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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 worldwide
• 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