

CCNx draft updates

April 2016 @ IETF 95

draft-mosko-icnrg-ccnxsemantics-02

draft-mosko-icnrg-ccnxmessages-02

Review document diffs

- <https://tools.ietf.org/rfcdiff?url2=draft-irtf-icnrg-ccnxsemantics-02.txt>
- <https://tools.ietf.org/rfcdiff?url2=draft-irtf-icnrg-ccnxmessages-02.txt>

Ravi's Questions

1. Should nameless objects be in the specs.
2. Should there be an explicit separation of locator names from identifier names.
3. How does this all affect the forwarding label draft.
4. Introduce a 3rd message type as NamelessContentObject in addition to a (Named)ContentObject.

ccnx:/name=done