

RFC4968, "Analysis of IPv6 Link Models for 802.16 Based Networks", August 2007

The following 1 erratum has been reported for RFC4968. Note that the list may include both verified and unverified errata records.

Errata ID: 1015

Status: Reported
Type: Editorial

Reported By: Alfred Hoenes
Date Reported: 2007-08-17

(1) Section 1 -- mis-expansion of acronym

At the bottom of page 2, Section 1 of RFC 4968 says:

```
[...]. Another method is to treat the IEEE 802.16
| MAC (Message Authentication Code) transport connections between an MS
| (Mobile Station) and BS (Base Station) as point-to-point IP links so
| that the IP protocols (e.g., ARP (Address Resolution Protocol), IPv6
| Neighbor Discovery) can be run without any problems.
```

It should say:

```
[...]. Another method is to treat the IEEE 802.16
| MAC (Media Access Control) transport connections between an MS
| (Mobile Station) and BS (Base Station) as point-to-point IP links so
| that the IP protocols (e.g., ARP (Address Resolution Protocol), IPv6
| Neighbor Discovery) can be run without any problems.
```

(2) Section 3.1 -- typo/grammar

The first paragraph of Section 3.1 says, at the bottom of page 3:

```
v
| [...] The following figures
| illustrates a high-level view of this link model wherein [...]
```

It should say:

```
| [...] The following figures
| illustrate a high-level view of this link model wherein [...]
```

(3) missing articles

(3a)

The RFC text regularly uses "to an AR", "via the AR", etc. It also should not omit the article 'the' in "of the AR" and in other context.

For instance:

- Section 3.1, 1st paragraph (page 5), 7th line:
"support of AR" --> "support of the AR"
- Section 3.1.4.2 (page 6), 2nd line:
"backend process in AR" --> "backend process in the AR"
- Section 3.1.4.4 (page 6), 3rd line:
"the MS and AR" --> "the MS and the AR"

(3b)

Similar inconsistent use/non-use of the article occurs for "BS". For instance,

- Section 3.3.4.6 (page 11), 2nd line:
"implemented in BS" --> "implemented in the BS"
- Section 4, first paragraph on page 12, last line:
"sends a single RA to BS" --> "sends a single RA to the BS"
- Section 4, last paragraph (page 12), 2nd line:
"sent by the AR to BS" --> "sent by the AR to the BS"

(3c)

Finally, I found inconsistent use of the article for "Ethernet CS" in the first paragraph of Section 7, on page 13. The RFC says:

```
Ethernet-Like Link models would be used when the deployment requires
| the use of Ethernet CS, as this is the only model being proposed for
| the Ethernet CS and running IPv6 over Ethernet is well understood.
```

It should say:

```
Ethernet-Like Link models would be used when the deployment requires
| the use of the Ethernet CS, as this is the only model being proposed
| for the Ethernet CS and running IPv6 over Ethernet is well
| understood.
```

(4) grammar / word omission

On page 9, Section 3.2.3.6 contains the bullet:

- | 1. Each MS is assigned a separate VLAN when IEEE 802.1X [12] or each MS must have an L2 tunnel to the AR to aggregate all the connections to the MS and present these set of connections as an interface to the IPv6 layer.

This sentence does not parse. Perhaps, it should say:

- | 1. Each MS is assigned a separate VLAN when IEEE 802.1X [12] is used or each MS must have an L2 tunnel to the AR to aggregate all the connections to the MS and present this set of connections as an interface to the IPv6 layer.

(5) extraneous word

The last sentence of Section 3.3.4.2 (on page 11) says:

```
Nevertheless, in case of bridging, direct inter-MSs communication may
| not be not allowed due to restrictions from the service providers.
| ^^^^^^^^^
```

It should say:

```
Nevertheless, in case of bridging, direct inter-MSs communication may
| not be allowed due to restrictions from the service providers.
| ^^^^^
```

(6) References

In Section 11.2, in the entries [4] and [5], a space character should have been inserted after "Part 16:" .
Do these two documents really have the same title ?

Search for [errata for other RFCs](#).