
CONFERENCE SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS
OPEN SOURCE, OPEN STANDARDS: MAXIMIZING UTILITY
WHILE MANAGING EXPOSURE

SEPTEMBER 12-14, 2004

SCOTTSDALE, AZ

Prepared by:

Sherrie Bolin

President & CEO

The Bolin Group

Phone 831.336.9964

sherrie@sbolin.com

Table of Contents

<i>Executive Summary</i>	3
<i>Introduction</i>	5
<i>Open Source Challenges and Solutions</i>	6
Intellectual Property Issues	7
Support and Integration Risks	11
<i>Implications for Open Source Adoption</i>	12
<i>Open Source/Open Standards Partnership</i>	13
Value of Open Standards	13
Linking the Two Communities	14
<i>A Call to Action</i>	16
<i>About The Standards Edge: Open Season™</i>	18
<i>Appendix A: Conference Panel Participants and Keynote Speakers</i>	20
Keynote Speakers	20
Conference Panels	20

Executive Summary

On September 12-15, 2004, leaders in open source and open standards, along with experts in intellectual property, business strategy, and government, gathered to discuss the challenges facing the widespread adoption of open source software and formulate potential solutions. With such notables as Larry Rosen, Bruce Perens, and Glenn Otis Brown, the conference discussions provided new insights into the challenges, potential solutions, and customer needs of open source software. Most importantly, the conference facilitated frank dialog and next steps towards the formation of a mutually beneficial working partnership between the open source and the open standards communities.

Participants and speakers alike provided insight into current OSS challenges and, in the end, identified four key issues. These issues were intellectual property litigation, availability of OSS support, OSS integration risks, and adherence to open standards. While each issue was explored in detail, it quickly became obvious that concerns over intellectual property and patent infringement were at the top of everyone's list. Solutions were proposed for all of the challenges and included ideas such as establishing a comprehensive paper trail to build up prior art for defensive purposes, expanding and publicizing support options that are better aligned with actual customer needs, and addressing the very real, and often costly, concerns of integration through open standardization.

While it was recognized that open standardization may offer potential solutions to some of open source's challenges, it was also apparent that the two communities will need to establish processes and working methods that respect each other's values and priorities. This conference went a long way in facilitating that goal through not only information sharing during the actual conference, but more importantly through the side discussions that can lead to collaboration and partnership opportunities between the two communities in the future.

Larry Rosen pointed out that for the two communities to work together, open standards principles would need to embrace those of open source. By taking the key OSS principles and mapping them to

open standardization, he created five basic open standards principles that are inline with open source beliefs. Intended as a mechanism to start discussions, these principles have already spurred conversations and ideas that will hopefully lead the two communities to a successful partnership.

Along with the conference, a book will be published in early 2005 that addresses and expands beyond the conference topics. *The Standards Edge: Open Season™* includes an integrated compilation of articles from many of the conference speakers and leading experts in open source, open standards, legal, and business strategy that discuss the key issues of open source challenges, potential solutions, and the potential for a successful open source/open standards partnership. The Standards Edge™ series, targeted towards decision makers in business, technology, government, and academia, explores key issues in the information and communications technology industry with a goal towards facilitating cross-community partnerships and the strategic use of standardization. Further information and copies of the book can be obtained by contacting the editor, Sherrie Bolin, at sherrie@sbolin.com.

Together, the book and the conference strive to bring people together to discuss and strengthen the open source software. The goal is to facilitate discussions towards creating rationale and workable solutions that may facilitate the adoption of open source software and the advancement of technology in general. And, with the conclusion of the conference, it looks like participants have taken a solid step in reaching that goal.

Conference Summary and Analysis

Introduction

Open Source, Open Standards...what was the impetus to bring these two words together in the same sentence, much less the same conference? After all, aside from the same initials, do they really have anything in common? More importantly, is there a reason, a benefit for these two ideals to work together towards a common goal? And, if so, how would the two communities, with seemingly disparate priorities and values, communicate much less collaborate?

These are some of the questions that leaders in the open source and open standards communities gathered to discuss in Scottsdale, Arizona in September 2004. With noted open source leaders such as Larry Rosen, Doc Searls, and Bruce Perens, along with standardization experts such as Danny Weitzner of W3C and Richard Mark Soley of OMG, the conference took an insightful look at the challenges facing open source and possible solutions to those challenges. Speakers and attendees included open source software developers, leaders of open source organizations, and even open source customers. Add to that mix experts in intellectual property rights (IPR), representatives from traditional proprietary companies, and noted academics studying the information and communications technology (ICT) industry, and it is not surprising that the discussions were honest, sometimes heated, and always productive.

The conference was set up to examine open source and open standards in four sessions:

- **Business Risk and Exposure in Open Source Utilization**
- **The Open Standards Deficit in Open Source: Problems in IP Management, Stability, and Market Growth**
- **Implications for Open Source Adoption**
- **Strengthening Open Source: Consideration of Alternative Solutions**

While all areas were addressed, it is not surprising that discussions in each session often focused on challenges *and* solutions. Perhaps that shows the caliber of the attendees—those that bravely admit the challenges facing their industries and, instead of wallowing in the challenges, forge ahead to

propose and honestly discuss potential solutions. This analysis will examine the conference in three parts: open source challenges and solutions, implications for open source adoption, and a potential open source, open standard partnership.

As an important outcome of the conference, a book entitled *The Standards Edge: Open Season™* will be published in early 2005. Encompassing the conference discussions and expanding beyond them, this book contains a collection of perceptive original articles by leading authors in open source, open standards, and business strategy.

The conference and the book are designed to not only open up the discussion about how open source and open standards can work together to maximize software utility and manage exposure, but to actually facilitate actions towards defining a workable vision and making it a reality. This conference summary analysis describes the progress made towards those goals in the Open Source, Open Standards conference of 2004.

Due to the litigious atmosphere surrounding open source now, though the publicity and FUD (Fear, Uncertainty, and Doubt) factor may create more damages than the actual lawsuits every will, it was agreed that any reports of the conference findings, and discussions would respect the privacy of individuals. Thus, with only a few exceptions in which prior permission was obtained, quotes will remain anonymous and discussions will be summarized along main points.

Open Source Challenges and Solutions

Open Source is changing industries across the world: ICT, media, radio, hardware, and even academic research are buying into the overarching concepts of open source. At its essence, open

“Open source allows mass buy in, increases competition, and may very well change the leaders of the ICT industrv...”

source software provides access to source code and allows for derivative works; as Creative Commons is noted as saying, “Creativity is always built on the past.” Open source software, hardware, and licensing models that emulate the open source philosophy may spur technological and other

advancements generally not possible in a worldwide economy that is constrained by an exponential growth in patents and riddled with infringement minefields that are becoming almost impossible to navigate. As one speaker stated, “Open source allows mass buy in, increases competition, and may very well change the leaders of the ICT industry, causing a paradigm shift.

Open Source, Open Standards: Maximizing Utility While Managing Exposure

On a more practical level, open source software is usually free, at least for the initial acquisition, relieves fears of vendor lock-in, and brings the advantage of having multiple developers—often with different areas of expertise—focus on solving a technical problem. It offers a promising alternative to proprietary software or, in some cases, an advantageous complement.

Open Source, as with any software or technological movement, faces challenges—especially as it

Clearly, the situation was prevalent in the minds of the conference participants. Barely mentioned as a topic on the agenda, discussions about how to handle Intellectual Property (IP) issues took center stage. In fact, we eventually had to end the discussions on IP so that other topics around open source and open standards could be explored.

The main concerns around IP issues included:

- Myth versus reality
- Individual/Company protection against patent infringement in software development
- Strategies for reforming the patent system

MYTH VS. REALITY

The reality is that highly publicized lawsuits, especially against big name software uses, have grabbed the attention of the press and of the software industry as a whole. Intellectual property is something that software developers and companies producing software must be aware of. But “aware of” is an interesting term in patent law—at least in the US. According to one speaker, a company that is successfully sued for patent infringement in a US court of law will incur treble damages if it is proven that they made an initial search for prior art before product release. Given the difficulty and expense of searching for previously existing patents, many organizations purposely take an ostrich approach: hiding their heads in the sand in the hopes that they, or at least any potential infringing patents, will not be seen.

“The study found that not a single software patent fully reviewed and validated by the courts is infringed by the Linux kernel.”

However, one speaker whose company recently conducted an investigation of patents in Linux reported “the study found that not a single software patent fully reviewed and validated by the courts is infringed by the Linux kernel.” The speaker did emphasize that developers should still be mindful of patent infringement as there are still 238 patents in the Linux kernel that the courts have not reviewed. However, because the Linux kernel is based on function principles that have been around for a long time, and are functions common to all operating systems, the speaker believes the risks in these remaining patents are manageable. Indeed, Mark Lemley, famed IP expert at Stanford Law School, reported in 2000 that, “only about 2% of all patents are ever litigated, and less than two-tenths of one percent of all issued patents actually go to court”.¹

INDIVIDUAL/COMPANY PROTECTION AGAINST PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Several strategies were discussed for protection against potential patent infringement lawsuits. The safest strategy, on the preventative side, is conducting an extensive search before making software

By documenting even the smallest technological innovations in a project, the community or the company creates their own prior art that can be used for defensive purposes if needed.

available—albeit, an often expensive strategy. Rather, most companies strive not to infringe on any *known* patents. A second strategy that is especially helpful in a community environment where developers worldwide are creating a

piece of software is to establish a paper trail. By documenting even the smallest technological innovations in a project, the community or the company creates their own prior art that can be used for defensive purposes if needed.

Apache takes such an approach in an effort to help protect its developers. These developers assign the right to redistribute their work to others to the Apache Software Foundation (ASF) along with any necessary patent/trademark rights. In addition, developers are asked to provide a reasonable guarantee that they have not violated any patents that they know of. This process has created a paper trail for all ASF-created software. While the ASF can't protect against submarine patents, it has taken reasonable steps to avoid patent infringement lawsuits. Their goal is to define a simple algorithm that says if you are developing things and putting it into the pool, you are protected if you do it this way.

Some are taking a more offensive approach when it comes to prior art. Open Source Risk Management has teamed with GrokLaw's moderator Pamela Jones to create Grokline. The goal is to work with the open source community to collect non-patent prior art that may help to dispute patent infringement allegations against Linux. The company also offers patent liability defense insurance for Linux as another option for protection.

STRATEGIES FOR REFORMING THE PATENT SYSTEM

Participants also explored the causes of today's IP problems—the issuing of numerous and potentially invalid patents. Many wondered what could be done to reform the patent approval process. Recommendations were given such as contacting your government representative to express your views and provide support for patent reform. On a larger scale, one speaker reported that the FTC has produced arguments that the current patent system is actually reducing innovation, stating

that “Questionable Patents Can Deter or Raise the Costs of Innovation.”² That report also included recommendations for improving the US patent system.

A FRESH APPROACH—CREATIVE COMMONS

“Royalty-(And Lawyer-) Free Creativity”—Glenn Otis Brown, executive director, Creative Commons

As a keynote speaker, Glenn Otis Brown offered a fresh look at the IP problem. Creative Commons (CC) provides licenses for creative works, except software, that allow creators to establish licenses to share their works according to designated rules. For example, a songwriter may allow his work to be copied and played or may even allow derivative works to be made and distributed. That songwriter can designate whether commercial uses are allowed and if attribution is required. The licenses provide the flexibility for sharing at desired levels that traditional copyrights do not.

The FTC has produced arguments that the current patent system is actually reducing innovation...

Creative Commons includes a metadata translation of the license in RDF (Resource Description Framework, developed by W3C), which states the terms and conditions in a machine readable way. Existing search engines such as Alta Vista are taking advantage of the CC markup language. If a web searcher clicks on the header, the machine-readable license will automatically translate into a human readable license. Moreover, their efforts do not stop at US borders. In fact, they are working with several law schools around the world to create similar licenses in accordance with each country’s legal code and language.

Creative Commons has shown phenomenal growth. Since the first license was released in December 2002, the number of Creative Commons licenses granted has grown by approximately 50-60% per quarter, according to Glenn Otis Brown.

Creative Commons has continued to fine-tune their license. Version 2, for example, no longer asks for warranties, which required owners to perform due diligence on material ownership. As a result, some interesting revenue streams for the material owners have emerged. Companies that want to use material with a Creative Commons license and require a warranty can work directly with the material owner. For example, one film company wanted a guarantee about film footage they planned to use.

The owner of the footage is charging that company to create a paper trail. This may be one option for open source communities to generate revenue—or at least cover the costs of creating a paper trail—and to provide prospective customers with a risk reduction mechanism.

Finally, Creative Commons facilitates finding appropriate materials through its custom built search engine that searches approximately 1.5 million websites to identify content available under different licenses, including some capability to search for GPL licenses.

SUPPORT AND INTEGRATION RISKS

In looking at challenges and potential solutions to open source adoption, it is helpful to first look at the customer or user needs. In regards to CIOs, the following needs were identified:

- Their priority is high quality delivery of business processes
- They do not care whether software is open source or proprietary
- They are concerned about the integration, support, and maintenance costs
- Risk management is a priority

One speaker stated, “Corporations look at software in terms of competitive advantage and also protection of trade secrets.”

A user from a major customer corporation reported that many people in the organization thought that open source is available free-of-charge, that it is less secure, and that it has no support. Risk was

Risk was the most important element when the corporation was considering whether to adopt open source.

the most important element when the corporation was considering whether to adopt open source. After dispelling some of the myths, the organization decided to proceed with open source adoption. While it

considered creating its own software, it wanted to focus on its core business not OSS development. It therefore chose options that offered both product and support together.

The bottom line, according to one speaker, is that the open source software industry has focused too much on vendor adoption and needs to focus more on user adoption.

The participants seemed to conclude that addressing the perceptions of high support and integration risks was critical to increasing open source adoption. In fact, many pointed out that open source customers have a variety of options open to them. They can choose to handle issues in-house and

reach out to the OSS development community as needed. Alternatively, they can purchase a full support package and even training programs such as the options offered by SQL.

Integration costs are an issue in almost every organization. In fact, the US Department of Defense recently reported, “For every dollar military officials spend buying back-office software, they spend another \$15 deploying it.”³

“For every dollar military officials spend buying back-office software, they spend another \$15 deploying it.”

One speaker who is a director of MIS for his company reported, “We spend millions on software to manage IS (Enterprise Management, Code Control, Requirements Management, Service Desk, etc.). A tremendous amount of this

becomes shelfware...We spend even more rewriting applications that other companies have already written.”

Obviously, the problems of support, integration, and management costs plague all software whether it is proprietary or open source. However, the current perception is that, unless you can do it yourself, outside resources are simply not available to OSS adopters on a reliable basis. These problems present an opportunity for the open source community. If they can address these issues more successfully than their proprietary counterparts—and ensure that these solutions are widely available and well known—they might just turn the market dramatically in their favor.

Implications for Open Source Adoption

One speaker explained that proprietary vendors see the world as one in which they provide products to customers and customers provide money/revenue to vendors. In the open source world, this is more complicated. Sometimes, customers supply themselves and both vendors and customers may belong to a development community. In fact, in the open source world every user is also a potential contributor.

Since the dynamics of open source differ from proprietary software, it only makes sense that their business models and methods for facilitating adoption vary as well. According to one speaker, the greatest ubiquity is achieved when software is open and in the public domain. This ubiquity is essential because it creates infrastructure. While traditional companies—Hollywood corporations were mentioned—might see the Net as a plumbing system for IP and content, open source

developers view it as a place where people can make culture and do business. They treat it as more of a commons and, as such, it must be respected and cared for so that all can benefit from it.

Even proprietary companies are starting to embrace some of the open source business models. One speaker explained that SAP spent extensive time modernizing their database, then released it under GPL and also provided it to MySQL AB in Sweden. By doing so, they worked towards achieving ubiquity (open source, public domain) and consequently should increase their sales of products that work with the database.

In the open source world every user is also a potential contributor.

Therefore, perhaps the lesson of the conference here is that, to increase open source adoption, the OSS community must address concerns around support, integration, and maintenance costs along with concerns about risk. These are issues that all software vendors must address. However, the OSS community can rely on its foundation and values to create new business models and approaches to address these concerns and create new opportunities that further open source adoption.

Open Source/Open Standards Partnership

VALUE OF OPEN STANDARDS

“Without standardization there wouldn’t be a modern economy.”—Wired Magazine⁴

Participants discussed the value of open standards and its relationship to open source. One speaker stated, “Open standards provide the highest long-term value to end-users while minimizing costs for non-competitive software for vendors. They give users more choices, allow vendors to amortize development and maintenance over a larger user base, and allow users to submit their requirements.” Another simply said, “Standards are the basis for competition—not conformity.” While standards do provide the benefits mentioned, their base function was summed up by one speaker who stated, “Standards facilitate communication across technologies.”

Standardization provides a tool for ensuring integration. Like open source, standardization efforts bring together a community of concerned people, sometimes as representatives of companies and

sometimes as individuals. Together they work towards a technical solution to a business problem, often giving up rights to royalties, or at least minimizing their potential royalties, along the way.

Standardization done correctly and with widespread implementations can go far in helping OSS to meet the customer/CIO needs identified previously. It can enable the CIO to provide high-quality delivery of business processes at lower costs. It facilitates integration while lowering the risk of both vendor lock-in and IP infringement. In short, it offers the open source community a solution to many of its challenges.

LINKING THE TWO COMMUNITIES

“Open standards are the foundation for software freedom.” —Larry Rosen

While open standards and open source have many similarities, they are not identical. As one speaker

Open source projects can increase adoption by implementing open standards.

stated “The open standards community argue that open standards offer the strongest way to ensure multiple, portable, interoperable implementations with fair access to all. The open source community promises more openness with access all the way down to the source.

They are different things, compatible, and offer each other value.” Another speaker explained the difference between open source and open standards: “With open source, everyone is free to; with open standards, licenses are free to.”

Although their approaches may be different in some cases, and certainly, their licenses are, the two communities have the potential to form a powerful partnership. For example, while having access to source code is open, this access will not solve the integration challenges for customers who, like our earlier major corporate customer example, do not have the desire to modify that source code. If that open source software was standardized to run on different platforms or with different applications, then that customer would lower both his integration costs and risks. In short, open source projects can increase adoption by implementing open standards.

In turn, the open standards community must recognize the value that open source brings to the table. OSS is impacting the market open standards serve and some of the standards produced will or do have to interact with those products. In addition, the OSS community is helping to facilitate a belief in openness, a goal that the open standards community has long supported.

Open Source, Open Standards: Maximizing Utility While Managing Exposure

However, to work together effectively, it was agreed that open standards communities cannot produce standards that are incompatible with open source. It is essential that standards setting organizations (SSOs) understand and accept open source principles. To facilitate this and to better align the open source and open standards communities, Rosen proposed five principles for open standardization:

1. Everyone is free to copy and distribute the official specification for an open standard under an open source license.
2. Everyone is free to make or use embodiments of an open standard under unconditional licenses to patent claims necessary to practice that standard.
3. Everyone is free to distribute externally, sell, offer for sale, have made or import embodiments of an open standard under patent licenses that may be conditioned only on reciprocal licenses to any of licensees' patent claims necessary to practice that standard.
4. A patent license for an open standard may be terminated as to any licensee who sues the licensor or any other licensee for infringement of patent claims necessary to practice that standard.
5. All patent licenses necessary to practice an open standard are worldwide, royalty-free, non-exclusive, perpetual and sublicenseable.

These open standards principles would be compatible with open source principles, which Rosen defines as:

1. Licensees are free to use open source software for any purpose whatsoever.
2. Licensees are free to make copies of open source software and to distribute them without payment of royalties to a licensor.
3. Licensees are free to create derivative works of open source software and to distribute them without payment of royalties to a licensor.
4. Licensees are free to access and use the source code of open source software.
5. Licensees are free to combine open source and other software.

Rosen's call to action was that the two communities would use these principles to begin discussions on how to work together, and, discussions ensued. Suggested changes were in regards to the open standards principles. Some suggested wording changes such as replacing "necessary" with "essential." Others pointed out that the principles did not define the process for creating the standards. In other

words, for a standard to be open and in alignment with open source principles, does the process itself have to be open to anyone who wants to participate? Alternatively, does it matter how the standard was created as long as it complies with the five open standards principles above?

Clearly, finding a satisfactory means for handling intellectual property rights and licensing issues so that the open source and open standards communities can work together will require discussion. Many SSOs use RAND (Reasonable and Non-Discriminatory) licensing, which conflicts with GPL licensing. Will those organizations simply be excluded from working with SSOs or is there a way for the two communities to address those issues? While the open source license works for its business model, it may not work for all of the different types of business models involved in standards.

W3C was held up as an example many times of an organization that can and does work well with the open source community. According to Danny Weitzner, the goal of the W3C RF policy⁵ is to produce recommendations that can be implemented on a royalty-free basis and allow technical work to continue with minimal interruption. To be useful for global web standards, royalty free licenses must be available to all, have no fees, have a defensive position, and all essential patents must be owned or controlled.

There are successful examples of an open source, open standards partnership:

- Eclipse Foundation's UML and Testing Projects directly implement OMG open standards as open source.
- The release of LSB 2.0 was announced at the conference and is, among other things, in alignment with current standards (POSIX 1003.1-2001/SUSv3). The Linux Standards Base was established "To develop and promote a set of standards that will increase compatibility among Linux distributions and enable software applications to run on any compliant system."⁶
- The IETF HTTP Working Group members and others started Apache HTTPD because they wanted a better web server, and they wanted a compliant and production quality http implementation that anyone could integrate, according to Brian Behlendorf.

A Call to Action

Open source faces significant, but surmountable, challenges as it evolves from early adoption to commoditization. At the top of the list are concerns about IP, providing support and integration

options—and convincing users that these are reliably available, and managing risks while maximizing software utility. Standardization offers an effective tool for addressing many of these concerns. However, the open standards community must both understand the value of open source and its principles.

The open source and open standards communities have the opportunity to form a powerful partnership. They already share much common ground. The challenge is to find a way to work with one another so that the value and goals of both communities are respected. Participants were asked to take the information gained from the conference presentations and their conversations with other attendees, along with the principles of open standards that are compatible with open source as outlined by Larry Rosen, to the various beneficiaries in order to:

- Gain further insight into the perceptions of each interested party/person
- Document requirements for cooperation to define open standards
- Gain broad industry commitment for the creation of open standards for open source software

In essence, they were asked to continue the tradition started at this conference—talking with one another in an effort to create satisfactory solutions. Smaller conferences are planned to move the actions items forward. Based on the outcome of this conference, it is obvious that members from both the open source and open standards communities are ready to take the next steps towards creating a mutually beneficial partnership.

About *The Standards Edge: Open Season*TM

The Standards Edge: Open Season contains an integrated collection of articles that address the current situation in open source, the debate over open source versus proprietary (or a mixture of both) to help companies make more informed software decisions, and present strategies for reducing risks with all software.

Containing articles from leaders such as Larry Rosen, Rosenlaw.com; Bruce Perens, Perens LLC; and Danny Weitzner, W3C, along with representatives from the open source, academic, ICT, and user communities, this edition represents a comprehensive collection of viewpoints, practical insights, and strategies for open source and open standardization.

The Standards Edge: Open Season is the third book in The Standards EdgeTM series. While each book in the series is funded by industry research grants, the funders have committed to allowing The Bolin Group editorial autonomy to ensure that objectivity is maintained. Future books will address other significant topics including the future generation of ICT technology, standardization and education, and eGovernment. Suggestions for future topics and potential authors can be sent to **sherric@sbolin.com**. To learn more about how to help sponsor this book or to request additional copies, please contact The Bolin Group.

About the Editor

Sherrie Bolin is President and CEO of The Bolin Group, a strategic consulting firm specializing in standardization, strategic planning and implementation, and standardization communications strategies (making standards interesting). The Bolin Group has become the premier provider in standardization consultation, offering expertise in research and analysis reports, communications strategy designs and implementation, and training curriculum development and delivery. By emphasizing a business approach to standardization, The Bolin Group provides each client with a unique package of strategies, implementation plans, and communication methodologies designed to position them in the complex world of standardization.

Ms. Bolin is the creator and editor of The Standards EdgeTM series. This series has become one of the most comprehensive resources on critical standards issues in the current environment and now serves as a significant guide to ICT industry leaders, academics, and representatives in the European

Union, Asia, and the United States. Ms. Bolin is currently at work on additional books in The Standards Edge™ series, which examine separate strategic standardization issues.

Please contact Ms. Bolin by phone or email:

Email: sherrie@sbolin.com

Phone: +1 (831) 336-9964

<http://www.thebolingroup.com>

Appendix A: Conference Panel Participants and Keynote Speakers

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

- **Larry Rosen**, Rosenlaw.com, LLP
- **Bruce Perens**, Senior Research Scientist for Open Source with George Washington University's Cyber Security Policy Research Institute, and Perens LLC.
- **Glenn Otis Brown**, Executive Director, Creative Commons

CONFERENCE PANELS

Business Risk and Exposure in Open Source Utilization

- **John Weathersby**, Executive Director, Open Source Software Institute
- **Richard Mark Soley**, Chairman & CEO, Object Management Group
- **Daniel Egger**, Founder and Chairman, Open Source Risk Management
- Moderator: **Doc Searls**, Senior Editor, *Linux Journal*; *DIY IT Garage*, Coauthor, *Cluetrain Manifesto*

The Open Standards Deficit in Open Source: Problems in IP Management, Stability, and Market Growth

- **Richard Mark Soley**, Chairman & CEO, Object Management Group
- **Jim Zemlin**, Executive Director, Free Standards Group
- **Brian Behlendorf**, Founder & CTO, Collabnet
- **Danny Weitzner**, Technology and Society Domain Leader, W3C
- Moderator: **Stacey Quandt**, Senior Business Analyst, Open Source Practice Leader; Robert Frances Group

Implications for Open Source Adoption

- **Harry Richardson**
- **Doc Searls**, Senior Editor, *Linux Journal*, *Proprietor*, *DIY IT Garage*, Coauthor, *Cluetrain Manifesto*
- **Kelly Phillipps**, O.C. Tanner
- **Gerry Carter**, Hewlett Packard; Release Manager, Samba Team
- Moderator: **Richard Mark Soley**, Chairman & CEO, Object Management Group

Open Source, Open Standards: Maximizing Utility While Managing Exposure

Strengthening Open Source: Consideration of Alternative Solutions

- **Eric Blossom**, Founder, GNU Radio
 - **Stephen Walli**, Business Development Manager, Microsoft
 - **Ted Cook**, Director of US Business Development, Linux Professional Institute
 - Moderator: **Larry Rosen**, Rosenlaw.com, LLP
-

Endnotes

¹ Lemley, Mark A.; “Rational Ignorance at the Patent Office”; (2000);

<http://emlab.berkeley.edu/users/bhhall/lemley00.doc>.

² Federal Trade Commission: “To Promote Innovation: The Proper Balance of Competition and Patent Law and Policy,” (2003), <http://www.ftc.gov/os/2003/10/innovationrpt.pdf>.

³ Integration Costs: FCW.com, “DOD Reigning in Integration Costs”; 2004,

<http://www.fcw.com/fcw/articles/2004/0607/tec-dod-06-07-04.asp>.

⁴ Wired Magazine, “The Turn of the Century”, Issue 10.01, January 2002,

<http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/10.01/standards.html>

⁵ W3C Patent Policy, <http://www.w3.org/TR/patentpolicy>.

⁶Linux Standards Base, <http://www.linuxbase.org/>.