International Journal of Science and Research Archive
eISSN: 2582-8185
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/ijsra
Journal homepage: https://ijsra.net/

(REVIEW ARTICLE)

Analyzing the impact of open-source licensing models on AI development, commercialization, and knowledge dissemination in technology sectors

Olajumoke Ifeoluwa Adebiyi [1] and Oluwafemi Clement Adeusi [2, *]

[1] *School of Law, Robert H. Mckinney, Indiana University, Indiana, USA.*
[2] *Department of Computer Science Network and Security, Staffordshire University, UK.*

International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 2025, 15(03), 1103-1113

Publication history: Received on 07 May 2025; revised on 14 June 2025; accepted on 16 June 2025

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2025.15.3.1753

Abstract

This review examines the evolving landscape of open-source licensing models and their impact on artificial intelligence development, commercialization strategies, and knowledge dissemination across technology sectors. As AI technologies become increasingly pervasive and influential across industries, the mechanisms governing their distribution and use have profound implications for innovation, market competition, and ethical development. This study synthesizes current literature on open-source licensing, knowledge commons, and AI governance to identify trends, challenges, and opportunities. Through comprehensive analysis of case studies and empirical research, we uncover several emerging patterns in licensing strategies that influence AI development trajectories. These models reveal varying approaches to balancing openness with commercial viability, community governance with corporate interests, and knowledge sharing with competitive advantage. Our findings suggest that successful open-source AI initiatives require nuanced licensing frameworks that address the unique characteristics of AI systems, including data dependencies, model reproducibility, and deployment contexts. The review also highlights the potential of specialized AI licenses and governance structures in addressing ethical concerns while facilitating innovation. By identifying key factors contributing to sustainable open-source AI ecosystems, this study provides valuable insights for policymakers, technology leaders, and researchers working at the intersection of open-source principles and artificial intelligence. Future research directions are proposed to further explore the long-term impacts of various licensing approaches on AI democratization, commercialization, and responsible development.

Keywords: Open-source Licensing; Artificial Intelligence; Technology Commercialization; Innovation Governance; Intellectual Property

1. Introduction

The convergence of open-source principles with artificial intelligence development represents one of the most significant paradigm shifts in modern technology evolution [1]. As AI systems increasingly underpin critical infrastructure, commercial applications, and research initiatives, the licensing frameworks governing their distribution, modification, and deployment have far-reaching implications for innovation trajectories, market dynamics, and ethical considerations [2]. This intersection of open-source licensing with cutting edge AI technologies presents unique challenges and opportunities that extend beyond traditional software licensing concerns.

Open-source licensing has revolutionized software development over the past three decades, enabling collaborative innovation, reducing redundant efforts, and democratizing access to technology [3]. From operating systems and web servers to development frameworks and databases, open-source software has become the foundation upon which much of modern digital infrastructure rests. The principles of transparency, collaboration, and permissive use embedded in

* Corresponding author: Oluwafemi Clement Adeusi

open-source licenses have facilitated rapid innovation cycles while creating vibrant developer communities and ecosystem effects.

The artificial intelligence landscape, meanwhile, has undergone dramatic transformation, evolving from primarily academic research to present commercial applications with profound societal impact [4]. Contemporary AI systems, particularly those based on machine learning approaches, introduce novel complexities to licensing considerations due to their dependence on training data, the nature of model weights as distinct from code, and the emergent capabilities that arise from their deployment. These characteristics create tensions between traditional open-source values of unrestricted access and the practical realities of responsible AI governance.

As organizations ranging from technology giants to research institutions navigate this complex terrain, diverse approaches to AI licensing have emerged [5]. Some entities have embraced fully open licensing models to accelerate research progress and adoption, while others have developed hybrid strategies that balance openness with commercial interests or ethical guardrails. These variations reflect different perspectives on how to optimize for innovation, business sustainability, and responsible development in the AI domain.

This review aims to comprehensively examine the impact of various open-source licensing models on AI development, commercialization strategies, and knowledge dissemination across the technology sector. By analyzing current literature, case studies, and empirical research, we seek to identify key patterns, challenges, and opportunities at this critical intersection. Our analysis encompasses a spectrum of licensing approaches, from permissive licenses to copyleft provisions, as well as emerging AI-specific licensing innovations designed to address the unique characteristics of machine learning systems.

The significance of this research lies in its potential to inform policy, business strategy, and community governance in the rapidly evolving field of AI development. As artificial intelligence continues to transform industries and societies, understanding how licensing choices influence development trajectories, market dynamics, and knowledge distribution becomes increasingly crucial for fostering innovation while ensuring responsible development practices.

2. Overview of Open-source Licensing in Technology Development

Open-source licensing has evolved from a counter cultural movement in software development to a mainstream paradigm that underpins much of the world's technological infrastructure [6]. This transformation reflects both the pragmatic benefits of collaborative development and the philosophical commitment to knowledge sharing that characterizes open-source communities. Understanding this evolution provides essential context for examining how open-source principles intersect with AI development.

The origins of open-source licensing can be traced to the free software movement of the 1980s, which emerged in response to the increasing privatization of software that had previously been freely shared among researchers and developers [7]. The GNU General Public License (GPL), created by Richard Stallman in 1989, pioneered the concept of "copyleft" using copyright law to ensure software remained free to use, modify, and distribute. This approach contrasted sharply with proprietary licensing models that restricted user freedoms and access to source code.

The 1990s and early 2000s saw the proliferation of various open-source licenses, each reflecting different perspectives on the balance between openness and pragmatic considerations [8]. Permissive licenses such as MIT, BSD, and Apache emerged as alternatives to the GPL's strong copyleft provisions, allowing greater flexibility in how licensed code could be incorporated into other projects, including proprietary ones. This diversity of licensing approaches enabled open-source adoption across different contexts, from community-driven projects to corporate environments.

Several key characteristics define open-source licenses despite their variations [9]. At minimum, these licenses grant users the freedom to use the software for any purpose, access and modify the source code, and redistribute both the original and modified versions. Beyond these basic freedoms, licenses differ in their requirements regarding attribution, patent grants, and obligations when redistributing modified code. These distinctions create a spectrum from highly permissive licenses that impose minimal conditions to those with strong reciprocity requirements.

The financial models supporting open-source development have also diversified significantly [10]. Early projects relied primarily on volunteer contributions and non-profit foundations. As commercial adoption increased, for-profit business models emerged around open-source software, including professional services, dual licensing, open core approaches, and cloud service offerings. These models demonstrate that open-source licensing can be compatible with commercial interests when appropriately structured.

The governance structures for open-source projects vary widely, from benevolent dictatorships and meritocratic communities to foundation-managed consortia and corporate-dominated projects [11]. These governance models influence how decisions are made, how contributions are managed, and how conflicts are resolved - all factors that significantly impact project direction and community health. Successful open-source initiatives typically establish clear governance processes that balance efficiency with inclusive and transparency.

The impact of open-source licensing on traditional software development has been profound, accelerating innovation cycles and enabling broader participation in technology creation [12]. By reducing duplication of effort and allowing developers to build upon existing work, open-source approaches have increased development efficiency and software quality across the industry. The collaborative problem solving that characterizes healthy open-source communities has proven particularly effective for addressing complex technical challenges and adapting quickly to changing requirements.

Beyond technical benefits, open-source licensing has democratized access to cutting-edge technology, enabling participation from individuals and organizations regardless of their size or resources [13]. This democratization has been especially significant for emerging economies and educational institutions, where access to proprietary software might otherwise be limited by cost constraints. The transparency inherent in open-source development has also facilitated knowledge transfer and technical education, creating pathways for developer skill development.

As we transition to examining the specific context of artificial intelligence, these established patterns in open-source licensing provide important reference points. However, the unique characteristics of AI systems introduce new considerations that traditional open-source frameworks may not fully address, necessitating innovative approaches to licensing and governance in this rapidly evolving domain.

3. Artificial Intelligence Development and Licensing Challenges

The development of artificial intelligence technologies presents distinctive challenges for open-source licensing frameworks that were originally designed for conventional software [14]. These challenges stem from the fundamental differences between traditional algorithmic software and modern AI systems, particularly those based on machine learning approaches. Understanding these differences is essential for evaluating the effectiveness of various licensing models in the AI context.

Unlike traditional software where functionality is explicitly programmed, machine learning systems derive their capabilities from training on data, resulting in statistical models whose behavior emerges from this training process rather than from explicit programming [15]. This data dependency creates a multi-layered intellectual property consideration that extends beyond source code to encompass training datasets, model architectures, trained parameters, inference methods, and deployment contexts. Each of these elements may require different licensing considerations to effectively balance openness with appropriate protections.

The sustainability challenge represents another significant distinction between AI and conventional software development [16]. While traditional open-source software can be precisely replicated if the source code is available, reproducing an AI model's capabilities requires access not only to the code, but also to the training data, computational resources, and specific methodologies used during development. This multi-faceted sustainability requirement complicates the application of traditional open-source principles that assume transparency of source code is sufficient for replication.

The potential for dual use applications and unintended consequences further complicates AI licensing considerations [17]. Advanced AI systems may be repurposed for harmful applications even if originally developed with beneficial intent. This potential for misuse creates tension between the open-source principle of unrestricted usage and the ethical responsibility to prevent harmful applications. Traditional open-source licenses, which typically grant broad usage rights without restrictions on purpose, may be insufficient for addressing these ethical considerations in AI development.

The computational resources required for developing advanced AI systems introduce economic barriers not typically addressed in open-source licensing frameworks [18]. While source code availability theoretically enables anyone to use and modify the software, the massive computational requirements for training state-of-the-art AI models effectively limit full participation to well-resourced organizations. This creates an implicit power imbalance that challenges the democratizing ideals of open-source philosophy, even when licensing terms are nominally open.

The rapid pace of AI advancement presents additional challenges for licensing frameworks [19]. As capabilities evolve quickly, licensing approaches that seemed appropriate for earlier generations of AI may become insufficient or problematic for more advanced systems. This rapid evolution necessitates adaptive licensing strategies that can accommodate emerging capabilities and concerns without requiring frequent license revisions or migrations.

Several notable tension points have emerged at the intersection of open-source principles and AI development needs. The balance between transparency and responsible deployment represents one key tension [20]. While transparency enables verification, improvement, and knowledge sharing, unrestricted access to powerful AI systems may facilitate harmful applications or exacerbate existing societal inequities. Finding the appropriate balance between openness and safeguards remains a central challenge for AI licensing frameworks.

The commercial viability of open AI development represents another significant tension point [21]. The substantial investments required for developing advanced AI systems create pressure for commercial returns, which may conflict with traditional open-source values of unrestricted access and redistribution. Organizations navigating this tension have developed various hybrid approaches, including open core models, restricted licensing for commercial uses, and tiered access systems based on model capabilities or user verification.

These unique characteristics and tensions have prompted experimentation with modified licensing approaches specifically designed for AI technologies [22]. These adaptations range from relatively minor modifications to existing open-source licenses to entirely new licensing frameworks developed explicitly for AI systems. The effectiveness of these approaches in balancing innovation, accessibility, responsibility, and sustainability remains an active area of exploration and debate.

4. Emerging Models of Open-source AI Licensing

As the AI field grapples with the limitations of traditional open-source licensing for machine learning systems, several innovative licensing models have emerged to address the unique characteristics and concerns of AI development [23]. These approaches represent various attempts to balance openness, innovation, ethical considerations, and commercial viability in ways that conventional licenses were not designed to accommodate.

Permissive with ethical constraints represents one emerging licensing category that maintains most open-source freedoms while adding specific restrictions on applications or use cases [24]. The Responsible AI License (RAIL) exemplifies this approach, offering a framework that prohibits uses that violate human rights, enable surveillance beyond legitimate law enforcement, or intentionally deceive users. Similarly, licenses like the Do No Harm License and Hippocratic License maintain most open-source freedoms while restricting applications that could cause harm to individuals or communities. These licenses attempt to preserve the benefits of open development while preventing the most concerning misuses of AI technology.

Tiered licensing structures that differentiate between model capabilities or user categories have gained traction among organizations releasing advanced AI systems [25]. Under these frameworks, smaller or less capable models might be released under fully permissive licenses, while more powerful systems are subject to additional restrictions or vetting processes. These tiered approaches attempt to balance broad accessibility for research and education with greater control over potentially more impactful applications.

Reciprocal licenses for AI have adapted the copyleft concept to address the unique aspects of machine learning systems [26]. These licenses require that derivatives or applications built using the licensed AI model must themselves be shared under similar open terms. The key innovation in these approaches is expanding the definition of derivative works to include fine tuned models, embeddings generated from the original model, or applications that substantially depend on the model's capabilities. This expansion attempts to ensure that the benefits of open development extend throughout the AI ecosystem.

Weight differentiated licensing represents another novel approach that applies different terms to different components of an AI system [27]. These frameworks might place the model architecture and training code under a fully open license while applying more restrictive terms to the trained weights or parameters. This differentiation acknowledges the distinct investment represented by trained model weights compared to the algorithmic approach they implement. EleutherAI's licensing approach for several large language models demonstrates this pattern, with permissive licensing for code but more restrictive terms for model weights [28].

Time delayed licensing strategies introduce a temporal dimension to access restrictions [29]. Under these models, cutting edge systems might initially be released under more restrictive terms that gradually relax as the technology matures or as newer systems supersede them. This approach attempts to balance competitive advantage for innovators with the eventual broader accessibility of technology, creating incentives for continued investment while ensuring technology ultimately becomes widely available.

Community governed licenses represent approaches where the terms of use evolve through collective decision making rather than being fixed at release [30]. The ML Commons License project exemplifies this approach, creating governance structures that can adapt licensing restrictions based on emerging capabilities, applications, and community concerns. These frameworks acknowledge the rapidly evolving nature of AI technology and attempt to create more dynamic and responsive governance mechanisms than static license texts can provide.

Data inclusive licensing frameworks address the critical role of training data by extending licensing considerations beyond code and model weights to encompass datasets [31]. These approaches attempt to create coherent legal frameworks that cover the entire AI development pipeline, addressing concerns about data provenance, consent, and appropriate use. By creating consistent terms across all elements of an AI system, these frameworks aim to reduce legal uncertainty and establish clearer expectations for responsible development practices.

Several notable case studies illustrate how these emerging licensing models are being implemented in practice. The GPT-4 licensing approach by OpenAI demonstrates a phased access strategy with different terms for research partners, API users, and enterprise customers [32]. This tiered approach attempts to balance safety considerations with broad access, using both technical limitations and legal terms to create a graduated system of responsible access expansion.

The BigScience Open RAIL license applied to the BLOOM large language model represents one of the most comprehensive attempts to create an ethical open-source framework for AI [33]. This approach combines permissive open-source principles with specific use restrictions and transparency requirements designed to prevent harmful applications while enabling legitimate research and beneficial applications. The community-driven nature of both the model development and licensing decisions illustrates the potential for collaborative governance in AI licensing.

The PyTorch licensing evolution demonstrates how frameworks may adapt their licensing approaches as their role in the AI ecosystem evolves [34]. Initially released under a more restrictive BSD+Patents license, PyTorch later migrated to the more permissive Apache 2.0 license to facilitate broader adoption and ecosystem development. This evolution reflects the competitive dynamics in AI frameworks and how licensing decisions respond to ecosystem pressures and strategic considerations.

While these innovative licensing approaches address many of the unique challenges of AI development, they also introduce new complexities and potential issues [35]. Many of these licenses lack legal precedent and may face enforceability challenges, particularly across different jurisdictions with varying approaches to software licensing and intellectual property. The compatibility between these new licensing approaches and existing open-source ecosystems remains uncertain, potentially creating fragmentation or integration challenges for developers.

The effectiveness of these emerging licensing models in achieving their intended outcomes – whether promoting innovation, preventing misuse, or ensuring equitable access – remains an empirical question that will only be answered through continued observation and analysis of their implementation in real-world AI development contexts.

5. Impact on AI Development and Commercialization

The choice of licensing model has profound implications for how AI technologies develop, who can access them, and how value is distributed across the ecosystem. This examines how different licensing approaches influence development trajectories, commercial strategies, and broader market dynamics in the AI sector.

Licensing decisions significantly impact collaboration patterns and development velocity in AI research and applications [36]. More permissive licenses typically attract larger contributor communities and enable faster initial adoption, creating powerful network effects. The development of frameworks like TensorFlow and PyTorch illustrates how permissive licensing can accelerate ecosystem growth and standard establishment [37]. By contrast, more restrictive licenses may result in smaller but potentially more committed communities with clearer alignment on development philosophy and application boundaries.

The distribution of innovation across different organizational types from independent researchers and startups to major corporations and academic institutions is strongly influenced by licensing approaches [38]. Fully open models tend to democratize innovation opportunities by reducing barriers to entry, enabling smaller organizations to build upon cutting edge research. This democratization can lead to more diverse applications and implementation approaches, potentially addressing needs that might be overlooked by dominant market players. Conversely, more restrictive licensing tends to concentrate innovation capacity among better-resourced organizations that can afford proprietary alternatives or negotiate special access agreements.

Different licensing strategies create distinct commercialization pathways for AI technologies [39]. Permissive licenses facilitate widespread adoption and downstream commercialization but may complicate capturing value for the original developers. In response, organizations have developed various value capture strategies around openly licensed AI, including complementary proprietary offerings, specialized implementation services, cloud API access, and enterprise support contracts. These approaches demonstrate that commercial viability does not necessarily require restrictive licensing, though it often demands more sophisticated business models.

The "open core" approach has emerged as a particularly common strategy in AI commercialization [40]. Under this model, fundamental components are released under permissive licenses while advanced features, optimizations, or integrated solutions carry commercial licenses. This strategy allows organizations to benefit from community contributions and ecosystem adoption while maintaining revenue streams to fund continued development. Hugging Face's business model exemplifies this approach, combining an open-source model hub with enterprise offerings and specialized services.

More restrictive licensing approaches create different commercial dynamics, often enabling more traditional product-based business models [41]. These approaches may provide stronger protections for competitive advantage but typically result in smaller ecosystems and more limited adoption. Some organizations mitigate these limitations through customized licensing agreements for specific partners or use cases, creating a middle ground between fully open and fully proprietary approaches.

Licensing decisions significantly influence market structure and competitive dynamics in AI sectors [42]. More open licensing approaches tend to accelerate commercialization of basic capabilities while shifting competition to higher-level services, specialized applications, or complementary assets. This pattern resembles earlier open-source impacts in operating systems and web servers, where core technologies became widely available while commercial activity concentrated in adjacent layers of the technology stack.

The balance of power between model providers and application developers is particularly affected by licensing choices. Restrictive model licensing can create dependency relationships where application developers face switching costs or uncertainty about continued access [43]. More permissive licensing reduces these dependencies but may limit funding for fundamental model development. Various intermediary approaches attempt to balance these concerns, including graduated licensing terms based on usage levels or selective restrictions that apply only to certain applications or scales of deployment.

Different licensing approaches also create varying patterns of geographic distribution in AI capability [44]. More permissive licensing facilitates technology adoption in emerging economies and by organizations with limited resources, potentially reducing global inequalities in AI capabilities. More restrictive approaches may exacerbate concentration of advanced AI capabilities among already-advantaged regions and organizations. These distributional effects have significant implications for global technology equity and the distribution of economic benefits from AI advances.

The evolution of AI markets suggests that licensing strategies often shift over time in response to ecosystem maturity, competitive pressures, and changing business models [45]. Initial phases of technology development frequently feature more open approaches to establish standards and build ecosystems, while commercialization pressure may lead to more restrictive approaches as markets mature. However, ongoing competition between open and proprietary alternatives creates complex dynamics that resist simple evolutionary patterns.

Several notable market consequences have emerged from the diverse licensing landscape in AI. The "foundation model" paradigm, where large pre-trained models serve as the basis for numerous downstream applications, has created new power dynamics between model providers and application developers [46]. The licensing terms governing these foundation models significantly influence who captures value in this relationship and how benefits are distributed

throughout the ecosystem. These dynamics echo earlier platform economies while introducing new complexities specific to AI development.

The emergence of parallel open and closed development tracks for similar technologies represents another significant market pattern. In large language models, for example, closed commercial models like GPT-4 and Claude compete with more openly licensed alternatives like Llama 2 and Mistral [47]. This competition influences pricing, accessibility, and innovation trajectories across the ecosystem, creating pressure on closed models to deliver sufficient value to justify their restrictions while challenging open models to match the capabilities of their better-resourced proprietary counterparts.

The financial sustainability of different licensing approaches remains an active question, with significant implications for the future of AI development [48]. While proprietary approaches have clear revenue mechanisms, the sustainability of more open development models particularly for resource-intensive foundation models has yet to be conclusively demonstrated at scale. Various hybrid models are emerging that attempt to balance openness with sustainable funding streams, but their long-term viability remains uncertain.

6. Knowledge Dissemination and Broader Impacts

The licensing landscape of AI technologies profoundly influences how knowledge flows throughout the ecosystem, with significant implications for educational access, research transparency, and broader societal impacts [49]. Open licensing approaches substantially enhance knowledge dissemination and educational opportunities in AI [50]. By providing access to cutting-edge models, architectures, and training methodologies, open licenses enable educators, students, and independent learners to develop practical skills with current technology rather than outdated or simplified alternatives. This educational access is particularly valuable in regions with limited resources, where commercial licenses might be prohibitively expensive. The growth of AI education programs globally correlates strongly with the availability of openly licensed frameworks, models, and learning resources.

The research reproducibility challenges in AI are significantly affected by licensing approaches [51]. More permissive licensing facilitates independent verification of research claims and enables building upon existing work, accelerating scientific progress. However, even with open licensing, reproducibility often remains limited by computational requirements, data availability constraints, or incomplete methodological documentation. These limitations highlight that licensing openness, while necessary, is insufficient alone to ensure genuine research reproducibility.

Knowledge transfer between academic research and commercial applications is shaped by the licensing interfaces between these domains [52]. Open licenses facilitate smoother transitions from research to application by reducing legal barriers to implementation. This transfer dynamic has accelerated the pace at which research advances reach practical applications, with new techniques often deployed in production environments within months rather than years [53]. This compression of the research-to-application cycle creates both opportunities and challenges, as implementations may outpace full understanding of techniques or thorough evaluation of their limitations.

Community knowledge building and collaborative problem solving demonstrate different patterns under various licensing regimes [54]. More open approaches typically foster larger, more diverse communities with broader knowledge sharing, while more restrictive approaches may result in deeper but more siloed expertise within specific organizations. The distributed discovery process characteristic of open-source communities has proven particularly effective for identifying and addressing edge cases, security vulnerabilities, and implementation challenges across diverse deployment contexts.

The diffusion of AI capabilities across industry sectors is significantly influenced by licensing decisions [55]. More permissive licensing approaches accelerate adoption in non technology industries by reducing legal barriers and implementation costs. This cross-sector diffusion enables AI application in domains like healthcare, agriculture, and education, potentially amplifying societal benefits. However, this diffusion also raises concerns about appropriate use and potential disruption in sectors that may lack established AI governance practices.

Global access disparities in AI capabilities demonstrate complex relationships with licensing approaches [56]. While open licensing reduces legal barriers to access, significant practical barriers remain, including computational resources, specialized expertise, and complementary infrastructure. These practical constraints mean that even openly licensed cutting edge AI systems may remain effectively inaccessible to many potential users, particularly in developing regions [57]. This reality challenges simplistic assumptions that open licensing alone can democratize AI access globally.

Knowledge concentration and diversity within the AI ecosystem show interesting patterns related to licensing strategies [58]. More open approaches tend to support greater diversity of participants but may still result in knowledge concentration among those with resources to build upon open foundations. According to research more restrictive approaches typically accelerate knowledge concentration within specific organizations but may eventually stimulate diversification through competitive responses [59]. These dynamics suggest that licensing approaches alone cannot ensure knowledge diversity without complementary efforts to address underlying resource and opportunity disparities.

Several specific knowledge dissemination mechanisms have proven particularly effective in the AI domain. Community benchmarking initiatives like GLUE and SuperGLUE have created shared evaluation frameworks that accelerate progress across different licensing regimes [60]. Open challenges and competitions have similarly fostered knowledge sharing and capability advancement while accommodating diverse licensing approaches among participants. These mechanisms demonstrate how knowledge dissemination can be enhanced through collaborative structures that complement and transcend specific licensing decisions.

The documentation quality and knowledge accessibility of AI systems vary significantly across licensing approaches [61]. While open licensing often correlates with more comprehensive documentation, this relationship is not universal, as some openly licensed projects lack adequate documentation while some proprietary systems provide extensive documentation without revealing implementation details. This variation highlights that licensing openness and knowledge accessibility, while related, represent distinct dimensions of AI transparency.

The broader societal impacts of different AI licensing approaches extend beyond technical and commercial considerations to encompass ethical, social, and political dimensions [62]. The governance mechanisms embedded in licensing decisions influence who benefits from AI advances, how risks are distributed, and what values shape technology development. These governance aspects of licensing have received increasing attention as AI capabilities advance and their societal implications become more pronounced.

The relationship between licensing approaches and AI safety considerations represents a particularly significant domain of broader impact [63]. More open licensing may accelerate safety research by enabling broader participation and independent analysis, but may also increase access to potentially dangerous capabilities without corresponding safety measures. More restrictive licensing can implement specific safety requirements or limitations, but may concentrate evaluation in fewer hands and slow independent safety verification. This tension has prompted exploration of intermediate approaches that attempt to balance safety governance with necessary transparency.

The distribution of economic benefits from AI development shows strong connections to licensing decisions [64]. More permissive licensing typically distributes economic opportunities more broadly but may reduce incentives for fundamental research investment. More restrictive approaches may concentrate economic returns among model developers but potentially reduce overall ecosystem value creation. Various hybrid approaches attempt to balance these considerations, creating different patterns of value distribution and incentive alignment across the AI landscape.

7. Conclusion and Recommendations

The examination of open-source licensing models reveals that traditional frameworks are insufficient for modern AI systems due to their multi component nature combining code, models, data, and deployment considerations. This insufficiency has driven the emergence of innovative licensing strategies specifically tailored to AI development contexts.

A central tension exists between openness and responsibility in AI licensing. While open approaches accelerate innovation and democratize access, they may enable harmful applications without appropriate safeguards. Conversely, restrictive approaches may impede beneficial innovation or concentrate capabilities among already advantaged entities. Finding appropriate balances requires nuanced approaches rather than one size fits all solutions.

Based on these insights, stakeholders should take specific actions: policymakers should develop legal frameworks better accommodating AI's unique characteristics; organizations should adopt licensing strategies aligned with both missions and societal responsibilities; research institutions should prioritize transparency and reproducibility and community organizations should establish standardized licensing frameworks for different AI contexts.

As artificial intelligence continues evolving and transforming society, thoughtfully designed licensing frameworks will grow in importance. By addressing AI systems' unique characteristics while balancing innovation, responsibility, and inclusivity, these frameworks can help ensure AI development broadly benefits humanity while minimizing potential

harms. This ongoing refinement of licensing approaches represents a crucial aspect of AI governance deserving continued attention from all stakeholders.

References

[1] Radanliev P. Artificial intelligence: reflecting on the past and looking towards the next paradigm shift. Journal of Experimental & Theoretical Artificial Intelligence. 2024 Mar 1:1-8.

[2] Lescrauwaet L, Wagner H, Yoon C, Shukla S. Adaptive legal frameworks and economic dynamics in emerging technologies: Navigating the intersection for responsible innovation. Law and Economics. 2022 Oct 30;16(3):202-20.

[3] Chopra S, Dexter SD. Decoding liberation: The promise of free and open-source software. Routledge; 2008 Mar 25.

[4] Alabdulatif A. The global impact of artificial intelligence. InTechnical and Technological Solutions Towards a Sustainable Society and Circular Economy 2024 May 14 (pp. 263-277). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

[5] Teixeira N, Pacione M. Implications of artificial intelligence on leadership in complex organizations: An exploration of the near future.

[6] Powell A. Democratizing production through open-source knowledge: from open software to open hardware. Media, Culture & Society. 2012 Sep;34(6):691-708.

[7] Chopra S, Dexter SD. Decoding liberation: The promise of free and open-source software. Routledge; 2008 Mar 25.

[8] Von Krogh G, Spaeth S. The open-source software phenomenon: Characteristics that promote research. The Journal of Strategic Information Systems. 2007 Sep 1;16(3):236-53.

[9] Laurent AM. Understanding open-source and free software licensing: guide to navigating licensing issues in existing & new software. " O'Reilly Media, Inc."; 2004 Aug 16.

[10] Colombo MG, Piva E, Rossi-Lamastra C. Open innovation and within-industry diversification in small and medium enterprises: The case of open-source software firms. Research policy. 2014 Jun 1;43(5):891-902.

[11] hhh

[12] Osterloh M, Rota S. Open-source software development—Just another case of collective invention?. Research Policy. 2007 Mar 1;36(2):157-71.

[13] Maxwell E. Open standards, open-source, and open innovation: Harnessing the benefits of openness. Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization. 2006 Jul 1;1(3):119-76.

[14] Mbah GO. Smart Contracts, Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: Transforming Licensing Agreements in the Tech Industry.

[15] Allamanis M, Barr ET, Devanbu P, Sutton C. A survey of machine learning for big code and naturalness. ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR). 2018 Jul 31;51(4):1-37.

[16] Wu CJ, Raghavendra R, Gupta U, Acun B, Ardalani N, Maeng K, Chang G, Aga F, Huang J, Bai C, Gschwind M. Sustainable ai: Environmental implications, challenges and opportunities. Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems. 2022 Apr 22;4:795-813.

[17] Brenneis A. Assessing dual use risks in AI research: necessity, challenges and mitigation strategies. Research Ethics. 2024:17470161241267782.

[18] Youvan DC. Evolution of Development Models: Navigating Open and Closed Ecosystems in AI and Computing.

[19] Akpobome O. The Impact of Emerging Technologies on Legal Frameworks: A Model for Adaptive Regulation. International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews. 2024;5(10):5046-60.

[20] Bildirici F. Open-Source AI: An Approach to Responsible Artificial Intelligence Development. REFLEKTİF Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. 2024 Feb 13;5(1):73-81.

[21] Bostrom N. Strategic implications of openness in AI development. InArtificial intelligence safety and security 2018 Jul 27 (pp. 145-164). Chapman and Hall/CRC.

[22] Mbah GO. Smart Contracts, Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: Transforming Licensing Agreements in the Tech Industry.

[23] Youvan DC. Evolution of Development Models: Navigating Open and Closed Ecosystems in AI and Computing.

[24] Laurent AM. Understanding open-source and free software licensing: guide to navigating licensing issues in existing & new software. " O'Reilly Media, Inc."; 2004 Aug 16.

[25] Mennega W. Developing an AI capability maturity model for Transmission system operators Bridging the gap between science and practice (Master's thesis).

[26] Margoni T. Artificial Intelligence, Machine learning and EU copyright law: Who owns AI?. Machine learning and EU copyright law: Who owns AI. 2018.

[27] Tylec G, Kwiecień S, Sarowski Ł, Sadowski A. Is it Possible to License Works Used in the Learning Process of Artificial Intelligence Algorithms?. Available at SSRN 4729495. 2024.

[28] Yu Z, Wu Y, Zhang N, Wang C, Vorobeychik Y, Xiao C. Codeipprompt: intellectual property infringement assessment of code language models. InInternational conference on machine learning 2023 Jul 3 (pp. 40373-40389). PMLR.

[29] Crama P, De Reyck B, Taneri N. Licensing contracts: Control rights, options, and timing. Management Science. 2017 Apr;63(4):1131-49.

[30] Ostrom E. Institutional analysis, design principles and threats to sustainable community governance and management of commons. Community management and common property of coastal fisheries in Asia and the Pacific: concepts, methods and experiences. 1994;45:34-50.

[31] Benjamin M, Gagnon P, Rostamzadeh N, Pal C, Bengio Y, Shee A. Towards standardization of data licenses: The montreal data license. arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.12262. 2019 Mar 21.

[32] Alto V. Modern Generative AI with ChatGPT and OpenAI Models: Leverage the capabilities of OpenAI's LLM for productivity and innovation with GPT3 and GPT4. Packt Publishing Ltd; 2023 May 26.

[33] Gibney E. Open-source language AI challenges big tech's models. Nature. 2022 Jun 30;606(7916):850-1.

[34] Jacobides MG, Brusoni S, Candelon F. The evolutionary dynamics of the artificial intelligence ecosystem. Strategy Science. 2021 Dec;6(4):412-35.

[35] Scherer MU. Regulating artificial intelligence systems: Risks, challenges, competencies, and strategies. Harv. JL & Tech.. 2015;29:353.

[36] Mbah GO. Smart Contracts, Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: Transforming Licensing Agreements in the Tech Industry.

[37] Osborne C, Daneshyan F, He R, Ye H, Zhang Y, Zhou M. Characterising Open-source Co-opetition in Company-hosted Open-source Software Projects: The Cases of PyTorch, TensorFlow, and Transformers. Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction. 2025 May 2;9(2):1-30.

[38] Powers JB, McDougall PP. University start-up formation and technology licensing with firms that go public: a resource-based view of academic entrepreneurship. Journal of business venturing. 2005 May 1;20(3):291-311.

[39] Lysaridis I, Chountalas PT, Magoutas AI. Critical Success Factors in the Technology Commercialization Process: A Comparative Case Study of International Licensing Alliances among Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises. Administrative Sciences. 2023 Dec 29;14(1):9.

[40] Manjunath TC, Nimmala S. Innovation Unleashed: The Commodity Revolution. Embracing the Cloud as a Business Essential. 2025 Apr 8:185.

[41] Sabatier V, Craig-Kennard A, Mangematin V. When technological discontinuities and disruptive business models challenge dominant industry logics: Insights from the drugs industry. Technological Forecasting and Social Change. 2012 Jun 1;79(5):949-62.

[42] Sanchez-Cartas JM, Katsamakas E. Artificial intelligence, algorithmic competition and market structures. IEEE Access. 2022 Jan 18;10:10575-84.

[43] Niculescu MF, Wu DJ. Economics of free under perpetual licensing: Implications for the software industry. Information Systems Research. 2014 Mar;25(1):173-99.

[44] Different licensing approaches also create varying patterns of geographic distribution in AI capability

[45] Burström T, Parida V, Lahti T, Wincent J. AI-enabled business-model innovation and transformation in industrial ecosystems: A framework, model and outline for further research. Journal of Business Research. 2021 Apr 1;127:85-95.

[46] Schneider J, Meske C, Kuss P. Foundation models: a new paradigm for artificial intelligence. Business & Information Systems Engineering. 2024 Apr;66(2):221-31.

[47] Hadi MU, Qureshi R, Shah A, Irfan M, Zafar A, Shaikh MB, Akhtar N, Wu J, Mirjalili S. Large language models: a comprehensive survey of its applications, challenges, limitations, and future prospects. Authorea Preprints. 2023 Nov;1:1-26.

[48] Aitken M, Toreini E, Carmichael P, Coopamootoo K, Elliott K, van Moorsel A. Establishing a social licence for Financial Technology: Reflections on the role of the private sector in pursuing ethical data practices. Big Data & Society. 2020 Mar;7(1):2053951720908892

[49] Lescrauwaet L, Wagner H, Yoon C, Shukla S. Adaptive legal frameworks and economic dynamics in emerging technologies: Navigating the intersection for responsible innovation. Law and Economics. 2022 Oct 30;16(3):202-20.

[50] Tlili A, Zhang J, Papamitsiou Z, Manske S, Huang R, Kinshuk, Hoppe HU. Towards utilising emerging technologies to address the challenges of using Open Educational Resources: a vision of the future. Educational Technology Research and Development. 2021 Apr;69:515-32.

[51] Semmelrock H, Ross-Hellauer T, Kopeinik S, Theiler D, Haberl A, Thalmann S, Kowald D. Reproducibility in machine-learning-based research: Overview, barriers, and drivers. AI Magazine. 2025 Jun;46(2):e70002.

[52] Debackere K, Veugelers R. The role of academic technology transfer organizations in improving industry science links. Research policy. 2005 Apr 1;34(3):321-42.

[53] Davis J, Edgar T, Porter J, Bernaden J, Sarli M. Smart manufacturing, manufacturing intelligence and demand-dynamic performance. Computers & Chemical Engineering. 2012 Dec 20;47:145-56.

[54] Lindkvist L. Knowledge communities and knowledge collectivities: A typology of knowledge work in groups. Journal of Management studies. 2005 Sep;42(6):1189-210.

[55] Liu J, Chang H, Forrest JY, Yang B. Influence of artificial intelligence on technological innovation: Evidence from the panel data of china's manufacturing sectors. Technological Forecasting and Social Change. 2020 Sep 1;158:120142.

[56] Peng L. Artificial Divides: Global AI Access Disparities and Constructions of New Digital Realities (Master's thesis, University of Washington).

[57] Aderibigbe AO, Ohenhen PE, Nwaobia NK, Gidiagba JO, Ani EC. Artificial intelligence in developing countries: Bridging the gap between potential and implementation. Computer Science & IT Research Journal. 2023 Dec;4(3):185-99.

[58] Jacobides MG, Brusoni S, Candelon F. The evolutionary dynamics of the artificial intelligence ecosystem. Strategy Science. 2021 Dec;6(4):412-35.

[59] Hitt MA, Hoskisson RE, Kim H. International diversification: Effects on innovation and firm performance in product-diversified firms. Academy of Management journal. 1997 Aug 1;40(4):767-98.

[60] Wang A, Pruksachatkun Y, Nangia N, Singh A, Michael J, Hill F, Levy O, Bowman S. Superglue: A stickier benchmark for general-purpose language understanding systems. Advances in neural information processing systems. 2019;32.

[61] Georgiev D, Antonova A. Enhancing Knowledge Sharing Processes via Automated Software Documentation Management Systems Using Gen AI Software Tools. In2024 XXXIV International Scientific Symposium Metrology and Metrology Assurance (MMA) 2024 Sep 7 (pp. 1-6). IEEE.

[62] Hagerty A, Rubinov I. Global AI ethics: a review of the social impacts and ethical implications of artificial intelligence. arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.07892. 2019 Jul 18.

[63] Hacker P. The European AI liability directives–Critique of a half-hearted approach and lessons for the future. Computer Law & Security Review. 2023 Nov 1;51:105871.

[64] Agrawal A, Gans J, Goldfarb A. Economic policy for artificial intelligence. Innovation policy and the economy. 2019 Jan 1;19(1):139-59.