**Summary of Minutes**

**of the Second Meeting of the Utilization and Promotion Committee**

Date and time: 13:00 ~ 15:00, November 7 (Wednesday), 2012

Venue: TKP Kotenma-cho Business Center, 4th Floor, Conference Room 401

Attendees:

Chairman: Ichiya Nakamura Professor, Graduate School of Media Design, Keio University

Vice Chairman: Fumihiro Murakami Mitsubishi Research Institute, Inc.

Committee members:

Yusho Ishikawa Project Professor, Interfaculty Initiative in Information Studies, The University of Tokyo

 Ikki Ohmukai Associate Professor, National Institute of Information

Hiroichi Kawashima Special Adviser of the Government of Saga Prefecture

 President, Institute for Public Sector Innovation

Iwao Kobayashi Representative director, Scholex

Sawako Nohara President and CEO, IPSe Marketing, Inc./ Project Professor, Graduate School of Media and Governance, Keio University

Observers:

- Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (MIC) (Information and Communications Bureau)

- Cabinet Secretariat (Information Communication Technology Office)

- Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (METI) (Commerce and Information Policy Bureau)

- Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism (MLIT) (Policy Bureau)

- Geospatial Information Authority of Japan

- Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF) (Food Industry Affairs Bureau)

- Japan Meteorological Agency

- Japan Business Federation

- ASP-SasS-Cloud Consortium (ASPIC)

- Yuriko Inoue (Chairman, Data Governance Committee)

- Noboru Koshizuka (Chairman, Technology Committee)

Associated members: Archetype Corporation, ITS Japan, ACCESS CO., LTD., Location Information Service Research Agency, Indigo Corporation, NTT Advanced Technology Corporation, NTT Communications Corporation, NTT DATA Corporation, NTT Docomo Inc., The Institute of Administrative Information Systems, KDDI CORPORATION, CTI Engineering Co., Ltd., GLOCOM International University of Japan, JMA Holdings, Inc., automation co, ltd., Car Information Data Management, Communications and Information network Association of Japan (CIAJ), smartvalue Inc., Japan Geotechnical Consultants Association, dialog Public Relations inc., dot-jp the specified nonprofit corporation, Nagareyama City, Nagareyama City Council, IBM Japan Ltd., Nikkei Inc., NEC Corporation, Hewlett-Packard Development Company, L.P., Microsoft Japan Co., Ltd., Nihon Unisys, Ltd., Pioneer Corporation, PIPED BITS Co., Ltd., Panasonic Corporation, Hitachi, Ltd., Fujitsu Limited, Mitsui Sumitomo Insurance Co., Ltd., International Universal Menu Asociation, Yokohama Community Design Lab., and a knowledgeable person

Other: DENTSU INC., Cabinet Office (Disaster prevention)

Secretariat: Fumihiro Murakami, Takeshi Tsukuni, Nao Fukushima, Yuko Takano (Mitsubishi Research Institute, Inc.)

Handouts:

Material 1. Seating chart

Material 2. List of members of the Open Data Promotion Consortium

Material 3. “Open Data, Open Innovation and the Cloud” (by Mark Gayler, Open Software Lead, Microsoft Corporation)

Material 4. Prospectus of establishment of the “Yokohama Open Data Solution Development Committee”

Material 5. About the holding of “Hackathon Conference”

Material 6. Schedule of meetings of the Utilization and Promotion Committee hereafter

Material 7. Outline of the holding of the Symposium (Draft)

Agenda:

1. Opening

2. Topics for discussions

 (1) “Open Data, Open Innovation and the Cloud” by Mark Gayler, (Microsoft Corporation) based on Material 3

【Questions and Answers】

：I have three questions. First, what is the shared protocol created by Microsoft and IBM according to the material, page 3? Is it like an interface or a platform?

Second, it is not clear to what degree we should disclose information as a government or municipal official in the discussion of Open Data. Personally, I think we should make information more open and promote Open by Default. However, the more open, the more unexpected problems will occur. Please tell me your opinion about this.

Third, good practices often come from the U.S. If there are any failures in the U.S. we should bear in mind in Japan, please let me know.

：First, OData Protocol is an open platform protocol to share data, which is based REST API.

Thanks to this, we can feed data through various kinds of technologies. It has been developed by a consortium that consists of Microsoft, IBM, SAP, CITRIX and so on. You can find more information at Odata.org.

The second question concerning risks is a common challenge that is often discussed. There are two points. First, we do not have to share all data. The government should only disclose what they decide to in order to secure a certain level of transparency. For example, data such as PHRs should not be made public. When data are called Open Data, they must be obviously non-personal data and anonymous data. The second is risk management. For the starting point of risk reduction, I think basic activities in the framework of information disclosure will give us a hint. Disclosed information contains information available on websites, information you can obtain only at administrative institutions, and information made public through some official application for information disclosure. Open Data means to proactively disclose information that has been disclosed reactively through an official, time-consuming process, as information that has already been disclosed. Of course, the government must take a risk by doing so. For example, when the government creates roads, citizens use them and criminals use them as well. The government still creates roads. It is an unfamiliar area to the government, but it is a controllable risk.

Concerning the third, failures will occur in two cases. First, it is when the government and administrative agencies will not disclose data until they are perfectly prepared. Many governmental and administrative agencies want to share Open Data. However, they say they cannot because the data are not perfect. This misses the chance. If they want to make data correct, they should disclose data and make them more accurate by crowdsourcing. Second, it is when the government and administrative agencies just share data and do nothing. If the government and administrative agencies disclose data, it is necessary to involve and excite citizens, and promote the development of applications and service delivery using data. In addition, it is also necessary to offer tools that can make it easy to create applications. It is also necessary to involve people in events like Hackathon. In this regard, Meteorological Data, Hackathon is a very good effort. We need to excite people by application contests and other events.

：I have two questions. How many examples about Open Data does Microsoft have? You have just introduced the standard of OData developed by private enterprises. The U.S. has the NEIM standard and Europe has other standards lead by governments. What do you think

about the relationship with them?

：I do not know exactly, but Microsoft has carried out projects concerning Open Data catalogues in more than 20 countries. In Canada, for example, there are more than 10 examples. Therefore, I would like you to think that there are a great many cases using the previously- mentioned technology.

OData is absolutely a protocol, not a format. It can be used by different techniques including cloud, Office software, and document preparation tools. It is compatible with the previously-mentioned standard. A good way to describe the openness of the OData protocol is the five-star standard for Open Data by Tim Burners-Lee. One star means that the government shares data. Two stars means that data are shared in a reusable format. Three stars means that the format is not an independent one. Four stars means that addresses with URI are shown. Five stars means that the data are Linked Data.

OData provides a four-star standard by default. For example, between a certain vendor’s cloud and another vendor’s Office software, applications can be loaded easily from the data store of the cloud even if they are written in Ruby, PHP or Java. It means that citizens and application developers do not need to care about the type of format in which data are stored, the type of technology used for data sharing, and what kind of device to be accessed. It is a very open, portable, popular protocol.

(2) Approaches by Yokohama City (state of progress, etc.) (by Committee member Mr. Kobayashi) based on Material 4

 (3) About the holding of “Hackathon Conference” (by Secretariat) based on Material 5

 (4) Introduction of other related approaches and events (by each Committee member)

1. Status of studies by the Technology Committee and the Data Governance Committee
2. Status of progress by the Technology Committee (by Chairman of Technology Committee, Mr. Koshizuka)
3. Status of progress by the Data Governance Committee (by Chairman of Technology Committee, Mr. Inoue)
4. Free discussions

【Questions and Answers】

Secretariat

：I have a question for Microsoft. Please tell me about the federal government’s system to promote Open Data.

：First of all, before I answer your question, I would like to mention my view. The ways to promote Open Data differ from country to country. In the U.S, and in the U.K., Open Data is carried out in a top-down manner. The federal governments develop plans and local governments promote them there. On the other hand, in some countries, it is carried out in a bottom-up manner. It happens when the central government is behind local governments. It is the case where the central government gives a low priority to Open Data. For example, in Canada, municipalities including Vancouver, Edmonton, Toronto serve as a model to lead the Canadian government. Such differences in promotion systems seem to have an influence in differences in the development of Open Data.

Now I answer your question. In the U.S., open government is one of the top priorities of the Obama Administration. It has been actively developed. It will be helpful for Japan to know what framework of measures and policies the government will build and what regulations it will have. Specifically, as a policy of the Obama Administration, it is obligatory that Open Data should be shared and disclosed in daily duties in the U.S. ministries and agencies. They have to make efforts at each ministry level. In this regard, today is a watershed moment. While a reduction in administrative costs is required, the improvement in service quality is also required. Therefore, if the Obama Administration continues, Open Data will make more progress. On the other hand, if candidate Romney has power, the situation will be uncertain. In any case, it is a good example of how open government is promoted at a national government level.

：We share examples of success. However, it is also important to collect and examine examples

of failure.

In Japan, it is said that the administration will break up soon. Even if the government changes, we have to be prepared for this activity. In Japan, it is necessary to consider the balance between the top-down and bottom-up approaches.

：We have a discussion in terms of the promotion of Open Data. We are considering what its obstacles are. The federal government actively promotes counter balance, that is, while it promotes information disclosure, it does not disclose all information. I understand that it does not disclose confidential information that should not be disclosed, or, what you call, information on dark areas. However, I think it is difficult to deal with public data which are in the gray area between the dark area and the white area. In order to set a border to divide the gray area into white and black areas, I think a good deal of communication is necessary between those who possess information and those who use and request information. In the U.S., what do they think about how to deal with this gray area?

：In some countries, a top-down approach is taken and in other countries, a bottom-up approach is taken. I do not mean one is better than the other. However, if we consider Open Data in Japan, it is desirable that all levels from the national level to the local municipality level should participate.

First, we should begin with data that can be disclosed easily, for example, data which have already been disclosed or are easily accessible. On the other hand, there are some data that are difficult to disclose for different reasons. The reasons vary: some of them are because of problems of systems, regulations, and privacy. In other cases, a merit of data disclosure may become an obstacle to other data disclosure. It is not easy. I would like you to think that we have a long way to go. It does not matter if we sort data into those that do not interest users, those that are subject to regulations, those concerning privacy, and so on in the process where we disclose them.

Let’s take a simple example. In Vancouver, about 10 applications appeared when they started their efforts for Open Data in 2009. Among them, there was an application that locates drinking fountains. After that, about 5 similar applications appeared. Each of them had good and bad. It is true that for the authority of Vancouver, one application was enough. However, this is a good example that shows that citizens and application developers brought ideas. In this way, in case more than one application appears, it is important to have a system which allows us to have a discussion or vote, allows citizens to develop applications themselves, and allows us to involve citizens and express opinions.

In successful cases in the U.S. and Canada, first, they share some data sets with citizens; then concerning the data sets, they ask citizens, through a kind of voting, what kind of data they want and in what form they want the data disclosed. In that case, they collect citizens’ interest by using social media. When you look at the websites of Vancouver City and Edmonton City, you will find they have linkage with social media. This is one of the keys to success. They involve citizens to consider the possibility, adequateness and necessity of disclosure.

：It was informative because I could confirm how important it is that the administration involve citizens actively into dialogue.

：In the presentation by Microsoft, you said that it is important for the government not only to offer data but also involve and excite the private sector. One of the examples is Hackathon. I think it is a public competition. As in the U.K., some governments even provide incubation. Data of high commercial value are expected to be used more actively. However, concerning data which are difficult to use commercially, I want to hear your opinion about to what extent the government should intervene as apart of an ecosystem.

：In Yokohama, we do activities with keywords of community informatization. In a community, it is more important that a big business is born rather than that many small businesses are born. It is important to broaden the scope and improve quality by apply Open Data to public services that have already been provided by NPOs. In this regard, it is important how we should support NPO people financially and offer them places to find disclosed information.

：Probably, what private enterprises really feel is that they want public institutions to share data and after that withdraw. It is important for the government not to intervene in the processes excessively unless they are not illegal, but to encourage the private sector to reuse data. It is important to permit open license to promote the reuse and use of data and to provide SLA to data for commercial use. Without SLA, enterprises cannot use data.

In addition, SLA should not have too many constraints. In the case of early Open Data in North America, they were allowed to use data but not to reuse them. As a result, the number of enterprises that try to create reusable application services has decreased. The government needs to create a safe and simple license that allows the private sector to reuse data. Open Government Policy in the U.K. is an example, and some state governments and cities in the U.S., also adopt simple rules.

We must understand that Open Data can also be offered for a fee. Free and fee-based are not contradictory, but they can coexist. Such partnership can be achieved that allows the government to disclose information for free and the private sector to provide information services with added value.

：The government hammered out the E-administrative Open Data Strategy in IT Strategic Headquarters. It holds up the following principle: the government shall disclose public data actively; data should be disclosed in a machine-readable and reusable way; the government shall promote their use whether for commercial purpose or for non-commercial purpose; the government shall start their specific activities quickly with public data easy to deal with and accumulate results steadily.

I want to consider technological specifications and licensing by reference to the opinions in the consortium.

：Concerning the relationship between the national and local governments, it is a basic idea of our strategy that the national government leads local municipalities. However, I would like you to draw on advanced efforts of local governments as a good reference. In the strategy, the policy that information should be disclosed on the condition that they are machine-readable and reusable is decided in a top-down approach. On the other hand, working-level meetings take a bottom-up approach, in that ministries and agencies, which are data holders, participate in the discussion there. The working-level meetings are to be prepared. I want to use the discussions in the Utilization and Promotion Committee as a reference.

：I think Open Data focuses on releasing the data of the government. The biggest market at the moment is the government. It is no doubt that the decision of the government and municipalities will have a great impact. Therefore, it is important to deal with it neatly.

An example that shows how important the government’s market is is procurement requirements for computers in the U.S. The federal government did not enforce adding a new requirement for computer specifications applied to the disabled. However, the government incorporated it into the procurement requirements for the computers the government procures. Because the government was the biggest market to the industrial world, computers sold in the U.S. started to include requirements for the disabled as standard equipment. This example will be a good reference.

：I would like to ask a favor of the consortium and Committee members. The use, application and dissemination of Open Data should come only after we discuss what kind of data should be disclosed. The Committee needs to clarify the process to promote it. Yokohama City and Sabae City are examples of a bottom-up approach, but the nation has not caught up with them. The government discloses statistics through e-Stat. We should take them up as an example of a top-down approach and discuss them. I would like the Committee to take up government statics data.

：It is important how we should collect best practices in Japan. Sabae, Aizuwakamatsu, and Nagareyama go ahead and it is commonly expected that Yokohama will follow. As a Committee member, Mr. Shoji mentioned in Facebook, in Miyashiro-cho, Saitama, there had already been activities concerning Open Data before the term “Open Data” appeared. 　It is important to provide information in a visible and quick manner: in what position we should put such data and how we should introduce them on the web. When we compare Open Data disclosed in the three cities, there will be an argument that a shared format will be necessary.

：I heard a term, “visualize.” It is important how we can involve people who are not here. When we are going to promote Open Data in Japan, consumers will ask, “Is it really safe to promote Open Data?” As mentioned in Microsoft’s material, on page 4, it is necessary to clearly visualize the figures of its merits and costs.