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 necessitate 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