

The Nature and Future of ICT Standards

(A conference held Dec. 12-13, 2002, Boston, MA)

By: John L. Hill, Sun Microsystems

To: INCITS

February, 2003

Boulder, CO

The Conference

- “The Nature and Future of ICT Standardization”
 - December 12-13, 2002
 - 19 speakers; 72 attendees; 3 sponsors
 - Focus Topics:
 - Organization and Structure
 - The Role of Government
 - Economics of Standardization
 - Intellectual Property Rights

To Cover

- Hosts
- Agenda
- Attendance and Speakers
- Outcomes
 - Survey
 - Evaluation
- Implications

Hosts

- Who they were:
 - Information Technology Industry council (ITIC), Rhett Dawson
 - Massachusetts Institute of Technology - Information Technology Laboratory, Victor Zue
 - U. S. Department of Commerce, Phillip J Bond
- What they controlled:
 - Agenda, attendance, speakers

Agenda

- Features
 - keynote address (Phil Bond, DoC)
 - two social events (reception, dinner)
 - four sessions:
 - three speakers/Q&A
 - one panel discussion/Q&A
 - summarization (Jean Francois Abramatic, ILOG)

Sessions

- Structure and organization of the standards setting organizations
- Determining a 'proper' role for government
- The economics for the participants
- Intellectual property rights

Structure and Organization

- Goal
 - Attendees gain a better understanding of the operational and financial aspects of standards setting organizations.
 - identify best practices
 - revenue sources
 - expense management
 - market responsiveness (nimbleness)
 - product quality
 - development paradigms

Organization and Structure

- Speakers

- Tim Berners Lee (MIT), From CERN to W3C: Why Innovation Needs Standards
- Ray Alderman (VITA), The Creative Destruction of IPR - The Function of Standardization
- Andrew Updegrave (LGU), Evolving Form and Structure

Economics of the Participants

- Goal
 - Attendees better understand the justification of standards activities.
 - align participants' positions with corporate goals (improve predictability)
 - improve productivity

Economics of the Participants

- Speakers
 - Pam Samuelson (UC Berkeley), Intellectual Property and Standards
 - Gail Levine (Federal Trade Commission), Standard Setting & FTC/DOJ Hearings on Antitrust & IP
 - Joe Farrell (UC Berkley), Who Cares about Standards and Why?
 - Joel West (San Jose State University), Should Anyone Care About Standards?

The Role of Government

- Goal
 - Attendees better understand how governments participate in standardization.
 - promote unique requirements
 - provide funds
 - assess conformity
 - develop standards
 - regulate (e.g., health & safety)
 - conduct research
 - address international trade
- Vardakas: “2% of European tax goes to standardization” (12/12/02, MIT)

The Role of Government

- **Speakers**

- Evangelos Vardakas (DG Enterprise), A European View
- Ben Wu (DoC), A US Government View
- Rhett Dawson (ITI), An Industry View

IPR, plus

- Goals
 - inform attendees about the confused situation
 - divergent laws and policies
 - more than patents
- Addressed
 - anti-trust
 - RAND: definition, ex ante negotiations
 - IPR held by non participants

IPR, plus

- Panelists

- George Arnold - Lucent
- Karen Hersey - MIT
- John Kelly - JEDEC
- Bruce Perens - Opensource
- Scott Petersen - HP
- Ollie Smoot - ITI
- Danny Weitzner - W3C

Attendance

Agere Systems	FedEx	Open Source
AOL/TW	Finnegan,...., LLP	Openwave Software
Associate Professor	Global Inventures, Inc.	Oracle
Bolin Communications	Grundig AG	Quinnipiac College
Bowstreet	Harvard University	Qwest
Broadcom	HP	Raytheon Company
Computerworld	IBM	Sun Microsystems
Creative Commons	IEC	Ericsson
DISA	ITI	UC Berkeley
DOC	JEDEC	University of Maryland
EIA	Lucash, Gesmer & Updegrove	VITA
Electronic Frontier Foundation	Lucent	W3C
ESRI	MIT	Zot Group
European Commission	NIST	
Federal Trade Commission	OGC	

Survey

- Population
 - attendees
- Analysis
 - using ‘six sigma’ methodologies
 - neutral, expert statistician

Attendee Survey Summary

5 point Likert scale (unfavorable to favorable)

Inquiry Median

ICT Marketplace Needs	4.0
Interoperability	3.0
Timeliness - Product Development	2.5
Timeliness - Market Window	3.0
Standards Quality	4.0
IPR Law Consistency	2.0
IPR Law Consistency	2.0
IPR Policies - Consistency	3.0
Government Participation	3.0
Government Role – Phase	----

Attendee Survey Summary

Inquiry Median

Standardization: Efficiency	2.0
Standardization: Cost Justification	4.0
Standards Development: Environment	4.0
Overlapping Standards	4.0
Alignment with Marketplace	3.0
Standards: Consortia v. Formal	3.0

Attendee Survey Summary

Composite Measure	Mean	Std. Dev.
<u>Organization Acceptability</u> = efficient + environment + alignment – overlapping std.	4.81	2.46
<u>Marketplace Needs</u> = technical content + timeliness for market + economically justified + market access	13.63	2.44
<u>Document Acceptability</u> = timeliness for development + timeliness for market + quality + technical content + interoperability	13.97	3.61

Evaluation

- The conference was successful. The lowest overall satisfaction rating was a 3 (on the five point scale used throughout).
- The conference formula needs small adjustments, not major overhaul.
- The degree to which the respondents felt challenged seems to be the single greatest factor in determining overall satisfaction.
- Networking, and the reception/dinner, received the highest rating of the factors studied.
- The room in which the conference took place received the lowest rating.
- All respondents were non-committal about changing their organizations as a result of the conference.

Implications

- Standards setting organizations should focus on a few narrow topics to:
 - comprehensively evaluate their ecosystem with a view to understanding their business opportunities
 - conduct a ‘lost business’ analysis
- Individual member organizations could:
 - work with ecosystem to make improvements for the benefit of all stake holders