Tails - Feature #8948
Reconsider the terminology around "persistence"
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**Description**

**Original problem statement**

We inherited this terminology from the world of live distributions but during the discussions about the Tor Browser confinement and the Greeter revamp, several people raise issues about it.

It might be worth thinking about that and see if we can find something better (and otherwise be happy with it but for a good reason).

We should be really careful while doing that as it could impact many many place in our project (website, documentation, code, even infrastructure). So feasibility, cost effectiveness and flexibility are important issues here as well.

**Current status**

In https://lists.autistici.org/message/20200227.123500.9aee624d.en.html, we agreed on using "Persistent Storage".

See examples: https://tails.boum.org/contribute/how/documentation/style_guide/persistent_storage/.

**Next steps:**

- Merge these examples into the style guide, reducing them to the minimum.
- Apply this change consistently across our doc and interfaces. It will break tons of translations so let's do it all at once.

**Subtasks:**

- Feature # 10048: Improve some terminology and phrasing of the Persistence wizard

**Related issues:**

- Related to Tails - Feature #8949: Rework/doc/encryption_andPrivacy/your_data_wont_be_saved_unless_explicitly_asked
  - Confirmed 02/24/2015
- Related to Tails - Feature #9814: Clarify what Tails is and what makes it so...
  - Confirmed 07/06/2014
- Blocks Tails - Feature #15573: Ask for confirmation when starting without unli...
  - In Progress 05/05/2018
- Blocks Tails - Bug #16384: Force restarting after creating persistent storage
  - Confirmed 01/23/2019
- Blocks Tails - Feature #17247: Core work 2020Q1 → 2020Q2: Technical writing
  - Confirmed

**Associated revisions**

Revision a39cdfe5 - 04/23/2020 04:16 PM - sajolida
Merge branch 'doc/8948-persistent-storage' (Closes: #8948)

**History**

#1 - 02/24/2015 12:13 PM - sajolida
- Related to Feature #8949: Rework/doc/encryption_and_privacy/your_data_wont_be_saved_unless_explicitly_asked added

#2 - 04/10/2015 04:47 PM - BitingBird
Could you be more specific about the issues that people raised? I do like the name "persistence" and users are used to it, so without more precise comments, I don't see the point...
To explain a bit more the issue. The word “persistence” does not define an object as such but the quality of an object. So unless we're confident enough in using such a neologism, we need to add some object to go along this quality. So far we've been using the object “volume” (quite a technical term without much meaning on its own). But then we realized that “persistent volume” was not conveying the idea of encryption which is another key idea (at least as much as being persistent in the case of Tails). So in some places I've used “encrypted persistence” (neologism) or “encrypted persistent volume”.

I agree that users are getting used to that term. And that's the reason why we should be careful while changing those things. But this should not prevent us from finding better terms that might be easier to grasp for newcomers or easier to manipulate for doc writers.

In the thread https://lists.autistici.org/message/20150425.181220.bd80416d.en.html, we are proposing "Persistent Encrypted Storage”. The word "storage" is less jargonistic and has much more meaning that "volume". It conveys better the idea of a place to store your data.

Note that when using "storage" the work "persistent" becomes slightly redundant.

I like "Persistent Encrypted Storage" - well, maybe with less caps, Persistent encrypted storage. I like mentionning that it's encrypted, lots of users are unaware of that and ask (at least on irc).

These days I'm thinking that going for the neologism "persistence" (without "volume" or "storage") should work and has the advantage of being shorter and it's also what use prefer using on development channels. Maybe we should ask opinion from natives about how this sounds.


In the german translation we call it Beständiger (verschlüsselter) Speicherbereich, pretty much persistent encrypted storage.

Next steps on this ticket: ask native speakers about the terminology as suggested by sajolida in https://labs.riseup.net/code/issues/8948#note-6.

Other than that we seem to be fine with the term now and could close this ticket.

Tentatively assigning this ticket to cbrownstein. See my previous comment and question.
I'll work on this with Simply Secure.

#12 - 06/12/2019 05:13 PM - sajolida
- Related to Feature #9814: Clarify what Tails is and what makes it so awesome added

#13 - 06/12/2019 05:15 PM - sajolida
- Target version set to Tails_3.16

From discussions with Simply Secure I'm tempted to stick with "Persistence", with a capital "P" to mark it as a special feature.

Users I've interviewed were fine with "persistence", or used their own version like "persistent memory".

I'll make a final call this summer while testing the content I'm writing for #9814 and I could update it in a bunch of places in time for Tails 4.0.

#14 - 06/12/2019 05:15 PM - sajolida
- Blocks Feature #16711: Core work 2019Q3 → 2019Q4: Technical writing added

#15 - 09/03/2019 09:35 AM - sajolida
- Target version changed from Tails_3.16 to Tails_3.17

#16 - 09/12/2019 02:25 PM - intrigeri
- Target version changed from Tails_3.17 to Tails_4.0

#17 - 09/18/2019 07:22 PM - sajolida
- Target version changed from Tails_4.0 to Tails_4.1

#18 - 11/21/2019 06:45 PM - sajolida
- Blocks Feature #15573: Ask for confirmation when starting without unlocking the persistent storage added

#19 - 11/21/2019 06:51 PM - sajolida
- Blocks Bug #16384: Force restarting after creating persistent storage added

#20 - 11/21/2019 06:52 PM - sajolida
- Blocks Feature #10048: Improve some terminology and phrasing of the Persistence wizard added

#21 - 12/04/2019 11:31 AM - CyrilBrulebois
- Target version changed from Tails_4.1 to Tails_4.2

#22 - 01/05/2020 04:23 PM - sajolida
- Blocks Feature #17247: Core work 2020Q1 → 2020Q2: Technical writing added

#23 - 01/05/2020 04:23 PM - sajolida
- Blocks deleted (Feature #16711: Core work 2019Q3 → 2019Q4: Technical writing)

#24 - 01/05/2020 04:25 PM - sajolida
- Status changed from Confirmed to In Progress
I'll apply [https://tails.boum.org/contribute/how/documentation/style_guide/persistence/] when working on #9814 and test it with users. All this will be done by 4.3.

#25 - 02/11/2020 03:25 PM - anonym
- Target version changed from Tails_4.3 to Tails_4.4

#26 - 03/12/2020 09:55 AM - CyrilBrulebois
- Target version changed from Tails_4.4 to Tails_4.5

#27 - 03/24/2020 07:19 PM - sajolida
- Description updated
- Target version changed from Tails_4.5 to Tails_4.6

I did a last round of answers on tails-project@ since I proposed "Persistent Storage" there on February 27. All core developers who answered were happy with this choice (segfault and moire) and nobody else raised important concerns. So it looks like we finally reached the end of this discussion. Pfff!

#28 - 04/01/2020 05:53 PM - sajolida
[https://lists.autistici.org/message/20200227.123500.9aee624d.en.html]

#29 - 04/15/2020 02:37 AM - sajolida
- Status changed from In Progress to Needs Validation
- Assignee changed from sajolida to cbrownstein
- Feature Branch set to doc/8948-persistent-storage

@cbrownstein: Here is a branch. Warning: it's huge.

- Don't review anything in /contribute: it's messy and not worth improving further :)
- I didn't update anything on /news, /blueprint, and /security.
- Now I use 'turn on', which was recommended over "enable" and "activate" by both the Microsoft and Apple style guides.
- I thought it was better to do 2 big commits instead of splitting bed90b6531 into a billion smaller commits.

I didn't update the UI itself so sometimes, the references on the actual labels in the interface don't match the style guide. I'll update the interface later on in #10048 but I didn't want to block one by the other.

#30 - 04/22/2020 10:55 PM - cbrownstein
- Assignee changed from cbrownstein to sajolida

I've pushed some changes to my branch:
[https://0xacab.org/cbrownstein/tails/-/commits/doc/8948-persistent-storage]

Otherwise, looks good!
#31 - 04/23/2020 04:18 PM - sajolida
- Status changed from Needs Validation to Resolved
- % Done changed from 0 to 100

Applied in changeset tailsja39cdfe552cfa71ee99ca01e22809b70606cac8.

#32 - 04/23/2020 04:21 PM - sajolida
- Assignee deleted (sajolida)

@cbrownstein: Thanks for the very careful review. I learned things!