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1. **Comments CID 177, 188, 215, R77, R78, R188, R191, R197**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CID** | **Commenter** | **Page** | **Clause** | **Line** | **Comment** | **Proposed change** |
| 177 | Noriyuki Sato | 22 | 5.2.1 | 39 | The detail of definition of 'Priority' seen in Table 2 on p.22, Table 4 on p.24, Figure 38 on p.58 is not defined. Is it treat as bit-wise, or byte-wise? Is the less value means high prior or low prior? | Add the definition of priority so that a device can manage it. |
| 188 | Don Sturek | 23 | 5.2.1 | 34 | See also p. 25 lines 33 and 39. While multiple metrics can be used in a single network, routing HAS to consider only a single consistent metric between all devices in the routing path. It does not make sense to have different metrics between routing devices and then attempt to choose an optimal path since the routing weight between the devices would differ. Either section 5.2.2 is not writen cleearly (and the use of single metric at a time is what is being done) or else A LOT more explanation is needed on how different metrics can used between differnet devices in the network and then somehow optimized into a single route. | Either an explanation is needed or else this is some sort of breakthrough in mesh routing that needs a lot of explanatory text. |
| 215 | Verotiana Rabarijaona | 25 | 5.2.2 | 35 | Explain the use fo the Priority field if more than 1 metric is used | See comment |
| R77 | Charlie Perkins | 23 | 5.2.1 | 34 | "Number of metrics in use in the L2R mesh tree" | How does this work? (xref needed) |
| R78 | Charlie Perkins | 23 | 5.2.1 | 34 | "Number of metrics in use in the L2R mesh tree" | Is zero allowed? If not, valid range is 0x01 - 0x07 |
| R188 | Charlie Perkins | 58 | 6.2.2.10 | 3 | Zero seems to be allowable as Number PQMs | Insert text to disallow |
| R191 | Charlie Perkins | 58 | 6.2.2.10 | 26 | Are all routes in mesh constrained to use the same metric? | Insert clarifying text |
| R197 | Charlie Perkins | 58 | 6.2.2.10 | 54 | Is the priority field associated with the message or the metric? | Reword "the Priority field is ignored" if with the metric. |

**Resolution: AiP**

Remove the concept of priority