LIAISON STATEMENT

Title:*	LS_to_OMA-DM_on_EventLog_LwM2M_Objects
Source:*	oneM2M MAS WG
Date:*	2017-05-26
To:*	OMA DM WG
Copy:	
Response to:	
Send replies to:*	oneM2M_liaison@list.onem2m.org
Contacts*	Yongjing Zhang, Huawei, zhangyongjing@huawei.com
List of attachments:	[1] MAS-2017-0118R04-LwM2M_Event_Log_Mapping

Introduction

oneM2M is currently working on the update of its TS-0005 "Management Enablement (OMA)", which specifies the usage and mapping of OMA DM (versions 1.3 and 2.0) and OMA LwM2M objects, to enhance the remote device management capability in Release 3. One aspect of the enhancement is to provide better alignment between the abstract oneM2M resource model and underlying OMA management objects.

In the latest version of TS-0005, a new LwM2M Object denoted as "Event Log Object" is introduced in clause 6.6.2 to support the collection and management of the event log for an oneM2M device using the LwM2M protocol. The mapping to the oneM2M resource [eventLog] is specified in clause 6.3.11 accordingly.

The new "Event Log Object" is designed based on the reusable log resources (ResourceID: 4010-4014) that are recently specified by OMA. To facilitate a direct mapping to the oneM2M resource [eventLog] without losing functionalities, some vendor specific values are also specified for the LogStatus resource. This enhancement aligned the log management capability across LwM2M and other management protocols (e.g. OMA DM 1.x/2.0 and BBF TR-069) in a consistent way from oneM2M perspective.

oneM2M would kindly ask OMA to review the proposed new object and welcome any technical feedback on the "Event Log Object".

Procedure-wise, oneM2M would like to have this object registered with OMNA as soon as possible to deliver this capability within the very tight timeframe of oneM2M Release 3 and to address the market needs in a timely manner. The current proposal is to register this new object as a 3rd party SDO extension (ObjectID range 2,048 - 10,240) in a straightforward way.

However, if OMA sees such an object could be more useful if it's registered as a generic OMA LwM2M objects (ObjectID range 0 - 1,023), and there is already an intention in OMA to work on that, oneM2M is also open to this approach and would be happy to collaborate

with OMA on potential enhancement and modification to the current object definition if needed (e.g. using the reserved value range instead of vendor specific values for LogStatus).

If OMA currently has no clear plan to work on this object or cannot make sure the work will be finished within a short timeframe (preferably before the next oneM2M TP#30 meeting in July 2017), oneM2M would proceed with the current proposal as is and register the object as a oneM2M extension with OMNA. If OMA would create a solution in a later phase for support of event logs, oneM2M may still consider an update to TS-0005 accordingly.

Actions

1. oneM2M would kindly ask OMA to review the proposed Event Log Object as currently specified in the oneM2M CR MAS-2017-0118R04 [1], and provide comments if any.(http://ftp.onem2m.org/Meetings/MAS/20170522_MAS29_China/MAS-2017-0118R04-LwM2M_Event_Log_Mapping.doc)

2. oneM2M would appreciate OMA's opinion on the approaches of the object registration with OMNA, as well as the potential work plan of OMA on the same topic if any.

Conclusion

oneM2M looks forward to continuous collaboration with OMA DM group on topics related to IoT device management.

Next oneM2M meetings

oneM2M TP#30: USA, 2017-07-10 to 2017-07-14

oneM2M TP#31: India, 2017-09-18 to 2017-09-22