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Abstract

The submission presents suggested comment resolutions for comments 50 and 51

CID 50

**Comment (Cls. 11.47.3.3; P2054L53):**

"... an IP address assignment procedure (using mechanisms that are out of scope)..." Enough already of the 'out of scope', how many times do we need to say this AND this indicates that the STA could use a mechanism that is in scope? Just delete it.

**Proposed Resolution by commenter:**

Delete" (using mechanisms that are out of scope)" also at P2055L18

**Discussion**:

TGai has defined a new mechanism for IP address assignment, which during association or within an “IP address request timeout period” after association using FILS Container frame, will assign an IP address to the STA. This newly defined mechanism is “in scope of the specification”, while the existing IP address assignment mechanisms (eg, DHCP) are called “outside the scope of this specification”.

There is a race condition, when the STA does not receive an IP address assignment using the mechanism defined in this specification within the time specified and resorts to an out of scope mechanism to request an IP address; after IP address has been requested using the out of scope mechanism, the STA will receive an IP address in a FILS Container frame, which it shall discard. The sentence on line 53-56 tries to describe this race condition.

**Suggested Resolution**:

The “using the mechanisms that are outside the scope” is needed as otherwise it would be ambiguous which IP address assignment mechanism the text refers to. Suggest the following resolution:

If an STA has initiated an IP address assignment procedure ~~(~~using mechanisms that are out of scope of this specification~~)~~, due to the expiry of the timeout period, and subsequently receives an FILS container frame containing an IP assignment, it shall discard the IP addressassignment received through the FILS container frame.

Note, the same change has to be implemented on P2055L18.

CID 51

**Comment (Cls. 11.47.3.3; P2055L23):**

"If a non-AP STA determines a duplicate IP address assignment (through means that are out of scope for this standard), it may discard the assigned IP address and request a new IP address."

Again seems to say that a STA may use means that are in the standard. Is it so difficult to notice a duplicate? Either make it clear that the standard does not describe how to determine a duplicate or just delete the phrase.

**Proposed Resolution by commenter:**

Either replace cited with "If a non-AP STA determines a duplicate IP address assignment (method of determination is out of scope for this standard)," or delete "(through means that are out of scope for this standard),"

**Discussion:**

This specification does not define a mechanism for detecting duplicate IP address assignment.

Also, there are IETF RFCs and OS best practices on how to deal with duplicate IP addresses. Simply discarding the IP address may not be enough and “request a new IP address” is not specific enough on which mechanism the STA should use, the one defined in this specification or the conventional ones.

**Suggested Resolution:**

Remove the sentence, upper layers will know how to deal with IP conflict situations.