

## Notes on 5C scope discussion

This document contains a collection of notes taken during the meeting and does not necessarily reflect the consensus or agreement of IEEE 802 LMSC or any individual at the meeting.

# 5C mission statement

- Is
  - A project contract within the WG and with the EC
  - Outside scrutiny to provide discipline to the WGs
  - Provide a hurdle that promotes good project selection/definition
  - *Maintain unique IEEE 802 identity*
  - Mandate compatibility of 802 standards
  - Provide a description of the project that is more detailed and relevant than the PAR form allows.
  - Quantify the feasibility of the proposed project.
  - Show that there is a market demand for the proposed standard/act as a market requirements document.
  - ½ page description of the project for 802
  - Shows a unique identity for the proposed project.
  - Acts as a consensus building activity
  - Is a business plan and tells the stakeholders why they should invest in this project
- Is not
  - Not a mechanism for developing the standard

# More ideas

- What content of the 5C would be beneficial to the TF/TG vs. beneficial to the EC. It should primarily benefit the TF/TG in the process of completing the project.
- Need some form of review during the project.
- If we do a second review, should have tools to find them for review.
- The strict process for PARs has made the process more tame.
- 5C was imposed for a particular reason some time ago. Do we have a particular problem that we are trying to solve and have we measured its impact.
- When we submit to NesCom, we have the cleanest submissions and have the fewest problems.
- ISO has a similar document for a new project. Kraemer will send a copy to Gilb (for reference) and post to mentor

# Comments

- Process is not working the way intended, it is a fire and forget process from some WGs
- They are simple hurdle to be crossed, is that what we want?
- What is the expectation regarding the level of review? Should there be a detailed review by others?
  - Will the EC do a detailed review?
  - Will other WGs do a detailed review?
  - Most of the review needs to happen in the WG, an 802 wide enforcement will improve this
- Two sides, compatibility and distinct identity are EC related, the other 3 tend to be more WG focused. Should it be split?
- Should not be a bureaucratic mess, should be easy to fill out.
- Should not be used to “beat” up a group at the end of the process
- Outside of IEEE 802, it is viewed well.
- Part of the project documentation to make sure that the project stays within its EC scope.

# When is 5C used?

- A project contract requires a check point prior to RevCom?
- During PAR approval process
  - Does it state what the project will do?
  - Does it state what is in the PAR?
  - Does it state what will be in the standard?
- As part of Sponsor ballot approval process? (checkbox?)
- Before forwarding to RevCom?
- The WG voters are the best to decide if the 5C has been met.
- Audit 5C closely occasionally, acts as the check. Done at the front end and during the project.

# Process going forward

- Write “mission statement” for 5C
  - Straw poll EC, comment period, intent is to be part of OM rev.
- Determine content of 5C and new name
  - List of items to be included
  - EC straw poll
  - Adequate WG review
- Write individual questions in a clear, consistent manner.
  - EC vote to approve changes to the OM
- Get consensus on the process for 5C maintenance and approval
  - Straw poll ideas
  - Develop firm text.

# Output

- “mission statement” for 5C that is added to OM
- A 5C that is written in a clear, consistent manner that includes guidance for the responses and achieves consensus approval of the EC
- An updated process for 5C approval/maintenance
- A document (text, presentation, etc.) that is available as a template to respond to the 5C