

**Get IEEE 802® FAQ** (not part of the Agreement)  
June 4, 2002 revision 01

*Why only current standards?*

This restriction was made for two reasons:

1. To protect the value of the subscriptions (and its revenue stream that allows the program to exist)

Subscriptions prices (adjusted for the program):

Single	\$1195
Two Users	\$2151
Five Users	\$2987.50
Ten users	\$3585
Twenty Users	\$5078.75
Fifty Users	\$5975
Enterprise (unlimited)	\$11,950

2. To reduce the impact on the single sales revenue – print and PDF.

*Why the delay in transferring PDFs to the program?*

It was never intended that the PDF transfer to the program would happen to the day of the six-month timeframe (There was a lot of debate over the appropriate period of sale as well as the publication versus Standards Board approval date.)

*Why can't we continue the program as is through the rest of the calendar (2002) year?*

We can. This idea is being discussed by the task force. It would give us more time to collect data on the economic impact on IEEE 802® standards sales as well as the sales of new products (e.g. IEEE Std 802.3™ and IEEE Std 802.15.1™) as well as the corporate sponsorship positions. November would be a good time to look at the numbers again.

*What happened to the original intent to have IEEE 802® standards available without charge from the date of publication?*

This remains the main goal of the program. However, to initiate the program last May, we had to compromise until the revenue stream and level of ongoing support was secured.

*Why is there such a lack of information on the costs to support and publish IEEE 802® standards?*

General program financial assumptions were discussed prior to launching the Get IEEE 802 program. IEEE staff repeatedly reinforced that IEEE 802® standards are not, in and

of themselves, a true P&L center. Rather, the entire standards program is a P&L center and some projects contribute better to the bottom line than other projects. We continue to work to change the current paradigm while incorporating programs such as Get IEEE 802<sup>®</sup>. Until then, IEEE 802<sup>®</sup> standards as well as other profitable standards projects will continue to cover the total program costs.

*Do downloads represent a sizeable “loss” revenue sales?*

IEEE-SA is seeking to meet revenue budgets through the sales, plenary contributions and corporate sponsorships regardless of the number of downloads. As downloads increase, the IEEE-SA is not seeking to necessarily increase revenues but keep the program financially viable.

*Why isn't the OUI revenue associated with the program?*

The program was always intended to be self-supporting and sponsors including the IEEE 802<sup>®</sup> LMSC would contribute to make up for lost sales revenues associated with making IEEE 802<sup>®</sup> standards available at no charge six month after publication. From the beginning, we agreed that OUI revenue stream would not be used to offset any shortfalls associated with the program.

*Won't going to twelve months keep frequently updated standards like IEEE Std 802.3<sup>®</sup> out of the program?*

With sufficient sales during the first six months and/or additional corporate support, prior versions could be left in the program. If a twelve-month window is implemented, older/prior versions might be left in the program until the new versions qualify to be entered. Adding the standard on the 366<sup>th</sup> day rather than in the month following the extended sale period could also be considered. It is also true that the start date could be based on approval rather than publication to impose an incentive to publish quickly. All of the above could be accomplished if revenues meet objectives.

*Does going to twelve months mean that some standards - less than twelve months - will be removed from the program?*

No one intends to eliminate any standard from the program based on moving to a twelve-month sale of PDF period. Only new standards not yet in the program would be affected. Besides, this change will probably not occur for the near future. More information is being gathered through November 2002.

*Isn't the trial for three years? If so, why are we looking to modify the program now?*

Yes. It is a three-year trial. However, budgeting is an annual process. It was originally agreed to review the program annually and modify as needed to keep the program viable. Moving the review dates to coincide with a time when both the IEEE 802 SEC and the IEEE-SA BOG meet is also being considered.

*Won't the sale of new standards such as IEEE Std 802.3<sup>TM</sup>-2002 significantly adjust the revenue?*

Not necessarily. In the first three months, IEEE Std 802.3<sup>TM</sup>-2002 revenue from the sale of PDF has been dismal compared to prior versions. E-mails and feedback indicate that people are waiting for the new standard to become available as part of the program rather than purchasing it today.

*Why aren't you investigating alternatives other than corporate sponsorship?*

One of the three foundations for the program is corporate sponsorship. The other two are sales prior to putting the standard into the program and ongoing subscriptions and print revenues as well as IEEE 802 LMSC contributions. Other alternatives are being investigated and discussed.

*Won't a nominal (\$2 to \$5) fee per download generate significant revenues?*

This is antithetical to the program objectives of making standards available without charge but certainly an alternative to explore. Just because there is an average 200,000 download requests monthly, one cannot assume that those downloads will translate into low cost purchases. There must first be agreement on whether the program should be changed from "no charge" to "very low cost" standards delivery.

*What changes may be proposed?*

The Task Force has recognized that the program needs to be reviewed more frequently than once a year. It is proposing that the review occur three times per year in concert with the March, July and November meetings of the 802 SEC and the IEEE-SA Board of Governors. The Task Force is also proposing that the plenary contributions become associated with a program continuation period per below:

<b>Plenary</b>	<b>Start</b>	<b>End</b>
July 2000	Start-up	
Nov 2000	contribution	
March 2001	May 2001	August 2001
July 2001	September 2001	December 2001
November 2001	January 2002	April 2002
March 2002	May 2002	August 2002
July 2002	September 2002	December 2002
November 2002	January 2003	April 2003
March 2003	May 2003	August 2003
July 2003	September 2003	December 2003
November 2003	January 2004	April 2004

We believe this would be a positive change for all and allow us to track and adjust things as needed. It would also allow us to accept contributions knowing that the program is intact for the following months and eliminate confusion regarding plenary payments during the pilot.

*Who is the Task Force?*

The task force is composed of Howard Frazier, Paul Nikolich, Geoff Thompson and Jerry Walker. Assistance has been provided by Christiane Vigil with sponsorship follow-up.