Improving IEEE 802 Process
Why discuss this? (opinion)

• IEEE 802 needs to remain market relevant
  – We should know how we are viewed by our customers
  – What do they like about IEEE 802 and what do they dislike

• For example, are we perceived as being an efficient process for standards development?

• How do we collect feedback regarding the perception of our group?
Topics for discussion

• Should we measure the time from idea to standard?
• Should we keep track of this time for all our standards process?
• Should we communicate this externally?
• Are there areas in which we can improve this time?
Feedback

• Quality is an aspect of what we add.
  – We offer expert feedback that improves the quality of the completed standard

• Perception is that we are slow
  – Consensus process does take time

• Lifecycle management
  – when does a feature become outdated or deprecated?

• Documents are way too large.

• We should ask these questions every year
Comments (2)

• We are an easy target, hence the criticism
  – Consensus becomes more difficult as you become more successful and attract more people
  – We don't defend our record as well as we could
  – Some of our negative perception is unwarranted
  – “IEEE-SA is where industry goes to make decisions.”
Comments (3)

• Schedules – keeping to them.
  – Slips are not common, we tend to make our commitments.

• There is a significant time at the front end, this can be a turn-off to business managers.

• Learn from mistakes
  – Assume people have same level of knowledge
  – Pro-actively identify where mentoring is needed and introduce a culture where mentoring is done.
Comments (4)

• We are relatively slow because we embrace consensus among stakeholders
  – Insist on quality, quality takes time
  – To go faster we would have to give up consensus, quality or both

• Are we too bound up in rules?
  – Every meeting we are changing the rules.
  – Expand culture of consensus
  – Rules should help, not get in the way.
Comments (++)

• Efficient oversight
  – EC should only coordinate
  – EC should review that what goes out is successful
  – Clarify liaison statements
  – Only bring to EC what needs to be brought here.

• Pay for services in some circumstances
  – Might be imbalanced as some groups require more than others.
  – Get funds from SA
Reduce Friction

• For a new group, technical editor and secretary can be difficult positions to fill

• For technical editor
  – Cost of Framemaker (floating license owned by IEEE 802?)
  – Difficulty using the Word template
  – Training to use Frame or the Word template
  – Pre-ballot editorial review to conform to style manual?

• For the secretary
  – Should we hire/pay for a rapporteur?
Outside feedback?

• How can we get outside feedback (i.e., people who don't attend our meetings) on our efficacy?