

Network Overlay

IETF MOPS WG

IETF 125

Shenzhen, China

March 16th, 2026

Authors:

Glenn Deen, Comcast NBCUniversal

Sanjay Mishra, Verizon

Network Overlay Impacts to Streaming Video

draft-ietf-mops-network-overlay-impacts-03

Status

[IESG evaluation record](#)

[IESG writeups](#)

[Email expansions](#)

[History](#)

Versions:

[00](#) [01](#) [02](#) [03](#)

draft-deen-mops-network-overlay-impacts

draft-ietf-mops-network-overlay-impacts



Document

Type

Active Internet-Draft ([mops WG](#))

Authors

[Glenn Deen](#) ✉, [Sanjay Mishra](#) ✉

Last updated

2025-10-20

Replaces

[Edit](#) [draft-deen-mops-network-overlay-impacts](#)

RFC stream

Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)

Review by David Schinazi on Network Overlay -03

Schinazi High-Level Feedback

- Strengths
 - Effectively captures real-world challenges privacy-enhancing technologies (PETs) pose to video streaming.
- Gap: Lacks a clear Call to Action
 - What should video operators change in their architecture?
 - What should PET designers do differently?
 - Current state feels like "identifying issues without a path forward."

Schinazi Privacy & API Considerations

- **Transparency:** Overlays are unlikely to "self-report" existence to applications
 - **Reasoning:** Prevents malicious apps from forcing users to disable privacy tools to enable tracking.
 - **Implication:** API surfaces must be designed for the "worst-offender" application.
- **VPN vs. Overlay Dichotomy:** Disagree with the current distinction
 - VPNs are a subset of network overlays, not a separate entity.
 - **Impacts are universal:** Whether using IPsec, MASQUE (RFC 9484), or QUIC-based tunnels, the performance hits (MTU reduction) remain similar.
 - **Focus on:** How these technologies behave rather than trying to categorize them differently, as the advice for mitigating their impact would be the same for both.

Schinazi Recommendations

- **For Streaming Operators:**
 - Encourage packet encryption to prevent intermediaries from interfering with traffic (beyond simple dropping).
- **A Reference:**
 - Align with RFC 9419 and draft-thomson-tmi regarding transport middlebox interference.
- You have a typo
 - s/RFC7264/RFC7624/

Next Steps?

- -04 version will include additional diagrams
- We will incorporate David's input
- Others – We'd like to hear your views
- Maybe WGLC in Vienna?

Thank you