```
Tentative Agenda for the Dagstuhl Perspectives Workshop 09102
on Naming and Addressing in the Future Internet
----------------------------------------------------------------------

Updated on February 21, 2009


MONDAY

9:00 - 10:20  Welcome, administrative, introduction

   Workshop arrangements, Christian Vogt (15 min)
   Personal introductions, all (40 min)
   Workshop scope and goals, Scott Brim (25 min)

10:20 - 10:35  Coffee

10:35 - 12:15  Invited presentations, part 1

   What is the problem?  Differing views.  Lixia Zhang (40 min)
   What should a name describe?  Leslie Daigle (40 min)
   Discussion (20 min)

12:15 - 13:30  Lunch

13:30 - 15:00  Invited presentations, part 2

   Discussion continues (30 min)
   Impacts of routing-scalability-related requirements for
      naming/addressing separation, Tony Li (30 min)
   Infrastructure implications of a naming and addressing, TBD (30 min)

15:00 - 15:15  Coffee

15:15 - 17:45  Invited presentations, part 3

   Discussion, all (60 min)
   Separating naming and addressing -- a solution space taxonomy,
      Christian Vogt (30 min)

18:00  Dinner


TUESDAY

9:00 - 10:00  Lightning talks

   Opportunity to give 5-10 min lightning talks, based on
   Monday's discussions, new ideas, etc.

10:00 - 10:30  Selection of break-out sessions

   Organize everyone into three or four break-out sessions.

   On Monday evening everyone should think about what the most
   interesting topics for break-out sessions are.  The organizers have
   the default proposal below, but this can be revised if there is an
   interest for other topics.

10:30 - 10:45 Coffee
```

10:45- 12:15   Break-out sessions

- Implications of different design alternatives

  Different naming and addressing separation approaches cause different
  impacts for support of existing nodes, application behavior,
  deployment, security, and other aspects. The result of this break out
  session will be an overall view of the different tradeoffs and
  implications.

- Requirements for name-to-address mapping systems

  Separating naming and addressing may necessitat a new system that maps
  names onto the corresponding addresses. The requirements for such a
  mapping system are important in the design of the system. What are the
  requirements in terms of lookup latency and security? How can mapping
  failures be efficiently detected, and how can failures be rapidly
  recovered from? Finally, given that a separation between naming and
  addressing is most useful with a dynamic mapping: Which update
  frequency and update latency should be supported?

- Pros and cons of application transparency

  Many proposed solutions for separating naming and addressing seek to
  not require support or awareness by applications, because such
  application transparency makes it easier to deploy a proposed
  solution. On the other hand, application transparency may have design
  implications that reduce the incentives to deploy a solution, such as
  performance penalties or extra complexity. What are the costs of
  application transparency, and are those worthwhile? Could
  transparency be made optional?

12:15 - 13:30   Lunch

13:30 - 15:00   Break-out sessions (continued)

15:00 - 15:15   Coffee

15:15 - 17:45   Break-out sessions (continued)

18:00   Dinner

WEDNESDAY

9:00 - 10:30   Plenary discussion

   Presentation of results from break-out session, session leaders
       (20 min per session)

10:30 - 10:45 Coffee

10:45 - 12:15   Plenary discussion (continued)

   Summary of preliminary conclusions
   Continued plenary discussion about results from break-out sessions

12:15 - 13:30   Lunch

```
13:30 - 16:00   Conclusion

   Identification of workshop conclusions
   Organization of follow-up work, such as workshop manifest

16:00   End of workshop
```