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##### This submission present proposed resolution for CID 2543. The proposed changes are based on REVmd/D2.3.

##### Revision history:

##### R0 – initial version

R1 – Updated per the discussion on August 2, 2019.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CID | Clause | Page | Line | Comment | Proposed Change |
| 2543 | 11.22.14 | 2361 | 43 | ARP as defined in RFC 826 defines requests and replies, all lowercase (ARP Probes as defined in RFC 5227 do get an uppercase P though) | At the referenced location change "When the IPv4 address being resolved in theARP request packet (IETF RFC 826) is used by a non-AP STA currently associated to the BSS, the proxyARP service shall respond on behalf of the STA to an ARP request (IETF RFC 925) or an ARP Probe (IETFRFC 5227).When an AP receives an ARP Request from one associated STA" to " When the IPv4 address being resolved in anARP request (IETF RFC 826) or probed in an ARP Probe (IETFRFC 5227) is used by a non-AP STA currently associated to the BSS, the proxyARP service shall respond on behalf of the STA.When an AP receives an ARP request from an associated STA" |

***Discussion:***



The commenter’s suggested text is as follows (i.e., drop the reference IETF RFC 925 and move the ARP probe to the “When” statement):

*When the IPv4 address being resolved in an ARP request (IETF RFC 826) or probed in an ARP Probe (IETF RFC 5227) is used by a non-AP STA currently associated to the BSS, the proxy ARP service shall respond on behalf of the STA.*

The following was discussed on the February 8th teleconference call:

*1.1.1 CID 2543 (EDITOR2)*

*1.1.1.1 Review Comment*

*1.1.1.2 Discussion on the ARP request process.*

*1.1.1.3 The orginal sentence may be better, but the reference and capitalization may need to be corrected.*

*1.1.1.4 More discussion may need to be done offline and bring back a new proposal.*

Update as of August 1:

* IETF RFC 925 is related to the use of “transparent subnets” supported by a multi-LAN extension of the ARP. ARP is used extensively in this memo but neither request nor reply is defined.
* ARP is defined in IETF RFC 826.

***Proposed resolution:***

Revised

At 2382.43 at D2.3, replace

“When the IPv4 address being resolved in the ARP request packet (IETF RFC 826) is used by a non-AP STA currently associated to the BSS, the proxy ARP service shall respond on behalf of the STA to an ARP request (IETF RFC 925) or an ARP Probe (IETF RFC 5227). <paragraph break> When an AP receives an ARP Request from one associated STA …”

with

“When the IPv4 address being resolved in the ARP request ~~packet~~ (IETF RFC 826) is used by a non-AP STA currently associated to the BSS, the proxy ARP service shall respond on behalf of the STA to an ARP request ~~(IETF RFC 925)~~ or an ARP ~~P~~probe (IETF RFC 5227). <paragraph break> When an AP receives an ARP ~~R~~request from ~~one~~ an associated STA …”

At 2382.52, replace “the ARP Response packet” with “the ARP response packet”.

At 153.24 at D2.3, delete the normative reference “IETF RFC 925, Multi-LAN Address Resolution, J. Postel, Oct. 1984”.