APPEAL TO THE IAB AGAINST A DECISION MADE BY THE IESG

Dear IAB Chair and IAB Members,
This is an appeal against a decision made by the IESG. It includes:

- the text of the IESG decision I appeal
- the reasons of the appeal
- the negative confirmation or the positive guidance I expect

Its attachments include:

- the decision of Harald Alvestrand to suspend my posting rights on ietf-languages@alvestrand.no
- the text of the ietf-languages@alvestrand.no mail quoted by his decision.
- the text of another mail I quoted in my appeal.
- the text of my appeal to the AD, the IESG directly addressed.

1. **This appeal concerns the following IESG decision**:

At 11:30 07/12/2005, Brian E Carpenter wrote:

Dear Jefsey Morfin,

Since the ietf-languages list is an IETF list but not a WG list, the IESG as a whole has considered your appeal. RFC 3934 does not strictly speaking**,** apply to non-WG lists but we have considered it by analogy. We believe that the list manager's action in this case would have been appropriate in the case of a WG mailing list and therefore we reject your appeal.

Brian Carpenter
as IESG Chair

P.S. Since this was sent as an appeal to an AD, it didn't get posted at
http://www.ietf.org/IESG/Appeals.html.

2. Reasons of this appeal

The documented purpose of my appeal to the IESG was to get an official response for two questions. I understand its denial as a negative answer to these two questions. I understand this means that:

- an IETF mailing list is **not** the appropriate place to debate on its **own** ethic and societal, economical and political impacts.

- the IETF supports Unicode internationalization. Internet multilingualisation is **out of the scope** for the IETF.

The IESG decision is not documented. Due to the importance of these two related issues, to the observed confusion about my motives, and for further reference, I will repeat those motives while I ask for an IAB confirmation.

2.1. My motives regarding the ethical and users' concerns oriented issues

Dr. L. Lessig says the Internet constitution is in the code. It is therefore in the IETF standards. The WSIS showed the importance of the Internet in the life of the world. This means that the IETF documents are part of the world's constitution, the same as treaties, international agreements, etc. However, they are produced by non-representative experts reaching WG consensus by exhaustion, controlled by IETF consensus by disinterest and accepted by IESG non-possibly fully informed consensus.

This situation cannot perpetuate. At some stage various levels of democratic representation, including Parliamentary Members and civil society activists will do the same as I did. They will come to the IETF for user, economical, political, and ethical and quality control. From my experience, the IETF is extremely vulnerable to legitimate demands and behaviours in that area. The IETF would probably block and die in a few months, its participants being discouraged by the resulting requirements, debate and traffic.

I think we **now** are at such a stage. Because six months from now, the IGF meeting will make the problem of the IETF ethic, impact on human values, and quality control, or of its replacement, a major issue or even a priority.

This appeal is to confirm that:

- the IETF has **no** (planned) internal answer to the problem above.

- my proposition of an ad-hoc **separate** entity (if possible as an ISOC entity, now or further on) is not currently investigated by the IETF, the IESG or the IAB. It therefore disrupt**s** or delays no existing effort to address that urgent issue.

  The role of my proposition will be to contribute towards the fully respected Internet standard process. Its purpose will be to protect the engineering debate from societal, economical and political concerns. It will do so in documenting these through technical requirements, comment on proposed documents and answers to IAB/IESG/WG requests. It will strive to protect the IETF transparency and openness, in exposing its ethical concerns and risks of COI. It will offer this way a non-committal interface and a "fuse" with the IGF it will translate the concerns in a way the IETF can understand and positively discuss. This proposition will be documented through an IETF Draft.

2.2. My motives regarding multilingualisation vs. internationalisation

The Tunis agreement accepts the current Internet as a "Mare Americanum". The International Network SSDO to replace the IETF will probably considered soon enough by the IGF. I think it might become a priority, if IAB confirms the IESG response to this second point.

RFC 3066 bis is the enhanced basic building block of the IETF/Unicode lingual architecture. IESG approved it within hours after the USA reached the Tunis agreement with the rest of the world. It leads to a **unique** consistent naming space for languages and locale files, possibly also for currently debated linguistic DNS zones. Its impact on e-commerce management, Internet traffic filtering, user profiling, printing, content and information industries, operating system design, document architecture, knowledge access, lingual and cultural empowerment, etc. and ultimately on the economy and the peace of the world is significant.

This is why it was important that:

- Its twice the IETF Last Call failed Draft be far **more achieved**, with a far less leaking ABNF.

- It would only **be adopted** after the Tunis Submit confirmed the Internet as the US national packet switch system (47 USC 230 (f)(1)), "reaching into just about every country in the world" (RFC 3935) through its internationalization solution (RFC 2277, 3066, etc.).

Painstakingly for all, I obtained both.

The challenge

Architecturally, legally, politically, operationally, economically, militarily and culturally the Internet is consistent with the reality today. The world has accepted and legitimated its support of the US independence and sovereignty. The Unicode "internationalization" (as documented below) supports the American English language empowerment.

Now, the world must make true and equal, for every community and every user, in a distributed open manner, what has been acknowledged and stabilised for the US nation and the American language.

It must be made true and equal for **every nation**, true and equal for **every language**. Languages are the most powerful mankind force, after and often orthogonal to nations. It must be made possibly true and equal for 20,000 language entities and an unlimited number of variants. It will help this way their sustainable empowerment, a major way to innovative development. Languages and cultures are legally and technically equal. None is universal, or even pivotal. This is a major challenge.

The reward

However, the network's semantic and architecture, the investment and the ROI of this major challenge are considered neither by the IETF Internet, nor by the GENI projects.

- Louis Pouzin's catenet lead to "**THE** network of the networks" of the current Internet. This was just a step in the catenet path. We now need the next one: "the networks **within** THE network". GENI considers infrastructural regions. ICANN considered structural **externets** (external look-alike networks within the network): ICP-3 calls for work on classes in that direction and they have approved ".cat". Metastructural spaces of exchanges, trust and services (SETS), the very basis of multilateral usage architecture have not even been discussed.

- The Internet is the "US ASCII English externet" **within** the international network. 19.999 other ones and their interrelations are to be supported. This is the architectural challenge and reward: to switch from a single unilateral globalization to a generalised multilateral harmonisation.

Do I ask for a change or for a progress ?

Internationalization is a **unilateral** concept defended by Mark Davis, responsible for globalization at IBM. It is simple and consistent (together with localization). It is to remove the lingual barriers between a provider and its clients (IBM definition, quoted by Addison Philips, his co-author of RFC 3066 bis). It is at the initiative and under the control of the provider: it permits (IETF mission, RFC 3935 Harald Alvestrand) to "influence" the ways in which people "design, use and manage" the Internet. It permits to export the IETF culture and its associated interests in a better way.

But it does not scale: it does not permit **multilateral reciprocity**. It is not designed to remove lingual barriers between "clients", so they may equally compete (or ally) with the US-ASCII system. Global scalability calls for cross-internationalization (or "multinationalisation") in every architectural area. In the language area this is multilingualisation. Solutions found in multilingualisation, or paid by multilingualisation, will most probably provide experience for the generalised multilateralisation, a distributed global network architecture MUST equally provide.

Unilateral internationalisation and multilateral harmonisation do not oppose. Every group of users, every user has a unilateral vision of the common system. Confusing the unilateral individual layer with the multilateral common layer was acceptable in a collapsed mono-layer internet prototype. It

may still be considered for a default approach. But using Unicode as an exclusive "internationalized-US-ASCII" is a layer violation. This can easily be corrected in RFC 3066 bis by adding a users' space to its existing private use space. RFC 4151 tag-URIs would hook there, at multilateral layer, the unlimited number of other "internationalization" or "lingualisation" layers descriptors.

Freeing the architecture from its self-inflicted constraints

Once the multi-layer internet model has been clarified, the distributed network architectural concatenation/partition dynamic can play freely. This will put Unicode in the multilateralisation layer where it belongs, as a concatenation of reference, which permits to easily document the charsets used at unilateral layers. This permits to more easily address issues like ML.ML domain names.

I submit that this mono-Internet vs. multi-Internet model applies to every architectural area. It is however probably easier to analyse, prototype and fund in the multilingual area.

Anyway, the question is to know if the IETF is the place to address the multilingual architectural demand, challenge, and priority. Work on multilingual support and brain to brain **interintelligibility** needs someone to do it, with standardisation and not commercial dominance in mind.

This appeal is to confirm that:

▪ the IETF and the IAB doctrine is the Unicode internationalisation. These are not the proper place to discuss the support of multilingualization as part of a global multilateral architecture.

▪ discussing and implementing a "multi-Internet" approach, as introduced above, does not conflict with any IETF endeavours as long as these do not violate or transparently replace and extend the "mono-Internet" solutions.

This will lead to an experimental open use and ISO 11179 compliant multilingual registry (langroot), supported by an ad-hoc task-force. This effort towards a multilingual digital convergence will be documented through IETF Drafts.

3. **expected negative confirmation, or positive guidance**

I expect from the IAB:

▪ either to confirm the decisions of the IESG and of Harald Alvestrand.

It will show that the IETF wants to stick to its current architecture and internationalization doctrine. It is legitimate for a US-ASCII English Internet, as agreed in Tunis. Global ethic and user concerns, as well as multinationalisation/multilingualisation technical issues, will be carried outside of the IETF.

▪ or to turn me right against the decision of the IESG and of Harald Alvestrand.

This would then call for:

▪ a debate on the way IETF WG's should address their own ethics, user related issues and societal and political impact, most probably leading to the creation, within the IETF, of an ad-hoc structure, such as the one I propose.

▪ an addition of two lines to the RFC 3066 bis, defining an RFC 4151 oriented users' space.

I thank you for your time, answers and comments.
JFC Morfin

Appendix 1. Suspension decided by Harald Alvestrand

At 03:39 21/11/2005, Harald Tveit Alvestrand wrote:

Jefsey,

you are again sending material to this list that does not belong here; this is a list for discussing language tags in the specific, not the general principles underlying the update to RFC 3066.

In addition you are again misrepresenting people's positions and insulting their motivation, their competence and their morals.

I'm suspending your posting privilleges to this list for another 30 days, the maximum permitted under RFC 3934.

      Harald Alvestrand

--On søndag, november 20, 2005 20:56:59 +0100 "JFC (Jefsey) Morfin" <jefsey@jefsey.com> wrote:
[the sole mail quoted in Appendix 2 here after]

Appendix 2. A response to Doug Ewell

At 18:27 20/11/2005, Doug Ewell wrote:

JFC (Jefsey) Morfin <jefsey at jefsey dot com> wrote:
http://www.yobserver.com/news_8624.php. Some of my positions better described.

Crystal's book, reviewed in this Yemen Observer article, argues that (1) languages other than English will remain important and must be preserved, and (2) the importance of regional variants of English is growing rapidly and must be recognised.

Surely no group has demonstrated a stronger commitment to promoting the use of minority languages and regional variants of English overthe Internet, by encouraging their accurate identification, than ietf-languages.

Dear Doug,
We agree on the effort, and on the probable motivations of most of the members of this group. However when the author says "Among the reasons set out by Crystal for the death of languages are natural disasters, cultural assimilation and homogenization, displacement or decimation of indigenous communities, and socio-economic pressures", I would add the technico-economic pressures.

The ietf-languages group is by essence where these pressures can be applied or blocked, as far as the leading technology is concerned. My fear, coming for a part of the real world which is not the one of most in here, are the perverse effects which happens in _every_ human effort. These perverse effects (which are not investigated) would make this effort to help these pressures and would support technically and culturally unjustified political or technical doctrines.

Doing a good job is a good thing. Doing a good job for an unethical cause, makes that job unethical and is a bad thing.

Your own remark on "Guam" shows that you are not happy with the obligation to only respect RFC 3066. My position only goes a step further in term of security: I have no objection to _also_ support RFC 3066, I have no objection to even set-it up as a default. I have a very deep ethic concern at making it exclusive. This leads this group to twist reality and spoil a great and good job to _only_ match it. I have a practical deep problem in having no way to non-conflictingly match other needs in term of modes, tones, styles, mediums, dates, sociolinguistic or trade entities, etc. etc.

In this I share the "red alert". What happened in Tunis, for example, just after the UNESCO GA where the mood was different, gives me the bitter feeling of a Monroe split - in addition to the perfectly understandable and acceptable technical, political, economical and societal positions of the various sides.

The "red alert" is for this group to make sure that its work (which will greatly extend with RFC 3066 bis if applied) has ethical effects. This is the same kind of moral concerns as the people of the Manhattan Project had. And I think the impact on the people of the world - through their language and cultures - is of the same magnitude.

jfc

Appendix 3. A response to Mark Crispin

(due to the timing this mail was also probably considered in the decision. I quoted in the IESG appeal. To make things clear to external readers, there is no doubt that Harald Alvestrand is, in my mind, among the people I refer to in the post scriptum).

At 01:35 21/11/2005, JFC (Jefsey) Morfin wrote:

> At 21:46 20/11/2005, Mark Crispin wrote:
>
>> On Sun, 20 Nov 2005, JFC (Jefsey) Morfin wrote:
>>
>> The ietf-languages group is by essence where these pressures can be applied or blocked, as far as the leading technology is concerned.
>
> I can assure you that *every* single instance in which you have applied pressure in this group has been ineffective in accomplishing positive benefit.

Dear Mark,
I have no intent to dispute with you or anyone. I am just an IETF user, calling for QA. Quality is never easy to obtain and popular. I do not think I ever applied "pressure" for a registration like others did: but I certainly behave the way I can in order to expose errors and pressures, and to catalyse new debates of common interest.

I therefore do not know how to understand "ineffective in accomplishing positive benefit". What I know, for example, is that there is a substantial difference between RFC 3066 bis and the text I opposed and this group thought good enough to be published as an RFC in December last. All the more if you consider the current work on filtering I restarted, at the cost of an appeal, while they thought the work on matching ready for LC.

We all want this group to be in the best situation to do nicely the best work possible in the best interest of everyone. We all agreed that this called for changes (IESG). As the user of the resulting deliverables to serve other users, my organisation and its members need _all_ these changes, as do many others we identify/relate with. I am sorry if I am disliked, but I am determined to get you guys in the best situation to do what you want to do: to best address the users' needs. If possible in avoiding the confusion of the alternative competition Doug still suggests me to create.

I have no problem with that, but is it really what this group want? To replicate the Tunis agreement, leaving the ietf-languages take care of the languages legacy internet issues, while a new IGF center of expertise will care for the Multilingual Internet and the digital convergence?

jfc

ps. To better understand what I refer to: http://www.rsf.org/article.php3?id_article=15613
My concern is simple: in most of the places the pressure is by the Government. In one [of them] it is by people we know.

Appendix 4. Text of the Appeal to the AD

Dear Scott,
This is an appeal of Harald Tveit Alvestrand's decision regarding my ban of the ietf-languages@alvestrand.no mailing list.

I will not discuss the particulars of this ban.

I do not want to explain how, IMHO, the technical positions of Harald Tveit Alvestrand and of his supporters are partly erroneous (we all know now the technical responses I usually receive: PR-action, political lobbying, bans).

I will not come back on my two previous odd bans: one by good pleasure of the list private owner, the other for having politely and positively addressed a wish of the IESG Reviewer.

I do not want to show how these positions are hurting the IETF: the internet globalization has received its detrimental sanctions in Tunis.

All this would call for the fastidious reading of low interest mails. And I certainly defend the right of Harald Tveit Alvestrand to think and behave the way he wants, within the limits of the law.

I only wish to use his sole motivated ban mail [above], and the quote of the mail which most probably really triggered the ban (I totally copy it for quick perusal of the real whole case - and because of the only technical person the RSF article, quoted in Post Scriptum, alludes to):

- to expose the control Harald Tveit Alvestrand shows he wants to keep on the IANA language registry and on its mailing list - the IESG said this list was (making him its permanent Chair?). This to **exclusively** support a globalization doctrine summarised by Mark Davis, his Unicode executive colleague [additions between brackets are my reading of their propositions] as

  globalization = [English ASCII] network (environment) **internationalization +**
  [Unicode CLDR based] (end-user's) computer **localization**.

  I recall that the global harmonisation, I support, **includes** the equal support of that proposition and of every other SSDO and users based propositions. Global harmonisation is already - but conflictingly - supported in using RFC 4151 URI-tags.

- to ask a simple question, in front of the "red alert" of the most respected English language expert, UNESCO and WSIS calls for cultural diversity protection and promotion, etc.: "is the language area of the IETF and its mailing list a property of Mr. Harald Tveit Alvestrand to the point that rising legitimate and serious ethical and technical concerns about the way this list is permitted to function and deliver is a cause for censoring?"

Technologies, networks and usages convergence will go where languages support is adequate to the users. The work of several organisations I share in (I represent or not) is for a practical language support permitting that convergence. That effort still wishes such a convergence to find a harmonious core support in the IANA and in the IETF technology.

Harald Tveit Alvestrand's doctrine and political action oppose that. We are repeatedly advised by the members of the "consensus" he shares in, to build it outside of the current IANA and of the IETF (cf. Doug Ewell's mail quoted below), so that the "best wins" (Addison Philips, author of RFC 3066 bis and current matching/filtering Draft).

I do not think that there should be any other winner than us, the users.

We just saw what this "Monroe split" attitude lead to in Tunis: this is why I think we should pay every effort to avoid an Internet balkanization, as a result of a competition/opposition between a "legacy" and an "IGF" attitude.

I therefore appeal from this ban in order to know:

1. If one can be censored on an IETF mailing list for expressing reasonable ethical and moral concerns about the [external] pressures received and the societal impact [on] that mailing list deliverables?

2. if the IETF wants to stick to an exclusive unilateral attitude in the language area (and will assume its RFC 3935 resulting competence and responsibility obligations), meaning that other technical convergence lingual and cultural support issues have to be addressed in competition, by an outside separated (and therefore possibly conflicting) structure?

jfc