HM Government

Open Standards Consultation

The Government response

OPEN STANDARDS CONSULTATION

The Government response

#opengovIT

Contents

Introduction

Today, the Cabinet Office is publishing its response to the public consultation, *Open Standards: Open Opportunities*.

The consultation set out a series of questions aimed at informing the Government on how to implement its commitment to "creating a common and secure IT infrastructure based on a suite of compulsory open standards, adopting appropriate open standards wherever possible" (*Government ICT Strategy,* published March 2011).

In particular, the questions looked at:

- The definition of open standard in the context of software interoperability, data and document formats in government IT
- The meaning of mandation and the effects compulsory open standards might have on government departments, delivery partners and supply chains
- International alignment and cross-border interoperability

The government response covers the process we followed, a review of the key themes that emerged in the consultation, how they have been taken on board and the next steps for open standards in government IT.

Scope of the consultation and response

Before elaborating on the process, we should reiterate and clarify some of the key aspects of the scope of the consultation, the government response and the resulting policy.

The scope refers to the Government in its role as a purchaser of IT. It applies to IT specifications for software interoperability, data and document formats for all services delivered by, or on behalf of, central government departments, their agencies, non-departmental public bodies (NDPBs) and any other bodies for which they are responsible.

We recognise, however, that most public bodies deliver services through IT enabled projects, many of which need to work across organisational boundaries. Consequently whilst this policy focuses on central government, we shall work to promote the Open Standards Principles for software interoperability, data and document formats with all public bodies in the UK. Local government, the wider public sector and the Devolved Administrations are encouraged to adopt the principles to deliver wider benefits.

The scope covers open standards for software interoperability, data and document formats. These standards enable software to interoperate through open protocols, and allow the exchange of data between data stores and software through open data and document formats. Standards for internal processing within hardware (including telecommunications hardware), which are not relevant to external interfaces, are out of scope.

The consultation and the resulting policy cover open standards not open source software. For information on the Government's open source policy see the Cabinet Office *Open Source Procurement Toolkit.*

Finally, the purpose of the consultation was to help the Government to refine its policy and to ensure that better choices are made by government bodies from the existing IT market.

The process

The consultation followed an earlier informal online survey, which ran from 25 February until 20 May 2011, to gather views on:

- The definition of the term open standard
- The open standards that should be a priority for the Government to consider
- Whether particular standards should mandated, recommended or avoided

There was keen interest in the survey. Over 970 responses were received online and a number of written responses were sent directly to the Cabinet Office, which constituted over 34,000 separate answers to analyse.

A report on the emerging findings of the survey was published in November 2011. It noted that the survey demonstrated the level of interest from individuals and organisations to engage in this policy area and open IT more generally, and provided a rich source of information. However, as a result of the complexity of the policy area and the responses to the survey, it also raised many questions that we needed to investigate in more detail. As a result, we took a decision to hold a formal public consultation to gather evidence transparently and to further develop the open standards policy. The views provided in the informal survey have been taken into account.

The *Open Standards: Open Opportunities* public consultation encouraged responses through an online engagement site. A series of roundtable discussions were held and responses were also accepted via email, face to face meetings and written channels. The consultation was due to run from 9 February to 3 May 2012. However, during the course of the consultation, evidence given at the first roundtable session was

discounted due to an undeclared conflict of interest. The roundtable was re-run and the consultation extended by a month to 4 June 2012. Due to the closing date falling on a Bank Holiday, late responses that were received on 6 June were considered.

At the close of the consultation, we had received evidence from over 480 responses in total, comprising:

- Online submissions
- Outputs of 6 roundtable discussions - giving opportunities for a wide range of groups including government representatives, industry (including small and medium enterprises (SMEs)) and community and voluntary organisations to contribute. A range of locations was also covered including the North West, South West and London
- Unstructured responses - 79 short and 12 longer submissions
- Four academic and professional articles

In the interests of transparency, online submissions were published during the consultation period to encourage debate. We shall also be making available the written evidence submitted as well as sound recordings of the roundtable sessions. We will be doing this in accordance with the access to information regime, and will redact only personal identifying information for which we do not have permission to share. The only exception to this will be any submissions which explicitly requested confidentiality.

The Centre for Intellectual Property Policy and Management (CIPPM) at the University of Bournemouth was commissioned to undertake the analysis of the evidence submitted. Cabinet Office has published this as an independent report (see the Cabinet Office website). The methodology for the analysis is also provided.

During the course of the consultation, Cabinet Office commissioned *Open Standards in Government IT: A Review of the Evidence* (also available on the Cabinet Office website) by the CIPPM. The review looked at economic and legal aspects of introducing an open standards policy for government IT, including an appraisal of costs and benefits. Bournemouth University published drafts for peer review and following this it has now been published by Cabinet Office.

The independent analysis and research elements were undertaken to ensure that due consideration was given to the complex evidence base and that a neutral analysis of the consultation responses is distinguishable from the policy decisions taken by the Government in light of the consultation exercise.

The Government response

There was an outstanding response to the consultation, demonstrating the ongoing level of interest in government IT, the importance of this agenda and the desire to contribute to how we shape our policies.

All of the evidence presented - from both the informal survey, the public consultation and the independent reports - has been taken into consideration in informing our response. It should be noted that, whilst it might appear that we had only 480 responses in the consultation compared to 970 responses received in the informal survey, the detailed nature of the public consultation meant that the provision of responses was a more challenging task.

This document is set out in the same order as the consultation, responding to the three themes of criteria for open standards, mandation of open standards, and international alignment.

In each of these sections, we demonstrate how the consultation has:

- Provided us with validation of some aspects of the proposed policy
- Identified areas where a range of strong views were expressed which required careful review for us to balance viewpoints and understand the implications
- Given us a basis for further consideration and investigation for aspects of the proposed policy where the evidence was inconclusive

Criteria for open standards

The basis for this section of the consultation was the outcome of the informal survey of 2011, which proposed that open standards should have the following characteristics

- Agreed and maintained through a collaborative, impartial and transparent decision making process;
- Adopted by a specification or standardisation organisation, or a forum or consortium with a feedback and ratification process to ensure quality;
- Published, thoroughly documented and publicly available at zero or low cost;
- As a whole have been implemented and shared under different development approaches and on a number of platforms from more than one supplier, demonstrating interoperability and platform/vendor independence;

- Owners of patents essential to implementation have agreed to licence these on a royalty free and non-discriminatory basis for implementing the standard and using or interfacing with other implementations which have adopted that same standard. Alternatively, patents may be covered by a non-discriminatory promise of non-assertion. Licences, terms and conditions must be compatible with implementation of the standard in both proprietary and open source software. These rights should be irrevocable unless there is a breach of licence conditions.

Many of you expressed your support for the proposed criteria and your confidence in the ability for these to bring about a positive change and benefits. This is supported by some of the findings of the analysis (available in full on the Cabinet Office website.)

- 62.1% of respondents were rather positive on the Government's proposed definition of open standards.

- 56.3% believed the proposed policy would make it easier for business to enter the government IT market.

- 63.6% stated that the Government's proposed policy would benefit his/her organisation.
  - Most of the small to medium enterprises (SMEs) declared that this was due to the levelling of the playing field among competitors. They stated this policy would give them a chance to become suppliers to the Government, whereas for the time being they do not even attempt to enter the competition for IT contracts.

- 76.3% were clearly positive on the effects that the proposed policy would produce for government expenses. In general, they declared that the policy would allow the Government to save money.

- 69% stated that the proposed policy would improve innovation, competition and choice in the provision of government services.

- 73.2% would welcome government engagement and/or funding for committees and bodies in the implementation of this proposed policy.

However, this aspect of the consultation also brought out some strong views particularly on the issue of licensing:

- 66.2% were generally sceptical on copyright licences and patents for open standards.
  - They (mostly SMEs and individuals) feared that the licensing costs would erase the competitive advantage introduced by open standards, by

counteracting the levelling of the playing field. They emphasise that the concept of low cost of licensing is relative. What is low for one company can be high for another, depending on the size of the company.

- 58.7% declared that fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory (FRAND) standards will not level the playing field.

- 79.4% were suspicious of the non-assertion of a patent when used in open source software.

- 82% responded that no different rationale should apply when mandating open standards to commercial off the shelf software (COTS) or bespoke solutions.

Areas of validation and agreement

We welcome the positive feedback from the majority of respondents for the proposed definition and for the affirmation that it would support our stated aims of improving value for money, innovation and competition for government IT projects. We are also encouraged that respondents in general did not consider that it would exclude suppliers from the government IT market.

The view expressed by the majority that off-the-shelf and bespoke solutions should be purchased with the same underlying rationale would appear to be appropriate. Thus value for money, taking into account all the aspects of whole-life costs, functionality, interoperability, licensing terms and legacy requirements will be the same in both cases.

Areas which required review to balance a range of views

We have reviewed the suggested modifications to the definition in the round and these are reflected in the revised definition in the Open Standards Principles (available on the Cabinet Office website.).

A range of views were expressed relating to implementation of the policy. We agree that the setting of criteria is only the starting point and the views expressed in the consultation indicated a need to be very clear in the terms we use - both in our guidance for stakeholders and in the processes that adoption of the policy will affect. We agree that clear objectives, transparency and a programme for implementation are vital.

We also recognise the perceived issue of weaknesses in the policy if there are too many opt-outs and exceptions. Therefore, in implementing this policy, we will make exceptions a challenging and rigorous process to ensure that the implications are

investigated. This will be enforced through a number of existing and developing processes and we will be transparent about compliance with the policy.

We acknowledge comments about having a process to maintain selected standards over time and to have oversight on areas such as the effects of implementing compulsory open standards. These will be factored into implementation and evaluation plans.

A related theme where a range of views was expressed was on the level of engagement in the ongoing implementation of this policy. We agree that we need to ensure that we have the right people involved - with both subject matter and delivery expertise.

> *"The engagement of the Government in standard setting is already working. One example is provided by the SIF Association UK, funded by an arm of Government to support the development of two open standards in the test industry (IEEE 1641 and IEEE 1671). In addition, the department that provides this funding also sends its own personnel to attend standards co-ordinating committee meetings; in this way both parties gain knowledge and expertise."* - SME

In addition to the formal governance and oversight structure we are setting up, consideration will be given to using a wide variety of knowledge sharing channels - including conferences, plugfests and other events. However, there are clear resource implications, particularly in some of the suggestions that the Government should fund research and standards setting bodies. We will need to make sure that any activities are modelled on best practice and that those involved are working in a hands-on implementation role.

Areas which needed further consideration due to inconclusive or complex evidence

One of the most complex areas that came out of the consultation related to licensing in standards and in particular the selection of standards based on intellectual property rights (IPR) that is made available through what are known as fair, reasonable and non-discriminatory (FRAND) terms against those that are available on a royalty free (RF) basis.

Whilst the views expressed by the majority of respondents were generally supportive of royalty free licensing as the default, with scepticism that FRAND would level the playing field, we identified this as needing a more detailed review.

This was because the topic raised strong views and arguments at both ends of the scale throughout the consultation. Those views were often emotive and not always backed up by evidence, which meant that conclusions could not easily be drawn.

In addition a lack of a common universal understanding and legal definition made the need for a considered response all the more important. This was reflected in a small number of consultation responses where respondents asserted that FRAND could level the playing field but that it needed better definitions, including whether licences are royalty free or not, and the engagement of subsequent owners of the licence to respect the same licensing conditions.

"Patents are also a bit of a red herring in the UK, because it is not legal to assert software patents in the EU. However, the UK must operate in a global economy and my own company have [sic] had some concerns in the past because a US competitor had filed patents on technology similar to that which we ourselves developed in the early nineties. So, despite the legal landscape in Europe, the patent elements of the open standards definition are very important."   *- SME*

The three key issues that emerged requiring further consideration were:

- Copyright/patent licences create barriers to interoperability
- Exclusion of FRAND standards tilts the playing field and introduces bias in competition
- For non-assertion of patents, concerns relating to changing terms and possible charging when ownership of rights is passed on

In weighing the views presented, we went back to the strategic aim of this consultation in the context of the IT Strategy - using open standards as a means of providing a diverse range of suppliers with the opportunity to compete on a level playing field, and for government to be able to benefit from this through more interoperable, cheaper solutions (that can be re-used).

The role of the Government in this instance is that of procurement rather than market intervention and the Bournemouth report highlights that in this case: "*arguments suggesting that royalties on standards are essential to reward and encourage innovation are not clear cut and the balance of interests is in fact far more nuanced.*"

We recognise that for small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in particular, clarity over licensing associated with implementation of a standard is going to be key, as the

research and legal overheads could be a significant issue. On the other hand, we also recognise that other companies may currently have business models built around the provision of standards based on IPR that is made available through FRAND.

The review of evidence by Bournemouth University noted that patents are an important means of protecting the value of software and can be effective revenue sources for the patent owner. However, issues exist in industry for example with regards to patents trolls and patent thickets – in the UK these are best considered by the Intellectual Property Office (for example through its work on implementing the Hargreaves Review).

In markets where competing software is implemented by small firms or individuals without significant funds, the economic effect of open standards may only be achieved on royalty free terms. If several standards exist in one product the amount of royalties that have to be paid, even under FRAND terms, could harm some competitors.

There is concern from some that precluding FRAND licensing creates an obstacle to bidders reliant on standards that are royalty-based. Some also consider that the size of the market for IT in the public sector means that an affirmative action for royalty free standards could be perceived as a form of market intervention.

In terms of the Government as a procurer of IT, there is a concern that patents could restrict the operation of open standards and interoperability. The patents referred to in the proposed open standards policy are specifically related to those embedded in open standards that are essential for implementation of the standard. Both proprietary and open source software may be built on open standards.

The royalty free aspect would however only extend to the standard, not to the product. In addition, the approach we've set out does not automatically exclude any standard, product or solution. Government bodies will continue to buy licensed software where this best meets their requirements and provides value for money. We therefore favour a comply or explain process to ensure that due consideration is given to decisions regarding standards in government IT specifications.

Having taken all of the arguments into account on the issue of licensing, it is worth reiterating that it is not our intention to create new markets but to open up the existing government market to a wider, more diverse range of suppliers.

As a default the Government preference is that rights related to implementation of a standard should be licensed on a royalty free basis that is compatible with both open source and proprietary licensed solutions.

We recognise that adopting a policy which mandates RF standards could reduce choice, as the vast majority of Standard Setting Organisations have at least one option that allows patent holders to charge on a FRAND basis. We appreciate that this could potentially limit the pool of standards available to us however, the evidence from the consultation showed few examples of what we would be excluded from doing by adopting an open standards policy based on a royalty free definition.

Of the two well known cases cited about FRAND licensing, one case (Canonical and MPEG-LA) relates to hardware which is out of scope of this consultation.

The other involved Red Hat and Firestar and was settled by the payment of a royalty of an undisclosed amount by Red Hat to Firestar as part of the settlement of infringement claims. This is a solution we do not consider to be feasible in most scenarios, as there are too many unknowns around achieving lump sum deals and having an organisation which would be willing to make a payment on behalf of other users. It might also have the effect of locking out companies.

We agree that careful consideration of each standard is required before adoption and we are therefore implementing a rigorous and transparent process to support this.

Finally, some consider that technology convergence, such as the smartphone, which merges functionality traditionally provided separately in phones and desktop computers, blurs the boundaries at which technology interoperates. When choosing goods such as telephones, laptops or computers, FRAND standards are often used. These are appropriate for similarity standards where the user can choose whether to take advantage of the patented technology.

Where standards define interfaces to support interoperability we have concluded that royalty free standards are likely to be more appropriate for giving us choice in what, nd when to buy our IT.

Mandation of open standards

The section on the mandation of open standards also demonstrated support for compulsory open standards and for achieving the aims of improving competition for government IT contracts by levelling the playing field:

- 72% of respondents supported the view that mandation of open standards (or of particular standards) would improve value for money in the provision of government services.
  - Among the causes of this improvement were cited: reduced risk of supplier lock-in; greater choice; faster migration / implementation; reduced cost of integration specialists; increased competition; lower prices; improved quality; building on existing products; enabling re-use and sharing across departments; and flexibility to change software components.
- 68.1% declared that mandation of open standards should not promote anti-competitive behaviour in public procurement.
  - Most specified that current practices, on the contrary, are rather anti-competitive. Mandation of open standards would level the playing field and therefore improve competition among suppliers.

However it also brought out some views around whether mandation would enable interoperability, innovation and reduced costs:

- 58.6% replied that mandation of competing open standards would not deliver interoperable software at reduced costs.

Areas of validation and agreement

We welcome the comments about the effect of mandating standards on improving value for money (VFM) in services. They would seem to be consistent with the benefits expected by the Government from setting compulsory open standards. We agree that standards should not be made compulsory for their own sake, especially if these are not in fact appropriate in a particular circumstance.

Similarly, we agree with the majority of respondents that mandation of open standards is not in itself likely to promote anti-competitive behaviour. A readily available standard, known in advance to all potential solution suppliers or service providers, should encourage competition for government IT contracts and reduce the opportunity for incumbent suppliers to be entrenched due to lock-in.

"NHS Scotland Procurement for linear accelerators tied to a closed system many years ago and no one could now compete for the £25m contract. Open standards cannot solve that (2011 Scots Law Times SLT 815.)."   *- BusOrg*

We recognise the concerns that standards which in reality support or are tied to specific vendors or proprietary solutions need to be considered very carefully and should normally be avoided.

Areas which required review to balance a range of views

Responses to the questions on criteria for mandation of open standards elicited a range of views which have required some consideration.

In some instances, mandating standards could significantly increase the cost and complexity of solutions commissioned by the Government, but mandating the right standards in the right places can be an important part of ensuring that government IT can be more flexible, with more options for migrating between systems.

Therefore, it is key that the Government starts by following the first of the Government Digital Service (GDS) Design Principles: "Start with needs". Many standards can be considered solutions without a clear problem and an approach that doesn't start with absolute clarity about the objective will simply add complexity and cost to development. By contrast, if there is a clearly understood problem, then adoption of appropriate open standards can follow. The primary principle must always be "*what is the user need for which we require a standards-based solution?*".

We note some of the concerns raised about the cost of compliance testing being a barrier for smaller suppliers. Selecting compulsory open standards which are mature and have strong evidence of market support should help to alleviate this concern. The Government will therefore use rigorous selection criteria, based on the European Common Assessment Methodology for Standards Selection (CAMSS) and suggestions made in the consultation responses. This will be coupled with transparent engagement processes as a basis for the assessment of compulsory open standards.

Areas which needed further consideration due to inconclusive or complex evidence

Whilst 39.1% of respondents declared that there are no barriers to mandating open standards, they referred mostly to procurement barriers and did not feel that they were suitably qualified to consider the legal debate.

We have taken on board the concerns relating to procurement and believe that they can be minimised by, for instance, by incorporating open standards into procurement requirements and into Government Procurement Service frameworks, thereby ensuring that they are incorporated into requirements as a matter of course. We also

agree that procurement officers, and indeed those who specify IT requirements, may be helped by appropriate training and advice on the selection and specification of open standards.

We agree that specification of compulsory open standards must be undertaken in accordance with European Union (EU) rules governing technical specifications. This was recognised in the consultation document, which drew attention to Regulation 9 of the Public Contracts Regulations 2006.

The EU has also recognised the role of fora and consortia in developing IT standards and has developed a Regulation to permit recognition of IT standards developed by these bodies, which will come into force in January 2013 and our new open standards policy will reflect this.[1]

58.6% replied that mandation of competing open standards would not deliver interoperable software at reduced costs. This would suggest that competing standards would not deliver the anticipated benefits and suggests a preference for a single standard. However the Government has a responsibility to balance choice against ensuring delivery and more importantly cannot risk "cherry picking" standards that later turn out to be inappropriate.

The selected standards need to be fit for purpose and procurement decisions should be based on the best solution, including adoption of open standards as part of the requirement. It is important that standards that are selected as compulsory do not restrict competition (as per our level playing field requirement). We therefore favour a comply or explain approach and informed decision making for standards selection.

Regarding legacy systems, and the point at which compulsory open standards should become implemented, views again were at each end of the spectrum - some favouring a gradual approach, others a strict approach. In this instance, we believe pragmatism is required. New systems should have immediate compliance, but we need a realistic and cost-effective programme for legacy implementations to transition. This will be considered on a case-by-case basis as part of the implementation of the policy.

_____

1 Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on European Standardisation, PE-COS 32/12:

http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/pe00/pe00032.en12.pdf The regulation will enter into force 20 days after its publication in the EU Official Journal and will apply directly in all EU member states from 1 January 2013.

A further area of interest was the trigger point for review of compliance to the policy. We agree that clear guidance and compliance mechanisms are needed. There are some existing mechanisms we can use such as spend controls[2] and project reviews. There are others in development, such as the role of the Open Standards Board and the Standards Hub process.

Finally, we asked for views on the Government's role to balance innovation and conformance. The steer from respondents would suggest that the focus should be on delivering the open standards policy and that will help the innovation. A key issue emerged in this section on the stage at which the Government adopts standards - and whether we should be an early adopter or a follower of trends. This needs to be balanced with some of the cost implications of adopting standards that have not yet been proven in the market against those that are considered mature.

Conformance tests are an important part of demonstrating the quality of any given standard, but all too often they are either missed out or demonstrations of the standard behave in a circular way (inter-operation of software heavily tailored to meeting a standard rather than demonstrating its use in a more practical setting). The Government will need direct access to sufficient expertise to evaluate the quality of the tests and sample implementations. Our approach will be to consider this on a case-by-case basis and any activity will be supported by transparent engagement activities.

International alignment

The theme in the consultation which received the fewest responses related to international alignment.

- 69.2% declared that the proposed policy would be beneficial for innovation and competition in the UK and in Europe.

Summary response

We would support the pursuit of benefits outlined by respondents in that the proposed policy should lead to the levelling of the playing field; more choice among

_____

2Spend controls - are a Cabinet Office process and measures for reviewing and authorising requests from government bodies to spend money on IT-enabled projects, within a specified threshold.

vendors, and new SMEs entering the market for the provision of products and services to governmental bodies.

We note the comments made by external observers about the positive experience of other countries and will look to learn from those experiences. We also take on board the need to be very clear about the immediate need that the adoption of a given standard meets.

However in terms of getting a picture of compatibility with European policies and legislation, the response from the consultation was inconclusive. Therefore, in drafting the policy and principles for open standards, we have drawn on legal and economic evidence presented in other sections to ensure that our approach is consistent with our European obligations. We have also considered the evidence presented in the Bournemouth review and drawn on the expertise of government officials in other departments.

We have looked specifically at competition law, the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, and guidance published by the European Commission on standardisation agreements (DG Competition). We are satisfied that our approach is consistent on the basis that it is not our intention to create new markets but to open up the existing government IT market to a wider range of suppliers.

The royalty free and FRAND debate has a European dimension. It was highlighted in the consultation that European Interoperability Framework v2.0 (EIF2) allows both royalty-free and royalty-bearing standards. However, it should be noted that in this context Royalty Free standards are considered to be a subset of FRAND standards.

Recommendation 22 of the EIF v2.0 states that "public administrations should prefer open specifications, taking due account of the coverage of functional needs, maturity and market support"[3]. We believe that our proposed policy is aligned with the spirit of the EIF.

The recently published Regulation on European Standardisation endorses a FRAND approach to the IPR in standards, but is focussed on co-operation and recognition of common standards. We note that there may be implications for our

_____

3 European Interoperability Framework version 2.0 – Annex II of the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of Regions 'Towards interoperability for European public services', COM(2010) 744 final, European Commission, December 2010 p. 26

approach in the implementation of this regulation and that our standards choices will need to consider those recognised by the EU.

Conclusion and next steps

The review and response to this consultation marks the start of an exciting new chapter that will inform every part of the Government's IT agenda - and enable us to reform the way we procure, design and run IT-enabled business change.

It has given us clear validation of core parts of our proposal such as the definition and scope of the policy. It has helped shape a position for implementing aspects such as how to deal with licensing and the selection of compulsory open standards. Finally, it has given us a starting point for other implementation aspects such as the development of adoption and compliance processes over time.

Alongside the Government Response, we are publishing the policy for open standards which is set out in the form of principles. The consultation exercise has been invaluable in helping to shape that policy. In particular, a number of themes emerged as areas of focus for government bodies:

- Understanding and communicating the needs (of business and users) clearly as a starting point for decisions
- Enabling organisations of all sizes to compete on a level playing field
- Supporting flexibility and change in government IT and improving its ability to deliver
- Putting better value for the public sector at the heart of decisions and putting in place robust mechanisms to ensure compliance
- Ensuring we have people with skills to make informed decisions - both those in scrutiny and oversight roles and for those in real implementation situations
- Being fair and transparent about selection and implementation
- Being fair and transparent in the specification and procurement of government IT

The *Open Standards Principles* (available on the Cabinet Office website) set out ways in which you can engage in the implementation of the policy and continue to shape our work.

Related documents

The following documents and files relating to the outcome of the *Open Standards: Open Opportunities* public consultation are available from the Cabinet Office website:

- *Open Standards Principles*
- *Open Standards in Government IT: A Review of the Evidence (CIPPM)*
- *An Analysis of the Public Consultation on Open Standards: Open Opportunities (CIPPM)*
    - *Annex 1: List of Respondents*
    - *Statistical Data*
- *Responses*

Sound recordings of the roundtable discussions are available online.