Overview of proposed 5C changes

Rationale/Goals

- The 5C has not been updated in a long time.

- It covers two areas
  - Criteria for starting a project
  - Ongoing requirements during project development
    - i.e., coexistence and managed objects

- The goal is to
  - update the 5C
  - Better document ongoing requirements

Overview of changes

- Change overall name to "Criteria for Standards Development" (CSD)
  - Contains 5C
  - Contains project process requirements
- Add requirement for review prior to Sponsor ballot and submission to NesCom
  - Balloter, WG and Sponsor all review.

Outline of revised CSD

- 14.1 Project Process Requirements
  - 14.1.1 Managed Objects
  - 14.1.2 Coexistence
- 14.2 5C Requirements
  - 14.2.1 Broad market potential
  - 14.2.2 Compatibility
  - 14.2.3 Distinct Identity
  - 14.2.4 Technical feasibility
  - 14.2.5 Economic Feasibility

Purpose statement for CSD

- New descriptive text in the beginning of clause 14:

  – The CSD documents an agreement between the WG and the Sponsor that provides a description of the project and the Sponsor's requirements more detailed than required in the PAR.

Change 1: Approval of CSD

Add the following text to OM 10.2:

The CSD shall be reviewed and approved by each balloter, WG and the Sponsor as part of the approval process for the following:

- Forwarding the PAR to NesCom
- Forwarding the draft to Sponsor ballot
- Forwarding the draft to RevCom

Sponsor approval of changes to the CSD after its initial approval may occur at plenary sessions or by electronic ballot between sessions.

A project uses the same CSD requirements for the review process throughout the life of the project, even if the CSD is subsequently modified in the IEEE 802 LMSC Operations Manual.

CSDs for PARs that were approved prior to July 2014 are exempt from the requirement for review prior to Sponsor ballot and submission to RevCom.

Rationale for Change 1

- Reviewed and approved by:
  - Balloter: Voting no on draft because CSD is not up to date is a valid comment.
  - WG and Sponsor: Now take votes prior to Sponsor ballot and submission to RevCom

- Grandfather current projects, new projects follow this process.

- Keep same CSD format and requirements throughout the life of the project.

Change 2: Managed Objects

- Delete from previous OM
  - Approval of the PAR by the EC is contingent on inclusion of accepted responses describing how the proposed PAR meets the CSD ~~five criteria and a work plan for the development of managed object definitions, either as part of the PAR or as a part of an additional PAR~~.

- Add to new OM clause
  - 14.1.1 Managed objects
  - Describe the plan for developing a definition of managed objects. The plan shall specify one of the following:
    - a) The definitions will be part of this project.
    - b) The definitions will be part of a different project and provide details of that project.
    - c) The definitions will not be developed and explain why such definitions are not needed.

Change 3: Coexistence

- Text in previous OM
  - 10.5.4.1 Coexistence of IEEE 802 LMSC wireless standards specifying devices for unlicensed operation
  - A WG proposing a wireless project is required to demonstrate coexistence through the preparation of a Coexistence Assurance (CA) document unless it is not applicable.
    - The WG will create a CA document as part of the WG balloting process.
    - If the WG elects not to create a CA document, it will explain to the Sponsor the reason the CA document is not applicable.
- In new OM clause
  - 14.1.2 Coexistence
  - A WG proposing a wireless project is required to demonstrate coexistence through the preparation of a Coexistence Assurance (CA) document unless it is not applicable.
    - a) Will the WG create a CA document as part of the WG balloting process? (yes/no)
    - b) If not, explain why the CA document is not applicable.

Change 4: Broad market potential

- Text in previous OM
  - 10.5.1 Broad market potential
  - A standards project authorized by IEEE 802 LMSC shall have a broad market potential. Specifically, it shall have the potential for:
    - a) Broad sets of applicability.
    - b) Multiple vendors and numerous users..
- In new OM clause
  - 14.2.1 Broad market potential
  - Indicate why this project has broad market potential. At a minimum, address the following areas:
    - a) Broad sets of applicability.
    - b) Multiple vendors and numerous users.

Change 4: Broad market potential

- Text in previous OM
  - 10.5.1 Broad market potential
  - A standards project authorized by IEEE 802 LMSC shall have a broad market potential. Specifically, it shall have the potential for:
    - a) Broad sets of applicability.
    - b) Multiple vendors and numerous users..
- In new OM clause
  - 14.2.1 Broad market potential
  - Indicate why this project has broad market potential. At a minimum, address the following areas:
    - a) Broad sets of applicability.
    - b) Multiple vendors and numerous users.

Change 5: Compatibility

~~IEEE 802 LMSC defines a family of standards.~~ All <u>IEEE 802</u> standards should be in conformance ~~:~~ <u>with</u> IEEE Std 802, IEEE 802.1D, and IEEE 802.1Q. If any variances in conformance emerge, they shall be thoroughly disclosed and reviewed with IEEE 802.1 WG <u>prior to submitting a PAR to the Sponsor</u>. ~~In order to demonstrate compatibility with this criterion, the Five Criteria statement must answer the following questions.~~

a) ~~Does the PAR mandate that the~~ <u>Will the proposed</u> standard ~~shall~~ comply with IEEE Std 802, IEEE Std 802.1D and IEEE Std 802.1Q?

b) ~~If not, how will the WG ensure that the resulting draft standard is compliant, or if not, receives appropriate review from the IEEE 802.1 WG?~~ <u>If the answer to a) is no, supply the response from the IEEE 802.1 Working Group.</u>

<u>In the case of an amendment or revision to an existing standard for which it has previously determined that compliance with the above 802.1 standards is not possible or is otherwise has been accepted, the review and response above is not required and it shall be so noted when submitting the PAR to the sponsor.</u>

Change 6: Distinct identity

- Previous OM
  - 10.5.3 Distinct identity
    - Each IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall have a distinct identity. To achieve this, each authorized project shall be:
      - c) Substantially different from other IEEE 802 LMSC standards.
      - d) One unique solution per problem (not two solutions to a problem).
      - e) Easy for the document reader to select the relevant specification.

- New OM
  - 14.2.3 Distinct Identity
    - Each IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall have a distinct identity. Identify standards and standards projects with similar scopes and for each one describe why the proposed project is substantially different.

Change 7: Technical feasibility

- Previous OM
  - 10.5.4 Technical feasibility
    - For a project to be authorized, it shall be able to show its technical feasibility. At a minimum, the proposed project shall show:
      - a) Demonstrated system feasibility.
      - b) Proven technology, reasonable testing.
      - c) Confidence in reliability.
- New OM
  - 14.2.4 Technical Feasibility
    - At a minimum, address the following items to demonstrate technical feasibility:
      - a) Demonstrated system feasibility.
      - b) Proven similar technology via testing, modeling, simulation, etc.

Change 8: Economic Feasibility

- Previous OM
  - 10.5.5 Economic feasibility
    - For a project to be authorized, it shall be able to show economic feasibility (so far as can reasonably be estimated) for its intended applications. At a minimum, the proposed project shall show:
      - a) Known cost factors, reliable data.
      - b) Reasonable cost for performance.
      - c) Consideration of installation costs.
- New OM
  - 14.2.5 Economic Feasibility
    - Demonstrate, as far as can reasonably be estimated, the economic feasibility of the proposed project for its intended applications. Among the areas that may be addressed in the cost for performance analysis are the following:
      - a) Balanced costs (infrastructure versus attached stations).
      - b) Known cost factors.
      - c) Consideration of installation costs.
      - d) Other areas, as appropriate.

Backup

Comments on 5C

- CSD approval only at Plenary?

- Grandfather clause (existing projects)

- Protect existing projects and work in progress, i.e., 5C in force when project is approved is the one to which they answer throughout the project?

- Provide template for content

- CSD is filed

- 5C during balloting? When is it applicable

- Is maintaining 5C term valuable, hold email straw poll.

- How are comments processed? How is it done in the balloting process WG and Sponsor? Logistics issues?

- How is the agreement agreed to? A CSD or the CSD?

Comments on 5C (cont.)

- PARs are not approved during telecom, should CSD update be allowed during telecom?

- Set of web based tools with formality. Submit through a form. Can we get a NesCom like tool?

- 5C in front matter of WG ballot?

- Table of what needs to be submitted at each step (Chair's guideline?)