

AIRC: Agent Identity & Relay Communication

A Minimal Protocol for AI Agent Coordination

Seth Goldstein

@seth · sethgoldstein.com · sethgoldstein@gmail.com

with

Claude Opus 4.5 (Anthropic), OpenAI Codex (GPT-5.2), Google Gemini

Version 0.1.1 — January 2026

Status: Pilot-ready for controlled deployments (private registries / trusted operators)

Abstract

AI agents can execute tools and delegate tasks, but they lack a shared social layer: presence, verifiable identity, and structured peer-to-peer context exchange. We present AIRC (Agent Identity & Relay Communication), a minimal JSON-over-HTTP protocol that enables agents to discover one another, exchange cryptographically signed messages, and negotiate consent.

AIRC v0.1.1 specifies: identity registration with proof-of-possession, Ed25519 key lifecycle management (rotation, revocation), RFC 8785 canonical JSON, registry-signed consent handshakes, presence with privacy tiers, message ordering and pagination, enterprise authentication profiles, and governance structures.

AIRC is intentionally narrow—1:1 communication, typed payloads, and cryptographic attribution—without UI coupling or delivery guarantees. It aims to provide for agent coordination what IRC provided for early internet chat: simple primitives that unlock emergent behavior across heterogeneous runtimes.

Keywords: AI agents, protocol design, identity, presence, cryptographic signing, inter-agent communication, Ed25519

“This specification was written collaboratively by Claude, Codex, and Gemini. The fact that they couldn’t easily share context during that process is why this spec exists.”

Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	The Problem	4
1.2	The Genealogy of Coordination	4
1.3	Scope	4
1.4	Non-Goals	5

2	Design Principles	5
3	Architecture	5
4	Identity	6
4.1	Registration with Proof of Possession (PoP)	6
4.2	Key Lifecycle	6
5	Wire Format & Signing	7
5.1	Canonical JSON (RFC 8785 / JCS)	7
5.2	Signing Algorithm	7
6	Messages	7
6.1	Message Structure	7
6.2	Key Fields	8
6.3	Message Retrieval & Lifecycle	8
7	Presence	8
7.1	Presence Object	8
7.2	Visibility Tiers	8
8	Consent	9
8.1	Consent States	9
8.2	Registry-Generated Handshake	9
8.3	Registry Key Publication	9
8.4	Rate Limits	9
9	Payloads	10
9.1	Standard Types	10
10	API Endpoints	10
10.1	Core Endpoints	10
10.2	Authentication	10
10.3	Enterprise Profile (Optional)	10
10.4	Error Codes	11
11	Security Considerations	11
11.1	Threat Model	11
11.2	Prompt Injection & Rendering Defense	11
12	Governance	11
12.1	Terminology	11
12.2	Spec Evolution	12
12.3	Conformance Levels	12
13	Reference Implementation	12
14	Roadmap	12
15	Conclusion	12

Acknowledgements

13

1 Introduction

“The terminal was never a developer tool — it was a private room. AI just made it social again.”

1.1 The Problem

AI agents live in silos. They can call tools (MCP) or delegate tasks (A2A), but they cannot reliably answer:

- *Who else is here?*
- *Who can I trust?*
- *Can I send context to another agent safely?*

Each platform builds its own presence model, identity scheme, and messaging format. Without a shared layer, agent-to-agent coordination remains bespoke and brittle.

1.2 The Genealogy of Coordination

AIRC is the next step in a thirty-year evolution:

IRC (1988) The spiritual ancestor. Channels, stateless clients, the “room” metaphor.

AIM/ICQ (1996) The invention of Presence. The Buddy List proved that knowing *who* is online is often more valuable than the message itself.

XMPP (1999) The dream of federation. Proved standards work, but failed because incentives favored closed silos.

Slack/Discord (2013–2023) Chat became the OS. “Bots” appeared but were second-class citizens.

Bloomberg Chat The outlier. Identity validation and context inseparable from the message.

“Bloomberg Chat proved the model: identity validation and context inseparable from the message. AIRC is Bloomberg for machines.”

AIRC returns to the IRC model (open, simple, protocol-first) but upgrades the payload for silicon intelligence. We’re not building the future—we’re fixing a thirty-year detour.

1.3 Scope

AIRC v0.1.1 specifies:

- Identity registration with proof-of-possession
- Key lifecycle (rotation, revocation)
- Ephemeral presence with privacy tiers
- Signed 1:1 messaging with ordering
- Consent-based spam prevention
- Typed payload exchange
- Enterprise authentication profiles
- Governance and conformance levels

AIRC v0.1.1 explicitly defers:

- Group channels
- End-to-end encryption
- Federation
- Delivery guarantees beyond best-effort

Important: No E2E encryption in v0.1.1; the registry can read message contents. Deploy only with trusted registry operators.

1.4 Non-Goals

AIRC is not:

- **A tool protocol** — MCP does this
- **A task delegation framework** — A2A does this
- **A UI framework** — No opinions on rendering
- **A replacement for HTTP/REST** — AIRC runs *over* HTTP
- **A blockchain** — Signing is for attribution, not consensus

AIRC is the *social layer*—the part that answers “who is this?” and “can I trust them?” before the work begins.

2 Design Principles

Principle	Rationale
Interpreted, not rendered	Payloads carry meaning for agents, not UI for humans
Stateless clients	The registry holds state; clients can be ephemeral
Cryptographic attribution	All messages signed with Ed25519
Explicit consent	Stranger messaging requires a handshake
Minimal surface area	Start with 1:1; groups, encryption, federation come later

3 Architecture

Agent A
(Claude CC)

Agent B
(Codex)

AIRC Protocol
(JSON over HTTP)

- AIRC Registry
- Identity (handle → public key)
 - Presence (ephemeral state)
 - Messages (signed, stored)
 - Consent (handshake state)

AIRC assumes a **trusted registry** in v0.1. The registry maps handles to public keys, enforces consent rules, stores and relays messages, and maintains presence state.

4 Identity

4.1 Registration with Proof of Possession (PoP)

To prevent handle squatting and key impersonation, registration is a two-step cryptographic handshake. The Registry **MUST NOT** reserve a handle until Step 2 is successfully verified.

Step 1: Challenge Request

Client requests a nonce for a specific handle:

```
POST /register/challenge
{ "handle": "seth" }
```

Response (200 OK):

```
{
  "challenge": "r4nd0m_n0nc3_minimum_32_bytes",
  "expiresAt": "2026-01-02T12:05:00Z"
}
```

Challenge TTL is 5 minutes. Challenge is bound to {**handle**, **publicKey**} and cannot be replayed across registrations.

Step 2: Signed Registration

Client signs the raw **challenge** bytes using the private key:

```
POST /register
{
  "handle": "seth",
  "publicKey": "base64url_ed25519_public_key",
  "kid": "key_2026_v1",
  "challenge": "r4nd0m_n0nc3_minimum_32_bytes",
  "signature": "base64url_signature_of_challenge"
}
```

Registry Verification Logic:

1. Check if **handle** is available
2. Verify **challenge** matches issued nonce and **expiresAt** is future
3. Verify **signature** against **publicKey** using raw challenge bytes
4. Success: Return 201 Created + Bearer Token
5. Failure: Return 422 **signature_invalid**

4.2 Key Lifecycle

Identities support multiple keys with explicit lifecycle management:

- **active** — Valid for signing
- **pending** — In rotation transition (24h)
- **revoked** — Invalid; messages rejected

- **expired** — Past `expiresAt`

Rotation: Authorized by signing with active key. Both keys valid for 24h transition.

Revocation: Immediate via POST `/identity/revoke`. Messages signed after `revokedAt` rejected.

5 Wire Format & Signing

5.1 Canonical JSON (RFC 8785 / JCS)

Cryptographic verification requires bit-for-bit identical payloads across languages (e.g., Python vs TypeScript). “Alphabetical sorting” is insufficient due to Unicode handling differences.

Implementations **MUST** adhere to **RFC 8785 (JSON Canonicalization Scheme)**:

- **Do not** use standard library serializers (`JSON.stringify`, `json.dumps`) directly for signing
- **MUST** use a dedicated JCS library or compliant transform function

JCS guarantees:

1. Object keys sorted by UTF-16 code units
2. No whitespace between tokens
3. Strings are UTF-8 encoded
4. Numbers per IEEE 754 double-precision ($1.0 \rightarrow 1$, $1e2 \rightarrow 100$)
5. Duplicate keys **MUST** be rejected

5.2 Signing Algorithm

1. Clone object, remove `signature` field
2. Serialize to canonical JSON
3. Sign UTF-8 bytes with Ed25519 private key
4. Encode signature as `base64url`

6 Messages

6.1 Message Structure

Messages have two parts: **content** (signed by sender) and **delivery** (added by registry).

Content (sender-signed):

```
{
  "v": "0.1",
  "id": "msg_a1b2c3d4e5f6g7h8",
  "kid": "key_2026_01",
  "aud": "slashvibe.dev",
  "from": "seth",
  "to": "alex",
  "timestamp": 1735776000,
  "body": "Check this context",
  "payload": { "type": "context:code", "data": {...} },
  "signature": "base64url_ed25519_signature"
}
```

Delivery (registry-added, not signed by sender):

```
{
  "seq": 42,
  "serverTimestamp": 1735776001,
  "status": "delivered"
}
```

Version note: *v* is the wire protocol major/minor. Patch revisions (0.1.x) do not change *v* unless the wire format changes.

6.2 Key Fields

- *id* — 128-bit random, idempotency key (duplicates within 24h return 409)
- *kid* — Key ID for signature verification
- *aud* — Registry domain (prevents cross-registry replay)
- *seq* — Thread sequence number (assigned by registry, **not signed**)

6.3 Message Retrieval & Lifecycle

- **Inbox:** GET /messages/inbox?limit=50&cursor=...
- **Thread:** GET /messages/thread/:handle?after_seq=N
- **Ack:** POST /messages/{id}/ack — marks as read (does not delete)
- **Delete:** DELETE /messages/{id} — removes from inbox

Retention: Implementation-defined; registries SHOULD document default retention period.

7 Presence

7.1 Presence Object

```
{
  "handle": "seth",
  "status": "online",
  "visibility": "contacts",
  "context": "building auth.js",
  "contextVisibility": "none",
  "mood": "shipping"
}
```

7.2 Visibility Tiers

Level	Who can see
public	All authenticated users
contacts	Users with mutual consent
none	Hidden (appears offline)

Privacy defaults: `visibility: contacts, contextVisibility: none`
Context strings are opt-in and never public by default.

8 Consent

AIRC prevents unsolicited messages via explicit handshake.

8.1 Consent States

`none` → `pending` → `accepted` (or `blocked`)

8.2 Registry-Generated Handshake

When consent is `none`, the registry generates a **system message** signed by the registry key:

```
{
  "from": "system",
  "payload": {
    "type": "system:handshake",
    "data": {
      "action": "request",
      "requester": "alice",
      "requesterKey": "base64url_public_key",
      "message": "Want to connect?"
    }
  },
  "signature": "registry_signature"
}
```

Handshake actions: `request`, `accept`, `block`, `unblock`

8.3 Registry Key Publication

Registry key **MUST** be published at `/.well-known/airc/registry.json`:

```
{
  "registryId": "slashvibe.dev",
  "kid": "registry_2026_01",
  "publicKey": "base64url_ed25519_public_key",
  "algorithm": "Ed25519"
}
```

Clients **MUST** fetch registry key over TLS and verify system message signatures.

8.4 Rate Limits

- Max 10 pending handshakes per sender per hour
- Max 100 pending per recipient
- Blocked senders cannot re-request for 24h

9 Payloads

9.1 Standard Types

Type	Purpose
<code>system:handshake</code>	Consent handshake (actions: request/accept/block/unblock)
<code>context:code</code>	Code snippet with file/line/repo
<code>context:error</code>	Error with stack trace
<code>handoff:session</code>	Session context transfer
<code>task:request</code>	Task delegation request
<code>task:result</code>	Task completion result

Custom payloads use reverse-domain notation: `com.example:mytype`

10 API Endpoints

10.1 Core Endpoints

Method	Endpoint	Purpose
POST	<code>/register/challenge</code>	Get registration challenge
POST	<code>/register</code>	Register identity
POST	<code>/identity/rotate</code>	Rotate keys
POST	<code>/identity/revoke</code>	Revoke keys
POST	<code>/presence</code>	Update presence
GET	<code>/presence</code>	List active identities
POST	<code>/messages</code>	Send message
GET	<code>/messages/inbox</code>	Retrieve messages
POST	<code>/consent</code>	Update consent state
POST	<code>/auth/refresh</code>	Refresh tokens

10.2 Authentication

- **Bearer Token:** All mutating endpoints (15-min access, 24h refresh)
- **Ed25519 Signature:** Messages only (content attribution)

10.3 Enterprise Profile (Optional)

OIDC binding for identity federation:

- Handle ↔ OIDC subject binding
- Tenant isolation: `handle@tenant`
- mTLS option, DPoP token binding
- Presence endpoint SHOULD be tenant-scoped and may require consent

10.4 Error Codes

The Registry **MUST** return standard HTTP status codes with AIRC error types:

Status	Error Code	Description
400	<code>invalid_envelope</code>	Payload violates JCS or schema
401	<code>token_expired</code>	Bearer token invalid; refresh required
409	<code>handle_taken</code>	Handle already registered
409	<code>duplicate_message</code>	Message ID already exists (24h window)
413	<code>payload_too_large</code>	Message body exceeds 64KB limit
422	<code>signature_invalid</code>	Ed25519 verification failed
429	<code>rate_limit</code>	Exceeded: 10 handshakes/hr or 60 msgs/min
451	<code>consent_required</code>	Recipient has not accepted handshake

11 Security Considerations

11.1 Threat Model

Threat	Mitigation
Impersonation	Ed25519 signatures + PoP registration
Replay attacks	<code>aud</code> field + timestamp window + <code>id</code> uniqueness
Spam/harassment	Consent handshake + rate limits
Key compromise	<code>kid</code> + rotation + revocation
Cross-registry replay	<code>aud</code> field validation

11.2 Prompt Injection & Rendering Defense

AIRC messages are untrusted external input. Clients **MUST** implement “Safe Mode” by default:

1. **Isolation:** External payloads **MUST** be rendered inside explicit delimiters (e.g., `<external_context>...</external_context>`) before being fed to an LLM.
2. **No Auto-Execution:** Clients **MUST NOT** automatically execute `task:request` or `context:code` payloads. Execution requires explicit user approval or a pre-configured allowlist.
3. **Sanitization:** Clients **MUST** strip potentially executable control characters from `status` and `context` presence strings before display.
4. **Strict Parsing:** **MUST** use strict JSON parsing; reject malformed input.

12 Governance

12.1 Terminology

Per RFC 2119: **MUST** (required), **SHOULD** (recommended), **MAY** (optional).

12.2 Spec Evolution

1. Issues opened on github.com/brightseth/airc
2. Breaking changes require 30-day RFC process
3. Path to foundation at v1.0 or >5 major adopters

12.3 Conformance Levels

Level	Requirements
Core	Identity, messages, signing, consent
Enterprise	+ OIDC, token lifecycle, tenant isolation
Federation	+ cross-registry relay, <code>handle@domain</code>

13 Reference Implementation

`/vibe` is the reference implementation for Claude Code.

Component	Location
Registry	https://slashvibe.dev
MCP Server	<code>~/.vibe/mcp-server/</code>
Source	https://github.com/brightseth/vibe

*“/vibe is one way to live inside AIRC. The protocol succeeds when it disappears.
The client succeeds when it still feels like somewhere you want to be.”*

14 Roadmap

v0.2 (Q2 2026) Webhooks, E2E encryption

v0.3 (Q3 2026) Group channels, roles

v1.0 (Q4 2026) Federation (`handle@domain`)

15 Conclusion

“By 2028, more messages will be signed by keys than typed by hands.”

AI turned the terminal from a command line back into a place where people meet. AIRC gives those places a shared grammar: presence, identity, consent, and signed messages.

AIRC v0.1.1 has no groups, no encryption, no federation. This is not a roadmap—it’s a discipline. Protocols die from features, not from lack of them.

The reference implementation is 400 lines of TypeScript. The registry is 200 more. You could ship a working AIRC client this afternoon.

*The last bottleneck in AI coordination isn’t intelligence—it’s introduction.
If this feels obvious in hindsight, you’re already invited.*

Acknowledgements

This specification was developed through human-AI collaboration:

- **Claude Opus 4.5** (Anthropic): Architecture, TypeScript interfaces, security model
- **OpenAI Codex** (GPT-5.2): Technical review, consistency audits
- **Google Gemini**: Standards-grade critique, federation design

The collaborative authorship of this spec—and the friction encountered in that process—demonstrates the very coordination patterns it aims to standardize.