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Issues That Are Resolved and Should Be Closed

IANA evaluation response
#28 opened 2024-03-16  (Resolved in next rev)

Should UDP ExIDs be distinct from TCP ExIDs, or use a common namespace?
#29 opened 2024-03-17 (Resolved in next rev)

WGLC Comments on Frag
#30 opened 2024-04-12 (Resolved in next rev, citing possible use case)

Med: WGLC Comments on RES/REQ
#31 opened 2024-04-12 (Resolved)

GF/CMH/ZS: WGLC Comments - Use cases
#42 opened 2024-04-12 (Resolved in next rev, citing possible use case)
Issues That Are Resolved and Should Be Closed

Med: WGLC Comments on Magic Number?
#32 opened 2024-04-12 (Closed - resolved)

Tom H: WGLC comments on Section 7: Surplus area
#38 opened 2024-04-12 (Resolved in next rev)

Tom H: WGLC Additions to terminology in Section 3
#35 opened 2024-04-12 (Resolved in next rev)

Tom H: WGLC comments on Section 12: "UNSAFE options are not safe to ignore"
#40 opened 2024-04-28 (Resolved in next rev, definitions to be added)

Tom H: WGLC comments on Section 7: OCS
#37 opened 2024-04-12 (Resolved in next rev, Change "Next HDR" to "Next Header" to be consistent with RFC8200)
Issues That Are Resolved and Should Be Closed

Tom H: WGLC comments on Appendix A
#41 opened 2024-04-12 (Resolved in next rev, text to be updated)

ZS/CMH: Backwards compatibility with UDP
#43 opened 2024-04-12 (Resolved in next rev, text to be updated)

CMH: Apply "first instance only" rule to options received in fragments as well as in the surplus area
#47 opened 2024-04-21 Resolved in next rev, text to be updated

CMH: Instructions on order of option processing
#46 opened 2024-04-21 Resolved in next rev, text to be updated

CMH: Clarify that EOL indicates the end the options in the per-fragment option area just as it does in the per-datagram surplus area
#49 opened 2024-04-21 Resolved in next rev, text to be updated

CMH: Clarify that EOL indicates the end the options in the per-fragment option area just as it does in the per-datagram surplus area
#50 opened 2024-04-22 Resolved in next rev, text to be updated
Issues That Are Resolved and Should Be Closed

CMH: Clarification for FRAG Option Corner Cases
#51 opened 2024-04-22 (Resolved in next rev)

MD/CMH: Change minimum reassembled UDP datagram size from 3000 to 2926
#52 opened 2024-04-22
Suggestion: Change minimum reassembled UDP datagram size from 3000 to 2926

CMH: Simplify language stating that FRAG is not reported to the user.
#53 opened 2024-04-22
Suggestion: Accept or reject proposed change and close after WG review.

CMH: Clarify the exact meaning of MRDS size
#54 opened 2024-04-22 (Resolved in next rev)
MD/CMH: Remove misleading stray text from Section 11.6
#55 opened 2024-04-22 (Resolved in next rev, text to be updated)

Erik: Inconsistency in Security Considerations regarding not passing FRAG, NOP, and EOL to the upper layer
#56 opened 2024-04-28 (Resolved in next rev, text to be updated)

Erik: correct or remove erroneous note in Step 3 of the fragmentation procedure (Section 11.4)
#57 opened 2024-04-28 (Resolved in next rev, text to be updated)
**Issues Needing Action**

**APC**

Tom H: WGLC comments on design of APC and Auth  
#34 opened 2024-04-12  
Tom H: WGLC comments on Section 11.3: APC Title; combination of APC & OCS; and silently ignore when failing  
#39 opened 2024-04-12  
Tom H: WGLC comments on Section 11.9: Authentication  
#58 opened 2024-04-28  
Discussion: These issues, all related, editors to propose a resolution for WG

**Transit Nodes**

WGLC: Is it OK for the endpoints to send information in UDP options which can be read (only) by the transit nodes and react to it?  
#45 opened 2024-04-12  
Proposal: Accept text, and confirm this is OK.