

To: Managing Director, IEEE-SA
Chair, IEEE-SA Standards Board
Chair, IEEE-SA Board of Governors
Copies: IEEE 802 LMSC Executive Committee
From: Paul Nikolich, Chairman IEEE 802 LMSC, on behalf of the 802 Executive Committee
Subject: 802 Position Statement regarding
Placement of turned down projects with other Sponsors
Date: July 16, 2004

Introduction

The topic under discussion here relates to the appropriateness of approving project proposals (PARs) in Sponsors outside of 802 for projects that have been considered and rejected by 802.

IEEE 802 Position

802 believes that a Sponsor (or equivalent entity) within the IEEE should not be allowed to start a project that is properly an amendment, revision or corrigenda to an existing standard of another active Sponsor who is the nominal custodian (The Custodian) of the existing standard. Appropriate exception to this would be where The Custodian explicitly asserts that such a project and sponsor is appropriate.

This position does not apply to new projects that will not be developing material that can be considered an amendment, revision or corrigenda to an existing standard.

Our Recommendation:

We request that projects that meet the above criteria only be considered for approval within the Sponsor of their obvious "base standard". Further, we request that the P&P be amended so that this policy is clearly articulated within the P&P.

We feel that the above is a necessary policy in order to meet our common goal which is:
To preserve the viability of the IEEE-SA as a standards setting entity

Rationale

We believe that for the IEEE-SA to operate otherwise has significant negative consequences. Our detailed rationale is:

- Ongoing maintenance and interpretations of the resulting set of standards that are spread across multiple owners would be a nightmare.
- Assuming that the remote placement of the standards work is the result of a negative decision the custodian sponsor, the ability of the custodian to make consensus decisions (i.e decisions that meet the IEEE threshold test for achieving consensus) on standards would be seriously compromised. The consequential result is that every proposed mode or option would have to be accommodated in every standard.
This would result in standards implementations that are vastly more expensive (and power hungry and heavy), implementations whose operation is vastly more complex and whose likelihood of interoperability is highly diminished.
 - This situation could easily drive up the cost of design qualification and production testing to such a large degree as to severely limit the economic feasibility of the product's very existence.
 - Communications standards, specifically, exist to reduce the number of options that vendors must make available in their equipment to meet the public's needs for communication between products from different vendors. Destruction of a standards group's ability to make decisions would be lethal to that standards group's ability to work in the future.

Sincerely,

IEEE 802 LMSC Executive Committee
(by Paul Nikolich for the EC)