Elements Of Free And Open Source Licenses: Features That Define Strategy

CAN:
Use/reproduce: Ability to use, copy / reproduce the work freely in unlimited quantities
Distribute: Ability to distribute the work to third parties freely, in unlimited quantities
Modify/merge: Ability to modify / combine the work with others and create derivatives
Sublicense: Ability to license the work, including possible modifications (without changing the license if it is copyleft or share alike)
Commercial use: Ability to make use of the work for commercial purpose or to license it for a fee
Use patents: Rights to practice patent claims of the software owner and of the contributors to the code, in so far these rights are necessary to make full use of the software
Place warranty: Ability to place additional warranty, services or rights on the software licensed (without holding the software owner and other contributors liable for it)

MUST:
Incl. Copyright: Describes whether the original copyright and attribution marks must be retained
Royalty free: In case a fee (i.e. contribution, lump sum) is requested from recipients, it cannot be royalties (depending on the use)
State changes: Source code modifications (author, why, beginning, end) must be documented
Disclose source: The source code must be publicly available
Copyleft/Share alike: In case of (re-) distribution of the work or its derivatives, the same license must be used/granted: no re-licensing.
Lesser copyleft: While the work itself is copyleft, derivatives produced by the normal use of the work are not and could be covered by any other license
SaaS/network: Distribution includes providing access to the work (to its functionalities) through a network, online, from the cloud, as a service
Include license: Include the full text of the license in the modified software.
Rename modified: Obligation to rename the work in case a modified/derivative version is distributed

CANNOT:
Hold liable: No recipient may charge the software owner or contributors for direct or indirect damages. This is a frequent clause in open licenses
Use trademark: No allowance of using the original licensor or contributors' names, trademarks or logos (i.e. for advertisement, promotion)
Commerce: No allowance of making use of the work for commercial purpose or to license it for a fee. This makes the license "non open source"
Modify: The software or work (i.e. the text of a regulation, of a court decision) is licensed "as is" and (re-) distributions cannot be modified. For software, this makes the license "non open source"
Ethical clauses: The use of the work is restricted based on matter/ethical conditions (i.e. not for nuclear industry, weapons, genetic etc.). This makes the license "non open source"
Pub sector only: The use of the work is restricted to a specific category of users, i.e. public sector. This makes the license "non open source"
Sublicense: Recipient re-distributing the work are not "licensors", even when users that receives the software automatically has the right to copy, modify and distribute the work.

COMPATIBLE:
None N/A: The license does not authorize reusing or merging the covered work in another work
Permissive: The license authorizes reusing or merging the covered code in software covered any other license (free/libre or proprietary)
GPL: The license authorizes reusing or merging the covered code in software covered by the GNU/GPL
Other copyleft: The license is interoperable with other copyleft licenses and authorizes reusing or merging the covered code in software covered by these other copyleft licenses
Linking freedom: "Linking for interoperability" with other software has no impact on the licensing condition of the other software
Multilingual: The license has a working value and is "original"; .in several languages (i.e. English, French, German, Italian, Spanish etc.)
For data: The license was designed or is also convenient for the distribution of data (i.e. it covers "the copyrighted work" in general)
For software: The license was designed for the distribution of software

LAW:

EU/MS law: The license states explicitly that the law of EU/or of a Member State is applicable (i.e. the Member State of the Licensor)

US law: The license states explicitly that the law of the United States of America is applicable (i.e. some US State)

Licensor's law: The license states explicitly that the applicable law is the one of the licensor's state

Other law: The license states explicitly that the law of a specific state (other than EU or US) is applicable

Not fixed/local: The license does not explicitly determine the applicable law

Venue fixed: The license fixes the competent court in case of litigation, with possible exceptions / agreements

SUPPORT:

Strong Community: The license is supported by a solid community: license steward has a web site / has a legal support addressing questions / publish FAQs or cases

Governments/EU: The license is supported by a government, an international organization, the European Union or important public agencies (i.e. NASA, CERN etc.)

OSI approved: The license is approved by the Open Source Initiative, as compliant with the Open Source Definition (OSD)

FSF Free/Libre: The license is considered as Free/Libre by the Free Software Foundation

---

1.	**AFL-3.0**

Academic Free License v3.0

https://opensource.org/licenses/AFL-3.0

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use, Use patents

Must: Incl. Copyright, Royalty free, Disclose source, SaaS/network

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Licensor's law, Venue fixed

Support: OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: Written by Lawrence Rosen (attorney, formal counsel of the Open Source Initiative), AFL-3.0 gives recipients a copyright and allows for a patent on the software so long as they include the original software, any of its copyrights or trademarks and a note saying that you modified it (as the case may be). Nearly identical as the Open Software License (same author), but not reciprocal: it is permissive (widely compatible), interoperable and doesn't force derivative works to use the same license. Applicable law and venue are those of the licensor.

2.	**Apache-2.0**

Apache License, Version 2.0
https://opensource.org/licenses/Apache-2.0
Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use, Use patents, Place warranty
Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Disclose source, Include license
Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark
Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software
Law: Not fixed/local
Support: Strong Community, OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre
License comment: Apache-2.0 is a permissive license. For OSI it is supported by an important community of developers. You can do what you like with the software, as long as you include the required notices. Compared with the MIT, recipients receive a patent license from the contributors of the code. Applicable law / competent court are not specified.

3.	**Artistic-2.0**

Artistic License 2.0
https://opensource.org/licenses/artistic-license-2.0
Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use
Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Disclose source, Include license, Rename modifications
Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software
Law: Not fixed/local
License comment: Artistic-2.0 is a license preserving control of the original copyright holder: recipient can use, modify and distribute the original versions (including bug corrections) but other modified versions must document how far they are different and be reported to the original author, or be distributed under a different name, or otherwise be available under the Artistic license or any other license granting similar rights (access to the original version and source code of modifications). Applicable law / competent court: not specified.

4.	**BSL-1.0**

Boost Software License 1.0

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: BSL is a short permissive license requesting only to maintain the original copyright notices and warranty disclaimer in all copies and derivatives, unless in the form of "machine-executable object code generated by a source processor." Applicable law / competent court: not specified. Alternative: use MIT.

5.	0BSD

BSD Zero Clause License

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use, Use patents, Place warranty

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: OSI approved

License comment: 0BSD is a very permissive license, like the BSD-2-Clause, but without the "attribution" requirement to include the authors' copyright notice, the license text and the disclaimer in either source or binary forms. The code may therefore be freely redistributed and relicensed without even mentioning its origin.

6.	BSD-2-Clause

BSD 2-Clause "Simplified" License

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: Strong Community, OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: BSD 2-clause (or Free BSD) is a permissive license. For OSI it is supported by an important community of developers. BSD-2 permits almost unlimited freedom with the software so long as you include the BSD copyright notice in it (as is in license text). Applicable law / competent court: not specified. Too many variations of the BSD license exist: using the popular MIT license instead is a reasonable alternative.

7.	**BSD-3-Clause-Clear**

BSD 3-Clause Clear License

https://spdx.org/licenses/BSD-3-Clause-Clear.html

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: FSF Free/Libre

License comment: Permissive license identical to the BSD-3-Clause, but the disclaimer adds an explicit exclusion of any patent rights: "NO EXPRESS OR IMPLIED LICENSES TO ANY PARTY'S PATENT RIGHTS ARE GRANTED BY THIS LICENSE".

8.	**BSD-3-Clause**

BSD 3-Clause "New" or "Revised" license

https://opensource.org/licenses/BSD-3-Clause

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: Strong Community, OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: BSD 3-clause is a permissive license. OSI states that it is supported by an important community of developers. BSD-3 allows you almost unlimited freedom with the software so long as you include the BSD copyright and license notice in it (found in Fulltext). Compared to BSD-2, the added clause 3 states that names of the copyright holder and contributors cannot be used to endorse or promote derived products (prior written permission). Applicable law / competent court: not specified. Too many versions of the BSD exist. Using the popular MIT license instead is a reasonable alternative.

9.	**CC0-1.0**

CC0 1.0 Universal (CC0 1.0) Public Domain Dedication

https://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Multilingual, For data

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: FSF Free/Libre

License comment: CC0 is a very permissive license, like the 0BSD it releases the covered work in the public domain and grants permission to use it for any purpose, without the "attribution" requirement to include the authors' copyright notice, the license text and the disclaimer in either source or binary forms. The code may therefore be freely redistributed and relicensed without even mentioning its origin. Disclaims patent licenses. Open Knowledge foundation recommends this license.

10.	**CECILL-2.1**

CeCILL-2.1

https://opensource.org/licenses/CECILL-2.1

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use, Use patents, Place warranty

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Disclose source, Copyleft/Share alike, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable

Compatible: GPL, Linking freedom, Multilingual, For software

Law: EU/MS law, Licensor's law, Venue fixed

Support: Governments/EU, OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: CeCILL-2.1 is a reciprocal (or copyleft) license initiated in France by INRIA, CEA and CNRS. It has a working value in EN/FR. It is compatible with the EUPL, GPL and AGPL as possible outbound licenses. Governed by French law. All disputes referred to the court in Paris. CeCILL is one of the licenses to be used (authorized) by French administrations.

11.	**CECILL-B**

CeCILL-B

https://spdx.org/licenses/CECILL-B.html

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, Multilingual, For software

Law: EU/MS law, Venue fixed

Support: Governments/EU, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: Like the popular MIT or BSD, CeCILL-B is a permissive license initiated in France by INRIA, CEA and CNRS. It has a working value in EN/FR. Obligations are limited to copyright attribution. Otherwise, recipients may reuse the software code without restrictions. Governed by French law. All disputes referred to the court in Paris. CeCILL is one of the licenses to be used (authorized) by French administrations.

12.	**CECILL-C**

CeCILL-C

https://spdx.org/licenses/CECILL-C.html

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Disclose source, Lesser copyleft

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, Multilingual, For software

Law: EU/MS law, Venue fixed

Support: Governments/EU, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: Like the LGPL, CeCILL-C is a so called moderately copyleft license initiated in France by INRIA, CEA and CNRS. It has a working value in EN/FR. It is widely compatible, since only the specific files source code must stay covered, and not the other files or components of a solution. It is therefore designed for components or libraries. Governed by French law. All disputes referred to the court in Paris. CeCILL is one of the licenses to be used (authorized) by French administrations.

13.   **CDDL-1.0**

Common Development and Distribution License (CDDL-1.0)

https://opensource.org/licenses/CDDL-1.0

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use, Use patents, Place warranty

Must: Incl. Copyright, Disclose source, Lesser copyleft, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: GPL, Linking freedom, For software

Law: US law

Support: OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: A moderately reciprocal (or "weak copyleft") license used by Sun, including explicit patent grants. It is similar to MPL and EPL. OSI states it is supported by a strong community. You can distribute compiled object code under any license, by the original source code (and modified derivatives) must be made available, under the CDDL. References to US law.

14.	**CPL-1.0**

Common Public License, version 1.0 (CPL-1.0)

https://opensource.org/licenses/CPL-1.0

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use, Use patents

Must: Incl. Copyright, Royalty free, Disclose source, Copyleft/Share alike, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: GPL, Linking freedom, For software

Law: US law, Venue fixed

Support: OSI approved

License comment: The license is superseded. The license steward has issued a new version of this license (Eclipse Public License: EPL-1.0 and later EPL-2.0). Check the licensing materials for the software distribution itself to confirm the correct version of the license. CPL is copyleft for source code only. Object code may be distributed under another license, provide it complies with the terms and conditions of the CPL. CPL is one of the compatible licenses listed by the EUPL-1.1, meaning that works distributed under the CPL may include parts of source code obtained under the EUPL. CPL is governed by the laws of the State of New York and the intellectual property laws of the United States of America.

15.	**CC-BY-4.0**

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC-BY-4.0)

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes

Compatible: None N/A, Permissive, Multilingual, For data

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: Strong Community

License comment: The less restrictive Creative Commons Attribution license is this international version 4, which gives recipients maximum freedom to do what they want with the work of the licensor. Recipients redistributing the work must give credit to the original author of the work (= attribution) and state changes if any, including a URL or link to the original work, this CC-BY license

and a copyright notice. Author can request to remove any attribution given information. Recipients re-distributing the work to third parties may not apply legal terms or technological measures (like Tivoization) that legally restrict the rights granted by the license. OKF (Open Knowledge Foundation) recommends this license.

16.	**CC-BY-SA-4.0**

Creative Commons Attribution Share Alike 4.0 International

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Copyleft/Share alike

Compatible: None N/A, Multilingual, For data

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: Strong Community

License comment: Creative commons license is based on version 4.0 of the creative commons attribution license. You must give credit to the original author of the work, including a URL or hyperlink to the work, this CC license and a copyright notice. It does allow making derivatives: you may distribute modified works, provide the same CC-BY-SA-4.0 is used for distribution.

17.	**CC-BY-ND-4.0**

Creative Commons Attribution No Derivatives 4.0 International

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, Copyleft/Share alike

Cannot: Modify

Compatible: None N/A, Multilingual, For data

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: Strong Community

License comment: Creative commons license based on version 4.0 of the creative commons attribution license. You must give credit to the original author of the work, including a URL or hyperlink to the work, this CC license and a copyright notice. It is very restrictive as it does not allow making derivatives: you may not distribute modified works. Therefore it is convenient for literary works (where the author agrees for distribution but refuses any alteration) or for legal texts / case law etc. that cannot be modified (even when respecting the general idea or spirit).

18.	**CC-BY-3.0**

Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported (CC BY 3.0)

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/us/

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright

Compatible: Permissive, Multilingual, For data

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: Strong Community

License comment: Creative Common permissive license. Use the last version 4.0 (CC-BY-4.0)

19.	**CC-BY-NC-SA-4.0**

Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial Share Alike 4.0 International

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Copyleft/Share alike

Cannot: Hold liable, Commerce

Compatible: None N/A, Multilingual, For data

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: Strong Community

License comment: Creative commons license is based on version 4.0 of the creative commons attribution license. You must give credit to the original author of the work, including a URI or hyperlink to the work, this CC license and a copyright notice. It additionally prevents commercial use and requires any derivative to use the same license ("share alike" provision). It also doesn't allow

Tivoization (restrictions related to specific hardware) and provides protection from defamation for the creator. Note that the prohibition of commercial use is - in general - not an "Open" good practice.

20.	**D-FSL-1.0**

Deutsche Freie Software Lizenz

https://spdx.org/licenses/D-FSL-1.0.html

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use, Use patents, Place warranty

Must: Incl. Copyright, Royalty free, State changes, Disclose source, Copyleft/Share alike, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: GPL, Linking freedom, Multilingual, For software

Law: EU/MS law

Support: Governments/EU

License comment: Written by Axel Metzger and Till Jaeger from the Institute for Legal Questions on Free and Open Source Software (ifrOSS), the D-FSL-1.0 is a GPL-compatible open source license. At the contrary of most open licenses (and like the EUPL-1.2), it is tailored to German and European law. It has a working value and is binding in German and English. The license is copyleft, but - in conformity to European Law, it is interoperable and accepts linking (with another part including the covered lines of code that are strictly required for implementing interoperability) without extending the D-FSL to this other part (no "viral effect"), provided that the part which is combined with the program can also be reasonably usable on a standalone basis or with other programs. The License is governed by German law.

21.	**EPL-2.0**

Eclipse Public License 2.0

https://opensource.org/licenses/EPL-2.0

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use, Use patents

Must: Incl. Copyright, Royalty free, Disclose source, Copyleft/Share alike, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: GPL, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Licensor's law, Not fixed/local

Support: Strong Community, OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: EPL, made and mainly used by the Eclipse Foundation, is similar to GPL but is interoperable, as it does not submit linking of the covered code to conditions or "viral" extension of license coverage to the other linked software. OSI states EPL is supported by a strong community. Binaries can be licensed under any license, as long as the source code stay available under EPL. EPL copyleft is "variable" as the source code may also be made available under secondary licenses, which includes the GNU GPL-2.0-or-later and any other license added by the licensor. This may facilitate the request of exceptions, when necessary.

22.	**EPL-1.0**

Eclipse Public License 1.0

https://opensource.org/licenses/EPL-1.0

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use, Use patents

Must: Incl. Copyright, Royalty free, Disclose source, Copyleft/Share alike, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: Linking freedom, For software

Law: US law

Support: Strong Community, OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: EPL-1.0 is now superseded by EPL-2.0. EPL-1.0 that was made and mainly used by the Eclipse Foundation, is similar to GPL but does not submit linking of the covered code to conditions or "viral" extension of license coverage to the other linked software. OSI states EPL is supported by a strong community. Binaries can be licensed under any license, as long as the source code stay available under EPL. This was not considered to be "compatible with the GPL." Therefore the EPL-2.0 now lists the GPL-2.0-or-later as a compatible secondary license for the source code. EPL is also listed as compatible by the EUPL.

23.	**EUPL-1.2**

European Union Public License 1.2

https://opensource.org/licenses/EUPL-1.1

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use, Use patents, Place warranty

Must: Incl. Copyright, Royalty free, State changes, Disclose source, Copyleft/Share alike, SaaS/network , Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, Multilingual, For data, For software

Law: EU/MS law, Licensor's law, Venue fixed

Support: Strong Community, Governments/EU, OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: Official License of the European Union (EC Decision, part of European law). The license is interoperable (no restrictions on linking in order to facilitate the integration of multiple components), reciprocal (third parties distributing improvements or derivatives must publish and provide back the modified source code) and compatible: no global relicensing permitted, but the source code could be reused in other projects under GPL/AGPL, EPL, LGPL, MPL, OSL, CeCILL, LiLiQ. EUPL covers SaaS / network distribution. EUPL covers "the Work" (software and ancillary data). Original in 23 EU languages. Replaces EUPL-1.1 for works "Licensed under the EUPL" without specifying license version, or adding "or later". Applicable law and court: licensor seat in EU (or specific additional agreement), otherwise Belgium. Support from the Joinup.eu community. Free legal support provided.

24.	**EUPL-1.1**

European Union Public License, Version 1.1 or later (EUPL)

https://spdx.org/licenses/EUPL-1.1.html

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use, Use patents, Place warranty

Must: Incl. Copyright, Royalty free, State changes, Disclose source, Copyleft/Share alike, SaaS/network , Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, Multilingual, For software

Law: EU/MS law, Licensor's law, Venue fixed

Support: Strong Community, Governments/EU, OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: License of the European Union, used in public and private sector. The license is reciprocal and covers SaaS. Replaces the EUPL-1.0. Original and working in English and 21 other EU languages. Interoperable (no restriction on linking). Compatibility list including some other copyleft licenses (GPL-2.0, EPL, OSL, CeCILL). Applicable law and court: licensor seat (EU law). Supported by the Joinup.eu community. Free legal support provided. "Or later" means coverage by the more compatible EUPL-1.2 (May 2017).

25.	**GPL-3.0-only**

GNU General Public License v3.0

https://opensource.org/licenses/GPL-3.0

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use, Use patents, Place warranty

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Disclose source, Copyleft/Share alike, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: Strong Community, OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: Fundamental revision of the GPL produced in 2007. OSI states GPL (without indicating version number) as supported by a strong community (the Free Software Foundation - FSF). You may copy, distribute and modify the software as long as you track changes/dates in source files. Any derivative including (i.e. via compiler) GPL-licensed code must also be made available under the GPL-3.0 along with build & install instructions. Lack of compatibility is a known GPL-3.0 issue, making its use problematic when a project combines multiple sources and stakeholders: the exception of AGPL-3.0, the license is compatible with no other (even the GPL-2.0) and, according to the FSF, linking of any kind to other software to GPLed works extends the GPL coverage to these other programs (i.e. viral).

26.	**LGPL-3.0-only**

GNU Lesser General Public License v3.0

https://opensource.org/licenses/LGPL-3.0

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use, Use patents

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Disclose source, Lesser copyleft, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Sublicense

Compatible: GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: The Free Software Foundation (FSF) produced LGPL for libraries. Works made by using the covered software could be distributed under any license. Distribution of derivatives (code modifications) must be done under LGPL. Reverse engineering must be allowed (= a general permission in EU law). FSF considers static linking to LGPL as producing derivatives (i.e. viral) (which is not the case in EU law when made for interoperability). FSF considers dynamic linking to LGPL as not producing derivatives (i.e. not viral).

27.	**GPL-2.0+**

GNU General Public License v2.0 or later

https://opensource.org/licenses/GPL-2.0

https://opensource.org/licenses/GPL-3.0

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use, Use patents, Place warranty

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Disclose source, Copyleft/Share alike

Cannot: Hold liable, Sublicense

Compatible: GPL, For software

Law: US law, Not fixed/local

Support: Strong Community, OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: Covers both the GPL-2.0 (the "historical" free software license), the GPL-3.0 and possible later versions. Supported by a strong community (the Free Software Foundation - FSF). Copy, modification and distribution authorized. Changes/dates must be traced in source files. Any derivative must also be made available under one or more of these GPL versions. According to the FSF, linking of any kind to other software to GPLed works extends the GPL coverage to these other programs (i.e. viral). Licensing under "GPL-2.0 or later" may be recommended since it is compatible with all GPL versions (2 and 3). At the contrary, licensing under "GPL-2.0-only" is not compatible with GPL-3.0.

28.	**LGPL-2.1**

GNU Lesser General Public License (LGPL) 2.1

https://opensource.org/licenses/LGPL-2.1

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Disclose source, Lesser copyleft, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Sublicense

Compatible: GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: The Free Software Foundation (FSF) produced LGPL for libraries. Works made by using the covered software could be distributed under any license. Distribution of derivatives (after code modification) must be done under LGPL. Reverse engineering must be allowed (= a general permission in EU law). FSF considers static linking to LGPL as producing derivatives (i.e. viral) (which is not the case in EU law when made for interoperability). FSF considers dynamic linking to LGPL as not producing derivatives (i.e. not viral).

29.	**AGPL-3.0-only**

GNU Affero General Public License v3.0

https://opensource.org/licenses/AGPL-3.0

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use, Use patents, Place warranty

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Disclose source, Copyleft/Share alike, SaaS/network , Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Sublicense

Compatible: GPL, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: A modified GPL-3.0 extended to network or Web services distribution (SaaS). Similar to the EUPL on that point. The license is copyleft: copies and derivatives may be distributed under the same AGPL only. According to the FSF, linking of any kind to other software to GPLed works extends the GPL coverage to these other programs (i.e. viral). Need to document derivatives' changes and dates. Incompatible with other licenses. Interoperability restricted to linking with code covered by the original GPL-3.0. Applicable law / competent court: not specified.

30.	**GPL-3.0-or-later**

GNU General Public License v3.0 or later

https://opensource.org/licenses/GPL-3.0

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use, Use patents, Place warranty

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Disclose source, Copyleft/Share alike, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: GPL, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: Strong Community, OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: GPL-3.0 was forged in 2007. It is a copyleft license. OSI states GPL (without indicating version number) as supported by a strong community (the Free Software Foundation - FSF). You may copy, distribute and modify the software as long as you track changes/dates in source files. Any derivative including (i.e. via compiler) GPL-licensed code must also be made available under the GPL-3.0 along with build & install instructions. Adding "or later" is recommended by the FSF to cover a hypothetical GPL-4.0, but still means "GPL-3.0 only" for the time being. Therefore licensing under "GPL-2.0 or later" will better improve compatibilities, because the use of the GPL-2.0 is still more important. According to the FSF, linking of any kind to other software to GPLed works extends the GPL coverage to these other programs (i.e. viral).

31.	**GPL-2.0-only**

GNU General Public License (GPL) 2.0

https://opensource.org/licenses/GPL-2.0

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use, Place warranty

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Disclose source, Copyleft/Share alike

Cannot: Hold liable, Sublicense

Compatible: For software

Law: US law

Support: Strong Community, OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: The "historical" free software license. Supported by a strong community (the Free Software Foundation - FSF). Copy, modification and distribution authorized. Changes/dates must be traced in source files. Any derivative must also be made available under the GPL along with build & install instructions. Lack of compatibility is a known GPL-2.0 issue when a project combines multiple sources and stakeholders. According to the FSF, linking of any kind to other software to GPLed works extends the GPL coverage to these other programs (i.e. viral). Licensing under "GPL-2.0 or later" is advised (otherwise it is "GPL-2.0-only" - not compatible with GPL-3.0).

32.	**ISC**

ISC License

https://opensource.org/licenses/ISC

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright

Cannot: Hold liable

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: ISC is a short and permissive software license (like MIT and BSD). Main obligation is to include the original copyright notice. For reducing license proliferation, it is advised to use the MIT license instead.

33.	**LPPL-1.3c**

LaTeX Project Public License v1.3c

https://opensource.org/licenses/LPPL-1.3c

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Disclose source

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: LPPL is a very specific, non-copyleft license. It organizes rights of the "maintainer" of a work versus other distributors who have to comply with documentation requirements and to communicate the original code (or report where it can be available).

34.	**LiLiQ-Rplus-1.1**

License Libre du Québec – Réciprocité forte version 1.1

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Disclose source, Copyleft/Share alike, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: GPL, Other copyleft, For software

Law: Other law, Venue fixed

Support: Governments/EU, OSI approved

License comment: This version of LiLiQ is the reciprocal (or copyleft) license produced by the State of Quebec (Canada). Official versions in French and English. Other reciprocal licenses GPL-2.0-or-later and the EUPL are expressly listed as compatible, meaning that the covered code can be reused in other projects covered by these licenses. Law of Quebec is applicable. Court of Quebec is competent.

| 35. | **LiLiQ-P-1.1** |

License Libre du Québec – Permissive version 1.1

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Other law, Venue fixed

Support: Governments/EU

License comment: This version of LiLiQ is the permissive license produced by the State of Quebec (Canada). Official versions in French and English. Law of Quebec is applicable. Court of Quebec is competent.

| 36. | **LiLiQ-R-1.1** |

License Libre du Québec – Réciprocité version 1.1

https://opensource.org/licenses/LiLiQ-R-1.1

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Disclose source, Lesser copyleft, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Other law, Venue fixed

Support: Governments/EU

License comment: This version of LiLiQ is the moderately reciprocal license produced by the State of Quebec (Canada). Official versions in French and English. A list of licenses with similar level of reciprocity is declared compatible, including GPL, EUPL, MPL, LGPL etc., meaning that the covered code can be reused in other projects covered by these licenses. Law of Quebec is applicable. Court of Quebec is competent.

37.	**MS-PL**

Microsoft Public License

https://opensource.org/licenses/MS-PL

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use, Place warranty

Must: Incl. Copyright, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: US law

Support: OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: Microsoft's permissive license. Availability of source code is not mandatory, but if re-distributed, source code must include the license and copyrights. Object code only distribution is permitted and may be done under any compliant (permissive) license.

38.	**MS-RL**

Microsoft Reciprocal License

https://opensource.org/licenses/MS-RL

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use, Place warranty

Must: Incl. Copyright, Disclose source, Copyleft/Share alike, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: US law

Support: OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: Microsoft's reciprocal/copyleft license. Availability of source code under the same MS-RL license is mandatory in case of re-distribution (in source or binary form) of any covered file. No impact on other files. Object code distribution may be done under any compliant license.

39.	**MIT**

MIT License

https://opensource.org/licenses/MIT

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: Strong Community, OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: MIT is the most recommended permissive license: short and very popular (probably the most used worldwide). OSI states it is supported by a strong community. Basically, you can do whatever you want as long as you include the original copyright and license notice in any copy of the software/source. Another version MIT-0 does not mention the obligation of including the copyright notice. MIT is one of the permissive licenses to be used (authorized) by French administrations.

40.	**MPL-2.0**

Mozilla Public License 2.0

https://opensource.org/licenses/MPL-2.0

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use, Use patents, Place warranty

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Disclose source, Copyleft/Share alike, Lesser copyleft, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local, Venue fixed

Support: Strong Community, OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: MPL is a reciprocal (or copyleft) license that is interoperable and - to a certain extend - compatible with other licenses, even copyleft or proprietary. OSI states it is supported by a strong community. The recipient must make the source code for any of distributed changes available under MPL, but can combine the MPL software with proprietary code, as long as the MPL code is kept in separate files. Version 2.0 is, by default, compatible with LGPL and GPL version 2 or later and with the EUPL (and the reciprocate is true in this last case, since MPL is listed as compatible by the EUPL). You can distribute binaries under a proprietary license, as long as you make the source available under MPL. Jurisdiction fixed where the defendant maintains its principal place of business. MPL is one of the reciprocal licenses to be used (authorized) by French administrations.

41.	**ODbL-1.0**

ODC Open Database License (ODbL)

https://spdx.org/licenses/ODbL-1.0.html

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, Copyleft/Share alike, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark, Sublicense

Compatible: Other copyleft, For data

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: Strong Community

License comment: ODC Open Database License (ODbL) is a reciprocal (or copyleft) license with specific terms convenient for databases. ODbL is recommended by Open Knowledge Foundation (OKF).

42.	**PDDL-1.0**

ODC Public Domain Dedication & License 1.0 (PDDL)

https://spdx.org/licenses/PDDL-1.0.html

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark, Sublicense

Compatible: Permissive, For data

Law: Not fixed/local

License comment: This license is meant to be an international, database-specific equivalent of public domain dedication. At the same time, license states that nobody can relicense or sublicense any database under PDDL because after a public domain dedication nobody longer own any rights to the database. It looks dubious that such prohibition is enforceable, and by whom? However, OKF (Open Knowledge Foundation) recommends this license.

43.	**OSL-3.0**

Open Software License v. 3.0 (OSL-3.0)

https://opensource.org/licenses/OSL-3.0

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, State changes, Disclose source, Copyleft/Share alike, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local, Venue fixed

Support: OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: Written by Lawrence Rosen (attorney, formal counsel of the Open Source Initiative), OSL is seen as a reciprocal license, incompatible with the GPL. It is interoperable (freedom of linking with other software). Law and jurisdiction where Licensor resides or conducts its primary business.

44.	**ODC-By-1.0**

Open Data Commons Attribution License (ODC-BY)

https://spdx.org/licenses/ODC-By-1.0.html

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark, Sublicense

Compatible: Permissive, For data

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: Strong Community

License comment: Open Data Commons Attribution (ODC-BY) is a rather permissive license written for databases. It allows users to freely share, modify, and use a database subject only to attribution requirements set out in its Section 4, but does not permit sublicensing or imposing any further restrictions on the exercise of the granted rights. ODC-BY is recommended by Open Knowledge Foundation (OKF)

45.	**PostgreSQL**

PostgreSQL License

https://opensource.org/licenses/PostgreSQL

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: OSI approved

License comment: MIT or BSD-style license, used specifically for PostgreSQL. When applicable and for avoiding license proliferation, the MIT license is a reasonable alternative.

46.	**OFL-1.1**

SIL Open Font License 1.1

https://opensource.org/licenses/OFL-1.1

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, Include license, Rename modifications

Compatible: None N/A

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: OFL is used for licensing fonts (character polices). Selling fonts by themselves is not allowed, but bundling with software and selling font design services is authorized. If font is modified, name must be changed. Document embedding is authorized.

47.	**UPL-1.0**

Universal Permissive License v1.0

https://opensource.org/licenses/UPL

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use, Use patents

Must: Incl. Copyright, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: FSF Free/Libre

License comment: UPL is a permissive license similar to the MIT plus an explicit patent grant, ability to relicense (even under proprietary or copyleft conditions) at the condition to maintain the copyright notice or a reference to UPL. It may be used as Contributor Licensing Agreement. Using the MIT instead is a reasonable alternative.

48.	**NCSA**

University of Illinois/NCSA Open Source License

https://opensource.org/licenses/NCSA

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, Include license

Cannot: Hold liable, Use trademark

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: University of Illinois short and permissive license. Distributions must include the license in full text. For limiting license proliferation, the MIT license is a reasonable alternative.

49.	**Unlicense**

The Unlicense

https://opensource.org/licenses/unlicense

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use

Cannot: Hold liable

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: FSF Free/Libre

License comment: To Unlicense means releasing code into the public domain, thereby releasing all rights and all control you may hold to that code. For more standardization and good practice, the use of a very permissive license like the MIT license is the recommended alternative.

50.	**WTFPL**

Do What The F*ck You Want To Public License – WTFPL

https://spdx.org/licenses/WTFPL.html

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Sublicense, Commercial use, Place warranty

Cannot: Use trademark

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: FSF Free/Libre

License comment: The WTFPL license is nearly a public domain grant. It permits nearly everything, except the use of patents & trademark. However, licensors acting under the European legal framework should prefer a widely used permissive license: the MIT license (the most used) is a reasonable alternative to WTFPL.

51.	**Zlib**

zlib/libpng License

https://opensource.org/licenses/Zlib

Can: Use/reproduce, Distribute, Modify/merge, Commercial use

Must: Incl. Copyright, Rename modifications

Cannot: Hold liable

Compatible: Permissive, GPL, Other copyleft, Linking freedom, For software

Law: Not fixed/local

Support: OSI approved, FSF Free/Libre

License comment: Specific license used for the zlib library and some other open-source libraries/packages. Short and permissive. Modified versions must be marked as such, and must not be misrepresented as being the original software (changing name is recommended). Exclude liability from original authors. Using the MIT instead is a reasonable alternative.