Subject: (Commercial) Upp consulting?!
Posted by JoseB on Mon, 30 Mar 2009 12:23:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello all,
As far as i understood, Upp is free for use for both open-source, freeware or commercial applications, right?

If I have a little enterprise. I am new in upp but as it is a really good tool, could i some day give consulting in UPP in my country in a commercial point of view.

I mean, can i organize paid trainning sessions and have paid upp tutorials etc?

Please, explain me if i could made that or not.

Thank you

Jose

Subject: Re: (Commercial) Upp consulting?!
Posted by mr_ped on Mon, 30 Mar 2009 13:16:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Basically:
new BSD license (also U++) - you can sell anything, even TheIDE itself, in whatever form (including binary, training, sources)...

GPL - you can sell training/support without limitation. You can sell your own work or the unmodified original work as long as you make sources accessible to customer and as long as the product is under GPL license too. But there's absolutely no restriction on monetary side of thing. (some people in forums have difficulty to understand this... just ignore them)

The problem is not whether you can. The problem is to find customer willing to pay for something what is available for free elsewhere. The training/support is best choice, because that's not available so directly, but if you are skilled merchant who can sell even firefox, you *can* (with sources and under GPL license).
Good luck turning this into profit (I'm not that good personally.).

Subject: Re: (Commercial) Upp consulting?!
Posted by JoseB on Mon, 30 Mar 2009 13:52:06 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

So, for trainning purposes and support material (tutorials etc) there is no problem.

Just one more question about UPP licences:

Upp is BSD
MinGW and gcc are GPL

Well, when we "generate" an executable from UPP source code using MinGW, what is the licence for the executable? BSD (From UPP) or GPL (from compilers)?

Thanks

Jose

Subject: Re: (Commercial) Upp consulting?!
Posted by mirek on Mon, 30 Mar 2009 14:00:56 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

JoseB wrote on Mon, 30 March 2009 09:52So, for trainning purposes and support material (tutorials etc) there is no problem.

Just one more question about UPP licences:

Upp is BSD
MinGW and gcc are GPL

Well, when we "generate" an executable from UPP source code using MinGW, what is the licence for the executable? BSD (From UPP) or GPL (from compilers)?

Compiler itself should not affect the final license.

You might want to check the license of libraries. AFAIK, mingw libraries are public domain...

Mirek

Subject: Re: (Commercial) Upp consulting?!
Posted by sergeynikitin on Mon, 30 Mar 2009 14:16:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

You may not deliver the GCC (MinGW).
Property of GCC - to produce a program in C++ language (not in GCC language). Without this feature, GCC - did not need. If you are not using their source GCC, which generate the code (not libraries to include C++ code), then you have no relationship to the license, which you use GCC.

Subject: Re: (Commercial) Upp consulting?!
Posted by JoseB on Mon, 30 Mar 2009 14:33:50 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Sorry people,

Let me know if i understood:

For training, support, tutorials, etc, no problem at all (BSD, GPL, LGPL).

For creating applications the best option is to delivery the source code too to not have problems of any type, right?

Jose

Subject: Re: (Commercial) Upp consulting?!
Posted by mr_ped on Mon, 30 Mar 2009 15:27:38 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

EDIT: I made huge mistake about linking of LGPL/GPL code, see following posts. (and I edited this one too).

Creating applications - depends what they consist of. Options are:

your C++ source - free

U++ libraries - new BSD (free)
 - some inclusions in "Bazaar" or "plugin" directory may have they own license, but they are either compatible with BSD in this aspect, or they should be reported to U++ developers as breaking the license. But usually if you see "external" code added to U++, it's worth to look out for license.

clib, stl and other common C/C++ libraries - usually LGPL or free

other more special libraries like SDL, xyzSQL, DirectX, etc..
 - you have to check license of each such library

Basically there are 3 most important licenses:

BSD - new is almost like "free", older ones sometimes require to give a credit of original authors

GPL - you can sell the result, but you must provide your source code under GPL too (sort of viral license)

LGPL - "lesser" GPL - very often used for libraries
 - you can link dynamically(!) to the library and remain free
 - if you modify the library source itself, you should provide it under GPL (sources), but only the

library. (i.e. inside library it's GPL as above, outside of library you are free)

- so pure U++ application is free. With some additional libraries like SDL/etc. you should check all the licenses and decide by those, LGPL are almost like free, GPL will infect whole source.

Subject: Re: (Commercial) Upp consulting?!
Posted by JoseB on Mon, 30 Mar 2009 18:04:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Well, my app uses these ones:

plugin\z
plugin\sqlite3
plugin\png
plugin\jpg

I got this info looking for the IDE window that shows the packages.

It seems that there are no problems with them.

Ok, i got the rule:
1. Develop pure Upp application
2. If external libs are needed, so check their lic or send an email to the authors

thank you

Jose

Subject: Re: (Commercial) Upp consulting?!
Posted by cbpporter on Mon, 30 Mar 2009 19:12:00 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

mr_ped wrote on Mon, 30 March 2009 18:27
GPL - you can sell the result, but you must provide your source code under GPL too (sort of viral license)
(clumsy) workaround - you can maybe link it dynamically (loading *.dll for example during program run) and call functions of it from commercial application. But this is sort of gray zone, because you have to do the dynamically linked part well (you can't link statically), and also I'm afraid you can't distribute such *.dll together with non-GPL software, i.e. you must distribute your application and those GPL modules separately. You have to provide sources for GPL modules. And some GPL people claim this is still not legal, maybe the best way is to ask author of GPL code if he likes your usage of it.

I think you can't do that. Still derived software. Must provide all sources, for modules also. This is why LGPL was invented, so that dynamically linked items can be distributed source free.

Subject: Re: (Commercial) Upp consulting?!
Posted by JoseB on Mon, 30 Mar 2009 19:17:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Confusion, is not it?

Like i said, we give the source code and no worries about lics.

Jose

Subject: Re: (Commercial) Upp consulting?!
Posted by mirek on Mon, 30 Mar 2009 20:55:31 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

mr_ped wrote on Mon, 30 March 2009 11:27

LGPL - "lesser" GPL - very often used for libraries
 - you can link statically to the library and remain free

AFAIK, wrong. You can only link DYNAMICALLY to the library and remain free.

(The obvious reason is that user of your application is then allowed to replace .so with altered code).

Note that some libraries, like wxWidgets, have amendments to LGPL that explicitly allows static linking too.

Mirek

Subject: Re: (Commercial) Upp consulting?!
Posted by mr_ped on Mon, 30 Mar 2009 22:14:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Yes, sorry, my mistake.
GPL - no linking.
LGPL - dynamic linking.