



ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 25 N 1765

Date: 2010-04-09

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

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

DOC TYPE: Voting report

TITLE: Voting report on SC 25 N 1735: FCD ISO/IEC 29104-2: Information technology – Centralized Management Protocol (CMP) for ubiquitous home network services - Part 1: Remote management of application servers

SOURCE: SC 25 Secretary

PROJECT: 25.01.15.02

STATUS: The NWIP has been distributed with the SC 25 N 1209 and JTC 1 N 8175. It has been approved as recorded in SC 25 N 1242
The CD was distributed with SC 25 N 1331 and did find substantial support as recorded in SC 25 N 1391. The comments were resolved as recorded in SC 25 N 1734.
The FCD was distributed with SC 25 N 1735 and did not find substantial supports since more than 25 % of those countries who voted, voted against.
A number of countries expressed doubts about the justification putting further effort in this project. The many abstentions received could be interpreted as supporting such doubts.

ACTION ID: FYI

DUE DATE: n/a

REQUESTED ACTION: For information

MEDIUM: Def

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

No of Pages: 7 (including cover)

Title **SC 25 N 1765 voting report on SC 25 N 1735: FCD ISO/IEC 29104-2: Information technology – Centralized Management Protocol (CMP) for ubiquitous home network services - Part 2: Remote management of application servers**

Approval of text of FCD ISO/IEC 29104-2

No Substantial Support

RESULT OF VOTING not counting abstentions as votes

P-Members voting: 8 in favour out 12 of = 66,67 % (requirement $\geq 66,66\%$) of those who have voted

P- Members voting: 4 negative votes out of 12 = 33,33 % (requirement $\leq 25\%$)

P-Members reacting: 17 out of 30 = 56,67 % (requirement $\geq 50\%$)

		Membership	Vote			Comments	
			Yes	No	abst.	given	#
Australia	SAI	P	1				
Austria	OVE	P	1				
Belgium	NBN	P		1		1	1
Canada	SCC	P			1		
China	CESI	P	1				
Czech Republic	UNMZ	P	1				
Denmark	DS	P			1		
Finland	SFS	P					
France	UTE	P		1		1	1
Germany	DKE	P		1		1	3
India	BIS	P					
Ireland	NSAI	P					
Israel	SII	P					
Italy	CEI	P	L	1		1	3
Japan	JISC	P	1				
Kazakhstan	KAZMEST	P					
Korea	KATS	P	1				
Lebanon	LIBNOR	P					
Mexico	DGN	P					
Netherlands	NEC	P		1		1	1
New Zealand	SNZ	P					
Norway	NEK	P					
Poland	PKN	P					
Russian Federation	GOST R	P					
Singapore	SPRING	P					
Spain	AENOR	P			1		
Sweden	SNC	P			1		
Switzerland	CES	P			1		
United Kingdom	BSI	P	1				
USA	ANSI	P	1				
Sum	not reacted	13 of 30	8	4	5	5	9
	reacted	56,67%	66,67%	33,33%			
Greece		O			1		

Collation of comments on SC 25 N 1735 FCD 29104-2: Information technology – Centralized Management Protocol (CMP) for ubiquitous home network services – Part 1: Remote management of application servers

E: editorial, G: general, T: technical

Page	Line	Clause	E/G/T	ID	Comment	Proposed change	Resolution
00	000		G	DE-01	The German National Body disapproves the above-mentioned document for reasons given below.		Note
00			G	Fr01	The historical French telecom operator considers that the resolution of comments of ETSI as recorded in 25N1721 are not sufficient to ensure full compatibility with TR-069	Reconsider the ETSI comment.	See DE 02, , but also BE and NL.
00			G	NL	This document doesn't contain a specification that's likely to be referenced or adopted by the industry.		In case the comment of he Netherland is correct, the project should be terminated. See alo BE.
0			G	IT1	The Italian NC casts a negative vote for the above mentioned document for the following reasons:		Note
0			G	IT2	<p>The proposals in object is a new edition of a previous one, dating back to 2008, that was at that time rejected due to several comments received.</p> <p>A general comment refers to N 1722, N 1735 and N 1737 that the changes introduced with respect to the initial proposal hardly meet the issues risen by the comments expressed at that time. In fact the new document is substantially the same that had been submitted 2 years ago, and the same comments still hold. Moreover, the TR069 has in the meanwhile evolved and included new devices and features, improving its characteristics, and the basis of devices implementing has further enlarged worldwide.</p> <p>The issues raised at that time implied the request to make the new proposed standard compatible and aligned with existing TR069, that have not been met in the new version.</p> <p>The detailed comments follow:</p>		It was in 2007 when the voting result on the CD was distributed. The CD found substantial support but the many comments on the relationship to TR 69 resulted in Resolution SC 25: 18/ 1, see DE 02

0			T	IT3	This document defines a communication protocol between the Remote Management System of the RG, operated by the unique SP that delivers and controls the RG devices, and other Application Servers of other service providers: it represents an interface at the OSS-OSS layer or also a business-to-business interface. The proposed communication protocol, security mechanisms and the application functionalities are technically approached as in 29401-1. On the DSL Forum side, a draft technical report (WT-131) is addressing the functionalities that a TR-069 ACS should provide to higher-level OSS on its "Northbound-interface", with a very broader functional coverage with to 29401-2, where only seven basic functionalities are defined. DSL Forum is not proposing a management protocol for ACS-OSS communication. HGI is proposing to adopt already available TMF communication protocols and interfaces among OSS systems in order to implement the ACS-OSS necessary management functions.		See NL2
1	1		T	BE	In summary: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CMP is not technically sufficient from a functional or interoperability standpoint. 2. CMP is not truly harmonized with the broadband Forum TR-069. 3. CMP is not international in its deployment scope. <p>These points are elaborated in more detail below in Annex 1.</p>	Replace whole CMP specification with reference to Broadband Forum TR-069 for remote management of residential gateways. The BBF TR-069 is available at: http://www.broadband-forum.org/technical/trlist.php	This comment raises the question whether this project is worth to be continued, see also NL. Annex 1 provides the impression of considerable work being needed to reach a ripeness already reached by TR 69 that is accepted by the market.
10	154	5.2.4	T	DE-02	Table 10 lists a "phone1 type" and "phone2 type", both int. The document does not specify a list of possible values for "phoneX type".	Provide specific definitions of values for parameters that are not of type string.	A standard needs to provide all details needed for implementation
22	209	Bibliography	E	DE-03	"ISO/IEC TR-14543, Home Electronic System Architecture" ISO/IEC 14543 is an International Standard not a TR.	Enter correct title for ISO/IEC 14543.	ISO/IEC 14543 is a series. Either add series or list all parts

Annex 1 - Detailed comments from Belgium:

Technical Concerns with the CMP spec:

- The tightly coupled nature of CMP, which has been shown in our analysis to be neither scalable from an implementation point of view nor from an ongoing specification point of view as additional services and features are added to the home network. Additionally it is out of alignment with the general direction of service oriented architecture and programming.
- The interoperability issues raised not only by the tightly coupled nature of the protocol but also by the lack of specification of session initiation, termination, error conditions, and retry mechanisms. It does not seem to have benefited from any implementation interoperability testing amongst different vendors, which will likely pose serious challenges in its field deployment.
- The incompleteness of the managed functions defined. They do not include basic requirements of the service provider community, including QoS management, various WAN and LAN interface management, statistics gathering, diagnostics testing, and the management of additional value-added services such as IP video, VoIP, and storage/content services.
- The incompleteness of the specification of the existing managed functions. For example parameters such as deviceType are only defined as being “home device type” without indicating how that type is to be determined, what the available options are, and any constraints (such as maximum length) on the variable itself. Such issues will have a severely negative impact on multi-vendor interoperability.
- The lack of detail about encoding UPnP information or actions across the WAN.

Specific Broadband Forum (TR-069) concerns:

The current document merely lists information about the CWMP protocol as defined in TR-069 as an alternate to the specified CMP protocol as originally defined in the previous version of these documents. It does nothing to bring these two approaches together, nor does it foster interoperability across vendors. We do not believe that the goal of the harmonization exercise has been achieved. We further believe that introducing yet another device management protocol into the industry will do nothing to serve consumer or operator needs, especially as TR-069 has been widely deployed and validated as meeting these industry requirements. Interoperability, real-world deployment experience, scalability, world-wide geographic coverage, and applicability to the industry are the hallmarks of any successful technology. To that end, the following information represents a non-exhaustive survey of TR-069 deployment and implementation:

- There are close to 40 Million shipments of TR-069 managed devices worldwide
- Service providers deploying TR-069 include:
 - AT&T
 - Bell Canada
 - BSNL
 - BT
 - China Telecom
 - Deutsche Telekom
 - Embarq
 - France Telecom
 - Hansenet
 - Iskon
 - NetOne
 - Qwest
 - Singtel
 - Swisscom
 - Telecom Italia
 - Telekomunikacja Polska
 - TeliaSonera
 - TelMex
 - Telstra
 - TELUS
 - Verizon
 - Vivodi

- Vendors who have implemented TR-069 and/or participated in interoperability plugfests include:
 - 2Wire
 - 3Com
 - ActionTec Electronic, Inc.
 - Airvana
 - Alcatel-Lucent
 - Allied Telesis
 - Alpha Networks, Inc.
 - Alpha Telecom, Inc.
 - AVM GmbH
 - Axiros GmbH
 - Aztech
 - Broadcom Corp.
 - Centillium
 - Cisco Systems
 - Cisco Systems – Linksys
 - Cisco Systems -- Scientific Atlanta
 - Comtrend
 - Conexant
 - D-Link
 - Dimark Technologies
 - Fine Point Technologies, Inc.
 - Funkwerk GmbH
 - Gatespace
 - Huawei
 - Infineon Technologies AG
 - Jungo
 - Motive, Inc.
 - Motorola
 - NETGEAR, Inc.
 - Philips
 - Pirelli Broadband Solutions
 - QA Café
 - Realtek Semiconductor Corp
 - SMC Networks
 - Sercomm
 - Siemens
 - Sphairon
 - SupportSoft
 - Telsey S.p.a
 - Texas Instruments
 - Thomson
 - Tilgin AB
 - Trendchip
 - Ubicom
 - Westell
 - Works Systems
 - Zhone Technologies
 - ZTE USA
 - ZyXEL Communications, Inc.
- Device types currently managed by TR-069 in deployment:
 - Residential Gateways
 - xDSL Modems
 - Wireless Access Points
 - VoIP devices
 - Set Top Boxes (Digital TV, Satellite, and IPTV)

The service providers and vendors on this list represent a commitment to TR-069 that spans geographies, services, and company size. There have been numerous plugfests hosted by multiple interoperability test labs,

and these events have proven that TR-069 is a multi-vendor interoperable protocol, just as the deployment figures demonstrate its scalability.

In addition, the following SDOs and consortia have referenced the TR-069 management framework for remote management of residential gateways and other home networking devices in their own documents or specifications:

- ATIS IPTV Interoperability Forum (IIF)
- ITU-T home networking and IPTV documents
- ETSI TS 183 065
- Home Gateway Initiative
- Digital Video Broadcasting (DVB) IPI documents
- Femto Forum
- WiMAX Forum
- Open IPTV Forum

These other groups have dependencies on TR-069 for remote management of a wide array of services and devices specified for these other groups that could be adversely affected by the introduction of an alternate technology.

Finally, this is not an international standard. It has been deployed within one telco in one country. It is very hard to view it as meriting the stamp of international recognition when it is so limited in its geographic applicability.

----- end of comments -----