

## Bip - Bug #192

### using "hide ping pong event" in mIRC doesn't work with bip

2011-02-09 19:10 - Pierre-Louis Bonicoli

<b>Status:</b> Feedback	<b>Start date:</b> 2011-02-09
<b>Priority:</b> Low	<b>Due date:</b>
<b>Assignee:</b>	<b>% Done:</b> 0%
<b>Category:</b>	<b>Estimated time:</b> 0:00 hour
<b>Target version:</b>	<b>Branch:</b>
<b>Patch Available:</b> No	<b>Security:</b> No
<b>Found in Versions:</b>	<b>Help Needed:</b> No
<b>Confirmed:</b> No	
<b>Description</b> Reported by DoDzy, thank to him !  i still get [10:35] * PONG from oftc < it used to work when i was using psybnc nvm, after all it is my client misbehaving "If mIRC sends a PING with a parameter, it expects a PONG response with that parameter. This is meant to be standard PING/PONG behaviour. If your bouncer is intercepting the message and is not replying correctly, then mIRC will not work."	
<b>Related issues:</b> Has duplicate Bip - Bug #355: Invalid PONG response <b>New</b> <b>2014-11-07</b>	

## History

### #1 - 2011-02-16 00:01 - Hjalmar Gylfason

If mIRC sends a PING with a parameter, it expects a PONG response with that parameter. This is meant to be standard PING/PONG behaviour. If your bouncer is intercepting the message and is not replying correctly, then mIRC will not work.

your text was missing some words :P

source: [http://trout.snt.utwente.nl/ubbthreads/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=151796&site\\_id=1#Post144201](http://trout.snt.utwente.nl/ubbthreads/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=151796&site_id=1#Post144201)

### #2 - 2011-04-12 02:03 - Pierre-Louis Bonicoli

- Target version changed from 0.8.8 to 0.8.9

### #3 - 2011-06-17 15:23 - Arnaud Cornet

That's what bip replies as far as I can see:

```
<telnet>
PING toto
:servername PONG toto
</telnet>
```

I wonder what mirc expects here. maybe the :servername makes it unhappy. Any idea on how to know?

#### #4 - 2011-12-20 02:10 - Pierre-Louis Bonicoli

- Assignee deleted (Pierre-Louis Bonicoli)

#### #5 - 2013-10-18 18:05 - Marc Dequènes

- Status changed from New to Feedback

- Priority changed from Normal to Low

- Target version deleted (0.8.9)

- Help Needed set to No

More info is needed. Currently it doesn't seem bip is behaving badly.

#### #6 - 2014-01-10 14:59 - vitok vitok

Arnaud Cornet wrote:

That's what bip replies as far as I can see:

```
<telnet>
PING toto
:servername PONG toto
</telnet>
```

I wonder what mirc expects here. maybe the :servername makes it unhappy. Any idea on how to know?

```
<< PING LAG130951
>> :servername PONG servername :LAG130951
```

here's the answer the irc client (mIRC and konversation) expects.

it's answer from raw debug mode of konversation on the normal irc server.

but bip answer is

```
<< PING LAG130714
>> :servername PONG LAG130714
```

and client dos not recognizes the answer. konversation in this instance reconnect after 3 min.

**#7 - 2014-11-07 22:20 - Marc Dequènes**

*- Has duplicate Bug #355: Invalid PONG response added*