Deadline for comments: 25/09/2015

ETSI SR 003 392

Cloud Computing Standards Maturity Assessment

Distributed: 7,

Organization	Section	Line Number	Comment Type General, Technical, Editorial	Comments	Proposed change
AFNOR	All		General	We recognise that many consortia are producing valuable specifications in the cloud arena. However, if we move to accept that a 'specification is a standard', and hence that all standards so-defined are of equal merit, we believe this is contrary to the objective of 'cutting thru the cloud standards jungle" as set out in the EU cloud strategy [COM(2012) 529 final]. Moreover, the proliferation of standards that would ensue, could create significant interoperability and security challenges for cloud users and service providers, which could undermine the development of cloud as an engine for economic growth in the EU, and to delivering the Digital Single Market. The approach of equating specifications with standards, which uniquely applies in the ICT sector, would make it difficult if not impossible • For customers: to know which standards were the most important in choosing a cloud service supplier; • For Cloud service providers: to comply with a vast number of different, inconsistent, and sometimes conflicting standards, and to endless rounds of compliance and certification audits that would ensue	

Deadline for comments:

25/09/2015

ETSI SR 003 392

Cloud Computing Standards Maturity Assessment

Distributed:

CloudWATCH project	n/a	n/a	General	activities that are going on elsewhere. Without that, the report would give the wrong impression of this report living in isolation. For example, the work in the CLoudWATCH (and in future, the CLoudWATCH2 project) as well as the work conducted in IEEE P2301 working group are all but two examples of the work in this space.	The work done in the CloudWATCH project in this area, reported in deliverables D2.2, D2.4, D3.4, D4.1, D4.2, and D4.3, as well as the draft outputs of IEEE P2301 should be a starting point for this new section.
OFE			Ge	One piece of work missing from this report is that there is no assessment of adoption since the phase 1 report. Has a standard increased its adoption, decreased or the same?	Add a recommendation that adoption of each appropriate standard should be tracked to see what is gaining favour what is losing favour etc.
MS1		80-82	ed	Table 7, 8, 9 are in Table of contents but not in document	Either add tables, or adjust Table of contents so as to be consistent
MS2	3.1	155-162	GE	SSO/SDO description is confusing: a specification is not a standard unless ratified by a recognised standards body. There is potential confusion among cloud users and service providers alike We note that such an outcome would be the exact opposite outcome of 'cutting thru the cloud standards jungle's issue raised in the original EU Cloud strategy [COM(2012) 529 final]	Clearly differentiate specification from standard. Recognise the need to strike an effective balance between having enough standards to allow customer choice, promote interoperability and trust, but not too many that can creates confusion for cloud users and service producers alike.
OFE		250	Ge	Certification has to be against standards that comply with regulation1025:2012. The focus should therefore be in the standards and can include and certification or compliance activities related to the standard. Schemes based on an underlying specification that does not meet annex II criteria should be excluded.	Remove certifications against non Annex II compliant specifications.

Deadline for comments:

25/09/2015

ETSI SR 003 392

Cloud Computing Standards Maturity Assessment

Distributed:

OFE		253	Ge	There are many interoperability and portability standards that are supported by cloud vendors	
				that are not cloud specific. It would be interesting to compare providers to see if there is a core set of these. (JSON, YAML,)	
ENISA	5.1.1	306-307	Technical	Despite the planning, what are the decision criteria to move to cloud or not?	Please describe what are the criteria that a company or organization should take into consideration to move to cloud. (eg. Type of data)
MS3	5.1	310-314	ge	Relatively low levels of awareness / use of standard's	Awareness/ Promotion effort to be spelled out in conclusions /Recommendations
CloudWATCH project	5.1.2	318	Editorial	A weak comment mostly on the wording of "marketing". Used in a commercial context to create demand for services sold at a given charge, the term bears a misleading connotation.	
MS4		325 -327	ge	Security Integrity and Privacy	Use 'Trust' as theme which captures these key elements
CloudWATCH project	5.1.3	329 ff.	Technical	multiple factors; (a) cloud service customers/users frequently conflate de-facto standards (e.g. Amazon EC2)	

Deadline for comments:

25/09/2015

ETSI SR 003 392

Cloud Computing Standards Maturity Assessment

Distributed:

ENISA	5.1.4	341-344	Editorial	31% are aware of CCSL but what is the type of	"Under the first objective of the EU Cloud
	0.1.4	341-344	Editorial	the respondents and which way does this percentage reflect a representative number of the reality? (37% is mentioned above that implement Cloud computing standards) – the way CCSL is presented is completely false, the CCSL is not an "attempt" by ENISA, it's an activity decided by the EC and the Cloud SIG under the first action of the EU Cloud Strategy, powered and	Strategy, the EC together with the Cloud Selected Industry Group (C-SIG) and ENISA have setup the Cloud Certification Schemes List (CCSL). CCSL gives an overview of different existing certification schemes which could be relevant for cloud computing customers. The survey shows that only 31% of respondents are aware of CCSL. This is clearly showing a need for increasing awareness of the Cloud Computing community on CCSL and for facilitating the access to pre-analysed certification schemes.
MS5	5.1	341		' however the selection of certification schemes is complex; see earlier point: the proliferation of specifications and certifications is not actually helpful#	Reinforce ENISA document ; Cloud Certification schemes Metaframework
Korea Association of Cloud Industry(KACI) Cloud Computing Standard Forum(CCF)		352	General	HARDLY UNDERSTAND THE MEANING OF Nb	3.2 Abbreviations, PLEASE SHOW THE FULL NAME OF Nb
OFE		357	Ge	Check whether CSA and Eurocloud specifications comply with regulation 1025. What about the other schemes under CSCL?	
MS6	5.2	360-365	ge		Add comment "considerable progress has been made in delivering key cloud standards since CSC Phase I

Deadline for comments:

25/09/2015

ETSI SR 003 392

Cloud Computing Standards Maturity Assessment

Distributed:

CloudWATCH project	5.2	375	Editorial/Technical	consolidation in the Cloud Computing landscape; it is converse in that there are <i>more</i> standards available instead of less, nor is there consolidation in the SSO/SDO landscape: There are more organisations active rather than less!	
				The right conclusion to draw is that the focus has shifted from white papers to actual standards and specifications – and that the <i>coverage</i> of use cases and activities has increased.	
ENISA	5.3	385	Technical	Which way did this approach/phases of lifecycle come up? Please explain in which fact you were based to produce this lifecycle and categorization of the cloud standards.	
	5.3	404		The cloud service lifecycle in 5.3 should really account for the build-out of the cloud infrastructure itself and the development of applications	
		409		Table 2 : Pre conditions Terminology and metrics 17788 clearly fits here	
CloudWATCH project	5.3.0	409	Technical	Two standards are missing in Table 2, i.e.: DMTF CIMI [DMTF1], and NIST SP 500-307 [NIST7] In the area of Terminology and Metrics	Add the suggested standards to the table, and the NIST SP 500-307 as referenceable NIST7 to Appendix A.2.10
Korea Association of Cloud Industry(KACI) Cloud Computing Standard Forum(CCF)		409	General	ADD STANDARD AT ROW3, COLUMN3(Related Standards & Specifications, Terminology and Metrics)	[ISO2] ISO/IEC 17788, [ITU5] ITU-T Y.3500 [ISO12] ISO/IEC 19086-2
Korea Association of Cloud Industry(KACI) Cloud Computing Standard Forum(CCF)		409	General	ADD STATUS AT ROW4, COLUMN3(status, Terminology and Metrics)	Published in progress

Deadline for comments:

25/09/2015

ETSI SR 003 392

Cloud Computing Standards Maturity Assessment

Distributed:

Korea Association of Cloud Industry(KACI) Cloud Computing Standard Forum(CCF)	Table 2	409	General	DELL REMARK AT ROW5, COLUMN3(Remark, Terminology and Metrics)	Delete 'Standard needed'
OFE		415	Те	No mention of Application portability where TOSCA and CAMP and be listed.	
MS7		415			
Korea Association of Cloud Industry(KACI) Cloud Computing Standard Forum(CCF)	5.3.1	415	General	missing status of the [OGF4] GFD.192 standard	add "Published"
ENISA	5.3.1	415	Technical	Strategy (and probably risk assessment) is something I think might be considered for the Acquisition of a Cloud Service	Include in Short Summary of Table 3 items that refer to Strategy and Risk assessment.
CloudWATCH project	5.3.1	Table 3	Technical	For activity "Security & Privacy Requirements specification" CSA's PLA specification [CSA4] should be mentioned	
CloudWATCH project	5.3.1	Table 3	Technical	For activity "Enabling Interoperability", the soon to be published OGF OCCI 1.2 specifications should be considered	Add OCCI 1.2 references, as in preparation or soon to be published, to appendix A.2.13, and add here as related specifications.

Deadline for comments:

25/09/2015

ETSI SR 003 392

Cloud Computing Standards Maturity Assessment

Distributed:

OFE		420	Те	table() regarding monitoring and ultimately providing reporting for SLA measurements.	A recommendation is needed to further the creation of standards to support the actions of the CSP covering monitoring to enable efficient and informative reporting.
MS8		420		Table 4 Standards for Operation: No section for service management or governance? (although IS 20000 is mentioned later in the document)	Include reference to revision work on IS 20000 - underway in SC40/WG2, and to IT Governance work underway in SC40/WG1 (IS 38500, TS 38501, TR 38502 and to the emerging 38505 series)
ENISA	5.3.2	420	Technical	"Monitoring Incident management" in table 4 shows there a no standards available at this time. This is not a cloud specific action, so standards like DSCI Security Framework should cover this item.	
CloudWATCH project	5.3.2	Table 4	Technical	Activity "Reporting SLA infringements" should be considered either as part of activity "Receiving and processing SLA reports", or being made part of a more generalised service reporting activity (part of Service Management, see below)	
CloudWATCH project	5.3.2	Table 4	Technical	Consolidate the following activities Responding to SLA infringements Resolving SLA infringement disputes into one activity "Service Reporting". These activities, while arguably slightly different in their goals and objectives, can be safely referred to as service reporting, which is a well- known common service management activity for any type of IT service.	
CloudWATCH project	5.3.2	Table 4	Technical	The referenced standard [ISO1] (i.e. OVF) leaves the issue of hypervisor conformance (let	Rename the activity into "Creation of a VM image for a given public Cloud" or similar, or otherwise clarify in the Remarks column that hypervisor interoperability and, more important, VM image portability(!) is <i>not</i> addressed by this standard.

Deadline for comments:

25/09/2015

ETSI SR 003 392

Cloud Computing Standards Maturity Assessment

Distributed:

CloudWATCH project	5.3.2	Table 4	Technical	Activity "Preventive [Preventative?] response to SLA infringement" is unclear. If it is what we think it is, then it should be part of the more general Service Reporting activity.		
CloudWATCH project	5.3.3	Table 5	Technical	unclear/ambiguous. Is this a service satisfaction	Clarify; might be perhaps part of Service Reporting (see above). For service satisfaction reports, there are likely standards not needed.	
CloudWATCH project	5.3.3	Table 5	Technical	Activity "Resolving disputes"	There are well-known best practices and standards available, such as ISO 10k, ITIL and its its not a Cloud-specific activity. Might be mentioned similar to other non-Cloud specific activities, or removed entirely.	
ENISA	5.3.3	426	Technical	Termination process does not have an long list of items	For the Termination of Cloud services include the Exit strategy	
OFE		433	Те	This is not consistent with regulation 1025! See comment for line 250.		
Kyung Hee University	6.2.1	457	Editorial	The list of standards include not published standards, i.e. OGF GFD.193.	·	
Korea Association of Cloud Industry(KACI) Cloud Computing Standard Forum(CCF)		464, 465, 512	Editorial	UNIFIED PATTERN OF CODING IS NEEDED	1. ISO/IEC 17789 / ITU-T Y.3502 2. ISO/IEC 27017 – ITU-T X.1631	
Kyung Hee University	6.2.1	466	Editorial	OGF GFD.192 is non cloud specific standard	Move the standards to the "Non cloud specific"	
Consortium of Cloud Computing Research	6.2.1	467	Editorial	OGF GFD.193 is not published	Move the standard below line 472.	
CloudWATCH project	6.2.2	490	Editorial	Specification NIST SP 500-307 is missing	Add NIST SP 500-307 to the list.	
OFE		498	Те	Identity and access management includes authentication and authorization		
MS9	6.2.3	512	ge	SC27 work on SLA security should be included	include ref to IS/IEC 19086-4	
MS 10	6.2.4	520	ge	Legal issues: are they being raised here; is it the right place	Editors discretion on the advisability of raising legal issues , of which there are many , in this document	

Deadline for comments:

25/09/2015

ETSI SR 003 392

Cloud Computing Standards Maturity Assessment

Distributed:

OFE		527	Те	CAMP needs to be added to this table, Camp	
				allows for managing running applications deployed in the cloud. Note CAMP 1.1 is published	
XLAB	6.3	533	General	Possible data theft by the national intelligence companies is certainly a problem. However, I'd be more worried by industrial espionage, possible sensitive data theft and re-use by hacking communities.	
MS 11	6.3	537-540	ge	no reference to SC38 work on 'data and its flow across devices and clouds'	include reference to SC38 work on 'data and its flow across devices and cloud (SC38/WG5), specifically ISO/IEC NP 19944
MS 12		561		re: SSO /SDO collaboration	Potential use of the JTC1 PAS process as a mechanism to enhance co-operation
ENISA	7	562	Editorial	number 2 only mentions 'chief concerns' without any explicit reference to section 6.1, i.e. security, or any proposal of how these could be addressed	
OFE		572	Те	One vital and important recommendation is missing regarding encouraging open source projects to formally specify apis via sso/sdos	Add a recommendation: Open source projects need to be encouraged and incentivized to bring apis into SSO/SDOs for standardisation.
OFE		612	Те	Colour coding is not accessible so need another way to highlight.	Use italics for the csc p1 identified specs.
OFE		617-618	Те		Enumerate the orgs that have transferred work (list from and 2) and those that have stopped operations
MS 13	A2	620-621	ge	Trying to reflect who / what is missing from the list of 'other actors': consider including IETF and W3C	
OFE		644	ed	OASIS CAMP 1.1 has been published. CAMP 1.2 is work in progress	

Cloud Standards Coordinatio	n Phase 2	WP4 Report v1.0.0	Deadlin	e for comments:	25/09/2015
ETSI SR 003 392	Cloud Com	outing Standards Maturity Asse	essment	Distributed:	7/08/2015

	B2	690	Editorial	Compliance with regulatory and/or national laws	"Compliance with regulatory and/or national laws
ENISA				is a main area of concern. It is mentioned as	is a main concern as it can block the adoption of
				other areas of concern in this report, but in	Cloud in some cases."
				some cases this could block the adoption of	
				Cloud.	