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My History

• Worked my first GPL enforcement case in 1999 (as FSF volunteer).

• Started working for FSF in 2000 (was there until 2005).

• Now: President & Distinguished Technologist of Software Freedom Conservancy & on Board of Directors of the FSF.

• Both FSF and Conservancy have extensive GPL enforcement programs:
  – so, the plurality of my time since 1999 has been spent on GPL enforcement.

How GPL Works (Theoretically)

• Copyright: the internationalized standard for authors’ controls over works.

• Use copyright license to grant permission.

• Make permission conditional on giving your downstream the four freedoms.

• This is the copyright law hack of copyleft.

• Copyright rules require compliance with the license.
How GPL Works (In Reality)

- What do you do when someone violates?
  - (and social pressure for compliance fails)?

- Violation of the license means lost rights for distribution.
  - See GPLv2§4 & GPLv3§8
  - Further distribution thereafter (even in compliance) is copyright infringement.

- Copyright holders must use copyright enforcement:
  - ... but for a good cause: the four freedoms.

Complexity of Modern Enforcement

- Not all GPL enforcement is software-freedom-motivated.
- Oracle, after all, holds MySQL’s copyrights now & enforces.
  - I call this the corrupt version of what I do.

- Compliance must be paramount . . .
  - ... over all other interests.
  - Some call this “community enforcement”.
  - What’s that mean?

Who Reports Violations?

- Who reports violations to community enforcers?
  - Individual users.
- The user buys buy embedded products . . .
  - ... (such as a TV, DVD Player, wireless router, mobile phone) . . .
  - ... user tries to get the GPL’d sources and build them . . .
  - ... and it doesn’t work.
- Conservancy gets a new report like this weekly.
Community Enforcement

- All community enforcement follows this rote procedure:
  - Receive a violation report from an end-user.
  - Verify it’s really a violation.
  - Send a letter to the violator.
  - CCS-Ask: Ask the violator to submit CCS candidates
  - Review and provide feedback on CCS.
  - If we know why CCS doesn’t work, give patches to violator.
  - If CCS still has issues, goto CCS-Ask.
  - Ask violator to inform past customers.
  - Ask violator to cover reasonable hourly cost of this work.
  - Restore copyright permissions.

- Let’s talk about the money issue first.

Money

- No community enforcer is getting rich.
  - 501(c)(3) non-profit charity enforcement == accountability.
  - On a Form 990, you can look up: ...
  - ... how much Conservancy spends on / receives from enforcement.
  - ... my annual salary & compensation.
  - https://sfconservancy.org/about/filings/

- Anyway, who should pay for enforcement:
  - Those who *comply* or those who *violate*?
  - Individual donors to non-profits?

- There must be a deterrent.
- Confidentiality is something violators ask for.
What Conservancy Strives to Avoid

- Junking products:
  - That’s bad for the environment.
- Injunctions:
  - We’ve gotten them, but only after:
    * 1+ years of ongoing violation,
    * many warnings to the violator, &
    * explicitly warning the violator that’s our plan.
- Companies switching away from GPL’d software.
  - We all want them to use: just in compliance
- Lawsuits of any kind:
  - suing someone is always a last resort . . .
  - . . . usually after years & hundreds of hours of begging them to comply.

What’s CCS?

- The point of GPL is not merely to examine the source.
- GPLv2 requires what it calls “complete, corresponding source”: CCS
- The freedom to modify requires, as GPLv2 says:
  - “the scripts used to control compilation and installation of the executable”
- CCS check: verify these scripts actually do compile and install the executable.
- For embedded systems, this is not always easy.
- But, why is it important?
Coalition of the Willing

• Spring 2003: dozens of reports on WRT54G.
• Discussions begin with Cisco (who’d bought Linksys just weeks before)
• Story hits slashdot on 2003-06-08.
• FSF puts together group to do enforcement.
  – key members: Erik Andersen (BusyBox) & Harald Welte (Linux)

WRT54G Begat OpenWRT

• After years of complex negotiation, and many CCS “rounds”:
  – All CCS works (only two proprietary Linux modules held back).
  – First check-in of OpenWRT is that CCS release.
• OpenWRT project leaders to this day credit this as their start.
  – Source: Gregers Petersen on FLOSS Weekly Episode 265
• OpenWRT blossomed into the key replacement firmware for most wireless routers.

GPL-violations.org

• FSF was initially shy about lawsuits.
• Harald participated with FSF in WRT54G matter.
  – But Harald disagreed with FSF’s early 2000s “no litigation” strategy.
  – (in hindsight, Harald was right).
• Launches multiple lawsuits in Germany (about 8 between 2005-2008).
• Quite successful, but gpl-violations.org is now mostly defunct.
  – except for running the mailing lists.
Embedded Violations Prevalent

- Erik Andersen becomes exasperated by mid-2006.
  - post-WRT54G: router & NAS market is a violation haven.
- Erik asks for help.
- Conservancy becomes his enforcement agent (& receives some others’ © assignment)
- Conservancy has had > 100 GPL violations queued for action since 2007.
  - Conservancy’s list is now > 300
- Conservancy’s work in BusyBox enforcement has made a real difference.
  - both to BusyBox and Linux compliance.

Samsung: A Success Story

- Samsung has violated the GPL before.
  - Conservancy even had to sue them over TV products.
- Conservancy settled & the final CCS was really good!
  - That CCS launched SamyGo project
- More recently, Conservancy helped Samsung fix their exFAT module violation.

Why Do Violations Happen?

- As Samsung now knows:
- Compliance actually isn’t difficult.
  - & compliance problems are easily remedied.
- So, why are there so many violations?
The Upstream Problem

When I said that I was king of forwards, you got to understand that I don’t come up with this stuff. I just forward it along. You wouldn’t arrest a guy who was just passing drugs from one guy to another.

— Michael Scott, The Office (USA Version)

Suppliers Bully OEMs, AFAICT

• I’d be the worst police officer in the world.

• No one ever turns “states’ evidence”
  
  — ... at least they don’t for me, anyway.

• Me: “Please, just tell me on the record your supplier violated when distributing to you.”

• Them: “We’ll work with our upstream to get into compliance.”

What Can You Do About This?

What Can You Do About This? (0)

• Make sure the suppliers’ base system builds/install from sources.
  
  – Consider using Yocto (automated tools to help w/ compliance)
  – It’s better engineering to have reproducible builds anyway.
  – Convince your bosses the build/install process isn’t their value add.

What Can You Do About This? (1)

• Just put that CCS online & put URL in the manual.
  
  – No, GPLv2 doesn’t require this!
  – But, I don’t want to test your offers for source.
  – Your fulfillment department will screw this up.
What Can You Do About This? (2)

- If possible, help select the supplier.
  - Ask the supplier up front about CCS.
  - Demand legal indemnity from your upstream!

What Can You Do About This? (3)

- But, most importantly:
- Please join Conservancy’s Coalition.
- For context, a bit of the coalition’s history:

Historical BusyBox Enforcement

- Erik Andersen rewrote BusyBox from scratch (starting 2001).
- BusyBox slowly but surely became standard userspace for embedded systems.
- Linux plus BusyBox:
  - Standard for embedded systems.
  - Usually out of compliance.

Just Look Busy!

- BusyBox enforcement was de-facto for Linux.
  - The Tempest in a Toybox
  - BusyBox copyright holders request comprehensive GPL compliance.
  - Some Linux developers felt this was unfair…
  - …but other Linux developers supported it.
  - (i.e., community was already split on this question.)
- BusyBox copyright holders don’t stand alone.

Busybox is arguably the most litigated piece of GPL software in the world. . . . Litigants have sometimes requested remedies outside the scope of busybox itself…
— Tim Bird of Sony Corporation, in January 2012
Denys, The Voice of Reason

- Current BusyBox maintainer has that special skill of Free Software developers...
  - ... to find the sane arguments hidden among troll-ish attacks.
- I walk through Brussels on the phone with Denys...
  - ... the day before FOSDEM 2012...
  - ... and he convinces me:
- To continue with enforcement, Linux developers must be involved.

Garrett, Linux’s Freedom Fighter

- For years, Matthew Garrett had asked me to help him enforce the GPL on Linux.
- I'd told him that as it stood, it was easier to just work based on BusyBox.
- After so much had changed, it made sense to simply engage directly on behalf of Linux developers.
  - & there were many others who felt the same as Matthew did.
- GPL Compliance Project for Linux Developers gives structure to Linux compliance activity.

Expanding the Coalition

- On 2012-05-29, Conservancy announced expanded GPL enforcement efforts.
- Conservancy now actively enforces GPL for:
  - BusyBox, Linux, Samba, Mercurial
- Linux is not a full Conservancy member project:
  - Conservancy enforces for a coalition of about a dozen prominent copyright holders.
  - Matthew Garrett & David Woodhouse are the most public.
  - We expect to offer this service to more projects.
The Great Queue

- We’re aware of hundreds of embedded Linux GPL violations.
  - Each one takes 40-100 hours of work to resolve.
  - Over a period of usually 3-6 months.
- The CCS issue is the most difficult:
  - CCS candidates just don’t build.
- But, we’re facing a worse problem everywhere.

Linux’s GPL Elephant

- I used to avoid the elephant, but now it’s the central issue of compliance.

Linux’s GPL Elephant

- Are Linux modules derivative/combined works of/with Linux?
  - I & our lawyers believe they almost always are.
  - Many corporate lawyers disagree.
- Case law is limited:
  - Both sides believe they’re correct.
  - No general rule: the actual facts of a specific situation always matter.
  - This is the exact type of issue that becomes a big court case.
- My political opponents call this: “the ground war of GPL”
  - Maybe it’s time for that ground war.

Biggest Way You Can Help

- You’re all embedded Linux developers.
  - That means it’s likely your copyrighted work that violators infringe.
  - Only you can help your users.
- OTOH, maybe you don’t care about the GPL or the freedoms it protects.
I don’t blame you if you don’t . . .

... the GPL doesn’t require you to like the license.

But, if you do care, you can join our coalition:

- To join the GPL Compliance Project for Linux Developers . . .
- . . . see me after the talk; I have blank forms with me. :)

More Info / Talk License

- URLs / Social Networking / Email:
  - Sign Up Today as part of the GPL Compliance Project for Linux Developers.
  - A Book I helped write: Copyleft and the GNU General Public License: A Comprehensive Tutorial is available.
  - Conservancy: sfconservancy.org & @conservancy
  - Me: faif.us & ebb.org/bkuhn
  - Slides: ebb.org/bkuhn/talks & gitorious.org/bkuhn/talks (source)
  - DONATE: https://sfconservancy.org/donate/
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