# Comment Resolution for Section 4 – Clause 9, MAC Fairness of P802.17/D0.2

Anoop Ghanwani, Section Editor
(anoop@lanterncom.com)

Necdet Uzun, Technical Editor
(nuzun@cisco.com)

# Statistics

| | Technical, Binding | Technical, Non-binding | Editorial | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Accepted | 5 | 4 | 3 | 12 |
| Accepted-Modified | 29 | 32 | 11 | 72 |
| Accepted-Duplicate | 4 | 9 | 3 | 16 |
| Accepted Clarify | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Rejected | 4 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| Rejected-Duplicate | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Withdrawn | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| Defer to WG | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| Editor to resolve | 0 | 0 | 30 | 30 |
| Total | 49 | 52 | 47 | 148 |

# Summary of Accepted Comments

- Use of TTL for client traffic policing
  - OK to use to determine where the choke point is (TTL_to_congestion)
  - Requiring it from client for policing is not OK, implementation specific: remove from the draft

- Clarification/confusion about fairness
  - Necdet with feedback from other interested people to address the following using state machines and tables
    - State machine for congestion detection
    - State machine for fairness message generation (Aggressive mode: Necdet; Conservative mode: Harry & Anoop)
    - State machine to describe behavior on receipt of fairness messages
    - Description of timers and counters
  - The above text will be made available to the group for review before the end of the next comment period
  - A comment will be submitted for inclusion in the next draft

# Summary of Accepted Comments (2)

- Lost fairness message, HoL delay timers
- Removed a figure 9-3 (belongs to clause 6)
- Dealing with (and generation of) null fairness messages
- Congestion thresholds clarified
- Control value normalization clarified
- Queue sizing clarified
- Editors note (Darwin sec.11) moved to normative

# Comments Deferred for Resolution by WG

- #163
  - Add example for an alternate method to calculate the fair rate

- #183, #308
  - Why is the fairness packet format different from all the other packets?

- #457
  - Add a description of RIAS to the annex on implementation guidelines

# Rejected Comments

- #166, #845, #848, #880
  - Propagation of NULL should not be *required,* otherwise congestion avoidance cannot be implemented; need to specify how fairness would work if "fair rates" are computed and sent even when a node is not congested
  - Provide a suggested remedy
- #727
  - Comment asking for explanation about how the FCU utilizes topology information
  - Concern is not valid
- #798
  - Not a good idea to use TTL for spatial reuse policing
  - Provide a suggested remedy
- #838
  - Access delay timer is larger than the decay interval
  - Commenter's concern is not valid
- #889
  - Use per-destination weights at each source (2N weights total)
  - Suggested remedy is not detailed enough

# Withdrawn Comments

- 4 comments withdrawn by the commenter

- No objections from the fairness comment resolution ad-hoc

# Comments to be Resolved by Editor

- Editor requested license to resolve 30 editorial comments
- License was granted by the fairness section comment resolution ad-hoc