Open-source Code Licensing

by Ashish Bhatia

22 September 2010

As defined by FSF (1986)

• run the program (for any purpose)

As defined by FSF (1986)

- run the program (for any purpose)
- 2 study how the program works (and change it to your needs)

As defined by FSF (1986)

- run the program (for any purpose)
- study how the program works (and change it to your needs)
- redistribute copies

As defined by FSF (1986)

- run the program (for any purpose)
- 2 study how the program works (and change it to your needs)
- redistribute copies
- improve the program and release your improvements to the public

• GNU General Purpose License

- GNU General Purpose License
- Q GNU Lesser General Purpose License



- GNU General Purpose License
- GNU Lesser General Purpose License
- Apache License



- GNU General Purpose License
- GNU Lesser General Purpose License
- Apache License
- BSD License



- GNU General Purpose License
- GNU Lesser General Purpose License
- Apache License
- BSD License
- Iot of others

most popular (and most sophisticated)

- most popular (and most sophisticated)
- a work derived from GPL licensed work must be licensed under GPL

- most popular (and most sophisticated)
- a work derived from GPL licensed work must be licensed under GPL
- Iinking to GPL code?

less restrictive than GPL

- Iess restrictive than GPL
- LGPL licensed code can be linked by non-(L)GPL code

- less restrictive than GPL
- UGPL licensed code can be linked by non-(L)GPL code
- derivative work must still release code for personal use (of customer)

- Iess restrictive than GPL
- UGPL licensed code can be linked by non-(L)GPL code
- derivative work must still release code for personal use (of customer)
- Use LGPL vs GPL? which one to use?

Very permissive

- Very permissive
- just give credits to the previous contributors

- Very permissive
- just give credits to the previous contributors
- no need to release source-code

- Very permissive
- just give credits to the previous contributors
- 3 no need to release source-code
- "If you want to give your software away for free, use BSD. If you want to share your software, use the GPL" (Courtesy:OSnews)

Apache

Permissiveness same as BSD but legally more explicit

Apache

- Permissiveness same as BSD but legally more explicit
- a handles the problem of software patents

Apache

- Permissiveness same as BSD but legally more explicit
- a handles the problem of software patents
- author of the code (automatically) gives up the right to any of (his/her) patent used in the code

 ACME systems internally uses CRM whose codebase is based on a GPL based CRM. Can someone ask the company for the source code?

• Microspecial Inc. supplies embedded systems to the government(which government later distribute to citizens), as per the government orders they cannot release the source code to anyone but their codebase is based on GPL based code. What if someone asks for the source code? do they have to give it?

 Stickpoint Solutions released Office software 1.0 under GPL and in the next version, they decide to move to BSD license? can they do it?

 Tivo used parts of Linux kernel code for its consumer electronics product, so they had to release the source code but they put on the hardware check to avoid customised code from execution. Is this a violation of GPL?

 Web Ultimates released source code of CMS(web application) under GPL, Web Peers Inc. used the code to develop their website, do they have to release the source code of their website?

References

Free Software Foundation (FSF) website