

IEEE 802 Rules meeting March 2013

Guidelines for IEEE-SA Meetings

- ▣ **All IEEE-SA standards meetings shall be conducted in compliance with all applicable laws, including antitrust and competition laws.**
- ▣ **Don't discuss the interpretation, validity, or essentiality of patents/patent claims.**
- ▣ **Don't discuss specific license rates, terms, or conditions.**
 - ▣ Relative costs, including licensing costs of essential patent claims, of different technical approaches may be discussed in standards development meetings.
 - ▣ Technical considerations remain primary focus
- ▣ **Don't discuss or engage in the fixing of product prices, allocation of customers, or division of sales markets.**
- ▣ **Don't discuss the status or substance of ongoing or threatened litigation.**
- ▣ **Don't be silent if inappropriate topics are discussed... do formally object.**

If you have questions, contact the IEEE-SA Standards Board Patent Committee Administrator at patcom@ieee.org or visit <http://standards.ieee.org/about/sasb/patcom/index.html>

See *IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual*, clause 5.3.10 and “Promoting Competition and Innovation: What You Need to Know about the IEEE Standards Association's Antitrust and Competition Policy” for more details.

This slide set is available
at <https://development.standards.ieee.org/myproject/Public/mytools/mob/slideset.ppt>

Agenda

- Review guidelines for IEEE SA meetings
- OM updates
 - Change name of 5C to criteria for standards development (CSD)
 - Move MIB requirement
 - CSD mission statement
- WG P&P updates
 - Which duly constituted interims count
- CG updates
 - Add “Access to published IEEE standards for outside groups”
 - Reflector failure/email ballot policy (new contribution)
- 5C/CSD updates
- Public statements (no contribution)

OM 10.2 and 10.3

- In anticipation of changes to the 5C:
 - change the first occurrence and in the title of the previous 5C to be “IEEE 802 criteria for standards development (CSD)”.
 - At all other occurrences of five criteria, 5C, 5 criteria, etc. change them to be “CSD”
 - Move “10.5 IEEE 802 criteria for standards development (CSD)” to become Clause 14
 - Fix all cross references to 10.5 to point to Clause 14
 - Move old 10.5.4.1 Coexistence (would be 14.4.1) to become 14.5 Coexistence

OM MIB requirement

- Delete the following from the second paragraph of 10.2
 - “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 the end of the current 10.5.2.
 - Describe the plan for developing a definition of managed objects. The plan shall be one of the following:
 - The definitions will be part of this project
 - The definitions will be part of a different project
 - The definitions will not be developed and explain why such definitions are not needed.

OM CSD mission statement

- Add the following to the new Clause 14:

The CSD is an agreement within the WG and with the Sponsor governing the project during its development. The CSD is used by the WG and the Sponsor to achieve the following goals:

- a) Enables a wider variety of input to improve the project definition
- b) Promotes good project selection/definitio
- c) Maintain unique IEEE 802 identity
- d) Mandate compatibility of IEEE 802 standards
- e) Provide a description of the project that is more detailed and relevant than the PAR form allows.
- f) Quantify the feasibility of the proposed project.
- g) Show that there is a market demand for the proposed standard/act as a market requirements document.
- h) Acts as a consensus building activity
- i) Tells the stakeholders why they should be involved in this project

WG P&P: Voting rights

- Which duly constituted interims count?
- Change the first paragraph of “7.2.1.Establishment” as shown:
 - one duly constituted interim WG or Task Group session may be substituted for one of the two plenary sessions required to establish membership. The interim substituted shall be any of the interims after the first of the four consecutive plenaries.
- Add the same sentence to the end of the paragraph in “7.2.2 Retention”

Access to published IEEE stds

2.18 Access to a published IEEE standard for outside groups

(SA/Karen McCabe Origin)

The process for IEEE 802 working groups to request no-charge access to an approved IEEE 802 standard by a legitimate standards developing body for the sole purpose of standards development-related work prior to the standard being in the Get IEEE 802 Program.

- 1) All requests shall be made by the Sponsor Chair or WG chair.
- 2) Email requests to Patricia Gerdon at p.gerdon@ieee.org.
- 3) The email shall include:
 - a) the standard designation and approval date,
 - b) the standards developing body/committee for whom the request is being made, and
 - c) a brief description on why the access to the standard is needed by the standards developing body/committee.
- 4) The IEEE-SA will provide one electronic copy (PDF) along with a terms of use agreement (which must be signed prior to access being provided).
- 5) The request shall be a one-time request specifically for standards development related purposes. If the IEEE-SA deems the request to encompass more than an exception for or addition to standards development related purposes, the IEEE-SA reserves the right, working with the IEEE 802 EC, to pursue a Memorandum of Understanding with the appropriate licensing terms.

Reflector failure/letter ballot

- 802 relies on reflector for business, what is our recovery plan?
 - Require all EC members to have alternate email address (i.e., non ieee.org) in contact list
 - Post key email items to we page when there is a failure? If so, how are people notified?
 - Other issues?
- EC letter ballot when reflector problem
 - Need to keep public for comment by 802 members
 - How do we notify members when reflector has a problem?
- Other ideas/problems?

New requirement for CSD review

- The CSD shall be reviewed and approved by each the 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

5C/CSD updates

- These are the big changes
- Broad market potential
 - Change to “at a minimum” and list 2
 - Should we list a few and say “answer those that apply”?
- Compatibility
 - 2 proposals, there may be more
 - Any change requires 2/3 approval

5C/CSD updates (cont.)

- Coexistence
 - Now applies to all projects
 - Many will say it doesn't apply
 - If it does, use current 802.19 review process
- Distinct identity
 - Not restricted to IEEE or 802 standards only
 - Bulleted list removed (add similar list with instructions: respond to items if appropriate?)

5C/CSD update (cont. 2)

- Technical feasibility – two items
 - “Demonstrated system feasibility.”
 - “Proven similar technology via testing, modeling, simulation, etc.”
- Economic feasibility
 - Keep list with new instructions: “Among the areas that may be addressed”
 - Balanced costs (infrastructure versus attached stations).
 - Known cost factors.
 - Consideration of installation costs.
 - Other areas, as appropriate.

Public statements (new item)

- What is a “Sponsor public statement”?
- Should Sponsor or subgroup statements have an expiration date (aka timeout)?
 - If so, is there a global value unless otherwise specified?
 - How is this communicated (in document, on web page, ???)
- Should they be archived in a specific location? (could be document group on mentor)
- Sponsor Chair issues approved regulatory responses
 - Is there a specific example of where this is not possible?
 - Can it be handed off as long as it has the Sponsor Chair's signature and contact information?
- Do we have enough document classes in the OM?
 - Currently 2, other standards bodies and government bodies
 - Add 2 more, e.g. “ITU” and “other (generic)”?