CRITERIA FOR STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT (FIVE CRITERIA)

Broad Market Potential
A standards project authorized by IEEE 802 shall have a broad market potential. Specifically, it shall have the potential for:

a) Broad sets of applicability.
b) Multiple vendors and numerous users.
c) Balanced costs (LAN versus attached stations).
   a) IEEE 802 systems require consistent management features. The MIB related mechanisms are applicable to all IEEE 802 systems including 802.16.

b) Multiple vendors, from all around the world have participated in the study group process that developed this PAR and 5 Criteria

c) A MIB mechanism is a common feature of 802 systems and has been shown not to adversely affect the cost of such systems.

Compatibility
IEEE 802 defines a family of standards. All standards shall be in conformance with the IEEE 802.1 Architecture, Management and Interworking documents as follows: 802. Overview and Architecture, 802.1D, 802.1Q and parts of 802.1f. If any variances in conformance emerge, they shall be thoroughly disclosed and reviewed with 802. Each standard in the IEEE 802 family of standards shall include a definition of managed objects which are compatible with systems management standards.

1. The proposed project will be developed in conformance with the 802 Overview and Architecture.
2. The proposed project will be developed in conformance with 802.1D, 802.1Q, 802.1f.
3. Managed objects will be defined consistent with existing policies and practices for 802.1 standards.

Consideration will be made to ensure compatibility with the 802 architectural model including at least 802, 802.2, 802.1D, 802.1f and 802.1Q.

This amendment is specifically intended to address the requirement for managed object consistent with existing policies and practices for 802.1 standards.

Distinct Identity
Each IEEE 802 standard shall have a distinct identity. To achieve this, each authorized
project shall be:
  a) Substantially different from other IEEE 802 standards.
  b) One unique solution per problem (not two solutions to a problem).
  c) Easy for the document reader to select the relevant specification.

a) There exists no other MIB standard for 802.16 systems.
b) The proposal for the standard is to develop a single MIB.
c) It will be obvious from the title and content of the standard that it is a standard defining a MIB for 802.16.

**Technical Feasibility**
For a project to be authorized, it shall be able to show its technical feasibility. At a minimum, the proposed project shall show:
  a) Demonstrated system feasibility.
  b) Proven technology, reasonable testing.
  c) Confidence in reliability
     a) MIBs are integral parts of most 802 systems. Thus they are demonstrably feasible.
     b) MIBs are already a proven and testable management mechanism, as shown through widespread deployment in millions of systems.
     c) There is no reason to consider MIBs to be unreliable.

**Economic Feasibility**
For a project to be authorized, it shall be able to show economic feasibility (so far as can reasonably be estimated), for its intended applications. At a minimum, the proposed project shall show:
  a) Known cost factors, reliable data.
  b) Reasonable cost for performance.
  c) Consideration of installation costs.

  a) MIB implementations are widely and cost effectively deployed today.
  b) The performance of MIBs are related to the performance of the underlying network technology. 802.16 is capable in this respect.
  c) MIBs will generally be included directly in products and will not demand costly installation methods. In addition, MIBs may serve to reduce installation costs of 802.16 systems.