

List of Comments to the WS-SMH Final Report

as at 2003-09-05

Originator	Referring to	Comment	Secretaries remarks/proposal	Final resolution
Oliver Janisch / ABB 12/08/03s	General	Accepts the Final Report, as is	Noted	
Ochel/Etsi 14/08/03	General	<p>ETSI needs to take a position on Smart Houses standardization as discussed in the CENELEC report.</p> <p>> I have prepared a draft, which could serve as a basis for our comments.</p> <p>> Please feel free to provide further comments or disagree with what I have said so far.</p> <p>></p> <p>> Please note in this context the OSGi Alliance (http://www.osgi.org) which had/has (?) a liaison with TIPHON. It seems that they work on APIs for Smart Houses.</p>	<p>the OSGi Alliance cannot have a liaison with TIPHON¹ as OSGi expert groups deal with specific OSGi concepts/applications. The only one existing is the Car expert group</p> <p>OSGI lists manufacturers with complying products:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4DHomeNet (www.4dhome.net) • ACUNIA (www.acunia.com) • Atinav (www.atinav.com) • Connected Systems (www.connectedsys.com) • Espial (www.espial.com) • Gatespace (www.gatespace.com) • IBM (www.ibm.com) • Mitsubishi Electric (www.mitsubishielectric.com) • ProSyst (www.prosyst.com) • Siemens VDO Automotive (www.siemensvdo.com) • Samsung (www.samsung.com) • Sun (www.sunmicrosystems.com) <p>4DHomeNet (www.4dhome.net)- 4DHomeNet offers 4DAgent™ and a remote</p>	

¹ "Telecommunications and Internet Protocol Harmonization Over Networks".

			management system that supports OSGi Service Platform Release 2. The system shows how home network operators can remotely manage their OSGi-based distributed residential gateways. 4DHomeNet also shows how OSGi Frameworks and DVB-MHP can work together providing a user-friendly interface via a TV set.	
Ochel/Etsi 14/08/03	General	<p>1 General comments</p> <p>ETSI appreciates the amount of collected information but is concerned about the critical analysis (clause 6), which indicates how little the industry is interested in standardized Smart Houses solution.</p> <p>ETSI concludes from the report that a large range of technical solutions is available which could be profiled to provide services. Unfortunately, service provision is not or only indirectly covered by the report.</p> <p>ETSI recognizes that a number of well-known standards organization and fora and consortia work on the components for Smart Houses even if they do not flag them as such, e.g. residential gateway, digital TV, etc.</p>	<p>Statement of facts; ETSI appears to have the same experiences</p> <p>Well known fact</p> <p>due to lack of contributions from relevant circles</p> <p>Unfortunately these activities do <u>not</u> <u>coordinate</u>. Each purports to have “the <u>solution</u>”. Therefore as shown by some of the contributions (Fraunhofer inHaus, UK “The Application Home Initiative”) there will be surely good practical but selective application experiences which could lead to some de-facto standards, but there is still no commitment to standardisation.</p>	
Ochel/Etsi 14/08/03	General	<p>ETSI does not see a need to create new experts groups for information exchange on Smart Houses where industry interest drives the development, e.g. entertainment, SOHO, remote controlled/diagnosed equipment, etc.</p> <p>Standards for technical solutions which do not address exclusively Smart House but which are necessary for them are being developed, e.g. security, privacy, eBusiness, DRM, WIFI, Bluetooth, etc.</p>	<p>Not accepted; the consequences of the EU order voucher result in a thorough coordination and promotion that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - truly interoperable Smart House are set-up - truly compatible offers from a multitude of product and service providers become available - data protection concerns of consumers are properly addressed - residential gateway(s) are available to ensure proper separation of responsibilities between in-house and 	

			access networks.					
Ochel/Etsi 14/08/03	General	<p>The Business Plan for the Workshop provided input from the HLSG report #4 (1999) and ANEC consumer requirements. These tables gave more specific information on standardization gaps at that time than the current report. These tables could have been completed with the answers from standardization and the still existing gaps.</p> <p>However, in supporting public interest policies for social integration and accessibility, ETSI commits itself to promote existing technical solutions to be used in niche markets to support services and applications for disabled and other people with special needs. ETSI has created a WG called NGN@home, which will provide deliverables for this purpose.</p>	<p>Noted, and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Niche markets show that there are Smart House markets - they constitute only a start; - hence the Workshops role to assist in the politically expected well coordinated All-out in the Smart House area. <p>ETSI and AT (NGN@Home) results will be considered when available</p> <p>In the meantime to meet the EU mandate and the EU policy decisions the Workshop looked also for harnessing other mayor Smart House technology developments such as OSGI and Digital TV.</p>					
Ochel/Etsi 14/08/03	Part 7: Conclusions and recommendations	<p>2 Specific comments on recommendations</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>WS-SMH recommendations</th> <th>ETSI comments</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a) harness the expertise of the identified CENELEC ICT TC: in view of the identified potential of Digital TV / DVB for the Smart House (also in view of mandate/331), there should be a joint Smart House Task Force or WG, composed of experts from CLC TC205, TC206 and TC215;</td> <td>This is not in line with the statements in the main part of the report which addresses a number of standards organizations and other specification providers. E.g. DVB & CENELEC/EBU/ETSI JTC Broadcast had been forgotten.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	WS-SMH recommendations	ETSI comments	a) harness the expertise of the identified CENELEC ICT TC: in view of the identified potential of Digital TV / DVB for the Smart House (also in view of mandate/331), there should be a joint Smart House Task Force or WG, composed of experts from CLC TC205, TC206 and TC215;	This is not in line with the statements in the main part of the report which addresses a number of standards organizations and other specification providers. E.g. DVB & CENELEC/EBU/ETSI JTC Broadcast had been forgotten.	<p>General: the received comments encourage, to review the Recommendations of the current text of the Final Report.</p> <p>Accepted that for DVB this JTC will be involved.</p> <p>Still particularly in the Smart House context different CENELEC TC concerned (TC205, TC206, TC209, TC215) are to also coordinate related Smart House activities.</p>	
WS-SMH recommendations	ETSI comments							
a) harness the expertise of the identified CENELEC ICT TC: in view of the identified potential of Digital TV / DVB for the Smart House (also in view of mandate/331), there should be a joint Smart House Task Force or WG, composed of experts from CLC TC205, TC206 and TC215;	This is not in line with the statements in the main part of the report which addresses a number of standards organizations and other specification providers. E.g. DVB & CENELEC/EBU/ETSI JTC Broadcast had been forgotten.							

Ochel/Etsi 14/08/03	Part 7: Conclusions and recommendations	b) an OSGI special group for "interoperable" <i>Smart House</i> services, which would have to define the API for the required OSGI bundles;	Not in line with a). Does this mean that CENELEC has given-up the idea of specifying RESIDENTIAL GATEWAYS?	See General remark above. Still in line with the decisions at the last Workshop² the foreseen endorsement of the JTC1/SC25 RESIDENTIAL GATEWAY results by CENELEC require to be complemented by such essential OSGI bundle(s) standardisation. Such a group could be easily run as a CENELEC Work Shop.	
Ochel/Etsi 14/08/03	Part 7: Conclusions and recommendations	c) extension of both Prof. Sibylle Meyer and Prof. Eva Schulze (Berlin Institute for Social Research) German statistical information on the rather "ordinary" consumer <i>Smart House</i> technology interest to other EU countries;	Is the production of statistical material a standardization activity? The "who"- question is left open.	See General remark above. Statistics are surely not a task for the ESOs. But such statistics, which must be widened to cover Europe, are an important incentive to really focus the European standardisation emphasis and related resources (expertise, financing, etc.).	
Ochel/Etsi 14/08/03	Part 7: Conclusions and recommendations	d) harness the existing experience of recognised Smart House Experiment and Show Cases by establishing a proper Expertise Networking among them and obtaining important feed- back into European standardisation;	Who will do the networking of experts?	See secretary remark to Etsi item 3, proposal, below.	

² See WS-SMH/Sec 40/INF-0503 attached to the final report in Annex_WS-Present.25

<p>Ochel/Etsi 14/08/03</p>	<p>Part 7: Conclusions and recommendations</p>	<p>e) in view of the already available extensive Smart House Technology base – a Smart House Plugfest platform for possible Smart House benchmarking and ultimate Smart House Certification scheme, to address and alleviate the consumer interoperability, QoS and reliability concern; depending on the successful operation of this d)-network, combining items d and e constitutes an interesting option;</p>	<p>It seems that comparative testing for benchmarking is envisaged. The basis for certification should be conformance testing which reports that the requirements of a standard have been met. Benchmarking between products is dangerous for standards organizations.</p> <p>“... alleviate the consumer interoperability” is not well understood.</p>	<p>Accepted: benchmarking may not be a basis for certification. However unless a well coordinated European standardisation approach leads to a complete set of standards for certifying interoperability of all Smart House related products and services, the different show cases will develop to competing and non-interoperable benchmarking. Therefore the proposal calls for networking among these “show and test cases” to tap into their experience and get feedback. Networks to be organised according to secretary remark to Etsi item 3, proposal, below.</p>	
<p>Ochel/Etsi 14/08/03</p>	<p>Part 7: Conclusions and recommendations</p>	<p>f) extending the Technology Watch and evaluation of its findings to address important technology gaps and to encourage a major push from related industries for a harmonised, consumer oriented <i>Smart House</i> standardisation;</p>	<p>Who will do this?</p>	<p>To be organised according to secretary remark to Etsi item 3, proposal, below</p>	

Ochel/Etsi 14/08/03	Part 7: Conclusions and recommendations	g) Find financial support for maintaining and extending the list of Smart House reference standards;	Another attempt to create an inventory.	See General remark above. However if ever there is to be Smart House certification, such a standards reference list must be run.	
Ochel/Etsi 14/08/03	Part 7: Conclusions and recommendations	h) CENELEC to successfully participate in the establishment of the COPRAS framework;	What has this to do with Smart Houses or is this the only recommendation on how to deal with RTD?	See General remark above. In view of the lack of contribution from contacted RTD projects, COPRAS could be an approach to better the chance for proper input from Smart House related RTD projects.	
Ochel/Etsi 14/08/03	Part 7: Conclusions and recommendations	i) Assess and enhance Smart House related CEN/ISSS eBusiness standardisation;	Would it be better to report SMH eBusiness, eLearning, eGovernment requirements (if any) to CEN/ISSS ?	See General remark above. The interest is surely mutual. E.g. eBusiness and related subjects (data protection, smart card usage, etc.) must surely be taken into account for organising Smart House services and/or devising Residential Gateway features.	
Ochel/Etsi 14/08/03	Part 7: Conclusions and recommendations	3 Proposal ETSI would like to propose <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to distribute the report among the ESOs' TCs and ICTSB members as a source of information; not to start phase 2 without a standardization task; following the subsidiarity principles ESOs and other ICTSB members should create work items where necessary to develop deliverables including service definitions, APIs, profiles; installation guides, etc.; Commission/EFTA should mandate work items/programmes which support public interest; such programmes could be reported to co-ordinated by the ICTSB; links between TCs and RTD projects could be promoted by the ICTSB. 		Disagreed: Whilst the ICTSB has surely an important ICT co-ordination role to play, its spectrum of subjects is far too large. The political decisions require, that the important Smart House/Home area as such organises its appropriate coordination entity (CENELEC TC205/WG16). WG16 by its inception reports to ICTSB. This is also in line with the conclusions and recommendations at the third and last Workshop.	

Chiara Giovannini / ANEC 2003-08-20	General	<p>Mr Brooker is on holidays for the moment. However, I think that our comments are "self-explicative" enough for starting the work</p>	Noted	
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	<p>ANEC Comments to the CENELEC « Smart Houses » Workshop final Report, July 2003</p> <p>ANEC, the European Consumer voice in standardisation, welcomes the opportunity to comment on the final Report of the CENELEC "Smart Houses" workshop.</p> <p>The opportunities offered by the Information Society considerably affect the lives of all consumers. Due to the enormous impact of the Information Society on the consumer, it is vital that standards elaborated for Information Society products and services take into account the consumer view. It is a basic consumer right to have access to products and services. Discrimination exists if elderly people and people with disabilities cannot use many of today's mainstream consumer products and services.</p>	Statements noted	
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	<p>ANEC Comments to the CENELEC « Smart Houses » Workshop final Report, July 2003</p> <p>ANEC, the European Consumer voice in standardisation, welcomes the opportunity to comment on the final Report of the CENELEC "Smart Houses" workshop.</p> <p>The opportunities offered by the Information Society considerably affect the lives of all consumers. Due to the enormous impact of the Information Society on the consumer, it is vital that standards elaborated for Information Society products and services take into account the consumer view. It is a basic consumer right to have access to products and services. Discrimination exists if elderly people and people with disabilities cannot use</p>	Statements noted	

		many of today's mainstream consumer products and services.		
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	<i>ANEC generic comments (1) primarily focus on the overall results of the CENELEC "Smart Houses" workshop. Then, ANEC specific comments (2) deal with the form of both the report itself (2a), which needs considerable editing, and of the process followed for the elaboration of the report (2b), that is to say the CENELEC Workshop procedure. The scope of the workshop (2c) and the content of the report (2d) are subsequently commented upon.</i>	Noted	
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	GENERAL COMMENTS In ANEC's view, developments in home electronics indicate that all houses in the future could be Smart Houses. Provided that consumer aspects are properly addressed, this can mean increased safety, comfort, convenience, security and energy savings for most groups of consumers, elderly and disabled people included. Therefore, ANEC is very interested in all standardisation attempts aimed at addressing those consumers' needs. However, with regards to the final Report of the CENELEC "Smart Houses" workshop, we feel the need to express some concerns about the form of the report itself and about its content (see below).	Statements noted	
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	As far as the latter is concerned, ANEC shares the report author's feelings expressed on page 33: "In view of all of the aforesaid, this first <i>Smart House</i> Workshop could (but) fail the Order Voucher's demanded task of a standardization program. However, the (Workshop) experience as such is promising.	Statements noted	
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	Still, substantial work of qualified advisers is required, e.g. to further the ANEC program	Accepted and covered; therefore, according to the decision at the last Smart	

		(consumer requirements)".	House workshop, May 2003, e.g. a phase 2 is being proposed	
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	In particular, we noticed that the main consumer concerns of safety and security have not been highlighted enough. We think in fact that current standards do not cover in an adequate manner the safety of connected appliances/devices. For consumers, the success of Smart Houses will depend on the Home Control System ability to operate appliances/devices and the potential to cause harm to the occupants of the house. Moreover, the issue of faulty system communication and data corruption seems essential.	Covered: Surely safety and security are of high importance. Issues are covered by CLC TC205 and JTC1/SC25 standards and ongoing standardisation work. However the main objective of the Workshop was and is to achieve open, fully interoperable Smart House systems and services through standards.	
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	From a manufacturer/service provider point of view, this will result in the need to ensure compatibility of appliances through interoperable standards and to extend the safety audit to cover the related additional risks.	Agreed; is covered	
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	2. SPECIFIC COMMENTS a) Form of the report ANEC suggests re-editing completely the report, possibly by a native English speaker, in order to make it clear, unambiguous and easy to understand. We are in particular concerned about the use of new, obscure and derogatory expressions and words.	Noted	
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	For example, on page 7, the report refers to the new European telecom framework package and the framework directive in particular ³ , calling them "eCom Directives". We would suggest avoiding this expression, as it could be misleading. When referring to	This acronym is explained in Annex Acc&Abb. It helps to repeat several times the descriptively incomplete "...electronic communications..." Directives. For clarification and as explained also in Annex EU-FMWRK there is not only the	

³ Directive (2002/21/EC) on a Common Regulatory Framework.

		the e-com directive in fact, the e-commerce directive, is generally concerned ⁴ .	Framework Directive but a whole set of 5 Directives which come into play. Moreover the e-Commerce Directive is everywhere referred to as e-Commerce.	
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	In addition, we would like the report to use the World Health Organization's (WHO) new standard definition of disability, <i>The International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF - May 2001)</i> , and avoid the use of expressions such as "handicapped, demented and less skilled people". This new definition emphasizes that disabled people's functioning in a specific domain is an interactive process between their health condition, activities and the contextual factors. It is a radical departure from the earlier versions, which focused substantially on the medical and individual aspects of disability. The social model of disability suggests that disability is not entirely an attribute of an individual, but rather a complex social and environmental construct largely imposed by societal attitudes and the limitations of the human-made environment. Consequently, any process of amelioration and inclusion requires social action, and it is the collective responsibility of society at large to make the environmental and attitudinal changes necessary for their full participation in all areas of life.	Noted. These terms are taken from the used documentation such as the Norwegian case study . Any modification to such documents is outside the scope of the Smart House Workshop.	
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	The report is missing also other definitions such as the definition of Assistive technology ⁵ . A specific section on Definitions, Abbreviations and Acronyms could be a good idea.	Accepted; will be added to the already existing Annex Acc&Abb, which contains already also a few definitions.	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Executive Summary	From an editing point of view, we suggest to clearly highlight in the Executive Summary the Workshop goals which should be	Editorial; covered already within the Preface	

⁴ Directive 2000/31/EC of 8 June 2000 on certain legal aspects of information society services, in particular electronic commerce, in the Internal Market ("Directive on electronic commerce").

⁵ According to ISO 9999 "Any product, instrument, equipment or technical system used by a disabled person, especially produced or generally available, preventing, compensating relieving or neutralizing the impairment, disability or handicap"

		<p>consistent with the objectives listed in section 5.2.2. It is opportune to clearly state which goals have been met/ not met in the Executive Summary.</p> <p>For example, it could be structured in the following way: Goals, Methods, Results achieved or not achieved and problems encountered.</p>		
ANEC 2003-08-20	List of Annexes	The "List of Annexes" contained in the report does not reflect the list published in the CENELEC CLCTECH web-site which present sometime the same annexes twice. We think it would be a good idea to "clean up" this list.	<p>Noted</p> <p>However as the Final report is a document in its own right, all material referred to must be accessible to its reader; hence this list of Annexes has been established according to the needs of the Final Report..</p> <p>The CLCTECH web-site serves a different purpose during the running of Workshops and is not generally acceptable</p>	
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	<p>b) Form of the workshop process</p> <p>Due to specific market needs in fast emerging technology areas, the European Standardisation Organisations decided to adopt less-formal standardisation procedures, leading to the adoption of New Deliverables. Workshops agreements are one example of New Deliverables. New Deliverables, however, create a problem for consumer representation because they are not automatically open for participation, and even if they are, consumer representation is hampered by a lack of resources and opacity of processes. Hence, ANEC called upon the European Commission to not use non-formal standards including New Deliverables of the European standards bodies to complement European legislation.</p>	Noted	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Page 29	As far as the CENELEC "Smart Houses" workshop is concerned, the opinion we expressed in the past was somehow confirmed. On page 29, the report refers to	Noted; page 29 lists the presentations sorted according the project team subjects	

		the presentations and considerations of three "Project teams" during the second workshop meeting on 19 November 2002. This is very puzzling because the three quoted 'Project teams" never met as not enough participants volunteered to take part.		
ANEC 2003-08-20	Page 30	During the last workshop meeting in May 2003, the ANEC representative was invited to make a presentation of the revised versions of the ANEC Report on Consumers Requirements in ICT. However, no mention of this presentation or of its content is made in the report. We have to express our regrets as we thought that one of the initial aims of the workshop was to provide a platform for the exchange of information for all parties interested in smart houses standardisation. We believe that just adding the ANEC Report on Consumers Requirements in ICT in the list of annexes is improper.	Covered. The version of the Final Report submitted to the dke and to Mr. Heinrichs/CENELEC clearly lists on page 30 that this Update on (ANEC) Consumer requirements had been provided and a footnote informs on the document's references in the Annex on Presentations. The Consumer Requirements are added additionally, as they will have to be taken up again in Phase 2.	
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	c) Scope of the Workshop The CENELEC "Smart houses" workshop, originally CLC/TC 205 WG 16, was set up following the request of the ICTSB in 2001. According to the Business plan for the Smart House Workshop (WS/SMH), the Workshop's objectives were: - to ensure effective co -ordination and information exchange with the relevant activities in the other ESOs CEN and ETSI, under the umbrella of the ICTSB including the Workshop on Design for All and Assistive Technologies in ICT, by keeping an overview of all relevant developments/activities, at national, European and global level, - to investigate together with market players, consumers, and other interested parties, the need for additional work and agree, where necessary, on recommendations for future	Covered Such coordination has been pursued by inviting experts from these ESOs to contribute to the Workshop As visible from the final report extensive efforts (see e.g. Preface) were made to address such market players and to identify additional work (e.g. in the OSGI	

		<p>standardisation work in the field of <i>Smart Houses</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to offer a forum for presenting RTD projects relating to the “Networked Smart House” - Platform and/or to “Services to Smart Houses” with the view of possible application specific European standardisation. - to keep an overview of the overall work plan implementing the high priority, relevant recommendations from the relevant expert groups - to ensure the consultation and active involvement of the user communities <p>In ANEC’s opinion, only the last three objectives have been addressed by the workshop so far.</p>	<p>area)</p> <p>Contained</p> <p>Lack of contributions</p> <p>Covered</p> <p>Covered</p> <p>Not accepted, as explained before.</p>	
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	Regarding the first two points, we have to highlight the fact that since December 2002, no progress report was made by the Workshop to the ICTSB	Noted. The secretary supplied summary reports to CENELEC which the CENELEC representative submitted to ICTSB	
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	Moreover, the report does not contain any significant reference to the work on Next Generation Networks undergone both at the European level (ETSI) and international level (ITU-T). We think that NGN standardisation is closely related to Smart Houses standardisation and that an international approach is essential in the ICTs context	Covered. Therefore information on NGN work, as far as available is included. However during the Workshop time NGN, specifically invited to the third workshop, did not attend: NGN was modifying its work item plan and could not provide more information.	
ANEC 2003-08-20	General	In addition, the workshop was supposed to “ensure effective co-ordination” among all relevant activities. However, we were not able to find in the report any mention of the other 15 working groups of CENELEC TC 205	Not relevant, as also checked with the CLC TC205 secretary.	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Pages 8	<p>d) Content of the Report</p> <p>Chapter 2 “Executive Summary”:</p> <p>□page 8: In ANEC’s view, the “Working Model” with its three elements seems to be a</p>	Statements noted	

		satisfactory model.		
ANEC 2003-08-20	Page 9	<p>□page 9: Three “consumer interests and communications preferences” are identified: entertainment, computer and mobile centric approaches.</p> <p>We would suggest that a “utility centric” approach should also be recognised. For example, because of their existing access to homes, gas, electricity and/or water providers could be primary providers of smart home communications and infrastructure and thereby offering services of interest to the consumer.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Covered. As the three”centricities” relate to the means of communication, the Utility issue relates only to one group of mayor service providers and is covered by the model !</p>	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Page 9	<p>However, it should be noted that consumers needs are not homogeneous – they vary widely, with respect to age, occupation, abilities, etc. The document should therefore emphasise the range and diversity of requirements to be met. This in turn leads to the need for adaptable user interfaces/ solutions, based on underlying standards, to meet a very wide range of consumers needs and abilities.</p>	<p>Noted; extensively dealt with e.g. in 4.1</p>	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Chapter 3	<p>Chapter 3 “The European political and regulatory environment”: □Section 3.3: We support the reference to the Energy Performance Directive, which we think is important for both consumers and the industry sector in the sustainable development perspective.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Chapter 4, section 4.1	<p>Chapter 4 “European Standardisation” :</p> <p>□Section 4.1: ANEC welcomes very much the “Design for All approach” because we strongly believe that Smart Houses represent an entirely new way of using the electrical installations and appliances in a house. If the technology is difficult for consumers to operate and maintain, some consumers will be disadvantaged, i.e. will not be able to</p>	<p>Statements noted</p>	

		enjoy the potential benefits (energy savings, integrated alarms) offered by the system. The groups (elderly and disabled people) who might gain the most benefit from such systems might be the very ones who cannot operate them. If Smart House technology is going to be beneficial to the consumer, standards must ensure ease of installation and operation according to Design for All principles.		
ANEC 2003-08-20	Paragraph 4.1.5	□ Paragraph 4.1.5 “CEN TC 224”: we suggest to mention the work of WG 6 which deals with Man Machine Interfaces of card systems. It has produced, among others, EN 1332-4 “Coding of User requirements”. It could be interesting for smart house standardisation in two respects. Firstly, the concept behind the standard is to code users requirements/ preferences onto a smart card. The coding then adjusts the services/ terminal to the preferred requirements. This concept has a number of applications for TV, mobile communications and smart houses. The second point of relevance could be that this standard was developed <i>ahead</i> of market needs. This is in contrast to many standards that “rubber stamp” existing solutions.	Agreed	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Paragraph 4.1.5	Perhaps some strategic smart Houses standards should be developed <i>before</i> market needs are in place.	Agreed in principle, but unfortunately beyond our means.	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Chapter 5, Section 5.1	Chapter 5 “The CENELEC initiatives”: □ Section 5.1: In ANEC’s opinion, Digital Interactive Television is just an element of the components of a smart home. There is little evidence to suggest that it will be a significant gateway in itself because subscriptions have not been significant where it already exists. This is confirmed by the CENELEC report on Digital Interactive Television by Mr Brusse, which highlights industry reluctance to reach interoperability though open Application	Disagreed, the more recent development e.g. in Germany, leads to an entire out-phasing of analogue TV. This is already achieved in the area of its capital. By 2010 it will be phased out in the whole country. Moreover statistics show that Digital TV and Multimedia constitute a much larger market, where people are ready to spent money ahead of any other “smart application”. Moreover practical examples show that the required set-top box is “the	

		Programming Interfaces platforms.	candidate” to house residential gateway applications.	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Section 5.2.3	□ Section 5.2.3: ANEC supports the recognition that the “open service gateway initiative” (OSGI) is an important initiative and could play a key role in the Smart Houses standardisation providing the OSGI technology is made readily available to all parties (see also Chapter 6).	Statement noted	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Chapter 6	Chapter 6 “Critical Analysis of results” ANEC shares the report author’s feelings expressed on page 33: “In view of all of the aforesaid, this first <i>Smart House</i> Workshop could but fail the Order Voucher’s demanded task of a standardization program. However, the Workshop experience as such is promising. Still substantial work of qualified advisers is required, e.g. to further the ANEC program”.	Statement noted	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Chapter 6	However, we would like to stress the importance of the OSGI initiative and advocate for the adoption of open and interoperable standards as far as the API platforms are concerned. From a consumer’s point of view, solutions should not be proprietary, because companies ‘owning’ the infrastructure will dictate the preconditions. In reality, the cost and complexity of a Smart House system will inevitably result in a number of proprietary systems together with a degree of commercial vertical integration. Consumers may therefore find themselves financially or physically ‘tied-in’ to a system. It is important for operational and technical standards to exist to ensure that consumers can change their system or service without major redesign and appliance replacement for their home.	Statement noted	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Chapter 6 and Annex RTD-PRJ	As far as the evaluation of SMH projects, the list of EU RTD SH projects (Annex RTD-PRJ) is missing some key projects under the TIDE	Agreed, these projects should be added however with a note to indicate that as they had not	

		programme such as: ASHoRED, Homebrain,, DEFIE, HS-ADEPT, Presence, Astrid, CASA and HOME SYSTEMS.	been identified to the Workshop secretariat no contact attempt had been made.	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Chapter 7 Recommendation a)	Chapter 7 " Conclusions and Recommendations Concerning recommendation a) we do not really see the potential of Digital Interactive TV for Smart Houses in the light of the its poor overall penetration in the European Union when compared to initial expectations. Consequently, it is widely recognised among stakeholders that standardisation could have a positive effect since the existing different economic positions and market situations can generate very different standardisation needs. In ANE C's opinion, linking the Digital Interactive TV standardisation efforts to Smart Houses standardisation would hamper the latter especially from the accessibility point of view.	General: the received comments encourage, reviewing the Recommendations of the current text of the Final Report. Covered by remark under clause 5.1 above	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Chapter 7 Recommendation a)	Digital television in fact is operated by remote controls and on-screen menus such as electronic programme guides. This on-screen information currently cannot be accessed other than by reading the screen. Moreover, current interfaces are not easy to use and do not apply Design for All principles.	Noted; this is just a very chance for the Smart House initiative to come forward, in cooperation with other related work, e.g. within ANEC, with standardised solution.	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Chapter 7 Recommendation b)	As stated before, ANEC supports the recommendation b) on setting up a special group for interoperable Smart Houses services. However, we wonder if the OSGI is the right forum to deal with it in term of lack of consumer participation in particular. We think that the European Standardisation organisations are in a better position for this purpose.	See general remark above; Coordination and hence allocation of work resides with CENELEC TC205 WG16	
ANEC 2003-08-20		Finally, regarding the recommendation e), we think that any Certification Scheme should	Generally agreed; however unless a well coordinated	

		comply with the requirements of independent verification and accreditation system for verifiers in order to be credible and reliable for consumers.	European standardisation approach leads to a complete set of standards for certifying interoperability of all Smart House related products and services, the different show cases will develop to competing and non-interoperable benchmarking. Therefore the proposal for networking among these “show and test cases” to tap into their experience and get feedback. Networks to be organised by CENELEC TC205 WG16 and Central Secretariat	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Chapter 7 Recommendation e)	We suggest to rephrase this paragraph as we think that consumers concerns should not be “alleviate” but “addressed”.	Agreed	
ANEC 2003-08-20	Chapter 7 Recommendation e)	We suggest to rephrase this paragraph as we think that items d) and e) should be “combined” instead of “combing	Agreed, that is an obvious Typo	