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Abstract
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# Introduction

<...>

# Conventions used in this document

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in RFC 2119 [RFC2119].

# Background

<common starting point>

# Architecture & Design Topics

<. . .>

## Naming

<. . .>

### NDN Approach

<Design, Implementation, Rationale>

### CCN Approach

<Design, Implementation, Rationale>

### Discussion

<non-judgmental discussion of implications of design choices vis-à-vis performance, evolution constraints, etc>

## Name Discovery, Interest Refinement (eg Selectors)

## Data Referencing and Retrieval

## Cache Control

## Cache Verification

## Interest Payloads

## Packet Structure and Packet Encoding

## Link and Network Adaptation

## Fragmentation

## Forwarding / Interest Looping

## Interest Aggregation

## Data Security

## Data Digest

# Security Considerations

<. . .>

# Acknowledgements

<. . .>
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# IANA Considerations

This memo includes no request to IANA

# Conclusions

<. . .>
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1. <First Appendix>
   1. <First Header level>

<Text>

* 1. <Second Header level 1>
     1. <H2>

<Text>
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