**­­­­PRACTICAL NO.2**

**DETAIL REPORT ON 3 DIFFERENT OPEN SOURCE LICENSES**

**1.GPL**

a) HISTORY OF LICENSE:- 1)The GPL was written by Richard Stallman in 1989, for use with programs released as part of the GNU project. The original GPL was based on a unification of similar licenses used for early versions of [GNU Emacs](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU_Emacs) (1985), the [GNU Debugger](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU_Debugger) and the [GNU C Compiler](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU_Compiler_Collection).

2) Version 1 of the GNU GPL,] released on 25 February 1989. second version of the license, version 2, was released in 1991.

3) In late 2005, the [Free Software Foundation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Free_Software_Foundation) (FSF) announced work on version 3 of the GPL (GPLv3). On 16 January 2006, the first "discussion draft" of GPLv3 was published, and the public consultation began.

4) The official GPLv3 was released by FSF on 29 June 2007. GPLv3 was written by Richard Stallman, with legal counsel from [Eben Moglen](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eben_Moglen) and [Richard Fontana](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_Fontana) from the [Software Freedom Law Center](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Software_Freedom_Law_Center).

b)IDEA:-1) Software under the GPL may be run for all purposes, including commercial purposes and even as a tool for creating [proprietary software](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Proprietary_software), for example when using GPL-licensed [compilers](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Compiler).

2) Users or companies who distribute GPL-licensed works (e.g. software), may charge a fee for copies or give them free of charge. This distinguishes the GPL from [shareware](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shareware) software licenses that allow copying for personal use but prohibit commercial distribution, or proprietary licenses where copying is prohibited by [copyright law](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copyright_law).

C)WHAT PROBLEMS DOES IT SOLVE :- 1)Code licensed under. LGPL is permitted to be linked with any other code no matter what license that code has. though the LGPL does add additional requirements for the combined work. LGPLv3 and GPLv2-only can thus commonly not be linked, as the combined Code work would add additional LGPLv3 requirements on top of the GPLv2-only licensed software. Code licensed under LGPLv2.x without the "any later version" statement can be [relicensed](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Software_relicensing) if the whole combined work is licensed to GPLv2 or GPLv3.

2) A number of businesses use [multi-licensing](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multi-licensing) to distribute a GPL version and sell a [proprietary](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Proprietary_software) license to companies wishing to combine the package with proprietary code, using dynamic linking or not.

d)DETAILED LICENSING MODEL:-1) Code licensed under several other licenses can be combined with a program under the GPL without conflict, as long as the combination of restrictions on the work as a whole does not put any additional restrictions beyond what GPL allows.

2) As a specific example of license incompatibility, [Sun Microsystems](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sun_Microsystems)' [ZFS](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ZFS) cannot be included in the GPL-licensed Linux kernel, because it is licensed under the GPL-incompatible [Common Development and Distribution License](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Common_Development_and_Distribution_License). Furthermore, ZFS is protected by patents, so distributing an independently developed GPL-ed implementation would still require Oracle's permission.

e)WHICH POPULAR SOFTWARE ARE RELEASED UNDER THIS LICENSE:-1)**September 02, 2017** [coreutils-8.28 released [stable]](http://lists.gnu.org/archive/html/info-gnu/2017-09/msg00001.html), *Pádraig Brady*, 00:50,[IceCat 52.3.0 release](http://lists.gnu.org/archive/html/info-gnu/2017-09/msg00000.html), *Ruben Rodriguez*, 00:50 2) **August 09, 2017**,[GnuPG 2.1.23 released](http://lists.gnu.org/archive/html/info-gnu/2017-08/msg00001.html), *Werner Koch*, 12:13 3) **August 14, 2017** ,[GCC 7.2 Released](http://lists.gnu.org/archive/html/info-gnu/2017-08/msg00004.html), *Richard Biener*, 09:10,[GNU Guile-CV 0.1.6 released](http://lists.gnu.org/archive/html/info-gnu/2017-08/msg00003.html), *David Pirotte*, 09:10 4) **August 27, 2017,**[pspp-1.0.1 released [stable]](http://lists.gnu.org/archive/html/info-gnu/2017-08/msg00011.html), *Ben Pfaff*, 21:24 ,[[ANNOUNCE] nano-2.8.7 is released](http://lists.gnu.org/archive/html/info-gnu/2017-08/msg00010.html), *Benno Schulenberg*, 09:21 5) A**ugust 24, 2017** ,[ANN: LaternaMagica 0.5](http://lists.gnu.org/archive/html/info-gnu/2017-08/msg00009.html), *Riccardo Mottola*, 09:21,[datamash-1.2 released [stable]](http://lists.gnu.org/archive/html/info-gnu/2017-08/msg00008.html), *Assaf Gordon*, 03:00

f)ANY POPULAR NEWS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS LICENSE:-1) It is possible to use the GPL for text documents instead of computer programs, or more generally for all kinds of media, if it is clear what constitutes the source code (defined as "the preferred form of the work for making changes in it").

2) Nevertheless, the [Debian](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Debian) developers recommended (in a resolution adopted in 2006) to license documentation for their project under the GPL, because of the incompatibility of the GFDL with the GPL (text licensed under the GFDL cannot be incorporated into GPL software).

3) A 1997 survey of [MetaLab](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ibiblio), then the largest free software archive, showed that the GPL accounted for about half of the software licensed therein. Similarly, a 2000 survey of [Red Hat Linux](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Red_Hat_Linux) 7.1 found that 53% of the source code was licensed under the GPL.

4) In August 2013, according to Black Duck Software, the website's data shows that the GPL license family is used by 54% of open-source projects.

g)POPULARITY:-1) Many corporations use GPL covered works to build their products. The successful adoption of GPLv3 will help limit DRM to those products built with proprietary software. Those products will be less attractive to consumers, more expensive, and less useful.2) After the release of the GPLv3 in June 2007, adoption of this new GPL version was much discussed[[119]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU_General_Public_License#cite_note-119) and some projects decided against upgrading. For instance the [Linux kernel](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linux_kernel), [MySQL](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MySQL),[]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GNU_General_Public_License#cite_note-120)[BusyBox](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/BusyBox), [AdvFS](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AdvFS), [Blender](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Blender_%28software%29), and [VLC media player](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/VLC_media_player) decided against adopting GPLv3. In 2011, four years after the release of the GPLv3, 6.5% of all open-source license projects are GPLv3 while 42.5% are GPLv2 according to Black Duck Software data.

h)IMPACT:-1) First, many very common UNIX applications, such as GNU Emacs, have been released under the GPL, and are used by countless numbers of users every day.

2) Second, the open source software movement has taken several ideas promoted by the GPL and modified them slightly. The most important is the idea that software licensing should include access to source code. As we move into a more complex era of computing, this issue becomes important for multiple reasons Like :-A)Stability and longevity.

**B)Security:-**By being able to review the source code, you can be certain that a mission-critical application is secure and doesn't contain any backdoors or other potentially devastating security flaws.