## **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. Almostlike-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)