LIAISON STATEMENT

Title:	OMA BAC MAE SWG liaison to W3C MMI WG on Multimodal Architecture and Interfaces Working Draft Published 22 April 2005 ☒ Public ☐ Confidential LS[1]
Date:	26 July 2005
To:	W3C MMI WG
Response to:	N/A
Source:	Mobile E-mail Sub-Working Group of Messaging Working Group of the Open Mobile Alliance
Send Replies to:	OMA BAC MAE sub-working Group, via OMA-LIAISON@mail.openmobilealliance.org
Contact(s):	Stéphane H. Maes, Oracle Corporation Ph: +1-203-300-7786 stephane.maes@oracle.com
Attachments:	N/A

1 Overview

The OMA BAC MAE SWG has reviewed the Multimodal Architecture and Interfaces Working Draft published on 22 April 2005 by the W3C MMI WG [http://www.w3.org/TR/2005/WD-mmi-arch-20050422/]. This working draft is called W3C MMI Working draft in the rest of this document.

As discussed at the last meeting of the MMI WG where OMA BAC MAE attended as observers and presented the status of the multimodal and multi-device enabler activities at OMA, OMA BAC MAE is hereby providing feedback on the Multimodal Architecture and Interfaces Working Draft as well as proposal for way forward and future cooperation.

2 Proposal

2.1 High level fundamental comments

- The proposed model is fairly abstract and as such its usefulness is limited without considering practical implementation issues.
- The proposed model is consistent / similar to OMA MMMD model as it assumes the same fundamental flow. This is good news and it guarantees compatibility between the W3C recommendations and the specifications that are developed by OMA.

[1] If the "Confidential LS" box is selected, this liaison statement is intended to be Confidential per agreement by OMA and the addressed organization. Neither side should make this communication available to non-members.

NO REPRESENTATIONS OR WARRANTIES (WHETHER EXPRESS OR IMPLIED) ARE MADE BY THE OPEN MOBILE ALLIANCE OR ANY OPEN MOBILE ALLIANCE MEMBER OR ITS AFFILIATES REGARDING ANY OF THE IPR'S REPRESENTED ON THE "OMA IPR DECLARATIONS" LIST, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE ACCURACY, COMPLETENESS, VALIDITY OR RELEVANCE OF THE INFORMATION OR WHETHER OR NOT SUCH RIGHTS ARE ESSENTIAL OR NON-ESSENTIAL.

THE OPEN MOBILE ALLIANCE IS NOT LIABLE FOR AND HEREBY DISCLAIMS ANY DIRECT, INDIRECT, PUNITIVE, SPECIAL, INCIDENTAL, CONSEQUENTIAL, OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF OR IN CONNECTION WITH THE USE OF DOCUMENTS AND THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE DOCUMENTS.

THIS DOCUMENT IS PROVIDED ON AN "AS IS" "AS AVAILABLE" AND "WITH ALL FAULTS" BASIS.

© 2005 Open Mobile Alliance Ltd. All Rights Reserved.
Used with the permission of the Open Mobile Alliance Ltd. under the terms as stated in this document.

- The terminology is such that the OMA multimodal synchronization and interaction manager can be seen as functionally equivalent to the W3C notions of interaction manager, data model, DPF and RTF. This is an issue that should be resolved.
- OMA MSP (and Multimodal and Multi-device Configuration Protocol) is functionally equivalent to the modality component APIs. It may be of value to recognize this in the W3C MMI WD as work progress via a reference to OMA activity and enabler in development.

2.2 More detailed analysis

2.2.2 Decomposition of run time architecture

The decomposition of the run time architecture diagram proposed by the W3C MMI with the multimodal synchronization and interaction manager split into IM/DM/DPF and RTF is not obviously useful, nor are the motivations for doing so, in the W3C working draft.

As an example, even in the W3C MMI working draft, none of the exchanges others than those of OMA MSP are characterized; perhaps a sign that the level of decomposition in MMI is not of obvious value. We fear that this decomposition may actually hurt by unnecessarily complicating the model required to characterize multimodal and multi-device interactions.

Also, we note that the relationship RTF / component execution is not clarified by the W3C MMI WG Working Draft model.

2.2.3 Terminology

Because of the decomposition; the terminology originally introduced in the field for interaction manager is unnecessarily constrained by the W3C WD. It seems to overlap but with a restricted meaning with the terminology used by OMA for the multimodal and multi-device enabler.

The OMA terminology is in our opinion closer to the original meaning and as stated before the decomposition proposed by W3C. We believe that the terminology was also initially introduced as part of the discussions / presentations made at the multimodal joint WAP Forum / W3C workshop in Hong Kong, September 2000.

2.2.4 Division of work

While we note the compatibility of the work between W3C MMI WG and OMA BAC MAE SWG, we want to emphasize that it is critical that the W3C MMI and OMA MMMD work be complementary and not different in any substantive way. For example, the architecture, protocol and infrastructure work being driven as part of the OMA multimodal and multi-device enabler specification, with particular focus on interoperability, should be referenced rather than being reproduced by the W3C MMI activity whereas other areas affecting multimodal should be driven by the W3C MMI activity and used by, rather than being produced by, an OMA activity, e.g. multimodal markup languages.

2.2.5 Additional comments and Editorial issues

- In section 2 the statement "At the design level, we assume that multimodal applications will take the form of mixed-markup documents....." is unsubstantiated. This is certainly a common and expedient approach. The question is whether it is the only approach or a valid and substantiated assumption for the MMI work ? It would help to get an idea of the W3C work direction…
- Section 3 and 3.1 - alignment of terms with the figure (data component vs data model). Where is the Systems and Environment Component in the figure and where is the Dynamic Properties Framework in the list of constituents (they appear to be one and the same)?

© 2005 Open Mobile Alliance Ltd. All Rights Reserved.
Used with the permission of the Open Mobile Alliance Ltd. under the terms as stated in this document.

- Section 5.1 - is it a necessity that asynchronous DOM3 events are the interface between modality components? Is it not enough to state events that must be supported? Then DOM3 would appear as a possible technology to support it.
- What happened to sections 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 ?
- 5.1.3 - typo its "Another" not "An other"
- App A
  - step 1 - discussion re UAPROF not dealing with user preferences and
  - DPF is not relevant to the use case - it could simply delete " but it is not extensible .....used here." and the sentence makes complete sense without speculation etc.
  - step 2 - no need for the "In VoiceXML 3.0...." piece - again its potentially speculation
- Aside.
  - section 5.1.3.1 - pause and paused, resume and resumed puzzle use as events. Should it rather be halt and run? The only difference between pause/resume and halt/run.

3 Requested Action(s)

We request that the W3C consider the following recommendations:

3.1 Terminology

The OMA terminology of interaction and multimodal synchronization manager is in our point of view an accurate description of the role of the component. We therefore believe that the OMA multimodal and multi-device enabler specifications keep this term.

Therefore, we also recommend that the W3C MMI WG considers the definition of interaction and multimodal synchronization manager used by OMA and recommends alignment of the W3C MMI WG by using different terminology for the interaction manager used in the W3C MMI working draft.

3.2 Architecture

We would like W3C MMI WG to consider the OMA BAC MAE concerns and comments with the decomposition of the interaction and multimodal synchronization manager into the W3C concepts of interaction manager, data model, DPF and RTF. Ideally the decomposition should be motivated or it should not be pursued. At the minimum, the terminology should be updated so that the term “interaction manager” in OMA “multimodal synchronization and interaction manager” designates and the W3C concepts of “interaction manager, data model, DPF and RTF” is consistent or qualified, one course of action being that the W3C concept of “interaction manager” be re-named / qualified.

3.3 Specifications

As the two architectures are clearly compatible and considering the mandates of the respective groups, the W3C MMI should be aware of OMA’s intention to specify this architecture in greater details with its components and in particular start with a detailed specification of the Multimodal Synchronization Protocol and the Multimodal and Multi-device Configuration Protocol.

OMA BAC MAE therefore encourages the W3C not to endeavour in similar specifications but to refer to the OMA specification and ensure that its specifications are developed within such a context.

3.4 Collaboration

OMA BAC MAE would encourage frequent feedback and discussions between the W3C MMI WG and OMA BAC MAE SWG to ensure that OMA specification satisfies the need of the W3C and that W3C MMI related specifications satisfy the needs of OMA.

© 2005 Open Mobile Alliance Ltd. All Rights Reserved.
Used with the permission of the Open Mobile Alliance Ltd. under the terms as stated in this document.

OMA is currently not planning to specify an authoring language. We wish for frequent discussions with W3C to be able to ensure that the authoring model that W3C develops can satisfy the need for authoring of multimodal and multi-device services as envisaged to be supported by the OMA multimodal and multi-device enabler.

We hope that OMA MMI WG will soon provide some guidance in terms of a standard authoring language.

In the absence of such guidance, OMA aims at supporting all the main authoring techniques currently used in the industry.

4 Conclusion

The OMA BAC MAE Sub-Working Group wishes to thank the W3C MMI WG for considering our review comments..

Furthermore the OMA BAC MAE Sub-Working Group looks forward to a continued dialogue and cooperation on these matters with the W3C MMI WG.

Finally the OMA BAC MAE Sub-Working Group wishes to thank the OMA MMI WG for its kind consideration of this liaison.

© 2005 Open Mobile Alliance Ltd. All Rights Reserved.
Used with the permission of the Open Mobile Alliance Ltd. under the terms as stated in this document.