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- Editorial updates (update terminology to RFC6622)
- Decided *against* specifying address ICVs
  - Reason: Not possible to protect against *negative* advertisement of addresses (i.e., a router not advertising addresses of a neighbor, or with a zero link quality)
  - Only limited use cases
Discussion (comment by Chris Dearlove)

- Allow for adding ICVs to RFC5444 packets (in addition to HELLO messages)?

- Answer of the nhdp-sec authors:
  - We strongly support specifying that
  - But: we prefer in another document, because:
    - Other protocols that do not use NHDP may want to use packet ICVs as well
Next steps

- WG LC?