



Draft

ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 25 N 1769

Date: 2010-04-26

Replaces ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 25 N/A

**ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 25**  
**INTERCONNECTION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EQUIPMENT**  
**Secretariat: Germany (DKE)**

**DOC TYPE:** Voting report / Table of replies

**TITLE:** Summary of Voting on Document JTC 1 / SC 25 N 1745:  
Proposal for New Work on Home network management

**SOURCE:** ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 25 Secretary

**PROJECT:** 01.25.01.20

**STATUS:** the NWIP has been distributed with SC 25 N 1745 and  
JTC 1 N 9964.  
The Work Item has been approved as recorded in this  
document.

**ACTION ID:** FYI

**DUE DATE:** n/a

**REQUESTED:** For information to the Members of SC 25.

**ACTION**

**MEDIUM:** Def

**DISTRIBUTION:** ITTF, JTC 1 Secretariat  
P-, L-, O-Members of SC 25

**No of Pages:** 5 (including cover)

## SC 25 N 1769: Voting Summary of JTC 1 / SC 25 N 1745 Proposal for New Work on Home network management

Ballot Information:	
<b>Ballot reference:</b>	SC 25 N 1745: NWIP Home network resource management
<b>Ballot type:</b>	NWIP
<b>Opening date:</b>	2010-01-24
<b>Closing date:</b>	2010-04-25

Member responses:			
<b>Votes cast (26)</b>	Australia (SA) Canada (SCC) Czech Republic (UNMZ) Finland (SFS) Germany (DKE) Ireland (NSAI) Italy (CEI) Korea, Republic of (KATS) Netherlands (NEN) Poland (PKN) Singapore (SPRING SG) Sweden (SNC) United Kingdom (BSI)	Belgium (NBN) China (CESI) Denmark (DS) France (UTE) India (BIS) Israel (SII) Japan (JISC) Lebanon (LIBNOR) New Zealand (SNZ) Russian Federation (GOST R) Spain (AENOR) Switzerland (SEV) USA (ANSI)	
<b>Comments submitted (1)</b>		Ukraine (DSSU)	
<b>Votes not cast (4)</b>	Austria (OVE) Mexico (DGN)	Kazakhstan (KAZMEMST) Norway (NEK)	

Questions:	
<b>Q.1</b>	"Do you accept the proposal in the attached NWI Proposal document as a sufficient definition of the new work item?"
<b>Q.2</b>	"Do you support the addition of the new work item to the programme of work of the joint technical committee?"
<b>Q.3</b>	"Do you commit yourself to participate in the development of this new work item?"
<b>Q.4</b>	"Are you able to offer a project editor who will dedicate his/her efforts to the advancement and maintenance of this project?"
<b>Q.5</b>	"Do you have a major contribution or a reference document ready for submittal?"
<b>Q.6</b>	"Will you have such a contribution in ninety days?"
<b>Q.7</b>	"Which standard development track is proposed?"

Q.1	Q.2		Q.3			Q.4			Q.5			Q.6			Q.7			
Australia (SA)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
Belgium (NBN)	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Default Timeframe				
Canada (SCC)	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Default Timeframe				
China (CESI)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
Czech Republic (UNMZ)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
Denmark (DS)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
Finland (SFS)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
France (UTE)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
Germany (DKE)	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
India (BIS)	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Default Timeframe				
Ireland (NSAI)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Default Timeframe				
Israel (SII)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
Italy (CEI)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
Japan (JISC)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
Korea, Republic of (KATS)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Default Timeframe				
Lebanon (LIBNOR)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abstain	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
Netherlands (NEN)	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
New Zealand (SNZ)	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Default Timeframe				
Poland (PKN)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
Russian Federation (GOST R)	Yes	Abstain	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
Singapore (SPRING SG)	Abstain	Abstain	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
Spain (AENOR)	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Default Timeframe				
Sweden (SNC)	Abstain	Abstain	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
Switzerland (SEV)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Extended Timeframe				
United Kingdom (BSI)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
USA (ANSI)	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Default Timeframe				
	Yes	No	Abs.	Yes	No	Abs.	Yes	No	Abs.	Yes	No	Abs.	Yes	No	Abs.			
Reacting 26	17	2	7	14	4	8	8	13	5	1	18	7	1	19	6	1	19	6

## Comments received on SC 25 N 1745

Question	ID	Comment	Observation of the Secretary
1	France	The vote will be reconsidered on a much more accurate document. To our understanding, everything could be introduced with this so wide scope.	Nothing received by
1	Germany	Home Network Resource Management has already been addressed by industry consortia like OSGi, HGI (Home Gateway Initiative) and UPnP Forum.  The subject of Home Network Resource Management shall be aligned with the work of these industry consortia as to avoid unnecessary deviations from already existing market standards.  Especially, Home Network Resource Management shall not be in conflict with, rather include, ISO/IEC 29341 (UPnP) documents, which are work assigned to JTC 1/SC 25.	According to JTC 1 resolution 49 from Nara 2009 plenary it is up to member bodies to justify activities that are not in line with the ISO and IEC "one standard (one specification, one test, one certificate) principle", see below.  Up to now member bodies have not confirmed such justification for ISO/IEC 29104.
1	Netherlands	Purpose and scope require more clarification	The request for more clarification should find a positive response.
1	Ukraine	abstain	Note
2	Italy	The proposed Working Item would seriously endanger the market of managed residential gateways and set top boxes, that is at present based on the TR069 protocol defined in the Broad Band Forum and used worldwide by the ISPs to provide their services and control and provision managed access gateways and set top boxes. The new technology is hardly compliant or harmonized with the existing standard.	Competing specifications can provide more harm in the residential market than in the professional market as decisions are made by laymen instead of professionals.
3	United Kingdom	Stephen Pattenden <a href="mailto:telemetra@telemetra.com">telemetra@telemetra.com</a>	Note
4	Korea, Republic of	Young-Sung Son, ETRI, <a href="mailto:ysson@etri.re.kr">ysson@etri.re.kr</a>	Note

## Comments received on JTC 1 N 9964

Nothing received by 2010-04-26 from JTC 1 Secretariat.

### Excerpt from ISO/IEC JTC 1 N9414: Resolutions Adopted at the 23rd Meeting of ISO/IEC JTC 1, 10-15 November 2008 in Nara, Japan

#### Resolution 49 - Clarification on Consistency of Standards vs Competing Specifications

JTC 1 notes the nature of standardization is to attract innovative ideas from multiple sources, choose the best ones and quantify them in specifications that facilitate widespread use.

Further, consistent with ISO's and IEC's "one standard" principle (four example TMB's policy and principal statement on Global Relevance), there are times when one standards is all that is required to meet the needs of the marketplace, especially in a particular application area, and there are other instances where multiple standards make the most sense to respond to market requirements and to the needs of our society. In reducing

the number of alternatives to a reasonable minimum, JTC 1 and other SDOs have demonstrated that is not necessary and may not be desirable to choose only one alternative for auction for standardisation.

Further, JTC 1 notes that the cycle of innovation in the ICT sector has result that in the continuous introduction of new technologies that improve upon existing standards. Any attempt to choose only one standards would ignore and threatened to inhibit the site of innovation that continues to fuel this industry.

Therefore, JTC 1 recognizes its core commitment to ISOs and IECs "one standards" principle; however, it recognizes that neither it nor the SCs are in a position to mandate either the creation or the use of a single standard, and that there are times when multiple standards make the most sense in order to respond to the needs of the marketplace and of society at large. It is not practical to define, A priori, criteria for making these decisions. Therefore each standard must be judged by the National Bodies, based on their markets, on its own merits.