

License Exceptions

¹ Contents

2	gcc-8 .																													2
3	libtool			•									•						•	•						•				3
4	elfutils		•	•	•		•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	3

⁵ Exceptions to the Apertis license expectations¹ are listed below. Each exception

⁶ must provide the following information:

project	The project name
component	The repository components apertis:*:target
date	The date at which the exception was added to this
	document
validator	The name of the person who validated the exception
rule	The rules that are ignored by this exception
reason	A description of why the exception is granted and makes
	sense

7 gcc-8

project	gcc-8
component	apertis:*:target
date	April 17, 2019
validator	fredo
rule	No GPL v3

 $^{^{1}} https://martyn.pages.apertis.org/apertis-website/policies/license-expectations/$

reason	The GCC source package is granted exception to be
	present in target repository component because it produces
	binary packages covered by different licensing terms:
	• the compiler packages are released under the GPL-3
	• the libgcc runtime library is covered by the GCC
	Runtime Library Exceptions ²
	Programs compiled with GCC link to the libgee library to
	implement some compiler intrinsics, which means that the
	libgcc must live in the apertis:*:target component since it
	is a direct runtime dependency of packages in the same
	component.
	For this reason, an exception is granted to the gcc source
	package on the ground that:
	• code that is shipped on target devices (that is,
	libgcc) is covered by the GCC Runtime Library
	Exceptions ³
	• the pure GPL-3 code is not meant to be shipped in

ipp target devices

8 libtool

project	libtool
component	apertis:*:target
date	August 05, 2019
validator	ritesh
rule	No GPL v3
reason	libtool is granted exception to be present in target
	repository component
	because all the source files are licensed under the GPLv2
	with the exception
	of build files, which are licensed under GPLv3.
	These build files are used only to build the binary package
	and are not
	GPLv3 violations for the built binary packages.

9 elfutils

project elfutils

 $[\]label{eq:linear} \begin{array}{l} ^{2} https://www.gnu.org/licenses/gcc-exception-3.1-faq.html \\ ^{3} https://www.gnu.org/licenses/gcc-exception-3.1-faq.html \\ \end{array}$

component	apertis:*:target
date	September 17, 2019
validator	andrewsh
rule	No GPL v3
rule reason	 No GPL v3 elfutils is software dual-licensed as LGPL-3+ or GPL-2+, which means that any combined work using it has to be shipped under terms compatible with either of those two licenses. To avoid the effects of the GPL-3 provisions as required for the target repository, any combined work depending on any of the libraries provided by elfutils must be effectively licensed under the GPL-2 terms. The following binary packages are linking against elfutils in way that no GPL-3 restrictions need to be applied as they only ship executables that produce combined works under the GPL-2: linux-perf-4.19: GPL-2, does not ship libraries, development tool not meant to be shipped on products linux-kbuild-4.19: GPL-2, does not ship libraries, development tool not meant to be shipped on products bluez: GPL-2, does not ship libraries libglib2.0-bin: LGPL-2.1, effectively combined to GPL-2, does not ship libraries
	In addition, the mesa source package produces binary
	packages containing drivers that need to be linked to
	libelf and, in turn, get linked to graphical applications. This would impose LGPL-3+ restrictions on libelf unless
	the application and all the other linked libraries can be
	combined as a GPL-2 work. This is not an acceptable
	restriction, so the affected drivers have been disabled, and
	no binary package produced from the mesa source package
	links to any library shipped by elfutils.
	mine to any normy simpport of ciracito.