



Project no. FP6-028038

## **Palette**

Pedagogically sustained Adaptive Learning Through the exploitation of Tacit and Explicit knowledge

Instrument: Integrated Project

Thematic Priority: Technology-enhanced learning

D.MAN.08 – PALETTE Open Source Strategy

Due date of deliverable: 31 January 2008  
Actual submission date: 28 March 2008

Start date of project: 1 February 2006

Duration: 36 months

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable: GEIE ERCIM

<b>Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework Programme</b>		
<b>Dissemination Level</b>		
<b>P</b>	Public	<b>PU</b>

Keyword List: Licenses, Open Source  
Responsible Partner: Karen Marache, GEIE ERCIM

<i>MODIFICATION CONTROL</i>			
Version	Date	Status	Modifications made by
1.0	23-02-2008	Draft	Karen Marache
1.1	12-03-2008	Draft	Christine Vanoirbeek
1.2	28-03-2008	Final	Karen Marache

**Deliverable manager**

- Karen Marache, GEIE ERCIM

**List of Contributors**

- Karen Marache, GEIE ERCIM
- Christine Vanoirbeek, EPFL

**List of evaluators**

- Vincent Quint, INRIA

**Summary**

The PALETTE consortium decided to collaborate with representatives of the QualiPSO European project, which goal is to help industries and organizations with Open Source Software strategies (more info, [www.qualipso.org](http://www.qualipso.org)).

This deliverable presents the progress of the collaboration with QualiPSO project in the framework of the Open Source strategy for PALETTE services.

The results of QualiPSO collaboration will impact the PALETTE Exploitation Plan.

**TABLE OF CONTENT**

**1 – INTRODUCTION.....4**

**2 – ANALYSIS OF QUALIPSO QUESTIONNAIRE .....4**

**3 – NEXT STEPS.....6**

**4 – CONCLUSION.....6**

## 1 – Introduction

In the previous deliverable D.MAN.07 “Draft open source strategy”, the first part of the document consisted in an analysis of the services developed and used within PALETTE project, in order to know and list the licenses used.

A preliminary analysis was conducted by INRIA Grenoble, based on a basic questionnaire submitted to the PALETTE development partners, but we quickly detected a bottleneck in the flood of information which we gathered.

For this reason, ERCIM and EPFL, on behalf of the Consortium, decided to contact the QualiPSo<sup>1</sup> European funded project. This project works on an IPR tracking methodology, which could be very useful for PALETTE open source issue. It can help to determine if the services developed by PALETTE are free of protected know how or not, that means help to determine the better licensing for the services, in PALETTE open source strategy.

In parallel, EPFL worked on the first draft of the Exploitation Plan designed for PALETTE services.

Thus, the “Final Open Source Strategy” deliverable aims at providing indicators in order to ensure the feasibility of the Exploitation Plan/ Business Plan for PALETTE services.

The first part of this deliverable presents the analysis of QualiPSo project questionnaire

The second part presents the questions raised from this above-mentioned analysis, and the next steps of the process to work on with QualiPSo team.

The results of the last QualiPSo analysis will be integrated in the “Final Exploitation Plan” deliverable due at the end of the project.

## 2 – Analysis of QualiPSo project questionnaire

The objective of the collaboration with QualiPSo project is to easily audit the different services developed within PALETTE project, to know if their licensing constraints fit with the Exploitation Plan defined by the Consortium.

In order to handle this task, the INRIA team involved in QualiPSo project (especially Stéphane Dalmas, INRIA Sophia-Antipolis) project built a questionnaire to collect related information (Annex I).

This questionnaire has been sent to the “development managers” of the PALETTE services, so-called “Services Mediators” of the project.

The services which were analysed are the following:

**Collaboration Services:** CoPe\_it! and eLogbook

**Knowledge Management Services:** SweetWiki, ECCO, BayFac,

**Information Services:** Amaya, LimSee3, DocReuse, Palette Web Portal

---

<sup>1</sup> QualiPSo Fact Sheet available at [http://cordis.europa.eu/fetch?CALLER=PROJ\\_I&ACTION=D&DOC=19&CAT=PROJ&QUERY=1187189361220&RCN=80465](http://cordis.europa.eu/fetch?CALLER=PROJ_I&ACTION=D&DOC=19&CAT=PROJ&QUERY=1187189361220&RCN=80465)

A first analysis of the questionnaires was provided end of December 2007 by Guillaume Rousseau, INRIA Paris-Rocquencourt, from QualiPSo project.

The questionnaire is composed of two parts: “Code and components” and “Contractual context and Peripheral IPR”.

#### First part: Code and Components

- Almost all components are based on a large number of external components
  - each external component must be clearly identified
    - This is not necessary the case for all tools and services
  - Some of them induce potentially strong constraints on possible exploitation scheme.
    - Identify carefully if the link between the external component and the tool induces contamination from GPL-like components
  - Some of the components have been modified.
    - Open question about integration of modified components into release of PALETTE tools or contribution to original community (with leading question about maintenance of modified/forked version)

#### Second part: Contractual context and peripheral IPR

- Contractual context
  - Pre-existing know-how (PKH) have been identified
    - Check if the initial version of the PKH (before modification by PALETTE) is reachable.
    - Check if all IPR owners are member of the PALETTE consortium
    - Check how PKH must be interpreted according the consortium agreement
    -
- Global exploitation / dissemination scheme
  - Some of the PALETTE services already appears to have different dissemination strategy from GPL based to more permissive one based on MIT or LGPL licenses
  - PALETTE project aims to provide an *interoperable and extensible set of innovative services*
    - Open question about heterogeneity of licensing scheme for different services
    - Depends on high level architecture implementing “interoperability” (ie what will be the nature of the link between the services)
  - Global vs. local dissemination scheme from the point of view of PALETTE objectives,
    - Define objectives and priority in term of dissemination
    - Improve understanding at services level of the possible compatibility problem with global dissemination strategy
    - Identify blocking/critical point
    - According to resources available, roadmap, and priority, consider to solve some of the problem identified (for instance substituting a component under contaminating license), modifying the global interoperability scheme at the technical, legal or dissemination level

### 3 – Next steps

The answers to the QualiPSo project questionnaire show rather important variations

- from a PALETTE service to another one, on the one hand
- in the policies of the different partners in favour of the Open Source Strategy, on the other hand.

In order to determine the perimeter of the audit and the methodology of traceability to be implemented, it is important to identify (via the Exploitation Plan Questionnaire for example) the characteristics of the communities to be set up.

According to their composition and to what is awaited from their members, it will be possible to identify the best adapted Open source licence's scheme (from the most permissive to the most contaminant).

It is also necessary to have one or more “global” architectural visions for the various services (representing the interoperability of services), which will have sense for the actors (users, service companies, software publishers, researchers, etc).

It will then be possible

- to determine if the exploitation schemas expected for the PALETTE services are compatible between them (legal analysis to be done...)
- to identify if the “legal situation” of the components allows these exploitation schemas. For this, we need a description of this legal situation on one hand (on the basis of answer to the questionnaires), and an analysis of the contents via dedicated tools for source code analysis. If problems are identified, we will be able to consider corrective measurements, or to adapt the exploitation schema.

In term of traceability, an infrastructure allowing the development activity is strongly advised (for example via the portal [gforge.inria.fr](http://gforge.inria.fr)). The governance of these communities will have to be the subject of a specific attention. If necessary, the IPR could be centralized, to simplify the evolution of the licensing schema.

### 4 – Conclusion

PALETTE consortium still needs to work in collaboration with QualiPSo project, to go further in the audit of the source codes of PALETTE services, once "packages" of the different services will be available and desired licence defined.

In parallel, PALETTE consortium should decide on (and provide QualiPSo project with)

- a global interoperability scheme
- an exploitation scheme for each service
- the OSS community and its governance
- an infrastructure for traceability

The result of this “brainstorming” will be included in the deliverable D.DIS.12 “Final Exploitation Plan” due at T36

# ANNEX I

## **QualiPSo questionnaire for PALETTE project**

### **Collecting information for auditing code**

The goal of this document is to describe information to be collected in order to conduct the first step of an investigation (audit) to determine the conditions upon which a given software can be distributed.

### **Context**

The situation we consider is rather general: you (an organization or individual) wish to make available to third parties (to distribute) a software package. This package may just include an executable program or it may contain its source code, possibly together with the source code of other needed software, and various documents.

The aim is to determine the conditions under which the software package may be distributed i.e. its possible licenses (if any). Especially in the case where it uses Open Source components. Determining these conditions may be quite complicated. As a first step it is necessary to collect some information. This information can be split into four categories:

- on external components and tools
- on your code
- on included literary and artistic works
- on peripheral IPR (Intellectual Property Rights)

The same information is needed even if the software is not really distributed but made available through a server.

#### **1. Information on external components and tools**

A rough definition of external components and tools could be: everything needed by your code at runtime or compile time. It may include libraries, servers, clients, frameworks, compilers and their runtime libraries, development environments, code generation tools, etc.

Information to be gathered is at least the name (and version) of each components or tools, a brief description of the way it is used, the license under which you got it (for commercial products it may be necessary to have the exact license text or contract as they may not be available under a standard, unique license), whether it will be distributed with your code or not (either in source or binary form, possibly statically linked into a program) and whether you modified it or not.

#### **2. Information on your code**

##### ***Borrowing information***

Your code may include code you borrowed from someone else (outside your organization). You may have modified or translated it (from another programming language), or just extracted some piece of it. This code should be identified together with its license if any and the kind of transformation you made (extraction, modification, translation...).

### ***Authorship information***

We will define author as any individual who wrote some part of the code, or some part of a specification or preparatory material (for example, things like precise or non trivial description of software architecture). An author may not have really written code but may have directed another person to write. An author may have none, one or more affiliation organizations (organizations that pay it or direct it).

The needed information is the list of authors, together with several elements:

- whether they write code or specification or preparatory material (and in the latter case what was it)
- their affiliation organizations
- what kind of rights the affiliation organizations have and on what grounds (work contract, national law, special status...)

This information is necessary also for the authors of the possible modifications to external components or tools.

If you have borrowed (reused, modified, translated) part of previously existing code in your organization the authors or this pre-existing code should also be listed.

### ***Contractual context***

The information needed is the set of contracts (or grants) under which part of the code (including previous version of the code) or modifications to external components or tools may have been written. Of interest are the IPR, confidentiality, publication or exclusivity clauses in these contracts.

As these contracts may be confidential, you can at least provide a list of their types and numbers (for example one contract with an industrial partner, one European contract and two state grants).

The information on previous distributions of (part of) your code (including previous versions) or modifications to external components or tools is also needed. It may be Open Source or ad-hoc licenses or contracts.

### **3. Information on literary and artistic works**

The same kind of information (as in the previous section) is needed for all the artistic and literary works included in the software package to be distributed. This includes documents such as user's manual or technical notes, logos, icons, images, drawings, animations... whatever their formats are. Also note that individual elements inside documents may need to be identified (for example a picture or drawing inside a text document at least when its author is not one of the authors of the document).

### **4. Information on peripheral IPR**

On patent: a list of the patents (pending or granted) that to your current knowledge may cover your code.

On trademarks: a list of the names that you may use for your code or in connection with your code.