

Comments heard today

- ❖ **Use of addresses as flow ID may prevent some fancy stuff in NSIS (Henning)**
- ❖ **Use implicit high order bits to extend sequence number space (Eric), as in ESP**
- ❖ **Security model assumes attackers can't see beginning of connection (Eric)**
- ❖ **Some apps will use nonce exchange out of band (Magnus), recommend use.**
- ❖ **Odd to use DCCP to negotiate DCCP features, consider using a signaling protocol, SIP may help. But still need connection setup in media channel (Jonathan).**

More comments

- ✿ **Diligent, clear, thorough, thoughtful presentations, outreach. Only 2 of 8 features are CC related. Concerned about complexity. Simpler protocol would deploy faster, be more robust. (D. Crocker)**
- ✿ **Inherited use of TCP/UDP checksum, other protocols made other choices. May want to investigate. Almost-like-another-protocol usually doesn't result in much code reuse – a weak reason to use sub-optimal checksums. (Henning)**
- ✿ **Experience in RTP is that building big servers can be problematic. Does service name make it harder for implementers. (Colin)**

More comments...

- ❖ **Assuming head-drop is right thing to do. True for most cases. But, some others may want to use other mechanisms. Don't use a fixed assumption. (S. Casner)**
- ❖ **Apps may use either or both of varying packet size and packet rate. (S. Casner)**
- ❖ **Mobility can be implemented in other parts of the stack. (Colin)**
- ❖ **Using address to find state will add complexity when implementing mobility. (Henning)**
- ❖ **Unclear about use cases for mobility. (Colin)**

More Comments

- ❁ **Sympathetic to criticism on complexity. Looks like “next generation transport”. What is the fundamental goal of the effort? (Lixia)**