database, and publication URL of the Update Notification File to any operators of mirror clients. The published public key MUST be encoded in PEM.

**Commenté [MB41]:** That is?

**Commenté [MB42]:** Please update as this was obsolete; also cite the exact section for UUIDv4

**Commenté [MB43]:** As this is a normative language.

Update Notification File, as it is the most frequently retrieved file.

**Commenté [MB44]:** What does that mean concretely.

#### 5.4. Encoding and signature

\* The actual Update Notification File contents MUST be a JSON Web Signature [RFC7515] and MUST use JWS Compact Serialization.

\* The JWS Payload MUST be the JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) [RFC8259] serialization of the structure described in the previous section.

\* The filename of the serialized data MUST be "update-notification-file.jose".

\* The algorithm MUST NOT be Deprecated, and it is RECOMMENDED to use Recommended or Recommended+ algorithms, as defined in JSON Web Algorithms [RFC7518]

**Commenté [MB45]:** This MUST is redundant with

The Update Notification File MUST be in the JSON Web Signature [RFC7515] format, where the payload is in the JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) format [RFC8259]. The Snapshot File and Delta Files MUST be in the JSON Text Sequences [RFC7464] format, so that each object in large files can be parsed independently.

**Commenté [MB46]:** MUST redundant with

The Update Notification File MUST be in the JSON Web Signature [RFC7515] format, where the payload is in the JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) format [RFC8259]. The Snapshot File and Delta Files MUST be in the JSON Text Sequences [RFC7464] format, so that each object in large files can be parsed independently.

**Commenté [MB47]:** Should we also cite <https://www.iana.org/assignments/jose/jose.xhtml?>

#### 6. Snapshot File

##### 6.1. Purpose

The Snapshot File reflects the complete and current contents of all IRR objects in an IRR Database. Mirror clients MUST use this to initialize their local copy of the IRR Database.

##### 6.2. Cache Concerns

A snapshot reflects the content of the IRR Database at a specific point in time; for that reason, it can be considered immutable data. Snapshot Files MUST be published at a URL that is unique to the specific session and version. The URL MUST also contain a random value that ~~can not~~ cannot be predicted before publication, to counter negative caching issues.

Because these files never change, they MAY be cached indefinitely. However, as snapshots are large and old snapshots will no longer be referred by newer Update Notification Files, it is RECOMMENDED that a limited interval is used in the order of hours or days.

To avoid race conditions where a mirror client retrieves an Update Notification File moments before it's updated, mirror servers SHOULD retain old Snapshot Files for at least 5 minutes after a new Update Notification File is published.

**Commenté [MB48]:** MUST is redundant with:

\* The URL where the Snapshot File is published MUST contain the session ID and version number to allow it to be indefinitely cached. It MUST also contain a random value that cannot be predicted before publication, to counter negative caching issues

**Commenté [MB49]:** Can we pick one? Days would OK for this case. No?

**Commenté [MB50]:** Can this be controlled by a configuration knob?

**Commenté [MB51]:** Move the example after the keys description

##### 6.3. File format and validation

Figure X depicts an Example example Snapshot File.:

```
{
  "nrtm_version": 4,
  "type": "snapshot",
  "source": "EXAMPLE",
  "session_id": "cal28382-78d9-41d1-8927-1ecef15275be",
  "version": 3
}
```

```
{
  "object": "route: 192.0.2.0/24\norigin: AS65530\nsource: EXAMPLE"
}
```

**Commenté [MB52]:** Please use an ASN that is in documentation range : 65536 - 65551

See rfc5398

Figure X: PLEASE ADD TITLE.

Note: IRR object texts in this example are shortened because of formatting.

The file is in JSON Text Sequences [RFC7464] format, and MUST contain one or more records (it must contain at least the header). The first record is the file header, and the following validation rules MUST be observed when creating or parsing a Snapshot File header:

**Commenté [MB53]:** The attribute description should be independent of the example.

- \* The nrtm\_version MUST be 4.
- \* The type MUST be "snapshot".
- \* The source MUST match the source in the Update Notification File.
- \* The session\_id attribute MUST match the session\_id in the Update Notification File.
- \* The version MUST be an unsigned positive integer, matching the Update Notification File entry for this snapshot.

The remaining records (zero or more) MUST each contain a string representation of an IRR object. The source attribute in the IRR object texts MUST match the source attribute of the Snapshot File.

## 7. Delta File

### 7.1. Purpose

A Delta File contains all changes for exactly one incremental update of the IRR Database. It may include new, modified and deleted objects. Delta Files can contain multiple alterations to multiple objects.

### 7.2. Cache Concerns

Deltas reflect the difference in content of the IRR Database from one version to another; for that reason, it can be considered immutable data. Delta Files MUST be published at a URL that is unique to the specific session and version. The URL MUST also contain a random value that can not be predicted before publication, to counter negative caching issues.

**Commenté [MB54]:** Already said. The normative language is redundant.

To avoid race conditions where a mirror client retrieves an Update Notification File moments before ~~it's~~ it is updated, mirror servers SHOULD retain old Delta Files for at least 5 minutes after a new Update Notification File is published that no longer contains these Delta Files.

**Commenté [MB55]:** I guess this is controllable with a configuration knob. Can we say that explicitly. Thanks

### 7.3. File format and validation

Figure X depicts an example Delta File.

**Commenté [MB56]:** Move the example to be positioned right after the keys description

```

R
S{
  "nrtm_version": 4,
  "type": "delta",
  "source": "EXAMPLE",
  "session_id": "ca128382-78d9-41d1-8927-1ecef15275be",
  "version": 3
}
R
S{
  "action": "delete",
  "object_class": "person",
  "primary_key": "PRSN1-EXAMPLE"
}
R
S{
  "action": "delete",
  "object_class": "route",
  "primary_key": "192.0.2.0/24AS65530"
}
R
S{
  "action": "add_modify",
  "object": "route: 2001:db8::/32\norigin: AS65530\nsource: EXAMPLE"
}

```

**Commenté [MB57]:** Need to explain the notation.

**Commenté [MB58]:** Please use an ASN that is in documentation range : 65536 - 65551

See RFC5398

**Commenté [MB59]:** The example can be moved after the attribute description.

**Figure X: ADD TITLE.**

Note: IRR object texts in this example are shortened because of formatting.

The file is in JSON Text Sequences [RFC7464] format, and MUST contain two or more records (at least the header and one change). The first record is the file header, and the following validation rules MUST be observed when creating or parsing a Delta File header:

- \* The nrtm\_version MUST be 4.
- \* The type MUST be "delta".
- \* The source MUST match the source in the Update Notification File.
- \* The session\_id attribute MUST match the session\_id in the Update Notification File.
- \* The version MUST be an unsigned positive integer, matching the Update Notification File entry for this delta.

The remaining records (one or more) MUST each contain a JSON object representing a change, which MUST meet the following rules:

- \* An action attribute, which is either "delete" for object deletions, or "add\_modify" for additions or modifications.
- \* If action is "delete": an object\_class attribute with the RPSL object class name, and a primary\_key attribute with the primary key, of the deleted object. For objects that are listed in [RFC2622] and [RFC4012] the primary key is the value of the RPSL field defined as "class key". For object classes that define a pair of attributes as class key, e.g. route, the values of the individual attributes are appended together without separators. For any other objects, the primary key is the value of the RPSL

field with the same name as the object class name. The primary key and object class name are not case sensitive and therefore mirror clients MUST use case insensitive matching against their local database.

- \* If action is "add\_modify": an object attribute with the RPSL text of the new version of the object.

**Commenté [MB60]:** I don't parse this sentence.

## 8. Operational Considerations

xx

**Commenté [MB61]:** May add a subsection with a summary of all configuration parameters mentioned in the spec with their defaults, if any.

### 8.1. IRR Object Validation

Throughout the years, various implementations of IRR servers have taken liberties with the various RFCs regarding RPSL. Implementations have introduced different new object classes, attributes and validation rules. Current IRR Databases also contain legacy objects which were created under different validation rules. In practice, there is no uniformly implemented standard for RPSL, but merely rough outlines partially documented in different places.

**Commenté [MB62]:** 1)What about load/scalability/dimensioning considerations?

This has the potential to create interoperability issues. Some are addressed by NRTMv4, like having a consistent character set when mirroring data between implementations. However, some issues can not be addressed in this way, such as one implementation introducing a new object class that is entirely unknown to another implementation.

(2) Are flash crowds a valid concern? How the mirroring can be distributed to soften the load on servers?

A mirror client SHOULD be able to handle unknown object classes and objects that are invalid according to its own validation rules, which may mean simply discarding them, without rejecting remaining objects or preventing future updates.

(3) can we mention measures to avoid exhaustion storage (limit cumulated updates, etc.?)

It is RECOMMENDED for mirror clients to log these cases, particularly those where an object was discarded due to violating validation rules. These cases create an inconsistency between the IRR objects of the server and client, and logs facilitate later analysis.

It is RECOMMENDED for mirror clients to be flexible where possible and reasonable when applying their own validation rules to IRR objects retrieved from mirror servers. For example, a route object with an origin attribute that is not a valid AS number can't be usefully interpreted. There is no way for an IRR server to correctly parse and index such an object. However, a route-set object whose name does not start with "RS-" [RFC2622], or an inetnum with an unknown extra "org" attribute, still allows the mirror client to interpret it unambiguously even if it does not meet the mirror client's own validation rules for authoritative records.

### 8.2. Intermediate Mirror Instances

An IRR Database generally has a single authoritative source. In some cases, an instance run by a third party will function as a kind of intermediate: both being a mirror client, mirroring IRR objects from the authoritative source, and simultaneously function as a mirror server to yet another mirror client.

There are various operational reasons for such a setup, such as the intermediate filtering certain records. Regardless of the reason, the mirror client and server function of an IRR server must be

treated as separate processes. In particular, this means they MUST have separate session IDs. The intermediate server MUST NOT republish the same files it retrieved from the authoritative source with the same session ID.

### 8.3. Reading from ~~L~~ocal ~~files~~Files

In the typical use case for NRTMv4, a mirror client retrieves files from an HTTPS endpoint. However, implementations MAY also support reading from files on the local filesystem instead, for when operators want to use a different method to retrieve or distribute the files. When reading from local files, mirror clients SHOULD still follow all validation rules, including the validation of the signature and hashes.

### 8.4. Public ~~K~~key ~~rotation~~Rotation

It is RECOMMENDED that IRR Database operators rotate the signing key on their mirror server about once per year. The next\_signing\_key field in the Update Notification File supports in-band key rotation using the following process:

- \* The server operator generates a new key and configures this in the mirror server implementation as the upcoming new signing key.
- \* The mirror server MUST include this key in the next\_signing\_key field in any Update Notification File generated while the new signing key is configured. Hence, the new signing key will start being propagated to the mirror clients with the next publication of the Notification File, which will take at most 24 hours. Mirror server implementations MAY offer a method to cause the Notification Update File to be refreshed earlier, with the new\_signing\_key included, and thus start the propagation earlier.
- \* When mirror clients next retrieve the Update Notification File, they MUST detect the next\_signing\_key field, and store the key in their configuration.
- \* After allowing mirror clients time to have seen the new Update Notification File with the next\_signing\_key field, the mirror server operator configures the new key as currently active key, and removes the old key. Any Update Notification File generated after this point MUST be signed with this new key, and will not contain a next\_signing\_key field.
- \* The RECOMMENDED period between publication of the upcoming key in the next\_signing\_key field, and removal of the old key, is one week. This offers all active clients a reasonable chance to follow the rotation process.
- \* When mirror clients retrieve an Update Notification File and find that the signature does not match, they MUST attempt to verify against a next\_signing\_key encountered in a previous (valid) file. If the signature matches for this new key, the client MUST update its configuration to use the new key for validation. After this, the client MUST NOT use the old key for validation at any time: a mirror server ~~can-not~~cannot switch back to an old key.



If a mirror client never retrieves an Update Notification file at any point during the rotation process, it will no longer be able to verify the signature. In that scenario manual recovery is required, similar to a ~~first-time~~first-time configuration of a new mirror client.

✘

## 9. Security Considerations

IRR objects serve many purposes, including automated network configuration and filtering. Manipulation of IRR objects can ~~therefore~~therefore, have a significant security impact. However, security in existing protocols is mostly absent.

Before NRTMv4, the most common protocols for IRR Database mirroring are FTP for retrieving full snapshots, and NRTM version 3 for retrieving later changes. There are no provisions for integrity or authenticity, and there are various scenarios where mirroring may not be reliable.

NRTMv4 requires integrity verification. The Delta and Snapshot Files are verified using the SHA-256 hash in the Update Notification File, and the Update Notification File is verified using its signature. Additionally, the channel security offered by HTTPS further limits security risks.

By allowing publication on any HTTPS endpoint, NRTMv4 allows for extensive scaling, and there are many existing techniques and services to protect against denial-of-service attacks. In contrast, NRTMv3 required mirror clients to directly query the IRR server instance with special ~~WHOIS~~ ~~whois~~ queries [RFC3912]. This scales poorly, and there are no standard protections against denial-of-service available.

The HTTPS endpoint used for NRTMv4 MUST be configured according to the best practices in [BCP195]~~[RFC9325]~~. Mirror clients MUST NOT use other protocols than HTTPS, such as HTTP or FTP.

## X. IANA Considerations

TBC.

## 10. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank George Michaelson, Shon Huang, Tim Bruijnzeels, Mahesh Aggarwal, Fedor Vompe, and Paul Etchells for their helpful review of this document and/or work on implementations.

## 11. Normative References

[RFC1952] Deutsch, P., "GZIP file format specification version 4.3", RFC 1952, DOI 10.17487/RFC1952, May 1996, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1952>>.

[RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate

**Commenté [MB63]:** Given that NRTMv3 is widely used, can we add a discussion on migration path per <https://ietf-opsawg-wg.github.io/draft-opsarea-rfc5706bis/draft-opsarea-rfc5706bis.html#name-migration-path>?

**Commenté [MB64]:** Prefer to cite the BCP itself.

**Commenté [MB65]:** --DISCUSS: Do we see a value in having a registry to track NRTM versions?

Do we need to register the supported parameters?

**Commenté [MB66]:** OK to list it here.

It is already cited in downref: <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/downref>

- Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119,  
DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [RFC2622] Alaettinoglu, C., Villamizar, C., Gerich, E., Kessens, D.,  
Meyer, D., Bates, T., Karrenberg, D., and M. Terpstra,  
"Routing Policy Specification Language (RPSL)", RFC 2622,  
DOI 10.17487/RFC2622, June 1999,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2622>>.
- [RFC3339] Klyne, G. and C. Newman, "Date and Time on the Internet:  
Timestamps", RFC 3339, DOI 10.17487/RFC3339, July 2002,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3339>>.
- [RFC4122] Leach, P., Mealling, M., and R. Salz, "A Universally  
Unique IDentifier (UUID) URN Namespace", RFC 4122,  
DOI 10.17487/RFC4122, July 2005,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4122>>.
- [RFC4012] Blunk, L., Damas, J., Parent, F., and A. Robachevsky,  
"Routing Policy Specification Language next generation  
(RPSLng)", RFC 4012, DOI 10.17487/RFC4012, March 2005,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4012>>.
- [RFC7464] Williams, N., "JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) Text  
Sequences", RFC 7464, DOI 10.17487/RFC7464, February 2015,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7464>>.
- [RFC7515] Jones, M., Bradley, J., and N. Sakimura, "JSON Web  
Signature (JWS)", RFC 7515, DOI 10.17487/RFC7515, May  
2015, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7515>>.
- [RFC7517] Jones, M., "JSON Web Key (JWK)", RFC 7517,  
DOI 10.17487/RFC7517, May 2015,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7517>>.
- [RFC7518] Jones, M., "JSON Web Algorithms (JWA)", RFC 7518,  
DOI 10.17487/RFC7518, May 2015,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7518>>.
- [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>>.
- [RFC8259] Bray, T., Ed., "The JavaScript Object Notation (JSON) Data  
Interchange Format", STD 90, RFC 8259,  
DOI 10.17487/RFC8259, December 2017,  
<<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8259>>.
- [RFC9325] Sheffer, Y., Saint-Andre, P., and T. Fossati,  
"Recommendations for Secure Use of Transport Layer  
Security (TLS) and Datagram Transport Layer Security  
(DTLS)", BCP 195, RFC 9325, DOI 10.17487/RFC9325, November  
2022, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9325>>.
- [SHS] National Institute of Standards and Technology, "Secure  
Hash Standard", March 2012,  
<<https://csrc.nist.gov/publications/fips/fips180-4/fips->

180-4.pdf>.

## 12. Informative References

- [RFC8182] Bruijnzeels, T., Muravskiy, O., Weber, B., and R. Austein, "The RPKI Repository Delta Protocol (RRDP)", RFC 8182, DOI 10.17487/RFC8182, July 2017, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8182>>.
- [NRTMv3] RIPE NCC, "Access to NRTM(v3)", July 2024, <<https://docs.db.ripe.net/RIPE-Database-Mirror/Access-to-NRTM/>>.

## Authors' Addresses

Sasha Romijn  
Reliably Coded  
Amsterdam  
Netherlands  
Email: [sasha@reliablycoded.nl](mailto:sasha@reliablycoded.nl)

Job Snijders  
Fastly  
Amsterdam  
Netherlands  
Email: [job@fastly.com](mailto:job@fastly.com)

Edward Shryane  
RIPE NCC  
Amsterdam  
Netherlands  
Email: [eshryane@ripe.net](mailto:eshryane@ripe.net)

Stavros Konstantaras  
AMS-IX  
Amsterdam  
Netherlands  
Email: [stavros.konstantaras@ams-ix.net](mailto:stavros.konstantaras@ams-ix.net)