

BIJLAGE X**Board-of-Directors and Euro-Summit at Cork90****C.G. van der Laan**

september 1990

*Cork90: the end of a decennium, the start of a new era***Summary**

TUG organizational:

- TUG is really open now.
- Working Groups will be sent off with better task descriptions and reporting time schedules.
- How to fulfil better membership needs is proposed.
- A scholarly TUGboat and a separate newsletter is proposed. Topical TUGboat issues are under consideration.
- No increased membership/postage fees for those outside USA.
- The dangling reciprocal membership question is near to a pilot study.
- BoD can operate faster because of adoption of voting by e-mail.
- An extended membership directory is asked for.
- A resource directory is asked for.
- Maintenance/evolution of \TeX etc. software must be handled by TUG and LUG s; $\text{D}\mathbb{E}\text{K}$ and LL are out of it!
- More attention will be paid to PR activities: Welcome c.q. Information/Demo packets will be prepared.

Euro-Summit:

- Eastern and Western European countries will exchange information.
- A status report, Euro-Summit Cork90(?), will appear with contact addresses and status reports.

Cork90

Cork is a friendly city by the sea with many bridges—not as famous as the Koningsberger bridges though—with in the past George Boole laying down computer science basics at this very University 1849–64: Boolean algebra. The conference was well organized, with the novelty of e-mail for every participant (Well-done Peter!)

This first TUG conference in Europe must not be confused with the previous European meetings sponsored by TUG, like e.g. the last Karlsruhe meeting. The organization had the usual set-up: conference over several days with one stream of presentations, the vendor booths, board meetings at ‘morning, noon and evening,’ with courses at the days before and after. The Europeans had their marathon too: The Euro-Summit!

Another novelty was the availability of the proceedings of the $\text{T}\mathbb{E}\text{X}$ as AM meeting. (Congratulations Lincoln!)

1 Board of Directors meetings

E-mail clashes and heavy phone-calls preluded what might be called a phoenix meeting. The key-issue was: How should TUG fulfil its international role, despite its USA roots and lacking time to handle things appropriately. Waves coming ashore from Western Europe, immediately followed by the even higher Eastern European

seas, not to mention the waves from the Pacific, especially Japan! Some numbers: TUG \approx 3,500 members, Western Europe \approx 1,500 members, Eastern Europe 500–1000, with an enormous potential, Japan \approx 500 members, Australia ?, China ?, One thing for sure: the sea will eventually calm down, let us make a guess at 10,000–15,000 members, within 5 years (another guess), with a tenfold or so out there, just silently running their $\text{T}\mathbb{E}\text{X}$ engine, without much ado. So, how is TUG going to address the international challenge?

1.1 Openness

First, the basics, what about openness? At this meeting the board was keen on *acting as a board* and therefore motioned to have access to all information, especially that privileged to the executive committee. It was also agreed to have the minutes available within a month after the meeting and have these accepted and available for free within another month, with the TUG office nagging. In TUGboat, or the newsletter, the president will summarize as soon as possible the main issues treated, in easy going prose.

1.2 Working groups

Second, the working groups (WG s) need a proper description of their task and reporting time schedules. More

or less so motioned and passed.

1.3 Organizational structure

Third, the organizational structure will be reconsidered by a WG appointed by Nelson Beebe, where the size of the board, the representation (by election, by appointment), etc. will be addressed. With an International TUG in mind, *perceived as such by the people outside the United States!* As an *aside*, some confusion of tasks has been cleared up: the executive director (ED) is no longer a board member! The renewal of the ED-contract can't be done without consent of the board! So TUG will endeavour hard times, and it is expected that the community will experience less service the coming year.

1.4 E-mail voting of BoD

The board of directors (BoD) also motioned the possibility of voting by e-mail, in order to continue work, instead of awaiting the next TUG meeting with an overcrowded BoD agenda. After settling details the motion was passed.

1.5 Reports

Apart from the Language/Local User Groups (LUG s) reports, the following committees reported:

- on local working groups (in writing),
- on membership issues (in writing),
- bylaws (in writing and acting),
- on local working groups (in writing),
- multilingual review (in writing and for review by the membership at large),
- scholarship,
- PD software and its distribution,
- elections/voting by (e-)mail,
- T-shirts (a winner in time spend-revenue ratio),
- finance committee (yes, we will have a loss).

Some 18 committees were listed, with a few missing, especially the one devoted to education.

Much information exchange took place and creative ideas filled the room.

From the written reports the main ideas are summarized below with some oversights added.

1.5.1 LUG s

TUG feels that LUG s are extremely important because they contribute to have T_EX etc. widely accepted. We have some well-known and prospering LUG s from Western Europe and Japan, with those from Eastern Europe just taking off. From within the USA the California and Delaware local groups made themselves known.

How to assist?

- Give the welcome feeling (Is formalization of LUG s necessary?).
- Provide information packets:
 - for members a resource directory,
 - for novices a welcome package (with among others membership/resource directory),
 - and for interessees a demo package.
- Provide a list of ideas where LUG boards might pick from in order to serve their members
 - How to:
 - handle local queries,
 - organize resources,
 - compile the good information,
 - disseminate information,
 - distribute books/software/gadgets etc.,
 - to organize local meetings,
 - to set-up a newsletter,
 - start cooperation,
- Support local meetings and conferences.
- Support organizing classes, by providing courseware, (names of) teachers, and some funding if needed.
- Share know-how (information/speakers/teachers exchange).
- Fund projects where everybody profits from (TUG-boat, L^AT_EX project, T_EXHaX, floppy copying machine (passed)).

In return?

- Submission of status reports, participation in board/committees, etc.
- Submission of articles,
- Provide speakers/teachers/authors etc.

Still dangling are:

- The reciprocal/mutual/associate/. . . -membership issues: TUG with any LUG.
- LUG cooperation; an European newsletter/journal in various representations? shared projects? fileservers synchronization?

1.5.2 Membership committee

Axiomatix is expansion of membership. Some proposals made:

- A membership satisfaction survey has been set up and sent out.
- A membership card is urged for.
- Members should be able to obtain discounts and/or special offers on the sale of T_EX/TUG materials.
- What about: 'Welcome to membership' packet from TUG and/or LUG?
- What about: 'Information packet with demo floppies or even PD version for free?'
- What about: 'TUG a member?'
- Reciprocal membership TUG with LUG s should be costed out, a pilot study?
- Encourage vendors to help: ask for including as part of a T_EX etc. book the TUG/LUG info leaflet; similar enclosure for software sold.

- What about: ‘Checking membership list with customer lists, \TeX HaX/MaG lists, and inviting non-members to membership?’
- What about: ‘Posters with the benefits of TUG/LUG?’
- We should follow-up lapsed members.

Added: Courseware for LUG/TUG beginning course should comprise the information packet.

1.5.3 Working Groups committee

One of the complaints is that WG s don’t report regularly. Although this demonstrates that in a volunteer-based organization ‘the flesh is stronger than the will,’ the board adopted a motion about providing proper guidance to WG s.

1.5.4 Font character encoding committee

Michael Ferguson pushed ahead the difficult standardization process. LUG s are strongly invited to comment on the WG-proposal, sealed by the board.

1.5.5 Fileservers/TUGlib work

Don Hosek and Nelson Beebe have been quite active in this area, not to forget the volunteers out there who feed and maintain the servers. Synchronization of the various file servers is an ideal task which will never be attained. The long-term goal of course is, to have your local file server intelligent enough to handle appropriately your requests. The Achilles heel in any system is to keep the directory up-to-date. Synchronization (and maintaining) tables of contents to strive for is already neat, and useful anyhow. NETlib experience has it that the software used to be available while the directory lagged behind.

1.5.6 (PD) Software validation and distribution

Thinking about software distribution by TUG, especially for personal computers (PC s), has just started. Some LUG s distribute already, apart from the difficult question of a quality/ \TeX seal (passed Trip/Trap test appropriately, sufficient documentation is provided, etc.) This is different from the former implementers job, because of scale.

A floppy copying machine will be purchased by the office; LUG s can make use of it, at some unknown conditions of yet.

1.6 Home work

During the conference two notes were composed:

- Expanding the use of \TeX along with implementation plan, and
- Objectives for TUG 1991–92.

Although these notes reflect most of what was brought to attention (before and at the meetings) they have not been discussed in open and have not been passed, because, . . . , believe it or not, lack of time, other important business, and *no time-control on the various items* of the agenda. For a complete report await the minutes which will be out very soon, because of e-mail acceptance procedure. For the impatient: look out for the president’s view of the meetings in next TUGboat or newsletter.

1.7 Next TUG conferences

The very next one is scheduled in summer at the ‘home’ of TUG: Providence Rhode Island. For the next ‘TUG in Europe’ meeting offers have been received from GUTenberg and CST \TeX . The decision will be made in October.¹

2 Euro-Summit

For this summit Western and Eastern European ‘LUG s’ were invited. Present were: GUTenberg, DANTE, uk \TeX ug, NordicTUG, NTG; Irina from Russia, two delegates from Poland, Yugoslavia, HunTUG, and from CSTUG. For TUG Nelson Beebe, Alan Hoenig and the executive director Ray Goucher, were present; the meeting was chaired by Malcolm, the European coordinator.

After a welcome etc. we started by making ourselves known followed by overviews of the status and wishes of the various LUG s. These surveys as well as the contact addresses were considered useful and therefore Malcolm volunteered in bundling this information (To appear)² Moreover, we agreed to extend the Western European information exchange process to the whole of Europe: every LUG will receive newsletters/minutes etc. from the other LUG s. Of course the European coordinator will be informed as well.

The atmosphere of the meeting was cordially, but a bit out of balance to my taste: some ‘patronizing’ attitude of the Western groups towards the Eastern. Undoubtedly it must have been read as eagerness to assist the ‘new’ ones. Agreed most Eastern LUG s endeavour difficulties because of *currency conversion* problems, *insufficient network facilities* and in general *hardware drawbacks*.

The Eastern representatives felt it extremely useful just to be present, to participate at the conference, to meet so

¹ GUTenberg pushed ahead. They announced to have the meeting in France, organized by GUTenberg next September, with all the LUG presidents on the program committee, independent from TUG.

² This report will partially overlap with the publications: Summary of resources available to \TeX users, TUGboat, 11#1, 32–35, # 2, 207. The international reports in the proceedings issue, TUGboat, 11#3, 444–450. \TeX , TUG, and Eastern Europe, TUGboat, 11#1, 122–123.

many people with similar interests, to share experience, and to take home most of the Aston archive.

2.1 A summary of characteristics

- **DANTE**

Most rapidly growing LUG with ≈ 800 members, a newsletter, two file servers (also FTP access), listserver, projects: \TeX at highschools, \TeX on TV, \TeX in journals, and several active famous people: Frank and Rainer, Appel, Schwarz, von Bechtolsheim, Wonneberger, Brüggeman-Klein, the \LaTeX -project guarded by Frank and Rainer.

- **GUTenberg**

A solid group with ≈ 400 members, a journal, a listserver, joined file server with DANTE, well-attended open meetings, with o.a. TUG/LUG representatives. Offered to host next European meeting.

- **uk \TeX ug**

They have Malcolm! (and therefore \TeX line, the Exeter proceedings out, firm contacts with other LUGs, . . .), the Ashton archive activity, moderated listserver, several teachers, a \TeX companion book in proof, a hundred members or so.

- **NordicTUG**

Humming \TeX and working on character encoding schemes, institutionalisation is fled from like the plague.

- **NTG**

Roughly a hundred members, two file servers, a listserver, \LaTeX activity, bother about teaching and cooperation (especially with other LUGs and SGML), no newsletter yet: just minutes plus appendices (≈ 100 p), various contributions to TUGboat.

On the whole Eastern European groups encounter language problems:

- lack of hyphenation tables,
- problems with accented characters,
- problems with (cyrillic) fonts,
- translation of *the* books into the local languages.

They also have problems in just getting the materials there. Most groups are not yet formally organized. At the moment it is unclear in what way help could be given apart from exchanging contact addresses, information, software and the news.³ Note that Bien and Ryško already published articles in TUGboat.

3 Birds-Of-a-Feather sessions

Of the several BoF's one did address a motion to the board.

3.1 Future of \TeX

The board is asked to acknowledge that TUG and the LUGs have to maintain and develop \TeX etc. That it should oversee and coordinate changes to \TeX in order to prevent fragmentation, that it shall find a balance between stifling and development, that it shall stimulate and/or fund research into unsolved typographical problems! This motion has not yet been discussed by the board, because, . . ., yes, you know already.⁴

4 Conference

A separate conference report will appear written by Nico, Johannes and myself.

³More detailed information: see the earlier announced Euro-Summit90 report

⁴Added in proof: See Knuth's statement enclosed as appendix.