Openness of W3C Working Groups Panel
W3C Technical Plenary

7 November 2007

Art Barstow

art.barstow@nokia.com

NOKIA

Contents

- Relevant Questions
- Upsides for More Openness
- Risks?
- Recommendations

NOKIA

Relevant Questions

- *Who is the Customer?*

- *Would increased openness reduce the value of a W3C Membership?*

- *How to increase WGs' accountability?*

- *Should any technical work be done in a Closed Member-only Mail List (ML)?*

NOKIA

Upsides for More Openness

- Increased adoption and community by-in
- Earlier feedback
- Facilitates liaisons
- Extends participation to people & communities that cannot afford the Membership fee
- Increased visibility of the technical work will result in new Members

NOKIA

Risks?

- *We'll get too much input from the Public*!
  - **Well *duh,* that's the idea!**
- *We'll get too much SPAM!*
  - **Write access to Public ML is controlled (e.g. white list)**
- *IPR insertion with no known licensing terms*
  - **Write access to the Public ML requires prior agreement to the W3C's Patent Policy**
- *Technical work in the Public reduces the value of W3C Membership*
  - **More Public transparency and accountability would make our membership more valuable**

NOKIA

Recommendations

- Confidentiality
  - Use Public MLs for all technical discussions
  - Only use Member-only MLs for non-technical purposes e.g. *where do eat dinner tonight*
- Accountability
  - WG must update their Charter's Milestones data via a Publicly-visible mechanism