Survey: Internationalisation of IEEE 802 Standards

Report compiled by

Tony Jeffree

tony@jeffree.co.uk

The Questions

- Is internationalisation in JTC1/ITU necessary for 802 LAN market adoption?
- Should 802 be selective in which standards to internationalise?
- Should the 802 ballot process proactively include the international community?
- Is there a better process, e.g., fast track, or JTC1 PAS?

The Process

- Reflector established
- Questions, with background material circulated
  - 802 participants
  - Other interested parties
- About a dozen reflector signups
- Very little reflector traffic
- Very little "conclusive evidence"
- Summary of comments follows

Harry Gold (US Military)

- Original direction was ISO
  - US "GOSIP" profile - TP4, CMIP…etc
- Commercial world more interested in Internet standards
- Important to have acceptance of standards by the commercial world - hence COTS
- ISO label only relevant if standard accepted by the commercial world
- Will follow the commercial companies

Hal Keen (NCR)

- Summarised input from various interested parties in NCR

- NCR feels it important for IEEE standards to be ISO-labelled

- Main reason - that while Europe respects IEEE standards, there is a danger of non-acceptance for some public procurements without the endorsement of ISO

Mick Seaman (3Com)

- Polled the marketing departments world wide

- Several responses - none felt ISO labelling important

- Feedback from Asia/Pacific region that ISO labelling instead of IEEE will confuse the customer

- Personal view: Those that feel the need for the dual labelling should fund it

Paul Kolesar (Lucent)

- Internationalisation not absolutely necessary but does add value

- Many countries view US as an economic enemy & can use lack of ISO approval as a barrier against US vendors

- Scope of work should remain international even if formal internationalisation is dropped

Robin Tasker (JTC1/SC6)

- View of 11 NBs & 2 Liaison Orgs that internationalisation of IEEE 802 standards is important

- Current example is their review of Japanese concerns over Wireless LANs & accommodation of national requirements

- Loss of internationalisation could cause delay and confusion in European procurements

- Wide ranging and comprehensive review is vital - NB review is a unique opportunity for this to happen

- Aware that past balloting & co-ordination has caused delays. Robin requested by SC6 chair to review procedures & propose improvements

Robin's Proposal (1)

- Make IEEE 802 a Class A Liaison organisation to ISO (SC6)
- Send a liaison (an Email) to SC6 on all WG ballots, inviting NB review and comment - address the comments in the normal way
- When a draft goes to Sponsor Ballot, send a liaison (an Email) to SC6 providing status info and inviting them to endorse the work

Robin's Proposal (2)

- SC6 publishes & updates a single TR that catalogues previously published joint 802/ISO standards, and also 802 standards that it has endorsed

- On completion of Sponsor Ballot, IEEE publishes the standard ONLY as an 802 standard

Robin's Proposal - Benefits

- Standard development follows 802's timetable only

- The process accommodates timely International input

- When its done, the standard has been widely circulated and agreed

- ISO documents its endorsement & involvement in the work, following their own timetable

Robin's Proposal - Difficulties

- Achieving Class A Liaison status for 802 - local US difficulties?

- Buying into the wider review?

- Getting both organisations to sign up for the approach?

Conclusions

- Some responders believe that there is still benefit in Internationalisation

- Current process needs major overhaul

- Robin's proposal offers potential for a "win/win" solution
  - Very small impact on normal IEEE/802 process
  - Accommodates ISO NB review
  - Removes dual label confusion opportunities
  - Raises 802 profile internationally