**APPEAL TO THE IAB REGARDING THE IESG DECISION
TO CONSIDER EXPEDITING THE PUBLICATION OF THE BCP 47 RFC**

by J-F C. Morfin
24 August 2006

Dear IAB Member,

On 16 August I forwarded a two-part appeal regarding the BCP 47 document management, which tends to publish these documents before the normal appeal process is carried out.

This document is online at: http://www.ietf.org/IESG/APPEALS/jefsey-appeal-to-iesg-08-17-2006.pdf

For clarity in the readability, I will use the same format as was used in the appeal with italics and additional margins for the IESG decision and an additional margin for my comments and appeal.

Appeal against the decision to consider a request to the RFC Editor to expedite the publication of draft-ietf-ltru-registry, draft-ietf-ltru-matching and draft-ietf-ltru-initial.

> **IESG:** *"Appeal against the decision to consider a request to the RFC Editor to expedite the publication of draft-ietf-ltru-registry,draft-ietf-ltru-matching and draft-ietf-ltru-initial" followed by various arguments.*
>
> *As discussed in the July 10 response to the appeal from Dean Anderson against draft-ietf-grow-anycast, the appeals process is designed to handle disputes that cannot be handled through other means. The IESG cannot come up with a situation where it would be appropriate to appeal the consideration of some action before a decision is made; this is certainly not such a case.*

>> The appeal was filed against the **decision** communicated by Brian Carpenter:
>>
>> "At 09:08 11/08/2006, Brian E Carpenter wrote:
>> *The IESG has asked me to inform you that in our meeting on August 17, we will consider requesting the RFC Editor to expedite publication of draft-ietf-ltru-registry, draft-ietf-ltru-matching and draft-ietfltru-initial.*"
>>
>> With the abnormal potential effect of reducing the normal appeal period, in violation of the Internet standard process:
>>
>> *"The appeal period of two months remains valid, but we would consider an appeal received by next Thursday as quickly as possible. Please be aware that if an appeal were to be accepted after RFC publication, the RFC could not be withdrawn, but could be reclassified as Historic"*.
>>
>> The reason why this tempers with the standard process is that reclassifying the current BCP 47 texts as historic is what the rechartering of the WG-LTRU now in IEGS Last Call expressly foresees for January 2007 (IETF Last Call).
>>
>> The IESG decision to consider expediting the BCP 47 documents (rather than first respecting their content) is detrimental to my organisation. I am not contesting any future decision (to expedite or not), but rather the grounds of a past decision (to consider expediting):
>>
>> *"The reason is that Unicode wishes to refer to draft-ltru-registry in the forthcoming Unicode 5.0 standard within the next few weeks, and it cites the other two drafts."*

The entire WG-LTRU process in reality has been to impose globalization (i.e. internationalization of the Internet English environment, localization of the English agents, English tagging of the language product line) in excluding (via multiple moves) from texts, registries, and procedures the Multilingual Internet (such as was documented at:http://www.itu.int/ITU-T/worksem/multilingual/programme.html)

and my own organisation's positions summarised in annex and work documented at:

http://www.itu.int/ITU-T/worksem/multilingual/bios.html#morfin
http://www.itu.int/ITU-T/worksem/multilingual/abstracts.html#S1-Morfin
http://www.itu.int/ITU-T/worksem/multilingual/presentations/S1-Morfin.pdf
http://www.itu.int/ITU-T/worksem/multilingual/papers/s1paper-morfin.pdf
http://intlnet.org/e-mdrs-intro.pdf
http://www.egeni.org/en/index.php?ID=1012636
http://www.intgovforum.org/Substantive_1st_IGF/e-mdrs-intro.pdf

(most of our other working documents are in the French language)

I hereby note that when Unicode asks for a favour, which disfavours our own work, the IESG listens to it. When I asked for the same thing for the same reasons (and to avoid the RFC 3066 Bis to be deprecated before being published as it is now announced by the IESG) I was not listen to. When we appeal, this appeal is then dismissed and our position is joked at:

"At 03:47 24/08/2006, Frank Ellermann wrote: Or more likely as humour, IIRC this contributor proposed to accelerate the publication of 3066bis, "appealing" the same proposal from a third party is incoherent..."

What looks incoherent from the IESG is :

- to have denied my request when this was useful,
- to now consider expediting the publication of a document the IESG published:

   - (http://ietf.org/IESG/APPEALS/response-morfin-appeal-ietf-languages-list.txt) its own violation irt. the ietf-languages mailing list. The IESG confusion between the Language Tag Reviewer using a privately owned mailing list and the newly created Language Subtag Reviewer with moderator duties of that mailing list.

   - "At   16:23   22/08/2006,   IESG   Secretary   wrote: *A modified charter has been submitted for the Language Tag Registry Update (ltru) working group in the Applications Area of the IETF.*
   Goals and Milestones:
   September 2006 Submit first WG draft of registry procedure update
   September 2006 Submit first WG draft of registry data update
   January 2007 Submit registry procedure update draft for IETF Last Call
   January 2007 Submit registry data update draft for IETF Last Call"

We are exactly in the very case that was considered with the RFC-Editor who stated:

"*Expedited process of documents for RFC publication is not encouraged for the reason you mentioned: "...one cannot expedite one particular RFC publishing process, by-passing and delaying all the others.*" .

IESG: Instead, participants should provide input to that consideration.

I accept that the BCP 47 saga has forced me into dialogue with the IESG. However, I did not expect to be called a "participant" in the IESG consideration process.

IESG: We interpret this appeal in that light: we interpret part 1 of the appeal as arguments why the IESG should choose to delay a decision to expedite this BCP.

This clearly shows the difference in the treatment between Unicode (internationalization layer only) and us (including the top multilingualisation layer).

Their reasons for deciding to consider an expedited procedure are accepted, yet our reasons for not considering at this stage are not (when they are simultaneously announced to be deprecated by the same date - WG-LTRU rechartering says that the obsoleting I-D should be introduced in September 2006 and the IESG wants the documents to be published by September 10, 2006).

Our reasons are only considered as contributions in order to **delay** a decision that therefore has to implicitly be taken. We do not want to delay a decision we in fact want that decision to not be considered.

The decision to consider expediting publication must be revoked, whatever the position the IESG might then take.

IESG: We note that RFC 2026 does not require appeals to have suspensive effect. If an appeal against the approval of a published RFC were to succeed, that RFC could be reclassified as Historic.

This comment only shows that the IESG considers at that time its own future decision to expedite the publication, not its published decision to considers if the publication is to be expedited or not, what is the matter of the appeal.

This future decision is to confusingly expedite the publication of two Historic RFCs.

Considering this point would mean the IESG would consider privileging private interests on false premises.

1. The claim is that Unicode would like to quote the Drafts in the forthcoming Unicode 5.0. There could be two reasons for an RFC number that must be urgently issued to that end:

    •   **to consider that such a publication would make them authoritative**.

    This is not the case: the WG has made sure - including against appeal - that the Drafts would be a BCP because BCPs are authoritative as soon as they are approved by the IESG.

    The IANA has partly executed them (creating the registries) but has not yet initiated the ietf-languages@iana.org mailing list. The IESG has not yet selected its Language Subtag Reviewer to moderate that IANA mailing list.

    IESG: We find no merit in the arguments in Part 1 of the appeal, which is dismissed.

- **to clearly identify the concerned documents.**
  It has been underlined several times by their authors that the advantage of having the Drafts as a part of a BCP was the use of a BCP stable number rather than changing RFC numbers.

  The project of the WG-LTRU new charter plans an RFC 3066ter to be introduced in the beginning of 2007, hence new RFC numbers for these very documents, which will have to be updated in hundreds of documents. Should Unicode quote these it should be strongly advised to refer to them by their "BCP47" name, as it was claimed to be a necessity to get a BCP status.

  IESG: It would not be sufficient for Unicode to refer generically to BCP 47; the reference needs to be to specific text and hence to the RFCs.

  Unicode Members and Unicode Members employees who make most of the WG-LTRU expect the IESG to approve the documents that will make these documents obsolete **prior** to the RFC-Editor normal process publication date. This has been explained multiple times on the WG-LTRU mailing list.

  i18n core wg:
  "by Felix Sasaki 2005-10-31 09:55 |

  Hi all,
  As part of my review of EMMA, see http://www.w3.org/International/2005/10/emma-review.html. I made a comment on references to BCPs (best common practice) rather than RFCs (Request for comments), see comment 2:

  RFC 1766 is obsoleted by 3066 (Tags for the Identification of Languages). What is essential here is the reference to a BCP (best common practice), which is for language identification BCP 47. Currenlty bcp 47 is represented by RFC 3066, so could you change the reference to "IETF BCP 47, currently represented by RFC 3066"?

  The background here is that there are currenlty two rfc numbers for "Tags for the Identification of Languages" (1766, 3066). The draft of rfc 3066bis which has now been approved by the IESG will have a third number. In the i18n core wg, we thought that to avoid the need to update specs which just want to refer to "Tags for the Identification of Languages", we should recommend them to cite BCP 47, which will 'always' have language identification as its topic.

  Although this originated in the rfc 3066(bis) discussion, I think it is a general question of how to refer to RFCs / BCPs. This disussion started on the w3t-arch list, but Dan Connolly suggested to discuss this also on these lists here. Any comments / opinions?

  Best,
  Felix

  IPTC:

  RE: On citation of RFCs / BCPs
  Click to flag this post
  by Misha Wolf 2005-10-31 11:29 |

  That (ie via BCP 47) is how I plan to refer to the Language Tags RFC in IPTC Specifications.

  W3C:
  http://www.w3.org/International/core/langtags/rfc3066bis.html
  This page tracks the latest versions of the drafts for the new BCP 47, replacing RFC

3066: Tags for the Identification of Languages. These tags are commonly used in Internet protocols and referred to in W3C specifications.

2. Unicode will hold its 30th Internationalization & Unicode Conference, on November 15-17. The two authors are key presenters there. I fully understand that having the Drafts published before that Conference would add to their commercial/professional aura. I have however, two ethical objections:

   • the request should have been presented on true grounds.

   IESG: We find no merit in the arguments in Part 1 of the appeal, which is dismissed.

   • it would disfavour other IETF Members having authored other RFCs and that are equally longing for the same aura (cf. the RFC Editor).

   IESG: We find no merit in the arguments in Part 1 of the appeal, which is dismissed.

3. I consider their proposition in competition with my organisation's doctrine and strategy (documented at http://www.intgovforum.org/Substantive_1st_IGF/e-mdrs-intro.pdf). It is also in the same situation with other propositions participating into the IGF or International Standardisation. For 18 months, they have manoeuvred to exclude the multilingualisation layer from the IETF doctrine and prevent interoperability at that layer. I made sure that RFC 3066 Bis was tuned enough in order to not prevent interoperability from the multilingualisation side, with the resulting PR-action they engaged to hamper that effort. I must spend time and effort to have the impact of their positions explained and documented (http://bcp47.org project). Expediting their RFC publication is an advantage given to them while we have not had the time to obtain, digest, discuss, and adequately present on the http://bcp47.org site as to how to interoperate their limited proposition (this appeal is a part of this effort, to obtain a clear, fair, and as complete as possible information on the resulting IETF doctrine).

   IESG: The IESG makes such requests regularly when another SDO's publication schedule requires the ability to cite a forthcoming RFC normatively. There is nothing exceptional or discriminatory about doing so in the case of Unicode.

   There is nothing exceptional here since RFC 4612 has introduced the possibility to publish Historic I-Ds.

   This does not mean that there is nothing discriminatory. In addition to imposing work on us under additional pressure and costs, it changes the schedules of all of our information and concertation meetings, which are based on the expected RFC-Editor usual schedule. We are to work out the interoperability externally since the WG-LTRU and IESG have refused to provide it internally (no ISO 11179 conformance, no RFC 4151 URI-tag support).

   The rechartering of the WG-LTRU, which is under the review of the IAB, should permit the correction of the deficiencies of the current BCP 47 document set before it is published as RFCs. In this way, we will prevent user confusion from using inadequate solutions (already disrespected by the IESG and planned to be modified by the WG-LTRU

   We therefore consider the request of Unicode to be detrimental.

I do not think the IESG should sponsor one doctrine over others, unless there is a public MoU as I suggest it. Should the IETF delegate Unicode its language doctrine, language issues, and IANA server, as it did with ICANN for names and numbers, the situation would be clearer.

IESG: We find no merit in the arguments in Part 1 of the appeal, which is dismissed.

This position is noted. My proposition was making official what it is that I am experiencing in the current situation. I am glad to learn that it is not the intention of the IESG. However, this leaves the current problem unresolved.

I underline hereby that the concept of "**primary language**" in RFC 3066 Bis is **not** the one familiar to US citizens (ex. http://www.cmwf.org/publications/publications_show.htm?doc_id=221295). If it keeps its ethnic and racial ties, it has a negative connotation that makes it injurious and locally illegal. The resulting language divide that it would create is a direct violation of the equal linguistic Human Rights. I know the IETF is not concerned with Human Rights, but application implementers are.

IESG: We find no merit in the arguments in Part 1 of the appeal, which is dismissed.

Noted.

appeal:

That the IESG does not consider expediting the publication of the concerned RFCs which are already authoritative as BCPs.

That the IESG advises Unicode and other SSDOs to use the BCP numbers to reference the BCP documents in order to keep their standard in tune with the IETF.

IESG: We find no merit in the arguments in Part 1 of the appeal, which is dismissed.

Appeal :

I hereby repeat that the requests set out in the appeal:

- concern the decision to discuss a possible expedition of the publication procedure and oppose the reasons published by the IESG to decide to consider such a possibility. They de not therefore concern a future decision but a past decision. This makes the appeal legitimate. There would be otherwise no reason of Charter Last Calls and to oppose the creation of a WG, on the grounds that the WG decisions are to come and that these objections should be considered as contributions to the future WG debate.

- are in the best interest of: the users, the future work of the WG-LTRU, the clarity of the Unicode documents, and those of other SSDOs. Additionally, they are in the best interest of our own work and of the Multilingual Internet to avoid the confusion maintained by the supporters of the sole globalization (internationalization, localization, constrained langtags) in using the "added image" of an expedited publication to claim a special IETF interest and a special sponsoring of their positions.

Appendix

The Multi-Internet Paradigm
the networks of the network of networks

We consider there are four layers to support the languages in the digital ecosystem.

- **universalisation**: technical independence from languages which is usually obtained by using digital codes
- **lingualization**: the support of a single language
- **globalization**: the extension of the lingualized environment (internationalization) and ends (localization) in order to remove the barriers between the supported language and other languages
- **multilingualisation**: an equal lingualisation and globalisation for every language

The IAB mailing list on the Internet architectural evolution of the Internet has shown the limits of the coupled lingualization - globalization paradigm, which belongs to what we call the network centric "mono-Internet paradigm" (with one core language, one single root, one single addressing plan, one single IANA, one single spammed mail system, single governance, etc.).

The full universalisation, lingualisation, globalization, multilingualisation "multi-Internet" user centric paradigm is the only way for a disassociated and financed R&D, innovation, and progressive evolution of the three main structural layers (hardware telecoms infrastructure, software datacoms superstructure, brainware relational metastructure) of the networks of the network of networks, which is what completes the Internet catenet doctrine.

The immediate problem created by the "globalization only" is that languages are considered as options. With the practical limit of 150 primary languages/locale files, where speakers of the 7200 (SIL), 20.000 (Linguasphere) must be channeled into (through filters).

This approach is "archaeological". It to tag documents and not real life communication spaces where documents are exchange among a vernacular audiences, having chosen existing keyboards, using existing domain names, resolving at existing ISP name servers, running existing applications and word processors the characteristics of which are much more granular and diversified than the proposed language tags.

To be able to check the langtag validity there is the need to maintain a copy of a foreseen 840++ pages, weekly updated, scores of registry related IANA registry, at one billion user machines. This is not documented. The need is to urgently address that question, rather than to consider expediting the need of its urgent answer.

At 12:24 25/08/2006, JFC Morfin wrote:

Dear IAB Member,.
this today exchange completes the information given in my appeal. It should be added to the quotes I made from the i18n core wg, W3C, IPTC.
This mail will be added as an appendix to http://jefsey.com/appeal-iab-part1.pdf

Peter Constable (Microsoft) is the initiator of the RFC 3066 Bis evolution.

He introduced the controverted difference between primary/extended languages:

> **At 02:45 25/08/2006, Peter Constable wrote:**
> *My recollection is that the idea of extended language subtags was my idea, and that*
> *fallback was not the paramount reason why it occurred to me that we do that.*

He is a Member of the ISO 639/JAC composed of three representatives of ISO TC37, three representatives of TC46 and a representative from each Registration Authority.
http://www.loc.gov/standards/iso639-2/iso639jac.html

> **At 02:45 25/08/2006, Peter Constable wrote:**
> *That that was exactly what we (the JAC) would be doing in adding zza to 639-2 was done*
> *before the JAC voted on that request.*
> *You're all in a flap over nothing...*

He expressed his opinion regarding the very RFC 3066 Bis the IESG both wants to expedite the publication before September 10 2006 and simultaneously deprecate (as per their WG-LTRU rechartering proposition).

> **At 02:45 25/08/2006, Peter Constable wrote:**
> *I don't see a particular reason to consider the present interim; only the 3066ter era matters.*

I don't either.

I thank you for your attention.
jfc morfin