

Comment Resolution for Section 4 (Clause 11, MAC Fairness) of P802.17/D0.1

Anoop Ghanwani (anoop@lanterncom.com)
Necdet Uzun (nuzun@cisco.com)

Statistics

- Received: 42
 - Editorial: 7
 - Technical, Binding: 19
 - Technical, Non-binding: 16
- Resolved: 30
 - Accepted: 3
 - Accepted Modified: 22
 - Accepted Duplicate: 4
 - Rejected: 1
- Unresolved: 12
 - Dependent on another section: 6
 - Comment for a different section: 3
 - Blanket comment: 1
 - Commenter not present: 1 (needed clarification)
 - Contribution invited: 1

Accepted/Accepted-Modified Comments – Editorial

- 7 editorial comments accepted
- 1 deferred to the protection group
 - keepalive vs keepAlive

Accepted Comments – Technical, Non-binding

- #339: Change "The MFE does not need to understand the ring topology, however it utilizes ..." to "The MFE utilizes ...".

Accepted-Modified Comments – Technical, Binding

- #265: Frame types should be “named”
- #342, 431: Definition of the access delay timer
- #402: TTL setting for fairness messages
- #433: Remove length field from fairness frame
- #95: Protection text moved to editor’s note
- #126, #401: Missing stuff from Darwin’s Clause 11 – will be added to either Clause 6 or 11
- #127: Editorial license to add scope, objectives, etc.
- #432, #128, #347: Necdet to provide details of fairness counters, resolution, normalization, etc.
- #129: Remove use of term “Basic RPR-fa”; add text to justify need for Type 1 and Type 2 messages

Accepted-Modified Comments – Technical, Non-binding

- #131, 345, 583: Need to move the discussion on **threshold settings** to an informative annex
 - Move this discussion to an informative annex/section and add a reference to that annex for the setting of these thresholds
- #346: LPTB high threshold setting
 - Specify it to be (buffer size – at least 1 MTU) so that an incoming packet from the transit path cannot possibly overflow the transit buffer
- #286: There is no fairness reference model (precise objective for a fairness algorithm under idealized settings)
 - David James and Ed Knightly to work together to generate some text for possible inclusion to an informative section or annex of the draft
- #582, 584: Against editors comment to move some paragraphs to informative annex
 - Will leave the normative text following the note as is
- #586: the type values and the names do not match for fairness messages
 - Call it Type A and Type B
- #590: Length field is optional and set to zero for Type 1 and 2
 - Remove the description of the length field and leave the bits as reserved

Rejected Comments

- #285: Request for liberalization of fairness algorithm
 - Request too vague
- Technical, non-binding

Unresolved Comments – Dependent on MAC Data Path

- #90, #129, #341, #343, #344, #589
- Better definition of reserved rate
- Single vs. dual transit buffer
- Allowing loss on the ring during congestion
 - Issue to be summarized in an editor's note in the next draft

Unresolved Comments – For the Protection Section

- #188, #348, #349
- Discussion of the use of fairness messages for protection does not belong in the fairness section
- The text will be moved to an editors note marked for future deletion
- The comments will be addressed by the protection section

Unresolved Comments – Other

- #340: Needed clarification, commenter not available
- #227: Blanket comment
 - Covered too much with general statements
- #350: Contribution Invited
 - How are rates calculated?
 - Stein Gjessing to prepare a contribution based on the pseudo-code for possible inclusion in the draft