

LENS Licence

9 messages

Daniel Chen <dcheny@gmail.com>

Sat, Jul 15, 2017 at 1:32 PM

To: pdplab-support@stanford.edu, plaut@cmu.edu, dr+lens@cs.cmu.edu

Hi everyone:

I'm currently working with Mark Orr at Virginia Tech and we're using LENS for individual agents in an agent-based model. I'm trying to package up LENS 2.63 so it's easier to install for everyone.

I've already created a docker image [1] for the program, and I'm in the middle of submitting a pre-built package to condaforge [2].

However, for me to submit the package to conda-forge, I need to specify the license of the program.

Is there a particular Licence I can list in the metadata?

ideally, it's one that is listed here: https://choosealicense.com/licenses/

- Dan

[1]: https://github.com/chendaniely/lens/tree/a490bf7f3ca7c149cbe93bf890568cc0071a03eb

[2]: https://conda-forge.org/

Mail Delivery Subsystem <mailer-daemon@googlemail.com> To: dcheny@gmail.com

Sat, Jul 15, 2017 at 1:33 PM



Message not delivered

There was a problem delivering your message to **dr+lens@cs.cmu.edu**. See the technical details below, or try resending in a few minutes.

The response from the remote server was:

550 5.1.1 <dr+lens@cs.cmu.edu>... Domain of dr+lens@cs.cmu.edu is local, but I can not find anyone with that email address

Final-Recipient: rfc822; dr+lens@cs.cmu.edu

Action: failed Status: 5.1.1

Remote-MTA: dns; mx-lb-03.srv.cs.cmu.edu. (128.2.217.14, the server for the

domain cs.cmu.edu.)

Diagnostic-Code: smtp; 550 5.1.1 <dr+lens@cs.cmu.edu>... Domain of dr+lens@cs.cmu.edu is local, but I can not find

anyone with that email address

Last-Attempt-Date: Sat, 15 Jul 2017 10:33:24 -0700 (PDT)

------ Forwarded message ------From: Daniel Chen <dcheny@gmail.com>

To: pdplab-support@stanford.edu, plaut@cmu.edu, dr+lens@cs.cmu.edu

Cc: Bcc:

Date: Sat, 15 Jul 2017 12:32:26 -0500

Subject: LENS Licence

Hi everyone:

I'm currently working with Mark Orr at Virginia Tech and we're using LENS for individual agents in an agent-based model. I'm trying to package up LENS 2.63 so it's easier to install for everyone.

I've already created a docker image [1] for the program, and I'm in the middle of submitting a pre-built package to condaforge [2].

However, for me to submit the package to conda-forge, I need to specify the license of the program.

Is there a particular Licence I can list in the metadata?

ideally, it's one that is listed here: https://choosealicense.com/licenses/

- Dan

[1]: https://github.com/chendaniely/lens/tree/a490bf7f3ca7c149cbe93bf890568cc0071a03eb

[2]: https://conda-forge.org/

Jay McClelland <jlmcc@stanford.edu>
To: Daniel Chen <dcheny@gmail.com>

Sat, Jul 15, 2017 at 1:59 PM

I applaud your effort! I can't really figure out which license would be more approapriate – I believe as it is we were thinking of the GPL about 10 years ago when I had active involvement with Lens. The numerosity of similar licenses seems to have metastasized – which one would you prefer?

From: Daniel Chen [mailto:dcheny@gmail.com] Sent: Saturday, July 15, 2017 10:32 AM

To: pdplab-support@stanford.edu; plaut@cmu.edu; dr+lens@cs.cmu.edu

Subject: LENS Licence

[Quoted text hidden]

Daniel Chen <dcheny@gmail.com>

To: Jay McClelland <ilmcc@stanford.edu>

Sat, Jul 15, 2017 at 3:14 PM

So I'm at SciPy right now, and I would've suggested MIT (since I'm not a lawyer). But, the general consensus here is to use BSD 3-Clause: https://opensource.org/licenses/BSD-3-Clause

I'm just not sure what I would put in for the year and copyright holder. Would it be Douglas Rohde?

The package I'm creating is also a version behind since that was the only thing I got working with the help of David Plaut [Quoted text hidden]

Jay McClelland <ilmcc@stanford.edu>

Sat, Jul 15, 2017 at 3:18 PM

To: Daniel Chen <dcheny@gmail.com>, "plaut@cmu.edu" <plaut@cmu.edu>

Doug Rohde should be the copyright holder, in my view, but let's see what Dave has to say!

From: Daniel Chen [mailto:dcheny@gmail.com]

Sent: Saturday, July 15, 2017 12:15 PM **To:** Jay McClelland <ia href="mailto:limbc@stanford.edu">jlmcc@stanford.edu

Subject: Re: LENS Licence

[Quoted text hidden]

David Plaut <plaut@cmu.edu>

Sat, Jul 15, 2017 at 4:37 PM

To: Jay McClelland <jlmcc@stanford.edu>, Daniel Chen <dcheny@gmail.com>

I agree (not that I think he cares at this point).

On 07/15/2017 03:18 PM, Jay McClelland wrote:

Doug Rohde should be the copyright holder, in my view, but let's see what Dave has to say!

David Plaut <plaut@cmu.edu> www.cnbc.cmu.edu/~plaut +1-412-268-5145 -2798 fax
Professor, Dept of Psychology, Carnegie Mellon Univ. Pittsburgh PA 15213-3890
Doubt is not a pleasant condition but certainty is an absurd one. --Voltaire

Daniel Chen <dcheny@gmail.com>

Thu, Jul 20, 2017 at 12:22 PM

To: David Plaut <plaut@cmu.edu>

Cc: Jay McClelland <ilmcc@stanford.edu>

Just to clarify I'll be using the GPLv3 License and Dough Rohde as the copyright holder.

Can I also use this email thread as a reference?

I'll send you guys a link when everything is up and running.

[Quoted text hidden]

Jay McClelland <ilmcc@stanford.edu>

Thu, Jul 20, 2017 at 1:14 PM

To: Daniel Chen <dcheny@gmail.com>, David Plaut <plaut@cmu.edu>

Fine with me!

Jay McClelland From my cell phone

----- Original message -----

From: Daniel Chen <dcheny@gmail.com>
Date: 7/20/17 6:23 PM (GMT+01:00)
To: David Plaut <plaut@cmu.edu>
Cc: Jay McClelland <jlmcc@stanford.edu>

Subject: Re: LENS Licence

Just to clarify I'll be using the GPLv3 License and Dough Rohde as the copyright holder.

Can I also use this email thread as a reference?

I'll send you guys a link when everything is up and running.

On Sat, Jul 15, 2017 at 3:37 PM, David Plaut <plaut@cmu.edu> wrote:

me too. d [Quoted text hidden]	
David Plaut <plaut@cmu.edu> To: Jay McClelland <jlmcc@stanford.edu>, Daniel Chen <dcheny@gmail.com></dcheny@gmail.com></jlmcc@stanford.edu></plaut@cmu.edu>	Thu, Jul 20, 2017 at 1:23 PM
David Plaut <plaut@cmu.edu> www.cnbc.cmu.edu/~plaut +1-412-268-5145 -2798 Professor, Dept of Psychology, Carnegie Mellon Univ. Pittsburgh PA 1527 Doubt is not a pleasant condition but certainty is an absurd oneVo</plaut@cmu.edu>	13-3890
Doug Rohde should be the copyright holder, in my view, but let's see what Dave h	as to say!
I agree (not that I think he cares at this point). d On 07/15/2017 03:18 PM, Jay McClelland wrote:	

=-----

[Quoted text hidden]