DEFINING OPEN STANDARDS
WHAT IS IT ALL ABOUT?

~What: Defining open standards

~ Why: The different interpretations and meanings of OS, and its consequences.

~ How: A paper about proposing a set of principles for Open Standards (conformity)
MORE ON WHY

~Wikipedia (Open Standards): There are more than 17 definitions on Open Standard.

~ Example: WC3 HTML5. An open standard, but there are problems implementing it over several organizations.
MORE ON WHY#2

~ ANSI: "Standards are all about process".

~ But as Rosen states: "process alone does not necessarily an open standard make".

~ The industry has a monolog rather than a dialog when it comes to defining their standards.
WHY ARE THERE NO DEFINITIONS?

~ Standards organizations often refuse to define "open standards".

~ It is a policy problem rather than a skill problem.

~ Note, there no elaboration or evidence for either of these claims.
WHAT ARE THE CONSEQUENCES?

~ We then have no easy way to distinguish standards we can implement under our software licenses and our development methodologies from those we cannot.
ISSUE #1 - OPEN SOURCE AND OPEN STANDARDS

~ Not all software needs to implemented under Open Source rules, the same goes for Open Standards.

~ P. #1: "Everyone should be free to implement open standards in both proprietary and open source software, or the standards should not be called open.

~ If not, the linkage between open standards and open source becomes unnecessary and misleading.
ISSUE #2 - RAND (REASONABLE AND NON-DISCRIMINATORY)

~ A major paradigm in the Open Standards is RAND royalties.

~ Many Open Standards today have RAND royalties.

~ Conflicts with Principle #1

~ P. #2: "Open standards should be available to everyone on royalty-free terms, or the standards should not be called open."
ISSUE #3 - STANDARDS ORGANIZATIONS

~ Without an open process, there is no way to judge the trustworthiness or utility of the standard.

~ It should follow the open development models that guide open source projects.

~ P. 3#: "Open standards should be developed using a collaborative, balanced, and consensus-based approval process, or the standards should not be called open."
ISSUE #4 - THIRD PARTIES

~ Open process should also apply when negotiating with third parties (licensing for IP).

~ Negotiations in secret may lock out some potential implementers and users of the standard.

~ P. #4: "Open standards should be developed under formal and binding commitments for the disclosure and licensing of copyrights and patent claims, or the standards should not be called open"
ISSUE #5 - PATENT RECIPROCITY AND OPEN STANDARDS

~ Patent owners may start to charge royalties or to impose other conditions on its implementation.

~ One common strategy in Open source to avoid this is Reciprocity. Rosen wants to use this in Open Standards as well.

~ P. #5: "Open standards should be made available under reasonable reciprocal licenses that require licensees to share under the same terms their own patent claims reading on the standard, or the standard should not be called open."
ISSUE #6 - SOURCE CODE AND OPEN STANDARDS

~ It can be difficult to distinguish the specification of a standard from its implementation. The source code can be the specification.

~ Therefore, the specification should follow the same rules of open source code.

~ P. #6: "The specifications for open standards should be available to everyone on open source copyright license terms, or the standards should not be called open."