**Summary of Legal Interoperability Breakout Session**

**10 March 2015, RDA P5, San Diego**

**By Paul Uhlir and Simon Hodson**

The discussion was split up into 3 sections, each dealing with the Interest Group’s (IG’s) deliverables: the Principles, Implementation Guidelines, and Case Studies (or Use Cases). The focus was on process, not substance, since we did not have time to have a substantive discussion and the meeting was only 1.5 hours. There were about 15 people in attendance. The list was kept electronically and is on the RDA website.

1. **Principles Discussion, led by Bob Chen**

Bob Chen provided the background on the IG’s activities since the last RDA Plenary, which were focused mostly on developing the 8 draft Principles. Two additional Principles were raised: Enforcement and Lowest Common Denominator. These items were tabled for discussion at the subsequent conference call, on March 27th. Other substantive comments have been added to the Implementation Guidelines, which will be discussed in the subsequent calls as well.

It was agreed that the Principles were largely complete and they would be submitted to the RDA and CODATA for formal review, along with the Implementation Guidelines, after P6.

1. **Implementation Guidelines Discussion, led by Paul Uhlir**

The Guidelines will be based on the Principles and should not be too detailed, say a few paragraphs to a few pages. Their function is to provide an explanatory summary of the key issues in the Principles, along with links to authoritative references and terminology defined in international documents.

The Guidelines will be elaborated, two at a time, in a series of biweekly conference calls after this meeting. It is likely that we will need at least two calls for each pair, with the goal of concluding the Guidelines and the calls by early August and formal review after the P6 in September. Participants on the IG who have particular expertise in some of the topics raised by the Principles may be asked to contribute some text for consideration by the whole IG.

A question raised but not answered during the discussion was: Should the guidelines lead into a ‘self-assessment tool’ for the use of licenses in particular communities? What is the relationship between such a tool and the focus on communities with what we pose as generic principles? A possible way forward is discussed below.

1. **Case Studies (Use Cases) discussion led by Ernesto Alonso Garcia**

We have had a mixed response in submitting the case studies. These have been delayed in favor of drafting the Principles first. It was determined by the group that there were not enough case studies on which to extrapolate the Principles, and there was sufficient knowledge in the IG to draft the Principles without the use of case studies, so the methodology was reversed. We now plan to use the case studies as examples of issues raised by the Principles and elaborated in the Implementation Guidelines.

Related to the self-assessment tool, raised above, could be a scorecard form for the self-assessment of legal interoperability. We can develop this in the context of the case studies – with each case study assessed in terms of the scorecard. We need to discuss this early in the follow-up conference calls, since the development of a self-assessment scorecard or a structured “report card” would need to precede the finalization of the case studies. Ernesto Alonso Garcia will lead that discussion and related efforts.

Finally, Mark Gahegan, Provost for Research at the University of Auckland, NZ, raised an interesting phone app on database legal rights that one of his graduate students, Richard Hosking, developed. He sent a pdf of an article that explains it: “An eScience tool for understanding Copyright in Data Driven Sciences.” The IG will discuss this as a possible adoption of the technology in an IG working group, and ah copy of that article will be made available prior to the discussion of the app in one of the IG’s conference calls.