Subject: [discussion] active systems for amd64
Posted by hd_scania on Sun, 22 Apr 2018 06:19:13 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Parabola, rolling, pacman userland, for both nosystemd and systemd
PureOS, rolling, deb userland, systemd only
GuixSD, rolling, Guix userland, unknown for nosystemd or systemd
Devuan (main pools only), LTS, deb userland, nosystemd only
Hyperbola, LTS, pacman userland nosystemd only
FreeNIX, LTS, Slackware userland, nosystemd only
Trisquel, LTS, deb userland, systemd only
Uruk, LTS, deb userland (virtually urpmi from UPMS), systemd only

Subject: Re: The active FreeNIX endorsed (GNU to-be-endorsed) systems for amd64
Posted by connie on Fri, 27 Apr 2018 00:41:03 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

This is a great list and a place to start, but we are not yet at a point where we can endorse stuff. I am personally unhappy with the name UTC. My latest stab at it is CONA software: Community/Collectively Owned--No Antifeatures.

And what I have in mind for the future is not an endorsement, as much as an evaluation, and may be some kind of rating on 1-5 scale. The highest rating(s) could be interpreted as an endorsement, while low ratings would indicate open issues of various severity. So we would have a forum thread per distribution, with a summary of sorts. Most non-libre distributions (like Ubuntu) would remain unrated, which is the implied lowest score: so non-free on the surface, analyzing them would be a waste of time.

Earlier on IRC I was brainstorming about ratings, I said: a point for ongoing development (a release in last n days), a point for active forum (a post/mailing list release in last n days), a point for keeping up to date with security, then one or more points for various freedom-related issues. FSF's list has reported issues like, they list distributions with a mystery development/maintenance/community support status alongside with much more viable, much better-supported distributions. With the rating system, users could easily see potential usability problems. And another thing coming to mind, collectively owned software should probably have a nontrivial and active collective behind it, or else it's hard to see how an ordinary (non-technical, non-rich) user could hope to exercise the freedom to modify.