CYBR2100 Reflection – Week 3

What I Learned

This week I learned how different open-source licenses set obligations that can really change how code is used. The **MIT license** is very permissive and basically says you can do almost anything with the code as long as you include the copyright and license text. That simplicity makes it popular for small projects or teaching, but it does not give clear patent protections. The **Apache 2.0 license** is also permissive, but it adds more structure: you must include a NOTICE file, mark changes, and it gives an explicit patent grant. That extra protection is why it is often a better choice for businesses. The **GPL license** is completely different because of its strong copyleft. If you distribute software with GPL code in it, you must also make your source code available under GPL. That creates a “share-alike” effect that keeps software open but can be difficult for companies who want to keep their code proprietary. The *Ethics in Technology* book emphasized how these licenses connect to intellectual property rights and fairness, and the *Choose a License* site showed how to quickly compare which license is best depending on goals.

How I’ll Apply It

For a small internal tool, I would choose the MIT license.

- It has almost no restrictions, so if the tool ever gets shared outside the company, it won’t create unexpected obligations.
- It’s highly compatible with other licenses, which makes it easy to combine with other code.
- The only requirement is attribution, which is straightforward to include.

Muddiest Point

I am still unclear on how dual licensing actually works in practice. I understand that a copyright holder can offer the same code under both a copyleft license like GPL and a commercial license, but I’m not sure how that plays out for companies that want to use the code. Does the company have to pick one license and stick with it, or can parts of their use fall under one

license while others fall under another? I also wonder how enforcement works if someone violates one side of the dual license agreement.

Portfolio Note

- I will add my MIT license choice for the internal tool and explain why it fits, to show I can compare license options and pick the right one.
- I will publish my initial vulnerability disclosure template as evidence that I can follow responsible disclosure practices.
- These matter because avoiding licensing pitfalls and handling security findings responsibly are essential skills for any security professional.

AI Use Note

I used ChatGPT as a structured writing partner. I provided the assignment instructions and lecture notes, then answered step-by-step questions to build each section. I rewrote the drafts in my own words so the final reflection reflects my understanding and writing style.