Replaces:

ISO/IEC JTC 1
Information Technology

Document Type:	National Body contribution
Document Title:	Comments from the National Body of France on Document JTC 1 N 9040, Request from ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 25 to JTC 1 for clarification on consistency of standards versus competing specification
Document Source:	National Body of France
Document Status:	This document is circulated to JTC 1 National Bodies for review and consideration at the November 2008 JTC 1 Plenary meeting in Japan.
Action ID:	ACT
Due Date:	
No. of Pages:	4

Generally speaking, should JTC1 wishes to give advice to a SC Secretariat, the advice could be based on the following points:

- The SC is sovereign for technical issues within its scope.
- The marketplace should be deciding which standards ought to be adopted. There is no simple answer to the question of multiple, evoluting, possibly overlapping standards in a given area. The role of JTC1 is to encourage SCs to find the best compromises in the interest of the user, and not to edict yes/no rules on dogmatic questions.
- Advice could include the point made in one of the JTC1 Banff recommendations, i.e. to put emphasis on the gathering of requirements and their harmonization so that standards possibly developed in various places, still dovetail to offer the end-user a set of valid solutions.

Background information

According to IEC standardisation strategy 2008 – 2011 (doc AC/188/2008) of the IEC Standardisation Management Board, emphasis should be on:
- rapid technological development;
- regional considerations;
- emerging technologies;
- cooperation.

Regional considerations are in line with the nowadays unanimously supported Global Relevance policy of IEC.

On another hand, on 2005/09/28, the SC25/WG1/N1189 stated:

Mr Yamamoto proposed "Multi international standard strategy" document at Las Vegas WG1 meeting in 1992. At that time also the world had many home bus regional standards. The proposal was rejected because, at that time, the world wanted a uni-standard. Mid 1990's we tried to agree on a uni-standard. The trial was failed. After mid 1990's we faced a new home network era again.
We should accept the practical realities that there are many regional home network specifications in the world. Before all discussion of WG 1, we have to discuss our strategy of how shall we promote the development of international standards.
At present, if we select one single home network specification as an international standard, it will cause huge confusion to regional consumers and manufacturers.
So, we have to treat all home network specifications equally at present.
We need to make standards that fit a common structure: (e.g.) Part 1, Part 2, Interoperability, Security, and so forth—and treat the rest of each home network specification as technical reports and/or profile standards. The market relevance of International Standards is important for accepting differences between regions.

Therefore, we recommend standardizing legacy regional Home Electronic Systems for low speed appliances, like:
- Echonet
- Konnex
- LonWorks
- HomePlug
- …

Current situation for intelligent home

Nevertheless, today the very idea of HES Class 1, HES Class 2 and HES Class 3 is no longer relevant in the framework of IPv6, http on TCP and UDP, over IP, over IEEE 802.xx over radio or twisted pairs. Indeed, IEC 62481-1/-2 for multimedia (DLNA) and ISO/IEC 29341-5/-6/-7 for command/control of

home appliances (heating, fans, shutters, …) are now well established standards. Switched voice (HES Class 2) is now an IP service over broadband (HES Class 3).

In some cases, where resilience to severe environment (e.g. high voltage) or integrated power supply is needed, HES Class 1 may be supported by specific systems.

Anyhow, legacy regional HES Class 1 standards should be matched to today's IP framework as has been done for Echonet (IEC 62457: Multimedia home networks - Home network communication protocol over IP for multimedia household appliances).

Request clarification

Moreover, the questions asked are not in line with JTC1 recommendations.

In Banff : *JTC 1 therefore instructs SC 25 to intensify its co-operation with the standardisation bodies involved in home networking (eg, via participation on IEC TC 100 Project Teams), to improve the gathering of requirements specifically from IEC TC 100, ITU-T and relevant consortia and to accelerate (within its scope) the development of a consistent set of standards for home networking with the aim of responding to the requirements of all interested parties. SC 25 is instructed to respond to their requirements in a timely manner and to report on the actions taken at the 2006 JTC 1 plenary meeting in South Africa.*

This resolution covers standards for systems as well as protocols and gateways that in this time and up to now are prepared in several committees like ISO/IEC JTC1/SC25, IEC/TC100, ITU-T.

The Jeju resolution is a little bit different:
Resolution SC 25: 18/ 6: *SC 25 requests clarification from JTC 1 of Banff 42 with respect to accommodation of competing protocols and the definition of conflict.*

The questions asked are neither in line with JTC1 recommendations nor in line with the Jeju resolution:
Question 1 does not imply competing protocols and/or conflicts, but multiple international standards for the same application and function.

Question 2 and 3 relate to competing solutions and specifications where the term competing has not been defined; solutions and specifications are no more defined (e.g. layer level, media, Graphic User Interface, Application Programming Interface, …).

Answers to ISO/IEC JTC1 N 9040 questions

Answers have been built assuming that only protocols are targeted.

Question 1 :
Yes, it is permissible for application layers. However, it is not desirable for the IP framework (including UPnP and DLNA);
e.g. for regional HES Class 1 legacy standards which should be accepted by ISO/IEC (e.g. LonWorks).

Question 2 :
Yes, for application layers, to avoid stifling innovation.

Question 3 :
In any case: **co-existence**.
In the IP framework:

- Same group of applications : **interworking** (preferably) or **interoperability** indeed multiple transmission media may be used (TP, PL, POF, Bluetooth, …)

- Different group of applications : **interoperability** (preferably) or **co-existence**

Further considerations

1) While JTC1 Banff's resolution 42 was specifically addressed to SC 25, we believe the requirement would also benefit other sub-committees of ISO/IEC JTC1 such as SC6, SC28, and SC29.

2) SC 25, as instructed by JTC 1, has made good attempts at installing co-operation with bodies involved in home networking, such as IEC TC 100. This is a long term task, not immediately successful as desire for co-operations has to be present on both sides. Further JTC 1 guidance or assistance would be helpful.

3) A crucial technical response to the Banff resolution is the definition and architecture of the residential gateway (IEC 100/1315/CD vs ISO/IEC 15045 series vs ITU-T). It is of the utmost importance to launch discussions to know whether or not totally different solutions should coexist.

4) Within the IEC, we would recommend using IEC Sector Board 4 (SB4) as the referee platform to convene such a discussion, while noting that equivalent platforms may be difficult to identify in other areas.