

# Automating Conflict-Aware ACL Configurations with Natural Language Intents

Wenlong Ding<sup>1</sup>, Jianqiang Li<sup>1</sup>, Zhixiong Niu<sup>2</sup>, Huangxun Chen<sup>3</sup>, Yongqiang Xiong<sup>2</sup>, Hong Xu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The Chinese University of Hong Kong, <sup>2</sup>Microsoft Research,

<sup>3</sup>Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou)

## Abstract

ACL configuration is essential for managing network flow reachability, yet its complexity grows significantly with topologies and pre-existing rules. To carry out ACL configuration, the operator needs to (1) understand the new configuration policies or intents and translate them into concrete ACL rules, (2) check and resolve any conflicts between the new and existing rules, and (3) deploy them across the network. Existing systems rely heavily on manual efforts for these tasks, especially for the first two, which are tedious, error-prone, and impractical to scale.

We propose Xumi to tackle this problem. Leveraging LLMs with domain knowledge of the target network, Xumi automatically and accurately translates the natural language intents into complete ACL rules to reduce operators' manual efforts. Xumi then detects all potential conflicts between new and existing rules and generates resolved intents for deployment with operators' guidance, and finally identifies the best deployment plan that minimizes the rule additions while satisfying all intents. Evaluation shows that Xumi accelerates the entire configuration pipeline by over 10x compared to current practices, addresses  $O(100)$  conflicting ACLs and reduces rule additions by  $\sim 40\%$  in modern cloud network.

## 1 Introduction

An access control list (ACL) is an ordered list of rules deployed at a router interface to control access to network resources [3, 7, 8]. It has long been used as a basic security mechanism in network management [46, 49]. An ACL rule has five attributes: source and destination IP prefixes, protocol/port, time range (optional), and action (permit or deny), that specify precisely what to do for packets matched to this set of conditions. An ACL is processed in a top down manner, i.e. the action of the first matched rule is applied to a packet and the processing ends.

ACL configuration is a foundational task in network management. Currently it heavily relies on manual effort [27, 46]. Network operations teams (NetOps) start by reasoning about a new policy or intent expressed in natural language. For example, for university NetOps, a new intent may be, "We shall block access to ChatGPT websites during the final exam period in all exam areas to prevent cheating". NetOps must reason about the intent and translate it into valid ACL rules with attribute specifics like OpenAI's IP prefixes. Then they

determine the deployment plan of which ACLs to add these new rules to, assess the impact on existing rules, and verify if the rules and deployment plan are correct. Finally they configure routers using vendor-specific scripts to deploy the new rules. Except for the final step where automation tools can assist [5, 11, 15, 45], most of this process is manual.

Not only is this process tedious and error-prone, but it also has become a bottleneck for the evolution of network management at scale. Alibaba reports that deploying one new intent in their cloud WAN can take about a week [46]. Our interview with another cloud WAN NetOps reveals similar configuration times. They also share that new intents can be triggered by daily configuration changes, and a large volume of them may arrive simultaneously when new devices are added.

Automating ACL configuration with natural language intents poses three key challenges.

- *Reasoning from Intent to Rule.* Large language models (LLMs), with their unprecedented language capabilities, seem a perfect fit for translating natural language intents into ACL rules to reduce manual effort. This allows NetOps to focus solely on reviewing and approving the rules generated by LLMs. Yet, LLMs have inherent limitations when used directly here. They lack proprietary network-specific information for attribute reasoning, such as translating "exam areas" into the correct IP prefixes. They also suffer from hallucinations that produce incorrect outputs. These limitations can lead to additional manual effort and corrections which negate the automation benefits.
- *Detecting Conflicts with Existing Rules.* New intents may conflict with some existing rules if they need to be deployed on the same ACL, which must be resolved before deployment. This can happen a lot in a large network with many existing ACL rules. Manual conflict detection is often impractical due to the combinatorial complexity, even for smaller campus networks. As a somewhat alarming example, we learned from a university NetOp that they have to resort to a reactive deploy-then-fix method to only resolve conflicts when they are reported by users, underscoring the need for proactive and automated conflict detection to prevent service loss before deployment.
- *Optimizing the Deployment.* NetOps eventually deploy new ACL rules to fulfill intents with as few rule additions as possible to ensure ease of maintenance. A common straw-man approach places rules on all interfaces along the paths

arXiv:2508.17990v1 [cs.NI] 25 Aug 2025

of the flows pertaining to an intent. This creates many redundant rules: for instance, a “deny” intent can be enforced by adding the rule to just one interface along a path. Due to the interaction between different rules of the same ACL and multiple ACLs on the same path, how to globally minimize total rule additions while ensuring correctness is a difficult combinatorial problem for multiple intents, each with multiple rules.

Recent work has started to look into similar problems [27, 46, 49]. Lumi [27] considers intent-based network configuration, but is limited to extracting natural language fragments such as “exam areas,” leaving the core reasoning task, such as mapping exam areas to the corresponding prefixes or gateway interfaces, to NetOps. It also ignores the subsequent conflict detection and deployment optimization tasks. JINJING [46] considers actual deployment but relies on low-level inputs like endpoint prefixes and router interfaces which are tedious and absent in high-level intents. Moreover, it only focuses on intent achievements without considering potential conflicts between new and existing rules. NetConfEval [49] uses LLMs to directly generate configurations without specific designs for hallucination mitigation or conflict detection. It relies completely on iterative human feedback to mitigate LLM’s incorrect outputs, which remains labor-intensive and hard to scale to large networks.

In this work, we build Xumi, a novel automated system for ACL configuration with minimal human intervention. Xumi tackles the three challenges with the following design.

First, Xumi performs *Intent Comprehension* using LLMs to help NetOps translate natural language intents into valid ACL rules for subsequent deployment (§2.1 and §4). We aim to maximize correctness of LLM’s output in order to reduce manual feedback on correcting errors like prior works [27, 49]. Specifically, we maintain a Semantics-Network Mapping Table (SNMT) to supply LLMs with up-to-date network-specific information required by ACL, and employ various prompting techniques to mitigate potential hallucinations. Once LLM’s outputs, expressed rigorously in an intermediate representation, are reviewed and approved by NetOps, the generated new rules are ready for subsequent tasks.

Next, Xumi proactively conducts *Conflict Detection & Resolution* to address all potential conflicts between each new intent rule and all existing rules. We show that the detection problem is more involved than it seems, due to many complicating factors such as the impact of preceding ACL rules and routing paths that can result in false positives (§2.2). Thus we first propose a novel concept named truly matched flows, representing flows exactly matched by a rule and excluding those matched by its predecessors, to ensure accurate individual detection for each new and existing rules. We further validate if a conflict flow routes on a feasible path to ensure detection accuracy. Note to resolve a conflict, Xumi as a general system needs to provide maximum flexibility to

NetOps instead of constraining them into a fixed set of strategies. Thus Xumi takes a conservative approach that allows NetOps to propose a resolution intent in natural language for each intent, if necessary, which are then also translated automatically to produce the reconciled rules (§5).

Finally, Xumi runs *Deployment Optimization* to identify a plan with minimal rule additions to implement all intents. Starting from current practices [3, 46] such as *endpoint* deployment (§2.3), we first present a few non-trivial scenarios where rule additions can be further reduced without affecting correctness, including using one rule to cover not only its corresponding intent but potentially also some others (§2.3). We formulate an optimization program that incorporates these possibilities to address the combinatorial problem across all new intents (§6).

We prototype Xumi on various LLMs and evaluate it in networks ranging from small campus (41 routers) to modern cloud (171 routers) to extreme-scale network ~6x larger than a typical cloud (§8). Results show that Xumi with GPT-4o achieves 98.5% and 90% comprehension accuracy without NetOps feedback for campus and modern cloud networks respectively, and fully comprehends all intents within 8 minutes with at most 3 feedback iterations. Xumi detects conflicts with 3.33x higher accuracy than baseline methods, completing detection in at most 2 hours for extreme-scale networks. Additionally, it reduces deployed rules by 38.8% on average compared to baselines, with deployment decisions made in under 3 minutes.

## 2 Motivation and Challenges

We start by outlining the novel research problems in Xumi’s three tasks, and our key insights on how to address them.

### 2.1 Intent Comprehension

Xumi first interprets the new natural language intents and derives the corresponding ACL rules with valid attributes [3, 7, 8] and gateway information as accurately as possible, thereby minimizing NetOps’ manual involvement. For the running example of blocking ChatGPT in exam areas during the final period introduced in §1, the five attributes include the *source* (prefixes for OpenAI’s ChatGPT service), *destination* (say “10.0.1.0/24” and “10.0.2.0/24” for the school’s “exam areas”), *application* (TCP ports 80 and 443 for web), *time range* (weekdays in May 2025), and *action* (deny). Enumerating all unique combinations of source, destination, and application then generates the corresponding ACL rules for this intent.

Naturally, we leverage large language models (LLMs) [2, 30, 47] for intent comprehension. LLMs have shown superior language processing capabilities compared to their predecessors [20, 21, 34, 36, 37] like BERT [48], and their large-scale pretraining on massive corpora also teaches them general computing knowledge including network protocols. They also easily handle the diverse natural language expressions

Attributes	ACL Config Specifics	NL Fragment
Source	104.18.33.170/32, 184.105.99.79/32, ...	OpenAI, oai, openai, ...
Destination	10.0.1.0/24	Laboratory, lab, labs, ...
Protocol(Port)	TCP(80), TCP(443)	HTTP and HTTPS, websites, web service ...
Time Range	weekdays	Mon. to Fri., business days, ...
Action	deny	prohibit, forbid, disallow, ban, ...


**Table 1.** Examples of *Intent Comprehension*. ACL configuration has rigid specifications for each attribute. An attribute specific may be expressed in multiple ways in natural language.

for the same attribute as shown in Table 1 without NetOps handcrafting rigid pattern matching rules. These advantages make LLMs an ideal candidate with the potential for high or even perfect comprehension accuracy. However, LLMs do suffer from two intrinsic limitations that hinder their accuracy when directly applied to our task.

- **Network-Specific Information.** Understanding ACL or network configuration intents requires not only interpreting the text but also incorporating the domain-specific information from the underlying network. For example, an LLM can easily identify “OpenAI” as the source from an intent as in Table 1, but it lacks domain-specific knowledge about (1) the prefixes of OpenAI’s web services, and (2) the router interfaces in the given network that can reach OpenAI. Unlike general knowledge (e.g., HTTP/HTTPS over TCP) learned during pre-training, this network-specific information is proprietary and keeps changing over time, and has to be explicitly incorporated.

- **LLM Hallucinations.** Hallucination is a well-known open issue with LLMs and currently an active research topic in the AI community [29, 35, 49, 50]. Compared to more tolerant tasks like email drafting, intent comprehension in network configuration has stringent correctness requirements on LLM’s output. Thus, we need to prevent LLMs from, for instance, fabricating a list of some TCP port numbers when the intent involves *any* TCP traffic, or misidentifying TCP as the protocol when the intent is for all traffic (due to the context where all prior intents target TCP, leading the LLM to believe that “TCP” is just omitted here), which we have actually observed in our experiments.

**Main Ideas.** To address these two key issues and achieve high comprehension accuracy, we first introduce a *Semantics-Network Mapping Table (SNMT)* that provides up-to-date network-specific information required for creating valid ACL rules in the target network (e.g., entity prefixes and gateway interfaces) (§4.1). Next, we design an *IR-enhanced System Prompt* to rigorously format ACL attributes into a unified Intermediate Representation (IR) (§4.1) and use prompting techniques such as *Chain-of-Thought Reasoning*, *Few-Shot Demonstration*, and *Self-Reflection* to guide IR completion and validation against hallucinations (§4.2). For each LLM round, Xumi invites NetOps to review and approve the output IR or provide feedback, which is organized into a *Feedback Prompt* for iterative refinement until final approval is obtained (§4.3).



**Figure 1.** Conflict detection. Naive method detecting flow overlaps between intents and existing rules with opposite actions can cause false positives.

Xumi finally generates valid ACL rules from the approved IR for subsequent tasks (§4.4).

## 2.2 Conflict Detection & Resolution

After *Intent Comprehension*, each intent can be characterized by a *group* of rule(s) that may need to be added to different ACLs. A new rule, however, may conflict with existing rules in the same ACL, requiring NetOps to explicitly resolve them before deployment to ensure correct actions are enforced on the flows as mentioned in §1. We do assume, without loss of generality, that the new intents themselves in the same round of configuration are conflict-free (as a result of thorough negotiation among the stakeholders).

At first thought, conflict detection simply involves checking two conditions between a new rule and existing ones in the target ACL: (1) whether there is an overlap between source-destination pair, application, and time range; and (2) whether they apply opposite actions on the overlapping segments. Figure 1(a) provides an example: the new rule permits traffic from DC2 to any destination, but along the routing path from DC2 to DC3, i.e., DC2→A→B→DC3, an existing rule on router B (interface 2) denies any HTTP traffic to DC3. This creates a conflict for HTTP traffic from DC2 to DC3.

What makes conflict detection intriguing is that, these two conditions alone may lead to many false positives (FPs), and neglecting them results in an ~70% accuracy drop as shown in our evaluation (§8.4).

- **Case 1: FPs due to Preceding Rules.** In Figure 1(b), when examining the new rule “DC2→any deny” for potential conflict with the ACL on router B’s interface 1, there appears to be a conflict with the second existing rule “any→DC3 http permit” for DC2 to DC3 HTTP traffic. Yet, since ACL’s processing order is from top to bottom, the first rule “DC2→DC3 deny” takes priority and would have already applied the same deny action as the new rule over DC2→DC3 traffic, which means the previously detected conflict using the two conditions is a FP.

- **Case 2: FPs due to Infeasible Routing Paths.** Another case of FPs arises when the interface with conflicting existing rules is not on a viable routing path for the detected overlapping traffic. As shown in Figure 1(c), although the new rule “DC1→any permit” and the existing rule at router A’s interface 1’s ACL “any→DC3 http deny” have opposite actions for DC1 to DC3 HTTP traffic, router A’s interface 1




Figure 2. Deployment optimization methods of intent rules.

is not on any path from DC1 to DC3. Therefore, this detected conflict has no actual effect and is a FP.

**Main Ideas.** Xumi tackles FPs in conflict detection rigorously. First, to avoid FPs caused by preceding rules, we define *truly-matched flows* to precisely characterize traffic matched to a rule at its position *after* all preceding rules fail in ACL. Conflicts are then detected by overlapping these truly-matched flows with the intent traffic. Second, Xumi uses *interface-path validation* to eliminate FPs caused by infeasible paths, by verifying whether routing paths of conflict flows include the conflicting interface (§5.1). Finally, to resolve conflicts after detection, Xumi invites NetOps for proposals to *protect* flows that should retain their existing rules, called protect intents. Xumi then automatically generates resolved intent rules for conflict-free deployment (§5.2). We cannot resort to a fixed set of criterion to resolve conflicts, since when to follow the existing rules and when to follow the new ones depend on many idiosyncrasies such as business considerations.

One might wonder if network verification tools [18, 22, 23, 41, 43, 44, 46] such as Batfish [22] could be used for conflict detection, as they validate flow reachability by directly identifying interfaces where reachability is violated. While verification tools can detect whether flows specified by an intent have the opposite intent actions, their focus on binary reachability results limits their effectiveness. It is sufficient for them to identify the first path and interface where a flow’s reachability is violated, whereas conflict detection requires identifying *all* potential violations simultaneously to ensure resolution. Without a full view of all violations, resolving one conflict may easily introduce new ones, creating a long or even infinite resolution loop. Furthermore, intents often specify a large number of flows, and applying this process to each flow also significantly increases the complexity, rendering verification-based methods impractical.

### 2.3 Deployment Optimization

The final step is to deploy conflict-free rules by inserting them at the top of target ACLs, following the default and common practice [3, 46]. The deployment requirements clearly differ for “permit” and “deny” rules: a “deny” rule is satisfied

as long as it is applied to at least one interface along each possible routing path, while a “permit” rule must be deployed on all interfaces of all possible paths. Thus, Xumi deploys “deny” rules at the *path level* to at least one ACL per path, and “permit” rules at the *interface level* on all ACLs along the traffic’s paths. Specifically, we take an *endpoint deployment* method that places “deny” rules on either source or destination gateway of each path, depending on which has the least total number of interfaces. We interviewed NetOps from a university and a production, and they confirmed these as the most privileged methods for ACL rule deployment.

While these simple approaches ensure correctness, they often introduce redundant rules, increasing the complexity of subsequent updates and maintenance, which NetOps are striving to avoid. As our evaluations show (§8.5), they result in 36.3% and 41.4% redundant rule additions for “permit” and “deny” intents respectively, compared to Xumi’s designs leveraging novel deployment observations below across all evaluated cases.

• **Bottleneck Deployment for “Deny” Rules.** We first note that endpoint deployment for “deny” rules does not always minimize rule additions, as it overlooks *path-level* flexibility of placing the rule on any interface along a path. For example, in Figure 2(b), endpoint deployment adds 7 rules by placing rule S1 on all source interfaces and S2 on all destination interfaces for two intents. In contrast, deploying rules at “bottleneck” interfaces, where most paths traverse through, reduces rule addition to 4 for the same effect as in Figure 2(c). Placing S1 on interfaces B1 and D1 (or A1 and C1) satisfies the requirement that each path has at least one rule, equivalent to deploying it on all source interfaces.

• **Complementary-Rule Deployment.** Our second observation is, surprisingly, adding a new rule may even fulfill another intent in some cases, creating more opportunities for us to reduce the rule additions needed. For example, at interface B1 in Figure 2(d), the new rule S2 “any→c tcp deny” combined with the existing rule “a→b tcp deny” covers the traffic managed by S1 “a→any tcp deny”. Deploying S2 on interface B1 thus eliminates the need for S1 on the same interface, further reducing the total rule additions to 3 from 4 based on bottleneck deployment in Figure 2(c). Obviously, this principle also applies to “permit” rules if the actions of intent and existing rules are reversed.

**Main Ideas.** We strive to minimize total rule additions for a given set of intents by leveraging the two observations above, which interact globally across interfaces and intents. For a “deny” intent  $I$  for instance, the interface covering the most paths for  $I$  may not be the one that maximizes the coverage of other intents deployable at the same interface with its existing rules. We thus formulate optimization problems to capture the combinatorial nature and determine the best deployment plan (§6.2). To do this we rely on a novel concept of *Equivalent Intent Set*: for each intent  $I$ , on each interface  $J$  it traverses, we identify all possible intents each of which can




Figure 3. Xumi architecture.

cover  $I$  with complementary rules, and group them into an equivalent intent set for that intent  $I$  and interface  $J$  (§6.1).

Recently JINJING [46] also considers reducing rule additions in ACL updates, highlighting its importance in production networks. However, it focuses on minimizing new rules on a single interface after the rules to be deployed are pre-determined. For example, if “any $\rightarrow$ a deny”, “b $\rightarrow$ any deny”, and “deny all” are to be deployed on one interface, JINJING suggests only deploying “deny all” as it covers the first two. This simple optimization aligns with our second observation. Xumi further considers the global impact of complementary rules in determining which interfaces to be used for rule deployment, further minimizing potential rule additions.

### 3 Design Overview

Xumi automates conflict-aware and deployment-efficient ACL configuration from natural language intents. Figure 3 illustrates its architecture with three sequential modules.

- First, *Intent Comprehension* module (§4) processes NetOps’ natural language intents and translates them into valid ACL rules with source and destination router gateways. NetOps are always involved in reviewing and approving LLM outputs (IR in §2.1) in this process. If errors are found during review, NetOps provide feedback for LLMs to refine the outputs until correct. Xumi assumes that NetOps provide conflict-free intents and considers potential conflicts between newly generated rules and existing ones.
- Second, *Conflict Detection & Resolution* module (§5) proactively identifies these potential conflicts across all interfaces along the routing paths of traffic specified by each new rule, and returns the specific set of conflict flows. NetOps are then invited to resolve them by identifying which (conflict) flows shall be “protected” to retain actions in their existing rules, and Xumi subsequently generates conflict-free intent rules for deployment.
- Finally, *Deployment Optimization* module (§6) deploys all the resolved intent rules by inserting them into target ACLs. Leveraging source and destination gateways identified before with routing information in the network topology that we assume Xumi knows, Xumi determines the precise paths corresponding to each rule. It then leverages insights including bottleneck deployment and complementary rules to minimize the total number of rule additions while ensuring intent satisfaction, by formulating these considerations as an optimization problem.




Figure 4. Workflow of *Intent Comprehension* with an intent example.

## 4 Intent Comprehension

Our goal is to instruct LLMs to understand NetOps’ natural language intents and derive ACL rules in quintuple format with their endpoint gateways with high accuracy, minimizing human involvement. Figure 4 presents a design overview with a specific example, highlighting two key components.

• **Network & Task Specifier** (§4.1): it incorporates carefully designed data structures to embed network-specific information unknown to LLMs but essential for ACL configuration, along with task-specific details to guide the LLMs in identifying the correct ACL attributes.

• **Hallucination Mitigator** (§4.2): it provides additional guidance to ensure LLMs follow the correct comprehension logic and revises its output if necessary.

Lastly, we detail Xumi’s manual feedback mechanism (§4.3) and methods to generate valid ACL rules with their gateways from LLM’s output approved by NetOps (§4.4).

### 4.1 Network & Task Specifier

As shown in Figure 4, we design two key data structures: the *Semantics-Network Mapping Table* (SNMT) for network specification, and the *ACL Intermediate Representation* (IR) for task specification. These two components are parts of the *system prompt* for LLMs.

**SNMT for Network Specification.** According to ACL domain knowledge [3, 7, 8], LLMs require all five ACL attributes for comprehension but lack real-time topology details, which are absent from both LLMs’ knowledge and NetOps’ intents (recall §2.1). In Figure 4, LLMs can infer attributes like *application* (e.g., DNS with port 53 for TCP and UDP) but lack knowledge of prefixes and gateways (e.g., for “group x”) in the target network. To address this, Xumi maintains a Semantics-Network Mapping Table (SNMT), which maps natural language entities to: (1) gateway routers and interfaces for determining routing paths for rule deployment, and (2) IP prefixes for ACL rule generation. For example, “DC1”

maps to gateway “R<sub>C</sub>@2” (Router C, interface 2) and prefix “10.1.0.0/16”. Note that LLMs can handle diverse entity expressions (e.g., “DC1”, “Datacenter 1” or even typos like “datecentre 1”), so SNMT does not need exhaustive entries for these variations. SNMT by default pairs a gateway interface with the corresponding prefix, but also allows enumeration between them when required, such as “egress b” which is mapped into a single pair of two gateways and prefixes, as both prefixes can egress through R<sub>A</sub> and R<sub>B</sub>.

In practice, real-time running metadata for devices or device groups, such as their names, IPs, gateways, group IDs, and other specifics, is maintained in a dataset, as confirmed through our interviews with NetOps in production. So we use automated scripts to extract the information required by SNMT to ensure its timeliness and avoid the need for tedious and frequent manual updates by NetOps.

Xumi uses SNMT as an external information source with prompting [40, 42] rather than fine-tuning [52]. We make this decision due to SNMT’s dynamic nature, which requires frequent updates in practice to reflect current network state. This makes fine-tuning resource-intensive and susceptible to outdated results caused by LLMs’ hallucination. When SNMT changes, Xumi can flexibly reset the context and reload the *system prompt* with the updated SNMT for comprehension.

**ACL IR for Task Specification.** Xumi then organizes extracted ACL attributes into an IR with template depicted in Figure 4 for subsequent rule generation. The *source* and *destination* fields record all gateway-prefix pairs for an endpoint as a list. Natural language name of the endpoint is also included for NetOps review. Similarly, *application* field captures application name with its protocol-port pairs as a list. The *action* field includes “permit”, “deny”, or “protect” which we introduce in §5.2. If NetOps do not explicitly specify an element in IR, say time, Xumi puts “any” as the default.

## 4.2 Hallucination Mitigator

Besides SNMT and IR, we use additional techniques below in *system prompt* to overcome LLM’s hallucinations.

**Chain-of-Thought Reasoning.** Inspired by [51], we provide step-by-step instructions to guide LLMs in locating the extraction source of each IR element based on the intent, SNMT or LLM’s general knowledge. Specifically, endpoint names, time ranges, and ACL actions are derived from NetOps’ inputs, with application protocols and ports inferred from LLMs’ general knowledge and network-specific details from SNMT. We utilize five-step instructions for filling each of the five IR fields; details are given in Appendix §A Figure 8(a) for brevity.

**Few-Shot Demonstration.** We further include a few examples of intents with their ground-truth IR to emphasize corner cases that LLMs are prone to error. For example, while LLMs typically associate a single protocol and port within an IR, DNS can use both UDP and TCP; this dual-protocol case is such an example.

**Self-Reflection.** We also design verification steps asking the LLM to verify identified IR elements. Specifically, the LLM checks for typical hallucination cases: (1) *Non-existent elements*, where IR elements fall outside valid range given in SNMT or absent from the intent, prompting LLMs to revisit related reasoning steps such as identifying source/destination endpoints or application fields; and (2) *Incorrect element dependency*, such as assigning a wrong port to a protocol that does not support it, requiring LLMs to redo the application protocol inference step. Figure 8(a) in Appendix §A illustrates how these verification steps integrate into the *chain-of-thought reasoning* prompts to enhance IR correctness.

## 4.3 NetOps Feedback

Xumi always invites NetOps to review the LLM’s output after each inference round, either approving it for subsequent tasks or providing feedback on errors. The feedback is expected to specify what LLM outputs incorrectly and how to find correct answer. This feedback, combined with wrong output and initial intent, is organized into a *feedback prompt* and returned to LLM for iterative refinement until result is correct and approved. Detailed prompt skeleton and NetOps-LLM interaction examples are provided in Appendix §A.

## 4.4 Intent Rule Generation From IR

After obtaining the IR from the LLM’s output for a given intent, the corresponding ACL rules can be generated from the IR. Since each ACL rule requires a single source and destination prefix with a single protocol (with or without a port), *source*, *destination*, and *application* fields are enumerated to produce all possible rules. For the running example in Figure 4, two destination prefixes and two protocol-port pairs yield four new rules.

Xumi also saves the gateway and interface information for source and destination of each rule, to facilitate subsequent rule deployment. This can be readily obtained by looking up the SNMT using the IP prefixes.

# 5 Conflict Detection & Resolution

Our next step is to identify and resolve conflicts between each new rule and all existing ones. The discussion here begins with accurate detection by avoiding the two false positive cases introduced in §2.2 (§5.1). We then explain how to resolve conflicts with NetOps’ “protect” intents (§5.2).

## 5.1 Accurate Conflict Detection

We first propose the concept of *Truly-Matched Flows (TMF)* of each existing rule to ensure detection is unaffected by the impact of preceding rules. We then conduct *Interface-Path Validation* to confirm that detected conflicting flows traverse through the feasible paths and constitute a real conflict.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Interface-Path Validation of Conflict Flows

---

**Input:**  $All\_C$ : Conflict flows detected at all interfaces;  $SNMT$ .  
**Output:**  $All\_VC$ : Validated conflict flows on all interfaces.

```
1 Func Validate_Each_Flow(interface, flow,  $SNMT$ ):  
   // Obtain all routing paths with gateways in SNMT  
2    $i_{src}, i_{dst} = Match(flow.src, flow.dst, SNMT.all\_prefix)$ ;  
  
3    $paths = Routing(SNMT[i_{src}].GWs, SNMT[i_{dst}].GWs)$ ;  
4   if interface  $\in paths$  then  
5     return True; // Interface-path validation  
6   return False  
  
// Validate conflicts on all rules of all interfaces  
7  $All\_VC = []$ ;  
8 for (interface, rule, conflict_flow)  $\in All\_C$  do  
9   if Validate_Each_Flow(interface, conflict_flow,  $SNMT$ ) then  
10     $All\_VC.add((interface, rule, conflict\_flow))$ ;  
11 return  $All\_VC$ ;
```

---

**TMF-Based Conflict Detection.** This process has two phases: *TMF Calculation* and *Intent Overlapping*. In the first phase, TMF of a given rule at an ACL’s position  $k$  (from the top), denoted as  $T_k$ , is defined as the subset of its specified flows (without considering other rules)  $R_k$  excluding those that are already matched by the preceding rules. Formally, we calculate from the top of an ACL using  $T_k = R_k - \bigcup_{i=1}^{k-1} T_i$ , initialized with  $T_1 = R_1$ <sup>1</sup>. Recall example in Figure 1(b) in §2.2: TMF of the 2<sup>nd</sup> rule includes all HTTP flows to DC3, except those originating from DC2. Then for a new intent rule  $I$ , conflicts are identified by checking the overlap between  $I$ ’s traffic  $R_I$  and  $T_k$  of each existing rule in the target ACL with opposite actions. This approach avoids FP case 1 in §2.2 and is applied to ACLs across all interfaces traversed by  $I$ ’s traffic.

We comment that implementation of the above detection process is non-trivial due to the *set operations* on flows such as *difference* ( $-$ ) for TMF calculation and *intersection* ( $\cap$ ) for intent overlapping. Each rule may use prefixes at different granularity, making it hard to efficiently represent the results of set operations. We refer the reader to §7 for more details, but the key idea is that, for each rule, we expand its flow set to the most fine-grained level found in the SNMT: e.g. when the rule contains DC1’s prefix, we expand its flow set into all clusters of DC1 as specified in SNMT for conflict detection.

**Interface-Path Validation.** For each conflict flow detected on an ACL, we validate whether it routes through this interface (lines 1–6 in Algorithm 1) to address FP case 2 in §2.2. The flow’s source and destination prefixes are matched against SNMT to identify gateway-prefix pair entries (line 2), where a match occurs if the prefix is equal to or a subset of the one in SNMT. Using these entries, we determine gateway interfaces of endpoints and retrieve all their feasible routing paths already known by Xumi (line 3). Finally, we check if

<sup>1</sup>Each interface’s ACL includes a default “permit” or “deny” rule for unspecified flows by other rules, which Xumi also accounts for during detection.

the interface is used on any path to classify if it is a FP or not (lines 4–6). This process is repeated for all conflict flows across existing rules on all interfaces, retaining only non-FP conflict flows as the final detection result (lines 7–11).

## 5.2 Conflict Resolution

Xumi presents all detected conflict flows to NetOps for explicit resolution. We introduce a simple “protect” mechanism, allowing NetOps to specify in natural language, which (conflict) flows should retain actions in their existing rules as another intent. These “protect” intents are comprehended in the same way as in §4, except the *action* is now “protect”. Note that Xumi enables NetOps to express a broad “protect” intent covering multiple flows, instead of specifying for each individual conflict, to reduce manual effort. For example, rather than addressing conflicts like “DC1→DC2 TCP” and “DC3→any TCP” one by one, NetOps can define a general intent to “protect” all HTTP traffic. Xumi then automatically overlaps protect flow set with actual conflicts to determine the “protect” flows for subsequent processing, such as “DC1→DC2 HTTP” and “DC3→any HTTP”.

Xumi then generates protect rules for these flows for deployment use, assigning them with anti-intent actions (e.g., “deny” for a “permit” intent) to preserve existing behaviors. Each intent rule is then combined with protect rules proposed by the same NetOps to form a resolved intent, with protect rules placed above intent rule to correctly take effect.

## 6 Deployment Optimization

We now need to deploy the new rules to satisfy all resolved intents. Each resolved intent with its rules as in §5.2 is treated as a unit for deployment and we insert the rules at the top of the ACLs of the chosen interfaces. To leverage the two findings in §2.3 for reducing the rule additions, we first compute the *Equivalent Intent Set* (EIS) for each intent  $i$ , identifying whether another intent  $j$  can satisfy  $i$  when  $j$ ’s rules are already deployed on the same ACL (§6.1). We then formulate an optimization program to fully explore the effect of these equivalences in reducing rule additions across multiple intents, while balancing the trade-off of deploying “deny” rules at bottleneck interfaces (§6.2).

Given the different deployment natures of “permit” and “deny” intents at *interface level* and *path level* respectively as mentioned in §2.3, we group resolved intents by their original action for separate optimization. Our design below applies to either intent group independently.

### 6.1 Equivalent Intent Set

To compute EIS for each intent, we first identify its equivalence computation scope by determining relevant interfaces and the associated intents that may be deployed on them.

**Equivalence Computation Scope.** For a resolved intent  $RI_i$  in the group  $\mathbb{R}I$  with the same original action, we identify

its EIS on all interfaces where  $RI_i$  has the potential to be deployed. Such an interface  $p$  must satisfy two conditions: (1) flows of  $RI_i$  that follow its original action, denoted as  $RI_i^{\text{flow}}$ , must traverse  $p$ , and (2) existing rules on  $p$  should not include  $RI_i$ , necessitating a new deployment. For the first condition, we focus on  $RI_i^{\text{flow}}$  as new rules only need to target flows and interfaces required for the original intent action, excluding those governed by “protect” rules in  $RI_i$ . For the second condition, since each interface’s ACL enforces a default rule controlling all network flows (§5.1), essentially it is satisfied when  $RI_i^{\text{flow}}$  shows conflicting actions between the intent and existing rules. This occurs when a conflict with  $RI_i$ ’s original intent is detected at  $p$ , which can be determined from conflict detection results.

We use the binary variable  $Q_{pi}$  to indicate if the two conditions above are met simultaneously. Only  $RI_i$  and  $p$  with  $Q_{pi} = 1$  are considered for EIS calculation and subsequent decision formulations. EIS computation of  $RI_i$  is then limited to the set of interfaces  $\{p \mid Q_{pi} = 1, \forall i\}$ .

**Equivalence Condition.** To determine if a resolved intent  $RI_j$  is equivalent to  $RI_i$  on a given interface  $p$ , we leverage the complementary-rule observation in §2.3 by checking whether the flow set  $RI_j^{\text{flow}}$  together with the TMF of all existing rules with the same action on  $p$  can cover  $RI_i^{\text{flow}}$ . Intents satisfying this condition are collected into  $RI_i$ ’s EIS. Formally, let  $T_{pk}$  represent the TMF of the  $k^{\text{th}}$  rule on the ACL at  $p$ ,  $RI_i$ ’s EIS on  $p$  can be computed as:

$$E_{pi} = \{RI_j \mid RI_i^{\text{flow}} \subseteq \cup_k T_{pk}^{\text{act}=RI_i.\text{act}} \cup RI_j^{\text{flow}}, \forall RI_j \in \mathbb{R}\mathbb{I}_p\}.$$

Here,  $\mathbb{R}\mathbb{I}_p$  denotes the set of resolved intents with potential to be deployed at interface  $p$ , i.e.,  $\{RI_j \mid Q_{pj} = 1\}$ . Note that  $RI_i$  is always included in its own EIS  $E_{pi}$ , as it is equivalent to itself by definition. We have an accelerated implementation for this equivalence calculation (§7).

## 6.2 Optimization Formulations

We now present the optimization formulations based on EIS to minimize the total rule additions across resolved intents and network interfaces. In addition to EIS, the formulations take as input the rule count for each resolved intent  $RI_i$  denoted as  $t_i$ , the potential deployment indicator  $Q_{pi}$  mentioned before, and path set  $\Omega_i$  for  $RI_i^{\text{flow}}$ . A deployment plan is specified by binary variables  $N_{pj}$  for all  $Q_{pi} = 1$ , indicating whether  $RI_i$  is deployed on  $p$  or not.

**Optimization for “Permit”.** Essentially, the optimization task for the “Permit” group on interface  $p$  ( $\mathbb{G}_p$ ) is to find a sub-group of resolved intents with minimal number of rules that satisfies all intents in  $\mathbb{G}_p$ . As shown in Constraint (2), each intent  $RI_i \in \mathbb{G}_p$  is satisfied by deploying at least one of its equivalent rules (including itself), i.e.,  $RI_j \in E_{pi}$ , which can be achieved via a logical OR operation. With Objective (1), which sums the rule numbers for all deployed intents, the optimization program is able to explore all deployment

combinations among intents and find one optimal solution. Formally, the formulation is defined as:

$$\min \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathbb{G}_p|} t_i N_{pi} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \bigvee_{RI_j \in E_{pi}} N_{pj} = 1, \quad \forall i, RI_i \in \mathbb{G}_p. \quad (2)$$

Since optimizations across interfaces are independent, the optimal decisions for each interface collectively form a globally optimal deployment plan.

**Optimization for “Deny”.** We begin by considering the bottleneck interfaces alone first, as each path requires at least one deny rule to be installed (recall §2.3). We formulate this path-level constraint for each resolved deny intent  $RI_i$  on each of its paths  $P \in \Omega_i$  as  $\bigvee_{p \in P} N_{pi} = 1$ . Note that we should not consider path  $P$  for  $RI_i$  if  $RI_i$  is already covered in at least one of  $P$ ’s interfaces by the existing rules since the path-level nature of deny intents, i.e. only consider  $P$  such that  $\bigwedge_{p \in P} Q_{pi} = 1$ .

Next, we incorporate EIS by revising the path-level constraint above: instead of deploying  $RI_i$  directly, we allow deploying any equivalent rule  $RI_j \in E_{pi}$  from its EIS. Specifically, we replace  $N_{pi}$  in the path constraint  $\bigvee_{p \in P} N_{pi} = 1$  with  $\bigvee_{RI_j \in E_{pi}} N_{pj}$ , enabling the optimization program to account for interactions between equivalence rules, as shown in Constraint (4). The complete optimization formulation for the group of “deny” intents  $\mathbb{D}$  is presented below:

$$\min \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathbb{D}|} \sum_p t_i N_{pi} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \bigvee_{p \in P} \bigvee_{RI_j \in E_{pi}} N_{pj} = 1, \quad (4)$$

$$\forall i \in \mathbb{D}, P \in \Omega_i \text{ such that } \bigwedge_{p \in P} Q_{pi} = 1. \quad (5)$$

## 7 Implementation

This section addresses key implementation issues of Xumi. The prompts used are anonymously open-sourced at [14], and the full code will be released upon paper acceptance.

**LLM Context Length Limitation.** Our first problem is for large networks, its SNMT can exceed maximum context length of the LLM, preventing it from being processed in one prompt. To address this, we partition SNMT into slices and process them iteratively. Each slice, combined with *system prompt* and IR from the last iteration, is fed into the LLM to generate an updated IR. Entities not identified in the current slice are labeled as “Not Found” in IR, and subsequent slices are processed until all endpoints in intent are found.

**Efficient Flow Set Operations.** Expanding each rule into flows based on the most fine-grained level of endpoint prefixes in SNMT (recall §5.1) can result in over millions of flows as observed in our evaluation (§8). Operating such large flow

sets with attribute specifics (e.g., prefixes) is obviously computationally expensive and memory-intensive. To address this, Xumi stores unique fine-grained flows with their attributes in a *global flow information table*, and flow sets only record *indices* referencing this table, reducing redundant storage and avoiding expensive set operations on attributes. These indexed flow sets are further encoded as *Bitarrays* [12] in Python with each bit representing the presence of a flow, enabling fast bitwise operations for set operations with further reduced storage and computation overhead. We also implement an efficient method to expand a rule to its indexed flow set, avoiding enumeration of all flows with attribute specifics and searching through the huge *global flow information table*. Appendix §D has more details.

Furthermore, we employ an *early termination* mechanism for flow set overlapping between intents and existing rules (*Intent Overlapping* in §5.1). As soon as the accumulated TMF of all the preceding rules already cover the intent traffic, the current and subsequent rules can be skipped right away.

**Accelerated EIS Calculation.** To check equivalence between (resolved) intents, Xumi requires a *union* of TMF for all existing rules with the same intent action on an interface (recall §6.1). Recomputing this for every intent pair is inefficient. Therefore, Xumi precomputes aggregated flow sets for both “permit” and “deny” actions per interface upon finishing TMF calculation for all existing rules. These precomputed sets are reused during equivalence checks, eliminating redundancy and improving efficiency.

**Redundant Protect Rules Elimination.** While redundant intent rules can be eliminated through *complementary-rule* observation (recall §2.3), overlapping intent rules may still have the same protect rules as they protect the same subset flows. When deployed in the same interface’s ACLs, this can also introduce redundancy. To address this, we remove duplicate protect rules in the updated ACL, retaining only the one with the highest priority.

## 8 Evaluation

In this section, we first present Xumi’s end-to-end performance and then evaluate the designs of its three modules in detail across various intents, network scales, and configurations. Our results reveal that:

- Overall, Xumi completes end-to-end configuration of 20 intents within 20 minutes for a modern-scale data center (DC) network with 171 routers, addressing conflicts on 183 ACLs and reducing total rule additions by approximately 40% compared to current practices (§8.2).
- Xumi achieves 98.5% and 90% accuracy (with GPT-4o) in intent comprehension for campus and cloud networks, respectively, without manual feedback. All intents are correctly processed within 8 minutes with feedback (§8.3).

	Network Information				#Prompt Tokens (SNMT ratio)
	#Routers	#Links	#Interfaces	#Entities	
<i>CampusNet</i>	41	66	361	60	4407 (51%)
<i>CloudNet</i>	171	219	2524	352	38755 (94%)
<i>ExtremeNet</i>	1026	1236	11796	2062	178414 (99%)

**Table 2.** Evaluated networks. We show token numbers of *system prompt* and its SNMT proportions. For DC networks (*CloudNet* and *ExtremeNet*), entity numbers are shown at the cloud WAN level (each DC as a unit).

- Xumi delivers 3.3x higher accuracy than baseline methods ignoring any FP for conflict detection. For our largest network with over 10k interfaces and 2k rules per interface, detection can be done within 2 hours (§8.4).
- Xumi solves the deployment optimization within 3 minutes for the largest network, and reduces rule additions by >60% in the best case and 38.8% on average (§8.5).

### 8.1 Evaluation Setup

We use OpenAI’s GPT-4o (version 2024-05-13) and o1 (version 2024-12-17) via APIs from Azure OpenAI Service [2]. In addition, we locally deploy two open-weight LLMs, Qwen2.5-72B with Int4 quantization [13] and Llama3.1-70B with FP8 quantization [10], provided by Hugging Face [9], running on four Ampere A100 GPUs with 80GB memory each in tensor parallel mode. Xumi’s remaining two modules are implemented in Python and run on three servers with four Intel Xeon Platinum 8268 24-Core processors and 768GB RAM each. Gurobi Optimizer [6] is used to solve the optimization.

**Networks and Entities.** We evaluate Xumi on three synthetic networks of varying scales as shown in Table 2, to reflect realistic topologies of a university and Azure’s global DC network publicly available in [1]. *CampusNet*’s SNMT has entities of 9 departments, associated facilities such as office buildings, and grouped entities spanning multiple buildings and networks such as exam areas. *CloudNet* models Azure’s global DC topology [1] comprising 57 regions with an average of 5 DCs per region, and includes 100 server groups (each with 16 servers) for two specific DCs to include the internal DC networks (DCN). The DCN topology is a 3-tier fat-tree [17, 32]. *ExtremeNet* scales *CloudNet* by a factor of 6, replacing each region with 6 similar ones to represent networks of future scales. Each of these networks includes 10 external entities, each with 5 ingress/egress points at random gateway routers. Routing paths between each two routers are configured using k-shortest paths with k=4, following typical WAN settings [26, 28, 33].

**Intents and Existing Rules.** We generate a dataset of 100 natural language intents for each network, with 50 manually crafted ones based on our NetOps interviews and another 50 generated by GPT-4o. “Permit” and “deny” intents each consist of 50% of the dataset. Each intent uses endpoint names or prefixes from the corresponding SNMT and common applications extracted from real ACLs of a university network

	Intent Comprehension			Conflict Detection & Resolution		Deployment		Total Time (s)
	Avg. Acc.	Avg. # FB	Time (s)	# Detected	Time (s)	# Rule	Decision	
	w/o FB	Rounds		Conflict ACLs		Additions	Time (s)	
Xumi	90%	1.2 rounds	237.0 s	183	55.0 s	285.6	5.80 s	297.8 s
Baseline	18%	17.2 rounds	3069.2 s	-	-	458.6	0.1132 s	3069.31 s

**Table 3.** End-to-end performance of Xumi with *CloudNet* and GPT-4o compared to a baseline inspired by prior works [27, 49] and common practice.

and a production cloud network. We include time ranges (e.g., weekdays) for half of the intents. Each attribute except action can be “any”, but cases where source, destination, and application are all “any” are avoided. About 5% intents have spelling errors in endpoint names in order to generate more realistic human inputs. Additionally, we handcraft 100 protect intents per network. Appendix §B has more details and examples about intents. We also open-source intents, network topologies and SNMT in [14].

We generate existing rules at each interface’s ACL in the same way, using the endpoint prefixes information from SNMT of each network and applications from real ACLs. Each ACL also includes a default rule: “deny all” for *CampusNet* and “permit all” for the other two<sup>2</sup>.

## 8.2 End-to-End Performance


We evaluate Xumi’s end-to-end performance in *CloudNet* with GPT-4o and compare it to a baseline representing state-of-the-art ACL configuration practices:

- Intent comprehension uses method similar to NetConfEval [49], which only contains basic task description and network information (IR and SNMT) without any hallucination mitigators. We also invite NetOps to provide feedback on errors and re-prompt LLM until all intents are fulfilled, as in Lumi [27] and NetConfEval [49].
- Deployment follows common practices acknowledged by production NetOps (recall §2.3): “permit” rules are applied to all interfaces along all routing paths, and “deny” rules follow *endpoint* deployment.

Baseline excludes conflict detection, as existing methods like verifications are impractical for *full* detection and may cause long or even infinite resolution loops (recall §2.3). In Baseline we assume all conflicts and resolved intents are given for deployment for fair comparison with Xumi. Each interface randomly contains 20, 200, or 2000 rules, with 10 new “permit” and 10 “deny” intents per experiment. Evaluation results are averaged over 10 runs.

Table 3 summarizes the results. Overall, Xumi completes configuration of 20 intents in 5 minutes on average, while Baseline takes over 10x longer. For Baseline comprehension, a simple user study with NetOps shows an estimated average time of ~237s for 20 intents (with GPT-4o). We notice that

<sup>2</sup>Based on our review of empirical ACLs in university and production, campus networks prioritize security, denying all traffic and opening specific connections as needed; while cloud networks prioritize connectivity.



**Figure 5.** Comprehension accuracy across prompts and LLMs. (a) shows accuracy without NetOps’ feedback across LLMs, (b) shows cumulative accuracy with feedback rounds using GPT-4o, and (c) evaluates specific hallucination mitigator under GPT-4o by excluding it from *system prompt* and measuring accuracy without feedback. CoT refers to *Chain-of-Thought Reasoning*, FSD to *Few-Shot Demonstration*, and SR to *Self-Reflection* in §4.2.

most of the time in the Baseline workflow is spent on intent comprehension due to low accuracy and repeated human effort (Table 3). Xumi enjoys much higher accuracy with hallucination mitigator design even without feedback, thus greatly reducing manual time. In Table 3, we omit manual resolution time for Baseline for fair comparison with Xumi, as it does not involve such a process. In the deployment process, Xumi reduces total number of deployed rules by ~40%, again highlighting the value of its optimization considering bottleneck and complementary-rule deployment.

## 8.3 Intent Comprehension

We evaluate *Intent Comprehension* using all original and protect intents, testing all four LLMs without feedback and GPT-4o with feedback until all intents are correctly comprehended. We also conduct ablation studies on each hallucination mitigator in *system prompt* by measuring GPT-4o’s performance when specific mitigators are excluded from Xumi.

**Comprehension Accuracy.** We first evaluate cases without NetOps feedback. As shown in Figure 5(a), GPT-4o outperforms other LLMs with 98.5% accuracy on *CampusNet* and 90% on *CloudNet*. Notably, o1 underperforms compared to GPT-4o, particularly on larger *CloudNet* and *ExtremeNet*, as it often produces partial outputs (e.g., mapping an entity to incomplete prefixes and interfaces). The smaller locally deployed models, Qwen and Llama, consistently underperform compared to GPT-4o and o1 due to their model size constraints, with Qwen outperforming Llama across all network scales. On *ExtremeNet*, containing 2000+ entities and requiring ~180k tokens (exceeding most LLMs’ 128k context limit) which enforce Xumi to apply iterative prompting (§7), all models struggle with errors like incorrect interface identification or partial outputs mentioned above, leading to accuracy only with up to 36% using GPT-4o. It suggests that the excessive length of SNMT overwhelms the models. We summarize common comprehension errors in Appendix §C.

Figure 5(b) shows that Xumi achieves 100% accuracy within 3 feedback rounds for all intents, including those in *ExtremeNet*. On *ExtremeNet*, single feedback from NetOps improves accuracy from 36% to 89%, while all error IRs on *CampusNet* and *CloudNet* can be corrected within 1 and 2

Time (s)	Initial Inference Time w/o Feedback				Cumulative Feedback Time (GPT-4o)			
	Llama3.1-70B	Qwen2.5-72B	GPT-4o	OpenAI o1	w/o FB	1 <sup>st</sup> FB	2 <sup>nd</sup> FB	3 <sup>rd</sup> FB
<i>CampusNet</i>	3.8	3.2	2.5	4.7	2.5	82.3	-	-
<i>CloudNet</i>	8.7	6.9	5.2	11.4	5.2	71.7	96.0	-
<i>ExtremeNet</i>	9.1	14.4	11.3	16.9	11.3	152.8	267.8	370.8

**Table 4.** Comprehension times of (1) Different LLMs’ inference without feedback and (2) Cumulative feedback time across feedback rounds with human review, feedback, and GPT-4o inference time.

rounds, respectively. This underscores that Xumi’s designs, including *system prompt* and *feedback prompt* (§4), effectively improve accuracy with each LLM inference, ensuring comprehension is completed with minimal manual efforts, even in challenging scenarios beyond current LLM capabilities.


We conduct ablation studies to evaluate the effectiveness of different hallucination mitigators (§4.2). As shown in Figure 5(c), compared to methods without specific mitigator, Xumi’s *Few-Shot Demonstration* (FSD) achieves the highest accuracy improvement (26.5%), followed by *Chain-of-Thought Reasoning* (CoT) (22.5%) and *Self-Reflection* (SR) (11.2%) averaged across all networks. Notably, all mitigators become more effective as network scale increases. For example, Xumi’s FSD improves accuracy by 1.27x over the method without it on *CampusNet* and by 3.27x on *ExtremeNet*.

**Comprehension Time.** As shown in Figure 4, all LLMs finish IR inference within 20 seconds without feedback, with GPT-4o being the fastest (6.3s on average), followed by Qwen, Llama, and o1 being the slowest (11.0s on average). Their inference times increase with topology size: a 112%–142% increase from *CampusNet* to *CloudNet* and 4%–116% from *CloudNet* to *ExtremeNet* across four LLMs. Notably, Llama shows only a 4% time increase from *CloudNet* to *ExtremeNet* but the lowest accuracy in *ExtremeNet* since it always returns error IRs after processing the first SNMT slice without checking further slices during iterative prompting (§7). With all feedback, Xumi with GPT-4o takes ~3 minutes per intent on average and up to ~8 minutes across networks. To conclude, GPT-4o achieves the best balance of speed and accuracy.

#### 8.4 Conflict Detection

We compare Xumi with three methods that do not fully account for FPs: (1) *Blind Overlapping* (BO), a baseline method that naively identifies overlapping traffic between intents and independent existing rules with opposite actions as conflicts, ignoring both two FP cases; (2) *BO+TMF*, which accounts for FPs caused by preceding rules based on BO; and (3) *BO+Path*, which accounts for FPs caused by infeasible paths based on BO. Detection accuracy of an evaluated method is defined as the proportion of existing rules where the correct conflict flow set is identified for the new intent rule, across all existing ones installed at routing paths of intent’s traffic.

We vary the number of existing rules per ACL from 20, 200, to 2000, all randomly generated. In each setting, 10 new intent rules are randomly selected from the comprehension



**Figure 6.** Conflict detection accuracy of Xumi and methods ignoring FPs.

results of our 100-intent dataset, and we report the results on average over 5 runs.

**Detection Accuracy.** As shown in Figure 6, Xumi achieves overall superior detection accuracy compared to other methods, with 3.33x, 1.15x, and 2.23x higher than BO, BO+TMF, and BO+Path, respectively, averaged across all networks and rule number settings. Xumi’s accuracy gain increases with rule numbers, outperforming BO and BO+Path that do not consider TMF. For example, on average across three networks, Xumi achieves 5.14x and 3.09x accuracy gains over BO, and 3.57x and 2.24x over BO+Path when each interface has 2000 rules compared to settings of 20 and 200. This is because more rules lead to higher overlap among existing rules in ACL, making TMF essential for accurate detection. Meanwhile, BO+TMF consistently achieves accuracies near or above 80% in all cases as shown in Figure 6, reducing FPs and outperforming BO+Path as rule number increases.

However, Xumi’s accuracy gain diminishes in larger networks with the same rule number. For example, with 2000 rules, Xumi has 16.2x accuracy gain over BO in *CampusNet* (Figure 6(a)) but 1.75x in *ExtremeNet* (Figure 6(c)). This is because larger networks have more entities and flows, resulting in lower existing rule overlap for the same rule number setting. BO+Path performs better than BO+TMF in these cases, as seen with 20 or 200 rules in *CloudNet* (Figure 6(b)) and *ExtremeNet* (Figure 6(c)). In conclusion, neither TMF nor path validation alone achieves consistently high accuracy across all scenarios. By jointly addressing both, Xumi overcomes their limitations and delivers robust and accurate detection.

**Detection Time.** As shown in Table 5, Xumi’s detection time across its three phases increases with network scale and per-interface rule numbers. For the largest topology *ExtremeNet* with 2000 rules per interface, detection for one new intent rule on all existing ones in an interface’s ACL can be completed in 6 minutes. In the worst case, where an intent’s traffic traverses all interfaces of *ExtremeNet*, detection can still finish within 2 hours on our setup with three servers (192 concurrent threads each). *TMF Calculation* and *Intent Overlapping* (§5.1) dominate detection time, which is worthwhile due to their critical role in ensuring accuracy under high existing rule overlap, while *Interface-Path Validation* is highly efficient by taking negligible time yet reduces FPs as shown in Table 5. Leveraging more concurrent threads across interfaces can further reduce overall detection time.

Time (s)	CampusNet			CloudNet			ExtremeNet		
	20	200	2000	20	200	2000	20	200	2000
TMF Calculation	0.0021	0.0175	0.1819	0.1130	0.9076	13.44	2.581	17.90	248.0
Intent Overlapping	0.0007	0.0053	0.0398	0.0469	0.3119	3.926	1.189	6.420	72.22
Interface-Path Validation	0.0002	0.0002	0.0003	0.0006	0.0007	0.0010	0.0012	0.0014	0.0013
Total Time	0.0030	0.0230	0.2220	0.1604	1.2202	17.367	3.771	24.32	320.2

**Table 5.** Xumi’s conflict detection time across three phases, averaged on the time of each intent rule detected at each interface’s ACL. Detection across different interfaces and intent rules can be run in parallel.

## 8.5 Deployment Optimization


We evaluate Xumi deployment optimization design. For “permit” intents, our baseline here is a *Catch-All* method which simply deploys an intent on all potential interfaces with non-empty conflict flow sets. For “deny” intents, the baselines include: (1) *Endpoint* method which deploys an intent on all source or destination gateway interfaces whichever has fewer ones; and (2) the *Bottleneck* method which applies optimization only to identify bottleneck interfaces.

We conduct experiments by varying the average *conflict ratio* across intents, which is defined as the fraction of interfaces (among those traversed by an intent’s traffic) whose existing ACL conflicts with the intent. Thus higher conflict ratios indicate more interfaces are potential intent deployment targets (recall §6.1). In each setting, we first select 10 “permit” and 10 “deny” intents from intent dataset, then generate each ACL’s existing rules randomly so that the average conflict ratio reaches the specified value. For each conflict here, its protect intent is randomly decided to be present or not. Results are averaged over five runs for each setting.

**Overall performance.** As shown in Figure 7, Xumi reduces rule additions by 38.8% on average across all settings. Specifically, Xumi reduces “permit” rule additions by 36.3% compared to *Catch-All* (Figures 7(a)(b)(c)) and “deny” additions by 24.0% over *Bottleneck*, while *Bottleneck* reduces them by 17.4% over *Endpoint* (Figures 7(d)(e)(f)). Table 6 shows Xumi’s decision time with varying network scale and conflict ratios. Even for *ExtremeNet* with a 75% conflict ratio, it can solve the optimization within 3 minutes, significantly better than the one-week manual configuration time reported in [46].

**Bottleneck Deployment.** We delve deeper into the impact of bottleneck deployment for the “deny” intents. As shown in Figure 7(d)(e)(f), as conflict ratio increases, bottleneck is more beneficial. This is because more conflicts lead to more routing paths that need to install new rules, increasing the likelihood of multiple intent paths traversing the same interface. Similarly, larger topologies also amplify the bottleneck’s effect. Compared to baseline, bottleneck saves 6.5% rule additions in *CampusNet* (Figure 7(d)), but 24.2% in *ExtremeNet* (Figure 7(f)), respectively, as more complex routing in larger networks increases the chances of path overlap at interfaces.

**Complementary-Rule Deployment.** We analyze deeper into complementary rules’ impact. Figure 7 shows that using



**Figure 7.** Normalized rule additions for different deployment optimization methods, with values normalized to corresponding baselines.

it greatly reduces rule additions compared to bottleneck deployment. As conflict ratios increase, it becomes more effective in reducing rule additions across all cases, because more conflicts mean more interfaces become potential deployment targets, and more intents may find their equivalences.

As shown in Table 6, Xumi solves optimizations quickly within 140s in the worst case. The solving time for “permit” is 23.4x higher than “deny” in the smaller *CampusNet* but only 0.263x in the larger *ExtremeNet*, averaged across all conflict ratios. This is because “permit” requires multiple sequential per-interface optimizations, making it slower in smaller topologies, while “deny” involves a single optimization. In larger networks, however, global optimization for “deny” is more complex, taking more time than “permit”.

## 9 Discussion

We discuss Xumi’s limitations and future works.

**Automated Routing Configurations.** Xumi currently only focuses on automating ACL configurations to manage and filter network flows, assuming that routing configurations are correct and predefined. In contrast, routing protocols like BGP [4], widely used in production networks, are far more complex due to their intricate protocol attributes and interdependencies. This complexity makes manual configuration error-prone, leading to potential misconfigurations that can disrupt desired reachability between endpoints and interfere with configurations of other flows. Inspired by Xumi, a similar workflow could be applied to automate routing configurations, i.e., by understanding routing intents, detecting and resolving conflicts, and deploying correct configurations. And the unique complexity of routing protocols may present both novel challenges and exciting research opportunities for future work.

**Open-Ended Intents.** Xumi currently supports expressing natural language intents tied to specific policies (i.e., ACLs) for configuration. However, in practice, NetOps may also want to propose open-ended intents that are not directly

Time (s)			CampusNet			CloudNet			ExtremeNet		
			25%	50%	75%	25%	50%	75%	25%	50%	75%
"Permit" Intents	Xumi	EIS	0.0119	0.0219	0.0475	0.9685	2.268	3.550	36.96	93.30	152.2
		OPT	0.0233	0.0148	0.0216	0.0288	0.0242	0.0338	0.0392	0.0417	0.0689
"Deny" Intents	Xumi	Bottleneck	0.0016	0.0027	0.0036	0.0725	0.0847	0.0946	0.4951	0.5073	0.5538
		EIS	0.0162	0.0215	0.0306	1.760	3.174	4.080	49.29	104.7	138.93
		OPT	0.0017	0.0031	0.0044	0.0727	0.0812	0.0939	0.5125	0.5638	0.6144

**Table 6.** Deployment plan decision time with Xumi’s different optimization observations and conflict ratios (25%, 50%, 75%). Xumi’s time includes “EIS” for *Equivalent Intent Set* computation and “OPT” for optimization.

tied to a specific policy like ACL. Instead, they expect the system to infer appropriate configurations based on the current network state to fulfill the intent. For example, NetOps might request: “Improve the WiFi signal in the technical department offices”. Addressing this intent could require selecting optimal WiFi frequencies and channels, adjusting transmission power, modifying bandwidth, or enabling QoS. The desired system should automatically diagnose the root causes of weak WiFi signals and identify the most suitable configuration adjustments for intent satisfaction. Handling such open-ended intents will be an exciting future work, presenting interesting research problems and new challenges.

## 10 Related Work

We present related work not discussed before in §1 and §2. **Named-Entity Recognition (NER).** Xumi’s *Intent Comprehension* resembles the well-established NER works [21, 27, 34, 36], including Lumi [27] from our network community. NER models are designed to extract “names”, which are fragments of human expressions corresponding to specific entities, such as identifying the specifics of five key ACL attributes. However, applying NER approaches to our work, which often use the traditional models like BERT [48], may present challenges: These models typically stop at identifying the NL fragments, such as the endpoint and application names, without mapping them to the ACL specifics (e.g., prefixes and protocol ports) for practical use. Addressing diverse NL expressions and aligning them with ACL specifics requires tedious additional training or fine-tuning [20, 24, 25, 37].

**Network Synthesizer.** Extensive research on network synthesizers [16, 19, 31, 38, 39] has focused on filling configuration templates with parameters according to specific intents, but these intents are often described at a low level, requiring NetOps to handcraft detailed attributes such as prefixes and routers, thus limiting automation. For example, Aura [39] requires NetOps to specify paths manually for a routing configuration and automates only simple tasks like determining global BGP communities. Recent works like CEGS [31] and COSYNTH [38] leverage LLMs to interpret high-level intents and select appropriate templates for certain devices, while Nassim [19] uses language models to translate parameters between vendor templates. However, these methods

still suffer from the limitations of traditional synthesizers in attribute handcrafting. Additionally, synthesizers focus solely on configuration correctness, ignoring conflict resolution and deployment simplicity, which are issues that our work addresses with clear advantages.

Although these synthesizers are not suitable for Xumi’s ACL configuration pipeline, we can still leverage their template-based approach to convert Xumi’s ACL rule quintuple into deployable scripts for realistic devices, since Xumi is not designed to directly generate ACL scripts from natural language intents. We assume templates are available as demonstrated in prior works [5, 11, 19, 45].

## 11 Conclusion

We propose Xumi, a novel automated ACL configuration system that helps translate NetOps’ natural language intents into router configurations with minimal manual intervention. Using advanced prompt designs to tackle network-specific information and LLM hallucinations, Xumi achieves high comprehension accuracy in deriving valid ACL rules from intents with LLMs, significantly reducing manual feedback. Its proactive conflict detection accurately identifies all conflicts for resolution, avoiding risky deploy-then-fix process, while deployment optimizations reduce rule additions and simplify maintenance. Evaluation results demonstrate that Xumi effectively automates entire ACL configuration pipeline, and all its module designs perform efficiently as expected.

## References

- [1] Azure Global DC Network. <https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/explore/global-infrastructure>.
- [2] Azure OpenAI Service. <https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/products/ai-services/openai-service/>.
- [3] Cisco ACL. [https://www.cisco.com/c/en/us/td/docs/ios-xml/ios/iproute\\_ospf/configuration/x-16/iro-xe-16-book/iro-cfg.html](https://www.cisco.com/c/en/us/td/docs/ios-xml/ios/iproute_ospf/configuration/x-16/iro-xe-16-book/iro-cfg.html).
- [4] Cisco BGP. <https://www.cisco.com/c/en/us/products/ios-nx-os-software/border-gateway-protocol-bgp/index.html>.
- [5] Graph-Based Live Queries in AOS. <https://apstra.com/products/>.
- [6] Gurobi Optimizer. <http://www.gurobi.com>.
- [7] H3C ACL. [https://www.h3c.com/en/d\\_201907/1213007\\_294551\\_0.htm](https://www.h3c.com/en/d_201907/1213007_294551_0.htm).
- [8] Huawei ACL. <https://support.huawei.com/enterprise/en/doc/EDOC1000178177/d8968298/configuring-a-basic-acl>.
- [9] Hugging Face. <https://huggingface.co/>.
- [10] Llama3.1-70B-FP8. <https://huggingface.co/nvidia/Llama-3.1-70B-Instruct-FP8>.
- [11] OpenConfig. <http://openconfig.net/>.
- [12] Python Bitarray. <https://pypi.org/project/bitarray/>.
- [13] Qwen2.5-72B-Int4. <https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct-GPTQ-Int4>.
- [14] Xumi. <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/Comprehension-opensource-17C8>.
- [15] YANG Model. <https://developer.cisco.com/docs/nso/guides/the-yang-data-modeling-language/>.
- [16] Ahmed El-Hassany and Petar Tsankov and Laurent Vanbever and Martin Vechev. NetComplete: Practical Network-Wide Configuration Synthesis with Autocompletion. In *Proc. USENIX NSDI*, 2018.
- [17] Al-Fares, Mohammad and Loukissas, Alexander and Vahdat, Amin. A Scalable, Commodity Data Center Network Architecture. In *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM*, 2008.
- [18] Ryan Beckett, Aarti Gupta, Ratul Mahajan, and David Walker. A General Approach to Network Configuration Verification. In *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM*, 2017.
- [19] Huangxun Chen, Yukai Miao, Li Chen, Haifeng Sun, Hong Xu, Libin Liu, Gong Zhang, and Wei Wang. Software-Defined Network Assimilation: Bridging the Last Mile Towards Centralized Network Configuration Management with NAssim. In *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM*, 2022.
- [20] Cruz, Breno Dantas and Jayaraman, Bargav and Dwarakanath, Anurag and McMillan, Collin. Detecting Vague Words & Phrases in Requirements Documents in A Multilingual Environment. In *2017 IEEE 25th International Requirements Engineering Conference (RE)*, 2017.
- [21] Maud Ehrmann, Ahmed Hamdi, Elvys Linhares Pontes, Matteo Romanello, and Antoine Doucet. Named Entity Recognition and Classification in Historical Documents: A Survey. 56(2):1–47, Sep. 2023.
- [22] Fogel, Ari and Fung, Stanley and Pedrosa, Luis and Walraed-Sullivan, Meg and Govindan, Ramesh and Mahajan, Ratul and Millstein, Todd. A General Approach to Network Configuration Analysis. In *Proc. USENIX NSDI*, 2015.
- [23] Aaron Gember-Jacobson, Raajay Viswanathan, Aditya Akella, and Ratul Mahajan. Fast Control Plane Analysis Using an Abstract Representation. In *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM*, 2016.
- [24] Gheith A. Abandah and Ashraf Suyyagh and Mohammed Z. Khedher. Correcting Arabic Soft Spelling Mistakes using BiLSTM-based Machine Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.01141*, 2021.
- [25] Gothe, Sourabh Vasant and Dogra, Sushant and Chandra, Mritunjai and Sanchi, Chandramouli and Raja, Barath Raj Kandur. An Efficient System for Grammatical Error Correction on Mobile Devices. In *2021 IEEE 15th International Conference on Semantic Computing (ICSC)*, 2021.
- [26] Chi-Yao Hong, Srikanth Kandula, Ratul Mahajan, Ming Zhang, Vijay Gill, Mohan Nanduri, and Roger Wattenhofer. Achieving High Utilization with Software-Driven WAN. In *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM*, 2013.
- [27] Arthur S. Jacobs, Ricardo J. Pfitscher, Rafael H. Ribeiro, Ronaldo A. Ferreira, Lisandro Z. Granville, Walter Willinger, and Sanjay G. Rao. Hey, Lumi! Using Natural Language for Intent-Based Network Management. In *Proc. USENIX ATC*, 2021.
- [28] Sushant Jain, Alok Kumar, Subhasree Mandal, Joon Ong, Leon Poutievski, Arjun Singh, Subbaiah Venkata, Jim Wanderer, Junlan Zhou, Min Zhu, Jon Zolla, Urs Hölzle, Stephen Stuart, and Amin Vahdat. B4: Experience with a Globally-Deployed Software Defined WAN. In *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM*, 2013.
- [29] Ji, Ziwei and Lee, Nayeon and Frieske, Rita and Yu, Tiezheng and Su, Dan and Xu, Yan and Ishii, Etsuko and Bang, Ye Jin and Madotto, Andrea and Fung, Pascale. Survey of Hallucination in Natural Language Generation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12):1–38, March 2023.
- [30] Jiang, Albert Q and Sablayrolles, Alexandre and Mensch, Arthur and Bamford, Chris and Chaplot, Devendra Singh and Casas, Diego de las and Bressand, Florian and Lengyel, Gianna and Lample, Guillaume and Saulnier, Lucile and others. Mistral 7B. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.
- [31] Jianmin Liu and Li Chen and Dan Li and Yukai Miao. CEGS: Configuration Example Generalizing Synthesizer. In *Proc. USENIX NSDI*, 2025.
- [32] Kandula, Srikanth and Sengupta, Sudipta and Greenberg, Albert and Patel, Parveen and Chaiken, Ronnie. The Nature of Data Center Traffic: Measurements & Analysis. In *Proc. ACM IMC*, 2009.
- [33] Praveen Kumar, Yang Yuan, Chris Yu, Nate Foster, Robert Kleinberg, Petr Lapukhov, Chiun Lin Lim, and Robert Soulé. Semi-Oblivious Traffic Engineering: The Road Not Taken. In *Proc. USENIX NSDI*, 2018.
- [34] Li, Jing and Sun, Aixin and Han, Jianglei and Li, Chenliang. A Survey on Deep Learning for Named Entity Recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 34(1):50–70, January 2020.
- [35] Li, Junyi and Cheng, Xiaoxue and Zhao, Wayne Xin and Nie, Jian-Yun and Wen, Ji-Rong. Halueval: A Large-Scale Hallucination Evaluation Benchmark for Large Language Models. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2305.11747*, 2023.
- [36] Liang, Chen and Yu, Yue and Jiang, Haoming and Er, Siawpeng and Wang, Ruijia and Zhao, Tuo and Zhang, Chao. Bond: Bert-Assisted Open-Domain Named Entity Recognition with Distant Supervision. In *Proc. ACM SIGKDD*, 2020.
- [37] Logan Lebanoff and Fei Liu. Automatic Detection of Vague Words and Sentences in Privacy Policies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.06219*, 2018.
- [38] Mondal, Rajdeep and Tang, Alan and Beckett, Ryan and Millstein, Todd and Varghese, George. What do LLMs Need to Synthesize Correct Router Configurations? In *Proc. ACM HotNets*, 2023.
- [39] Sivaramakrishnan Ramanathan, Ying Zhang, Mohab Gawish, Yogesh Mundada, Zhaodong Wang, Sangki Yun, Eric Lippert, Walid Taha, Minlan Yu, and Jelena Mirkovic. Practical Intent-driven Routing Configuration Synthesis. In *Proc. USENIX NSDI*, 2023.
- [40] Reynolds, Laria and McDonell, Kyle. Prompt Programming for Large Language Models: Beyond the Few-Shot Paradigm. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2021.
- [41] Steffen Smolka, Praveen Kumar, Nate Foster, Dexter Kozen, and Alexandra Silva. Cantor Meets Scott: Semantic Foundations for Probabilistic Networks. In *Proceedings of ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, 2017.
- [42] Sorensen, Taylor and Robinson, Joshua and Rytting, Christopher Michael and Shaw, Alexander Glenn and Rogers, Kyle Jeffrey and Delorey, Alexia Pauline and Khalil, Mahmoud and Fulda, Nancy and Wingate, David. An Information-Theoretic Approach to Prompt Engineering without Ground Truth Labels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11364*, 2022.
- [43] Samuel Steffen, Timon Gehr, Petar Tsankov, Laurent Vanbever, and Martin Vechev. Probabilistic Verification of Network Configurations. In *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM*, 2020.

- [44] Kausik Subramanian, Anubhavnidhi Abhashkumar, Loris D’Antoni, and Aditya Akella. Detecting Network Load Violations for Distributed Control Planes. In *Proceedings of ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, 2020.
- [45] Yu-Wei Eric Sung, Xiaozheng Tie, Starsky HY Wong, and Hongyi Zeng. Robotron: Top-down Network Management at Facebook Scale. In *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM*, 2016.
- [46] Bingchuan Tian, Xinyi Zhang, Ennan Zhai, Hongqiang Harry Liu, Qiaobo Ye, Chunsheng Wang, Xin Wu, Zhiming Ji, Yihong Sang, Ming Zhang, Da Yu, Chen Tian, Haitao Zheng, and Ben Y. Zhao. Safely and Automatically Updating In-Network ACL Configurations with Intent Language. In *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM*, 2019.
- [47] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and Efficient Foundation Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [48] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is All you Need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- [49] Changjie Wang, Mariano Scazzariello, Alireza Farshin, Simone Ferlin, Dejan Kostić, and Marco Chiesa. NetConfEval: Can LLMs Facilitate Network Configuration? *Proceedings of the ACM on Networking*, 2(CoNEXT2):1–25, June 2024.
- [50] Wang, Changjie and Scazzariello, Mariano and Farshin, Alireza and Kostic, Dejan and Chiesa, Marco. Making Network Configuration Human Friendly. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2309.06342*, 2023.
- [51] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [52] Duo Wu, Xianda Wang, Yaqi Qiao, Zhi Wang, Junchen Jiang, Shuguang Cui, and Fangxin Wang. NetLLM: Adapting Large Language Models for Networking. In *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM*, 2024.

## Appendices

### A Comprehension Prompts and Human Interaction Example

```
1 IR-enhanced_System_Prompt = ""
2 # Task overview
3 <Task description to specify expected input and output>
4 <IR with format constraints>
5 # SNMT
6 <Semantics-Network Mapping Table>
7 # Instructions by steps
8 <Step 1: extract source & destination endpoints and policy directly from NL input>
9 <Step 2: refer SNMT to get corresponding router interface pairs and prefixes>
10 <Verify 2.1: Range verification: unified endpoint name, existence of prefix and interface>
11 <Verify 2.2: Dependency verification: endpoint2prefix, endpoint2interface>
12 <Step 3: infer application with protocols and TCP/UDP ports>
13 <Verify 3.1: Range verification: protocol keyword, port range>
14 <Verify 3.2: Dependency verification: valid port in protocol>
15 <Step 4: identify time information by general knowledge>
16 <Verify 4.1: Range verification: time range, valid keyword>
17 <Step 5: collect all elements and output IR>
18 # Examples
19 <Examples with input, step-by-step analysis, and output>
20 ""

21 (a) System prompt skeleton

1 Feedback_Prompt = ""
2 In the previous round, for the intent: <natural language intent>,
3 you gave the following wrong answer: <IR output from last attempt>.
4 Hint from user: <user's feedback>.
5 Please try again.
6 ""

7 (b) Feedback prompt skeleton
```


**Figure 8.** The skeleton of the prompts used in *Intent Comprehension*. Note that “Step 1–5” corresponds to the *Chain-of-Thought Reasoning* prompts, “Examples” represent the *Few-Shot Demonstration* prompts, and “Verify x.x” refers to the *Self-Reflection* prompts.

**Prompt Skeletons.** As discussed in §4.2, we use a system prompt that guides LLMs to complete the *Intent Comprehension* task and a feedback prompt that requires NetOps to check IR and provide human feedback for any comprehension errors. Figure 8 shows the skeleton of two prompts.

More specifically, the system prompt is divided into several parts as shown in Figure 8. First, in the task overview, we define the organization of IR and the format constraints for each item. Second, SNMT is then loaded for the LLM’s reference. Third, the step-by-step instructions are provided for guidance, where *Chain-of-Thought Reasoning* and *Self-Reflection* strategies are applied together. At each step of instruction, the LLM is asked to focus on extracting the specifics of one ACL attribute and verify the element range and dependencies of each extracted element results. It moves on to the next step only if all verification passes, and finally organizes and formats the entire IR at Step 5. Lastly, *Few-Shot Demonstration* is provided, each example includes the sample intent and its ground truth IR, with a further step-by-step explanation about why the ground truth is correct. In practice, edge cases are found particularly useful for better overall performance. All specific prompts used in our evaluation are open-sourced at [14].

The feedback prompt skeleton is shown in Figure 8(b), and all its details are discussed in §4.

**NetOps Interaction.** The NetOps can interact with Xumi just like talking to a normal chat robot, as illustrated in Figure 9. The agent is always initialized with a system prompt before it starts. Then, NetOps can specify an intent, making



**Figure 9.** An interaction example under web-chat-based demo. NetOps are invited to review the IR output and provide feedback if any errors are detected.

the agent to be triggered to generate an IR for manual review. If any errors are identified, NetOps provides manual feedback, which the agent uses to regenerate result IR. This feedback loop continues until NetOps confirms correctness. Finally, an IR of an intent is transformed into corresponding ACL rules of the intent as discussed in §4.4, facilitating conflict detection and rule deployment.

### B Examples of Intents

Table 7 provides detailed information about the intent dataset used for *Intent Comprehension* evaluation. For each network in §8, 100 original intents and 100 protect intents are generated. For each network, entities are designed to be meaningful and may contain other entities. For example in Table 7, “Edu Office” in the first example (first line) is included in “Education” as a whole university department in the second example (second line). Endpoints (source/destination) in intent can contain prefixes rather than endpoint names only. For example, there are prefixes-only intents like “Protect the HTTPS flow from 10.0.7.0/24 in Law to 10.0.6.0/24 in Education over TCP port 443” and “OSPF routing traffic from 10.123.0.0/16 to 11.27.0.0/16 must be protected on weekends”. To enhance linguistic diversity, the datasets incorporate abbreviations, acronyms, and typos. Approximately 5% of the data contains intentional typos, such as “SunPRC” for “SunRPC”, while another 5% includes abbreviations, such as “Biz

Network	Type (50% Permit/Deny)	Number	#chars	Example
CampusNet	Original intent	100	64	Biz Admin Classroom should always be able to communicate with Edu Office.
	Protect intent	100	112	Protect the HTTPS flow from 10.0.7.0/24 in Law to 10.0.6.0/24 in Education over TCP port 443, as defined in the current configuration.
CloudNet	Original intent	100	65	Authorize SunPRC traffic from East Asia DC5 to any destination on weekends.
	Protect intent	100	107	OSPF routing traffic from 10.123.0.0/16 to 11.27.0.0/16 must be protected on weekends.
ExtremeNet	Original intent	100	65	All traffic from NZ North C to Japan West F is denied Mon-Fri.
	Protect intent	100	107	UDP traffic from Sweden Central C DC2 to Central India D DC2 must be protected from any changes.

**Table 7.** Detailed information of *Intent Comprehension* dataset with examples.

Admin Classroom” for “Business Administration Classroom” or “NZ North C” for “New Zealand North C,” in Table 7.

These datasets are all open-sourced at [14] to facilitate further research within the community.

### C Comprehension Error Causes Analysis

For one-shot comprehension across LLMs, the most common error is incorrect interface/prefix mapping (63%), with varying behaviors among models. For instance, in *CloudNet*, where a region endpoint should be mapped to 5 interface-prefix tuples (2 interfaces per prefix), o1 returns only the first tuple, while Llama includes all 5 tuples but only the first interface for each. Qwen, limited by its 32k context length, struggles with tackling SNMT inputs beyond the first 1000 lines, leading to incorrect mappings.

Wrong endpoint name errors (34%) are frequent when intents provide only prefixes for endpoints, with Qwen and Llama more prone to this mistake. Errors related to applications or time are rare (3%) and include issues like failing to identify typos (e.g., incorrectly writing “sunprc” as “sunrpc”) or unnecessarily generating absolute time references (e.g., “year 2023 or 2024”). Llama occasionally introduces formatting errors, such as using square brackets [] instead of parentheses (). Notably, no errors related to wrong actions were observed across any model.

### D Bitarray-Based Flow Set Operations

**Basic Set Operations with Bitarray.** As described in §7, each flow set is represented as a bitarray, where each bit indicates the presence of a specific flow in the network. All flows, characterized by combinations of attributes such as *source*, *destination*, and *application*, are recorded in the *global flow information table*. We leverage the bitwise operations of *Bitarray* to perform the typical flow set operations required by Xumi. For instance, suppose  $A$  and  $B$  are two flow sets represented in *Bitarray* format. The *intersection* ( $\cap$ ) of  $A$  and  $B$  is computed as  $A \wedge B$ , the *difference* ( $-$ ) as  $A \wedge \neg B$ , and the *union* ( $\cup$ ) as  $A \vee B$ . Additionally,  $A$  is determined to be a *subset* ( $\subseteq$ ) of  $B$  if their *difference* is empty, i.e.,  $(A \wedge \neg B).count(1) = 0$ .

These Bitarray-based flow set operations cover all operations required by Xumi. For example, *intersection* is used

in *Intent Overlapping* (§5.1), *difference* is used in *TMF Calculation* (§5.1), and *union* and *subset* are used in equivalent condition calculations (§6.1).

**Efficient Indexed Flow Set Extraction of A Rule.** Since we now conduct flow set operations using indexed flow sets, each rule must be expanded into a set of indexes corresponding to its flows for these operations. At first glance, this requires enumerating all flows governed by the rule and finding their indexes in the *global flow information table*. To achieve this, we enumerate all possible values (or specifics) for each attribute of the rule and generate combinations of these specifics across attributes to identify individual flows. For example, the rule “deny 10.0.0.0/31  $\rightarrow$  11.0.0.0/31 HTTP” has its source attribute “10.0.0.0/31” expanded into “10.0.0.0/32” and “10.0.0.1/32,” while its destination attribute “11.0.0.0/31” expands into “11.0.0.0/32” and “11.0.0.1/32,” with the application attribute being HTTP. By combining these specifics, we generate four flows: “10.0.0.0/32  $\rightarrow$  11.0.0.0/32 HTTP”, “10.0.0.1/32  $\rightarrow$  11.0.0.0/32 HTTP”, “10.0.0.0/32  $\rightarrow$  11.0.0.1/32 HTTP”, and “10.0.0.1/32  $\rightarrow$  11.0.0.1/32 HTTP”. Next, we locate these flows in the *global flow information table* to determine their indexes. For instance, if the global table assigns indexes 1, 2, 3, and 4 to these flows, their corresponding Bitarray representations would be “1000”, “0100”, “0010” and “0001”, respectively, assuming only these four flows exist in the network. However, directly enumerating all flows for a rule and searching for their indexes in a large table is highly inefficient.

To improve efficiency, we use a precomputed index set for each specific value of each attribute, stored in the *global flow information table*. For example, for the specific source prefix “10.0.0.0/32”, the precomputed index set includes all indexes of flows related to this prefix. In this case, “10.0.0.0/32” corresponds to the flows “10.0.0.0/32  $\rightarrow$  11.0.0.0/32 HTTP” (index 1) and “10.0.0.0/32  $\rightarrow$  11.0.0.1/32 HTTP” (index 3), so its index set is {1, 3}, represented as the Bitarray “1010”. Using these precomputed index sets, we can efficiently compute the flow set for a rule. First, we enumerate all specifics of an attribute and take the union of their precomputed index sets. For example, in the rule “deny 10.0.0.0/31  $\rightarrow$  11.0.0.0/31 HTTP”, the source prefix “10.0.0.0/31” expands into the specifics “10.0.0.0/32” (Bitarray “1010”) and “10.0.0.1/32” (Bitarray “0101”),

and the union of these sets is “ $1010 \vee 0101 = 1111$ ,” representing all flows related to the source. Similarly, we compute the flow sets for the destination and application attributes. Finally, we compute the intersection of the resulting flow

sets to obtain the final indexed flow set for the rule. For example, in the rule “deny 10.0.0.0/31  $\rightarrow$  11.0.0.0/31 HTTP,” the source, destination, and application attributes all yield the Bitarray “1111” in this example, so the final flow set of the rule is  $1111 \wedge 1111 \wedge 1111 = 1111$ .