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CRITERIA FOR STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT (CSD)

Based on IEEE 802 LMSC Operations Manuals approved 13 November 2015
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 **Title:**

IEEE Standard for [Enhanced Ultra-wideband]

# IEEE 802 criteria for standards development (CSD)

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. The CSD consists of the project process requirements, 1.1, and the 5C requirements, 1.2.

## Project process requirements

### Managed objects

Describe the plan for developing a definition of managed objects. The plan shall specify one of the following:

1. The definitions will be part of this project. Yes/No/Pick one of these options
2. The definitions will be part of a different project and provide the plan for that project or anticipated future project.
3. The definitions will not be developed and explain why such definitions are not needed.

###  Coexistence

A WG proposing a wireless project shall demonstrate coexistence through the preparation of a Coexistence Assurance (CA) document unless it is not applicable.

1. Will the WG create a CA document as part of the WG balloting process as described in Clause 13? (yes/no) Yes
2. If not, explain why the CA document is not applicable.

## 5C requirements

### Broad market potential

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall have broad market potential. At a minimum, address the following areas:

1. Broad sets of applicability.

There are many, we should elaborate a bit.

1. Multiple vendors and numerous users.

Already deployed in many devices: elaborate.

### Compatibility

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard should be in conformance with IEEE Std 802, IEEE 802.1AC, and IEEE 802.1Q. If any variances in conformance emerge, they shall be thoroughly disclosed and reviewed with IEEE 802.1 WG prior to submitting a PAR to the Sponsor.

1. Will the proposed standard comply with IEEE Std 802, IEEE Std 802.1AC and IEEE Std 802.1Q? [For 15.4, “no” because of 64-bit addressing [See 4z example]. But if we add 48-bit addressing then we could answer Yes].

b) If the answer to a) is no, supply the response from the IEEE 802.1 WG.

* + 1. Distinct Identity

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall provide evidence of a distinct identity. Identify standards and standards projects with similar scopes and for each one describe why the proposed project is substantially different.

Why we need new work and why we haven’t done this in 802 yet.

### Technical Feasibility

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall provide evidence that the project is technically feasible within the time frame of the project. At a minimum, address the following items to demonstrate technical feasibility:

1. Demonstrated system feasibility.

Can it be done? .

1. Proven similar technology via testing, modeling, simulation, etc.

What has already been done and why we think feasible to move forward

### Economic Feasibility

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall provide evidence of 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:

1. Balanced costs (infrastructure versus attached stations).

The proposed amendment enhances capabilities defined in the existing standard and does not add any significant cost to either the infrastructure or the attached stations.

1. Known cost factors.
2. The standard is built upon 802.15.4 UWB which has been widely deployed at reasonable costs.
3. Consideration of installation costs.

There are no or at most minimal additional costs associated with installation.

1. Consideration of operational costs (e.g., energy consumption).

Costs associated with operation are negligible.

1. Other areas, as appropriate.