

Understanding intellectual property in academic software: scientific publications versus research software

Teresa Gomez-Diaz

Laboratoire d'informatique Gaspard-Monge – PLUME

FOSSa 2010 - Grenoble, november 10th 2010



Plan

- 1 Motivation
- 2 Scientific publication versus research software
 - Study in 17 points
 - The 17 points
- 3 Conclusion
 - Understanding academic software
- 4 References

Motivation - why this study?

- CNRS research eng. at LIGM, software development experience
- lab's software mission (june 2006): increase **software visibility**
- study of lab's software, understanding (IP) problems
- joint PLUME (dec. 2008), publication lab's software:
(3 + 33) <http://www.projet-plume.org/LIGM>
(18) <http://www.projet-plume.org/en/taxonomie/1936/en>
- several PLUME docs: FAQ licenses, software lab's guide...
- PLUME theme manager: software assets of a laboratory

The 17 points of the study

Study framework: a (French) research laboratory.

Legal aspect's framework: *Code de la propriété intellectuelle* (France) (intellectual property rights).

| Scientific publication versus research software | | |
|--|--------------|------------------------|
| definition | work (œuvre) | authors |
| right owners | signature | research lab's list of |
| dates | evolution | validation |
| quality and evaluation | prior works | motivation |
| diffusion | rights | licenses |
| reference | object | |

Paper vs. software: **definition**

We speak here about a publication or software in a research laboratory:
at least one author is a member of the lab.

Definition of academic software can be very large, it is restricted here to **research** software: software associated to a scientific paper.

| | definition |
|-----------------|--|
| Paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- publication in a scientific revue- well known object |
| Software | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- program associated to a published paper- not well defined object |

Paper vs. software: **work (œuvre)**

[remainder] The legal framework:

Code de la propriété intellectuelle (CPI) in France.

| | work (œuvre) |
|-----------------|---|
| Paper | protected by the CPI |
| Software | what is protected by the CPI: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- code (source, object)- preliminary work (documents,...)- interfaces- documentation (user,...) |

The protection of preliminary work: also for papers, not important.

Paper vs. software: **authors**

Legal expert: the author writes the work.

| | authors |
|-----------------|--|
| Paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- sign the paper- share the same % of authorship |
| Software | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- determine authors can be a legal problem (*)- attribute a % of authorship- signed and dated document |

(*) Reference:

IPR tracking methodology, deliverable A1.D2.1.4, Qualipso project.

<http://www.projet-plume.org/fr/ressource/rapport-tracer-propriete-intellectuelle>

Paper vs. software: **right owners**

[remainder] The legal framework:

Code de la propriété intellectuelle (CPI) in France.

The list of right owners derives from the list of authors.

| | right owners |
|-----------------|--|
| Paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- authors- share the same % of ownership |
| Software | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- exception CPI- usually employers i.e. head institutions: CNRS, Universities,...- authors if not status of employee- % of ownership results of % of authorship |

Paper vs. software: **signature**

For example a PhD student in a lab with 3 head institutions, working at university 1, with a professor at university 2 and in collaboration with a CNRS researcher (3rd institution).

| | signature |
|-----------------|---|
| Paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- list of authors- their affiliations: lab, institution, address- defined by head institutions- well known |
| Software | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- copyright mentions right owners- can be difficult to determine- need to refer to signed agreements- not well defined- important to associate the lab (as in papers) |

Paper vs. software: **research lab's list of**

| | research lab's list of |
|-----------------|---|
| Paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- labs publish the list of references- used at lab's evaluation- up-to-date document |
| Software | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- difficult to find whole list of lab's software- can be an internal list- some software on web sites- usually an unknown object |

Paper vs. software: **dates**

| | dates |
|-----------------|---|
| Paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- submission date- publication date |
| Software | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- preliminary work's date- version's dates |

For a paper, the date of preliminary work can be important, but usually avoided by early publications.

The evolution of a software can be caotic, from the legal point of view it is appreciated to have dates clearly stablished (APP, IDDN, others).

Paper vs. software: **evolution**

| | evolution |
|-----------------|---|
| Paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- another paper- independent work |
| Software | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- new version, independent work?- authors, right owners, %, dates, ... revisited |

Paper vs. software: **validation**

| | validation |
|-----------------|---|
| Paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- submission procedure- experts evaluation |
| Software | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- validation procedure?- good testing can help- bugs are waiting |

PLUME has its own concept of "validated software", related to (at least 3) well known institutional users.

How to assure **reproducibility** of research when the associated software is unknown?

Paper vs. software: **quality and evaluation**

[remainder] Study framework: a research laboratory.

| | quality and evaluation |
|-----------------|--|
| Paper | - can be done (for ex.) with citation index |
| Software | - can be done by the associated papers - capacity to attract users and contracts - software quality production methods can help - quality of software \neq quality of research software |

Paper vs. software: **prior works**

| | prior works |
|-----------------|---|
| Paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- citation of previous papers- not a legal problem |
| Software | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- inclusion of software components- license compatibility- license heritage- use of a component means license acceptance |

Paper vs. software: **motivation**

| | motivation |
|-----------------|--|
| Paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- research- enhance, spread knowledge- another publication |
| Software | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- research- another publication- enhance, spread knowledge- rarely the software itself |

Researchers and developers need incentive, motivation and help (technical, legal aspects) to improve research software diffusion.

Does not help: there is no software validation procedure.

Paper vs. software: **diffusion**

| | diffusion |
|-----------------|---|
| Paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- revue editors- web (own site, HAL, ArXiv, ...) |
| Software | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- web- forge- need license |

Paper vs. software: **rights**

[remainder] The legal framework:

Code de la propriété intellectuelle (CPI) in France.

| | rights |
|-----------------|--|
| Paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- can read- can't copy |
| Software | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- can read- can't use (without explicit given right)- can't modify, redistribute, ... (without explicit ...)- need license |

Paper vs. software: licenses

| | licenses |
|-----------------|---|
| Paper | - Creative Commons (for example) |
| Software | - free/open source - proprietary - can release software under multiple licences |

Free/Open Source Software requires a explicit Free/Open Source license: without a Free/Open Source license, a software is a proprietary software.

Law is local to a country. What is legal in one country can be against the law in another country, but where are the borders of the web?

Paper vs. software: **reference**

| | reference |
|-----------------|--|
| Paper | - HAL - http://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/ |
| Software | - PLUME - http://www.projet-plume.org/ |

HAL can produce the list of a lab's (or institution) publications.

PLUME produces:

- index cards to describe software
- pages to present lab's (or institution) software

Paper vs. software: **object**

[remainder] Study framework: a research laboratory.

| | object |
|-----------------|--|
| Paper | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- scientific object- usually not used for technology transfer |
| Software | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- 3D object (*)<ul style="list-style-type: none">- scientific- transfer of technology- industrial- two last dimensions are often unfamiliar, strange- two last dimensions are unavoidable |

(*) Reference: INRIA F/OSS strategy (in french)

<http://www.inria.fr/valorisation/Strategie-inria-logiciel-libre.pdf>

Conclusion: understanding academic software (1)

| Scientific publication versus research software | | |
|---|------------------|------------------------|
| definition | work (œuvre) | authors |
| right owners | signature | research lab's list of |
| dates | evolution | validation |
| quality and evaluation | prior works | motivation |
| diffusion | rights | licenses |
| reference | object | |

Academic software as an extension of research software (teaching, ...).

By comparing papers and software we try to understand problems related to academic software and how to tackle them.

Conclusion: understanding academic software (2)

- indispensable/necessary to take care of intellectual property aspects
- laboratories should improve software situation:
enhance promotion, visibility, research evaluation
- how to help developers to distribute their software:
PLUME, ENVOL, ...
- PLUME concept: validated software

References

- PLUME - <http://www.projet-plume.org/>
- PLUME-FEATHER - <http://www.projet-plume.org/en/>
- RELIER - <http://www.projet-plume.org/relier>
- Logiciels LIGM
 - <http://www.projet-plume.org/fr/LIGM>
 - <http://www.projet-plume.org/en/taxonomie/1936/en>
- Patrimoine logiciel d'un laboratoire
<http://www.projet-plume.org/patrimoine-logiciel-laboratoire>
- Stratégie de l'INRIA sur le logiciel libre
<http://www.inria.fr/valorisation/Strategie-inria-logiciel-libre.pdf>