

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 ongoing 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 subcluase 10.2 as follows:

10.2 IEEE 802 LMSC approval

A complete proposed PAR and, if applicable, the criteria for standards development (CSD) statement ~~five criteria responses to the~~, as described in Clause 14~~10.5 below~~, 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 ~~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.~~ PARs ~~that~~ which introduce no new functionality are exempt from the requirement to provide a CSD statement responses to the five Criteria. Examples of such PARs are: Protocol Implementation Conformance Statements (PICS), Managed Object Conformance Statements (MOCS), PARs to correct errors, and PARs to consolidate documents. Such PAR packages shall provide a statement that the project is not intended to provide any new functionality.

At the discretion of the Sponsor Chair, PARs may be submitted in parallel to NesCom when the Sponsor Closing meeting date allows the PAR to be removed from consideration prior to NesCom recommendation to the Standards Board.

At the discretion of the Sponsor Chair, PARs for ordinary items (e.g., Maintenance PARs) and PAR changes essential to the orderly conduct of business (e.g., division of existing work items or name changes to harmonize with equivalent ISO JTC-1 work items) may be placed on the Sponsor agenda if delivered to Sponsor members 48 hours in advance.

All PARs must be accompanied by supporting documentation, which shall include:

- a) Explanatory technical background material
- b) Expository remarks on the status of the development of the PAR (e.g., approved by WG, Draft pending WG approval at next meeting, etc.)

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

- Forwarding the PAR to NesCom
- As part of the WG ballot to assure the draft is consistent with the 5C
- Forwarding the draft to Sponsor ballot
- Forwarding the draft to RevCom

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

Sponsor approval of changes to the CSD statement after its initial approval may occur either at plenary sessions or by electronic ballot, as described in 4.2.1.

Replace 10.5 Criteria for Standards Development (Five Criteria) with the following as Clause 14. ~~No Any changes are shown in this version, just the new clause are with respect to the previous version of the document and are not with respect to the previous 5C.~~

14. 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, 14.1, and the 5C requirements, 14.2.

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 [the plan for details of that project or anticipated future 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 shall 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 [as described in Clause 13](#)? (yes/no)
- b) If not, explain why the CA document is not applicable.

14.2 5C requirements

14.2.1 Broad market potential

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall have 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

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standards should be in conformance with IEEE Std 802, IEEE 802.1~~ACD~~, 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.

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

The review and response is not required if the proposed standard is an amendment or revision to an existing standard for which it has been previously determined that compliance with the above IEEE 802 standards is not possible. In this case, the CSD statement shall state that this is the case.

14.2.3 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.

14.2.4 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:

- a) Demonstrated system feasibility.
- b) Proven similar technology via testing, modeling, simulation, etc.

14.2.5 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:

- a) Balanced costs (infrastructure versus attached stations).
- b) Known cost factors.
- c) Consideration of installation costs.
- d) Consideration of operational costs (e.g., energy consumption).
- e) Other areas, as appropriate.