

Background

While the 5C is used at PAR approval, it is also supposed to be reviewed and updated periodically. From the IEEE 802 LMSC Working Group Policies and Procedures:

“5.WG responsibilities

...

The WG shall periodically review and confirm that the response to the five criteria, refer to the criteria for standards development subclause in the IEEE 802 LMSC Operations Manual [4], used to approve its PAR(s) still reflect the state of the project(s) to which they relate. Should a WG need to modify the responses to the five criteria during a projects’ development in order to accurately reflect the state of the project, the modified responses shall be submitted to the Sponsor for approval.”

We currently have 5 criteria, a requirement to develop managed objects (or a plan for a project that does them) and a requirement, if necessary, to participate in the coexistence assurance (CA) document process.

The goals of the changes are:

- Maintain the value of the 5C brand (people are used to it, no need to confuse them).
- Allow 802 to create a logical separation of requirements for approving and progressing projects.
- Formalize the 5C review process and make it a part of ballot approval, in a manner similar to the PAR.
- Clearly explain the purpose and use of the CSD/5C

Hence the following changes are suggested:

- Add the managed objects requirement to the CSD reporting. Thus it will be evaluated not only at the beginning of the project, but also during its development phase (as is done with the CA document).
- The CA and managed objects are an ongoing process as opposed to criteria to be met (e.g., a bar to pass). So these are put in a separate subclause
- The 5C is a new subclause (part of the overall CSD), that now is not the “five criteria,” but rather is simply “5C” (in case we want to do more or fewer criteria in the future).

Some clause 10 rule changes will also be required.

Change subcluse 10.2 as follows:

10.2 IEEE 802 LMSC approval

A complete proposed PAR and, if applicable, responses to the ~~five criteria~~ criteria for standards development (CSD), as described in ~~10.5 below~~ Clause 14, shall be submitted to the Sponsor via the Sponsor email reflector for review no less than 30 days prior to the day of the opening Sponsor meeting of an IEEE 802 LMSC plenary session. The submittal message should include Internet links to the required submittal documents. Presence of the submittal message in the reflector archive (with time stamp) is evidence of delivery.

Approval of the PAR by the EC is contingent on inclusion of accepted responses describing how the proposed PAR meets the ~~five criteria~~ CSD. PARs which introduce no new functionality are exempt from the requirement to provide responses to the ~~five Criteria~~ CSD. Examples of such PARs are: Protocol Implementation Conformance Statements (PICS), Managed Object Conformance Statements (MOCS), PARs to correct errors, and PARs to consolidate documents.

...

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.

Replace 10.5 Criteria for Standards Development (Five Criteria) with the following as Clause 14. No changes are shown in this version, just the new clause.

14. IEEE 802 criteria for standards development (CSD) and 5C

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.

14.1 Project process requirements

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.

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.

14.2 5C requirements

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.

14.2.2 Compatibility

All IEEE 802 standards should be in conformance with 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 Working Group prior to submitting a PAR to the Sponsor.

- a) Will the proposed standard comply with IEEE Std 802, IEEE Std 802.1D and IEEE Std 802.1Q?
- b) If the answer to a) is no, supply the response from the IEEE 802.1 Working Group.

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.

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.

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.

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.