

# Responses to comments received on new TG process

# Comments from 802.11

Concern:

Not seen large numbers interested in attending 802.24

If we are creating White papers instead of Standards, then are we needing to create a new process.

Can the Industry Connection be a process that is sufficient rather than change 802.24?

# Response to 802.11 comments

- Interest in 802.24:
  - IEEE 802.24 has 42 voting members and typically has about 10-30 in attendance during its sessions.
  - The IoT NaB had attendance of 40 with an 802.3 CFI occurring at the same time.
- Process:
  - The current scope of 802.24 allows the creation of whitepapers within the IEEE 802 P&P
- Industry connections
  - The industry connections process could be used, but it requires creating a new group and covers typically only a single output.
  - IEEE 802.24 can submit an ICAID for any activity or document that might require it on an as needed basis.

# 802.21 comments, Slide 2 (1)

- IEEE 802.24 Vertical Applications TAG focuses on application categories that use IEEE 802 technology and are of interest to multiple IEEE 802 WGs and have been assigned to IEEE 802.24 by the IEEE Executive Committee.
- Does this mean before 802.24 discusses an application area, it requires 802 EC approval?
  - Answer: IEEE 802.24 can hear presentations that would propose new Task Groups, but work on the application begins after EC approval.
  - Add to the subgroup approval bullet “The IEEE 802.24 TAG Chair will inform the Sponsor of the formation of the group.”

## 802.21 comments: Slide 2 (2)

- Develops white papers, guidelines, presentations and other documents that do not require a PAR that describe the application of 802 standards to those emerging application
- Are these guidelines, documents meant to be used within 802 or will be circulated to external bodies? If it is shared with external bodies, how will that be done without a PAR? In particular, if the 'guidelines' has the similar meaning that of what IEEE-SA specifies.
  - Answer: The documents may be circulated to external bodies. The terms “guidelines” is too close to the term “guide”, which is a document that requires a PAR. Delete “guidelines”

## 802.21 comments: Slide 2 (3)

- Acts as a resource for understanding 802 standards for certification efforts by industry bodies.
- What is the meaning of 'certification' here? Is this a product certification?
  - Answer: Yes, this is related to product certification. However, IEEE 802.24 will not be starting a product certification process.
  - Change to “Acts as a resource for understanding 802 standards for certification efforts by industry bodies that require more than one IEEE 802 WG's input.

# • 802.21 comments: Slide 3 (1)

- If the response from the presentation is favorable, request from the IEEE 802.24 TAG the formation of a subgroup to write a TG scope document for that application category (the current form is 24-14-0014-01). Approval for forming a subgroup is a majority vote.
- Is it correct that a subgroup is in the form of an ad hoc or interest group appointed by the TAG chair?
  - Answer: The subgroup is formed under the rules stated in “Subgroups of the WG” subclause in the IEEE 802 Working Group Policies and Procedures. The WG (TAG) forms the subgroup and determines its scope and duties. The TAG Chair appoints the subgroup Chair.
- Suggested change: 'a TG scope' should be 'a proposed TG scope'
  - Answer: Accepted and changed in the same manner in other locations to be consistent.

## 802.21 comments: Slide 3 (2)

- Submit the document to all IEEE 802 WGs for review following the rules for a PAR for a new project in the IEEE 802 LMSC Operations Manual.
- Suggested change 'Submit the document' to 'submit the proposed scope document'
  - Answer: Change “Submit the document” to be “Submit the proposed TG scope document.”



## 802.21 comments: Slide 4 (1)

- Get a motion in a minimum of 2 IEEE 802 WGs (not TAGs) that expresses support for adding this application category and that they will be active participants.
- What will happen if there is support from only one WG?
  - Answer: The TG is not formed

## 802.21 comments: Slide 4 (2)

- Is active participation required in 802.24 TAG by the supported group or groups?
  - Answer: This was seen to be impossible to require, so delete “and that they will be active participants.”
- A TG is dissolved by a majority vote of the TAG.
- If the formation of TG requires EC approval, how the termination can happen by the TAG? Suggest to delete this.
  - Answer: Change to “The IEEE 802.24 TAG may request that the EC rescind the scope of a TG, thereby dissolving the TG.”

# 802.21 comments: General

- WG recommends that 802.24 considers writing a PAR and CSD by converting it as a WG when there is interest on a specific topic and is approved by EC. Otherwise, the entire process of creating a scope document by 802.24 and then other WGs write a PAR and CSD can simply add one year or more delay to the overall Standards process.
  - Answer: The 802.24 TAG was not formed with the purpose to create standards or other documents that require PARs. While its work may result in a PAR being created, such a PAR would be ultimately handled by another IEEE 802 WG. Most, if not all the work done by 802.24 TGs will not result in PAR related activity.

# 802.21 comments: General

- WG recommends that 802.24 considers writing a PAR and CSD by converting it as a WG when there is interest on a specific topic and is approved by EC. Otherwise, the entire process of creating a scope document by 802.24 and then other WGs write a PAR and CSD can simply add one year or more delay to the overall Standards process.
  - Answer: The 802.24 TAG was not formed with the purpose to create standards or other documents that require PARs. While its work may result in a PAR being created, such a PAR would be ultimately handled by another IEEE 802 WG. Most, if not all the work done by 802.24 TGs will not result in PAR related activity.

# 802.19: Slide 2 (1)

- The IEEE 802 point of contact for regulatory bodies is the 802.18 TAG, so the scope should not include regulatory bodies.
  - Answer: Move regulatory bodies from this location to the bullet that discusses acting as a resource, 802.18 is the point of contact.
- Is EC approval required on 802.24 liaisons to other organizations?
  - Answer: In the IEEE 802 LMSC WG P&P subclause on the Chair's responsibilities, it says:
    - To maintain liaison with other organizations at the direction of the Sponsor or at the discretion of the WG Chair with the approval of the Sponsor
  - So, yes, EC approval is required for liaisons to other organizations

## 802.19: Slide 2 (2)

- The use of term "guidelines" is confusing since the IEEE-SA specifies a document called a "guide" which has a very similar name and function. In IEEE-SA terminology a guide is a type of standard.
  - Answer: "guidelines" has been deleted.

# 802.19: Slide 3

- It says that approval of the TG scope document will follow the PAR approval process. Does that mean that a CSD needs to be filled out with the scope document? It seems that a CSD is not required, so maybe it would be better to explicitly what is the process. Parts of the PAR process probably make sense (e.g. comments from WGs on Tuesday and responses by Wednesday) but other parts of the PAR process (e.g. CSD) may not apply.
  - Answer: Change to: “following the review and comment process in the “Plenary review” subclause of IEEE 802 LMSC Operations Manual. Note that neither a PAR nor a CSD is not being created.”

## 802.19: Slide 4 and 6

- Slide 4: Are the active participants working groups or individuals?
  - Answer: This was confusing and impossible to guarantee, so this phrase has been deleted.
- Slide 6: Under Customer it asks "Is there a clear need for standards in this application space." This seems to imply that 802.24 is looking to develop new standards. If the TAG is not looking to develop new standards why is this question asked?
  - Answer: Delete "Is there a clear need for standards in this application space?"



# 802.19: General

- Will the 802.24 TAG produce a WG operation manual and place these rules in the OM? Since these rules are 802.24 specific, the 802.24 OM seems like the best place for these rules.
  - Answer: Yes, the draft document posted on mentor. The group is waiting for the process to be approved before approving the document.:
  - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.24/dcn/14/24-14-0007-01-0000-802-24-operations-manual.docx>

# Comments on Smart Grid TG scope document.

# Comments from Bob Heile

- Comments are on Smart Grid proposed TG scope document (24-14-0015-01)
- On the first bullet below – I think the role should be to identify areas requiring liaison and overseeing the establishment of the same either within the TAG or elsewhere in 802 as appropriate and with concurrence of the EC.
  - Answer: Changed to two bullets as shown:
  - Identifies and oversees liaison activities with regulatory agencies, industry organizations, other SDOs, government agencies, IEEE societies, etc.
  - Acts as a point of contact for the above organizations for questions regarding the use of IEEE 802 standards in Smart Grid applications.
- Should also include IEEE 2030.5
  - Answer: IEEE 2030.5 and IEEE SCC21 were added

# Comments from David Law

- Item 3 of the Form:
- For understandable reasons, I don't understand why SCC 21 isn't on the list of possible liaisons.
  - Answer: We have added IEEE SCC21
- Response to 7:
- I do not understand what the difference is between the list of 802 standards and a catalog of 802 Smart Grid standards. Many 802 technologies are applicable and were listed as useful communications technologies in IEEE Std 2030 (not only standards done specifically for Smart Grid). The described white paper would be a good candidate for an IEEE Guide or Recommended practice, if what we produce is something that describes the advantages and limitations of our various technologies. A quick look at the list of Ethernet PHY types should lead 802.24 to quickly recognize that we have a lot of port types because they have different applications. The number of deprecated for new installations port types is another example of how our technologies evolve.
  - Answer: Our intent is not to write a recommend practice, but rather an informative document. If the work product ends up becoming more like a guide or recommended practice, then the group would ask for a PAR to be written to create that activity.