

# OSI Approved Licenses (57)

[Academic Free License](#)  
[Adaptive Public License](#)  
[Apache Software License](#)  
[Apache License, 2.0](#)  
[Apple Public Source License](#)  
[Artistic license](#)  
[Attribution Assurance Licenses](#)  
[New BSD license](#)  
[Common Development and Distribution License](#)  
[Common Public License 1.0](#)  
[CUA Office Public License Version 1.0](#)  
[EU DataGrid Software License](#)  
[Eclipse Public License](#)  
[Educational Community License](#)  
[Eiffel Forum License](#)  
[Eiffel Forum License V2.0](#)  
[Entessa Public License](#)  
[Fair License](#)  
[Framework License](#)  
[GNU General Public License \(GPL\)](#)  
[GNU Library or "Lesser" General Public License \(LGPL\)](#)  
[Lucent Public License \(Plan9\)](#)  
[Lucent Public License Version 1.02](#)  
[IBM Public License](#)  
[Intel Open Source License](#)  
[Historical Permission Notice and Disclaimer](#)  
[Jabber Open Source License](#)  
[MIT license](#)

[MITRE Collaborative Virtual Workspace License \(CVW License\)](#)  
[Motosoto License](#)  
[Mozilla Public License 1.0 \(MPL\)](#)  
[Mozilla Public License 1.1 \(MPL\)](#)  
[NASA Open Source Agreement 1.3](#)  
[Naumen Public License](#)  
[Nethack General Public License](#)  
[Nokia Open Source License](#)  
[OCLC Research Public License 2.0](#)  
[Open Group Test Suite License](#)  
[Open Software License](#)  
[PHP License](#)  
[Python license \(CNRI Python License\)](#)  
[Python Software Foundation License](#)  
[Qt Public License \(QPL\)](#)  
[RealNetworks Public Source License V1.0](#)  
[Reciprocal Public License](#)  
[Ricoh Source Code Public License](#)  
[Sleepycat License](#)  
[Sun Industry Standards Source License \(SISSL\)](#)  
[Sun Public License](#)  
[Sybase Open Watcom Public License 1.0](#)  
[University of Illinois/NCSA Open Source License](#)  
[Vovida Software License v. 1.0](#)  
[W3C License](#)  
[wxWindows Library License](#)  
[X.Net License](#)  
[Zope Public License](#)  
[zlib/libpng license](#)

<http://opensource.org/licenses/>

# The Success of the Commons

- Resources are overused because they are available to everyone (Tragedy of Commons)
- Software is the opposite (low marginal cost)
- The more people that use it the more valuable the software is (e.g. “.pdf”)
- Open source community cannot allow for subtraction (i.e. turning public code into proprietary code) -> Copyleft

# Open Source Definition

1. Free Redistribution
2. Source Code Access
3. Derivative Works (copyleft)
4. Integrity of The Author's Source Code
5. No Discrimination Against Persons or Groups
6. No Discrimination Against Fields of Endeavour
7. Distribution of License (copyleft)
8. License Must Not Be Specific to a Product
9. License Must Not Restrict Other Software
  - Non-contamination clause
10. License Must Be Technology-Neutral

# Copyleft

- How software is distributed is the main difference between licenses
- Strong Copyleft Licenses (GPL)
- Weak Copyleft Licenses (MPL, CPL)
- Non-Copyleft Licenses (BSD, MIT)
- Other open source licenses (AFL)
  - Take attributes of many licenses

# GNU General Public Licence (GPL)

- Who Uses it
  - Individual Developers (most common)
- Main Motivation for creation/use
  - Safeguard against private appropriation of collective efforts
  - Low barriers to entry and maximize number of participants
- Viral or Inheritance Property
  - Companies forced into using it

# Berkeley Software Distribution (BSD)

- Not copyleft
- No restriction on redistribution and use
  - Do not have to redistribute modified code
- Can mix BSD code with proprietary code
  - Can turn code proprietary
- Motivation
  - Simple, authors of code do not want to be hassled

# Mozilla Public License

- Failed under Netscape Public License
- Only code that modifies files that are MPL must be released to the public (at least 12 months)
- Can be used with proprietary software
- Similar to the CPL (IBM - more patent language)
- Motivation for creation/use
  - Code can be used proprietary, but any modification must be released under same license

# Conclusion

## Licensee Requirements

	PD	BSD	CPL	LGPL	OSL	GPL
Maintain Attribution and Disclaimer	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Must Distribute Modified Source (if code is released publicly)	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Same License for Larger Work (must use)	N	N	N	N	Y	Y

# **Licensing schemes in the production and distribution of Open Source software. An empirical Investigation**

Bonaccorsi and Rossi



# Introduction

- Individuals have a mix of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations
- Firms want to make a profit out of participation
- Empirical study of license choice based on firm's
  - Structural characteristics
  - Business model
  - Attitude toward the OSS community
  - Participation in the community

# Motivation for Firms

- Distribute code to gain feedback and contributions
- New products and services
- We made much more complete list yesterday

## Division of Firms

- Copyleft firms (21%)
- Mixed-license firms (60%)
- Non-copyleft firms (19%)
- 74% of Projects on source forge are GPL

# Results

- Business model determines license
- Firms that used copyleft licenses assign a higher score to social motivation
- All Firms want feedback from OSS community
  - Firms that value this feedback most have more copyleft licensed products
- Firms that are more active in the OSS community have more copyleft licensed products

# Why I didn't like this paper!

- “Licensing schemes ... “ hardly discussed the different schemes, really just compared copyleft with non-copyleft
- Poorly structured (confusing)
  - Method, limitations, hypothesis, etc.
- More information about firms
  - Size, who answered survey, how successful