Open Source
≠
Open Source

Workshop 25th of May 2016
Jimmy Ahlberg

ERICSSON

Open Source is not homogeneous

› Many different interpretation of what "Open Source" is.
  – Not to mention Free software.

› Many different licenses (1000+) but…
  – -95% of projects are under 10 different licenses, and the majority of the remaining 990+ licenses are variations or re-branded versions of the "top" 10 licenses used.

Apache License 2.0
Artistic License
BSD License 2.0
Eclipse Public License
GPL v2
GPL v3
LGPL v2.1
LGPL v3.0
MIT License
Mozilla 1.1

Differences

› One aspect where the various Open Source licenses differ is patents:

› Some licenses does not mention patents at all (For example BSD, MIT)

› Some licenses have explicit patent license grants(For example Apache 2.0, GPLv3)

› Some licenses uses F/RAND mechanisms (For example OSA Public License V. 1.0, PARC Software license)

difference

› Governance models differ.

  – Some more "democratic" than others

› Engaged parties are differ from project to project.

  – Some project have large corporate presence others less so.

› All of the licenses have successful projects, so obviously the license is not the "end all" reason for the success of a project.

  – The wrong license can however easily kill a project.

› So what does all of this have in common?

  – Ways of working, Methodology, access to source code, enthusiastic community.

Conclusion

› What conclusion can we draw from this?

› Can we learn anything from the way that Open Source communities work, and embrace those ways of working in standardization?

› Access to Source Code

› Community engagement

› Clear vision and mission