
Subject: License ?

Posted by [Oliver Merle](#) on Mon, 02 Apr 2012 20:23:52 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

What are the licenses of Fairbase, PandaRoot, etc. ? It seems to be impossible to get solid information from the source package. PandaRoot ships a GPLv2 license without referencing to it, while fairbase has no license file at all. Most source files don't mention license information. So, to what are the contributors actually contributing to? Maybe I just miss something.

Kind Regards,
Oliver

Subject: Re: License ?

Posted by [Oliver Merle](#) on Wed, 04 Apr 2012 08:39:42 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Anyone? According to these forums there were discussion about licensing back in 2008/2009, so I guess answering this question can't be too hard right now in 2012.

To be more concrete:

According to the sources, the codebase is (to my understanding) implicitly proprietary. It will remain proprietary as long as you don't define a license to free it. Is that by accident, or is it intended?

Every contributor should be interested in that question.

Regards,
Oliver

Subject: Re: License ?

Posted by [Stefano Spataro](#) on Wed, 04 Apr 2012 09:05:57 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

As far as I know we have no license.

Subject: Re: License ?

Posted by [Radoslaw Karabowicz](#) on Wed, 04 Apr 2012 17:14:54 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

And at least me do not really care about the license. I do not think it is important. Anyways, from what I understand we even CANNOT license the stuff, as it is developed using government money...

yours
radek

Subject: Re: License ?

Posted by [Mohammad Al-Turany](#) on Wed, 04 Apr 2012 19:02:25 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi,

We had the discussion before, and then we contacted the GSI license and patent office (Yes we have such an office at the GSI!) and because we are using something like 12-15 packages with all kind of possible licenses (GPL, LGPL, BSD, CERN, Geant4, ...) So for us (FairRoot team) it was too complicated to decide. So after months of waiting and consulting the CERN office responsible for such stuff, no body could decide or say what would be the license. The fact that the GSI is GmbH, but we are paid from tax money make it also more complicated. In any case I am speaking here about FairBase, and I believe we will finally make LGPL or something similar, but this will not be valid for PandaRoot, CbmRoot, etc. There each experiment has to decide it self how to do it.

As you see it is complicated (at least for me!). And just for my education what is your problem now and why you are interested in such a topic?

regards,

Mohammad.

Subject: Re: License ?

Posted by [Oliver Merle](#) on Wed, 04 Apr 2012 19:37:29 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thanks for the answers,

my problem in the first place was that there is no clear license statement in the codebase what is rather unusual for software which is already distributed. I think developers have to know this for various reasons.

A practical example: We all know that non-GPL software is not allowed to link against GPL software. Just look at PandaRoot, which is surely non-GPL atm, and examine the files "pgenerators/EMFFgenerators/ranlx*". So if PandaRoot can be considered "distributed", this is a GPL violation. (For sure this code can be easily replaced - but its there, thats the point.) One has to be aware of the fact that GPL code may be a no go here.

The Fairbase license is important because the PandaRoot license depends on it.

It is also very important for some people who are interested in contributing. Without a license, only the copyright holders have any rights - no one else. There is no sharing. I'm happy to share, but I don't do other peoples work for free. The license makes the difference.

I don't open the can of worms regarding the 'transfer of copyright' question if people contribute their own source to the project.

I am happy that you will (eventually) choose LGPL.

Regards,
Oliver

Subject: Re: License ?

Posted by [Johan Messchendorp](#) on Thu, 05 Apr 2012 06:50:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Oliver,

I think you do address here an important issue and I do appreciate your concern. From the response you got already, I guess you understand that we are concerned about it, but that it is not an easy problem to solve at this moment. It was a topic of hot discussion already some time ago. This doesn't mean that we forgot about it. As Mohammad already pointed out the formal problems for fairroot on this, you can imagine it is similarly difficult for pandaroot (in particular since its a collaboration issue, there are no MoU yet and the role of the funding agencies etc. etc.). My educated bet is that we will follow the fairroot choice and that we will go likely to a LGPL license eventually.

Greetings,

Johan
