

Network Working Group  
Internet-Draft  
Intended status: Informational  
Expires: 26 November 2026

S. Jovancevic  
SKGO, IKT Support  
25 May 2026

Verifiable Identity Claims and Delegation Model (VICDM)  
draft-jovancevic-vicdm-08

## 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 26 November 2026.

## Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2026 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.

## Abstract

This document defines a conceptual framework for handling identity assertions in application-layer protocols. It introduces a model in which identity on the Internet is optional, but any asserted identity MUST be verifiable.

It further defines a delegation mechanism that allows entities to authorize third-party infrastructure to act on their behalf in a verifiable and transparent manner.

The goal is to reduce identity misrepresentation while fully preserving the ability for anonymous and pseudonymous interaction. This document does not define a protocol; it defines the principles that protocol specifications SHOULD follow when addressing agent identity.

A concrete protocol implementation of these principles is defined in [SAIP].

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction . . . . .	3
2. Terminology . . . . .	4
3. The Core Principle . . . . .	4
4. Identity Classes . . . . .	5
5. Identity Verification . . . . .	5
6. Delegation Model . . . . .	6
6.1. Delegation Requirements . . . . .	6

6.2.	DNS-Based Attestation Discovery . . . . .	7
6.3.	Cryptographic Delegation Tokens . . . . .	8
6.4.	DNS-Native Agent Self-Registration (Alternative) . . . .	9
6.5.	Agent Letter of Intent (ALOI) . . . . .	14
6.5.1.	Definition and Purpose . . . . .	14
6.5.1.1.	ALOI Content (Modular) . . . . .	15
6.5.1.2.	The Dual Nature of an ALOI . . . . .	15
6.5.1.3.	ALOI and Server Response: Three Outcomes . . . .	16
6.6.	Verifiable Data Access Contract (VDAC) . . . . .	19
6.6.1.	Relationship to ALOI . . . . .	20
7.	Trust Classification . . . . .	21
8.	Policy Enforcement . . . . .	22
9.	Relationship to Anonymous Authentication . . . . .	9
10.	Non-Goals . . . . .	10
11.	Security Considerations . . . . .	10
12.	Privacy Considerations . . . . .	11
13.	IANA Considerations . . . . .	11
14.	References . . . . .	11
14.1.	Normative References . . . . .	11
14.2.	Informative References . . . . .	12
Appendix A.	Document History . . . . .	12
Author's Address	. . . . .	13

## 1. Introduction

The Internet is built on a principle of openness: entities may communicate without being required to identify themselves. This property is fundamental and MUST be preserved.

However, modern internet systems increasingly rely on identity assertions for access control, prioritization, rate limiting, and trust evaluation. Automated agents -- AI crawlers, IoT devices, backup systems, enterprise automation -- routinely assert identities to influence how servers treat their requests.

A critical problem arises when these identity assertions cannot be verified. An agent that claims to be "GoogleBot" or "legitimate-backup-service" without cryptographic proof provides no more assurance than an agent that claims nothing at all. Worse, false identity assertions actively harm the ecosystem by:

- o Allowing malicious actors to impersonate trusted services
- o Corrupting reputation systems that depend on identity signals
- o Undermining filtering mechanisms that would otherwise work
- o Creating false trust that delays detection of abuse

The fundamental issue is not the presence or absence of identity claims -- it is the verifiability of those claims.

This document defines the VICDM principle:

Anonymous interaction is permitted.  
Identity assertion is permitted.  
False identity assertion is not.

This seemingly simple principle has significant architectural implications for how protocols handling agent identity should be designed.

A concrete protocol implementing these principles is defined in the Signed Agent Identity Protocol [SAIP].

### 1.1. Relationship to webbotauth Work

The IETF webbotauth working group is developing mechanisms for bot authentication. Current proposals focus on anonymous

attestation models in which a bot proves it is vouched for by a trusted attester without revealing its specific identity.

Anonymous attestation and VICDM are complementary, not competing:

- o Anonymous attestation addresses the privacy use case: a bot proves legitimacy without disclosure of its identity.
- o VICDM addresses the accountability use case: when a bot DOES assert an identity, that assertion must be verifiable.

Both models are needed. They serve different threat models and different operational requirements.

## 2. Terminology

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.

Anonymous Client:	A client that does not assert any identity. This is always a valid and permitted mode of interaction.
Claiming Client:	A client that asserts an identity, such as a domain name, organization, or service name.
Verified Client:	A client whose asserted identity has been validated through one or more verifiable mechanisms as defined in Section 5.
Identity Claim:	Any statement or metadata by which a client represents itself as belonging to a specific domain, organization, or service.
Delegated Infrastructure:	Third-party systems that have been explicitly authorized to act on behalf of an entity through verifiable mechanisms.
Attester:	An entity that vouches for the legitimacy of a client without necessarily disclosing the client's identity. Used in anonymous attestation models.

## 3. The Core Principle

The VICDM model is founded on a single, minimal principle:

Systems MUST allow anonymous interaction.

A client asserting an identity MUST provide verifiable linkage to that identity.

Failure to provide verifiable linkage to an asserted identity MUST result in that identity claim being treated as invalid.

This principle is deliberately minimal. It does not require universal identity. It does not prohibit anonymity. It requires only that identity claims, when made, be honest and verifiable.

The distinction between an Anonymous Client and a Claiming Client whose claim is unverifiable is operationally significant:

- o An Anonymous Client makes no representation about its origin or affiliation. Servers may apply default anonymous policies.
- o An unverified Claiming Client actively misrepresents itself. This is categorically different from anonymity and SHOULD be treated with lower trust than genuine anonymity.

Implementations SHOULD distinguish between these two cases and SHOULD NOT treat unverified identity claims as equivalent to anonymous interaction.

#### 4. Identity Classes

Under the VICDM model, clients fall into one of four classes:

##### Class 0 -- Anonymous:

The client asserts no identity. No identity claim is present. This is a valid and fully supported mode of interaction. Servers apply default anonymous policies.

##### Class 1 -- Unverifiable Claim:

The client asserts an identity but provides no verifiable linkage. The claim MUST be treated as invalid. Trust SHOULD be lower than for Class 0 (anonymous) clients, as the client is actively misrepresenting itself.

##### Class 2 -- Partially Verified:

The client asserts an identity and provides partial verification (e.g., DNS consistency but no cryptographic proof). Servers MAY grant limited elevated trust based on deployment policy.

##### Class 3 -- Fully Verified:

The client asserts an identity and provides full cryptographic verification of that identity. Servers MAY grant elevated trust, priority handling, or increased rate limits based on deployment policy.

#### 5. Identity Verification

Verification of identity claims MAY use one or more of the following mechanisms. No single mechanism is mandated; systems MAY combine multiple signals to increase confidence.

##### 5.1. DNS-Based Verification

The asserted identity SHOULD be consistent with DNS records for the claimed domain:

- o Forward DNS resolution of the claimed domain SHOULD return an address associated with the client's network.
- o Reverse DNS (PTR) resolution of the client's IP address SHOULD return a hostname within the claimed domain.
- o DNS TXT records at a well-known prefix (see Section 6.2) MAY carry cryptographic key material for stronger binding.

DNS-based verification alone provides weak assurance. It SHOULD be combined with cryptographic mechanisms where possible.

##### 5.2. Cryptographic Verification

The client provides a cryptographic signature over a defined canonical string using a private key whose corresponding public key is discoverable and bound to the claimed identity.

This is the strongest form of verification and is RECOMMENDED for all deployments where security is a concern. A concrete implementation is defined in [SAIP].

### 5.3. Transport-Layer Indicators

Consistency between the identity claim and transport-layer signals (e.g., TLS SNI, TLS client certificate) MAY be used as a supporting signal. These indicators SHOULD NOT be used as the sole verification mechanism.

### 5.4. Attester-Based Verification

A trusted third-party Attester MAY vouch for the legitimacy of a client without disclosing the client's specific identity. This is the basis of anonymous attestation models such as those being developed in the IETF webbotauth working group.

Attester-based verification satisfies the VICDM requirement for Class 2 or Class 3 verification only if the Attester itself is verifiable and its delegation is explicit per Section 6.

## 6. Delegation Model

Large-scale internet deployments commonly use third-party infrastructure -- CDN providers, cloud services, proxy networks -- to serve content or operate agents on behalf of a domain owner.

This creates an identity delegation problem: the actual client IP address or User-Agent may belong to the infrastructure provider, not the domain owner. Without explicit, verifiable delegation, servers cannot determine whether the infrastructure is legitimately acting on the domain owner's behalf.

### 6.1. Delegation Requirements

Any infrastructure acting on behalf of an entity and asserting that entity's identity MUST be explicitly authorized through verifiable mechanisms.

Specifically:

- o The domain owner MUST publish an explicit authorization for the delegated infrastructure to act on its behalf.
- o The authorization MUST be verifiable by any server without requiring prior coordination with the domain owner.
- o Absence of verifiable delegation authorization MUST result in the identity claim being treated as invalid (Class 1).
- o The delegation authorization SHOULD be bound to specific infrastructure identifiers (IP ranges, ASNs, public keys) rather than being open-ended.

This requirement directly addresses scenarios where large infrastructure providers assert client identities on behalf of multiple customers without explicit per-customer authorization. Such assertions, without verifiable delegation, MUST be treated as invalid identity claims under this model.

### 6.2. DNS-Based Attestation Discovery

Entities MAY publish delegation authorization using DNS TXT records at the following well-known prefix:

`_saip.<domain>.`

The record format is:

`_saip.<domain>. IN TXT "v=saip1; [parameters]"`

The following parameters are defined:

<code>v=saip1</code>	Version indicator. MUST be present.
<code>re=&lt;hostname&gt;</code>	Preferred Registration Entity hostname. MAY be present. Multiple <code>re=</code> parameters are permitted.
<code>pk=&lt;key&gt;</code>	Base64URL-encoded public key for stateless verification. MAY be present.
<code>asn=&lt;list&gt;</code>	Comma-separated list of authorized ASNs for delegated infrastructure. MAY be present.
<code>ip=&lt;prefix&gt;</code>	CIDR prefix of authorized delegated infrastructure. MAY be present. Multiple <code>ip=</code> parameters are permitted.
<code>exp=&lt;ts&gt;</code>	Unix timestamp after which this record SHOULD be considered expired. MAY be present.

Example DNS records:

```
; Vendor publishing their SAIP public key
_saip.acme.com. IN TXT "v=saip1; pk=base64urlkey...;
                        re=rel.saip-registry.example"

; Vendor authorizing a CDN provider by ASN
_saip.acme.com. IN TXT "v=saip1; asn=13335,15169;
                        re=rel.saip-registry.example"

; Vendor authorizing specific IP ranges
_saip.acme.com. IN TXT "v=saip1; ip=192.0.2.0/24;
                        ip=2001:db8::/32"
```

DNS record TTL SHOULD be set to a value appropriate for the key rotation policy of the deployment. A TTL of 3600 seconds (1 hour) is RECOMMENDED as a default.

Servers performing DNS-based verification MUST validate DNSSEC signatures where available [RFC4033].

### 6.3. Cryptographic Delegation Tokens

As an alternative or supplement to DNS-based Attestation Discovery, domain owners MAY issue signed Delegation Tokens to authorized infrastructure:

```
DelegationToken = Sign(MasterKey,
                        infrastructure_id ||
                        valid_from ||
                        valid_until ||
                        scope)
```

Where:

- o `infrastructure_id` identifies the authorized infrastructure (e.g., ASN, IP range, or public key fingerprint)
- o `valid_from` and `valid_until` define the validity period
- o `scope` limits the actions the infrastructure may take

Infrastructure presenting a valid Delegation Token MAY assert the domain owner's identity for requests within the token's scope and validity period.

#### 6.4. DNS-Native Agent Self-Registration (Alternative Trust Model)

This section defines an alternative trust establishment mechanism that replaces the Registration Entity model with the existing DNS infrastructure. Vendors adopting this model use their DNS zone as the identity registry for their agents, following the same principles established by DKIM [RFC6376].

The DNS-Join trust model rests on three principles: hardware secures the Master Key, DNS publishes it and acts as the trust circuit breaker, and Rolling Keys provide speed and network efficiency.

##### 6.4.1. Model Overview

In traditional agent identity systems, a central registry holds agent public keys. In the DNS-Native model, the vendor's DNS zone serves as the distributed registry. Each agent self-registers by publishing its Master Public Key as a DNS TXT record within the vendor's delegated subdomain.

This is directly analogous to DKIM key publication [RFC6376]:

```
DKIM:      mail._domainkey.example.com  TXT "v=DKIM1; p=<pubkey>"
SAIP-DNS:  agent-id._saip.example.com   TXT "v=saip1; pk=<pubkey>"
```

The vendor delegates the `_saip.<domain>` subdomain, granting agents the ability to publish and manage their own TXT records within it. The vendor retains control as the DNS zone authority -- the ultimate trust circuit breaker.

##### 6.4.2. Key Hierarchy

The DNS-Native model uses a two-tier key structure:

Tier 1 -- Master Key (long-term, DNS-published):

- o The agent generates a Master keypair on its hardware security module (TPM, HSM, or Secure Enclave).
- o The Master Private Key MUST NEVER leave the hardware module.
- o The Master Public Key is uploaded once to the DNS TXT record: `agent-id._saip.<vendor-domain>. TXT "v=saip1; pk=<MasterPubKey>"`
- o This record represents the agent's long-term identity.
- o The vendor, as DNS zone authority, acts as the trust circuit breaker: deleting this record instantly revokes the agent's identity across the entire ecosystem after DNS TTL expiry.

Tier 2 -- Rolling Keys (per-request, locally generated):

- o For each request, the agent generates a fresh ephemeral keypair (RollingKeypair).
- o The agent signs the Rolling Public Key with its Master Private Key, producing a Rolling Key Certificate (rcert):

```
rcert = Sign(MasterPrivateKey,
              RollingPublicKey ||
              instanceID      ||
              ts               ||
              nonce           ||
              method           ||)
```

path)

- o The nonce, ts, method, and path fields bind the rcert to exactly one request, making it non-replayable by design.
- o The Rolling Private Key signs the canonical request string.
- o Both the Rolling Public Key (rpk=) and rcert= are transmitted in the SAIP header.

#### 6.4.3. Verification Flow

Server verification requires a DNS lookup only once per agent, after which the Master Public Key MAY be cached per DNS TTL:

1. Server receives SAIP header containing rpk= and rcert=.
2. On first encounter with this agent id=, the server performs a DNS TXT lookup:  
agent-id.\_saip.<vendor-domain>.  
and retrieves the Master Public Key. This result SHOULD be cached according to the record TTL.
3. Server verifies rcert= using the cached Master Public Key. This confirms that the Rolling Public Key was authorized by the legitimate Master Key holder for this exact request.
4. Server verifies the request signature using rpk=.  
This confirms the request was made by the holder of the Rolling Private Key.
5. Both verifications MUST succeed for the request to be accepted.

DNS is consulted once per agent (or per TTL expiry), while per-request verification is entirely local -- providing both strong security and high performance.

#### 6.4.4. Trust Circuit Breaker

Because the Master Public Key is published in DNS under the vendor's authoritative zone, the vendor retains ultimate control:

- o To revoke a single agent: delete its \_saip TXT record.  
After DNS TTL expiry, servers will reject its rcert= values as they can no longer verify them against a Master Public Key.
- o To revoke all agents: rotate the vendor's zone signing key or remove the \_saip subdomain delegation entirely.
- o DNS TTL for \_saip records SHOULD be set to 300 seconds (5 minutes) to minimize the revocation window while maintaining reasonable DNS query load.
- o Servers MUST NOT cache Master Public Keys beyond the DNS TTL of the record from which they were obtained.

#### 6.4.5. Security Properties

+=====+	
Threat	Mitigation
+=====+	
Stolen rcert	Per-request nonce+ts+method+path binding
	-- structurally non-replayable
+-----+	
Stolen rpk+rcert	Valid for exactly one request only
+-----+	
Master Key theft	Hardware module (TPM/HSM) -- never



	leaves hardware	
DNS poisoning	DNSSEC + short TTL (300s)	
Mass compromise	DNS record deletion -- all instances revoked after TTL expiry	

This model provides stronger replay protection than TLS Session Tickets [RFC5077] because rcert= is bound to a single request rather than a time window, while retaining equivalent performance characteristics through DNS caching.

#### 6.4.6. Comparison with RE-Based Model

Property	RKDF + RE Model	DNS-Native Model
Key registry	RE infrastructure	DNS TXT records
Revocation	RE propagation (within 300s)	DNS deletion + TTL (default 300s)
Per-request key	HMAC derivation (deterministic)	Fresh keypair + MasterKey rcert
Replay protection	Nonce + sequence	Nonce bound in rcert
Infrastructure	RE ecosystem	Existing DNS only
Best suited for	Enterprise, regulated envs	Decentralized, IoT, small vendors, KISS

Both models implement VICDM principles. Implementations MAY support both simultaneously. Servers SHOULD apply equivalent trust to successfully verified agents regardless of model used.

#### 6.4.7. MAC-Based Identity Binding (Hardware Identity Layer)

This section defines an optional extension to the DNS-Native model that adds a hardware identity layer through MAC address binding. When present, this creates a verifiable triplet:

```

MAC address      (hardware identity layer)
+ IP / ASN       (network identity layer)
+ MasterPublicKey (cryptographic identity layer)
= Complete Agent Identity

```

All three components MUST be consistent for an agent to be classified as Class 3 (Fully Verified) under this extension. Inconsistency in any component MUST result in downgrade to Class 1 (Unverifiable Claim).

##### 6.4.7.1. The Bot as Identity Broker

Because MAC addresses operate at Layer 2 and are not visible beyond the local network segment, direct MAC verification by remote servers is not possible. Instead, the agent acts as a local identity broker:

The agent:

1. Reads the MAC address from its local network interface (Real MAC), OR derives a Virtual MAC (V-MAC) from its MasterPublicKey (see Section 6.4.7.3).
2. Signs the MAC address using its MasterPrivateKey,

producing a MAC Attestation Proof (mac\_proof).  
3. Includes mac= and mac\_proof= in the SAIP header.

The server:

1. Retrieves the MasterPublicKey from DNS.
2. Verifies mac\_proof using MasterPublicKey.  
This proves the MAC was attested by the legitimate MasterKey holder -- not merely asserted.
3. Applies identity binding policy.

The MasterPublicKey in DNS is the root of trust that validates everything -- both Real MAC and V-MAC attestations. The DNS record is the single source of truth; the bot is the cryptographic bridge between local hardware and remote verification.

#### 6.4.7.2. Real MAC -- Physical Hardware Binding

A Real MAC is the hardware MAC address of the agent's network interface, as reported by the operating system:

```
Linux:    /sys/class/net/<interface>/address
Windows:  Get-NetAdapter | Select-Object MacAddress
macOS:    ifconfig en0 | grep ether
```

Real MAC binding is RECOMMENDED for:

- o IoT devices with fixed network interfaces
- o Physical servers with stable hardware
- o High-assurance deployments where hardware binding is a compliance requirement

The MAC Attestation Proof for a Real MAC:

```
mac_proof = Sign(MasterPrivateKey,
                  "real"           ||
                  mac_bytes         ||
                  ts                 ||
                  nonce)
```

Where mac\_bytes is the 6-byte IEEE 802 MAC address in canonical form (big-endian, no separators).

#### 6.4.7.3. Virtual MAC (V-MAC) -- Cryptographic Identity

A V-MAC is derived mathematically from the MasterPublicKey, providing a stable, unique, human-readable identifier for virtual agents, cloud instances, and software bots that do not have a meaningful physical MAC address.

V-MAC derivation:

```
raw      = SHA256(MasterPublicKey)[0:6]    (first 6 bytes)
v_mac    = raw with bit 1 of byte 0 set to 1 (LAA bit)
          = (raw[0] | 0x02) || raw[1:6]
```

The LAA (Locally Administered Address) bit distinguishes V-MAC from globally assigned hardware MACs per IEEE 802.

Example:

```
MasterPublicKey -> SHA256 -> first 6 bytes: AC:CE:7F:3A:B1:09
Set LAA bit:      AE:CE:7F:3A:B1:09
V-MAC:           AE:CE:7F:3A:B1:09
```

The V-MAC is mathematically bound to the MasterPublicKey.  
Any server can verify:  
(SHA256(claimed\_MasterPublicKey)[0] | 0x02) == v\_mac[0]

```
AND SHA256(claimed_MasterPublicKey)[1:6] == v_mac[1:6]
```

The MAC Attestation Proof for a V-MAC:

```
mac_proof = Sign(MasterPrivateKey,  
                 "virtual" ||  
                 mac_bytes ||  
                 ts       ||  
                 nonce)
```

V-MAC is RECOMMENDED for:

- o Cloud agents and virtual machines
- o Software bots without meaningful hardware identity
- o Privacy-sensitive deployments (V-MAC reveals no hardware manufacturer information)

#### 6.4.7.4. DNS Record Format with MAC Binding

When MAC binding is used, the DNS TXT record SHOULD include the mac= parameter:

```
; Real MAC binding (IoT device)  
wm-bg-4471._saip.manufacturer.com. 300 IN TXT  
"v=saip1;  
 mac=B8:27:EB:4A:3C:11;  
 mac-type=real;  
 pk=<MasterPublicKey>;  
 asn=1234"  
  
; V-MAC binding (cloud agent)  
crawler-nyc-042._saip.acme.com. 300 IN TXT  
"v=saip1;  
 mac=AE:CE:7F:3A:B1:09;  
 mac-type=virtual;  
 pk=<MasterPublicKey>;  
 asn=64496"
```

Defined MAC-related DNS parameters:

mac=            The MAC address (real or virtual) in  
                 XX:XX:XX:XX:XX:XX format.

mac-type=      Either "real" or "virtual". MUST be present  
                 when mac= is present.

#### 6.4.7.5. Network Identity: IP and ASN Binding

The network identity component of the triplet MAY be expressed as either an IP address, CIDR prefix, or ASN:

For stable deployments (physical servers, IoT):

```
ip=203.0.113.42            (exact IP)  
ip=203.0.113.0/24         (CIDR prefix)
```

For dynamic deployments (cloud, autoscaling):

```
asn=64496                 (Autonomous System Number)
```

IP/ASN binding is OPTIONAL. When present, servers SHOULD verify that the source network matches the registered value. Mismatch SHOULD result in trust downgrade but MUST NOT cause automatic rejection without additional policy context, as legitimate network changes (ISP failover, cloud migration) may cause temporary mismatches.

#### 6.4.7.6. Verification Triplet Summary

Component	Source	Verification Method
MasterPublicKey	DNS TXT pk=	Signature verification
MAC (real)	DNS TXT mac= + hardware	mac_proof verified by MasterPublicKey
MAC (virtual)	DNS TXT mac= + derivation	SHA256(pk) derivation check + mac_proof by MasterKey
IP / ASN	DNS TXT ip= / asn=	Source address comparison (advisory, not mandatory)

All cryptographic verifications (MasterPublicKey signature, mac\_proof) are REQUIRED for Class 3 classification.  
IP/ASN verification is RECOMMENDED but OPTIONAL.

#### 6.5. Agent Letter of Intent (ALOI)

This section defines the fourth principle of the VICDM model, extending the core framework with behavioral commitment:

Anonymous interaction is permitted.  
Identity assertion is permitted if cryptographically proven.  
Delegated infrastructure must be explicitly authorized.  
Declared intent MUST be honored.  
Self-reported deviation is good faith.  
Concealed deviation is fraud.

This principle is analogous to voluntary disclosure in financial regulation: entities that self-report violations to regulators receive reduced penalties compared to those discovered through external audit. SAIP applies this principle cryptographically -- an agent that self-reports an ALOI deviation is demonstrably acting in good faith, and the ecosystem SHOULD reward that behavior with reduced sanctions.

##### 6.5.1. Definition and Purpose

An Agent Letter of Intent (ALOI) is an optional, cryptographically bound declaration that an agent publishes, stating its intended operational conduct.

The name is deliberate. An ALOI is a Letter of Intent: a signed, binding declaration by which an agent announces what it intends to do. It is an invitation to enter into agreement -- not an agreement in itself. An ALOI commits the agent to its declared intent; it does not, by itself, bind any server.

The ALOI serves three purposes:

- o Commitment: The agent formally declares what it will do, creating a verifiable, signed statement of intent.
- o Detection: Servers can automatically detect deviation from declared intent without subjective judgment.
- o Accountability: Deviation is cryptographically attributable to a specific agent instance, enabling proportional sanctions.

ALOI is OPTIONAL. An agent that does not publish an ALOI operates under standard identity verification only (Section 5). An agent that publishes an ALOI is held to its declared intent.

#### 6.5.1.1. ALOI Content (Modular)

An ALOI declaration is modular. It MAY carry two distinct kinds of content, independently:

- o Operational boundaries: the agent's own declared scope, access boundaries, rate limits, and exclusions. These parameters are defined in Section 6.5.2.
- o Policy compliance (OPTIONAL): a declaration that the agent has observed, and commits to honor, a site's published, resolved policy outcome.

The policy compliance content is policy-source-agnostic. The resolved policy outcome MAY originate from any external preference or policy system. The AIPREF framework [AIPREF] is one such system; robots.txt is another. ALOI does not privilege any particular policy source: it references the resolved policy outcome, not the system that produced it.

When an ALOI carries policy compliance content, it MUST name the policy source it refers to (for example, "aipref" or "robots"), so that a server can apply the correct interpretation. This mirrors the identity-mechanism naming used elsewhere in this document family: the mechanism is named, never assumed.

Declaring policy compliance in an ALOI is a unilateral act. The agent states, on its own, that it will honor the site's already-published policy. This requires no response from the site; the agent has bound itself.

#### 6.5.1.2. The Dual Nature of an ALOI

An ALOI has a dual nature.

As an initial proposal: an ALOI is the agent's opening position toward forming a bilateral agreement. An agent that wishes to enter into a Verifiable Data Access Contract [VDAC] MAY use its ALOI as the agent-side initial proposal.

As a standing declaration: independently of any agreement, an ALOI is a valid unilateral declaration of intent. It is in force from the moment it is issued. Its effect does not depend on any server's response.

These two roles coexist. The same ALOI is simultaneously an opening proposal (should agreement formation follow) and a standing declaration (whether or not it does).

#### 6.5.1.3. ALOI and Server Response: Three Outcomes

Because an ALOI is a Letter of Intent and not an agreement, what follows from it depends on how the server responds. There are exactly three outcomes:

1. The server explicitly accepts. If the server cryptographically accepts the ALOI, the declaration transitions into a bilateral agreement. The mechanics of that agreement -- dual signatures, per-request binding, mutual logging -- are specified in [VDAC]. At this point the agent is a Contracted Agent (the highest trust class; see Section 7).
2. The server explicitly declines. The server may issue a signed refusal. No agreement is formed. The agent knows, unambiguously, that it was declined, and acts accordingly -- operating anonymously, or not accessing the site.

3. The server is silent. If the server does not respond, NO agreement is formed. Server silence MUST NOT be interpreted as acceptance. The absence of a "no" is not a "yes".

The third outcome is the critical one. Earlier informal treatments of ALOI left the silent case implicit, which risked the assumption that an unanswered ALOI was somehow agreed to. This specification removes that ambiguity: an unanswered ALOI forms no agreement.

However -- and this is the value of the standing-declaration nature -- an unanswered ALOI does not vanish. It remains in force as a unilateral declaration of intent. The agent operates under its own declared ALOI constraints and is held to them (Sections 6.5.5 through 6.5.8), but it does so as an Intent-Declaring agent, NOT as a Contracted Agent. It carries no agreement and the elevated trust and protections of a contract do not apply.

In short:

ALOI issued	-> declaration in force
ALOI + server acceptance	-> bilateral agreement [VDAC]
ALOI + server refusal	-> no agreement; declined
ALOI + server silence	-> no agreement; declaration remains in force

The ALOI complements robots.txt:

robots.txt:	The server declares what bots MAY access. (server-defined policy, unilateral)
ALOI:	The bot declares what it WILL do. (agent-defined commitment, cryptographic)

These are complementary mechanisms. A well-behaved agent SHOULD respect both robots.txt restrictions and its own ALOI declaration.

#### 6.5.2. ALOI Parameters

The following parameters are defined for ALOI publication in DNS TXT records. All ALOI parameters use the "aloi-" prefix for namespace isolation:

aloi=	Primary intent category. MUST be one of: "crawl" -- web crawling and indexing "backup" -- data backup and archival "monitor" -- monitoring and health checks "api" -- API integration and data sync "smtp" -- mail relay and delivery "iot" -- IoT telemetry and control "sync" -- file and data synchronization Implementations MAY define additional values.
aloi-scope=	URL path scope the agent declares it will access. Supports glob patterns: /public/* -- all paths under /public/ /blog/*.html -- HTML files under /blog/ * -- unrestricted (use with caution)
aloi-rate=	Maximum request rate the agent self-imposes. Format: <number>/<unit> Examples: 10/sec, 1000/day, 60/min
aloi-exclude=	Comma-separated list of paths or categories

the agent declares it will NOT access:  
/admin, /api, /private, /user-data

aloi-ua= User-Agent string the agent declares it will use. MUST be consistent with the agent identity asserted by the identity mechanism in use (for example, the SAIP id= field, or the corresponding identifier of whichever other mechanism is in use). Servers SHOULD flag mismatches.

aloi-expires= Unix timestamp after which this ALOI declaration should be considered expired. Agents SHOULD refresh ALOI before expiry.

#### 6.5.3. ALOI Cryptographic Binding

The ALOI declaration MUST be cryptographically bound to the agent's identity. This binding is achieved in two ways:

First, publication in the agent's DNS TXT record ties the ALOI to the MasterPublicKey in the same record. Any server can verify that the ALOI was published by the legitimate key holder.

Second, each request MUST include an ALOI commitment hash:

aloi-hash = SHA256(canonical ALOI string from DNS record)

The aloi-hash= value is carried in the request-authentication data of the identity mechanism in use (for example, within the SAIP header, where SAIP is the mechanism in use) and MUST be covered by that mechanism's request signature. Where SAIP is used, the canonical signed string is:

id=<id>;ts=<ts>;nonce=<nonce>;method=<METHOD>;path=<path>;  
aloi-hash=<aloi-hash>

Other identity mechanisms carry and sign the aloi-hash value using their own equivalent request-authentication data; the requirement is that aloi-hash be present and signed, not that any particular mechanism be used.

This cryptographically proves that the agent is operating under the stated ALOI for this specific request. A server that detects deviation has cryptographic proof of the commitment and the violation simultaneously.

#### 6.5.4. DNS Record Format with ALOI

Example DNS TXT records with ALOI declaration:

```
; Web crawler with strict scope declaration
crawler-nyc-042._saip.acme.com. 300 IN TXT
"v=saip1;
pk=<MasterPublicKey>;
aloi=crawl;
aloi-scope=/public/*,/blog/*,/sitemap.xml;
aloi-rate=10/sec;
aloi-exclude=/api,/admin,/private,/user-data;
aloi-ua=AcmeBot/2.0 (+https://acme.com/bot)"
```

```
; Backup agent with narrow scope
backup-agent-01._saip.corp.com. 300 IN TXT
"v=saip1;
pk=<MasterPublicKey>;
aloi=backup;
```

```

aloi-scope=/exports/*,/snapshots/*;
aloi-rate=100/min;
aloi-exclude=/live,/user-sessions"

; IoT monitoring device
sensor-bg-4471._saip.vendor.com. 300 IN TXT
"v=saip1;
pk=<MasterPublicKey>;
aloi=iot;
aloi-scope=/telemetry/submit,/config/read;
aloi-rate=1/sec;
aloi-exclude=/config/write,/admin,/firmware"

```

#### 6.5.5. Server-Side ALOI Enforcement

Servers implementing ALOI enforcement MUST perform the following checks on each request from an ALOI-declaring agent:

1. Retrieve ALOI from DNS cache (same lookup as MasterPublicKey).
2. Verify aloi-hash=, as carried by the identity mechanism in use, matches SHA256 of the DNS ALOI record. Mismatch indicates ALOI substitution attempt and MUST be treated as a Class 1 violation.
3. Check request path against aloi-scope=:  
If path does not match declared scope -> scope violation.
4. Check request path against aloi-exclude=:  
If path matches any excluded pattern -> exclusion violation.
5. Check request rate against aloi-rate=:  
If rate exceeds declared maximum -> rate violation.
6. Check User-Agent against aloi-ua= (if present):  
If User-Agent does not match -> identity inconsistency.

Violation detection MUST trigger the sanctions defined in Section 6.5.7.

#### 6.5.6. ALOI Violation Response Header

When a server detects an ALOI violation, it SHOULD include a structured violation signal in the response. The header is named for the layer to which it belongs -- the ALOI layer -- and not for any identity mechanism. Its name is fixed and does not vary with the identity mechanism in use:

```

ALOI-Violation: <violation-type>;
                mechanism=<identity-mechanism>;
                declared=<declared-value>;
                attempted=<attempted-value>;
                penalty=<applied-penalty>

```

The mechanism= field names the identity mechanism under which the agent was operating (for example, "saip" or "vicdm-dns"). The header name itself remains ALOI-Violation regardless of that value: a server always knows which header to read, while the identity mechanism is recorded in the content.

Example:

```

ALOI-Violation: scope-exceeded;
                mechanism=saip;
                declared=/public/*;
                attempted=/api/private-data;

```



penalty=throttle

Defined violation types:

scope-exceeded      Request path outside declared aloi-scope=  
exclusion-breach    Request path matches aloi-exclude=  
rate-exceeded       Request rate exceeds aloi-rate=  
ua-mismatch         User-Agent inconsistent with aloi-ua=  
aloi-expired         aloi-expires= timestamp has passed  
aloi-hash-mismatch   aloi-hash= does not match DNS record

#### 6.5.7. Violation Sanctions and Scoring

ALOI violations MUST be handled proportionally. The following scoring model is RECOMMENDED:

Violation Count	Penalty	Action
1	Warning	ALOI-Violation header only. Log for audit. No rate change.
2-3	Throttle	Reduce to minimal rate limit. Report to vendor via header.
4-5	Downgrade	Trust downgrade to Class 1. Report to RE (optional).
6-10	Block	Reject all requests. Report to RE for revocation.
>10	Revocation	RE revokes InstanceID. Vendor notified.

Violation scores SHOULD decay over time. A RECOMMENDED decay rate is -1 point per 24 hours of compliant behavior.

Servers MAY report violations to the RE using a standardized violation report:

POST <re-endpoint>/violation  
Content-Type: application/json

```
{
  "instance-id": "<agent-id>",
  "violation":   "<violation-type>",
  "declared":    "<declared-value>",
  "attempted":   "<attempted-value>",
  "ts":          <unix-timestamp>,
  "server-sig": "<MasterKeySig_over_report>"
}
```

#### 6.5.8. Agent Self-Reporting (Good Faith Mechanism)

An agent that detects it has unintentionally violated its own ALOI declaration MAY self-report the violation before the server detects it. This is the Good Faith Mechanism.

This principle is directly analogous to voluntary disclosure in financial and regulatory contexts: entities that proactively report their own violations to authorities receive reduced penalties compared to those discovered through external audit.

Self-reporting is performed by including a self-report signal in the immediately following request. As with the violation

header (Section 6.5.6), the header name belongs to the ALOI layer and is fixed; it does not vary with the identity mechanism in use:

```
ALOI-Self-Report: violation=<violation-type>;
                  mechanism=<identity-mechanism>;
                  declared=<declared-value>;
                  attempted=<attempted-value>;
                  ts=<unix-timestamp-of-violation>;
                  self-sig=<Sign(identity-private-key,
                                violation-type||declared||
                                attempted||ts||nonce)>
```

The mechanism= field names the identity mechanism in use (for example, "saip" or "vicdm-dns"). The self-sig= MUST be signed by the agent's identity private key under whichever mechanism is in use (under SAIP, the MasterPrivateKey). This proves the self-report is genuine and cannot be fabricated by a third party.

Self-reported violations MUST result in reduced penalties:

Condition	Server-Detected	Self-Reported
1st violation	Warning	No penalty
2nd-3rd	Throttle	Warning only
4th-5th	Downgrade	Throttle
6th-10th	Block	Downgrade
>10	RE Revocation	Block (no revocation)

Agents that consistently self-report SHOULD receive elevated trust scores over time, as self-reporting demonstrates that the agent's vendor has implemented responsible operational practices.

The Good Faith Mechanism creates a positive incentive structure: vendors who build self-reporting into their agents benefit from higher trust levels and reduced sanctions, while vendors whose agents conceal violations face progressively harsher penalties.

## 6.6. Verifiable Data Access Contract (VDAC)

This section introduces the fifth principle of the VICDM model. The full protocol specification is defined in a companion document, the Verifiable Data Access Contract [VDAC].

The VICDM Core Principle is extended as follows:

- Anonymous interaction is permitted.
- Identity assertion is permitted if cryptographically proven.
- Delegated infrastructure must be explicitly authorized.
- Declared intent MUST be honored (ALOI).
- Agreed intent MUST be honored bilaterally (VDAC).
- Self-reported deviation is good faith.
- Concealed deviation is fraud.

VDAC is the natural bilateral extension of ALOI. Where ALOI (Section 6.5) is a unilateral declaration by the agent ("here is what I intend to do"), VDAC is a cryptographic agreement between a site and an agent ("here is what we have agreed I

will do").

Under VDAC, a site publishes an access Offer, an agent accepts that Offer, both parties sign the resulting Contract, and each subsequent request references the Contract cryptographically. Both parties retain non-repudiable logs, making any divergence between agreed terms and actual behavior provable rather than merely asserted.

An agent operating under a valid VDAC contract is classified as Class 4 (Contracted Agent) under the VICDM trust model (Section 7), receiving the highest trust level in that classification.

VDAC verifies the existence of an agreement, not the wisdom of its terms. Pricing, payment, commercial settlement, and the substantive content of agreements are explicitly outside the scope of both VICDM and VDAC. These remain entirely between the contracting parties.

The complete VDAC wire protocol -- including the Offer, the Acceptance, and the Contract document formats; discovery mechanisms; per-request contract reference; mutual tracking obligations; reconciliation; violation handling; and contract termination -- is specified in [VDAC]. Implementers requiring the bilateral agreement mechanism should refer to that document.

#### 6.6.1. Relationship to ALOI

ALOI and VDAC are complementary, not alternative:

- o ALOI is unilateral. The agent declares; the site receives.
- o VDAC is bilateral. Both parties agree; both are bound.

An agent MAY operate under both simultaneously. ALOI defines the agent's general operational scope across all interactions; VDAC defines the specific terms for one particular site. When in conflict, the more specific commitment governs: VDAC terms supersede ALOI declarations for requests under the contract, while ALOI continues to apply for interactions outside any VDAC contract.

This creates a natural progression: agents start with ALOI for general accountability, then enter VDAC agreements with specific sites where bilateral terms are warranted.

### 7. Trust Classification

The VICDM trust model classifies every interacting entity into one of five trust classes. Servers use this classification to apply proportionate access policy.

Class	Identity Status	Trust Level	Recommended Policy
Class 4	Contracted Agent (VDAC)	Highest	Contract terms govern access
Class 3	Fully Verified	High	Full access, may receive elevated rate limits
Class 2	Partially Verified	Medium	Standard access with monitoring

Class 0	Anonymous	Low	Default anonymous policy
Class 1	Unverifiable Claim	Minimal	Lower than Class 0 log for audit

Note that Class 1 (unverifiable claim) receives LOWER trust than Class 0 (anonymous). This is intentional: an entity that actively misrepresents its identity is more concerning than one that simply does not identify itself.

## 8. Policy Enforcement

Systems SHOULD NOT rely on binary allow/deny decisions. Instead, they SHOULD apply adaptive trust-based policies proportional to the verified identity class.

Policy actions MAY include:

- o Full acceptance and priority handling for Class 3 clients
- o Standard acceptance with monitoring for Class 2 clients
- o Default anonymous handling for Class 0 clients
- o Throttling and logging for Class 1 clients
- o Rejection in high-risk or sensitive contexts for Class 1

The specific thresholds and actions are deployment-specific and outside the scope of this document.

## 9. Relationship to Anonymous Authentication

Anonymous authentication systems (such as Privacy Pass and related mechanisms being developed in the IETF webbotauth working group) allow a client to prove it is vouched for by a trusted Attester without revealing its specific identity.

Anonymous authentication is fully compatible with VICDM:

- o A client using anonymous attestation falls under Class 0 (Anonymous) or Class 2 (Partially Verified, via Attester) depending on the Attester's trust level.
- o A client using identified authentication (such as SAIP [SAIP]) falls under Class 3 (Fully Verified) when verification succeeds.

The two models serve different operational requirements:

Anonymous attestation is appropriate when:

- o The site's primary concern is rate limiting and abuse prevention at the Attester level
- o Bot privacy is a design requirement
- o Per-instance accountability is not needed

Identified authentication is appropriate when:

- o Per-instance revocation is required
- o Audit trails are a compliance requirement
- o Reputation systems depend on persistent agent identity
- o IoT or enterprise fleet management is involved

Systems MAY support both models simultaneously and apply different policies to each class of client.

## 10. Non-Goals

This document does NOT:

- o Eliminate or restrict anonymous interaction. Anonymous access MUST remain a first-class mode of operation.
- o Require universal identity adoption. Identity remains opt-in.
- o Define a mandatory implementation protocol. Protocol specifications implementing these principles are separate documents (see [SAIP]).
- o Replace existing standards for authentication, authorization, or access control.
- o Define specific rate limits, trust scores, or policy thresholds. These are deployment-specific.

## 11. Security Considerations

### 11.1. False Identity Claims

The primary security concern addressed by this document is false identity assertion -- clients that claim to be trusted entities without cryptographic proof.

By defining Class 1 (unverifiable claim) as receiving lower trust than Class 0 (anonymous), this model removes the incentive to make unverifiable identity claims. An agent that cannot prove its identity is better served by not claiming one.

### 11.2. DNS Security

DNS-based verification (Section 5.1 and 6.2) is subject to DNS spoofing and cache poisoning attacks. Implementations MUST use DNSSEC [RFC4033] where available to validate DNS responses used for identity verification.

### 11.3. Delegation Scope Creep

Delegation tokens and DNS delegation records SHOULD be scoped as narrowly as possible. Overly broad delegation (e.g., an open-ended authorization for all infrastructure operated by a large provider) defeats the purpose of the delegation model by creating de facto anonymous identity claims under a trusted name.

### 11.4. Attester Compromise

In anonymous attestation models, compromise of an Attester allows issuance of credentials to malicious clients. This model does not address Attester security directly; that is the responsibility of the attestation protocol specification.

## 12. Privacy Considerations

This document preserves anonymity as a first-class mode of operation. No client is required to assert an identity.

When a client does assert an identity, the verification mechanisms in Section 5 may disclose information about the client's network location and infrastructure to the verifying server. Clients that wish to preserve privacy SHOULD use anonymous interaction (Class 0) rather than identity assertion.

DNS-based Attestation Discovery records (Section 6.2) are publicly accessible. Entities publishing such records should be aware that the records disclose information about their infrastructure

and delegation relationships.

### 13. IANA Considerations

This document requests IANA to create the following new registry:

Registry name: VICDM DNS Delegation Record Parameters  
Registration policy: Specification Required  
Initial contents: v, re, pk, asn, ip, exp  
as defined in Section 6.2 of this document.

This document has no other IANA actions.

### 14. References

#### 14.1. Normative References

- [RFC2119] Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", BCP 14, RFC 2119, DOI 10.17487/RFC2119, March 1997, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc2119>>.
- [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>>.
- [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>>.
- [RFC1035] Mockapetris, P., "Domain names - implementation and specification", STD 13, RFC 1035, DOI 10.17487/RFC1035, November 1987, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1035>>.
- [RFC4033] Arends, R., Austein, R., Larson, M., Massey, D., and S. Rose, "DNS Security Introduction and Requirements", RFC 4033, DOI 10.17487/RFC4033, March 2005, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc4033>>.

#### 14.2. Informative References

- [RFC7208] Kitterman, S., "Sender Policy Framework (SPF) for Authorizing Use of Domains in Email, Version 1", RFC 7208, DOI 10.17487/RFC7208, April 2014, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc7208>>.
- [RFC6376] Crocker, D., Ed., Hansen, T., Ed., and M. Kucherawy, Ed., "DomainKeys Identified Mail (DKIM) Signatures", STD 76, RFC 6376, DOI 10.17487/RFC6376, September 2011, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc6376>>.
- [RFC9110] Fielding, R., Ed., Nottingham, M., Ed., and J. Reschke, Ed., "HTTP Semantics", STD 97, RFC 9110, DOI 10.17487/RFC9110, June 2022, <<https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9110>>.
- [SAIP] Jovancevic, S., "SAIP: Signed Agent Identity Protocol", draft-jovancevic-saip-08, April 2026, <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-jovancevic-saip/>>.

- [AIPREF] IETF AI Preferences (AIPREF) Working Group,  
"Vocabulary for Expressing AI Usage Preferences",  
Work in Progress, Internet-Draft, 2026,  
<<https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/aipref/>>.
- [VDAC] Jovancevic, S., "Verifiable Data Access Contract  
(VDAC)", draft-jovancevic-vdac-01, May 2026,  
<[https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/  
draft-jovancevic-vdac/](https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-jovancevic-vdac/)>.

## Appendix A. Document History

This appendix is informative and will be removed before publication as an RFC.

Changes in draft-jovancevic-vicdm-08:

- o Made the ALOI layer explicitly identity-mechanism-agnostic. Earlier text tied ALOI to SAIP in several places, which misrepresented ALOI as a SAIP extension. ALOI is an independent layer; SAIP is only one of several identity mechanisms that may carry it. This is a conceptual correction, not an editorial one.
- o Section 6.5.2 (aloi-ua): the User-Agent consistency requirement now refers to the agent identity asserted by the identity mechanism in use, with SAIP id= given only as one example.
- o Section 6.5.3 (ALOI Cryptographic Binding): the aloi-hash commitment is now described as carried by whichever identity mechanism is in use, not by SAIP specifically.
- o Section 6.5.5: the server-side aloi-hash verification step is likewise mechanism-independent.
- o Sections 6.5.6 and 6.5.8: the violation and self-report response headers were renamed from SAIP-Violation and SAIP-Self-Report to ALOI-Violation and ALOI-Self-Report, because these headers belong to the ALOI layer, not to any identity mechanism. The header name is fixed and does not vary with the identity mechanism in use. A mechanism= field was added to both headers to record, in the content, which identity mechanism was in use.

Changes in draft-jovancevic-vicdm-07:

- o Expanded Section 6.5.1 (ALOI Definition and Purpose) into a precise definition plus three subsections. ALOI is defined as a Letter of Intent: an invitation to enter into agreement, not an agreement in itself.
- o Added Section 6.5.1.1 (ALOI Content, Modular): ALOI may carry operational boundaries and optional policy-compliance content. The policy-compliance content is policy-source-agnostic; AIPREF is given as one example, robots.txt as another. The policy source must be named.
- o Added Section 6.5.1.2 (Dual Nature): an ALOI is both an initial proposal toward agreement and a standing unilateral declaration.
- o Added Section 6.5.1.3 (Three Outcomes): server acceptance, refusal, or silence. Server silence forms no agreement; the absence of a refusal is not acceptance.

- o Added the [AIPREF] reference; updated the [VDAC] reference.

Author's Address

Srecko Jovancevic  
SKGO, IKT Support  
Makedonska 22  
11000 Belgrade  
Serbia

Email: [srecko.jovancevic@skgo.org](mailto:srecko.jovancevic@skgo.org)  
Email: [srecko.jovancevic@gmail.com](mailto:srecko.jovancevic@gmail.com)  
URI: <https://github.com/sreckojovancevic>