

Obligations:

I plan on using the licensed software internally only

Can I distribute the licensed software unmodified?

There are no restrictions on use if the GPL licensed software is used internally and is not distributed outside the organization. You may even combine GPL licensed software with proprietary licensed software.

Yes:

If the unmodified licensed software will be conveyed outside the organization, there is an obligation to make the source code available to downstream users and publish the original copyright notices and warranty disclaimers.

You may not impose any further restrictions on the recipient's rights.

GPL v.2

No restrictions on internal use as long as your license otherwise remains in force.

Yes:

If the unmodified licensed software will be conveyed outside the organization, there is an obligation to make the source code available to downstream users and conspicuously publish on each copy the original copyright notices, warranty disclaimers, and give all recipients a copy of the license.

You may not impose any further restrictions on the recipient's rights. However, you may remove additional permissions and place additional permissions on material added by you.

GPL v.3

No restrictions on internal use.

Yes:

If the unmodified licensed software will be conveyed outside the organization, there is an obligation to make the source code available to downstream users and publish the original copyright notices and warranty disclaimers.

You may not impose any further restrictions on the recipient's rights.

LGPL v.2.1

No restrictions on internal use.

Yes:

No obligation to disclose source code.

Redistribution of source and binary code must retain the copyright notices, and you must not use the name of the licensor to endorse or promote products derived from the software.

New BSD License

No restrictions on internal use.

Yes:

Include a copy of the license with every copy of the source code you distribute.

Duplicate the notice contained in Exhibit A in each file of the source code.

Mozilla Public License (MPL) 1.1

No restrictions on internal use.

Yes:

No obligation to disclose source code. You may redistribute the original or modified code as open source or proprietary.

You may copy and distribute the software so long as you provide a copy of the license and retain the copyright, patent, trademark and attribution notices from the originating file.

Apache License 2.0

Obligations:

Do I have to release the source code of my modifications?

Can I use the licensed software as part of a technological measure?

Yes:
If the modified code will be conveyed externally, there is an obligation to make the source code for all original and modified portions of the licensed code available to all downstream users.

You must prominently notify users what files have been modified and the date of change.

Include all original copyright notices and warranty disclaimers.

You may distribute the GPL licensed software for a fee, but purchasers have the freedom to release it to the public without a fee.

Yes:
No specific restriction

GPL v.2

Yes:
If the modified code will be conveyed externally, there is an obligation to make the source code for all original and modified portions of the licensed code available to all downstream users.

You must prominently notify users what files have been modified and the date of change.

Include all original copyright notices and warranty disclaimers. Prominently notify users that the work is released under this license and of any additional permissions.

Yes:
The US Digital Millennium Copyright Act and similar non-US laws prohibit the intentional circumvention of technological measures designed to prevent unauthorized use/access to copyrighted works. (Note: Canada does not currently have any anti circumvention laws)

(continued)

GPL v.3

Yes:
If the modified code will be conveyed externally, there is an obligation to make the source code for all original and modified portions of the licensed code available to all downstream users.

You must prominently notify users what files have been modified and the date of change.

Include all original copyright notices and warranty disclaimers

Yes:
No specific restriction. However, with LGPL v.3 licensed software you waive any legal power to forbid circumvention of the technological measures when you distribute the licensed work.

LGPL v.2.1

No:
No obligation to disclose the source code of your modifications.

Yes:
No specific restriction.

New BSD License

Yes:
You must make the source code of your modifications available.

Maintain a file documenting modifications, date of the change, and a prominent statement that the modification is derived from the original code, and include the name of the initial developer in the source code.

Yes:
No specific restriction.

Mozilla Public License (MPL) 1.1

No:
No obligation to disclose the source code of your modifications.

Prominently notify users of any modified files.

You may add your own copyright statement and license terms to your modifications so long as you do not remove any of the original license requirements.

Yes:
No specific restriction.

Apache License 2.0

Obligations:

Can I distribute licensed software (modified or unmodified) that has been combined or linked with code covered by another licensing model?

Maybe

Any software that contains GPL code or is derived from GPL code must be licensed as a whole under the GPL terms. What this means is that in order to distribute software that has combined or linked GPL code with non-GPL code, the licenses must be compatible. For example, GPL v.2 is not compatible with GPL v.3. (See <http://www.fsf.org/licenses/licenses>)

The GPL does not explicitly state that linked files create a work derived from the GPL code. However, it is generally understood that static linking, which modifies the code of one program, creates a derivative work and therefore must be licensed under the GPL. It is less clear whether or not dynamic linking creates a derivative work. Dynamic linking does not necessarily modify any code. As this issue has not been litigated, it might be prudent to assume that under the GPL, statically or dynamically linked files both create derivative works.

GPL v.2

(Can I use the licensed software as part of a technological measure - continued)

The GPL v.3 does not stipulate what you can and cannot program. However, it does state that the licensed software shall not be deemed part of an effective technological measure. When you distribute the licensed work, you waive any legal power to forbid circumvention of the technological measures.

Maybe:

Please see the above explanation for GPL v.2 and refer to <http://www.fsf.org/licenses/licenses> for a more in depth look at license compatibility.

GPL v.3

Maybe

The LGPL has an exemption that allows for the linking of LGPL code to non-LGPL code, without violating the license and without requiring source code disclosure of non-LGPL files.

The license describes a library as a collection of software functions intended to be conveniently linked with application programs to form executables.

A program that is designed to work with the LGPL licensed library by being compiled or linked with it, and does not contain a portion of the licensed library, is a work that uses the library, and is not a derivative work and therefore outside the scope of the LGPL. Any modifications to the licensed library itself or any work that contains portions of the licensed library is considered a derivative work and therefore covered by the LGPL.

LGPL v.2.1

Yes:

No specific restriction.

New BSD License

Yes:

Unlike strong copyleft licenses, code under the MPL may be combined with code not licensed under the MPL. When such a larger work has been created, MPL source code and any modifications thereof must remain under the terms of the MPL, however non-MPL code remains non-MPL.

Mozilla Public License (MPL) 1.1

Yes:

No restrictions.

Apache License 2.0