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  - when does a feature become outdated or deprecated?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?