FOSS Licensing

Wikibooks.org

March 13, 2013

On the 28th of April 2012 the contents of the English as well as German Wikibooks and Wikipedia projects were licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported license. An URI to this license is given in the list of figures on page 61. If this document is a derived work from the contents of one of these projects and the content was still licensed by the project under this license at the time of derivation this document has to be licensed under the same, a similar or a compatible license, as stated in section 4b of the license. The list of contributors is included in chapter Contributors on page 59. The licenses GPL, LGPL and GFDL are included in chapter Licenses on page 65, since this book and/or parts of it may or may not be licensed under one or more of these licenses, and thus require inclusion of these licenses. The licenses of the figures are given in the list of figures on page 61. This PDF was generated by the LaTeX typesetting software. The LaTeX source code is included as an attachment (`source.7z.txt`) in this PDF file. To extract the source from the PDF file, we recommend the use of `http://www.pdflabs.com/tools/pdftk-the-pdf-toolkit/` utility or clicking the paper clip attachment symbol on the lower left of your PDF Viewer, selecting `Save Attachment`. After extracting it from the PDF file you have to rename it to `source.7z`. To uncompress the resulting archive we recommend the use of `http://www.7-zip.org/`. The LaTeX source itself was generated by a program written by Dirk Hünniger, which is freely available under an open source license from `http://de.wikibooks.org/wiki/Benutzer:Dirk_Huenniger/wb2pdf`. This distribution also contains a configured version of the `pdflatex` compiler with all necessary packages and fonts needed to compile the LaTeX source included in this PDF file.

Contents

1 Preface

Under the current copyright[1] regime, software[2] users are subject to restrictive regulations. This regime is said to provide individuals with incentives in terms of economic returns and thus encourages them to develop creative works. However, some software developers disagree with this default configuration of copyright law and value other things more than short-term economic incentives.

The Free/Open Source Software[3] (FOSS) Movement was started by grassroots developers who are not content with the current copyright system. They tactically use specifically designed FOSS licenses to allow a community with a different world-view to develop and flourish. Lawyers are sometimes brought in to facilitate the collaboration between developers.

However, software development[4] and software licensing[5] are very different activities, and developers and lawyers often have very different mindsets. While developers tend to use whatever resources are available to them to achieve a particular feature, lawyers may request a copy of the license of every existing module that developers wish to adopt, before they actually approve the integration into the project. And while developers tend to use acronyms to make their communication more succinct, lawyers tend to use arcane terms and complicated sentences to make sure their ideas can be clearly delivered. Therefore, in order to successfully develop FOSS applications, both these professions are required to cooperate with each other.

As the FOSS Movement[6] has been growing rapidly in recent years, more and more different kinds of stakeholders are brought in to participate in different roles. Some of them are end-users, developers, business entities, or government agencies that provide funding for FOSS projects. This primer is designed to provide these stakeholders with some basic knowledge about copyright, software copyright and FOSS licenses. Legal issues may vary in different situations and this primer may not be able to provide answers to all situations. But, hopefully, it will serve as a bridge between lawyers and non-lawyers in this joint venture of FOSS development.

---

1   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copyright
2   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Software
3   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20and%20Open%20Source%20Software
4   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/software%20development
5   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/software%20licensing
6   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20software%20movement

2 Introduction

A general introduction to free/open source software[1] (FOSS) is provided in the first of this series of primers. That first primer is available at the International Open Source Network[2] (IOSN) website at:

`http://www.iosn.net/foss/foss-general-primer/foss_primer_current.pdf`

Under the prevailing copyright regime, licenses decide whether software can be free and/or open. As David A. Wheeler[3] said, FOSS are programs whose licenses give users the freedom to run them for any purpose, to study and modify them, and to redistribute copies of either the original or modified programs without having to pay royalties to original developers. [1]

Starting from the mid-1980s[4], the birth of the GNU General Public License[5] (GNU GPL or LGPL) has enabled a model for software development. [2] Following GNU GPL, various FOSS licenses[6] have been drafted and adopted by FOSS communities, academic institutes and commercial companies. The number of FOSS licenses is growing rapidly. In early 2003[7], 43 licenses were recognized by the Open Source Initiative[8] (OSI) as open source licenses. A year-and-a-half later, in July 2004[9], the number had reached 54. The diversity among FOSS licenses sometimes causes confusion and difficulty for people who want to participate in FOSS projects or adopt FOSS solutions. Some have argued that to reduce the transaction cost, new licenses should not be created. However, the number of FOSS licenses has been growing.[3]

This primer aims to provide an introduction to FOSS licensing[10] issues. It begins with a brief overview of "intellectual property[11]" rights,[4] and then moves on to the development of copyright[12] law, the category of "intellectual property" that is most relevant here. The primer will then examine different proprietary and FOSS licenses which use copyright law to regulate the use of software. Finally, it briefly explains how the FOSS movement uses licenses as a way to create a different model of software development[13].

---

1   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20and%20open%20source%20software`
2   `http://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/FOSS%20Licensing%2FAbout%20IOSN`
3   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David%20A.%20Wheeler`
4   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1980s`
5   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20General%20Public%20License`
6   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20software%20license`
7   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2003`
8   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open%20Source%20Initiative`
9   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2004%23July`
10 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20software%20license`
11 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/intellectual%20property`
12 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/copyright`
13 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/software%20development`

There are many FOSS licenses[14], and they may differ from each other in major ways. Due to page limitations, however, only three pervasively adopted licenses are discussed in this primer: the GNU GPL[15], the GNU Lesser General Public License[16] (LGPL) and the Berkeley Software Distribution[17] (BSD) style licenses. These three are important not only because a large number of FOSS projects are under licenses, but also because they represent very different styles of FOSS licensing.

In the last section[18] of the primer, some scenarios are given to highlight possible copyright[19] issues regarding the use of FOSS by end-users, developers and vendors. Given the increased attention paid by governments to FOSS development, the primer also includes two cases regarding government-sponsored FOSS projects.

2.1 Footnotes

- [1] Wheeler, D., "Why OSS/FS? Look at the Numbers!" Available from `http://www.dwheeler.com/oss_fs_why.html`; accessed on 7 November 2003.
- [2] GNU[20] is a recursive acronym for "Gnu's not Unix".
- [3] For example, five licenses were approved in February 2004, and two licenses were added to the list of approved licenses in June 2004. Available from `http://www.opensource.org/weblog/2004/01/03#newsblog` and opensource.org/weblog/2004/06/03#Jun2-04 ; accessed on 5 July 2004. As of 13 October 2006, the link is dead.
- [4] The term "Intellectual Property[21]" covers different areas of law such as Copyright[22], Patent[23], and Trademark[24]. Some people, especially free software[25] advocates, advise against using the term because they believe that these different areas of law cannot be generalized. Another reason to object to its usage is that the term implies that these disparate legal issues are taken as based on an analogy of the property rights to tangible objects, whereas software is intangible. See, for example, "Some Confusing or Loaded Words and Phrases that are Worth Avoiding." Available from `http://www.gnu.org/philosophy/words-to-avoid.html` ; accessed on 13 October 2006. It is true that the term "intellectual property" is relatively new and is loaded with the above meaning. Nevertheless, since the existing legal structure does take intangible objects as tangible objects, the term is still used in this primer but is within quotation marks to draw attention to these critical opinions.

---

14   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20software%20licenses`
15   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20General%20Public%20License`
16   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20Lesser%20General%20Public%20License`
17   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BSD%20licenses`
18   Chapter 8 on page 39
19   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/copyright`
20   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU`
21   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intellectual%20Property`
22   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copyright`
23   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Patent`
24   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trademark`
25   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software`

3 Overview of Intellectual Property Rights

Intangible products of human creative activities are regarded as a kind of property and are granted protection in the same way as property rights have been traditionally protected and applied to tangible objects.

Copyright[1], patent[2], trademark[3] and trade secret[4] all fall under the category of "intellectual property[5]". But each must be understood to be significantly distinct from the others.

3.1 Trade Secret

A trade secret[6] is a confidential practice, method, process, design, the "know-how" or other information used by a business to compete with other businesses. The precise language by which a trade secret is defined varies by jurisdiction. However, there are three factors that (though subject to different interpretations) are common to all such definitions: a trade secret is some sort of information that is not generally known to the relevant portion of the public; confers some sort of economic benefit on its holder; is the subject of reasonable efforts to maintain its secrecy. Trade secrets are regulated by using a variety of civil and commercial means, such as confidentiality or non-disclosure agreements[7] signed by those who are given access to special knowledge and information.

3.2 Trademark

Trademarks[8] are brand names. distinctive names, phrases, symbols, designs, pictures or styles used by a business to identify itself and its products or services to its consumers. In many countries, colors, three-dimensional marks, sounds, and even smells can also be trademarked.

A trademark or service mark includes any word, name, symbol, device, or any combination, used or intended to be used to identify and distinguish the goods/services of one seller or

---

1   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copyright
2   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/patent
3   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/trademark
4   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/trade%20secret
5   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/intellectual%20property
6   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/trade%20secret
7   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/non-disclosure%20agreement
8   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trademark

provider from those of others, and to indicate the source of the goods/services. Although federal registration of a mark is not mandatory, it has several advantages, including notice to the public of the registrant's claim of ownership of the mark, legal presumption of ownership nationwide, and exclusive right to use the mark on or in connection with the goods/services listed in the registration. Trademarks are usually given for periods between 7 and 20 years with unlimited renewability.

Purpose of a trademark The specific purpose of a trademark is to prevent others from using the same words, designs, graphics or symbols to identify a good or service. The significance of this is that, the trademark does not prevent the good or service itself. As long as a group uses different words, symbols or designs to identify the same good, the trademark is not violated.

Interpretations of a Trademark Other than the simple protection against copying, trademarks can be interpreted in many different ways. The first interpretation associates trademarks with the quality of the good or service. According to the economists Landes and Posner, trademarks are a sign to consumers that the good or service possesses quality. A good or service with a trademark indicates that that good or service is worthy of placing a unique name on it. This unique name means that someone wants to be able to distinguish this good or service. Thus rationally, only goods that possess quality would be worthy of such a distinction.

Another interpretation of a trademark is that it is a signal of innovation. While patents are made to protect and invention or idea when it is created, the inventor is likely going to want to spread the word about his invention or idea. By trademarking that invention, it is a formal declaration that this idea exists. It can also be used to express innovation should an idea not be novel enough to pass through patent regulations. Many ideas are unique yet due to being somewhat related to something already in existence, are unable to be patented. Trademarking allows for that idea to be represented as brand new.

A third interpretation of a trademark is the ability to build a brand from it. To promote an idea or invention, one needs a unique way of identifying it. Once the idea or invention is trademarked, it can acquire significance through its mark.

Trademarks can be acquired through the United States Trademark and Patent Office by filling out an application. The process involves searching through the list of active trademarks to ensure that a similar mark does not already exist.

3.3 Patent

While trade secrets[9] enable a business to keep certain information from the public, patents[10] are designed to grant the inventor monopoly[11] rights or monopoly status over certain newly developed knowledge for a period of time (usually 20 years) in exchange for its disclosure. Typically, to gain such rights, the inventor is required to file a patent application, which

---

9   Chapter 3.2 on page 7
10   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Patents`
11   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/monopoly`

will be reviewed by a designated patent examiner. Novelty of the invention is an essential criterion in granting a patent.

3.4 Copyright

Copyright[12] is applied to various kinds of creative works, such as literary[13] works, music compositions, paintings and software. Unlike patents[14], copyright applies to a work upon its creation, regardless of its novelty.

However, the ideas employed by the work cannot be copyrighted. Copyright[15] only prevents others from copying the copyright holder's particular way of expressing those ideas. Under Copyright Law, the copyright holder is entitled to exclusive rights of reproduction, modification, distribution, and public display and performance of her copyrighted work. A license is often used to explain under which terms and conditions the work can be used. To accommodate different situations, the copyright holder is entitled to draft and adopt different kinds of licenses for each piece of her work.

3.5 How is software regulated?

Software[16] is now subject to Copyright Law. Moreover, in recent years it has been argued that software should be patentable as well. Although software patents[17] have been granted in some cases, they are still questioned by many, especially by the FOSS community. Due to page limits and the complexity of the issue, this primer does not address this topic.

---

12   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copyright
13   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/literature
14   Chapter 3.3 on page 8
15   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copyright
16   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Computer%20Software
17   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/software%20patents

4 Copyright Basics

4.1 Why do We have Copyright?

Compared to other legal concepts, copyright[1] is a relatively new invention in human history. The development of copyright regulation reflects the social and technological transformation around human creative activity and distribution of the resultant profits. While granting exclusive private rights to authors or copyright holders[2] has been considered as a way of encouraging human creative activity, copyright law also claims to recognize the larger public interest, particularly with respect to education, research and access to information.[9]

Copyright law uses various means to balance public and private interests. In the Statute of Anne[3] (1710[4]), the earliest modern copyright law, authorities are allowed to limit and control the price of printed books according to their best judgement. In the United States Constitution[5], authors are granted exclusive rights to their writings within a limited time. In copyright law, fair use exceptions are specified to avoid the drawbacks of excessive assertion of exclusive rights and to attain a balance between conflicting interests.

4.2 What can be Copyrighted?

Copyright[6] applies to the expression of ideas in different forms, including literary, dramatic, musical, artistic, and other intellectual works. [10] The ideas expressed in such works are themselves not copyrightable. [11] Since the 1980s, the copyrightability of software became internationally accepted.[12]

4.3 How do I Copyright my Work?

Nowadays, copyright[7] law does not require formalities. The author does not need to publish, register, pay a registration fee of any kind, nor attach a copyright notice to his/her/its work, for the copyright to take effect. Copyright is automatically applied to a work once it is created [13] and the creator of the work automatically becomes the copyright holder.

---

1   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/copyright`
2   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/copyright%23The%20exclusive%20rights%20of%20the%20copyright%20holder`
3   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Statute%20of%20Anne`
4   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1710`
5   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United%20States%20Constitution`
6   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copyright`
7   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/copyright`

4.4 What Rights are Granted to the Copyright Holder?

Copyright[8] is actually a bundle of rights, including the right to reproduce the work, to prepare derivative works based on it, to distribute copies of a work, and to perform and display a copyrighted work publicly. A few other kinds of rights are defined in copyright law. [14] Without the consent of the copyright holder, it is illegal for anyone to perform any of the activities mentioned above.

4.5 The Expansion of Copyright Law

Copyright Law has been expanded with time.

The first copyright legislation (the Statute of Anne[9], 1710[10]):

Compared to other legal systems, copyright law came relatively late in human civilization. The first known copyright legislation was the Statute of Anne[11], enacted in 1710 in Great Britain.[15] For a newly created work, the Statute of Anne granted the copyright holders the right to print and reprint books and other writings for 14 years.

All-dimensional expansion of copyright law:

We can see from the Statute of Anne[12] that, initially, the scope of copyright was quite limited. The copyrightable works were limited to books and other writings, the rights granted to the copyright holder were limited to printing and reprinting the work, and the length of the protection was limited to 14 years. Now, copyright law does much more. Copyrightable works now include paintings, sculpture, music compositions, music recording, architecture, and software. The bundle of rights granted to the copyright holder have been expanded to include the right to print, reprint, modify, display publicly, perform publicly, and distribute the work. Moreover, the term of copyright protection has been increased to 50 years after the author's death. (In Europe and the US, it has been expanded to 70 years.)[16]

4.6 From National to International

The expansion of copyright law has not been limited to one jurisdiction; it has become standardized internationally.

Berne Convention[13]:

---

8   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copyright`
9   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Statute%20of%20Anne`
10   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1710`
11   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Statute%20of%20Anne`
12   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Statute%20of%20Anne`
13   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Berne%20Convention%20for%20the%20Protection%20of%20Literary%20and%20Artistic%20Works`

In the late 19th century[14], as copyrighted works gradually became important in international trade, the transnational copyright system gradually became a serious issue. The Berne Convention of 1886[15] first introduced the national treatment principle. This means that signatories to the Berne Convention will treat the work of a foreign copyright holder just as they treat their own citizens' work. Thus, it created an international standard for copyright regulation.

However, without a dispute resolution mechanism, the Berne Convention offered a somewhat weak copyright, as it will be too costly for copyright holders to claim their rights in a foreign country where they believed their rights had been infringed.

More enforceable international standard: WTO and TRIPs:

In the 1990s, the World Trade Organization[16] (WTO) and the Trade Related Intellectual Property Agreement[17] (TRIPs) sought to establish a stronger international copyright regime. Every economy intending to become a WTO member is required to sign the TRIPs, and every TRIPs signatory must agree to comply with all of the key sections of the Berne Convention[18]. The WTO also provides a dispute-settlement and enforcement mechanism for copyright infringements among member countries. Thus, copyright has become more enforceable internationally.[17]

4.7 The Abolition of Formality Requirements

As set forth in the 1908[19] Berne Convention, copyright[20] is applied to a work once it is created, without the need for any formality.[18] The author is not required to register, or even to publish a work to enjoy full copyright protection. In Berne Convention signatory countries, the law assumes that all authors claim all rights granted to them unless they explicitly state otherwise.

Copyright[21] laws in different countries have been revised to comply with this standard. For example, anticipating that it would join the Berne Convention Union, the US revised its Copyright Act[22] and abolished formality requirements in 1976[23].[19]

4.8 Footnotes

- [9] As stated in the Preamble of WIPO Copyright Treaty. Available from `http://www.wipo.int/clea/docs/en/wo/wo033en.htm` ; accessed on 29 June 2004.

---

14   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/19th%20century`
15   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1886`
16   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World%20Trade%20Organization`
17   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/TRIPs`
18   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Berne%20Convention%20for%20the%20Protection%20of%20Literary%20and%20Artistic%20Works`
19   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1908`
20   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/copyright`
21   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copyright`
22   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United%20States%20copyright%20law`
23   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1976`

- [10] Available from `http://www.wipo.int/copyright/en/faq/faqs.htm#rights` ; accessed on 28 June 2004.
- [11] Available from `http://www.wipo.int/copyright/en/faq/faqs.htm#ideas` ; accessed on 28 June 2004.
- [12] Available from `http://www.wipo.int/copyright/en/faq/faqs.htm#P39_5114` ; accessed on 28 June 2004.
- [13] Different jurisdiction may have been set at different points when copyright came into existence. Some jurisdiction may require the work to be fixed, others may only ask the work to be finished.
- [14] Available from `http://www.wipo.int/copyright/en/faq/faqs.htm#rights`; accessed on 28 June 2004.
- [15] Available from `http://www.copyrighthistory.com/anne.html`; accessed on 28 June 2004.
- [16] Little, J., "History of Copyright- A Chronology," 2002; available from `http://www.musicjournal.org/01copyright.html` ; accessed on 28 June 2004.
- [17] Story, A., "Don't Ignore Copyright, the 'Sleeping Giant' on the TRIPs and International Educational Agenda," pp.132-33, in Drahos, P.and Mayne, R. (eds.), Global Intellectual Property Rights, Knowledge, Access and Development, NY: MacMillan, 2002.
- [18] Lessig, L., "Free Culture," Footnote 194 ; available from `http://www.jus.uio.no/sisu/freeculture.lawrence.lessig/14`; accessed on 29 June 2004.
- [19] Little, J., "History of Copyright- A Chronology", 2002 ; available from `http://www.musicjournal.org/01copyright.html`; accessed on 28 June 2004.

5 Software and Copyright

5.1 Extension of Copyright Law to Software

Since 1980[1], it has become an international trend for copyright to be applied to computer software[2]. The WIPO Copyright Treaty[3] (1996[4]) also states that computer software should be regulated by copyright law.

5.2 Copyrightability of the Source Code and the Object Code

Software can be expressed in both source code and object code. However, TRIPs[5] states that software copyright applies to both forms.[20] In practice, proprietary software[6] companies tend to release their product only in object code, and keep the source code of the product as their trade secret.[21]

As mentioned earlier, under copyright law only the expression of ideas but not the ideas themselves can be copyrighted. For example, with a literary work or a music composition, although the form of the work is copyrighted, other people can use the ideas expressed in the work as inspiration for their new works. With software, ideas can only be perceived by reading the source code. Since the source code is not often accessible, in effect the proprietary company is able to withhold the ideas that underpin the software. This contravenes the principle that only form and not the idea should be exclusively owned – a principle designed to maintain the balance between private and public interests.

5.3 Users' Rights Denied in Proprietary Licensing Models

The revision of the US copyright law[7] in 1976[8] and shifts in the information technology[9] (IT) industry in the 1970s[10] changed the practices of software distribution. Before that,

---

1   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1980`
2   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/computer%20software`
3   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/WIPO%20Copyright%20Treaty`
4   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1996`
5   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/TRIPs`
6   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/proprietary%20software`
7   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United%20States%20copyright%20law`
8   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1976`
9   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/information%20technology`
10   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1970s`

users received both source and binary object codes. Today, under proprietary license models, proprietary software[11] companies usually make the source code inaccessible to ensure and maximize profit. Studying a proprietary software is usually explicitly prohibited. For example, even in licenses for developers, for example, Microsoft End User Agreement and Microsoft Developer Network Subscription, reverse-engineering, decompilation and disassembly are not allowed except and only to the extent that it is expressly permitted by the applicable law.[22]

For end-users, proprietary licenses usually allow only one copy of the software for each computer. That means, if the user has one desktop and one laptop, or two desktops, she will have to purchase two copies if she wants to run the program legally on both machines. If there are defects in the program that she has legally purchased, her only recourse is to contact the proprietary company regarding these defects. She will not be able to legally debug the program herself, or use unofficial patches, since modification of the program is not allowed. In effect, users of proprietary software are completely dependent upon the vendor.

Under the traditional proprietary licensing model, end-users were not able to protect their interest in a cooperative manner. The FOSS movement[12] has contributed to the positive transformation of this situation. The Free Software Foundation[13] (FSF), which was founded in 1985[14], is dedicated to promoting users' rights to use, study, copy, modify and/or redistribute computer programs.[23] These are the rights that are not usually granted to end-users in the licenses of proprietary software.

5.4 Footnotes

- [20] Available from `http://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/legal_e.htm#TRIPs` ; accessed on 28 June 2004.
- [21] Halligan, R. M., "How to Protect Intellectual Property Right in Computer Software;" available from `http://my.execpc.com/~mhallign/computer.html` ; accessed on 1 July 2004.
- [22] Available from `http://www.msdnaa.net/EULA/NA/English.aspx` ; accessed on 4 August 2004.
- [23] Available from `http://www.fsf.org/fsf/fsf.htm` ; accessed on 4 August 2004.

---

11   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/proprietary%20software`
12   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software%20movement`
13   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20Software%20Foundation`
14   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1985`

6 How is FOSS Different from Proprietary Software

The development of FOSS[1] may be considered a reaction of the community of software developers to existing legal definitions of software copyright. For both free software[2] and open source[3] developers, access to the source code is a prerequisite to exercise the rights bundled in copyright, such as the right to make copies of a work, to distribute these copies, and to prepare derivative works.

6.1 Transition in IT Industry and Legal Institutions

In the 1970s[4], developments in legal institutions and the IT industry stimulated the formation of the free software movement[5] in the US. For one thing, the US copyright law[6] went through a major revision in 1976[7], and the question of whether software is copyrightable was put on the table under relentless pressure from IT companies.[24] Second, while software used to be bundled with hardware in the hardware market, the IT industry began to consider the software itself as a separate product.[25] At this point, IT companies began to recruit more developers from research institutes to develop software, and the companies asked these individuals to sign confidentiality agreements upon recruitment.

6.2 Richard Stallman on a Stark Moral Decision

Prior to the above transition, the common practice in laboratories was to share sources and copies. For Richard Stallman[8] (RMS) who worked at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology[9] (MIT) laboratory at the time, the change undermined the community that honoured sharing and the ethic of "helping your neighbours". For Stallman, a talented programmer who could easily sign a contract and a confidentiality agreement with a proprietary company in exchange for a well-paid salary, the "stark moral decision" was between private gain for himself (and proprietary software companies) or the survival and

---

1   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20and%20open%20source%20software
2   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software
3   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/open%20source
4   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1970s
5   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software%20movement
6   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/united%20states%20copyright%20law
7   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1976
8   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard%20Stallman
9   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Massachusetts%20Institute%20of%20Technology

sustainability of the community of software developers. He chose the latter and began the Free Software movement.[26]

6.3 Free Software Defined

Free software[10] is about granting users the freedom to run, copy, distribute, study, change and improve the software. Free software is any software that provided the following freedoms. The freedom to:

1. Run the program, for any purpose (freedom 0).
2. Study how the program works, and adapt it to your needs (freedom 1). Access to the source code is a precondition for this.
3. Redistribute copies so you can help your neighbour (freedom 2).
4. Improve the program, and release your improvements to the public, so that the whole community benefits (freedom 3). Access to the source code is a precondition for this.[27]

Apart from emphasizing access to the source code[11], the Free Software Definition[12] also stipulates the user's right to copy, to distribute the copy, to modify the software, and to distribute the derivative work of a copyrighted work. All these rights are granted exclusively to the copyright[13] holder under copyright law.

6.4 Creating a Free Software Environment

6.4.1 The GNU Project and the Free Software Foundation

It is not sufficient to stipulate the rights of users or non-copyright holders. It is also important to have a computing environment in which these rights can be exercised. Thus, the GNU project[14] was launched in 1984[15] to develop the GNU system, a complete UNIX-style free operating system. Today, the GNU project also includes other software applications.

In 1985[16], the Free Software Foundation[17] (FSF) was established to promote the idea of free software[18]. It promotes the development and use of free software not only by distributing free software, but also by encouraging the creation of a coherent system, the GNU operating system, and providing alternative solutions to proprietary software. For more information, see `http://www.gnu.org/gnu/thegnuproject.html` .

---

10   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20software`
11   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/source%20code`
12   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20Software%20Definition`
13   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/copyright`
14   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20project`
15   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1984`
16   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1985`
17   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20Software%20Foundation`
18   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software`

6.4.2 GNU General Public License

Under existing legal norms, once a work is created, copyright protection is granted exclusively to the copyright holder. Without an explicit expression, it is assumed that the copyright holder claims all the rights granted to her. The law burdens the copyright holder with explicit expression if she wishes to relinquish some or all rights granted to her.

Some people may not want to exercise all of the rights granted to them. However, they may not know how to make such an explicit expression. The GNU General Public License[19] (GNU GPL) serves as a legal tool to help people to do so.

GNU GPL[20] is a license. Unlike proprietary licenses, it grants users the rights that the law grants exclusively to the copyright holder. These include the right to access the source code; to run the program; to make copies and redistribute the copies; and to modify the program and distribute the modified program.

On the other hand, although GNU GPL[21] grants the user many rights and freedoms to use the software, it also sets certain limitations on those who want to distribute the program or make and distribute derivative works to ensure that the software and its derivations will remain free. [28]

When a work is licensed under GNU GPL[22], it means that its author still claims copyright but adopts a different license as an explicit expression to allow the public to have greater freedom to use her work than what the copyright law allows by default.

6.5 Open Source Software

While free software[23] advocates consider the four freedoms to be a moral issue, promoters of open source[24] software focus more on the technical values and are, consequently, more business-friendly.[29] The Open Source Initiative[25] (OSI) operates as an organization to promote the open source movement by managing and promoting the Open Source Definition[26] (OSD) and its certification mark for open source licenses and products.

---

19   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20General%20Public%20License`
20   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
21   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
22   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
23   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software`
24   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/open%20source`
25   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open%20Source%20Initiative`
26   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open%20Source%20Definition`

6.6 Open Source Definition

The OSD[27] is a revision of a policy document of the Debian[28] GNU/Linux Distribution that served to clarify which licenses are free licenses.[30] The OSI explains the basic idea of Open Source[29] as:

> *The basic idea behind open source is very simple: When programmers can read, redistribute, and modify the source code for a piece of software, the software evolves. People improve it, people adapt it, people fix bugs.*[31]

The OSD[30] echoes the rights stated in the Free Software Definition[31], including the users' access to the sourcecode (Section 2), the rights of users to copy the work and distribute the copies (Section 1), and the right to modify the work and distribute derivative works (Section 3).

The OSD also has several non-discrimination clauses (Sections 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10). Though not stated in the same way, these non-discriminatory ideas are also found in the Free Software Definition. Section 7 of the OSD aims to prevent the source code from being withheld by indirect means such as by requiring non-disclosure agreements. However, the emphasis on the integrity of the author's source code and the requirements for the distribution of modified works (Section 4) are not explicitly stated in the Free Software Definition. For details, see `http://www.opensource.org/docs/definition.php`.

6.7 OSI-approved Licenses

The OSI[32] certifies and recognizes licenses as open source by following certain procedures. The certification is made upon request, and newly approved open source licenses are added to a list of open source licenses maintained by the OSI at `http://www.opensource.org/licenses` .

The number of OSI-approved licenses has been growing with the recent FOSS development. Some licenses are derived from the FOSS community: the GNU GPL[33], the LGPL[34], the PHP License[35] and the NetHack General Public License[36]. Those from academic/research institutes include the NASA Open Source Agreement, the MIT License[37] and the University of Illinois/NCSA Open Source License. Some proprietary companies that have adopted FOSS as part of their strategies have also developed FOSS licenses including the Apple

---

27   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open%20Source%20Definition`
28   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Debian`
29   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open%20Source`
30   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open%20Source%20Definition`
31   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20Software%20Definition`
32   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open%20Source%20Initiative`
33   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
34   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL`
35   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PHP%20License`
36   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NetHack%20General%20Public%20License`
37   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MIT%20License`

Public License[38], the Eclipse Public License[39], the Qt Public License[40] and the Mozilla Public License[41]. Actually, a large proportion of OSI-approved licenses are developed by for-profit companies.

6.8 Free or Restrictive?

Although the Free Software Definition[42] and the Open Source Definition[43] have much in common, they do differ in rhetoric, which reflects their differences in philosophy.

For example, some people may describe the GNU GPL[44] and the LGPL[45] as "highly restrictive" because the FSF[46] set many restrictions to make sure that free software[47] and their derivative works stay free. However, for the FSF, these restrictions are prerequisites for a healthy environment for free software.

The FSF[48] also maintains a list of free software licenses and non-free software licenses. Although the FSF may sometimes describe these relatively simple licenses as "permissive", it never qualifies their more complicated ones as "restrictive".

Though there are philosophical differences, in most cases, the FSF[49] and the OSI[50] agree on the classification of FOSS and non-FOSS licenses. Twenty-six OSI-approved licenses have been analysed by the FSF, and only two of these, the Original Artistic License[51] and the Reciprocal Public License[52], are regarded as non-free licenses.

6.9 Footnotes

- [24] Richard, J., "Copyright Protection for Computer Software in the United States," 2002; available from `http://www.ladas.com/Patents/Computer/SoftwareAndCopyright/Softwa04.html` ; accessed on 28 June 2004.
- [25] Campbell-Kelly, M., "Development and Structure of the International Software Industry, 1950-1990;" available from `http://www.dcs.warwick.ac.uk/~mck/Personal/SoftIndy.pdf` ; accessed on 1 July 2004.

---

38   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apple%20Public%20Source%20License`
39   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eclipse%20Public%20License`
40   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Q%20Public%20License`
41   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mozilla%20Public%20License`
42   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20Software%20Definition`
43   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open%20Source%20Definition`
44   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
45   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL`
46   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20Software%20Foundation`
47   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software`
48   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20Software%20Foundation`
49   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20Software%20License`
50   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open%20Source%20Initiative`
51   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Original%20Artistic%20License`
52   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reciprocal%20Public%20License`

- [26] Stallman, R.[53], 1999, "The GNU Operating System and the Free Software Movement," pp.53-56, O'Reilly & Associates, Inc., Canada.
- [27] Available from `http://www.fsf.org/philosophy/free-sw.html;` accessed on 31 May 2003.
- [28] See the Preamble of GNU GPL. Available from `http://www.fsf.org/licenses/gpl.txt` ; accessed on 31 May 2004.
- [29] Wong, K. and Sayo, P., Free/Open Source Software, A General Introduction, pp. 6-7, 2004; available from `http://www.iosn.net/foss/foss-general-primer/foss_primer_current.pdf` ; accessed on 31 May 2004.
- [30] Perens, B[54]., "The Open Source Definition," in Open Sources, Voice From the Open Source Revolution, CA: O'Reilly & Associates, Inc., 1999.
- [31] Available from `http://www.opensource.org/` ; accessed 31 May 2004.

---

53   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard%20Stallman`
54   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bruce%20Perens`

7 How to Make the Source Free or Open

Under current legal norms, software is protected by copyright law. Therefore, the FOSS movement[1] has developed many different FOSS licenses[2] to enable software developers to easily state that they grant their users some rights that copyright law grants exclusively to them. FOSS licenses also serve as agreements among FOSS developer communities.

There are many FOSS licenses, and their characteristics differ. In a later section of this primer, we will focus on three major licenses: the GNU GPL[3], the LGPL[4] and the BSD License[5]. They not only represent three very different styles of FOSS licensing but are also the most pervasively adopted licenses.[32] Table 1 helps us to get a quick and general overview.[33]

---

1   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software%20movement
2   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software%20licenses
3   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL
4   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL
5   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BSD%20Licenses

Table 1

Obligations of Licensee/Licensor	Original Work				Derivative Work			
License	As a principle, should redistributions provide source code?	When redistributed WITHOUT source code, can the distributor of source code alone charge a fee higher than the physical transfer cost?	When redistributed WITH the source code, can the distributor charge a fee higher than the physical transfer cost?	Sub-licensable?	Derivative works should adopt the same license as adopted by the original work	Is source code required to be open?	Should the copyright notice of the original work be attached?	Is documentation required to be provided?
GNU GPL[6] v 2	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes, Copyleft[7]	Yes	Yes	Yes
LGPL[8] v 2.1	Yes	No	Yes	No	Work based on the library — Yes, Copyleft[9]	Yes	Yes	Yes

---

6 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL
7 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copyleft
8 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL
9 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copyleft

Table 1

				Executable that links a "work that uses the Library" with the library			
				No	No	Yes	Yes
BSD License[10]	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Artistic License[11]	Yes	(Source Code is always redistributed)	No	No	No	No	No
MIT License[12]	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Apache License[13] v 1.1	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
Apache License[14] v 2.0	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No

10 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BSD%20Licenses
11 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Artistic%20License
12 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MIT%20License
13 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apache%20License
14 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apache%20License

Table 1

Mozilla Public License[15] v 1.1	Yes	(Source code is always redistributed)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, the additional rights described in MPL may be included in an additional document	Yes	Yes	Yes
Zlib/libpng License[16]	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
QPL	Yes	No	Yes	No	QPL requires all modifications must exist in a form separable from the original work, e.g. a Patch (does not allow people to Qt Public modify the original work directly) and regulates the patches with clauses that are similar to the clauses other licenses regulate the derivative works.	No	No	
Common Public License[17] v 1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No

15 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mozilla%20Public%20License`
16 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zlib%2Flibpng%20License`
17 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Common%20Public%20License`

Table 1

Academic Free License[18] v 2.1	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
PHP License[19] v 3.0	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
Open Software License[20] v 2.1	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Zope Public License[21] v 2.0	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Python Software Foundation License[22] v 2.1.1	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes

18   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Academic%20Free%20License`
19   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PHP%20License`
20   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open%20Software%20License`
21   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zope%20Public%20License`
22   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Python%20Software%20Foundation%20License`

The FOSS licenses[23] listed in Table 1 have the following common features:

- The source code of the original work is open.
- Making copies of the original work is allowed.
- Distribution of the original work is allowed. A copyright notice should be attached to all distributions.
- The license grant is non-exclusive, global, royalty-free, and for all purposes.
- Warranty is disclaimed.

However, these FOSS licenses[24] differ from each other in how these rights can be exercised. For one, although authors are always required to provide access to the source code , whether redistributors are also required to provide such access varies from one license to another. For example, when redistributing a BSD[25]-ed program, one is not required to provide the source code.

Even for licenses that require redistributors to provide the source code, there are different regulations regarding the distribution fee the redistributors can collect. The GNU GPL[26] and the LGPL[27] are particularly detailed about when one can collect a fee higher than the physical transmission fee. This is because the GNU GPL and the LGPL offer redistributors various ways to distribute the program, with or without the source code, while simultaneously ensuring that redistributions remain free software. An individual can sell free software for any price she wishes, since the market would help to keep the price within a reasonable range. But if a package is sold without the source code, the fee collected for the distribution of the source code itself cannot exceed the cost of physical transmission.

Clauses on derivative works vary widely. Although access to the source code of original works is a requirement, access to the source code of derivative works might not be. And even if a FOSS license requires the source code of derivative works to be open, it may not require them to be licensed under exactly the same license as the original work. For example, although a derivative work of a GPL[28]-ed program also has to be licensed under the GNU GPL, a derivative work of a BSD[29]-ed program does not have to be licensed under the BSD license. As a matter of fact, a derivative work of a BSD-ed program does not even have to be distributed along with source code.

FOSS licenses also differ on the possibility of allowing a FOSS program to be combined with proprietary programs. When combining different programs into a larger project, it is quite inevitable that the larger project, while embracing all or part of the source code of the programs combined, becomes the derivative work of all of the combined programs. For example, project ABC is combined with a GPL-ed program A, a BSD program B and a proprietary program C, and has source code from all three programs. As a derivative work of program B, project ABC need not be licensed under the BSD License or even required to

---

23   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software%20licenses
24   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software%20licenses
25   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BSD%20licenses
26   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL
27   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL
28   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL
29   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BSD%20licenses

open its source. However, as a derivative work of program A, project ABC is required to be licensed under the GNU GPL[30].

Thus, the developer will have no choice but to license the whole project ABC under the GNU GPL[31], or find an alternative to program A, especially if she wishes to make it a proprietary software project.

This is why the GNU GPL[32] is considered by proprietary companies to have the so-called "viral" effect, and it is regarded as unfriendly to the proprietary software development model. But the GNU GPL is designed to serve the interests of the free software community rather than the proprietary business sector. The FSF has also designed the LGPL to encourage greater use of free libraries even in proprietary software projects.

The three typical FOSS licenses – the GNU GPL[33], the LGPL[34] and the BSD[35] – are explained further below.

7.1 GNU General Public License

The GNU GPL[36] is the classic free software license[37]. It is also the most well-known and the most widely adopted among all FOSS licenses. The GNU GPL was developed to fulfil the freedoms defined by the Free Software Movement[38]. It is not just a license, but is also an expression of the basic ideas behind the movement

7.1.1 Copyleft

The idea

The way the GNU GPL[39] guarantees freedom is also called "copyleft[40]". While the traditional proprietary model says "copyright, all rights reserved", the GNU GPL says "copyleft, all rights reversed". Copyleft is not just about making the original work free when the copyright holder releases it, but also about keeping it free when it is being further distributed and modified. Although there is no limitation when derivative works are created only for internal use, when they are being distributed to the public, coplyleft is applied to make sure that derivative works are as free as the original work.

How it works

---

30   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL
31   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL
32   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL
33   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL
34   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL
35   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BSD%20licenses
36   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL
37   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software%20license
38   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20Software%20Movement
39   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL
40   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/copyleft

Copyleft prevents free software[41] from being turned into proprietary software[42]. It uses copyright law to achieve the exact opposite of its usual purpose. Instead of being the means of privatizing software, in copyleft licenses the rights granted to authors are reversed to keep the software free.[34]

Unlike works in the public domain[43] that everyone is free to exploit, a GPL[44]-ed work or a copyleft-ed work is copyrighted. The author of the GPL-ed work does not give up her rights as a copyright holder, but exercises these rights in a way different from a traditional copyright holder.

If authors who want to make their software free simply disclaim their rights as copyright holders and release their work into the public domain, it will expose the work to the danger of being privatized and closed again. Instead, to keep their works and their derivates free, authors must claim their rights, and with the exclusive rights granted to them, they include the copyleft clause so as to regulate the ways other people can make use of their work. By licensing their work under the GNU GPL[45], authors are allowing users to have the rights stipulated by the Free Software Movement[46].

Also by licensing under the GNU GPL[47], authors require people who wish to distribute the program and developers who wish to modify the work and distribute the modified works, to take on some responsibility in keeping derivatives as free as the original work.

7.1.2 Major Terms and Conditions of GNU GPL

User's freedoms

When a program is licensed under the GNU GPL[48], besides the freedom to access the source code, users are also free to:

1. Run the program (Section 0).
2. Make copies of the program (Section 1).
3. Redistribute the program, even for commercial purposes, provided an appropriate copyright notice and disclaimer of warranty are retained (Section 1). Redistribution in the object code or executable form is also possible, so long as the source code[49] is available for all recipients (Section 3).
4. Prepare and distribute derivative works of the program, provided the derivative works are also licensed to all third parties under the GNU GPL[50] (Section 2).

No warranty

---

41 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software
42 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/proprietary%20software
43 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/public%20domain
44 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GPL
45 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL
46 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20Software%20Movement
47 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL
48 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL
49 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/source%20code
50 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL

Though the distribution of the work can be commercial, the work itself is licensed free of charge. Therefore, there is no warranty for GPL-ed software (Sections 11, 12). The distributor could choose to offer warranty protection in exchange for a fee (Section 1).

License issued directly from the author

The work is not sub-licensable. When a program is redistributed, recipients still receive the license from the original licensor. Redistributors may not impose any further restrictions on recipients' exercise of the rights granted in the GNU GPL[51] (Section 6).

Acceptance and termination

By the act of modifying or distributing the GPL[52]-ed program, a person indicates his acceptance of the license (Section 5). The license grant is irrevocable but when the licensee violates the license, the rights granted will be terminated automatically. However, the rights of those who received the copy of the program from her will not be affected (since they received the license from the original licensor) so long as they remain in full compliance with the license (Section 4).

Co-exist with other legal obligations?

The GNU GPL does not concede to any contradictory conditions that are imposed on the recipients. If compliance with the license is not possible as a consequence of a court judgment, allegation of patent infringement or any other reason, then the recipient may not redistribute the program at all (Section 7). A GPL-ed program cannot be incorporated into a proprietary program, or linked with a proprietary library.

The full GNU GPL text can be found at `http://www.fsf.org/licenses/gpl.txt`

The FSF[53] also maintains a thorough FAQ on the GNU GPL which can be accessed at `http://www.gnu.org/licenses/gpl-faq.html`

7.2 GNU Lesser General Public License

Apart from the GNU GPL[54], the FSF[55] offers a special copyleft license for libraries. The GNU Lesser General Public License[56] (LGPL) permits LGPL-ed libraries to be linked with proprietary software.

This exception is to serve different situations. It can be a strategic decision to encourage the development of proprietary applications on the GNU system.[35] For a free library whose features may be largely replaced by other proprietary libraries, releasing it under the LGPL[57] rather than the GNU GPL[58] can encourage its wider use,[36] and thus make possible more

---

51 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
52 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GPL`
53 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20Software%20Foundation`
54 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
55 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20Software%20Foundation`
56 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20Lesser%20General%20Public%20License`
57 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL`
58 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`

improvements on it. With a larger body of free software users, there would also be wider support for free software in general.[37]

However, the FSF still encourages people to use the GNU GPL[59] for their libraries rather than the LGPL[60], especially for those libraries that have a significant number of unique capabilities. This is because people who are interested in utilizing such GPL-ed libraries will have to release their modules as GPL-ed software too, resulting in more useful modules and programs available in the free software environment.[38]

7.2.1 Major Terms and Conditions of LGPL

The LGPL[61] is identical to the GNU GPL[62] in many ways, including clauses that disclaim warranty, declare that the license is issued directly from the author, and specify when the license is applied and terminated. Also, other legal obligations applied upon users are the same as those for the GNU GPL.

On users'rights, the LGPL distinguishes two different kinds of situations when one uses a library. A "work based on the Library" means either the Library itself or any derivative work under copyright law (Section 0), while a"work that uses the Library" means a program that contains no derivative of any portion of the Library but is designed to work with the Library by being compiled or linked with it (Section 5).

Works Based on the Library

In the case of a "work that uses the Library", i.e., the Library itself and its derivative works, the terms are very similar to those in the GNU GPL.

- User's Freedoms
    1. Run the program (Section 0).
    2. Make copies of the program (Section 1).
    3. Redistribute the program, even for commercial purposes, provided an appropriate copyright notice and disclaimer of warranty are retained (Section 1). Redistribution in the object code or executable form is also possible, so long as the source code[63] is available for all recipients (Section 4).
    4. Prepare and distribute derivative works of the program, provided the derivative works are also licensed to all third parties under the LGPL[64] (Section 2c).
    In addition, one may opt to apply the terms of the GNU GPL instead of the LGPL to a given copy of the LGPL-ed library, especially when one is incorporating part of the code into a program that is not a library (Section 3).

Works that use the Library

---

59   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
60   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL`
61   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL`
62   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
63   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/source%20code`
64   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL`

In the case of a "work that uses the Library," the work itself is NOT subject to the LGPL[65]. But when linking the "work that uses the Library" with the Library, an executable version that is a derivative work of the Library would be created, and such a version is covered by the LGPL (Section 5).

Although the LGPL[66] allows authors to distribute the object code of executables (Section 5) and license these under terms of their choice, it is also required that those terms permit modification of the work for the customer's own use and reverse engineering. When distributing executables, the author has a choice either to distribute the Library together, provided the source code of the Library is made available in those ways similar to the distribution of GPL-[67]ed programs, or not to distribute the Library together but only use a suitable shared library mechanism to link with the Library (Section 6).

By creating this category, the LGPL[68] provides a way for LGPL-ed libraries to be used in proprietary programs. The full LGPL text can be found at `http://www.fsf.org/licenses/lgpl.txt`.

7.3 BSD Style Licenses

The Berkeley Software Distribution (BSD) License[69] was first used for the Berkeley Software Distribution[70], a version of Unix developed in the University of California at Berkeley.[39] It is easy to follow the BSD License template to create one's own license by changing the values of owner, organization and year, which appear in the copyright notice and the license. Unlike the GNU GPL and the LGPL, BSD style licenses are not copyleft licenses. A BSD License allows people to freely distribute and modify the original work, but it does not require that the modified works be as free as the original work. BSD style licenses are relatively simple and have only limited restrictions on the use of the software.

- User's Freedoms
  1. Make copies and redistribute the program, with either its source code or its binary code. The distributor is not obliged to provide the source code.
  2. Prepare derivative works and distribute them, either with their source code or binary code. The author is free to choose either FOSS or proprietary licenses for derivative works.
  3. Incorporate the program into proprietary software.

The original BSD License (four-clause BSD) has an advertising clause. The revised BSD License (three-clause BSD) is very similar to the MIT License[71], but the latter does not have the "no endorsement for derivative works" clause. There is also the two-clause BSD, which has taken away the endorsement clause and is most similar to the MIT License.[40]

---

65   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL`
66   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL`
67   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GPL-`
68   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL`
69   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BSD%20licenses`
70   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Berkeley%20Software%20Distribution`
71   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MIT%20License`

7.4 Multiple Licensing

It is important to note that a work can be licensed under more than one license. The choice of license reflects the type of relationship that the author wishes to have with the user of the copyrighted work. Since there can be more than one kind of user, and more than one possible relationship, the copyright holder is entitled to choose different kinds of licenses for different situations.

Take OpenOffice[72] as an example. OpenOffice is dual-licensed under the GNU GPL[73] and the Sun Industrial Standards Source License[74] (SISSL). Although OpenOffice states clearly that users are encouraged to use the GNU GPL to participate fully in the OpenOffice community, SISSL is provided as an alternative for developers and companies who are not able to use the GNU GPL.[41] ,[42] MySQL[75] is another example. MySQL offers both the GNU GPL and a commercial license. Organizations that do not want to release their applications under the GNU GPL can choose to use MySQL under the MySQL Commercial License.[43]

7.5 What about Documentation?

7.5.1 GNU Free Documentation License (GNU FDL)

Good documentation and manuals are extremely important for FOSS programs. When they are not licensed as free/open, it is difficult for people to make complete use of relevant FOSS programs.

Although the GNU GPL[76] is a license designed mainly for software, it can also be used for works that are not software, so long as it is defined clearly what the "source code[77]" is when adopting the license.[44] The FSF[78] also provides a license that is specially designed for documentation. The GNU Free Documentation License[79] (GNU FDL or FDL) is a form of copyleft license for manuals, textbooks or other documents that grants everyone the freedom to copy and redistribute the documents, with or without modifications, either commercially or non-commercially.[45]

By applying GNU FDL to a document, the author grants users the right to make verbatim copies of the work, to modify the work and to distribute modified works. Since it is a copyleft[80] license, it requires the copy and the distribution of modification of the FDL-ed work is also licensed under the FDL.

---

72 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/OpenOffice.org`
73 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
74 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sun%20Industrial%20Standards%20Source%20License`
75 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MySQL`
76 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
77 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/source%20code`
78 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20Software%20Foundation`
79 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20Free%20Documentation%20License`
80 `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/copyleft`

7.5.2 Creative Commons Licenses

Table 2				
	Attribution required	Allow Commercial Uses	Allow Derivative Works	Derivative works should be licensed under the same license as the original
CC BY	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
CC BY-NC	Yes	No	Yes	No
CC BY-NC-ND	Yes	No	No	
CC BY-NC-SA	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
CC BY-ND	Yes	Yes	No	
CC BY-SA	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CC NC ●	No	No	Yes	No
CC NC-ND ●	No	No	No	
CC NC-SA ●	No	No	Yes	Yes
CC ND ●	No	Yes	No	No
CC SA ●	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
GNU FDL	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

BY: Attribution. For any reuse and distribution, it is required that credit is given to the original author.

NC: Non Commercial. The work cannot be used for commercial purposes.

ND: No Derivative Works. The work cannot be altered or transformed; derivative works built upon the work are not permitted.

SA: Share Alike. It is allowed to alter and transform the work, and to prepare derivative works upon the work, so long as the resulting work is licensed under a license identical to this.

● Starting in 2004, Creative Commons made the "attribution" requirement the default in the second version. Thus only the first six CC licenses above remain in the second version.

Inspired by the FOSS development, the Creative Commons[81] advocates for openness of digital content and is urging for a more reasonable and flexible layer of copyright in the face of increasingly restrictive default rules.[46]

In 2002[82], the first versions of Creative Commons Public Licenses[83] (CC licenses) were released. By identifying major concerns of authors – i.e., whether attribution is required (attribution, BY), whether users are allowed to make commercial uses of the work (non-commercial, NC), whether users are allowed to make derivative works (no derivative works, ND), and when derivative works are allowed, whether they are required to be licensed under exactly the same license as the original work (share alike, SA) – Creative Commons[84] developed a set of 11 different CC licenses. Each represents a unique combination of the above four conditions. Authors are free to choose among the 11 licenses and decide which best suits their needs and works.

In 2004[85] Creative Commons[86] released the second version of CC licenses. Since the requirement of attribution has been widely adopted by users of CC licenses, the attribution requirement has become default, and thus there are only six CC licenses in the second version. However, the 11 licenses in the first version are not superseded and are still available (Table 2).[47]

CC licenses[87] are designed for all kinds of digital content except for software, including art works, photographs, music and literary texts. CC licenses do not deal with the FOSS issue, since ideas in the works referred to are transparent and are not compiled into forms that cannot be perceived. Some CC licenses do not allow modification or for-profit use and might not be regarded as "free". However, CC licenses are successful in spreading the idea of freedom and openness to the greater public, which might not be familiar with recent software developments fostered by FOSS movements.

7.6 Footnotes

- [32] If we look at SourceForge.net, the largest FOSS development website, we can see that the GNU GPL[88], the LGPL[89] and the BSD[90] are the three most adopted licenses. Of the 53,026 projects that are licensed under OSI-approved licenses, 36,962 projects are licensed under the GNU GPL, 5,817 projects are under the LGPL[91], and 3,813 projects are licensed under the BSD[92]. Available from `http://sourceforge.net/softwaremap/trove_list.php?form_cat=14;` accessed on 1 August 2004.
- [33] Open Source Software Foundry is Seeking Software Freedom, A Comparison of FOSS Licenses; available from `http://www.openfoundry.org/en/archives/000388.html` ; accessed on 2 August 2004.
- [34] Stallman, R., "The GNU Operating System and the Free Software Movement," p.59.
- [35] Stallman, R., "The GNU Operating System and the Free Software Movement," p.63.

---

82   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2002`
83   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Creative%20Commons%20Licenses`
84   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Creative%20Commons`
85   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2004`
86   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Creative%20Commons`
87   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Creative%20Commons%20licenses`
88   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
89   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL`
90   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BSD%20licenses`
91   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL`
92   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BSD%20licenses`

- [36] Stallman, R., "Why you shouldn't use the Library GPL for Your Next Library," Feb 1999; available from `http://www.fsf.org/licensing/licenses/why-not-lgpl.html` ; accessed on 29 May 2004.
- [37] Preamble, the "GNU Lesser General Public License;" available from `http://www.fsf.org/licenses/lgpl.txt;`
- [38] Stallman, R., "Why You Shouldn't Use the Lesser GPL for Your Next Library;" Feb 1999; available from `http://www.fsf.org/licenses/why-not-lgpl.html` ; accessed on 29 May 2004.
- [39] "MIT License Definition", June 2004; available from `http://www.bellevuelinux.org/mitlicense.html;` accessed on 1 July 2004.
- [40] "WikiReader, Free Software and Free Content," June 2005; available from `http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/en/a/a9/WikiReader_Free_Software_and_Free_Contents.pdf;` accessed on 8 July 2004.
- [41] "Licenses," August 2002; available from `http://www.openoffice.org;` accessed on 28 June 2004.
- [42] One is entitled to choose the license only for the code that belongs to him. In cases involving collaboration among different individuals or entities, all of the co-contributors have to agree on which licenses to choose for the work as a whole. This can be done either by an agreement among all co-contributors or, as in the OpenOffice case, participants in the project are required to sign a Joint Copyright Assignment with Sun Microsystem.
- [43] "MySQL Licensing Policy;" available from `http://www.mysql.com/company/legal/licensing/;` accessed on 10 November 2004.
- [44] Available from `http://www.gnu.org/licenses/fdl.html;` accessed on 4 August 2004.
- [45] Available from `http://www.gnu.org/licenses/licenses.html#TOCFDL;` accessed on 4 August 2004.
- [46] Creative Commons, "Some Rights Reserved, Building a Layer of Reasonable Copyright;" available from `http://creativecommons.org/learn/aboutus/` ; accessed on 4 August 2004.
- [47] Creative Commons Public Licenses are available at `http://creativecommons.org/licenses/.`

8 Scenarios

Different stakeholders will have different uses for FOSS. A developer might use a program more intensively than an end-user, which means that the developer's activities might be subject to more restrictions than an end-user. The following section tries to provide some scenarios as examples to explain the different legal issues that may arise for different stakeholders.

8.1 End-user (Individual/Business/Government)

> Abul is a public high school teacher. His school cannot afford expensive license fees for proprietary office applications. Although proprietary software companies offer special rates for schools, Abul wanted to find an alternative solution to reduce students' dependence on proprietary software. His friend, Nazlee, a programmer who has participated in FOSS projects, introduced him to a FOSS office application. Abul and his colleagues then downloaded FOSS office solutions and taught students both proprietary and FOSS applications. He is satisfied with the performance and introduced Nazlee's program to his colleagues. Gradually, the school administrative body began to use the FOSS solution for administrative work.

In this case, neither Abul (an individual) nor his school (a public government body) made any modification to the software that they downloaded from the Web. They were simply end-users.

The situation for end-users is relatively simple. The end-user of a software program may be an individual, a government body, or a business entity. These individual persons or legal entities may have different reasons to use FOSS. Some may be trying to find a cheaper solution or a solution that suits their needs better; others may wish to use FOSS for better customization; still others may wish to reduce their dependence on proprietary companies.

Legal issues involved

The way end-users use FOSS solutions might not be very different from the way they use proprietary solutions. They download a copy of a FOSS solution or purchase a copy (usually in exchange for some support and services), install it in the computer (thus making a copy on the hard disk), run the program, and have its functions serve their needs. The rights that are of concern here are the right to make copies of the program and to run it. (The act of running a program may also count as an act of making copy, but it is stated differently in some FOSS licenses. For example, the GNU GPL[1] has no restrictions on the

---

1   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`

running of the GPL[2]-ed program but does regulate the act of making a copy.) These rights are granted by all FOSS licenses. Thus there are fewer legal disputes involving end-users. However, end-users do need to consider some issues.

- Issue 1: Technical Support Since an end-user might not be a computer whiz, she might have concerns regarding technical support when choosing a FOSS solution. Thus, instead of simply downloading a copy of the FOSS solution for free, she might choose to purchase a box of FOSS in a shop where a proprietary solution is also available, sometimes at approximately the same price. The difference is that when purchasing, let's say, a commercial Linux distribution in the store, the end-user is not paying for the license fee, but for the service and support. Additional copies of the software and FOSS documentation may be distributed freely, e.g. to pupils, or installed on other computers; such additional users or installations are usually not covered by the support, unless explicitly included in the agreement. When the term of service expires, the end-user can choose to pay for another term of service, or ask other available providers for similar services.
- Issue 2: Customization When existing FOSS solutions do not fit their needs, end-users might need to ask individual developers or vendors to customize the solutions. In such cases, since end-users may not be technically savvy enough to detect possible infringements, they may wish to have a written clause in the contract ensuring that the vendor or developer will take on the entire responsibility for any possible copyright infringement, and will compensate for any possible losses that may be caused by allegations of infringement. The buyer is free to add these clauses to the contract when negotiating with the vendor or developer.
- Issue 3: Government Procurement Since FOSS licenses are different from traditional software licenses, governments should be particularly aware of the differences when they open a bid for software solutions or sign a contract with vendors. Existing government bid and contract templates may have been drafted under the traditional proprietary model of traditional copyright law, and have to be examined, or revised, if they fail to treat FOSS and proprietary software equally.

8.2 Developer (Individual, Business)

Developers (individuals and business entities) need to be more careful with the terms and conditions of different licenses while using FOSS. Developers usually not only run and copy the software, but also create derivative works from the software, and distribute these derivative works together with the original program. Therefore, for developers to contribute to the development of a certain FOSS program, it is essential to have the rights to run the program, to make copies, to distribute the program and to prepare derivative works.

These rights are granted by all FOSS licenses[3], for these essential rights are considered important both in the Free Software Definition[4] and the Open Source Definition[5]. Nevertheless, different FOSS licenses may have different restrictions on exercising these rights,

---

2   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GPL
3   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software%20licenses
4   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20Software%20Definition
5   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open%20Source%20Definition

especially on creating and distributing derivative works. Developers should pay particular attention to this, and consult their lawyers on their specific situation when needed.

There are different considerations when a developer participates in different stages of software development.

8.2.1 When Starting a New Project

> Abul's colleague Jolly is the school librarian. The school library is not that large, but it is open to villagers. Jolly sought her friend's help to write a program that would enable her to keep an accurate record of the books in the library.

- **Legal issues involved — choosing a license of one's own**

Developers

What does this project mean to me and to others? How do I want others to be involved? What do FOSS licenses say? What are the differences between FOSS licenses?

The situation is relatively simple if the developer is starting a new project without using any existing modules, since she will not have to look through the licenses of existing modules that she might have used.

However, starting a new project is not an easy task either. The different characteristics of the FOSS license she chooses will have a significant influence on the possible development path of the project. The developer should define her main concerns before choosing a license.

For example, if the developer is a supporter of copyleft, she may stick with the GNU GPL[6] or the LGPL[7]. If the developer thinks she doesn't need to require people to license their modified works under FOSS licenses, a BSD-style license[8] would be appropriate. Or when the developer thinks it is better to control the development in a firm and central line, she might not be interested in BSD style licenses. But if forking is preferred in the future development, BSD style licenses may be a better choice.

Developer

Can I change my mind after licensing my project?

The copyright holder of a project can always decide to choose another license for the program, even when the previous versions have already been licensed under certain FOSS licenses[9]. This will not affect the rights of the recipients of the previous versions since license grants are irrevocable. The situation will be more complicated if contributions from the community have been incorporated into the newer version, which means that these other contributors may claim copyright to certain pieces of the code in the newer version. In this case, unless there is prior agreement, the license must be chosen by all contributors.

---

6   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
7   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL`
8   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BSD%20license`
9   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software%20licenses`

Developer

I don't like any of the existing FOSS licenses[10]. Can I start a new one?

Though there are already many FOSS licenses[11], it is possible that a developer will find that she does not like any of the available licenses. As long as the developer owns the code, she is entitled to choose any license for the project, including a new one that she drafts by herself. However, creating a new FOSS license requires legal knowledge and skill to avoid vagueness and loopholes. Also, there are already many FOSS licenses and the transaction cost for understanding these licenses is high. Creating a new license is not recommended unless a developer has strong reasons to do so.

8.2.2 When Modifying an Existing Module

The office application Abul and his school are using has an English interface. It does not support the local language. Using an English interface might not pose a problem for high school students. However, it is difficult when Abul tried to teach villagers. He consulted Nazlee about the problem. Nazlee has constantly contributed to FOSS programs and is also quite familiar with the source code of the office application. She discussed this with a few friends and, as a team, they began to localize the application.

- **Legal issues involved: Ascertain the license of the program to be modified**

When a developer tries to modify an existing module, and when the modification is not solely for her own use but for further distribution (e.g., localizing a project), she needs to first identify the license of the module.

Developers

Under the license, what are the rights I am granted and what are the restrictions in exercising those rights?

For example, on the distribution of a FOSS work, some FOSS licenses (e.g., the GNU GPL[12], the LGPL[13]) may require distributors to provide both object code and source code, or at least provide the information on how to access the source code[14]. On modifying a FOSS work, some FOSS licenses (e.g., GNU GPL[15], LGPL[16], BSD[17]) may require the modifier to provide documentation of the changes being made. On distributing the derivative work, copyleft[18] licenses require derivative works to be licensed under the same license as the

---

10   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software%20licenses`
11   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software%20licenses`
12   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
13   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL`
14   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/source%20code`
15   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
16   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGPL`
17   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BSD%20license`
18   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/copyleft`

original work, while other FOSS licenses allow the modifier to choose a different license (BSD[19], MIT[20]).

If Nazlee and her friends are trying to localize the dual-licensed OpenOffice[21], and they decide to use the one under the GNU GPL[22], then the localized OpenOffice would also be GPL-ed. Using the original license scheme (dual-licensing) the localizations are easily integrated in the original project and can then at least partly be maintained there. Using a more restrictive scheme means that the localizations probably must be maintained locally. Allowing additional licenses (e.g. to later be able to use part of the work in another project) is usually unproblematic.

Some FOSS licenses[23] (e.g., the MIT License[24]) may allow users to sublicense the original work. This means that when distributing the verbatim copy of the original work, within the scope granted by the original copyright holder, the distributor may choose a different license and become a licensor him/herself. In such cases, when a developer creates a derivative work and distributes it together with the original work, he/she can choose to become a licensor of both the original work and the derivative work, which simplifies the legal relations to one that exists only between the two parties. If a sublicense is not allowed, people who receive the modified work would have two licensors for this piece of work. The licensor of the original work will be the author of the original work, while the licensor of the derivative work will be the developer who prepared the derivative work.

8.2.3 When Integrating Different FOSS Modules into One Service

Nazlee works in AA Software Inc. To better oversee the many different projects that the company is developing, the team built a project management system by integrating different FOSS modules. The management system is only for internal use now, but since it is pretty handy, the company also plans to distribute it commercially in the future.

FOSS licenses[25] do not impose restrictions on modifications that are made for internal use. But when a public distribution is created based on these modifications, the developer must consider all the licenses of the modules being used.

- **Legal issues involved: Identify the licenses of the programs being integrated, and see if these licenses are compatible.**

When publishing something that integrates several different modules, it is essential to ascertain the licenses of each module. If they happen to be licensed under the **same** license, such as the GNU GPL[26], then the integrated system would be licensed under that license. The situation is similar when all modules are licensed under the BSD License[27]. But in

---

19   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BSD%20license
20   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MIT%20license
21   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/OpenOffice.org
22   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL
23   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software%20licenses
24   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MIT%20License
25   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software%20licenses
26   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL
27   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BSD%20License

this second case, because the BSD license is more permissive, AA would be able to choose another FOSS license or a proprietary license for the modified modules and the integrated system. (The permissive nature of the BSD license allows AA to "narrow down" the licence by adding further conditions, while the GPL does not allow this.)

However, if some of the modules have **different** licenses, then AA will have to look at the compatibility of these licenses. When two licenses are *compatible*, the two modules licensed under the two licenses can be combined into a larger work while complying with both licenses.[48]

When combining a GPL[28]-ed program and BSD[29]-ed (GPL-compatible) into a larger program, the larger program will have to be GPL-ed to meet both the requirement of the GPL-ed program and BSD-ed program. If some of the modules are GPL-ed but other modules are GPL-incompatible, AA must decide which module is more important for them and replace the other one with a module with a compatible license.[49]

The licenses used in different modules and the way they are combined together would determine how the integrated system can be licensed and distributed.

- **Other considerations – choice of law and choice of venue clauses**

Finally, for those who are able to choose licenses for their programs, either because they started their own programs or they are allowed to choose licenses for the derivative works they prepared, they should be aware that many OSI-approved licenses are developed by proprietary software companies. Some are designed to meet their company policy and strategy, and thus might not be a good choice for developers in general. Some technical issues, such as clauses on choice of law and of venue (which could be found in the Qt Public License[30], the Mozilla Public License[31], the Common Public License[32], etc.), may become significant when a lawsuit is brought up.

8.3 Vendor/Producer (Business)

Nazlee and her friends have made the localized version of the FOSS office version available. AA Software Inc. is interested in this application. They have also developed some other small but useful programs for administrative work. They package the localized office together with their own programs (licensed under their proprietary license). The package is a big hit. A few months later, AA also decides to commercially distribute the project management system that they had integrated from different FOSS modules.

Mere distribution

In this situation, both FOSS and proprietary programs are distributed in one package. For the FOSS application, AA is merely a distributor, and must distribute it as its FOSS

---

28   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GPL`
29   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BSD`
30   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Qt%20Public%20License`
31   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mozilla%20Public%20License`
32   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Common%20Public%20License`

license requires. For proprietary programs, AA holds the copyright and is able to choose the license and ways of distribution. It is all right to put FOSS and proprietary applications into one distribution package, such as one CD-ROM, if the applications function separately and do not link together to create any derivative work.

Distribution of integrated systems

In the case of an integrated system distribution, what is key are the licenses of the different integrated modules and the ways in which the modules are combined. As explained earlier, AA needs to first make sure that the licenses of the different modules allow AA to combine them. These licenses will also determine the ways by which AA can distribute the integrated system.

Other considerations – drivers and certifications

One difficulty that FOSS vendors might encounter is that hardware vendors may not be aware of FOSS software and thus fail to provide drivers that will enable FOSS applications to work on the hardware. It is important to promote the idea of FOSS among hardware vendors. This will be easier when there is a larger group of FOSS users.

Likewise, certification is sometimes needed for FOSS to work properly with specific proprietary software. A larger FOSS user group will encourage proprietary software companies to certify FOSS applications that might be used together with their programs.

Other considerations – FOSS used in embedded systems or devices

FOSS is also used in embedded systems in electronic devices, such as cell phones, hand-held devices, digital cameras and DVD players. The use of FOSS may help device manufactures to lower their cost when developing new products. The distribution of the device is different from the distribution of the FOSS itself. With regard to the latter, the rules of specific licenses still apply.

The GPL version 3 mandates making available not only the source code for embedded devices, but also describing how to install a locally modified version of the software into the device, unless the device cannot be updated (e.g. because of having the software in ROM).

Other considerations – Source code

Many FOSS licenses insist on the source code being available. This must be the actual source code for the compiled program that has been distributed. As changes to the software can introduce subtle bugs making it unusable in the setting where it is used, it is not enough to provide the latest version of the source code. The simplest way not to have to keep track on every version is to always distribute the source code together with the compiled software (or keep them available together, if distributed by offering downloads).

8.4 Government-sponsored Projects

FOSS movements and rapid FOSS developments have received attention not just from the FOSS community, but also from academics and policy-makers. In some Asian countries, governments work with PC manufactures/vendors to provide affordable PCs bundled with

FOSS operating systems[33] and office applications.[50] Governments also support FOSS development, generate FOSS-related projects and promote FOSS as a national technology and industrial policy.[51] But long before governments began to notice the potential of FOSS and developed a clear position on it, some government-affiliated academic institutes have already been working on FOSS-related projects.

The FSF-maintained FAQs about the GNU GPL also list questions about whether the United States Government could release a program under the GNU GPL or release improvements to a GPL-ed program.[52] Situations may differ from country to country and from case to case under different government regulations in different countries. Most government regulations on government-sponsored projects are usually drafted under their domestic copyright and patent law and might be informed by a more protectionist mentality and thus be unfamiliar, or even unfriendly, to FOSS licensing and development models.

Below are two cases of government-funded FOSS studies. The first one is about FOSS-related studies made in a government research institute without related government policy, while the second one is about a national FOSS project.

8.5 Government-funded FOSS Projects: Cases from the Asia-Pacific

8.5.1 A FOSS Project under a Government-affiliated Research Institute: Multi-Lingual Editor, Japan

Emacs[34] is a multilingual text editor first developed by Richard Stallman[35] at MIT[36]. After the GNU project[37] started in 1984[38], the development of GNU Emacs was started and it was first released in 1985[39], under the GNU GPL[40].

The Japanese governmental research institute, Eletrotechnical Laboratory (ETL),[53] began to work on the multilingual information processing and integration of GNU Emacs[41] and Mule (multilingual text editor based on Emacs and later merged into GNU Emacs as MULE) in the mid-1990s[42], but there were various copyright issues.

ETL was a government research institute, and the licensing model in the GNU GPL is very different from Japanese copyright law, so no one was able to decide whether ETL could assign the code to the FSF and release the code under the GNU GPL[43]. As a result, ETL never officially released the code but released the trial versions instead. More negotiations

---

33   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/operating%20systems
34   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emacs
35   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard%20Stallman
36   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MIT
37   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20project
38   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1984
39   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1985
40   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL
41   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emacs
42   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1990s
43   http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL

between ETL and FSF[44] took place later, and resulted in a special agreement. The FSF agreed not to require ETL to assign the copyright of the modified code to the FSF, and ETL agreed to grant FSF the right to use the code. This was the first time that part of the code in Emacs did not belong to the FSF.

In 2001[45], ETL was reorganized into the National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST). Although AIST is still a government-funded institute, it is an independent organization and its assets are not national property. It seemed that AIST would be able to release the code under the GNU GPL[46] officially. But, initially, it was still very difficult for the higher levels of AIST to make a final decision. It took them another year of internal negotiation to decide that AIST was entitled to release their works and choose the licenses of their works. It was also not easy to convince people about the advantage of adopting the GNU GPL. According to Dr Kenichi Handa, a senior researcher in AIST, it was never clear what convinced the AIST management to make the final decision.

This happened before the Japanese Government had formed a clear position on FOSS development. During an open source conference among Asian countries in 2003[47] where Dr Handa was invited to give a talk on the development of Emacs, Shuichi Tashiro, the leader of the Japanese FOSS project under the Ministry of Economic, Trade and Industry, said that the Japanese Government has made necessary regulatory revisions to give developers of government-funded projects the copyright (and thus the right to choose the license) so long as the law was applicable from the beginning of the project.

In this case, we can see that when the government is not familiar with the FOSS licensing and developing model, related government regulations may create unnecessary difficulties for government-affiliated research institutes seeking to participate fully in FOSS development. It took AIST, formerly ETL, years to finally be able to officially release the code under the GNU GPL. Even though now there is a special regulation to facilitate the use of FOSS licenses for government-funded open source projects, as they are still considered exceptions.

8.5.2 A National FOSS Project: Free Software Industrial Development Project, Taiwan

Under pressure from Congress, the Taiwanese Government began the planning of a national FOSS project in 2002[48], and in 2003[49] a significant budget had been allocated to a five-year FOSS project. The Ministry of Economics Affairs (MoEA) was assigned to structure, sponsor and oversee all of the sub-projects.

Under general government regulations administered by the National Science Council (NSC), although the results can be copyrighted by the entity which carries out government-funded projects, applications of such results are still subject to certain regulatory principles. Unless it would be more beneficial for the national development of science and technology, the results have to be:

---

44   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free%20Software%20Foundation`
45   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2001`
46   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
47   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2003`
48   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2002`
49   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2003`

1. Licensed for a fee.
2. Licensed to Taiwanese institutes or firms.
3. Used or manufactured within Taiwanese jurisdiction.

Though exceptions might be made for FOSS projects, the law had not been officially interpreted in this way, and no one wanted to risk violating the regulation.

In addition, the national FOSS project was assigned to the MoEA, which has the more important task of protecting national interest and economic competitiveness. Thus their regulations are more protectionist/ restrictive than the general rule. These restrictive regulations were applied to the national FOSS project. Under MoEA regulations, only the third principle (used and manufactured within Taiwanese jurisdiction) can be exempted. This meant that the outputs of the national FOSS project had to be licensed for a fee, and it can be licensed only to Taiwanese institutes or firms. Such principles are inconsistent with the FOSS licensing model, making it difficult for all sub-projects under the national FOSS project to release their code.

This issue was raised as soon as the five-year FOSS project started. Different government bodies met several times to find a solution. Because the FOSS licensing model was so alien to the models they were used to, the problem was not solved until mid-way into the second year (2004[50]) and the code developed in the first year was not officially released in time.

This was particularly problematic since one of the sub-projects under the national FOSS project was integrating an existing FOSS program. At the same time, the sub-project intended to participate in and contribute to this particular FOSS project. When the community was about to incorporate all of the recent developments and release its newer version under the GNU GPL[51] in March 2004[52], they found it difficult to incorporate the code developed under the government-funded sub-project in Taiwan.

It was not until after a negotiation held in May 2004[53] that different government bodies finally came out with a solution. The MoEA submitted the case to the Administrative Yuan (highest administration body) to obtain an official interpretation from the Government regarding whether FOSS projects meet the exception clause and are thus exempt from the principles. Meanwhile, the MoEA began to look into the possibility of revising its restrictive regulations.

The official interpretation was finally made by the Administrative Yuan in July 2004[54], 18 months after the official launch of the national FOSS project. Under the new interpretation, government-funded FOSS projects met the exception clause of the general NSC rule and can be exempted from the principles that conflict with FOSS licenses. Although the MoEA regulation has not yet been modified, some code-generating FOSS projects are assigned to NSC and the general NSC rule, rather than the more restrictive MoEA rules . It is hoped that FOSS projects will be able to release the code under FOSS licenses thereafter.

This case shows that while the government has started to recognize the importance of FOSS development, its regulatory and administrative structure might not be ready to accommodate

---

50   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2004`
51   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU%20GPL`
52   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2004%23March`
53   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2004%23May`
54   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2004%23July`

FOSS. In the case of the Taiwan National FOSS Project, with the combined efforts of related government and project personnel, the problem was finally solved to a certain extent. But it had already caused some serious problems, especially in collaborating with international and local FOSS communities. As many countries now also recognize the importance of FOSS development, and are starting or planning to start their governmental FOSS projects, it is critical that the related legal structures are examined and updated to facilitate FOSS development.

8.6 Footnotes

- [48] "What does it mean to say that two licenses are compatible?;" available from `http://www.gnu.org/licenses/gplfaq.html#WhatIsCompatible` ; accessed on 7 July 2004; "FAQ on Open Source Licenses;" available from `http://www.openfoundry.org/en/archives/FAQonOSL.pdf` ; accessed on 7 July 2004
- [49] "Various License and Comments About Them;" available from `http://www.fsf.org/licensing/licenses/index_html#GPLCompatibleLicenses` ; accessed on 7 July 2004. The FSF provides a list of GPL-compatible and GPL-compatible FOSS licenses.
- [50] "Malaysian 'People's PC'- Microsoft experience "Thailand Linux" pain all over again," Mar 2004; available from `http://www.asiaosc.org/article_191.html` ; accessed on 7 July 2004. See also Koanantakool, T., "A Case for Nation-wide PC Distribution," November 2003; available from `http://www.asia-oss.org/;` accessed on 7 July 2004.
- [51] Related links available at uwstudent.org/wiki/OpenSourceInGovernment ; accessed on 8 July 2004. Also available from `http://www.asiaosc.org/enwiki/page/Ideas_for_OSS_policy.html` ; accessed on 8 July 2004.
- [52] Available from `http://www.fsf.org/licensing/licenses/gpl-faq.html#GPLUSGov` and `http://www.fsf.org/licensing/licenses/gplfaq.html#GPLUSGovAdd` ; accessed on 10 July 2004.
- [53] Handa, K., "Development of Multi-Lingual Editor," 2003; available from `http://www.asia-oss.org/nov2003/present/handa/handa.html` ; accessed on 10 July 2004.

9 Online Legal Resources and Materials

- Free Software Foundation[1]
- Open Source Initiative[2]
- Open Source License LawResource Center[3]
- Open Source Licensing[4]
- WikiReader_Free_Software_and_Free_Contents.pdf WikiReader[5]
- Groklaw[6]
- FLOSS Concept Booklet[7]
- Frequently Asked Questions about GNU GPL[8]
- Quiz to Test Your Knowledge of the GPL and LGPL[9]
- Apache License and Distribution FAQ[10]
- Mozilla Relicensing FAQ[11]
- Netscape Public License FAQ[12]
- ur0312b/ Feature[13]
- A Comparison of Open SourceLicenses[14]
- Electric Frontier Foundation[15]
- Foundation for a Free Information Infrastructure[16]
- IP Justice[17]
- League for Programming Freedom[18]
- Infochange - Intellectual Property Rights[19]
- Patents/SoftwareProtectionIndex.html Copyrights and Software Protections by Patents andCopyrights[20]
- Journal of Information[21]

---

1   http://fsf.org
2   http://opensource.org
3   http://www.denniskennedy.com/resources/technology-law-central/opensourcelaw.aspx
4   http://www.anu.edu.au/people/Roger.Clarke/EC/OSLic.html
5   http://en.wikipedia.org/upload/a/a9/
6   http://www.groklaw.net/index.php
7   http://www.sarai.net/floss_book.pdf
8   http://www.gnu.org/licenses/gpl-faq.html
9   http://www.gnu.org/cgi-bin/licensequiz.cgi
10 http://www.apache.org/foundation/licence-FAQ.html
11 http://www.mozilla.org/MPL/relicensing-faq.html
12 http://www.mozilla.org/MPL/FAQ.html
13 http://www.unixreview.com/documents/s=8925/
14 http://swan.iis.sinica.edu.tw/LicenseWizard/OSI_License_compare_v3.0.4EN.pdf
15 http://www.eff.org
16 http://www.ffii.org
17 http://ipjustice.org/CODE/
18 http://lpf.ai.mit.edu
19 http://www.infochangeindia.org/Intellectual_Property_Rights.jsp
20 http://www.ladas.com/
21 http://elj.warwick.ac.uk/Jilt/

- Creative Commons[22]
- Legal+Guidance+%26+Documents&L3=Software+Licensing+%26+Development&L4=Open+Source+Le
  Open Source Legal Toolkit[23]
- Software Freedom Law Center[24]

---

22   `http://creativecommons.org`

23   `http://www.mass.gov/portal/site/massgovportalmenuitem.769ad13bebd831c14db4a11030468a0cpageID=`
     `itdsubtopic&L=5&L0=Home&L1=Policies%2c+Standards+%26+Legal&L2=`

24   `http://www.softwarefreedom.org/index.html`

10 Glossary

This section is a derivative work of its Mandarin version co-authored by Rong-chi Chang and Chingyuan Huang, former colleagues of the OSSF, Institution of Information Science, Academia Sinica.

Copyleft[1]

Proposed by free software[2] advocates, copyleft is an alternative framework conceived within copyright law which usually confers exclusive rights to copyright holders and thus limits access to the work by all others. Authors may want to "copyleft" their works to grant certain rights to people who are interested in distributing or modifying their works, provided these people will also "copyleft" all the derivative works. Although copyright and copyleft might represent very different ideas regarding the relationship between authors and their works, copyleft is not against copyright law. On the contrary, without the rights granted by the copyright law, authors will not have the power to copyleft their works. Please also refer also to the definition provided by the Free Software Foundation at `http://www.gnu.org/copyleft/copyleft.html` .

Copyright[3]

A bundle of rights regarding the use of a creative expression (including literary works, music compositions, movies, paintings, software, and the like) that the law grants exclusively to the author. Copyright is applied to a work upon its creation. Except for the limitation set by copyright law, any use of a work without the copyright holder's consent is regarded as an infringement. Note that copyright law protects only the expression of ideas but not the ideas themselves.

Copyright Holder

The individual or legal entity who is entitled to exclusive rights under copyright law. It is usually said that copyright law aims to protect authors of creative works. But since most of the rights protected are treated as property rights and may be transferred, many copyright holders are not the authors of the works themselves but their employers or those who have commissioned these works.

Derivative Work

Copyright law is applied to every work once it is created. With the consent of the copyright holder, one can use this (original) work to create derivative works. For example, a newer version of a program might contain all or part of the code of the earlier version. Thus the

---

1   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copyleft`
2   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software`
3   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copyright`

newer version is a derivative work of the earlier version. Translation of a document is also regarded as a type of derivative work.

Distribution/Redistribution

Distribution of the copies of a work is also an exclusive right granted to the copyright holder. In FOSS licenses, all receivers of copies of a program are allowed to make further distributions. The term redistribution may be used when emphasizing that the distributor has received the program from somewhere and is distributing further.

Fair Use

Copyright law seeks to maintain a balance between private and public interests. "Fair use" is developed to limit excessive copyright protection and to allow the general public greater access to copyrighted works. When a work is used without the consent of the copyright holder for purposes of criticism, comments, news reporting, teaching, scholarship or research, such use might not be considered an infringement. Though copyright may differ in different jurisdictions, usually the following factors are considered by the court in deciding whether a case falls under fair use or is an infringement:

- The purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for non-profit educational purposes.
- The nature of the copyrighted work.
- The amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole.
- The effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work.

First-sale Doctrine

The first-sale doctrine is an exception of copyright law that is codified in Section 109 of the US Copyright Act[4]. Similar doctrines may be also be adopted by other countries. The doctrine allows the person who purchased a legally acquired copy of a copyrighted work to further distribute (including sell, rent or give away) the copy without permission from the copyright holder. But the first-sale doctrine does not apply to phono-records and computer software.

License

A license is a legal document that copyright holders may adopt to regulate how people can use their works. Users are often required to accept the terms and conditions of a license as a prerequisite to their use of the copyrighted works.

Multiple Licensing

The copyright holder of a work can have various ways of making use of his/her work available to others. The terms and conditions she would want users to accept may differ from case to case. For example, the copyright holder of an editor software may be willing to issue an academic license that is cheaper and more affordable for students, while commercial licenses are adopted when the program is sold to commercial entities. A copyright holder can also decide to license a work under both FOSS licenses and proprietary licenses to achieve different purposes.

---

4   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United%20states%20copyright%20law`

Public Domain

The term public domain is used to describe all creative works that are not protected by copyright law and can therefore be used freely. Works that are in the public domain might be cultural heritage that came to existence before copyright law, or works that were once protected but whose copyright has expired, or works for which their copyright holder decides not to claim copyright. In the latter case, the disclaimer must be made explicitly. In some countries, a signed written document deposited with a national registrar may even be required. Works that are licensed under FOSS licenses are still copyrighted and do not fall into this category.

Source Code[5]

Source code is written in special kinds of languages designed for programming. A program in its source code form might not be easy for lay people to understand, but it is comprehensible to trained programmers. When the source code is converted to machine readable form, even programmers will have difficulty understanding and modifying the program. Therefore, access to the source code is a prerequisite for the development of FOSS and a principle embraced in all FOSS licenses. A more detailed explanation of "source code" can be found in the Glossary of the introductory primer, Free/Open Source Software, A General Introduction, which is available online at `http://www.iosn.net/downloads/foss_primer_current.pdf`

Sub-license

When a copyright holder licenses her work to someone else, she can also choose to allow the licensee to sublicense the work. That is, when the licensee distributes the work, within the scope of rights granted by the licensor, the licensee is not only a (re)distributor but also a licensor of a sub-license between her and the other party (licensee of a sub-license). However, most FOSS licenses do not grant people the right to sub-license. For example, A is the copyright holder of X program. B receives a copy of X and distributes more copies. C receives the copy from B. If A does not grant B the right to sub-license, both B and C receive the license directly from A. If A grants the right B to sub-license program X, within the scope of the rights granted by A, B may start a new license and him/herself become a (sub)licensor of program X.

Warranty Disclaimer

Warranty is a guarantee made by the vendor against potential liabilities arising from the use of a product. All FOSS licenses come with a warranty disclaimer. Such clauses are designed to protect the author of FOSS programs, for these programs are licensed without royalty and changes might be added in its development. However, although FOSS programs themselves are royalty-free and disclaim warranty, vendors of FOSS programs can always provide their customers with a warranty and various kinds of supports for a fee.

Another reason why licenses of community distributions may not include warranty clauses may be because developers are expected to understand the code and fix the bugs, and are invited and expected to take on some responsibility as a member of the community. However, in commercial distribution, it is unreasonable to expect customers to be capable

---

5   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Source%20Code`

to read and change the code. In some countries, failure to provide minimum guarantee will lead to consumer protection issues

11 About the Author

11.1 Original Author

Shun-ling Chen did her master degrees in law both at National Taiwan University[1] and Harvard Law School[2]. Her research interests and political commitments have been mainly about how self-organized social agencies are able to instigate driving forces for structural transitions. She has been working with various NGOs and sees FOSS as one of such community building processes. Until the summer of 2004[3], she was the project co-lead of Creative Commons[4] Taiwan and served in the OSSF[54] project as the project manager of its Law and Policy team.

Built with FOSS modules, OSSF is a public platform that offers free (as in free beer!) tools and spaces for FOSS community to develop their projects. The OSSF is carried out by the Institute of Information Science, Academia Sinica, Taiwan.

11.1.1 Acknowledgements

The author (Shun-ling Chen) would like to acknowledge her debt of gratitude to the following:

- The reviewers of this primer, Richard M. Stallman[5], Eric S. Raymond[6], Dr. Nah Soo Hoe, Aniruddha Shankar, Mahesh T. Pai, and Kenneth Wong for their valuable comments and suggestions.
- Her colleagues at the OSSF project and the FOSS community members who have developed their projects on the OpenFoundry[7], for providing their valuable inputs towards understanding FOSS licensing issues and developing the ideas contained in this primer.
- The current and former UNDP[8]-APDIP[9] colleagues Sunil Abraham, Khairil Yusof, Phet Sayo, Shahid Akhtar and Kenneth Wong for their efforts and assistance that made this primer possible.

---

1   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National%20Taiwan%20University`
2   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harvard%20Law%20School`
3   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2004`
4   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Creative%20Commons`
5   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard%20Stallman`
6   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eric%20S.%20Raymond`
7   `http://www.openfoundary.org`
8   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/UNDP`
9   `http://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/FOSS%20Licensing%2FAbout%20APDIP`

- And finally, those who have contributed their time, efforts, and resources to the FOSS movement[10] with enthusiasm which has shown us what voluntary collaboration among human beings can achieve.

11.2 Contributors

This book is a wiki. You can edit this book too, if you want! If you make a significant contribution to this project, please list your name here:

- Andrew Whitworth[11] 14:00, 5 September 2006 (UTC)
  Performed the initial conversion from PDF, and the transfer of this material to the wikibooks server. He set up most of the initial formatting.

11.3 Footnotes

- [54] OSSF is a recursive acronym for "OSSF Supports Software Freedom",

---

10   `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/free%20software%20movement`
11   `http://en.wikibooks.org/wiki/User%3AWhiteknight`

12 Contributors

Edits	User
1	AVRS[1]
11	Adrignola[2]
15	Aizatto[3]
1	Avicennasis[4]
10	Christineapikul[5]
2	Darklama[6]
1	Dirk Hünniger[7]
1	Dnas[8]
2	Gpvos[9]
5	LPfi[10]
2	Mcld[11]
3	Panic2k4[12]
68	Whiteknight[13]
3	Wknight8111[14]

1   http://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=User:AVRS
2   http://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=User:Adrignola
3   http://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=User:Aizatto
4   http://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=User:Avicennasis
5   http://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=User:Christineapikul
6   http://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=User:Darklama
7   http://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=User:Dirk_H%C3%BCnniger
8   http://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=User:Dnas
9   http://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=User:Gpvos
10 http://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=User:LPfi
11 http://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=User:Mcld
12 http://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=User:Panic2k4
13 http://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=User:Whiteknight
14 http://en.wikibooks.org/w/index.php?title=User:Wknight8111

List of Figures

- GFDL: Gnu Free Documentation License. `http://www.gnu.org/licenses/fdl.html`

- cc-by-sa-3.0: Creative Commons Attribution ShareAlike 3.0 License. `http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/`

- cc-by-sa-2.5: Creative Commons Attribution ShareAlike 2.5 License. `http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/2.5/`

- cc-by-sa-2.0: Creative Commons Attribution ShareAlike 2.0 License. `http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/2.0/`

- cc-by-sa-1.0: Creative Commons Attribution ShareAlike 1.0 License. `http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/1.0/`

- cc-by-2.0: Creative Commons Attribution 2.0 License. `http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/`

- cc-by-2.0: Creative Commons Attribution 2.0 License. `http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/deed.en`

- cc-by-2.5: Creative Commons Attribution 2.5 License. `http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.5/deed.en`

- cc-by-3.0: Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License. `http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/deed.en`

- GPL: GNU General Public License. `http://www.gnu.org/licenses/gpl-2.0.txt`

- LGPL: GNU Lesser General Public License. `http://www.gnu.org/licenses/lgpl.html`

- PD: This image is in the public domain.

- ATTR: The copyright holder of this file allows anyone to use it for any purpose, provided that the copyright holder is properly attributed. Redistribution, derivative work, commercial use, and all other use is permitted.

- EURO: This is the common (reverse) face of a euro coin. The copyright on the design of the common face of the euro coins belongs to the European Commission. Authorised is reproduction in a format without relief (drawings, paintings, films) provided they are not detrimental to the image of the euro.

- LFK: Lizenz Freie Kunst. `http://artlibre.org/licence/lal/de`

- CFR: Copyright free use.

- EPL: Eclipse Public License. `http://www.eclipse.org/org/documents/epl-v10.php`

Copies of the GPL, the LGPL as well as a GFDL are included in chapter Licenses[15]. Please note that images in the public domain do not require attribution. You may click on the image numbers in the following table to open the webpage of the images in your webbrower.

---

15 Chapter 13 on page 65

13 Licenses

13.1 GNU GENERAL PUBLIC LICENSE

The GNU General Public License is a free, copyleft license for software and other kinds of works.

The licenses for most software and other practical works are designed to take away your freedom to share and change the works. By contrast, the GNU General Public License is intended to guarantee your freedom to share and change all versions of a program–to make sure it remains free software for all its users. We, the Free Software Foundation, use the GNU General Public License for most of our software; it applies also to any other work released this way by its authors. You can apply it to your programs, too.

When we speak of free software, we are referring to freedom, not price. Our General Public Licenses are designed to make sure that you have the freedom to distribute copies of free software (and charge for them if you wish), that you receive source code or can get it if you want it, that you can change the software or use pieces of it in new free programs, and that you know you can do these things.

To protect your rights, we need to prevent others from denying you these rights or asking you to surrender the rights. Therefore, you have certain responsibilities if you distribute copies of the software, or if you modify it: responsibilities to respect the freedom of others.

For example, if you distribute copies of such a program, whether gratis or for a fee, you must pass on to the recipients the same freedoms that you received. You must make sure that they, too, receive or can get the source code. And you must show them these terms so they know their rights.

Developers that use the GNU GPL protect your rights with two steps: (1) assert copyright on the software, and (2) offer you this License giving you legal permission to copy, distribute and/or modify it.

For the developers' and authors' protection, the GPL clearly explains that there is no warranty for this free software. For both users' and authors' sake, the GPL requires that modified versions be marked as changed, so that their problems will not be attributed erroneously to authors of previous versions.

Some devices are designed to deny users access to install or run modified versions of the software inside them, although the manufacturer can do so. This is fundamentally incompatible with the aim of protecting users' freedom to change the software. The systematic pattern of such abuse occurs in the area of products for individuals to use, which is precisely where it is most unacceptable. Therefore, we have designed this version of the GPL to prohibit the practice for those products. If such problems arise substantially in other domains, we stand ready to extend this provision to those domains in future versions of the GPL, as needed to protect the freedom of users.

Finally, every program is threatened constantly by software patents. States should not allow patents to restrict development and use of software on general-purpose computers, but in those that do, we wish to avoid the special danger that patents applied to a free program could make it effectively proprietary. To prevent this, the GPL assures that patents cannot be used to render the program non-free.

The precise terms and conditions for copying, distribution and modification follow. TERMS AND CONDITIONS 0. Definitions.

"This License" refers to version 3 of the GNU General Public License.

"Copyright" also means copyright-like laws that apply to other kinds of works, such as semiconductor masks.

"The Program" refers to any copyrightable work licensed under this License. Each licensee is addressed as "you". "Licensees" and "recipients" may be individuals or organizations.

To "modify" a work means to copy from or adapt all or part of the work in a fashion requiring copyright permission, other than the making of an exact copy. The resulting work is called a "modified version" of the earlier work or a work "based on" the earlier work.

A "covered work" means either the unmodified Program or a work based on the Program.

To "propagate" a work means to do anything with it that, without permission, would make you directly or secondarily liable for infringement under applicable copyright law, except executing it on a computer or modifying a private copy. Propagation includes copying, distribution (with or without modification), making available to the public, and in some countries other activities as well.

To "convey" a work means any kind of propagation that enables other parties to make or receive copies. Mere interaction with a user through a computer network, with no transfer of a copy, is not conveying.

An interactive user interface displays "Appropriate Legal Notices" to the extent that it includes a convenient and prominently visible feature that (1) displays an appropriate copyright notice, and (2) tells the user that there is no warranty for the work (except to the extent that warranties are provided), that licensees may convey the work under this License, and how to view a copy of this License. If the interface presents a list of user commands or options, such as a menu, a prominent item in the list meets this criterion. 1. Source Code.

The "source code" for a work means the preferred form of the work for making modifications to it. "Object code" means any non-source form of a work.

A "Standard Interface" means an interface that either is an official standard defined by a recognized standards body, or, in the case of interfaces specified for a particular programming language, one that is widely used among developers working in that language.

The "System Libraries" of an executable work include anything, other than the work as a whole, that (a) is included in the normal form of packaging a Major Component, but which is not part of that Major Component, and (b) serves only to enable use of the work with that Major Component, or to implement a Standard Interface for which an implementation is available to the public in source code form. A "Major Component", in this context, means a major essential component (kernel, window system, and so on) of the specific operating system (if any) on which the executable work runs, or a compiler used to produce the work, or an object code interpreter used to run it.

The "Corresponding Source" for a work in object code form means all the source code needed to generate, install, and (for an executable work) run the object code and to modify the work, including scripts to control those activities. However, it does not include the work's System Libraries, or general-purpose tools or generally available free programs which are used unmodified in performing those activities but which are not part of the work. For example, Corresponding Source includes interface definition files associated with source files for the work, and the source code for shared libraries and dynamically linked subprograms that the work is specifically designed to require, such as by intimate data communication or control flow between those subprograms and other parts of the work.

The Corresponding Source need not include anything that users can regenerate automatically from other parts of the Corresponding Source.

The Corresponding Source for a work in source code form is that same work. 2. Basic Permissions.

All rights granted under this License are granted for the term of copyright on the Program, and are irrevocable provided the stated conditions are met. This License explicitly affirms your unlimited permission to run the unmodified Program. The output from running a covered work is covered by this License only if the output, given its content, constitutes a covered work. This License acknowledges your rights of fair use or other equivalent, as provided by copyright law.

You may make, run and propagate covered works that you do not convey, without conditions so long as your license otherwise remains in force. You may convey covered works to others for the sole purpose of having them make modifications exclusively for you, or provide you with facilities for running those works, provided that you comply with the terms of this License in conveying all material for which you do not control copyright. Those thus making or running the covered works for you must do so exclusively on your behalf, under your direction and control, on terms that prohibit them from making any copies of your copyrighted material outside their relationship with you.

Conveying under any other circumstances is permitted solely under the conditions stated below. Sublicensing is not allowed; section 10 makes it unnecessary. 3. Protecting Users' Legal Rights From Anti-Circumvention Law.

No covered work shall be deemed part of an effective technological measure under any applicable law fulfilling obligations under article 11 of the WIPO copyright treaty adopted on 20 December 1996, or similar laws prohibiting or restricting circumvention of such measures.

When you convey a covered work, you waive any legal power to forbid circumvention of technological measures to the extent such circumvention is effected by exercising rights under this License with respect to the covered work, and you disclaim any intention to limit operation or modification of the work as a means of enforcing, against the work's users, your or third parties' legal rights to forbid circumvention of technological measures. 4. Conveying Verbatim Copies.

You may convey verbatim copies of the Program's source code as you receive it, in any medium, provided that you conspicuously and appropriately publish on each copy an appropriate copyright notice; keep intact all notices stating that this License and any non-permissive terms added in accord with section 7 apply to the code; keep intact all notices of the absence of any warranty; and give all recipients a copy of this License along with the Program.

You may charge any price or no price for each copy that you convey, and you may offer support or warranty protection for a fee. 5. Conveying Modified Source Versions.

You may convey a work based on the Program, or the modifications to produce it from the Program, in the form of source code under the terms of section 4, provided that you also meet all of these conditions:

* a) The work must carry prominent notices stating that you modified it, and giving a relevant date. * b) The work must carry prominent notices stating that it is released under this License and any conditions added under section 7. This requirement modifies the requirement in section 4 to "keep intact all notices". * c) You must license the entire work, as a whole, under this License to anyone who comes into possession of a copy. This License will therefore apply, along with any applicable section 7 additional terms, to the whole of the work, and all its parts, regardless of how they are packaged. This License gives no permission to license the work in any other way, but it does not invalidate such permission if you have separately received it. * d) If the work has interactive user interfaces, each must display Appropriate Legal Notices; however, if the Program has interactive interfaces that do not display Appropriate Legal Notices, your work need not make them do so.

A compilation of a covered work with other separate and independent works, which are not by their nature extensions of the covered work, and which are not combined with it such as to form a larger program, in or on a volume of a storage or distribution medium, is called an "aggregate" if the compilation and its resulting copyright are not used to limit the access or legal rights of the compilation's users beyond what the individual works permit. Inclusion of a covered work in an aggregate does not cause this License to apply to the other parts of the aggregate. 6. Conveying Non-Source Forms.

You may convey a covered work in object code form under the terms of sections 4 and 5, provided that you also convey the machine-readable Corresponding Source under the terms of this License, in one of these ways:

* a) Convey the object code in, or embodied in, a physical product (including a physical distribution medium), accompanied by the Corresponding Source fixed on a durable physical medium customarily used for software interchange. * b) Convey the object code in, or embodied in, a physical product (including a physical distribution medium), accompanied by a written offer, valid for at least three years and valid for as long as you offer spare parts or customer support for that product model, to give anyone who possesses the object code either (1) a copy of the Corresponding Source for all the software in the product that is covered by this License, on a durable physical medium customarily used for software interchange, for a price no more than your reasonable cost of physically performing this conveying of source, or (2) access to copy the Corresponding Source from a network server at no charge. * c) Convey individual copies of the object code with a copy of the written offer to provide the Corresponding Source. This alternative is allowed only occasionally and noncommercially, and only if you received the object code with such an offer, in accord with subsection 6b. * d) Convey the object code by offering access from a designated place (gratis or for a charge), and offer equivalent access to the Corresponding Source in the same way through the same place at no further charge. You need not require recipients to copy the Corresponding Source along with the object code. If the place to copy the object code is a network server, the Corresponding Source may be on a different server (operated by you or a third party) that supports equivalent copying facilities, provided you maintain clear directions next to the object code saying where to find the Corresponding Source. Regardless of what server hosts the Corresponding Source, you remain obligated to ensure that it is available for as long as needed to satisfy these requirements. * e) Convey the object code using peer-to-peer transmission, provided you inform other peers where the object code and Corresponding Source of the work are being offered to the general public at no charge under subsection 6d.

A separable portion of the object code, whose source code is excluded from the Corresponding Source as a System Library, need not be included in conveying the object code work.

A "User Product" is either (1) a "consumer product", which means any tangible personal property which is normally used for personal, family, or household purposes, or (2) anything designed or sold for incorporation into a dwelling. In determining whether a product is a consumer product, doubtful cases shall be resolved in favor of coverage. For a particular product received by a particular user, "normally used" refers to a typical or common use of that class of product, regardless of the status of the particular user or of the way in which the particular user actually uses, or expects or is expected to use, the product. A product is a consumer product regardless of whether the product has substantial commercial, industrial or non-consumer uses, unless such uses represent the only significant mode of use of the product.

"Installation Information" for a User Product means any methods, procedures, authorization keys, or other information required to install and execute modified versions of a covered work in that User Product from a modified version of its Corresponding Source. The information must suffice to ensure that the continued functioning of the modified object code is in no case prevented or interfered with solely because modification has been made.

If you convey an object code work under this section in, or with, or specifically for use in, a User Product, and the conveying occurs as part of a transaction in which the right of possession and use of the User Product is transferred to the recipient in perpetuity or for a fixed term (regardless of how the transaction is characterized), the Corresponding Source conveyed under this section must be accompanied by the Installation Information. But this requirement does not apply if neither you nor any third party retains the ability to install modified object code on the User Product (for example, the work has been installed in ROM).

The requirement to provide Installation Information does not include a requirement to continue to provide support service, warranty, or updates for a work that has been modified or installed by the recipient, or for the User Product in which it has been modified or installed. Access to a network may be denied when the modification itself materially and adversely affects the operation of the network or violates the rules and protocols for communication across the network.

Corresponding Source conveyed, and Installation Information provided, in accord with this section must be in a format that is publicly documented (and with an implementation available to the public in source code form), and must require no special password or key for unpacking, reading or copying. 7. Additional Terms.

"Additional permissions" are terms that supplement the terms of this License by making exceptions from one or more of its conditions. Additional permissions that are applicable to the entire Program shall be treated as though they were included in this License, to the extent that they are valid under applicable law. If additional permissions apply only to part of the Program, that part may be used separately under those permissions, but the entire Program remains governed by this License without regard to the additional permissions.

When you convey a copy of a covered work, you may at your option remove any additional permissions from that copy, or from any part of it. (Additional permissions may be written to require their own removal in certain cases when you modify the work.) You may place additional permissions on material, added by you to a covered work, for which you have or can give appropriate copyright permission.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this License, for material you add to a covered work, you may (if authorized by the copyright holders of that material) supplement the terms of this License with terms:

* a) Disclaiming warranty or limiting liability differently from the terms of sections 15 and 16 of this License; or * b) Requiring preservation of specified reasonable legal notices or author attributions in that material or in the Appropriate Legal Notices displayed by works containing it; or * c) Prohibiting misrepresentation of the origin of that material, or requiring that modified versions of such material be marked in reasonable ways as different from the original version; or * d) Limiting the use for publicity purposes of names of licensors or authors of the material; or * e) Declining to grant rights under trademark law for use of some trade names, trademarks, or service marks; or * f) Requiring indemnification of licensors and authors of that material by anyone who conveys the material (or modified versions of it) with contractual assumptions of liability to the recipient, for any liability that these contractual assumptions directly impose on those licensors and authors.

All other non-permissive additional terms are considered "further restrictions" within the meaning of section 10. If the Program as you received it, or any part of it, contains a notice stating that it is governed by this License along with a term that is a further restriction, you may remove that term. If a license document contains a further restriction but permits relicensing or conveying under this License, you may add to a covered work material governed by the terms of that license document, provided that the further restriction does not survive such relicensing or conveying.

If you add terms to a covered work in accord with this section, you must place, in the relevant source files, a statement of the additional terms that apply to those files, or a notice indicating where to find the applicable terms.

Additional terms, permissive or non-permissive, may be stated in the form of a separately written license, or stated as exceptions; the above requirements apply either way. 8. Termination.

You may not propagate or modify a covered work except as expressly provided under this License. Any attempt otherwise to propagate or modify it is void, and will automatically terminate your rights under this License (including any patent licenses granted under the third paragraph of section 11).

However, if you cease all violation of this License, then your license from a particular copyright holder is reinstated (a) provisionally, unless and until the copyright holder explicitly and finally terminates your license, and (b) permanently, if the copyright holder fails to notify you of the violation by some reasonable means prior to 60 days after the cessation.

Moreover, your license from a particular copyright holder is reinstated permanently if the copyright holder notifies you of the violation by some reasonable means, this is the first time you have received notice of violation of this License (for any work)

from that copyright holder, and you cure the violation prior to 30 days after your receipt of the notice.

Termination of your rights under this section does not terminate the licenses of parties who have received copies or rights from you under this License. If your rights have been terminated and not permanently reinstated, you do not qualify to receive new licenses for the same material under section 10. 9. Acceptance Not Required for Having Copies.

You are not required to accept this License in order to receive or run a copy of the Program. Ancillary propagation of a covered work occurring solely as a consequence of using peer-to-peer transmission to receive a copy likewise does not require acceptance. However, nothing other than this License grants you permission to propagate or modify any covered work. These actions infringe copyright if you do not accept this License. Therefore, by modifying or propagating a covered work, you indicate your acceptance of this License to do so. 10. Automatic Licensing of Downstream Recipients.

Each time you convey a covered work, the recipient automatically receives a license from the original licensors, to run, modify and propagate that work, subject to this License. You are not responsible for enforcing compliance by third parties with this License.

An "entity transaction" is a transaction transferring control of an organization, or substantially all assets of one, or subdividing an organization, or merging organizations. If propagation of a covered work results from an entity transaction, each party to that transaction who receives a copy of the work also receives whatever licenses to the work the party's predecessor in interest had or could give under the previous paragraph, plus a right to possession of the Corresponding Source of the work from the predecessor in interest, if the predecessor has it or can get it with reasonable efforts.

You may not impose any further restrictions on the exercise of the rights granted or affirmed under this License. For example, you may not impose a license fee, royalty, or other charge for exercise of rights granted under this License, and you may not initiate litigation (including a cross-claim or counterclaim in a lawsuit) alleging that any patent claim is infringed by making, using, selling, offering for sale, or importing the Program or any portion of it. 11. Patents.

A "contributor" is a copyright holder who authorizes use under this License of the Program or a work on which the Program is based. The work thus licensed is called the contributor's "contributor version".

A contributor's "essential patent claims" are all patent claims owned or controlled by the contributor, whether already acquired or hereafter acquired, that would be infringed by some manner, permitted by this License, of making, using, or selling its contributor version, but do not include claims that would be infringed only as a consequence of further modification of the contributor version. For purposes of this definition, "control" includes the right to grant patent sublicenses in a manner consistent with the requirements of this License.

Each contributor grants you a non-exclusive, worldwide, royalty-free patent license under the contributor's essential patent claims, to make, use, sell, offer for sale, import and otherwise run, modify and propagate the contents of its contributor version.

In the following three paragraphs, a "patent license" is any express agreement or commitment, however denominated, not to enforce a patent (such as an express permission to practice a patent or covenant not to sue for patent infringement). To "grant" such a patent license to a party means to make such an agreement or commitment not to enforce a patent against the party.

If you convey a covered work, knowingly relying on a patent license, and the Corresponding Source of the work is not available for anyone to copy, free of charge and under the terms of this License, through a publicly available network server or other readily accessible means, then you must either (1) cause the Corresponding Source to be so available, or (2) arrange to deprive yourself of the benefit of the patent license for this particular work, or (3) arrange, in a manner consistent with the requirements of this License, to extend the patent license to downstream recipients. "Knowingly relying" means you have actual knowledge that, but for the patent license, your conveying the covered work in a country, or your recipient's use of the covered work in a country, would infringe one or more identifiable patents in that country that you have reason to believe are valid.

If, pursuant to or in connection with a single transaction or arrangement, you convey, or propagate by procuring conveyance of, a covered work, and grant a patent license to some of the parties receiving the covered work authorizing them to use, propagate, modify or convey a specific copy of the covered work, then the patent license you grant is automatically extended to all recipients of the covered work and works based on it.

A patent license is "discriminatory" if it does not include within the scope of its coverage, prohibits the exercise of, or is conditioned on the non-exercise of one or more of the rights that are specifically granted under this License. You may not convey a covered work if you are a party to an arrangement with a third party that is in the business of distributing software, under which you make payment to the third party based on the extent of your activity of conveying the work, and under which the third party grants, to any of the parties who would receive the covered work from you, a discriminatory patent license (a) in connection with copies of the covered work conveyed by you (or copies made from those copies), or (b) primarily for and in connection with specific products or compilations that contain the covered work, unless you entered into that arrangement, or that patent license was granted, prior to 28 March 2007.

Nothing in this License shall be construed as excluding or limiting any implied license or other defenses to infringement that may otherwise be available to you under applicable patent law. 12. No Surrender of Others' Freedom.

If conditions are imposed on you (whether by court order, agreement or otherwise) that contradict the conditions of this License, they do not excuse you from the conditions of this License. If you cannot convey a covered work so as to satisfy simultaneously your obligations under this License and any other pertinent obligations, then as a consequence you may not convey it at all. For example, if you agree to terms that obligate you to collect a royalty for further conveying from those to whom you convey the Program, the only way you could satisfy both those terms and this License would be to refrain entirely from conveying the Program. 13. Use with the GNU Affero General Public License.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this License, you have permission to link or combine any covered work with a work licensed under version 3 of the GNU Affero General Public License into a single combined work, and to convey the resulting work. The terms of this License will continue to apply to the part which is the covered work, but the special requirements of the GNU Affero General Public License, section 13, concerning interaction through a network will apply to the combination as such. 14. Revised Versions of this License.

The Free Software Foundation may publish revised and/or new versions of the GNU General Public License from time to time. Such new versions will be similar in spirit to the present version, but may differ in detail to address new problems or concerns.

Each version is given a distinguishing version number. If the Program specifies that a certain numbered version of the GNU General Public License "or any later version" applies to it, you have the option of following the terms and conditions either of that numbered version or of any later version published by the Free Software Foundation. If the Program does not specify a version number of the GNU General Public License, you may choose any version ever published by the Free Software Foundation.

If the Program specifies that a proxy can decide which future versions of the GNU General Public License can be used, that proxy's public statement of acceptance of a version permanently authorizes you to choose that version for the Program.

Later license versions may give you additional or different permissions. However, no additional obligations are imposed on any author or copyright holder as a result of your choosing to follow a later version. 15. Disclaimer of Warranty.

THERE IS NO WARRANTY FOR THE PROGRAM, TO THE EXTENT PERMITTED BY APPLICABLE LAW. EXCEPT WHEN OTHERWISE STATED IN WRITING THE COPYRIGHT HOLDERS AND/OR OTHER PARTIES PROVIDE THE PROGRAM "AS IS" WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND, EITHER EXPRESSED OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. THE ENTIRE RISK AS TO THE QUALITY AND PERFORMANCE OF THE PROGRAM IS WITH YOU. SHOULD THE PROGRAM PROVE DEFECTIVE, YOU ASSUME THE COST OF ALL NECESSARY SERVICING, REPAIR OR CORRECTION. 16. Limitation of Liability.

IN NO EVENT UNLESS REQUIRED BY APPLICABLE LAW OR AGREED TO IN WRITING WILL ANY COPYRIGHT HOLDER, OR ANY OTHER PARTY WHO MODIFIES AND/OR CONVEYS THE PROGRAM AS PERMITTED ABOVE, BE LIABLE TO YOU FOR DAMAGES, INCLUDING ANY GENERAL, SPECIAL, INCIDENTAL OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF THE USE OR INABILITY TO USE THE PROGRAM (INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO LOSS OF DATA OR DATA BEING RENDERED INACCURATE OR LOSSES SUSTAINED BY YOU OR THIRD PARTIES OR A FAILURE OF THE PROGRAM TO OPERATE WITH ANY OTHER PROGRAMS), EVEN IF SUCH HOLDER OR OTHER PARTY HAS BEEN ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGES. 17. Interpretation of Sections 15 and 16.

If the disclaimer of warranty and limitation of liability provided above cannot be given local legal ef-

fect according to their terms, reviewing courts shall apply local law that most closely approximates an absolute waiver of all civil liability in connection with the Program, unless a warranty or assumption of liability accompanies a copy of the Program in return for a fee.

END OF TERMS AND CONDITIONS How to Apply These Terms to Your New Programs

If you develop a new program, and you want it to be of the greatest possible use to the public, the best way to achieve this is to make it free software which everyone can redistribute and change under these terms.

To do so, attach the following notices to the program. It is safest to attach them to the start of each source file to most effectively state the exclusion of warranty; and each file should have at least the "copyright" line and a pointer to where the full notice is found.

<one line to give the program's name and a brief idea of what it does.> Copyright (C) <year> <name of author>

This program is free software: you can redistribute it and/or modify it under the terms of the GNU General Public License as published by the Free Software Foundation, either version 3 of the License, or (at your option) any later version.

This program is distributed in the hope that it will be useful, but WITHOUT ANY WARRANTY; without even the implied warranty of MERCHANTABILITY or FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. See the GNU General Public License for more details.

You should have received a copy of the GNU General Public License along with this program. If not, see <http://www.gnu.org/licenses/>.

Also add information on how to contact you by electronic and paper mail.

If the program does terminal interaction, make it output a short notice like this when it starts in an interactive mode:

<program> Copyright (C) <year> <name of author> This program comes with ABSOLUTELY NO WARRANTY; for details type 'show w'. This is free software, and you are welcome to redistribute it under certain conditions; type 'show c' for details.

The hypothetical commands 'show w' and 'show c' should show the appropriate parts of the General Public License. Of course, your program's commands might be different; for a GUI interface, you would use an "about box".

You should also get your employer (if you work as a programmer) or school, if any, to sign a "copyright disclaimer" for the program, if necessary. For more information on this, and how to apply and follow the GNU GPL, see <http://www.gnu.org/licenses/>.

The GNU General Public License does not permit incorporating your program into proprietary programs. If your program is a subroutine library, you may consider it more useful to permit linking proprietary applications with the library. If this is what you want to do, use the GNU Lesser General Public License instead of this License. But first, please read <http://www.gnu.org/philosophy/why-not-lgpl.html>.

13.2 GNU Free Documentation License

Version 1.3, 3 November 2008

Copyright © 2000, 2001, 2002, 2007, 2008 Free Software Foundation, Inc. <http://fsf.org/>

Everyone is permitted to copy and distribute verbatim copies of this license document, but changing it is not allowed. 0. PREAMBLE

The purpose of this License is to make a manual, textbook, or other functional and useful document "free" in the sense of freedom: to assure everyone the effective freedom to copy and redistribute it, with or without modifying it, either commercially or noncommercially. Secondarily, this License preserves for the author and publisher a way to get credit for their work, while not being considered responsible for modifications made by others.

This License is a kind of "copyleft", which means that derivative works of the document must themselves be free in the same sense. It complements the GNU General Public License, which is a copyleft license designed for free software.

We have designed this License in order to use it for manuals for free software, because free software needs free documentation: a free program should come with manuals providing the same freedoms that the software does. But this License is not limited to software manuals; it can be used for any textual work, regardless of subject matter or whether it is published as a printed book. We recommend this License principally for works whose purpose is instruction or reference. 1. APPLICABILITY AND DEFINITIONS

This License applies to any manual or other work, in any medium, that contains a notice placed by the copyright holder saying it can be distributed under the terms of this License. Such a notice grants a world-wide, royalty-free license, unlimited in duration, to use that work under the conditions stated herein. The "Document", below, refers to any such manual or work. Any member of the public is a licensee, and is addressed as "you". You accept the license if you copy, modify or distribute the work in a way requiring permission under copyright law.

A "Modified Version" of the Document means any work containing the Document or a portion of it, either copied verbatim, or with modifications and/or translated into another language.

A "Secondary Section" is a named appendix or a front-matter section of the Document that deals exclusively with the relationship of the publishers or

authors of the Document to the Document's overall subject (or to related matters) and contains nothing that could fall directly within that overall subject. (Thus, if the Document is in part a textbook of mathematics, a Secondary Section may not explain any mathematics.) The relationship could be a matter of historical connection with the subject or with related matters, or of legal, commercial, philosophical, ethical or political position regarding them.

The "Invariant Sections" are certain Secondary Sections whose titles are designated, as being those of Invariant Sections, in the notice that says that the Document is released under this License. If a section does not fit the above definition of Secondary then it is not allowed to be designated as Invariant. The Document may contain zero Invariant Sections. If the Document does not identify any Invariant Sections then there are none.

The "Cover Texts" are certain short passages of text that are listed, as Front-Cover Texts or Back-Cover Texts, in the notice that says that the Document is released under this License. A Front-Cover Text may be at most 5 words, and a Back-Cover Text may be at most 25 words.

A "Transparent" copy of the Document means a machine-readable copy, represented in a format whose specification is available to the general public, that is suitable for revising the document straightforwardly with generic text editors or (for images composed of pixels) generic paint programs or (for drawings) some widely available drawing editor, and that is suitable for input to text formatters or for automatic translation to a variety of formats suitable for input to text formatters. A copy made in an otherwise Transparent file format whose markup, or absence of markup, has been arranged to thwart or discourage subsequent modification by readers is not Transparent. An image format is not Transparent if used for any substantial amount of text. A copy that is not "Transparent" is called "Opaque".

Examples of suitable formats for Transparent copies include plain ASCII without markup, Texinfo input format, LaTeX input format, SGML or XML using a publicly available DTD, and standard-conforming simple HTML, PostScript or PDF designed for human modification. Examples of transparent image formats include PNG, XCF and JPG. Opaque formats include proprietary formats that can be read and edited only by proprietary word processors, SGML or XML for which the DTD and/or processing tools are not generally available, and the machine-generated HTML, PostScript or

PDF produced by some word processors for output purposes only.

The "Title Page" means, for a printed book, the title page itself, plus such following pages as are needed to hold, legibly, the material this License requires to appear in the title page. For works in formats which do not have any title page as such, "Title Page" means the text near the most prominent appearance of the work's title, preceding the beginning of the body of the text.

The "publisher" means any person or entity that distributes copies of the Document to the public.

A section "Entitled XYZ" means a named subunit of the Document whose title either is precisely XYZ or contains XYZ in parentheses following text that translates XYZ in another language. (Here XYZ stands for a specific section name mentioned below, such as "Acknowledgements", "Dedications", "Endorsements", or "History".) To "Preserve the Title" of such a section when you modify the Document means that it remains a section "Entitled XYZ" according to this definition.

The Document may include Warranty Disclaimers next to the notice which states that this License applies to the Document. These Warranty Disclaimers are considered to be included by reference in this License, but only as regards disclaiming warranties: any other implication that these Warranty Disclaimers may have is void and has no effect on the meaning of this License. 2. VERBATIM COPYING

You may copy and distribute the Document in any medium, either commercially or noncommercially, provided that this License, the copyright notices, and the license notice saying this License applies to the Document are reproduced in all copies, and that you add no other conditions whatsoever to those of this License. You may not use technical measures to obstruct or control the reading or further copying of the copies you make or distribute. However, you may accept compensation in exchange for copies. If you distribute a large enough number of copies you must also follow the conditions in section 3.

You may also lend copies, under the same conditions stated above, and you may publicly display copies. 3. COPYING IN QUANTITY

If you publish printed copies (or copies in media that commonly have printed covers) of the Document, numbering more than 100, and the Document's license notice requires Cover Texts, you

must enclose the copies in covers that carry, clearly and legibly, all these Cover Texts: Front-Cover Texts on the front cover, and Back-Cover Texts on the back cover. Both covers must also clearly and legibly identify you as the publisher of these copies. The front cover must present the full title with all words of the title equally prominent and visible. You may add other material on the covers in addition. Copying with changes limited to the covers, as long as they preserve the title of the Document and satisfy these conditions, can be treated as verbatim copying in other respects.

If the required texts for either cover are too voluminous to fit legibly, you should put the first ones listed (as many as fit reasonably) on the actual cover, and continue the rest onto adjacent pages.

If you publish or distribute Opaque copies of the Document numbering more than 100, you must either include a machine-readable Transparent copy along with each Opaque copy, or state in or with each Opaque copy a computer-network location from which the general network-using public has access to download using public-standard network protocols a complete Transparent copy of the Document, free of added material. If you use the latter option, you must take reasonably prudent steps, when you begin distribution of Opaque copies in quantity, to ensure that this Transparent copy will remain thus accessible at the stated location until at least one year after the last time you distribute an Opaque copy (directly or through your agents or retailers) of that edition to the public.

It is requested, but not required, that you contact the authors of the Document well before redistributing any large number of copies, to give them a chance to provide you with an updated version of the Document. 4. MODIFICATIONS

You may copy and distribute a Modified Version of the Document under the conditions of sections 2 and 3 above, provided that you release the Modified Version under precisely this License, with the Modified Version filling the role of the Document, thus licensing distribution and modification of the Modified Version to whoever possesses a copy of it. In addition, you must do these things in the Modified Version:

* A. Use in the Title Page (and on the covers, if any) a title distinct from that of the Document, and from those of previous versions (which should, if there were any, be listed in the History section of the Document). You may use the same title as a previous version if the original publisher of that version gives permission. * B. List on the Title

Page, as authors, one or more persons or entities responsible for authorship of the modifications in the Modified Version, together with at least five of the principal authors of the Document (all of its principal authors, if it has fewer than five), unless they release you from this requirement. * C. State on the Title page the name of the publisher of the Modified Version, as the publisher. * D. Preserve all the copyright notices of the Document. * E. Add an appropriate copyright notice for your modifications adjacent to the other copyright notices. * F. Include, immediately after the copyright notices, a license notice giving the public permission to use the Modified Version under the terms of this License, in the form shown in the Addendum below. * G. Preserve in that license notice the full lists of Invariant Sections and required Cover Texts given in the Document's license notice. * H. Include an unaltered copy of this License. * I. Preserve the section Entitled "History", Preserve its Title, and add to it an item stating at least the title, year, new authors, and publisher of the Modified Version as given on the Title Page. If there is no section Entitled "History" in the Document, create one stating the title, year, authors, and publisher of the Document as given on its Title Page, then add an item describing the Modified Version as stated in the previous sentence. * J. Preserve the network location, if any, given in the Document for public access to a Transparent copy of the Document, and likewise the network locations given in the Document for previous versions it was based on. These may be placed in the "History" section. You may omit a network location for a work that was published at least four years before the Document itself, or if the original publisher of the version it refers to gives permission. * K. For any section Entitled "Acknowledgements" or "Dedications", Preserve the Title of the section, and preserve in the section all the substance and tone of each of the contributor acknowledgements and/or dedications given therein. * L. Preserve all the Invariant Sections of the Document, unaltered in their text and in their titles. Section numbers or the equivalent are not considered part of the section titles. * M. Delete any section Entitled "Endorsements". Such a section may not be included in the Modified Version. * N. Do not retitle any existing section to be Entitled "Endorsements" or to conflict in title with any Invariant Section. * O. Preserve any Warranty Disclaimers.

If the Modified Version includes new front-matter sections or appendices that qualify as Secondary Sections and contain no material copied from the Document, you may at your option designate some or all of these sections as invariant. To do this, add their titles to the list of Invariant Sections in the Modified Version's license notice. These titles must be distinct from any other section titles.

You may add a section Entitled "Endorsements", provided it contains nothing but endorsements of your Modified Version by various parties—for example, statements of peer review or that the text has been approved by an organization as the authoritative definition of a standard.

You may add a passage of up to five words as a Front-Cover Text, and a passage of up to 25 words as a Back-Cover Text, to the end of the list of Cover Texts in the Modified Version. Only one passage of Front-Cover Text and one of Back-Cover Text may be added by (or through arrangements made by) any one entity. If the Document already includes a cover text for the same cover, previously added by you or by arrangement made by the same entity you are acting on behalf of, you may not add another; but you may replace the old one, on explicit permission from the previous publisher that added the old one.

The author(s) and publisher(s) of the Document do not by this License give permission to use their names for publicity for or to assert or imply endorsement of any Modified Version. 5. COMBINING DOCUMENTS

You may combine the Document with other documents released under this License, under the terms defined in section 4 above for modified versions, provided that you include in the combination all of the Invariant Sections of all of the original documents, unmodified, and list them all as Invariant Sections of your combined work in its license notice, and that you preserve all their Warranty Disclaimers.

The combined work need only contain one copy of this License, and multiple identical Invariant Sections may be replaced with a single copy. If there are multiple Invariant Sections with the same name but different contents, make the title of each such section unique by adding at the end of it, in parentheses, the name of the original author or publisher of that section if known, or else a unique number. Make the same adjustment to the section titles in the list of Invariant Sections in the license notice of the combined work.

In the combination, you must combine any sections Entitled "History" in the various original documents, forming one section Entitled "History"; likewise combine any sections Entitled "Acknowledgements", and any sections Entitled "Dedications". You must delete all sections Entitled "Endorsements". 6. COLLECTIONS OF DOCUMENTS

You may make a collection consisting of the Document and other documents released under this License, and replace the individual copies of this License in the various documents with a single copy that is included in the collection, provided that you follow the rules of this License for verbatim copying of each of the documents in all other respects.

You may extract a single document from such a collection, and distribute it individually under this License, provided you insert a copy of this License into the extracted document, and follow this License in all other respects regarding verbatim copying of that document. 7. AGGREGATION WITH INDEPENDENT WORKS

A compilation of the Document or its derivatives with other separate and independent documents or works, in or on a volume of a storage or distribution medium, is called an "aggregate" if the copyright resulting from the compilation is not used to limit the legal rights of the compilation's users beyond what the individual works permit. When the Document is included in an aggregate, this License does not apply to the other works in the aggregate which are not themselves derivative works of the Document.

If the Cover Text requirement of section 3 is applicable to these copies of the Document, then if the Document is less than one half of the entire aggregate, the Document's Cover Texts may be placed on covers that bracket the Document within the aggregate, or the electronic equivalent of covers if the Document is in electronic form. Otherwise they must appear on printed covers that bracket the whole aggregate. 8. TRANSLATION

Translation is considered a kind of modification, so you may distribute translations of the Document under the terms of section 4. Replacing Invariant Sections with translations requires special permission from their copyright holders, but you may include translations of some or all Invariant Sections in addition to the original versions of these Invariant Sections. You may include a translation of this License, and all the license notices in the Document, and any Warranty Disclaimers, provided that you also include the original English version of this License and the original versions of those notices and disclaimers. In case of a disagreement between the translation and the original version of this License or a notice or disclaimer, the original version will prevail.

If a section in the Document is Entitled "Acknowledgements", "Dedications", or "History", the requirement (section 4) to Preserve its Title (section 1) will typically require changing the actual title. 9. TERMINATION

You may not copy, modify, sublicense, or distribute the Document except as expressly provided under this License. Any attempt otherwise to copy, modify, sublicense, or distribute it is void, and will automatically terminate your rights under this License.

However, if you cease all violation of this License, then your license from a particular copyright holder is reinstated (a) provisionally, unless and until the copyright holder explicitly and finally terminates your license, and (b) permanently, if the copyright holder fails to notify you of the violation by some reasonable means prior to 60 days after the cessation.

Moreover, your license from a particular copyright holder is reinstated permanently if the copyright holder notifies you of the violation by some reasonable means, this is the first time you have received notice of violation of this License (for any work) from that copyright holder, and you cure the violation prior to 30 days after your receipt of the notice.

Termination of your rights under this section does not terminate the licenses of parties who have received copies or rights from you under this License. If your rights have been terminated and not permanently reinstated, receipt of a copy of some or all of the same material does not give you any rights to use it. 10. FUTURE REVISIONS OF THIS LICENSE

The Free Software Foundation may publish new, revised versions of the GNU Free Documentation License from time to time. Such new versions will be similar in spirit to the present version, but may differ in detail to address new problems or concerns. See http://www.gnu.org/copyleft/.

Each version of the License is given a distinguishing version number. If the Document specifies that a particular numbered version of this License "or any later version" applies to it, you have the option of following the terms and conditions either of that specified version or of any later version that has been published (not as a draft) by the Free Software Foundation. If the Document does not specify a version number of this License, you may choose any version ever published (not as a draft) by the Free Software Foundation. If the Document specifies that a proxy can decide which future versions of this License can be used, that proxy's public statement of acceptance of a version permanently authorizes you to choose that version for the Document. 11. RELICENSING

"Massive Multiauthor Collaboration Site" (or "MMC Site") means any World Wide Web server that publishes copyrightable works and also provides prominent facilities for anybody to edit those works. A public wiki that anybody can edit is an example of such a server. A "Massive Multiauthor Collaboration" (or "MMC") contained in the site means any set of copyrightable works thus published on the MMC site.

"CC-BY-SA" means the Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 license published by Creative Commons Corporation, a not-for-profit corporation with a principal place of business in San Francisco, California, as well as future copyleft versions of that license published by that same organization.

"Incorporate" means to publish or republish a Document, in whole or in part, as part of another Document.

An MMC is "eligible for relicensing" if it is licensed under this License, and if all works that were first published under this License somewhere other than this MMC, and subsequently incorporated in whole or in part into the MMC, (1) had no cover texts or invariant sections, and (2) were thus incorporated prior to November 1, 2008.

The operator of an MMC Site may republish an MMC contained in the site under CC-BY-SA on the same site at any time before August 1, 2009, provided the MMC is eligible for relicensing. ADDENDUM: How to use this License for your documents

To use this License in a document you have written, include a copy of the License in the document and put the following copyright and license notices just after the title page:

Copyright (C) YEAR YOUR NAME. Permission is granted to copy, distribute and/or modify this document under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License, Version 1.3 or any later version published by the Free Software Foundation; with no Invariant Sections, no Front-Cover Texts, and no Back-Cover Texts. A copy of the license is included in the section entitled "GNU Free Documentation License".

If you have Invariant Sections, Front-Cover Texts and Back-Cover Texts, replace the "with ... Texts." line with this:

with the Invariant Sections being LIST THEIR TITLES, with the Front-Cover Texts being LIST, and with the Back-Cover Texts being LIST.

If you have Invariant Sections without Cover Texts, or some other combination of the three, merge those two alternatives to suit the situation.

If your document contains nontrivial examples of program code, we recommend releasing these examples in parallel under your choice of free software license, such as the GNU General Public License, to permit their use in free software.

13.3 GNU Lesser General Public License

This version of the GNU Lesser General Public License incorporates the terms and conditions of version 3 of the GNU General Public License, supplemented by the additional permissions listed below. 0. Additional Definitions.

As used herein, "this License" refers to version 3 of the GNU Lesser General Public License, and the "GNU GPL" refers to version 3 of the GNU General Public License.

"The Library" refers to a covered work governed by this License, other than an Application or a Combined Work as defined below.

An "Application" is any work that makes use of an interface provided by the Library, but which is not otherwise based on the Library. Defining a subclass of a class defined by the Library is deemed a mode of using an interface provided by the Library.

A "Combined Work" is a work produced by combining or linking an Application with the Library. The particular version of the Library with which the Combined Work was made is also called the "Linked Version".

The "Minimal Corresponding Source" for a Combined Work means the Corresponding Source for the Combined Work, excluding any source code for portions of the Combined Work that, considered in isolation, are based on the Application, and not on the Linked Version.

The "Corresponding Application Code" for a Combined Work means the object code and/or source code for the Application, including any data and utility programs needed for reproducing the Combined Work from the Application, but excluding the System Libraries of the Combined Work. 1. Exception to Section 3 of the GNU GPL.

You may convey a covered work under sections 3 and 4 of this License without being bound by section 3 of the GNU GPL. 2. Conveying Modified Versions.

If you modify a copy of the Library, and, in your modifications, a facility refers to a function or data to be supplied by an Application that uses the facility (other than as an argument passed when the facility is invoked), then you may convey a copy of the modified version:

* a) under this License, provided that you make a good faith effort to ensure that, in the event an Application does not supply the function or data, the facility still operates, and performs whatever part of its purpose remains meaningful, or * b) under the GNU GPL, with none of the additional permissions of this License applicable to that copy.

3. Object Code Incorporating Material from Library Header Files.

The object code form of an Application may incorporate material from a header file that is part of the Library. You may convey such object code under terms of your choice, provided that, if the incorporated material is not limited to numerical parameters, data structure layouts and accessors, or small macros, inline functions and templates (ten or fewer lines in length), you do both of the following:

* a) Give prominent notice with each copy of the object code that the Library is used in it and that the Library and its use are covered by this License. * b) Accompany the object code with a copy of the GNU GPL and this license document.

4. Combined Works.

You may convey a Combined Work under terms of your choice that, taken together, effectively do not restrict modification of the portions of the Library contained in the Combined Work and reverse engineering for debugging such modifications, if you also do each of the following:

* a) Give prominent notice with each copy of the Combined Work that the Library is used in it and that the Library and its use are covered by this License. * b) Accompany the Combined Work with a copy of the GNU GPL and this license document. * c) For a Combined Work that displays copyright notices during execution, include the copyright notice for the Library among these notices, as well as a reference directing the user to the copies of the GNU GPL and this license document. * d) Do one of the following: o 0) Convey the Minimal Corresponding Source under the terms of this License, and the Corresponding Application Code in a form suitable for, and under terms that permit, the user to recombine or relink the Application with a modified version of the Linked Version to produce a modified Combined Work, in the manner specified by section 6 of the GNU GPL for conveying Corresponding Source. o 1) Use a suitable shared library mechanism for linking with the Library. A suitable mechanism is one that (a) uses at run time a copy of the Library already present on the user's computer system, and (b) will operate properly with a modified version of the Library that is interface-compatible with the Linked Version. * e) Provide Installation Information, but only if you would otherwise be required to provide such information under section 6 of the GNU GPL, and only to the extent that such information is necessary to install and execute a modified version of the Combined Work produced by recombining or relinking the Application with a modified version of the Linked Version. (If you use option 4d0, the Installation Information must accompany the Minimal Corresponding Source and Corresponding Application Code. If you use option 4d1, you must provide the Installation Information in the manner specified by section 6 of the GNU GPL for conveying Corresponding Source.)

5. Combined Libraries.

You may place library facilities that are a work based on the Library side by side in a single library together with other library facilities that are not Applications and are not covered by this License, and convey such a combined library under terms of your choice, if you do both of the following:

* a) Accompany the combined library with a copy of the same work based on the Library, uncombined with any other library facilities, conveyed under the terms of this License. * b) Give prominent notice with the combined library that part of it is a work based on the Library, and explaining where to find the accompanying uncombined form of the same work.

6. Revised Versions of the GNU Lesser General Public License.

The Free Software Foundation may publish revised and/or new versions of the GNU Lesser General Public License from time to time. Such new versions will be similar in spirit to the present version, but may differ in detail to address new problems or concerns.

Each version is given a distinguishing version number. If the Library as you received it specifies that a certain numbered version of the GNU Lesser General Public License "or any later version" applies to it, you have the option of following the terms and conditions either of that published version or of any later version published by the Free Software Foundation. If the Library as you received it does not specify a version number of the GNU Lesser General Public License, you may choose any version of the GNU Lesser General Public License ever published by the Free Software Foundation.

If the Library as you received it specifies that a proxy can decide whether future versions of the GNU Lesser General Public License shall apply, that proxy's public statement of acceptance of any version is permanent authorization for you to choose that version for the Library.