

Commenting Gerd's suggestions

Manfred Lotz, <manfred@dante.de>

July 18, 2015

Contents

1 (P1) Legal	2
2 (P3) Communication Platform CTAN	3
3 Topics	4
3.1 Recommendations	4
3.2 (P4) Structured Topics	4
4 (P2) Licenses	4
5 Packages	6
5.1 Remove container packages	6
5.2 (N) Eliminate File Packages	6
5.3 No version number in package directories	6
5.4 (P4) Readme Files	6
5.5 (N) Proper Title of Documentation	6
5.6 (P2) Modification Date for Packages	6
6 (P3) T_EX Archive under Version Control	7
7 Portal	7
7.1 (P4) Images for Packages and Topics	7
7.2 (P1) Personalized Portal Features	7
7.3 Admin Interface	7
8 Catalogue in T_EX Archive	7
9 (P1) Upload	7
9.1 CGI Upload	7
9.2 (P1) Fields	7
10 (P4) Hall of Fame	7

Here are some comments about Gerd's document. I have marked stuff with priorities from my point of view. (P1) highest, (P5) lowest, and finally (N) which means that I don't agree.

1 (P1) Legal

I'm totally a dummy regarding legal issues. My only idea is to get advice from a lawyer who is a specialist for these things. As ctan.org is registered in the USA (see below) we should talk to Karl Berry.

whois ctan.org gives:

```
[Querying whois.publicinterestregistry.net]
[whois.publicinterestregistry.net]
Domain Name:CTAN.ORG
Domain ID: D968637-LROR
Creation Date: 1998-03-11T05:00:00Z
Updated Date: 2015-03-04T21:47:05Z
Registry Expiry Date: 2017-03-10T05:00:00Z
Sponsoring Registrar:DNC Holdings, Inc. (R48-LROR)
Sponsoring Registrar IANA ID: 291
WHOIS Server:
Referral URL:
Domain Status: clientDeleteProhibited -- http://www.icann.org/epp#clientDeleteProhibited
Domain Status: clientTransferProhibited -- http://www.icann.org/epp#clientTransferProhibited
Domain Status: clientUpdateProhibited -- http://www.icann.org/epp#clientUpdateProhibited
Registrant ID:DN2-808280
Registrant Name:Executive Director
Registrant Organization:TeX Users Group
Registrant Street: P.O. Box 2311
Registrant City:Portland
Registrant State/Province:OR
Registrant Postal Code:97208
Registrant Country:US
Registrant Phone:+1.5032239994
Registrant Phone Ext:
Registrant Fax:
Registrant Fax Ext:
Registrant Email:office@tug.org
Admin ID:DN2-808280
Admin Name:Executive Director
Admin Organization:TeX Users Group
Admin Street: P.O. Box 2311
Admin City:Portland
Admin State/Province:OR
Admin Postal Code:97208
```


3 Topics

3.1 Recommendations

What does it mean?

3.2 (P4) Structured Topics

Could be done. It has to be discussed how to set it up technically. To be honest: in light of the other points this is not high priority for me.

4 (P2) Licenses

Not quite sure how sophisticated the new scheme should be. Here are some questions I posted on the CTAN list:

Hi all,

After having had a private discussion with Gerd about the license issue where we disagreed at some points I want to prepare for a discussion at the TUG 2015 conference.

Overview

=====

- I think we agree that today's situation (only a single license can be registered for a package) is unsatisfying.
- My view is that this is a high priority issue.

Before deciding for a technical solution I would like to clarify what we want to achieve.

Here is my view

=====

Goal: I want to be able to solve the license registry issue for almost (not in the mathematical sense which means 0 is also almost all) all CTAN packages. Currently we have 4962 packages. If we are able to register license information properly for 4955 packages then I would be really happy. BTW, this would be 99.85%. If we could do 100% the better.

If there are different or other goals please state.

What does it mean to solve the license registry issue?

=====

- we complete the list of possible licenses so that practically all licenses could be registered.
Gerd has a list here: <http://comedy.dante.de/~gene/licenses/licenses>
- we support combinations of licenses occurring in the CTAN context.
Gerd has something here: <http://comedy.dante.de/~gene/licenses/>

Which license combinations do we expect realistically?

=====

I think those could be expected:

- a single license (this is what we properly serve today)
I guess this is the majority of all case.
- a scoped license (is there a better term?) where there are at least two different licenses covering different areas of the package.

Example: lpp1.3 for the LaTeX part of a package and OFL for the font part of a package

- Multi license
The user of the package has a choice of at least 2 licenses when using the package.

Example: a package offers the alternative of being GPL or BSD licensed.

Question

=====

Do we expect more complex combinations, i.e. for instance having a multi license where one of those is a scoped license?

Example: package P is licensed under either BSD or a scoped license of say LPPL1.3 for the LaTeX part and OFL for the font part.

If yes should we allow even more sorts of weird recursive licensing schemes? There is no limitation to weirdness, of course.

5 Packages

5.1 Remove container packages

What do you mean by this besides obsolete?

5.2 (N) Eliminate File Packages

- Then we need to create 94 directories for 94 Heiko Oberdieck packages which
 - contain a single file only
 - are all in `macros/latex/contrib/oberdieck/`

There might others where we would have a lot of work to migrate.

- I agree not to create new packages containing a single file only.
- Why is it important for you to convert the existing *file packages*?

5.3 No version number in package directories

- I don't remember any case where we had to rename a directory when upgrading.
- Any example?

5.4 (P4) Readme Files

- Ok with me.
- But want to hear Rainer's view.

5.5 (N) Proper Title of Documentation

- I don't like this.
 - who will do this?

5.6 (P2) Modification Date for Packages

Ok but:

- For using this it is required that the author is forced to fill it.
- I don't feel like searching for a suitable date in a package directory only to be able to fill the date field appropriately.

6 (P3) T_EX Archive under Version Control

I think this is a good idea. But it requires...

- changing the `ctan_install` script
- changing the mirroring scripts which injects files into CTAN
- anything else to deal with???? Rainer might know
- currently it is convenient to search for something and being able to see that if is in `obsolete`. So I would be reluctant to make `obsolete` hidden.

7 Portal

7.1 (P4) Images for Packages and Topics

7.2 (P1) Personalized Portal Features

The *login for authors* is very important in my opinion as it makes our work considerably easier if this means that **authors will be provided by a pre filled form** for their package..

7.3 Admin Interface

No opinion without having seen it.

8 Catalogue in T_EX Archive

Do you mean stuff like this <http://ctan.org/tex-archive/biblio/bibtex/utis/bibtool?>
If yes how is the navigation in the huge PDF document better than navigating the html pages?

9 (P1) Upload

9.1 CGI Upload

If the alternative is an author's login where for an upload the (or a) form gets prefilled then fine. If the alternative is anything else then for understanding an explanation is required.

9.2 (P1) Fields

In XML version is splitted in *version number* and *version date*. Upload form should reflect this. Please note that the *version date* does not denote the date of the upload. It is date given by the author. Some authors uses it, others do not.

10 (P4) Hall of Fame