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**Introduction**

This document contains comments regarding the scenario parameters [1] after careful review of the TGD [2]. It also provides suggestions to modify the scenario parameters of document #338r4 and/or to amend to the TGD.

In the following, statements in orange are citation from the scenario parameters document #338r4 and sentences in blue are citation from the TGD #753r14.

The comments are as follows:

1. **Use of device to device communication**

The TGD does not mention any use case using device to device communication such as M2M applications in the Use cases clause (Clause 5) [1]. We suggest to

* + 1. either amend the TGD with use cases requiring device to device communication and create a corresponding new scenario
    2. or delete the device to device type of communication from the scenarios

1. **Linear topology**

The description "For Linear Topology M = 999 (33x33), where the middle row or column has M =100"[1] is unclear. We propose the following modification:

“For linear topology M = 10000 (100 x 100), where the communication between 100 nodes of only one row or one column is considered.”

1. **Subnet merging**

We should agree on what is meant in Clause 6 of the TGD [2]:

"It should be possible to merge an independent subnet into a larger network when connectivity between them becomes available, providing both are using similar operating parameters. The merge operation should ideally take place without outside intervention. It should be possible for a network to operate as a number of independent subnets in the event of failure of parts of the network."

There are two essential parts to this paragraph:

"It should be possible to merge an independent subnet into a larger network when connectivity between them becomes available, providing both are using similar operating parameters.”

Our understanding of this statement is as depicted below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| C:\Users\Verotiana\Documents\NICT\Standardization\15.10\TGD\Module parameters\SmallPANBigPAN.png | C:\Users\Verotiana\Documents\NICT\Standardization\15.10\TGD\Module parameters\2PANs merging.png |

“It should be possible for a network to operate as a number of independent subnets in the event of failure of parts of the network.”

Here are two possible meanings of this statement:

* + 1. Several nodes in the network are able to act as the PAN coordinator. Only one of them is the PAN coordinator. In the event that that PAN coordinator (here, A) is turned off due to some reason (power failure, maintenance…), nodes that have PAN coordinator capability (here B and C) start new PANs to maintain the connectivity of network.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| C:\Users\Verotiana\Documents\NICT\Standardization\15.10\TGD\Module parameters\Original3PANCoordTopology.png | C:\Users\Verotiana\Documents\NICT\Standardization\15.10\TGD\Module parameters\2backupPANCooord.png |

* + 1. There are several PANs in a network with their respective PAN coordinators. If one of the PAN coordinators (here, A) is turned off, the nodes that were associated with A are able to join one of the other PANs left (here, coordinated by B or C).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| C:\Users\Verotiana\Documents\NICT\Standardization\15.10\TGD\Module parameters\3actingPANCoord.png | C:\Users\Verotiana\Documents\NICT\Standardization\15.10\TGD\Module parameters\2backupPANCooord.png |

Accordingly, we suggest including in the TGD at the end of Clause 6.1:

“The proposal should include a mechanism to enable routing after a PAN reconstruction”

1. **Multiple entry/exit point**

We should agree on the meaning of clause 6.18 and on the definition of entry and exit point [2]:

"Devices shall implement a method to select the most appropriate **entry/exit point** for their communications **with entities outside the network**"

Here is our understanding of those terms based on the uses cases described in clause 5 of the TGD:
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Accordingly, Clause 6.18 addresses the selection of the entry/exit point selection and not communication from an entry point to an exit point.

“It **may** be possible for the protocol to use connections external to the network between ingress and egress points as part of the route between devices within the network (backbone routing).”

As described in the last paragrah of Clause 6.18 above, communication between devices through entry(ingress) point and exit(egress) points **may** be possible through backbone routing, however this is not the primary scope of this group. If communication between devices through a backbone of entry/exit points is to be addressed in the scenarios, we recommend that it be an optional requirement as suggested by the use of “**may**” in the clause. Otherwise we suggest considering the scenarios with only a single entry/exit point.

Further, the number of entry/exit points for the upstream and downstrean scenarios of “M-1” should be replaced with “1” in document #338r4 [1].

1. **Multiple PAN communication**

There is no mention in the TGD that the routing protocol should provide routing between devices from different PANs. If this is an issue desired to be addressed, we suggest amending Clause 6.1 of the TGD after the second paragraph with:

“If the network is composed of several subnets, the proposal **should** (**may**?) provide routing between devices of different subnets”

1. **Mandatory and optional parameters**

We propose that scenario parameters in document #338r4 based on “**shall**” statements be made **mandatory** and parameters based on “**should**” and “**may**” statements be made **optional**.
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