

Status	Actual Release	added to Github ?	License Full Name	License Short Identifier	Source/uri	Template Needed	License Author?	Date Submitted	Notes	Notes from Legal Team discussion
2. Accepted in v2.7		Y	BSD 1-Clause License	BSD-1-Clause	https://svnweb.freebsd.org/base/head/include/licenses.h?revision=250887&view=markup	Y	Berkeley Software Design, Inc.	11/30/2017	Submitted by Pedro Giffuni with the following remarks: While looking at adopting SPDX tagging for FreeBSD's source tree, I was unable to find references for many BSD license variants. The one-clause variant seems a logical extrapolation of the 3-Clause and 2-Clause BSD licenses. In the case of the URL, the file originated in Berkeley Software Design, Inc., a company set up by Berkeley CSRG alumni. The number (1) is likely unnecessary but serves the historical purpose of denoting the historic BSD ancestry.	https://github.com/spdx/license-list-XML/pull/522
2. Accepted in v2.7		Y	Community Data License Agreement - Permissive - Version 1.0	CDLA-Permissive-1.0	https://cdla.io/permissive-1-0	?	Linux Foundation	10/24/2017	Submitted by Michael Dolan: It is a new license for open data. We would like to have an SPDX identifier early on in its adoption if possible so that early adopters can use it.	https://github.com/spdx/license-list-XML/pull/470
2. Accepted in v2.7		Y	Community Data License Agreement - Sharing - Version 1.0	CDLA-Sharing-1.0	https://cdla.io/sharing-1-0	?	Linux Foundation	10/24/2017	Submitted by Michael Dolan: It is a new license for open data. We would like to have an SPDX identifier early on in its adoption if possible so that early adopters can use it.	https://github.com/spdx/license-list-XML/pull/471
2. Accepted in v2.7		Y	Eclipse Public License 2.0	EPL-2.0	https://www.eclipse.org/org/documents/epl-2.0/EPL-2.0.txt	?	Eclipse Foundation	8/21/2017	From Wayne Beaton wayne.beaton@eclipse-foundation.org The EPL-2.0 has been approved by the OSI and the Eclipse Board of Directors. We'd obviously like to see it included in the SPDX license list. FWIW, we're updating our legal documentation requirements to make heavy use of SPDX. License name: Eclipse Public License 2.0 Proposed Identifier: EPL-2.0 URL: https://www.eclipse.org/legal/epl-2.0/ The license is OSI-approved (though only just recently and so it's not posted yet) The Eclipse OMR and Eclipse OpenJ9 projects are both currently switching over to the new version and we expect numerous other existing Eclipse projects do so as well. The Eclipse Foundation is investing in the use of SPDX and since we expect many/most of our projects to update to the new version of the license, having representation in SPDX is critical path.	https://github.com/spdx/license-list-XML/pull/499
4. Not Accepted			License Agreement for the Usage of the OSCAT libraries	OSCAT	http://www.oscat.de/manager.html	No	OSCAT Project	7/27/2017	My employer redistributes the OSCAT libraries through our web site (https://store.codeys.com/catalogsearch/result?q=oscat), and we're in the process of improving our license handling. We want to standardize on SPDX license identifiers for free/open source software, and the OSCAT license currently has no such identifier. Remark: Other than indicated above, I'm not affiliated with OSCAT in any ways, and I did not yet communicate with the OSCAT project about this request. Thank you in advance! Best regards Markus Schaber CODESYS is a trademark of 3S-Smart Software Solutions GmbH	Clauses 1.4 and 1.5 need some clarification. Email sent to the requester on 2017-12-07.
2. Accepted in v2.7		Y	European Union Public License v1.2	EUPL-1.2	https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ckeditor_files/files/EUPL_v1.2%20EN%20UIF%20.pdf	No	the European Union	7/14/2017	OSI approved. Requested by both Sébastien Règne and Thomas Steenbergen.	Accepted without issues.
2. Accepted in v2.7		Y	BSD-2-Clause plus Patent License	BSD-2-Clause-Patent	https://opensource.org/licenses/BSDFplusPatent	?	McCoy Smith	5/31/2017	OSI approved. Note: This license is designed to provide: a) a simple permissive license; b) that is compatible with the GNU General Public License (GPL), version 2; and c) which also has an express patent grant included.	Name and Short Identifier need to be clarified. https://github.com/spdx/license-list-XML/pull/472
4. Not Accepted			BTC License	BTC	https://gist.github.com/jhabdas/018c0ba38f9f6c0c1076ab005cd8842		Josh Haddas	7/4/2017		Duplicate of ISC License, but with a different copyright statement.
4. Not Accepted			Glasgow Haskell Compiler License	ghc	https://www.haskell.org/ghc/license			4/28/2017		Duplicate of BSD-3-Clause.
2. Accepted in v2.6	2.6		W3C Software Notice and Document License (2015-05-13)	W3C-Software-20150513	https://www.w3.org/Consortium/Legal/2015/copyright-software-and-document		W3C		Wendy Seltzer (wseltzer@w3.org) writes: As of 13 May 2015, W3C uses the Software and Document License for its code: https://www.w3.org/Consortium/Legal/2015/copyright-software-and-document > Provide a short explanation regarding the need for this license or exception to be included on the SPDX License List, including identifying at least one program that uses this license. This license was updated from the 2002 version currently listed, to make clear that the license is applicable to both software and text, by changing the name and substituting "work" for instances of "software and its documentation." It moves "notice of changes or modifications to the files" to the copyright notice, to make clear that the license is compatible with other liberal licenses. > Indicate whether the license is OSI-approved An update to an OSI-approved license, updating the names and clarifying application to text and software. https://opensource.org/licenses/W3C	
3. On Hold			Licencia Pública General para Bolivia, v1	LPG-Bolivia-1.0	https://softwarelibre.gob.bo/licencia.php	No	Agencia para el Desarrollo de la Sociedad de la Información en Bolivia	9/29/2016	From David Nina M. nmtdavid@gmail. Es muy importante incorporar este tipo de licencia a todo tipo de Software desarrollado en el territorio de Bolivia y su uso libre. Hacer que no solo las instituciones públicas de Bolivia, puedan usarla sino hacer que el conjunto de los desarrolladores puedan utilizarla y hacer crecer la comunidad de Software Libre en Bolivia. Este proyecto debe contener una licencia LPG-Bolivia https://www.rnmjs.com/package/codigos-gob-bo	Discussed on Dec 22 - inclined to add this, but had no way to verify OSI definition aspect b/c no one fluent Spanish speakers. Is based on GPL. JL to reply to requestor (and ask fluent Spanish speaker to review) - but likely to add for 2.6 Discussed 1/5/2017 - need to reach out to license requestor and/or FSF to determine if it is an official translation, unofficial translation, or a translation and a port to local law
2. Accepted in v2.6	2.6		Unicode License Agreement - Data Files and Software (2015)	Unicode-DFS-2015	https://web.archive.org/web/20151224134844/http://unicode.org/copyright.html		Unicode, Inc.	7/27/2016	From: "Steven R. Loomis" <sr295@gmail.com> Date: Wed, 27 Jul 2016 14:07:11 -0700 Unicode-TOU revision This license has a revision. Short name: Unicode-TOU re: http://spdx.org/licenses/Unicode-TOU.html#licenseText Please note that the Unicode-TOU has been revised, see http://www.unicode.org/copyright.html - the ICU project is now under Unicode, and so ICU is now under Unicode-TOU and not under ICU Example use: ICU website: http://site.icu-project.org/link/open-source-license ICU contents: http://source.icu-project.org/repos/icu/icu/trunk/LICENSE	Discussed on Sept 29 2016 call: - changes to Unicode-TOU are not significant. Sam to add markup to Unicode-TOU accommodate this - did not have Unicode License Agreement for Data Files and Software - either old version or current version. Versions are different (clause c was removed in 2016 version). no templation needed b/c specific full name: UNICODE, INC. LICENSE AGREEMENT - DATA FILES AND SOFTWARE (2016) Identifier: Unicode-DFS-2015 Identifier: Unicode-DFS-2015 https://web.archive.org/web/20151224134844/http://unicode.org/copyright.html
2. Accepted in v2.6	2.6		Unicode License Agreement - Data Files and Software (2016)	Unicode-DFS-2016	http://www.unicode.org/copyright.html		Unicode, Inc.	7/27/2016	From: "Steven R. Loomis" <sr295@gmail.com> Date: Wed, 27 Jul 2016 14:07:11 -0700 Unicode-TOU revision This license has a revision. Short name: Unicode-TOU re: http://spdx.org/licenses/Unicode-TOU.html#licenseText Please note that the Unicode-TOU has been revised, see http://www.unicode.org/copyright.html - the ICU project is now under Unicode, and so ICU is now under Unicode-TOU and not under ICU Example use: ICU website: http://site.icu-project.org/link/open-source-license ICU contents: http://source.icu-project.org/repos/icu/icu/trunk/LICENSE	Discussed on Sept 29 2016 call: - changes to Unicode-TOU are not significant. Sam to add markup to Unicode-TOU accommodate this - did not have Unicode License Agreement for Data Files and Software - either old version or current version. Versions are different (clause c was removed in 2016 version). no templation needed b/c specific full name: UNICODE, INC. LICENSE AGREEMENT - DATA FILES AND SOFTWARE (2016) Identifier: Unicode-DFS-2016 Identifier: Unicode-DFS-2015 https://web.archive.org/web/20151224134844/http://unicode.org/copyright.html
2. Accepted in v2.6	2.6		TCP Wrappers License	TCP-wrappers	http://tc.quest.com/topics/openssh/license.php#tcpwrappers	No	Wietse Venema	3/30/2016	From Tom Incovia: Please consider including the TCP-wrappers template license in the SPDX license list. This license is associated with a very common open source component, TCP-Wrappers. Although not used much outside of TCP-wrappers, this license is very frequently referenced with regards to TCP-wrappers as a subcomponent in other open source projects. If you Google search the specific phrase "tcp-wrappers license", you will see ~1,200 hits - there are tens of thousands more hits for a less specific search - FYI, "merchantability" is misspelled in the license, and can be used for definitive searches for the license.	Discussed on Sept 29, 2016 call, could template second paragraph, but don't need to so won't now.
2. Accepted in v2.6	2.6		Net-SNMP License	Net-SNMP	http://net.snmp.sourceforge.net/about/license.html	?	?	8/1/2016	From Tom Incovia: Would you please consider including the Net-SNMP license as an SPDX-vetted license? Here is a reference in DejaCode: https://enterprise.deja.com/license_library/Demo/net-snmpl/ . In terms of use in the wild, 273,000 hits on the text Net-SNMP and License; 3,500 hits on the specific string "Net-SNMP license". from Sam Ellis: The licenses in this file that look to me as if could be fully described with the expression: BSD-3-CLAUSE AND MIT-CMU. Are we seeing licenses in this file that are neither of these two, or are there other reasons that the combination deserves a separate identifier?	Discussed on Aug 4 & Dec 22: see minutes: http://wiki.spdx.org/view/Legal_Team/Minutes/2016-08-04 and email discussion: https://lists.spdx.org/?l=spdx-legal&list=archive&subject=2016-August/thread.html and December minutes: http://wiki.spdx.org/view/Legal_Team/Minutes/2016-12-22

Status	Actual Release	added to Github ?	License Full Name	License Short Identifier	Source/uri	Template Needed	License Author?	Date Submitted	Notes	Notes from Legal Team discussion
2. Accepted for v2.3	2.3		curl License	curl	https://github.com/hagger/curl/blob/master/COPYING	No		10/20/2015	DMC: The cURL project is a bit spelling-challenged. One sees "curl", "Curl", and "cURL" throughout the project artifacts. "cURL" might be the preferred spelling. See http://curl.haxx.se/legal/thename.html also http://curl.haxx.se/docs/copyright.html "curl" chosen	
2. Accepted for v2.3	2.3		Info-ZIP License	Info-ZIP	http://www.info-zip.org/license.html	No		10/20/2015	Per Tom Inconvia: Has SPDX considered the Info-Zip License: http://www.info-zip.org/license.html , with additional explanations here: https://enterprise.deja.com/license_library/Demo/info-zip/#license-text? Tom	
2. Accepted for v2.3	2.3		Open CASCADE Technology Public License	OCCT-PL	http://www.opencascade.com/content/occt-public-license	No		10/12/2015	Eric Weddington Eric.Weddington@trnbl.com via lists.spdx.org I've recently run across the Open Cascade project: http://www.opencascade.com/content/open-source-development http://dev.opencascade.org/ For versions <= 6.6.0, they have their own custom license, the Open Cascade Technology Public License: http://www.opencascade.com/content/occt-public-license (DMC: See the Exceptions worksheet for the following.) For versions >= 6.7.0, they are using the LGPL-2.1 + Open CASCADE Exception (version 1.0): http://www.opencascade.com/content/licensing AFAIK, neither of these have been OSI approved. I propose that both the earlier custom license, and the newer exception, be added to the SPDX list. I do not have a proposed full name or short identifier, as I am not the owner / creator of these licenses.	"12. Term This License is granted to You for a term equal to the remaining period of protection covered by the intellectual property rights applicable to the Original Code." Assuming that this means the license reverts to public domain after the expiration of the copyright.
2. Accepted for v2.2	2.2		BSD Zero Clause License	0BSD	http://landley.net/0bsd/license.html	No		6/15/2015	Per Rob Landley: This is the license used by Toybox, which was merged into android and lizen. Other projects are considering it, which is why SPDX was suggested. The provided license URL has a "Why 0BSD?" section, Full Name and Short Identifier modified by legal group.	
2. Accepted for v2.2	2.2		CeCILL Free Software License Agreement v2.1	CECILL-2.1	http://opensource.org/licenses/CECILL-2.1			5/26/2015	From Sam Ellis: I'd like to propose adding the CECILL-2.1 license to the license list. The license list already contains earlier versions of this license, so the proposed details follow on from the existing scheme: OSI Approved: Yes (2.1 only, see http://opensource.org/licenses/CECILL-2.1) Specimen copies: * html en: http://www.cecill.info/licenses/Licence_CeCILL_V2.1-en.html * text en: http://www.cecill.info/licenses/Licence_CeCILL_V2.1-en.txt * html fr: http://www.cecill.info/licenses/Licence_CeCILL_V2.1-fr.html * text fr: http://www.cecill.info/licenses/Licence_CeCILL_V2.1-fr.txt	
2. Accepted for v2.2	2.2		CrystalStacker License	CrystalStacker	https://fedoraproject.org/wiki/Licensing:CrystalStacker?rd=Licensing/CrystalStacker	No		10/17/2015	Approved in Legal Call. Legal group decided to use the Fedora text.	
2. Accepted for v2.2	2.2		Interbase Public License v1.0	Interbase-1.0	https://web.archive.org/web/20060319014854/http://info.borland.com/developsupport/interbase/opensource/PL.html	No		10/17/2015	Approved in Legal Call. From Fedora list.	
2. Accepted for v2.2	2.2		Sendmail License	Sendmail	http://www.sendmail.com/pdfs/open_source/sendmail_license.pdf	No		10/17/2015	Approved in Legal Call. From Fedora list.	
2. Accepted for v2.5	2.5		BSD 3-Clause No Nuclear License	BSD-3-Clause-No-Nuclear-License	http://download.oracle.com/otn-pub/java/licenses/bsd.txt?AuthParam=1467140197_43d516ca1776bd08a6923ea775b5a1cc	no		3/30/2016	Sam Ellis - see: http://lists.spdx.org/?l=lists.spdx.org/pipermail/spdx-legal/2016-March/001678.html and related discussion Note field: this is the same license as BSD-3-Clause-No-Nuclear-Warranty, except it specifies that that software is "not licensed" for use in a nuclear facility, as opposed to a non-warranty for such use. This is an older, copyright Sun.	
2. Accepted for v2.5	2.5		BSD 3-Clause No Nuclear License 2014	BSD-3-Clause-No-Nuclear-License-2014	https://java.net/projects/javaservlet/ai/pages/Berkeley_License	no		7/7/2016	More recent than the other no-nuclear licenses. post-Oracle-acquisition	
2. Accepted for v2.5	2.5		BSD 3-Clause No Nuclear Warranty	BSD-3-Clause-No-Nuclear-Warranty	https://jogamp.org/glt/?r=gluegen-glt-a=blod_plain-f=LICENSE.txt	no			Very commonly used The license text in the URL provided starts at "1.2) The GlueGen source tree contains code from Sun Microsystems, Inc. which is covered by the New BSD 3-clause license."	
2. Accepted for v2.5	2.5		BSD Source Code Attribution	BSD-Source-Code	https://github.com/robbehanson/CocoaHTTPServer/blob/master/LICENSE.txt	Yes	did not respond	2/28/2016	From Tom Inconvia: I have come across the license below several times now. It is generally stated to be the "BSD license". It is the SPDX BSD-3-Clause minus clause 2. Redistributions in binary form must reproduce the above copyright notice, this list of conditions and the following disclaimer in the documentation and/or other materials provided with the distribution". Below is an example for the CocoaHTTPServer. Other project that use this license include TaffyDB (Taffy.js), CocoaLumberjack, and several projects produced by Deusty LLC. This license is not hugely popular, but the attribution as the "BSD License" for multiple projects is potentially confusing which may merit a separate SPDX license if for no other reason than avoiding confusion regarding this being THE BSD license. CocoaHTTPServer BSD License Copyright (c) 2011, Deusty, LLC All rights reserved. Redistribution and use of this software in source and binary forms, with or without modification, are permitted provided that the following conditions are met: Redistributions of source code must retain the above copyright notice, this list of conditions and the following disclaimer. Neither the name of Deusty nor the names of its contributors may be used to endorse or promote products derived from this software without specific prior written permission of Deusty, LLC. THIS SOFTWARE IS PROVIDED BY THE COPYRIGHT HOLDERS AND CONTRIBUTORS "AS IS" AND ANY EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE ARE DISCLAIMED. IN NO EVENT SHALL THE COPYRIGHT OWNER OR CONTRIBUTORS BE LIABLE FOR ANY DIRECT, INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL, SPECIAL, EXEMPLARY, OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES (INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, PROCUREMENT OF SUBSTITUTE GOODS OR SERVICES; LOSS OF USE, DATA, OR PROFITS; OR BUSINESS INTERRUPTION) HOWEVER CAUSED AND ON ANY THEORY OF LIABILITY, WHETHER IN CONTRACT, STRICT LIABILITY, OR TORT (INCLUDING NEGLIGENCE OR OTHERWISE) ARISING IN ANY WAY OUT OF THE USE OF THIS SOFTWARE, EVEN IF ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGE. Per Kevin P. Fleming: "HIRC someone was just asking about this exact license construction on the OSI lists recently. They were wondering what the results would be for a binary distribution."	
2. Accepted for v2.4	2.4		Free Art License 1.2	FAL-1.2	http://artlibre.org/licenses/la/licence-art-libre-12/	No		1/21/2016	The Free Art License (and its original french version "Licence Art Libre") has gained popularity among the years especially in the artistic and designer community of Europe. Countless projects use it today and, for example, Github hosts more than a thousand files referencing this license. Github is also willing to include it in their license suggestions (from the choosealicense.com website), if it has an entry in the SPDX list (hence this request). See this link for more info: https://github.com/github/choosealicense.com/issues/314 A well know free software project using the Free Art License 1.3 is Wallabag https://www.wallabag.org/ , an open source clone of Pocket. Wallabag uses this license for their logo https://github.com/wallabag/logo Thanks a lot for considering adding this to the SPDX list. Have a nice day. Julien Deswaef =>>> Discussion in progress to determine if all seven (7) language versions of the license need to be added to the SPDX license list.	

Status	Actual Release	added to Github ?	License Full Name	License Short Identifier	Source/uri	Template Needed	License Author?	Date Submitted	Notes	Notes from Legal Team discussion
2. Accepted for 2.4	2.4		Free Art License 1.3	FAL-1.3	http://artlibre.org/licenses/fal/en/	No		1/21/2016	<p>The Free Art License (and its original french version "Licence Art Libre") has gained popularity among the years especially in the artistic and designer community of Europe. Countless projects use it today and, for example, Github hosts more than a thousand files referencing this license.</p> <p>Github is also willing to include it in their license suggestions (from the choosealicense.com website), if it has an entry in the SPDX list (hence this request). See this link for more info: https://github.com/github/choosealicense.com/issues/314</p> <p>A well known free software project using the Free Art License 1.3 is Wallabag https://www.wallabag.org/, an open source clone of Pocket. Wallabag uses this license for their logo https://github.com/wallabag/logo</p> <p>Thanks a lot for considering adding this to the SPDX list. Have a nice day. Julien Deswaef</p> <p>==> Discussion in progress to determine if all seven (7) language versions of the license need to be added to the SPDX license list.</p>	
2. Accepted for 2.4	2.4		FSF All Permissive License	FSFAP	http://www.gnu.org/prep/maintain/html_node/License-Notices-for-Other-Files.html	No		10/20/2015	<p>Didier Verna didier.epita.fr via lists.spdx.org</p> <p>Full name: GNU All Permissive License Short Identifier: GAPL OSI-Approved: no Explanation: This license is a short all-permissive one. Although I'm not qualified to certify this, it may be more or less equivalent to the UPL, but it is considerably shorter, to the point that it can be conveniently included in the header of short files directly, without the need for a separate LICENSE file in a software distribution. It is particularly well suited to files such as README etc.</p> <p>At least one program is using it thoroughly: https://www.lrde.epita.fr/~didier/software/lisp/misc.php#asdf-flv https://github.com/didierverna/asdf-flv</p> <p>License text: Copying and distribution of this file, with or without modification, are permitted in any medium without royalty provided the copyright notice and this notice are preserved. This file is offered as-is, without any warranty.</p>	
2. Accepted for 2.4	2.4		Licence Libre du Québec – Permissive version 1.1	LILIQ-P-1.1	http://opensource.org/licenses/LILIQ-P-1.1	No		1/17/2016		
2. Accepted for 2.4	2.4		Licence Libre du Québec – Réciprocité version 1.1	LILIQ-R-1.1	http://opensource.org/licenses/LILIQ-R-1.1	No		1/17/2016		
2. Accepted for 2.4	2.4		Licence Libre du Québec – Réciprocité forte version 1.1	LILIQ-Rplus-1.1	http://opensource.org/licenses/LILIQ-Rplus-1.1	No		1/17/2016	Concerned about the use of the "*" in the license name.	
2. Accepted for 2.4	2.4		Norwegian Licence for Open Government Data	NLOD-1.0	http://data.norge.no/nlod/en/1.0	No		1/7/2016	This license is not really intended for software (their info actually recommends using other licenses specific to s/w), but for other types of copyrightable material and databases http://lists.spdx.org/pipermail/spdx-legal/2016-January/001621.html	
2. Accepted for 2.4	2.4		OSET Public License version 2.1	OSET-PL-2.1	http://opensource.org/licenses/OPL-2.1	?		1/17/2016	The license short identifier suggested by the original license author, and used in the OSI URL, OPL-2.1, will cause confusion because there is already an "Open Public License" (OPL-n.n). The SPDX legal group prefers something like OSET-PL-2.1 for clarity.	
2. Accepted for 2.4	2.4		Secure Messaging Protocol Public License	SMPPL	https://github.com/dcbake/SMP/blob/master/Documentation/License.txt	No		1/28/2016	from Tom Iacoviva see: http://lists.spdx.org/pipermail/spdx-legal/2016-January/001634.html	
2. Accepted for 2.1	2.1		Lesser General Public License for Linguistic Resources	LGPLLR	http://www.igm.univ-niv.fr/~unitex/igpllr.html	No		4/16/2015	<p>Per Cristian Martinez cristian.martinez@univ-paris-est.fr</p> <p>LGPLLR is the Lesser General Public License for Linguistic Resources (electronic dictionaries, tree banks, word nets, syntactic grammars, annotated corpora, etc), formally a collection of data about language prepared so as to be used with application programs. Linguistic data may be easier to fix and extend than programs, but available manpower is useless if data are not modifiable, this is the example of linguistic resources with restricted distribution policies which suffer from the same problems that non-free software, to overcome this issue, the LGPLLR allows people to share and modify the data with an appropriate license. Some works using the LGPLLR:</p> <p>Unitex/GramLab : (http://unitexgramlab.org) A corpus processing system. Electronic Dictionaries and Grammars are distributed under the terms of the LGPLLR</p> <p>Prolex : (http://www.cnrtl.fr/lexiques/prolex) Prolex Linguistic Resources are distributed under the terms of the LGPLLR</p> <p>Blogoscopie : (http://www.lina.univ-nantes.fr/?Ressources-disponibles-sous.html) Blogoscopie Corpus is distributed under the terms of the LGPLLR</p> <p>Hoop : (https://www.projet-plume.org/relier/hoop) Hoop resources are distributed under the terms of the LGPLLR</p>	
2. Accepted for 2.1	2.1		Lesser General Public License for Linguistic Resources - continued	LGPLLR continued	https://raw.githubusercontent.com/UnitexGramLab/LGPLLR/master/LGPLLR			4/16/2015	<p>Per Sam Ellis via lists.spdx.org</p> <p>Further background information on the license can be found here: http://2009.mil.info/IMG/pdf/RMLL2009-Sciences-Sebastien_Paumier-LGPLLR.pdf</p> <p>How widespread is the license? Googling for the license name suggests that the license is at present very niche, with the primary references being in various academic papers. Nonetheless I was able to find a few recent (2009, 2010, 2013) examples of software that included this license (in addition to those that Cristian listed below).</p> <p>Is the short name sensible? The proposed short name is also how the license is abbreviated on various websites I looked at, though there is inconsistency as to whether or not a hyphen is present. The license carries no obvious version number, so not including a version in the short identifier looks correct.</p> <p>Does the license fall under the scope of SPDX? SPDX primarily covers "software" licenses, by which I think is usually meant licenses for "code" or derivations thereof. This license covers data, but the data is primarily for consumption by software, and thus one can expect this data to be found in or alongside software releases.</p> <p>What does FOSSology make of the license? FOSSology 2.6.1 reports the license as LGPL.</p> <p>Per Kevin Fleming kevin@kpfleming.us</p> <p>What is the relationship of this license to the LGPL as published by the FSF? While the name "LGPL" is not a trademark, unless this license is closely related to it, using the name "LGPL" is bound to cause confusion (especially because the Lesser part of the LGPL provides additional freedoms that don't seem to be relevant for data).</p>	
2. Accepted for 2.1	2.1		Spencer License 86	Spencer-86		No		4/16/2015	<p>Suggested by Dennis Clark, for the sake of completeness, during Legal review of Spencer-97.</p> <p>Copyright (c) 1986 by University of Toronto. Written by Henry Spencer. Not derived from licensed software.</p> <p>Permission is granted to anyone to use this software for any purpose on any computer system, and to redistribute it freely, subject to the following restrictions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The author is not responsible for the consequences of use of this software, no matter how awful, even if they arise from defects in it. The origin of this software must not be misrepresented, either by explicit claim or by omission. Altered versions must be plainly marked as such, and must not be misrepresented as being the original software. <p>Beware that some of this code is subtly aware of the way operator precedence is structured in regular expressions. Serious changes in regular-expression syntax might require a total rethink.</p>	

Status	Actual Release	added to Github?	License Full Name	License Short Identifier	Source/url	Template Needed	License Author?	Date Submitted	Notes	Notes from Legal Team discussion
2. Accepted for 2.1	2.1		Spencer License 94	Spencer-94	https://sourceware.org/newlib/COPYING.NEWLIB	No		2/8/2015	Suggested by Tom Incorvia. Note added by Sam Ellis: "I can confirm that I've seen this license too. An example is in newlib (https://sourceware.org/newlib/COPYING.NEWLIB) about half-way down." Note added by Dennis Clark: "I have most often seen this license text used by Henry Spencer for his Regexp components. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry_Spencer " Per Legal discussion: Added 97 to the name/identifier. Copyright (c) xxx by xxx. Written by xxx. Not derived from licensed software. Permission is granted to anyone to use this software for any purpose on any computer system, and to redistribute it in any way, subject to the following restrictions: 1. The author is not responsible for the consequences of use of this software, no matter how awful, even if they arise from defects in it. 2. The origin of this software must not be misrepresented, either by explicit claim or by omission. 3. Altered versions must be plainly marked as such, and must not be misrepresented (by explicit claim or omission) as being the original software. 4. This notice must not be removed or altered.	
2. Accepted for 2.1	2.1		Spencer License 99	Spencer-99		No		4/16/2015	Suggested by Dennis Clark, for the sake of completeness, during Legal review of Spencer-97. Note that credit in documentation is optional in this license. Copyright (c) 1998, 1999 Henry Spencer. All rights reserved. Development of this software was funded, in part, by Cray Research Inc., UUNET Communications Services Inc., Sun Microsystems Inc., and Scriptics Corporation, none of whom are responsible for the results. The author thanks all of them. Redistribution and use in source and binary forms - with or without modification - are permitted for any purpose, provided that redistributions in source form retain this entire copyright notice and indicate the origin and nature of any modifications. I'd appreciate being given credit for this package in the documentation of software which uses it, but that is not a requirement. THIS SOFTWARE IS PROVIDED "AS IS" AND ANY EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTIES, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF MERCHANTABILITY AND FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE ARE DISCLAIMED. IN NO EVENT SHALL HENRY SPENCER BE LIABLE FOR ANY DIRECT, INDIRECT, INCIDENTAL, SPECIAL, EXEMPLARY, OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES (INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, PROCUREMENT OF SUBSTITUTE GOODS OR SERVICES; LOSS OF USE, DATA, OR PROFITS; OR BUSINESS INTERRUPTION) HOWEVER CAUSED AND ON ANY THEORY OF LIABILITY, WHETHER IN CONTRACT, STRICT LIABILITY, OR TORT (INCLUDING NEGLIGENCE OR OTHERWISE) ARISING IN ANY WAY OUT OF THE USE OF THIS SOFTWARE, EVEN IF ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGE.	
2. Accepted for 2.1	2.1		Universal Permissive License (UPL) v1.0	UPL-1.0	http://opensource.org/licenses/UPL	No		3/18/2015	OSI approved. The SPDX Legal working group determined that the short identifier should have a version: UPL-1.0	
2. Accepted for 2.0rc-3	2.0rc-3		CNRI Jython License	CNRI-Jython	http://www.jython.org/license.html	No		1/25/2015	SPDX Discussion: Technically, this could be represented as: Python-2.0 AND BSD-3-Clause AND LICENSE-REF. Then "JPython 1.1" should be added as CNRI-Jython. Python-2.0 AND BSD-3-Clause AND CNRI-Jython Per Sam Ellis: I'd like to propose adding the license for Jython (a Java implementation of Python) to the SPDX License List. As is a similar case for Python, portions of the Jython software are actually covered by a number of different licenses (http://www.jython.org/license.html), representing the history of the code. * Python Software Foundation License Version 2: This is actually almost identical to the first license for the Python entry on the SPDX License List (https://spdx.org/licenses/Python-2.0). As per previous emails on this subject, I advocate splitting out these combined Python licenses into separate 'atomic' licenses so that they can be reused in other places. Jython is one such example of where a portion of the existing Python entry can be reused. If we go down this route, the entry can be shared by templating it to cope with the variation 'Jython' instead of 'Python' as the software name, and coping with a slightly different copyright declaration in clause 2. * Jython 2.0, 2.1 License: This is a BSD-3-Clause license and does not need to be added to the License List separately. * Jython 1.1.x Software License: The License List already contains a similar license (https://spdx.org/licenses/CNRI-Python). However, apart from the obvious software name differences ('Jython' versus 'Python' and so on), there is a material difference; the Jython copy includes an additional clause (4) in relation to trademarks that the CNRI-Python license is missing. That in my opinion warrants the Jython version of this license being listed separately. If so, my suggestion for short identifier is 'CNRI-Jython', and full name is 'CNRI Jython License'. I have attached a plain text copy of this license text to this email.	
2. Accepted for 2.0rc-3	2.0rc-3		ICU License	ICU	http://icu-project.org/license			11/18/2014	As compared to the existing SPDX licenses, ICU most closely resembles the X11 license. As compared to the X11 license, ICU does not permit sublicensing and there are different terms around permission notices. The ICU project looks to be under active development according to their website. As an example, the ICU license is used in Eclipse IDE and can be found by downloading this Eclipse plug-in, http://download.eclipse.org/eclipse/updates/4.4/R-4.4.1-201409250400/plugins/com.ibm.icu_52.1.0.v201404241930.jar , extracting the contents and examining the file named <code>icu_files/license.html</code> .	
2. Accepted for 2.0rc-3	2.0rc-3		RSA Message-Digest License	RSA-MD	http://www.faqs.org/rfcs/rfc1321.html	Yes		1/28/2015	Per requestor, Sam.Ellis@arm.com: "I have seen two variants of this license for MD4 and MD5 algorithms, with the difference between these being only the copyright line and the name of the algorithm, and thus it may be possible to represent both of these with a single license template. An example of both MD4 and MD5 can be found here, by searching for "Message-Digest": http://www.zimbra.com/license/open_source_licenses_8.5.0.txt Per comments from Philippe Ombredanne: Both the MD4 and MD5 notices are found in RFCs, which is a good reference URL IMHO as they were crafted and submitted there by Ron Rivest from RSA. MD4: page 6/7: https://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc1320.txt MD5: page 7: https://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc1321.txt SPDX notes: Templating the product name (MD4 vs MD4 vs etc.) and provide Notes on the License List to indicate that this license covers all of them.	
2. Accepted for 2.0rc-3	2.0rc-3		W3C Software Notice and License (1998-07-20)	W3C-19980720	http://www.w3.org/Consortium/Legal/copyright-software-19980720.html			1/5/2015	Per requestor, Sam.Ellis@arm.com: "The license list already contains a newer version of this license dated 20021231 (http://spdx.org/licenses/W3C). These versions differ subtly in their legal terms so ideally the list should contain them both... OSI approved: no, not this version, though the newer 20021231 version is yes. Evidence of use: Examples of use can be seen in the following products third-party IP disclosure http://www.zimbra.com/license/open_source_licenses_7.1.4.txt . Searching for the term "W3C SOFTWARE NOTICE AND LICENSE" shows a number of matches, the first of which is the existing (newer) W3C Software license, and the second is an example of this older license. It may be beneficial to rename the existing license to clarify its version, and that it is different from the other W3C licenses that exist (such as the W3C Documentation license that I have separately emailed about). For example, renaming the short name to be: W3C-SOFTWARE-20021231." (Note: SPDX will change the Full Name of the later version of this, but not the Short Identifier, to conform with this one.)	

Status	Actual Release	added to Github ?	License Full Name	License Short Identifier	Source/url	Template Needed	License Author?	Date Submitted	Notes	Notes from Legal Team discussion
2. Accepted for 2.0rc-3			Jython License (additional notes)	Jython (additional notes)				1/26/2015	<p>Per Tom Incovia: On a previous legal team call I offered to look into differences between the Python License 2.0 (Python-2.0) and the Jython licenses. Note that Jython was originally called JPython. References to the full set of JPython and Jython software will be stated below as "JPython/Jython".</p> <p>There are 3 licenses associated with JPython/Jython. Only one, the JPython 1.1.x Software License, is unique. The other licenses are template matches for existing SPDX licenses:</p> <p>The licenses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> JPython 1.1.x Software License (attachment 1, unique); this is similar to but NOT a match for the SPDX CNRI Python License Jython 2.0, 2.1 License (attachment 2, template match); matches SPDX BSD-3-Clause license Jython License - covers version 2.2 and beyond; (attachment 3, template match); matches SPDX Python License 2.0 <p>The comparisons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> SPDX CNRI Python License and JPython 1.1.x Software License (attachment 4) - NO match SPDX BSD-3-Clause license and Jython 2.0, 2.1 License (attachment 5) - template match SPDX Python License 2.0 and Jython License (attachment 6) - template match <p>Recommendations: let's discuss.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fedora does not distinguish between the 3 licenses - they are collapsed into a single "Good License" line item: "JPython License (old)". Although the single line item serves the Fedora "Good" "Bad" requirement, a single name for 3 distinct licenses will not be effective for the SPDX license matching criteria, and is not recommended "Jython 2.0, 2.1 License" and "Jython License" are template matches. Our standard is to not create unique licenses for templates. 	
3. On Hold			Open Government Licence v3.0	OGL-3.0	http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/			6/5/2015	<p>From Matt Smith: This license is used by many public sector departments when releasing open data, such as: http://data.london.gov.uk/dataset/employment-rate-gender-working-age-disability-borough http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/Council_and_democracy/Your_information/Open_data/Payments_to_suppliers/index.htm http://data.gov.uk/dataset/road-accidents-safety-data</p> <p>From Dennis Clark: The text of the license at the provided URL contains this sentence: "This is version 3.0 of the Open Government Licence." There may be an issue regarding the Full Name: "License" or "Licence"?</p> <p>Per Legal Group: Decisions pending regarding whether Versions 1 and 2 should also be added. Mike Linksvayer should be invited to the Legal Group discussion regarding this submission.</p>	
4. Not Accepted			Sun BSD-3-Clause	Sun-BSD-3-Clause	http://net-snmp.sourceforge.net/about/license.html	?	?	8/4/2016	<p>The Sun entry in the Net-SNMP "license" is actually a variant of the standard BSD-3-Clause license because of the addition of:</p> <p>"Use is subject to license terms below. This distribution may include materials developed by third parties. Sun, Sun Microsystems, the Sun logo and Solaris are trademarks or registered trademarks of Sun Microsystems, Inc. in the U.S. and other countries."</p>	<p>Discussed on Aug 4 & Dec 22: (inapsis decision on Net-SNMP above) if want to use license expression, then would be good to add this as new license, to avoid using LicenseRef: to identify full stack. Is this used elsewhere (besides Net-SNMP) - doesn't appear so, some instances of it appearing alone, but only seems to be in old versions of Net-SNMP.</p> <p>From Sam Ellis: Personally I am not a fan of the 'package' licenses such as Python-2.0. They typically represent the combination of licenses found in a specific version of a specific package. There are lots of versions and lots of packages out there. How should we decide which of these deserves a license list entry. The use of SPDX expressions allows representation of all of these combinations of license without expanding the SPDX license list, so I consider it to be a more scalable solution.</p> <p>Another view on this comes from license compliance. For example, in the company I work for I know that my legal team are very familiar with BSD and MIT licenses and they and I would have an easy time if I wanted to use or contribute to a project that uses these. On the other hand, every differently named license that my legal team have not seen before creates a lot of work for them and me. Most likely in this case we would spot that the constituent licenses are BSD and MIT and all would be fine, but it still involves some time to make that comparison and check that we all agree with that. Having the license represented as a set of smaller and more readily identifiable licenses can help to reduce the cost of license compliance. My expectation is that this scenario is true for many companies as well as the open source community - familiar licenses are easy to deal with, unfamiliar licenses involve more work.</p> <p>Consierr adding note as to use in Net-SNMP b/c this part is so common to that license stack.</p>
4. Not Accepted	N/A		ISC OpenBSD License	ISC-OpenBSD	http://cvsweb.sro.openbsd.org/cgi-bin/cvsweb/sro/share/misc/license.template?rev=1.3&content-type=text/x-cvsweb-markup			4/18/2015	<p>Per Legal Team discussion: This is a duplicate of the ISC License. http://spdx.org/licenses/ISC.html</p> <p>Per Dennis Decker, Jensen ddj@gmail.net: There is no standard license header. The attached license template is from the OpenBSD project itself as linked to, and as it is used there currently (CVS revision 1.3).</p> <p>Many software components of OpenBSD are in widespread use, notably OpenSSH, LibreSSL, netcat, mg, PF, OpenBGPD, OpenNTPD, OpenSMTPD, mandoc, and OpenKED, besides the main project OpenBSD itself which is commonly used in firewalls. Hence there is a need to take into consideration its license, which is not exactly the ISC license.</p> <p>The ISC license of the OpenBSD project is the same as the ISC license, except the word "and" is used in the former, and the word combination "and/or" is used in the latter.</p> <p>ISC itself modified the ISC license in the year 2004. In a sense the ISC OpenBSD license is version 1.0 of the ISC license while the current ISC license for the years 2004 and forth would be version 1.1 or version 2.0. However, ISC provides no official version number on its license, so I recommend not attaching any version information to the short identifier.</p> <p>The confusion regarding the replacement of "and" with the word combination "and/or" appears to never have been resolved, since there are contradictory statements from ISC (Paul Vixie), FSF, and the University of Washington. Safe to say, OpenBSD has chosen to stay with the old version of the ISC license, because of simpler choice of words, and no perceived need to change.</p> <p>The difference may be interpreted differently by lawyers and courts, hence this request for a new license (variation).</p> <p>Wikipedia has links to discussion by Paul Vixie, etc., and FSF has links to the concerns of the University of Washington.</p> <p>As far as I can tell, U of W complained to FSF about the interpretation of the word "and", hence FSF complained to ISC, which then modified the ISC license to use the word combination "and/or" instead. However, it appears that U of W afterwards complained about the use of the word combination "and/or"? If you look closely at the dates, and what Paul Vixie is saying, it is not entirely clear what the fuzzi is about, and which party actually had any concern. What remains certain is that lawyers do not agree about the importance of the difference.</p> <p>Regards, Dennis Decker Jensen</p>	
4. Not Accepted			NAIST IPADIC License	IPADIC	http://chasen.naist.jp/chasen/distribution.html.en			1/29/2015	<p>Per requestor, Sam.Ellis@arm.com: "I found the ipadic license within Eclipse IDE, which ultimately derives from IBM's ICU (International Components for Unicode), and the source repository (http://source-icu-project.org/repos/icu/trunk/license.html) includes this license (search for "NAIST"). It is worth noting that this license makes reference to and includes a copy of a separate ICOT license. Optionally, these two licenses could be separated into two entries for the purposes of the SPDX License List. I will leave that for further discussion."</p> <p>SPDX legal group discussion: This is a unique, composite license, probably only used in this one instance, and not sufficiently common for the SPDX License List. Recommend that any use of this deploy with the License Ref syntax. If additional votes and/or usages are found, it can be reconsidered.</p>	
4. Not Accepted			Open Game License v1.0a	OGL-1.0a	http://www.wizards.com/G20/files/OGLV1.0a.pdf	No		10/15/2015	<p>Rob Conley robertsconley@gmail.com via lists.spdx.org Proposed Full Name: The Open Game License v1.0 Proposed Short Identifier: OGL-1.0 Not OSI-approved.</p> <p>For original request, see: http://lists.spdx.org/pipermail/spdx-legal/2015-October/001520.html</p> <p>2015-12-10: Needs more analysis by Legal group by someone familiar with gaming; Alan volunteered to look at 2016-01-07: decided not to accept, for explanation, see: http://wiki.spdx.org/view/Legal_TeamMinutes/2016-01-07</p>	

License List Field	Explanation of SPDX License List Fields
	The following information describes how each field on the License List is treated.
Status	Assigned by the SPDX Legal Working Group
1. Under Review	A license addition has been requested and is currently under review.
2. Accepted in v__	The license was added to indicated version of the SPDX License List. The SPDX License List version indicated may be yet to be released in the case where a license is accepted in between SPDX License List releases.
3. On Hold.	This means that more research is needed or there are other extenuating factors that have prevented a decision on the addition of the license to be made. See the Notes for more information.
4. Not Accepted.	The license was reviewed by the Legal Team and it was decided to not add the license to the SPDX License List at this time.
Actual Release	<i>Actual Release of the SPDX License List to include a License</i>
License Full Name	Name of the license as taken from its text or derived from its context.
	The full license name may omit certain words, such as "the," for alphabetical sorting purposes.
	No commas are used in the full name of the license.
	The word "version" is not spelled out for space reasons.
	For version, use lower case v and no period or space between v and the version number.
	No abbreviations are used after the full license name.
License Short Identifier	aka "SPDX license Identifier"
	Short identifier to be used to identify a license match to licenses contained on the SPDX license list in the context of an SPDX file
	Identifier should have no spaces in it
	Identifier consists of a short name, abbreviation, or acronym for the license
	Where applicable, license abbreviation will be followed by a dash and then the version number, in X.Y format
Source/url	URL for the standard text of the license, if an official standard text exists.
	Alternatively, another website that has a text version of the license, or source code that contains the license text.
Template Needed	Yes = License has replaceable text, and a template is needed for matching purposes.
Date Submitted	The date that a license inclusion request was submitted to the SPDX Legal Working Group.
Notes	Concise discussion points about the license.

Exception List Field	Explanation of SPDX License Exceptions List Fields
	The following information describes how each field on the License Exceptions list (whether on the webpage or within the spreadsheet) is treated.
Status	Assigned by the SPDX Legal Working Group
1. Under Review	An License Exception addition has been requested and is currently under review.
2. Accepted in v__	The License Exception was added to indicated version of the SPDX License Exceptions List. The SPDX License Exceptions List version indicated may be yet to be released in the case where a License Exception is accepted in between SPDX Exceptions List releases.
3. On Hold.	This means that more research is needed or there are other extenuating factors that have prevented a decision on the addition of the License Exception to be made. See the Notes for more information.
4. Not Accepted.	The License Exception was reviewed by the Legal Team and it was decided to not add the License Exception to the SPDX License Exceptions List at this time.
Planned Release	<i>Planned Release of the SPDX License and Exception List to include a specific exception.</i>
Full name of Exception	Name of the Exception as taken from its text or derived from its context.
	The full exception name may omit certain words, such as "the," for alphabetical sorting purposes.
	No commas are used in the full name of the exception.
	The word "version" is not spelled out for space reasons.
	For version, use lower case v and no period or space between v and the version number.
	No abbreviations are used after the full exception name.
Exception Identifier	aka "SPDX Exception Identifier"
	Short identifier to be used to identify an exception match to exceptions contained on the SPDX exception list in the context of an SPDX file
	Identifier should have no spaces in it
	Identifier consists of a short name, abbreviation, or acronym for the exception
	Where applicable, exception abbreviation will be followed by a dash and then the version number, in X.Y format
Source/url	URL for the standard text of the exception, if an official standard text exists.
	Alternatively, another website that has a text version of the exception, or source code that contains the exception text.
Notes	Most importantly, a reference to the license(s) to which this exception typically applies.
	May refer to an SPDX license that has been deprecated.
	May include the date of release, if known, using day-month-year format.
	Contains only facts or links to information. No interpretation allowed in these notes.
Text	Full exception text or, in the spreadsheet, reference to separate .txt file named by SPDX Exception Identifier that contains full exception text
Example of use	If known, a URL to a specific open source licensed package where this exception is used.
	Any additional information or columns contained in the spreadsheet version of the SPDX Exception List are not part of the official SPDX Exception List and are included for tracking or informational purposes only.