Standardisation Forum

Expert Recommendation OWMS version 4.0

Date   03 August 2011

Colophon

Project name	Expert Recommendation OWMS version 4.0
Version number	1.0
Organisation Location	Forum Standaardisatie PO Box 96810 2509 JE Den Haag forumstandaardisatie@logius.nl
Authors	Mr Wolfgang Ebbers Mr Dennis Krukkert

Contents

Executive Summary

Subject

This report contains recommendations from the OWMS version 4.0 Expert Group to the Standardisation Forum and the Standardisation Board concerning the inclusion of the OWMS version 4.0 standard [1] in the list of open standards, which fall under the principle of 'comply or explain'.

OWMS (Overheid.nl Web Metadata Standard) version 4.0 is a standard for placing metadata onto (government) information. With help from the standard, the properties of an information object (e.g. a document) can be recorded, such as the author, modified date, the organisation that authorised the document, etc.

The standard is based on Dublin Core, a widely used international standard for provision of metadata. Samenwerkende Catalogi (Catalogue Collaboration) (and other Informatie Publicatie Modellen (Information Publication Models)) make use of OWMS.

Process Description

OWMS has evolved. This has occurred as a result of the application of new insights and requirements. In August 2008, the previous version, version 3.5, was established as the first fully-fledged version. The latest version (4.0) was established in April 2011.

This version has been registered by the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations Netherlands. An Expert Procedure was then initiated by the Standardisation Forum. This Expert Recommendation is the result of this expert procedure.

Results of the standard against the assessment criteria

− *Openness*

The OWMS version 4.0 standard complies sufficiently with the criteria of openness. The Expert Group have identified a number of areas for improvement (see 4.3), but these are not prohibitive for inclusion in the list.

− *Usability*

OWMS is quite a mature standard, and it is expected to be widely used. Also, there is sufficient support offered by suppliers. The Expert Group recommends that the financing model be less dependent upon 1 party. This point is not prohibitive for inclusion in the list

− *Potential*

Independence from suppliers can be improved by allowing the supplier to be easily changed when using OWMS. Also, interoperability will be improved through the use of this standard. One concern is that there are

XML schemas offered, but these are not part of the standard documentation. Other schemas can therefore be used during implementations, from which it may be possible that, when exchanging with other parties, modifications are required or the metadata may need to be converted by the supplier. However, the Expert Group believes that this does not prevent inclusion.

− *Impact*

Introducing OWMS has limited impact on the operations of an organisation. The quality and durability of information is improved by the use of OWMS.

In the field of provision of information, technology, privacy and security there are no major advantages or risks identified.

Conclusion of the Expert Group
OWMS version 4.0 can be included in the list of open standards for 'comply or explain'.

The Expert Group recommends the following functional scope of application:

 "Provision of metadata for public government information on the internet"

The Expert Group recommends that the OWMS version 4.0 organisational working scope should be in line with the 'comply or explain' principle, namely:

"Governments (central government, provinces, municipalities and water authorities) and institutions in the (semi-)public sector[1]."

Additional recommendations in respect of the adoption of the standard
During the expert meeting, a number of improvements have been identified that would not prevent inclusion in the list. These regard the decision-making process, use by the community and stimulation of adoption. These opinions are described in section 4.3 and 4.4 of the report.

---

1 As defined in the action plan "Nederland Open in Verbinding (An Open Connection in the Netherlands)" [2].

1 Objective of the Expert Recommendation

1.1 Background

On Monday, 17 September 2007, the Secretary of State for Economic Affairs sent the Action Plan for Open Standards and Open Source Software to Parliament. The purpose of the plan is to make the provision of information more accessible, to achieve independence from IT suppliers and to pave the way for innovation.

One measure of the action plan is to use a list of standards covered by the principle of 'comply or explain'. The Standardisation Board shall decide which standards will be included in the list based upon an expert assessment of the standard.

The experts are collected in an Expert Group, which assesses the standard against a number of criteria. These criteria, and the effects developed in the form of specific questions, are examined and the results are provided in this Expert Recommendation. The criteria and procedure are taken from the report "Open standaarden: het proces om te komen tot een lijst met open standaarden"("Open standards: the process to arrive at a list of open standards"), which was approved by the Standardisation Board and can be found on the Standardisation Forum website [3].

OWMS version 4.0 is registered for inclusion in the list of open standards for 'comply or explain', by the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, in coordination with the content standards team for the e-Overheid voor Burgers (e-Government for Citizens) with ICTU program. During the first interview on 16 November 2010 it was shown that OWMS version 4.0 was in need of improvement in a number of areas before it can be included in the list. The main points were documenting the specification of the standard and the structural organisation of an open management environment. After these improvements were implemented a second interview took place on 16 May 2011, and the Standardisation Forum decided to carry out an expert assessment.

The task of the Expert Group was to provide an opinion about whether or not to include the OWMS version 4.0 standard in the list of open standards and whether conditions should be applied to the inclusion. In addition, the Expert Group was asked for opinions (with respect to adoption) for inclusion in the Expert Recommendation.

1.2 Process

The following procedure was used in the preparation of this recommendation:

− The Expert Group began by assigning an individual score to OWMS version 4.0 based on a question list. This question list contains the

criteria described in the report mentioned above. Based on the answers obtained, the Chairman and Supervisor of the Expert Group identified the constraints.
- Next, the Expert Group held a meeting on 01 July 2011 to discuss the findings and especially, the constraints. During this meeting, the scope of application and the working scope were also determined.

The findings of the Expert Group have been compiled by the Chairman and the Supervisor in this advisory report. A preliminary draft version was sent to the Expert Group members with a request for comments. After the received comments have been processed, the report will be completed and submitted for public consultation.

1.3   Continuation

When the Expert Recommendation, as contained in this document, has been established, it will be made available by the Office Standardisation Forum for public consultation. All stakeholders may provide feedback about the Expert Recommendation during the 4-week consultation period. The Standardisation Forum Office can forward these comments to the Chairman and, if necessary, to the Expert Group.

The Standardisation Forum shall provide advice to the Standardisation Board on the basis of the Expert Recommendation and relevant insights obtained from the public consultation. The Standardisation Board will ultimately decide whether the standard will be included in the 'comply or explain' list, based upon the recommendation of the Forum.

1.4   Composition of the Expert Group

The Expert Group is composed of people who are invited based on their personal expertise or who work for an organisation that is either directly or indirectly involved with the standard. In addition, an independent chairman is appointed to lead the Expert Group and to be responsible for the final Expert Recommendation.

It was decided that the Chairman would be Mr Wolfgang Ebbers, who works at Novay and is associated with the Centre for e-Government Studies at the University of Twente. In Novay he is the chief researcher for public services. His expertise lies in the field of acceptance and organisational impact of innovations in public electronic services as well as multi-channel management. He has many years of experience in dealing with eGovernment related projects.

The Expert Group was commissioned by the Standardisation Forum by Mr Dennis Krukkert, consultant at TNO. During the expert meeting, Maarten van der Veen from the Standardisation Forum Office was present as an observer.

The following participated in the Expert Group:

- Mr Marco Aarts (ICTU)
- Mr Freek Bom (IND)
- Mr Jop Cornelisse (Interior Ministry, sponsor)
- Mr Hugo ter Doest (Dimpact)
- Mr Loek Kasting (Ministry of General Affairs)
- Mr Willem Kossen (BKWI)
- Mr John Kruidhof (Ministry of Economic Affairs) Mr Mark Lindhout (Langdradig)
- Mr Hans Overbeek (ICTU, e-Overheid voor Burgers program, content standards team)
- Mr Richard Wassink (Ministry of Economic Affairs)
- Mrs Ludwina van der Wijst (ICTU, Catalogue Collaboration program)
- Mrs Lian Wintersman (Royal Library)

1.5 Explanatory Notes for OWMS version 4.0

OWMS (Overheid.nl Web Metadata Standard) version 4.0 is a standard for placing metadata onto (government) information. The intended purpose of the standard is to make it easier to find information. With help from the standard, the properties of an information object (e.g. a document) can be recorded, such as the author, modified date, the organisation that authorised the document, etc.

The standard is based on Dublin Core, a widely used international standard for provision of metadata. OWMS describes a set of elements, of which nine are required (the 'OWMS-core'). Samenwerkende Catalogi (Catalogue Collaboration) (and other Informatie Publicatie Modellen (Information Publication Models)) makes use of OWMS.

OWMS has evolved. This has occurred as a result of the application of new insights and requirements. Version 3.5 was established as the first fully-fledged version in August 2008. At that time it was already known that developments would follow. Especially in the use of pointers (URLs) and the government ownership metadata: authority. Meanwhile OWMS 4.0 was developed to include this functionality.

OWMS distinguishes between a standard specification and supporting materials. A standard specification includes a (syntax neutral) domain semantic model and a conceptual model, and a description of the OWMS properties. The support materials include such things as value lists and schema definitions. The standard specification is registered for inclusion in the list of open standards.

1.6 Relationship with other open/industry standards

The Expert Group discussed the relationship of OWMS with other standards.

The standard is based on Dublin Core, a widely used international standard for provision of metadata. There are (in the Netherlands) organisations that use Dublin Core, but not OWMS. The expectation of the Expert Group is that this will not lead to problems. The elements of Dublin Core used by OWMS are very common.

Then there is a possible relationship with NL-LOM, the meta-data standard for describing learning objects in the sectors of primary education, secondary education, secondary vocational and higher education.

This standard has recently been included in the list of 'comply or explain'. However, in the opinion of the Expert Group, a clear distinction must be made about the scope of application.

A number of large suppliers search engines (such as Google, Microsoft and Yahoo!) have started an initiative called Schema.org. This is a relatively new and not yet widely used standard whereby web pages are designed with embedded information to allow improved search results in search engines. Depending upon the development of this standard, the Expert Group believes that a relationship between OWMS and this standard should be researched in the future.

1.7 Summary

Chapter 2 describes how the OWMS version 4.0 should be used at a functional level (functional scope of application) and by which organisations (organisational working scope). To determine whether the standard should be included in the list of open standards it was assessed against four criteria established by the Standardisation Board. Chapter 3 contains the results of this assessment. Chapter 4 contains an outline summary of the key results and the opinion of the Expert Group to the Standardisation Forum.

2   Scope of application and working scope

Government organisations are expected to use the list of open standards during tendering procedures following the 'comply or explain' regime. Interfaces and standards should be deployed from the above list, depending upon the functionality to be purchased. In order to do this, the Expert Group has described how OWMS version 4.0 should be used at a functional level (functional scope of application) and by which organisations (organisational working scope).

2.1   Functional scope of application

The Expert Group has used the definition of the scope of application proposed by the sponsor as a basis to determine the functional scope for OWMS version 4.0. This proposal was: "a standard for the provision of government information metadata on the internet".

Before establishing a final scope of application, the Expert Group first applied a number of principles:

–   The possible inclusion of the standard in the list means that if information (within the scope of application) is provided with metadata, this should be based upon OWMS.
–   Possible inclusion does not mean emphatically that all of the metadata information (within the scope of application) should be included. This may not be desirable and a debate may be required, but the list of open standards is simply not the right forum to discuss this.
–   This means, for example, that "transactional exchanges" (e.g. exchange of XML messages) would fall outside the scope (since these kind of messages are often not equipped with metadata).
–   Many organisations provide information objects with more metadata than OWMS prescribes. This is not a problem, as long as the mandated OWMS metadata (the ownership in the OWMS-core) is included.
–   Using OWMS would be appropriate for information that is publicly available. It should not be mandatory for use with non-public information (e.g. in a mijn-overheid portal).

Considering these principles, the Expert Group recommends the following scope of application:

  "Provision of metadata for public government information on the internet"

2.2   Organisational working scope

The Expert Group recommends that the OWMS version 4.0 organisational working scope should be in line with the 'comply or explain' principle, namely:

> *"Governments (central government, provinces, municipalities and water authorities) and institutions in the (semi-)public sector[2]".*

The above description of the working scope is the opinion of the Expert Group to all relevant parties to whom the standard applies directly or indirectly. The Expert Group saw no reason to further limit the working scope described above.

2 As defined in the action plan "Nederland Open in Verbinding (An Open Connection in the Netherlands)" [3].

3 Criteria for assessment of the standard

To determine whether OWMS version 4.0 should be included in the list of open standards it was assessed against some criteria. These criteria are described in the report, "Open standaarden, het proces om te komen tot een lijst met open standaarden (Open standards, the process to arrive at a list of open standards)" [3] and on the website of the Standardisation Forum. The result of the assessment for each criterion will be described in this chapter. For completeness, the definition of each criterion will be included (in italics).

3.1 Openness

3.1.1. Endorsement and maintenance

The standard is endorsed and will be maintained by a non-profit organisation. On-going development occurs on the basis of an open decision-making procedure available to all interested parties (consensus or majority decision etc.).

The OWMS version 4.0 standard is commissioned by the Interior Ministry and is currently managed by ICTU in the e-Overheid for Citizens program. It is currently planned to transfer the management to Logius on 1 January 2012 [4]. All these organisations are non-profit. However, the Expert Group makes a particular point that all current activities should be bought together and replicated and the management of the website, standaarden.overheid.nl must be guaranteed.

The financing of the standard is guaranteed by the Interior Ministry until 2015. It is not clear exactly which budget is reserved. The Expert Group does not believe this should prevent the standard from being included in the list of standards, but points out that the time to implement a metadata standard up to 2015 is not very long. The Interior Ministry indicated that this is the maximum period for a commitment and that this is in connection with a budget that runs until 2015.

Different organisations are involved in the standardisation decision making process:

- The Interior Ministry is the commissioning body and financier and makes the final decision about changes to (and new versions of) the OWMS standard specification.
- The ICTU e-Overheid for Citizens program (Content Standards team) carries out daily management tasks and develops new versions. This is commissioned by the Interior Ministry.
- The OWMS user council makes decisions about changes of all products, with the exception of the standard specification. These products include the different value lists, the validation environment, the website, etc. The User Council has an advisory role in changes to

the standard specification. Participation in the User Council is (still) free. However, it must be assumed that an organisation has a certain interest in OWMS.

– There is a community in which everyone can participate. Members of the community may submit amendment proposals, and give recommendations on products and the standard specification.

The Expert Group believes that the standardisation process is open enough for inclusion in the list. The Expert Group believes that the process can be further improved. It recommends the management team to make the decision-making process more transparent. This can be done by openly publishing the decisions taken and the related considerations.

3.1.2.   Availability

The standard is published and the specification document for the standard is freely available, or can be obtained for a nominal contribution. It must be possible, free of charge or for a nominal price, for anyone to copy it, make it available and use it.

The OWMS standard specification is available free of charge via the internet at standaarden.overheid.nl [1]

3.1.3.   Intellectual property

The intellectual property, i.e. patents, of the standard, or parts thereof, must be made available on a royalty-free basis irrevocably.

A Creative Commons license applies and this is published in the OWMS management plan as part of the standard document. This license is not listed in the standard document itself. The Expert Group recommends the management team to print the license in future versions of the standard document. For the current version this is not a barrier to inclusion.

3.1.4.   Reuse

There are no restrictions on the reuse of the standard.

The Creative Commons license has several variants that may be chosen. The "CC-by-nd" variant has been chosen by the management team. Put simply, this means that the document may be freely used and distributed but no alterations may be carried out. The Expert Group believes that this is an unnecessary restriction of openness, and recommends the management team to bring the standard document under the "CC-by-sa" variant. The latter variant may be altered, provided the work retains the same name and it is issued under the same license.

The management team notes that actually, the intention is to allow the work to be altered, provided that the name of OWMS is not used for the altered work. This will prevent third-parties from releasing "OWMS-lite", for

example. The Expert Group recommends the management team to protect the name, OWMS and bring the standard specification under the CC-by-sa license. The CC-by-sa license provides (limited) protection to a name and it is up to the management team to determine whether this license adequately provides the required protection.

The Expert Group sees no further obstacles to inclusion in the list of open standards with regard to the intellectual property if this recommendation is followed.

3.2 Usability

3.2.1. Maturity

The standard is sufficiently mature.

OWMS is based on the Dublin Core standard, which is widely used both nationally and internationally. In addition, the standard itself has now reached version 4.0 and is, in the opinion of the Expert Group sufficiently crystallised.

Further development and maintenance of the standard are assured.

The management of the OWMS standard is currently carried out by ICTU and is expected to be transferred to Logius in 2012. The Interior Ministry has guaranteed funding until 2015. Although the Expert Group considers this timescale to implement a metadata standard to be quite short, it is not an obstacle to inclusion in the list.

The Expert Group notes, however, that development of the standard is currently subject to financing. It would be of benefit to the continuity of the standard if a model was found with several financiers. This is also the case with many other standards. The Expert Group recommends the management team broaden the community of OWMS users in the coming years and move on to a model in which the management of the of the standard can, as far as possible, be financed by participants from this community.

There is a method by which compliance with the standard can be determined.

The OWMS standard document (awaiting assessment) identifies a number of metadata fields, explains the fixed naming of these fields, and describes their meaning.

However, the standard document does not establish how the metadata should be recorded. The management organisation does offer XML schemas to which OWMS metadata in files can be structured and validated. These are not included in the standard document, but users are encouraged to use these XSD. The owner of the standard will not require

users to make use of these XSD. A mandatory XML schema for OWMS metadata would prevent a flexible, wide application of OWMS. The power of OWMS is that the standard can be expanded to include application-specific properties and values. Moreover, there are also many other methods to generate OWMS metadata than just in XML.

At present there is a lack of a validation tool that allows a user to automatically determine whether published metadata complies with OWMS. The lack of automated validation testing is a potential risk to the inter-changeability of government information with OWMS metadata. The establishment of a tool that can at least validate the features and syntax of the various formats (XML, XHTML, HTML and XHTML+RDFa) would be an interesting improvement.

Incidentally, there is a validation environment that is designed for some specific applications of OWMS, for example, a number of Information Publication Models (IPMs).

Also, given the nature of the OWMS standard, the Expert Group see consideration should be given to this point, but it is no obstacle to inclusion.

There is plenty of practical experience using the standard.

The OWMS standard is already used by many organisations, and there is a lot of experience with previous versions. However, the Expert Group noted that many organisations use the standard, but only for a part of their (published) information. The adoption of the standard is not as widespread as it should be, and could use a helping hand.

The expectation that the standard will be used in the future is positive.

There are several vendors that support the standard, and virtually every major Content Management System in the public sector supports it. In order to make the adoption of the standard easier for users, the Expert Group recommends that a list of suppliers that support the standard be set up. For some applications of the standard (for the Informatie Publicatie Modellen (Information Publication Models)) these lists already exist[3] and could be reused. However, it is necessary that care should be taken: inclusion in the list should not be construed that a supplier is 'certified' by the management organisation. An overview list of suppliers should be clearly identified as nothing more than an overview list so that it cannot be misinterpreted as a recommended list of suppliers.

---

3 See for example http://www.e-overheidvoorburgers.nl/producten.decentraleregelgeving/Leveranciers.html

3.2.2. Functionality

The standard meets the functional requirements for operation within the proposed scope of application. In the opinion of the experts, OWMS version 4.0 complies with the requirements (implicitly) set within the proposed scope of application.

3.2.3. Standards

Are there competing standards? If so, what are they and who uses them? What are the pros and cons of this standard when compared to other standards?

A standard called Schema.org, in which a number of search engine suppliers (including Google, Microsoft and Yahoo!) participate. This is a standard to apply metadata to specific websites. Although this standard is not an alternative for OWMS (not open, limited suitability for other types of content other than web pages), it begs the question to what extent organisations in the future must apply metadata to their web content with OWMS as well as Schema.org. The Expert Group acknowledges this point, but does not see it as a reason not to include OWMS in the list of open standards.

A second potential standard that could be earmarked as a competitor is Dublin Core itself. OWMS is based on Dublin Core, and makes a selection from the Dublin Core fields. Potentially, an organisation that has implemented Dublin Core may have made other choices regarding the use of fields and therefore, this may be incompatible with OWMS. The Expert Group considers, however, that the fields used by OWMS are generic and that this is not a big risk.

Different sectors make use of their own meta data standards. For example, the education domain makes use of NLLOM. This standard has recently been included in the list of 'comply or explain'. However, in the opinion of the Expert Group, a clear distinction can be made about the scope of application.

In the opinion of the Expert Group there is no competing standard to prevent inclusion of OWMS version 4.0 in the list of open standards.

3.3 Potential

3.3.1. Independence from suppliers

The inclusion of the standard in the list contributes to increasing independence from suppliers.

The Expert Group believes that the inclusion of the standard in the list will lead to increased independence from suppliers. By making use of the same metadata standard, it will be easier to change suppliers. The lack of XML schemas in the standard documentation (as described in section 3.2.1) may mean that conversion of metadata is required if suppliers are changed.

3.3.2. Interoperability

The inclusion of the standard in the list contributes to increasing interoperability.

The Expert Group believes that the inclusion of the standard in the list will lead to increased interoperability.

In chapter 3.2.1 it is noted that the XML schemas are not part of the standard documentation. The Expert Group notes that this brings a level of risk, and that transformations are required when different applications exchange data. These transformations must be defined manually, but they can be carried out automatically. To achieve interoperability, it is possible that additional actions may be necessary, but the standard shall certainly contribute to improved interoperability.

3.4 Impact

3.4.1. Operational Management

Does implementation of the standard bring risks to operational management?
Does implementation of the standard bring advantages to operational management?

According to the Expert Group, applying OWMS brings no major risks. In the process of development of information (such as documents), it is often that fact that in practice, the metadata is added at the end of the process. In that sense, there is little impact on current processes.

The Expert Group believes that it is better to add metadata during the development of information. This not only concerns metadata for publishing (which is the focus of OWMS), but also "internal metadata" needed for business activities. Other standards are also available, such as the government-wide metadata standard for archiving. The management

team notes that there is a great deal of alignment during the development of this standard, so that connection is secured.

Using OWMS to join metadata information has a positive impact on the sustainability of information. Also, the quality of information will be increased: for example, a distinction can be made between the city of Utrecht and the province of Utrecht as the owner of certain information.

3.4.2. Provision of information

Does implementation of the standard bring risks to the provision of information?
Does implementation of the standard bring advantages to the provision of information?

The Expert Group believes that the standard brings no serious risks to the field of information provision. In the standard, different code/value lists are used. The Expert Group recommends the management team to keep aligning with organisations that maintain similar lists.

3.4.3. Technological risks

Does implementation of the standard bring technological risks?
Does implementation of the standard bring positive technical advantages to the provision of information?

According to the Expert Group, applying OWMS brings no major risks. There is still a remark about the lack of so-called "meta-metadata", which can be used for example to provide information about the OWMS version. However, this is not seen as a big risk, especially since the current version is backwards compatible with the previous (commonly used) version 3.5. This means that metadata that corresponds to version 3.5, also satisfies 4.0.

3.4.4. Security and privacy

Does implementation of the standard bring risks to security or privacy?
Does implementation of the standard bring positive technological effects to the provision of information?

OWMS says nothing about the content of the information published. There is no relation to privacy, and it therefore plays no part in privacy issues. OWMS also has little impact on security, although the Expert Group noted that, through the use of this standard, traceability of information increases, which has a positive effect with regard to information security.

3.4.5. Migration

Would migration to the standard be simple?

The migration to OWMS itself is not very complex, and therefore relatively easy. However, the Expert Group noted that applying metadata information is fairly labour intensive, especially if the metadata must be applied to older information objects. However, this is not a property of OWMS, but of metadata in general.

4 Recommendation to the Forum/Board

4.1 Summary of assessment criteria

In summary, the outcome of the assessment criteria is as follows:

– *Openness*

The OWMS version 4.0 standard complies sufficiently with the criteria of openness. The standard is freely available; no Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) apply to the standard; and Logius, as the intended management organisation, is open and responsible for management and maintenance of the standards.

The Expert Group have identified a number of areas for improvement (see 4.3), but these are not prohibitive for inclusion in the list.

– *Usability*

The standard meets the criteria of usability. OWMS is quite a mature standard, and it is expected to be widely used. Also, there is sufficient support offered by suppliers. The Expert Group highlights risk in the financing structure of OWMS. The standard is very dependent on one financier, and it would be wise to choose another method of funding to reduce this dependence.

– *Potential*

Independence from suppliers can be improved by allowing the supplier to be easily changed when using OWMS. Also, interoperability will be improved through the use of this standard. One concern is that there are XML schemas offered, but these are not part of the standard documentation. Other schemas can therefore be used during implementations, from which it may be possible that, when exchanging with other parties, modifications are required or the metadata may need to be converted by the supplier.

– *Impact*

Introducing OWMS has limited impact on the operations of an organisation. In many organisations metadata is not added until the end of the process. In order to be better prepared in the future to add metadata during the execution of business processes, relevant initiatives to align OWMS should be implemented by the management team. The quality and durability of information is improved by the use of OWMS.

In the field of provision of information, technology, privacy and security there are no major advantages or risks identified.

4.2   Recommendation to the Forum/Board

A majority of the Expert Group recommend the Board include OWMS version 4.0 in the list of open standards for 'comply or explain'. There are no conditions attached to this inclusion.

4.3   Recommendation to the Sponsor

During the expert meeting, a number of improvements have been identified that would not prevent inclusion in the list. The Expert Group makes the following recommendations to the sponsor regarding OWMS:

- The decision making process should be made more transparent by openly publishing the decisions taken and the related considerations.
- In future versions of the standard, attach the used license to the standard document itself.
- Choose the Creative Commons 'CC-by-sa' license for the standard document. This license fits the stated intentions of the management team better. The current license places unnecessary restrictions regarding the preparation of derivative products. However, the Expert Group recommends that the name, OWMS, should be protected. The CC-by-sa license provides (limited) protection to a name and it is up to the management team to determine whether this license adequately provides the required protection.
- In the standard, different code/value lists are used. The Expert Group recommends the management team to keep aligning with organisations that maintain similar lists.

4.4   Recommendation to further promote adoption

- In the coming years, improve and increase the OWMS user-community. Make a transition to a model in which the management of the standard is financed by participants from this community.
- Make a list of suppliers that support the standard. This makes the adoption of the standard by end users easier. For some applications of the standard (for the Informatie Publicatie Modellen (Information Publication Models)) these lists already exist and could be reused. However, it is necessary that care should be taken: inclusion in the list should not be construed that a supplier is 'certified' by the management organisation.

5   References

[1] Standard Specification OWMS version 4.0, ICTU: E-Overheid voor Burgers (e-Government of Citizens), 3 May 2011,

http://standaarden.overheid.nl/owms/4.0/doc/NormatievespecificatieOWMS4.0v1.0.1.pdf

[2] Actieplan Nederland Open in Verbinding (Action Plan: An Open Connection in the Netherlands), The Hague:

Ministry of Economic Affairs, 2007.

[3] P H Minnecré and L Korsten, Open Standards,

The process to arrive at a list of open standards, Verdonck, Klooster & Associates B.V., 2008.

[4] OWMS Management Plan, ICTU: E-Overheid voor Burgers, 3 May 2011,
http://standaarden.overheid.nl/owms/beheer/BeheerplanOWMSv1.0.pdf