Notes on license discussions

Dear author,

Thank you very much for willingness to contribute your code for our comparative exercise. We are very excited and hope to be able to include as many approaches as feasible. For your information I attach a brief description of the setup. In short, we would like to standardize the input and the output of all codes, apply them to different data sets and then share and compare across banking markets.

Looking ahead we are anticipating that other researchers will want to use these codes and apply them to their data as well. We could refer each of these requests to the individual authors but this could prove to be a logistical burden which we would rather not take on. A more efficient approach, we feel, would be to distribute the codes in a package.

In the explanation included in the package we will prominently the following:

Your use of any software included in this package is subject to the terms of any licence or agreement provided with the software. Some of these agreements incorporate the terms of the GPL or other open source licences. Please read these licences and agreements before installing and using the software; by installing and using the software, you will have accepted the terms of the licences and agreements.

Then, within the section for your code, we can include any license you seem fit. As default we propose Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY).

We don’t want to be overly legalistic about this but feel that it will be more efficient in the long run. If you have questions, suggestions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Kind regards,

Iman & Dilyara (on behalf of all RTF LST colleagues involved)

**Information on licenses**

We are not experts regarding licenses (caveat emptor) but as far as we are aware there exists two main possibilities:

* common license for different types of work **Creative Commons**

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Creative_Commons>

<http://creativecommons.org/>

* one of the most used licenses for software, **GNU GPL (General Public License)**

<http://www.gnu.org/licenses/gpl-3.0.en.html>

GNU GPL imposes copy-left, however it allows for commercial use.

Usually, it is advised to use special licenses for software (GNU GPL or any other), because of some detailed programming features included in the license text. Though, taking into account that the codes are pretty simple, we can easily propose to authors to use Creative Common license. And it has several attributions, so it is much flexible.

Creative Commons licenses consist of four major condition modules: Attribution (BY), requiring attribution to the original author; Share Alike (SA), allowing derivative works under the same or a similar license (later or jurisdiction version); Non-Commercial (NC), requiring the work is not used for commercial purposes; and No Derivative Works (ND), allowing only the original work, without derivatives These modules are combined to currently form six major licenses of the Creative Commons:

* Attribution (CC BY)
* Attribution Share Alike (CC BY-SA)
* Attribution No Derivatives (CC BY-ND)
* Attribution Non-Commercial (CC BY-NC)
* Attribution Non-Commercial Share Alike (CC BY-NC-SA)
* Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives (CC BY-NC-ND)

# Dilyara’s start

Dear Iman,

Concerning the license, several possibilities are available depending on the author’s preferences.

First of all, it is possible to have each code with its own license, the authors may choose themselves the license they want. And we can write something similar on the site with the codes (copied from Ubuntu site)

“Your use of any software obtained from this site is subject to the terms of any licence or agreement provided with the software. Some of these agreements incorporate the terms of the GPL or other open source licences. Please read these licences and agreements before installing and using the software; by installing and using the software, you will have accepted the terms of the licences and agreements.”

Then several decisions need to be made, such as if the non-commercial use should be explicitly forbidden and if the codes and derivatives of the initial codes should always be under the same license requirements (so called copy-left).

Two main possibilities exist:

* common license for different types of work **Creative Commons**

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Creative_Commons>

<http://creativecommons.org/>

* one of the most used licenses for software, **GNU GPL (General Public License)**

<http://www.gnu.org/licenses/gpl-3.0.en.html>

GNU GPL imposes copy-left, however it allows for commercial use.

Usually, it is advised to use special licenses for software (GNU GPL or any other), because of some detailed programming features included in the license text. Though, taking into account that the codes are pretty simple, we can easily propose to authors to use Creative Common license. And it has several attributions, so it is much flexible.

Creative Commons licenses consist of four major condition modules: Attribution (BY), requiring attribution to the original author; Share Alike (SA), allowing [derivative](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Derivative_work) works under the same or a similar license (later or jurisdiction version); Non-Commercial (NC), requiring the work is not used for commercial purposes; and No Derivative Works (ND), allowing only the original work, without derivatives.[[22]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Creative_Commons#cite_note-CCLicenses1-22) These modules are combined to currently form six major licenses of the Creative Commons:[[22]](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Creative_Commons#cite_note-CCLicenses1-22)

* Attribution (CC BY)
* Attribution Share Alike (CC BY-SA)
* Attribution No Derivatives (CC BY-ND)
* Attribution Non-Commercial (CC BY-NC)
* Attribution Non-Commercial Share Alike (CC BY-NC-SA)
* Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives (CC BY-NC-ND)

Hope it is clear enough, but if you have any questions, please don’t hesitate.

We should give the choice to the authors, but I’m just afraid they are not very much aware of all these possibilities.

Best,

Dilyara