

Re: sci.stat.math.moderated ?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.stat.math/2006-04/msg00178.html>

- *From:* Jerry Dallal <gdallal@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 07 Apr 2006 13:48:03 GMT
-

beliavsky@xxxxxxx wrote:

A moderated newsgroup devoted to the proper subject of sci.stat.math should not be necessary, but I guess it is. If someone starts the process rolling (there is an established Usenet procedure that I am not familiar with), there will be at least one vote in favor, and I suspect there will be many.

Having created a few newsgroups, including a big-8, and seen other proposals go down in flames, I'm familiar with the process.

<http://www.faqs.org/faqs/usenet/creating-newsgroups/part1/>

In essence, there is a Request for Discussion followed by a Call for Votes.

Some random thoughts:

- (1) Someone has to shepherd the process (be the proposer). It can be a ton of work. "If someone will start the process" is the equivalent of "and then if a miracle happens". (Miracles do sometime happen.)
 - (2) I'll be very curious to see the Rationale section of the RFD.
 - (3) Some one/entity will have to moderate.
 - (4) Moderated newsgroups tend not to do as well as unmoderated ones because of the lag time while waiting for the moderator to approve posts. (If you build it, they don't have to come.)
- .