The following are comments made by OMA Members to explain their survey response that: OMA has only met some or has not met any of their expectations (Question 6)

HOPEFULLY THE TOUGH TIMES ARE BEHIND

- OMA has met most of our expectations. Some WGs move too slowly. Would like to see a more streamlined process with more flexibility.
- OMA has been going through a hard and rough political and administrative stabilization; hence its technical accomplishments were overshadowed. I would expect to see OMA entering a more mature and more productive period of its life.
- Our company has attended a number of ETSI and later 3GPP meetings. It is clear that the OMA is still suffering a number of growing pains
- OMA slowed down significantly the progress Wireless Village had achieved. Politics and Bureaucracy are the main causes. Also, the fees for being an associate company are too high for the return. We still recommend joining OMA and we hope the processes improve after its first year of creation. OMA's mission is very important for improving the mobile value chain and we strongly believe in it. We understand things may not work perfectly from the start, so we aim to keep improving things.
- There is no replacement for the WAP Certification (Open Group) yet
- Some of the things we liked about SyncML org have been eliminated by the OMA. The OMA has not provided any alternative to the missing support. Protocol Certification and "logo" in particular.
- Much of OMA's time to date has been spent completing legacy work of the associations which merged together to create OMA. When the new work which was initiated in 2003 is delivered later in 2004, then this will go further towards meeting my company’s objectives.
- Too disorganized and too much bureaucracy and personal/company agenda’s
- Efficiency and focus, and balance of benefits among different levels of membership
- Our membership is too recent to assess full OMA capabilities wrt our expectations

TOO FAST

- OMA is developing new releases too fast, and it's not obvious for a company to follow and stay up to date.

TOO SLOW

- OMA is too slow; it takes too much time and is too difficult to make decisions and release specifications
- OMA is too slow, openness is limited, restrictive IPR policy, insufficient market orientation, missing roadmap, blocking culture
- OMA has been slow in producing specifications that the industry can use
- The cost is too high for following the spec work, and the meetings are moving to slowly because the routines are not well established and understood.
- Single companies have too much control in that they can lame the whole group

- OMA focuses far too much on process versus results. Specification work is not keeping up with the industry as a whole.
- So much politics and so little work.
- The procedural roadblocks are disappointing as certain individuals use such procedures to prevent any kind of useful progress.
- My company wanted OMA to be something speedy and responsive. Instead we get a 3GPP look alike – too slow to be relevant.
- OMA is still too slow and bureaucratic. It lacks a mechanism for lightweight creation of new candidate solutions that could become standards, driving companies to develop outside OMA and then attempt to "dump" largely finished approaches on the organization
- Takes too long to make standards that everybody supports, commercial proprietary solution is often only way to make real business.
- OMA can be slow, unpredictable, and highly political. Having all groups and subgroups meet all day at the same time makes it impossible to participate in multiple areas without sending a very large team.

STRUCTURE/ OPERATIONAL COMMENTS

- Interoperability is top level priority for OMA as we have understood and support. However, the OMA operational and membership commitment is lacking and we would like see more membership commitment from the whole value chain and allocate OMA staff the needed resources and priority for IOP
- Requirements process is messy. Board is too large (and redundant).
- Standards are big and complex - need to define multiple levels (3?) of compliance; Need a certification process whereby two Level X certified devices can be assured of interoperability
- OMA legal framework different to those of other major bodies and fora, thus making OMA an organization hard to liaise with
- OMA processes are very formal. Focus on policies may limit achievement of the real goals.
- We expected OMA to take a fresh approach to Standardization, but much of the problems of previous fora have also been incorporated.
- OMA needs to be more focused in terms of the areas in which we choose to deliver specs. Today we are too organic, bottom up.
- We are not fully satisfied with the progress in the organization and with our influence

WORKING GROUP

- Not much produced by OMA in key technical areas: e.g. Architecture, Web Services
- Introduction of new activities (WID approval)is a too complex process: decisions and arguments are taken too early by parties that may not even understand the domain and proposal. Work should be allowed to start more rapidly and produce an overview TR / more detailed proposal, before a decision to go ahead or not pursue is taken by TP.

- Numerous decisions / reviews are taken by people with limited to no understanding of the key technical issues.
- OMA needs to do more on ensuring interoperability between products. OMA needs to realize just defining Enablers without inter-operable products is not going to help the industry.
- OMA seems to have lost some momentum recently; Web Service development is occurring at a rapid pace, and yet OMA's Mobile Web Service activities seem to be taking longer to evolve & emerge into the market-place .... this is worrying. I would have expected BOWSER to have been released Fall '03, and yet .....
- Too much disparity of technical expertise and backgrounds. The disparity of technical expertise leads to misunderstanding and often meaningless arguments that can block valuable proposals
- Disconnect between technical WGs, REQ and ARCH.
- We were expecting faster processes and more accurate planning of IOT Test Fests. "OMA focuses too much on Client/Server interface and seems to avoid addressing Client/Smartcard interface.

WEB-SITE

- Based on the quality of the website and emails from the working groups, the OMA seems very disjointed. The information I receive via email is not very informative and therefore not useful. The website is not kept up to date and does not reflect the current work done by the working groups. For example I complained about the home page showing an out of date list of working groups. The members page is very complicated and not user friendly at all. I cannot get up to date documents from the website. We are considering reducing our membership level. Personally I have not seen any signs of the OMA delivering any of the promises the OMA makes in presentations and marketing material.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- Not enough real focus on interoperability; sometimes too much focus on process related issues
- OMA should use member's resources for making real specifications rather than discussing meta level topics.
- Some companies seem to have joined OMA out of 'mass hysteria' – so that they would not be left out
- OMA needs to gain influence for CDMA
- Improvements needed:
    - Articulating the value of OMA specifications to the industry at large, e.g. Hitchhiker's Guide in leveraging OMA specifications in your business"
    - Failure to achieve on an OMA architecture as the unifying force for the existing (and future) → Service Enabler Strategy is a disappointment.
- Entire segments of the value chain get short shrift in deference to operators' concerns.
- It is difficult for enterprise concerns to be addressed.
- Have not use most of the available OMA services yet.
- OMA still needs more content provider representation.

- The influence of the largest companies is hard to overcome, as they have much greater resources allowing them to push their agenda over other companies.
- A few members only monitor - active contribution of these members would better support OMA and our industry
- For a smaller company not able to participate actively in most meetings, we find it difficult to stay updated by means of information made available on the OMA web site.
- The inherited structure and organization slows the work progress of OMA. A complete overhaul of how we operate is needed to be more reactive to the marketplace.
- Not enough liaising with "IT-related" fora and SDOs. Working liaisons heavily unbalanced towards "network centric" fora and SDOs.