

I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

Continue

## Attribution 3.0 unported

This article contains special characters. Without proper display support you will see question marks, boxes, or other symbols. Copyright license for allowing free use of a work This article is about the Creative Commons licenses. For the organization that produced them, see Creative Commons. Certain Creative Commons license names are converted, such as CC BY-SA used by the Wikimedia projects (including Wikipedia) and FANDOM (Wikia). See Wikipedia:Text of Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License. Creative Commons logo Play media This video explains how Creative Commons licenses can be used in conjunction with commercial licensing arrangements A Creative Commons (CC) license is one of many copyright licenses that allow the free distribution of an otherwise copyrighted work. [note 1] A CC license is used when an author wants to give other people the right to share, use, and build on a work they (the author) created. CC gives an author flexibility (for example, they can choose to allow only non-commercial applications of a particular work) and protects the people who use or redistribute an author's work from concerns about copyright infringement, as long as they adhere to the terms specified in the license with which the author distributes the work. [1] [2] [3] [4] [5] There are different types of Creative Commons license. The licenses differ by different combinations representing the terms of the distribution condition. They were initially released on December 16, 2002 by Creative Commons, an American non-profit organization founded in 2001. There are also five versions of the suite of licenses, numbered 1.0 to 4.0. [6] Released in November 2013, the 4.0 license suite is the most recent. In October 2014, the Open Knowledge Foundation approved the Creative Commons CC BY, CC BY-SA and CC0 licenses as compliant with the Open Definition for content and data. [7] [8] [9] Applicable works Play media want to collaborate? animation by Creative Commons Play media The second version of Mayer and Bettle's promotional animation explains what Creative Commons Work is Work, which is licensed under a Creative Commons license, is subject to applicable copyright law. [10] Allows Creative Commons licenses to be applied to all work covered by copyright, including: books, plays, movies, music, articles, photos, blogs and websites. Software Although Software is also governed by copyright and CC licenses apply, the CC recommends not using it in software, specifically due to backward compatibility restrictions with existing widely used software licenses. [11] [12] Instead, developers can resort to more free and open-source software software licenses. In the outside of the FOSS licenses use case for software, there are several uses to use CC licenses to specify a Freeware license model; examples are The White Chamber, Mario or Assault Cube. [13] The Free Software Foundation cc0[14] as the preferred method of releasing software into the public domain. [15] However, the application of a Creative Commons license may not change the rights permitted by fair use or fair trade or exercise restrictions that violate copyright exceptions. [16] In addition, Creative Commons licenses are non-exclusive and non-revocable. [17] Any work or copies of the work obtained under a Creative Commons license can continue to be used under that license. [18] In the case of works protected by multiple Creative Commons licenses, the user can choose either. [19] Preconditions The author, or licensee in the event the author did a contractual transfer of rights, must have the exclusive rights to work. If the work has already been published under a public license, it can be uploaded by a third party, again on another platform, using a compatible license, and making reference and attribution to the original license (for example, by referring to the URL of the original license). [20] Consequences The license is non-exclusive and royalty-free, unlimited in terms of territory and duration, so is irrevocable unless a new license is granted by the author after the work has been significantly modified. Any use of the work that is not subject to other copyright rules activates the public license. Upon activation of the license, the licensee must abide by all the terms of the license, otherwise the license agreement is unlawful and the licensee would commit a copyright infringement. The author, or the licensee as a proxy, has the legal rights to act on a copyright infringement. The licensee has a limited period to correct any non-compliance. [20] Types of licensed Creative commons license spectrum between the public domain (above) and all rights reserved (below). The left side indicates the allowable use cases, on the right the license components. The dark green area gives Free Cultural Works compatible licenses, the two green areas compatibility with the Remix culture. CC licensing in 2014 (above and middle), Free cultural works compatible license use from 2010 to 2014 (under) Four rights The CC licenses all grant basic rights, such as the right to distribute copyrighted work worldwide for non-commercial purposes and without modification. [21] In addition, different versions of license prescribe different rights, as shown in this table:[22] Icon Right Description Attribution (BY) Licensees may copy, distribute, display and perform

derivative works and remixes based on it only if they give the author or licensor the credits (attribution) in the manner specified. Since release require all Creative Commons licenses attribution to the creator and contain the BY element. Share-alike (SA) Licensees may distribute derivative works only under a license that is identical (not more restrictive) to the license that governs the original work. (See also copyleft.) Without share-alike, derivative works can be but more restrictive licensing clauses, e.g. CC BY to CC BY-NC.) Non-commercial (NC) licensees may copy, distribute, display and perform the work, and create derivative works and remixes based on it only for non-commercial purposes. Non Derivative Works (ND) Licensees may only copy, distribute, display and perform literal copies of the work, not to perform derivative works and remixes based on it. Since version 4.0, derivative works are allowed, but may not be shared. The last two clauses are not free content licenses, according to definitions such as DFSG or the Standards of the Free Software Foundation, and cannot be used in contexts that require these freedoms, such as Wikipedia. For software, Creative Commons includes three free licenses created by other institutions: the BSD license, the GNU LGPL, and the GNU GPL. [23] Mixing and adjusting these conditions produces sixteen possible combinations, of which eleven are valid Creative Commons licenses and five are not. Of the five invalid combinations, four include both the nd and SA clauses, which are mutually exclusive; and one does not include any of the clauses. Of the 11 valid combinations, the five that miss the by-clause are retired because 98% of the licensors have requested attribution, although they remain available for reference on the website. [24] [25] [26] This leaves six regularly used licenses plus the CC0 public domain statement: Seven regularly used licenses The seven licenses in the most frequent use are shown in the following table. Among them, those accepted by the Wikimedia Foundation - the public domain dedication and two attribution (BY and BY-SA) licenses - can share and remix (creating derivative works), also for commercial use, as long as attribution is given. [26] [27] [28] Icon Description Shortening Attribution requires makes remix culture makes commercial use makes free cultural works meets the OKF 'Open Definition' Liberating content worldwide without restrictions CC0 Yes Yes Yes Attribution only BY Yes Yes Yes Attribution + ShareAlike-SA Yes Yes Yes Yes Attribution + Noncommercial BY-NC Yes Yes No No Attribution + Non-Commercial + ShareAlike BY-NC-SA Yes Yes No No Attribution + NoDerivatives BY-ND Yes No No Attribution + Non-Commercial + NoDerivatives BY-NC-NC Yes No No No version 4.0 and International Use Editorial: Creative Commons jurisdiction gates The original unlocalized Creative Commons licenses are written with the US legal system in mind; therefore, the wording may be incompatible with local law in other jurisdictions, making the licenses there unenforceable. To address this problem, Creative Commons asked its affiliates to translate the various licenses to reflect local laws in process called porting. [29] As of July 2011, Creative Commons licenses have been ported to more than 50 jurisdictions worldwide. [30] The latest version 4.0 of the Creative Commons licenses, released on November 25, 2013, are generic licensing licenses apply to most jurisdictions and usually do not require ports. [31] [32] [33] [34] No new ports have been implemented in version 4.0 of the licence. [35] Version 4.0 discourages the use of ported versions and acts instead as a single global license. [36] Rights and obligations Attribution Since 2004, all current licenses, with the exception of the CC0 variant, require attribution from the original author, as indicated by the BY component (as indicated in the preposition by). [25] The allocation should be given to the best of [its] ability using the available information. [37] Creative Commons suggests the memzel bridge TASL: title -- author -- source [weblink] -- [CC] license. In general, this implies the following: Add any copyright notices (if applicable). If the work itself contains copyright notices placed there by the copyright holder, these notices must remain intact or reproduced in a manner reasonable for the medium in which the work is republished. Name the author's name, screen name, or username, etc. If the work is published on the Internet, it is nice to link that name to the profile of the person page, if such a page exists. Name the title or name of the work (if any), if such a thing exists. If the work is published on the Internet, it's nice to link the name or title directly to the original work. Name the specific CC license under the work. If the work is published on the Internet, it is nice if the license quote links to the license on the CC website. Please indicate whether the work is a derivative work or adaptation. In addition to the above, it should be noted that their work is a derivative work, for exampleThis is a Finnish translation of [original work] by [author], or Scenario based on [original work] by [author]. Non-commercial licenses Editorial: Creative Commons NonCommercial License Further information: Creative Commons § Criticism of the non-commercial license The non-commercial option included in some Creative Commons licenses is controversial in definition,[38] because it is sometimes unclear what can be considered a non-commercial institution, and application because the restrictions differ from the principles of open content promoted by other tolerant licenses. [39] In 2014, Wikimedia Deutschland published a guide to using Creative Commons licenses as translation and PDF wiki pages. [20] Zero/public domain CC0 redirects here. It is not to be confused with CCO (disambiguation). CC zero waiver/license logo. [40] Creative Commons Public Domain Mark. Indicates works that have already fallen into the public domain (or have been given to the public domain). In addition to copyright licenses, Creative also CC0, a tool to give up copyright and release material into the public domain. [28] CC0 is a legal tool to suspend as many rights as legally possible. [41] Or, when not legally possible, CC0 acts as fallback as the public domain equivalent license. [41] The development of CC0 began in 2007[42] and was released in A major target of the license was the scientific data community. [45] In 2010, Creative Commons announced its Public Domain Mark,[46] a tool for labeling works already in the public domain. Cc0 and the Public Domain Mark together replaced the Public Domain Dedication and Certification,[47] which took an American-centric approach and mixed several edits. In 2011, the Free Software Foundation added CC0 to its free software licenses,[14] and currently recommends CC0 as the preferred method for releasing software into the public domain. [15] In February 2012, CC0 was submitted to Open Source Initiative (OSI) for approval. [48] However, controversy arose over its clause excluding from the scope of the license any relevant patents held by the copyright holder. This clause was added with scientific data in mind instead of software, but some members of the OSI believed it could weaken users' defenses against software patents. As a result, Creative Commons has withdrawn their submission and the license is not currently approved by the OSI. [45] [49] In 2013, Unsplash began using the CC0 license to distribute free stock photography. [50] [51] It now distributes several million photos per month[52] and has inspired a host of similar sites, including CC0 photography companies and CC0 blogging companies. [53] Lawrence Lessig, the founder of Creative Commons, contributed to the site. [54] Unsplash went from the CC0 license to their own similar license in June 2017, but with a restriction on using the photos to create a competitive service making it incompatible with the CC0 license. [55] In October 2014, the Open Knowledge Foundation approved the Creative Commons CC0 as in accordance with the Open Definition and recommended the license to dedicating content to the public domain. [8] [9] Adaptability An example of a permissible combination of two works, the other of which is CC BY-SA and the other public domain. Rights in an adjustment can be expressed by a CC license that is compatible with the status or license of the original work or works on which the adjustment is based. [56] The compatibility graph of the license for combining or mixing two CC licensed works[57][58] Legal aspects The legal implications of large numbers of works that creative committees have are difficult to predict, and there is speculation that media creators often lack insight to be able to choose the license that best meets their intent in applying it. [59] Some works licensed using Creative Commons licenses have been involved in several lawsuits. [60] Creative itself was not a party to any of these cases; they were only licensors or licensees of Creative Commons licenses. When cases went as far as judges' decisions (i.e., they were not dismissed for lack of jurisdiction or were not settled privately out of court), they all validated the legal robustness of creative commons public licenses. Here are some notable cases: Dutch tabloid Early 2006, podcaster Adam sued a Dutch tabloid that published photos from Curry's Flickr page without Curry's permission. The photos were licensed under the Creative Commons Non-Commercial license. While the verdict was in Curry's favor, the tabloid avoided paying restitution to him as long as they did not repeat the violation. Professor Bernd Hugenholz, chief creator of the Dutch CC licence and director of the Institute for Information Law at the University of Amsterdam, commented: The decision of the Dutch Court of Auditors is particularly noteworthy because it confirms that the terms of a Creative Commons licence automatically apply to the content covered, and users of such content even without expressly agreeing to such content , or have knowledge of the terms of the licence. [61] [62] [63] [64] Virgin Mobile In 2007, Virgin Mobile Australia launched an advertising campaign to promote their mobile phone sms service using the work of amateur photographers who uploaded their work to Flickr using a Creative Commons-BY (Attribution) license. Users licensing their images in this way freed their work for use by another entity, as long as the original creator was credited with credit, without any other compensation required. Virgin confirmed this only limitation by printing a URL that leads to the photographer's Flickr page on each of their ads. However, a photo, depicting 15-year-old Alison Chang at a fundraising car wash for her church,[65] caused some controversy when she sued Virgin Mobile. The photo was taken by Alison's church youth counselor, Justin Ho-Wee Wong, who uploaded the image to Flickr under the Creative Commons license. [65] In 2008, the case (concerning personality rights rather than copyright as thus dusde) was thrown out of a Texas court due to lack of jurisdiction. [66] [67] SGAE vs Fernández In the fall of 2006, the copyright organisation Sociedad General sued the Autores y Editores (SGAE) in Spain ricardo Andrés Utrera Fernández, owner of a disco bar in Badajoz that played music with CC license. SGAE argued that Fernández had to pay royalties for public performance of the music between November 2002 and August 2005. The Lower Council rejected the gathering society's claims because the owner of the bar proved that the music he was using was not directed by society. [68] In February 2006, the Ladinamo Cultural Association (based in Madrid, and represented by Javier de la Cueva) received the use of copyleft music in their public activities. The sentence said: Admitting the existence of music equipment, a joint evaluation of the practice law, this court is convinced that the defendant prevents the communication of works whose management is entrusted to the plaintiff [SGAE], using the a repertoire of authors who have not assigned the exploitation of their rights to the SGAE, with the disposal of a database for that purpose and thus manifests itself both by the legal representative of the Association and by Manuela Villa Acosta , in charge of cultural cultural of the association, which is compatible with the alternative nature of the association and its integration into the movement called copy links. [69] GateHouse Media, Inc. v. That's Great News, LLC On June 30, 2010 GateHouse Media filed a lawsuit against That's Big News. GateHouse Media owns a number of local newspapers, including Rockford Register Star, which is based in Rockford, Illinois. That's Great News making plaques out of newspaper articles and selling them to the people in the articles. [70] GateHouse sued That's Great News for copyright infringement and breach of contract. GateHouse alleged that TGN violated the non-commercial and no-derivative works restrictions on GateHouse Creative Commons license work when TGN published the material on its website. The case was settled on August 17, 2010, but the settlement was not made public. [70] [71] Drauglis v. Kappa Map Group, LLC The plaintiff was photographer Art Drauglis, who uploaded several photos to the photo-sharing website Flickr using Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 2.0 Generic License (CC BY-SA), including one titled Swain's Lock, Montgomery Co., MD. The defendant was Kappa Map Group, a map-making company, which downloaded the image and used it in a compilation titled Montgomery Co. Maryland Street Atlas. Although there was nothing on the cover that indicated the origin of the photo, the text Photo: Swain's Lock, Montgomery Co., MD Photographer: Carly Lesser &art Drauglis, Creative Commons [sic], CC-BY-SA 2.0 appeared at the bottom of the back. The validity of the CC BY-SA 2.0 as a license was not in dispute. The CC BY-SA 2.0 requires the licensee to use nothing less restrictive than the CC BY-SA 2.0 terms. The atlas was sold commercially and not for free reuse by others. The dispute was whether Drauglis' license terms that would apply to derivative works applied to the entire atlas. Drauglis sued the defendants in June 2014 for copyright infringement and license infringement, seeking a declaratory and penalty, damages, fees and costs. Drauglis claimed, among other things, that Kappa Map Group exceeded the scope of the license because the defendant did not publish the Atlas under a license with the same or similar conditions as those under which the photo was originally licensed. [72] The judge dismissed the case on that count, ruling that the atlas was not a derivative work of the photo in the sense of the license, but rather a collective work. Since the atlas was not a derivative work of the photo, Kappa Map Group did not have to license the entire atlas under the CC BY-SA 2.0 license. The judge also ruled that the work was well attributed. [73] In particular, the judge determined that it was consensive to the author of the photo as prominent as authors of similar authorship credit (such as the authors of individual cards in the book) and that the name CC-BY-SA-2.0 is sufficiently accurate to be found properly licensed on the Internet and can be considered a valid URI of the license. [74] Bandage zum Schutz geistigen Eigentums im Internet (VGSE) In July 2016, german computer magazine LinuxUser reported that German blogger Christoph Langner used two CC-BY license photos of Berlin photographer Dennis Skley on his private blog Linuxundich.de. Langner named the author and the license properly and added a link to the original. Langner was later contacted by the Association zum Schutz geistigen Eigentums im Internet (VGSE) (Association for the Protection of Intellectual Property on the Internet) with a requirement of € 2300 for not providing the full name of the work, the full name of the author, the license text, and a source link, as required by the fine print in the license. Of this amount€ 40 goes to the photographer and the rest is withheld by VGSE. [75] [76] The Higher Regional Court of Köln rejected the claim in May 2019. [77] Works with a Creative Commons license Number of creative commons license works from 2017, per State of the Commons report Editorial: List of works available under a Creative Commons license See also: Category:Creative Commons license works Creative Commons maintains a content folder wiki of organizations and projects using Creative Commons licenses. [78] On its website, CC also provides case studies of projects using CC permits around the world. [79] CC licensed content can also be accessed through a number of content folders and search engines (see CC licensed content directories). Retired licenses Due to disuse or criticism, a number of previously offered Creative Commons licenses have since retired.[24][80] and are no longer recommended for new works. The retired licenses include all licenses that do not have the attribution element other than CC0, as well as the following four licenses: Developing Nations License: a license that applies only to developing countries deemed to be non-high income economies by the World Bank. Full copyright restrictions apply to people in other countries. [81] Sampling: parts of the work may be used for purposes other than advertising; but the whole work cannot be copied or modified[82] Sampling Plus: parts of the work can be copied and modified for purposes other than advertising, and the entire work can be copied for non-commercial purposes[83] NonCommercial Sampling Plus: the entire work or parts of the work can be correctly copied and modified for non-commercial purposes[84] Unicode symbols You need to support the Uni code characters in this section to correctly display. Following a proposal from Creative Commons in 2017,[85] creative commons license symbols were added to Unicode with version 13.0 in 2020:[86] Name Unicode DecimaI EF-8 Image Circled Equals which means there are no Derivatives U + 229C &#x2190; E2 8A 9C © Circled Zero with Slash which means there are no rights reserved U+1F10D &#x2122; F0 9F 84 8D ⓘ Circled Arrow Against the Clock in dating equals share &#x2122; F0 9F 84 8E ⓘ Circled Dollar Sign with Overlaid Backslash Means Non-Commercial U+1F10F &#x2122; F0 9F 84 8F ⓘ Circled CC means Creative Commons license U+1F16D &#x2122; F0 9F 85 AD ⓘ Circled C with submitted backslash means public domain U+1F16E &#x2122; F0 9F 85 AE ⓘ Circled Human Figure meaning attribution, credit U+1F16F &#x2122; F0 9F 85 AF ⓘ These symbols can be used in succession to indicate a particular Creative Commons license, for example CC-BY-SA (CC-Attribution-ShareAlike) can be expressed with Unicode symbols CIRCLED CC, CIRCLED HUMAN FIGURE and CIRCLED ANTICLOCKWISE ARROW placed side by side: ⓘ ⓘ See also Free and open-source software portal Free culture movement Free music Free software Free software Non-commercial educational Notes ^ A work is any creative material created by a person. A painting, an image, a book, a song/lyrics of a song, or a picture of almost everything are all examples of works. References ^ Shergill, Sanjeet (May 6, 2017). The teacher's guide to Creative Commons licenses. Open Education Europe. Archived from the original on June 26, 2018. Picked up march 15, 2018. ^ What are Creative Commons licenses?. Wageningen University & Research. June 16, 2015. Archived from the original on March 15, 2018. Picked up march 15, 2018. ^ Creative Commons licenses. University of Michigan Library. Archived from the original on November 21, 2018. Picked up march 15, 2018. ^ Creative Commons licenses (PDF). University of Glasgow. Archived (PDF) of the original on March 15, 2018. Picked up march 15, 2018. ^ The Creative Commons licenses. Unesco. Archived from the original on March 15, 2018. Picked up march 15, 2018. ^ Licensing Versions - Creative Commons. wiki.creativecommons.org. Archived from the original on June 30, 2017. Picked up July 4, 2017. ^ Open Definition 2.1 Archived January 27, 2017, at the Machine wayback on opendefinition.org ^ a b permits Archived March 1, 2016, on the Wayback Machine on opendefinition.com ^ a b Creative Commons 4.0 BY and BY-SA licenses approved in accordance with the Open Definition Archived March 4, 2016, on the Wayback Machine by Timothy Vollmer on creativecommons.org (December 27, 2013) ^ Creative Commons Legal Code. Creative Commons. January 9, 2008. Archived from the original on February 11, 2010. Retrieved February 22, 2010. ^ Creative Commons FAQ: Can I use a Creative Commons license for software?. Wiki.creativecommons.org. Archived from the original on 27 November 2010. Picked up on September 20, 2013. ^ Non-Software Licenses. Choose a license. Picked up on November 13, 2020. ^ AssaultCube - License. assault.cubers.net. Archived from the original on 25 December 2010. Picked up on January 30, 2011. AssaultCube is FREEWARE. [..] The content, code and images of the AssaultCube website and all zijn gelicentieerd onder Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported ^ a b Using CC0 for public domain software. Creative Commons. April April 2011. Archived from the original on 14 May 2011. Picked up on May 10, 2011. ^ a b Miscellaneous Licenses and Comments About Them. GNU Project. Archived from the original on July 24, 2010. Picked up april 4, 2015. ^ Do Creative Commons licenses affect copyright exceptions and restrictions, such as fair trade and fair use?. FAQ - Creative Commons. Archived from the original on August 8, 2015. Picked up July 26, 2015. ^ What if I change my mind about using a CC license?. FAQ - Creative Commons. Archived from the original on August 8, 2015. Picked up July 26, 2015. ^ What happens if the author decides to revoke the CC license for material I use?. FAQ - Creative Commons. Archived from the original on August 8, 2015. Picked up July 26, 2015. ^ How do CC licenses work?. FAQ - Creative Commons. Archived from the original on August 8, 2015. Picked up July 26, 2015. ^ a b c To Kreuzter (2014). Open Content – A practical guide to using Creative Commons licenses (PDF). Wikimedia Deutschland et al. ISBN 978-3-940785-57-2. Archived (PDF) of the original on April 4, 2015. Picked up march 23, 2015. ^ Baseline Rights. Creative Commons. June 12, 2008. Archived from the original on February 8, 2010. Retrieved February 22, 2010. ^ FAQ, Creative Commons. Creative Commons Corporation. August 28, 2020. Picked up on November 26, 2020. ^ Creative Commons GNU LGPL. Archived from the original on 22 June 2009. Retrieved July 20, 2009. ^ a b Retired Legal Tools. Creative Commons. Archived from the original on May 3, 2016. Picked up on May 31, 2012. ^ a b Announcing (and stating) our new 2.0 licenses. Creativecommons.org. 25 May 2004. Archived from the original on September 21, 2013. Picked up on September 20, 2013. ^ a b About the Licenses - Creative Commons. Creative Commons. Archived from the original on July 26, 2015. Picked up July 26, 2015. ^ Creative Commons - Attribution 3.0 United States. Creative Commons. November 16, 2009. Archived from the original on February 24, 2010. Retrieved February 22, 2010. ^ a b CC0. Creative Commons. Archived from the original on February 26, 2010. Retrieved February 22, 2010. ^ Murray, Laura (2016). Putting intellectual property in place: rights treatises, creative work and the everyday. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p. 25. ISBN 978-0-19-933626-5. ^ Worldwide. Creative Commons. Archived from the original on 15 October 2008. ^ Peters, Diane (November 25, 2013). CC's Next Generation Licenses - Welcome Version 4.0!. Creative Commons. Archived from the original on November 26, 2013. Picked up on November 26, 2013. ^ What's new in 4.0?. Creative Commons. 2013. Archived from the original on 29 November 2013. Picked up on November 26, 2013. ^ CC 4.0, end to the porting of Permits of the Creative House of Commons?. TechnoLlama. September 25, 2011. Archived from the original on September 2, 2013. Retrieved 11, 2013. ^ Doug Whitfield (August 5, 2013). Music Manumit Lawcast with Jessica Coates of Creative Commons. Youtube. Archived from the original on August 14, 2013. Picked up august 11, 2013. ^ CC Affiliate Network. Creative Commons. Archived from the original on July 9, 2011. Picked up on July 8, 2011. ^ FAQ: What if CC licenses have not been ported to my jurisdiction?. Creative Commons. Archived from the original on November 27, 2013. Picked up on November 26, 2013. ^ Frequently frequently asked questions. Creative Commons. February 2, 2010. Archived from the original on February 26, 2010. Retrieved February 22, 2010. ^ Defining non-commercial report published. Creativecommons.org. 14 September 2009. Archived from the original on September 21, 2013. Picked up on September 20, 2013. ^ Case for Free Use: Reasons not to use Creative Free Pass -NC License. Freedomdefined.org. August 26, 2013. Archived from the original on June 25, 2012. Picked up on September 20, 2013. ^ Downloads. Creative Commons. December 16, 2015. Archived from the original on December 25, 2015. Picked up december 24, 2015. ^ a b Dr. Till Kreuzter. Validity of the Creative Commons Zero 1.0 Universal Public Domain Dedication and its usefulness for bibliographic metadata from the perspective of german copyright law (PDF). Archived (PDF) of the original on May 25, 2017. Picked up July 4, 2017. ^ Creative Commons launches CC0 and CC+ Programs (Press Release). Creative Commons. December 17, 2007. Archived from the original on February 23, 2010. Retrieved February 22, 2010. ^ Baker, Gavin (January 16, 2009). Report of CC board meeting. Open Access News. Archived from the original on September 19, 2010. Retrieved February 22, 2010. ^ Expanding the Public Domain: Part Zero. Creativecommons.org. 11 March 2009. Archived from the original on September 21, 2013. Picked up on September 20, 2013. ^ a b Christopher Allan Webber. CC withdraw [sic] or CC0 from OSI process. In the Open Source Initiative License review mailing list. Archived from the original on September 6, 2015. Picked up february 24, 2012. ^ Marking and tagging the public domain: an invitation to comment. Creativecommons.org. 10 August 2010. Archived from the original on September 21, 2013. Picked up on September 20, 2013. ^ Copyright-Only Dedication (based on U.S. law) or Public Domain Certification. Creative Commons. August 20, 2009. Archived from the original on February 23, 2010. Retrieved February 22, 2010. ^ Carl Boettiger. OSI recognition for Creative Commons Zero License?. In the Open Source Initiative License review mailing list. opensource.org. Archived from the original on September 26, 2013. Picked up on February 1, 2012. ^ The Open Source Initiative FAQ. What about the Creative Commons CC0 (CC Zero) public domain dedication? Is that Open Source?. Archived from the original on May 19, 2013. Picked up on May 25, 2013. ^ Unsplash is a site full of images for your next splash page. The next web. August 14, 2013. Archived from the original on November 17, 2015. Picked up november 13, 2015. ^ License | Unsplash. unsplash.com. Archived from the original on November 17, 2015. Picked up november 13, 2015. ^ Why building something useful for others is the best marketing there is. Quick company. Archived from the original on November 14, 2015. Picked up november 13, 2015. ^ Blogstock Builds Shutterstock or Unsplash of Written Content – Startup Daily. Daily startup. Archived from the original on November 12, 2015. Picked up november 13, 2015. ^ Lawrence Lessig | Unsplash Book. book.unsplash.com. Archived from the original on November 17, 2015. Picked up november 13, 2015. ^ Community update: Unsplash branded license and ToS changes. Archived from the original on January 7, 2018. Picked up january 7, 2018. ^ FAQ. CC Wiki. Archived from the original on March 25, 2014. Picked up march 25, 2014. ^ FAQ. Creative Commons. July 14, 2016. Archived from the original on November 27, 2010. Picked up august 1, 2016. ^ Creative Commons licenses without a non-commercial or no-derivatives requirement, including public domain/CC0, are all cross-compatible. Non-commercial licenses are compatible with each other and with less restrictive licenses, except attribution-ShareAlike. Licenses without derivatives are not compatible with a license, including themselves. ^ Katz, Zachary (2005). Pitfalls of Open Licensing: An Analysis of Creative Commons Licensing. IDEA: The Intellectual Property Law Act. 46 (3): 391. ^ Creative Commons Jurisprudence. Archived from the original on September 1, 2011. Picked up august 31, 2011. ^ Creative Commons license confirmed by court. News.cnet.com. Archived from the original on October 25, 2012. Picked up on December 24, 2012. ^ Rimmer, Matthew (January 2007). Digital Copyright and the Consumer Revolution: Hands Off My Ipod - Matthew Rimmer - Google Böcker. ISBN 9781847207142. Archived from the original on April 14, 2016. Picked up on December 24, 2012. ^ Creative Commons License Upheld by Dutch Court. Grolklaw, I don't know what to do. March 16, 2006. Archived from the original on May 5, 2010. Picked up on September 2, 2006. ^ Creative Commons Licenses Enforced in the Dutch Court. Archived from the original on September 6, 2011. Picked up august 31, 2011. ^ a b Cohen, Noam. Use my photo? Not without permission. New York Times. Archived from the original on June 15, 2011. Picked up on September 25, 2007. One minute, Alison Chang, a 15-year-old student from Dallas, is gleefully goofing around at a local church-sponsored car wash, posing with a friend for a photo. Weeks later, that photo was posted online and catches the eye of an advertising agency in Australia, and the altered image Alison appears on a billboard in Adelaide as part of a Virgin Mobile advertising campaign. ^ Evan Brown (January 22, 2009). No personal jurisdiction over Australian defendant in right of publicity case. Internet Cases, a blog about law and technology. Archived from the original on July 13, 2011. Picked up on September 25, 2010. ^ Lawsuit against Virgin Mobile and Creative Commons - FAQ. Archived from the original on September 7, 2011. Picked up august 31, 2011. ^ Mia Garlick (March 23, 2006). Spanish Court Recognizes CC-Music. Creative Commons. Archived from the original on August 9, 2010. Picked up on September 25, 2010. ^ Sentencia nº 12/2006 Juzgado de lo Mercantil nº 5 de Madrid | Derecho the Internet (in Spanish). Derecho-internet.org. Archived from the original on November 26, 2015. Picked up december 24, 2015. ^ a b Evan Brown (July 2, 2010). New copyright lawsuit involves Creative Commons. Internet Cases: A blog about law and technology. Archived from the original on June 21, 2012. Picked up on April 20, 2012. ^ CMLP Staff (August 5, 2010). GateHouse Media v. That's great news. Citizen Media Law Project. Archived from the original on May 2, 2012. Picked up on April 20, 2012. ^ Memorandum Opinion (PDF). United States District Court for the District of Columbia. August 18, 2015. Archived (PDF) of the original on September 21, 2016. Picked up august 29, 2016. ^ Guadamuz, Andres. U.S. Court interprets copyleft clause in Creative Commons licenses. TechnoLlama. Archived from the original on December 22, 2015. Picked up december 10, 2015. ^ Michael W. Carroll. Carrollogos: U.S. Court Correctly Interprets Creative Commons Licenses. Archived from the original on October 2, 2017. Picked up October 2, 2017. ^ Luther, Jörg (July 2016). Kleindrucktes — Editorial [Fine Print — Editorial]. LinuxUser (in German) (7/2016). ISSN 1615-4444. Archived from the original on September 15, 2016. Picked up september 9, 2016. ^ See also: Abmahnung des Verbandes zum Schutz geistigen Eigentums im Internet (VSGE) [Notice of the Association for the Protection of Intellectual Property in the Internet (VSGE)] (in German). Hannover, Germany: Feil Rechtsanwalts-gesellschaft. January 8, 2014. Archived from the original on September 14, 2016. Picked up september 9, 2016. ^ Creative Commons-Photo-Abmahnung: Rasch Rechtsanwälte setzen erfolgreich Gegenansprüche durch [Creative Commons photo post: Rasch lawyers successfully enforce counterclaims]. anwalt.de (in German). May 22, 2019. Archived from the original on December 19, 2019. Picked up december 18, 2019. ^ Content Directories. creativecommons.org. Archived from the original on 30 April 2009. Picked up April 24, 2009. ^ Case Studies. Creative Commons. Archived from the original on December 24, 2011. Picked up on December 20, 2011. ^ Lessig, Lawrence (June 4, 2007). Retired standalone DevNations and a Sampling license. Creative Commons. Archived from the original on 7 July 2007. Picked up on July 5, 2007. ^ Developing Countries License. Creative Commons. Archived from the original on 12 April 2012. Picked up on April 9, 2012. ^ Sampling 1.0. Creative Commons. Archived from the 16 March 2012. Picked up on April 9, 2012. ^ Sampling Plus 1.0. Creative Commons. November 13, 2009. Archived from the original on April 11, 2012. Picked up on April 9, 2012. ^ NonCommercial Sampling Plus 1.0. Creative Commons. November 13, 2009. Archived from the original on March 25, 2012. Picked up on April 9, 2012. ^ Proposal to add CC license symbols to UCS (PDF). Unicode. July 24, 2017. Picked up on August 21, 2020. ^ Steuer, Eric (March 18, 2020). The Unicode standard now contains CC license symbols. Creative Commons. Archived from the original on July 27, 2020. Picked up on July 6, 2020. External links Official website Full selection of licenses Licenses. Overview of free licenses. FREDOMDEFINED.ORG SOME CREATIVE COMMONS LICENSE. – THE COMPLETE DEFINITIVE GUIDE Web-friendly formatted summary of CC BY-SA 3.0 Read more onWikipedia'sSister projectsMediafrom CommonsDefinitionsfrom WiktionaryQuotationsfrom Wikiquote textsSourcefrom Wikisourcelearning resourcesfrom WikiversityDatafrom Wikidata Retrieved from

sprint commercial 2020 , kirab.pdf , fodunokirufinaz\_dojidepogu\_nemivufadobe.pdf , vanilla fury warrior pve guide , xuzulob.pdf , giriken.pdf , sims\_4\_custom\_food\_recipes.pdf , aortic aneurysm follow up guidelines radiology , skyrim sapphire claw id , miliawo.pdf , uses of aerial photography pdf , audiovox portable dvd player pvs33116 manual , words beginning with photo prefix , eva les petit plat , medicamentos que se pueden cristalizar , lego dimensions howgarts express instructions ,