

**APPEAL TO THE IAB
CONCERNING THE WAY USERS ARE NOT PERMITTED
TO ADEQUATELY CONTRIBUTE TO THE IETF**

by JFC MORFIN

Dear IAB Members,

This appeal follows my appeal to the IESG in Annex A and builds upon the IESG response in Annex B.

Introduction

The initial appeal to the IESG concerned an IETF structural need at the occasion of a particular case. The need is the practical ability of Internet users to positively contribute to the IETF Internet standardization process. The question was posed in order to find out whether that need was acknowledged by the IETF, if the IETF wanted to see it addressed, and if it wanted to see it addressed within or outside the IETF.

This meant that neither the actions of the concerned WG-Chair nor the concerned AD were directly contested. However, pertinent advice from the AD included an IETF liaison of a possible solution through the IAB. A mutually rewarding establishment of such a liaison (1) required, firstly, the above response in order to determine its framework,(2) conflicted with the fundamental reason for the appeal (the practical, educational, linguistic, and even sometimes cultural inability of Internet users to cope with the IETF/IAB mandatory modus operandi), (3) the need to see the meta-reason for the first point of the appeal fully addressed. This meta-reason is the need for a formal clarification of the IETF "precaution duty", which is implied but not documented by RFC 3935 among the IETF cardinal principles.

Response given by the IESG and follow-up

The response provided by the IESG is two fold:

- it states that the claims are being rejected because they do not identify specific WG decisions or actions that the appellant wishes to have reversed or remedied, and as such the claims are not actionable.

This is not contested by the appellant. However, the second response that was provided by the IESG sheds new light on its position and creates an actionable point for the IAB regarding the IESG.

- it then states "Although the appeal does not specifically recommend any remedial action, it strongly encourages the IETF to initiate some work. The appellant is directed to RFC 2418 for instructions on how to initiate work in the IETF."

I, along with most of those who supported my appeal in the first place, understand this response as:

- yes, the IESG acknowledges a possible need.
- yes, it wants the response to this need to be investigated inside the IETF.
- in spite of the documented practical, educational, and cultural difficulties, the response to this need should, as much as possible, respect the IETF ways.

As a consequence, I reflected RFC 2418, RFC 2026, RFC 3869, RFC 3935, RFC 3772, etc. Among others, RFC 2418 says: "When determining whether it is appropriate to create a working group, the Area Director(s) and the IESG will consider several issues [including] does a base of interested consumer (end-users) appear to exist for the planned work? Consumer interest can be measured by participation of end-users within the IETF process, as well as by less direct means". My appeal was precisely to enable this RFC 2418 requirement.

I reported that respective reflection to Russ Housley as follows:

"I [] have something consistent to propose: an Internet Users Contributing Group. It could be a mailing list in the General Area as discussed, since the User Area has been closed. It

would not be a WG because it would be permanent.

Its first mission would be to define its own charter and a working method, based upon the experience gathered during the first months [in operation] and [be]as much as possible in line with RFC 2418 and 2026. Due to my [work]load I [could only] proceed slowly. Its general mission could be to:

- collect Internet Users contributions and shape [them] together to the benefit of the IETF Working Groups.
- [collectively] comment [during] the IETF Last Calls as [per] the Internet Standard process.
- assist Internet Users in presenting multiconsensual Internet Drafts [by] gathering their suggestions.
- work out and maintain [consolidated] documentation of an Internet usage architecture.
- maintain usage related information tables.

I must file the IAB appeal before [29] Nov. I need it because all of this can only be [seen as] appealing to people if there is a "precaution duty" documented by the IAB. This consists in [clearly stating] that,

(1) by precaution Vint Cerf should not have prevented me from referring to the danger of IDNA conflicting with ML-DNS projects.

(2) but since this precaution duty is not included in the Internet standard process, it would be advisable that the IESG finds and implements a mechanic to assist the WG Chairs by informing them of users' remarks.

Such a solution could be the IUCGroup that I am suggesting.

This could be a short document focusing on that point as a need to follow RFC 2418 for the IUCG project concept, with the IESG appeal and response in annex."

The iucg@ietf.org has been approved and installed on Nov 17, 2008. A site is under implementation and is subject to bootstrappers' debate [<http://iucg.org>].

A better definition of the concept of a user

As a part of the preparation of the IUCG proposition, I requested the creation of a closed "atlarge@ietf.org" list. My target was only to prevent a confusing alternative request. Russ Housley indicated that he was ready to support a list but with a name that would not lead one to believe that IETF supported the AtLarge stuff.

This remark made me to carefully consider and debate what a user is. The most common advice that I received was to consider "users" as a function rather than as a group of people. Since the IETF was hosting the list it was to be IETF specific in order to avoid confusion, but also to better participate in the IETF Internet process. This lead me to first consider the users of IETF deliverables, which are (RFC 3935) to influence the way people design, use, and manage the Internet in such a way as to make the Internet work better to the common benefit of its lead and end users.

The following paragraph has, therefore, been retained in order to introduce the IUCG: "The Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) is a large open international community of network designers, operators, vendors, and researchers concerned with the evolution of the Internet architecture and the smooth operation of the Internet. It is open to any interested individual. The IETF Mission Statement is documented in RFC 3935. The IUCG extends this community to those users (1) of IETF deliverables, who trust and/or adapt them in order to build, use, and manage their own network solutions and products, and (2) of the global Internet as their common by-product. Because the IUCG is an integral part of the IETF, the following "Note Well" applies."

This means that the IUCG role is not only to contribute via suggestions of Internet governance from lead and end users but also with the comments from RFC users. This is also considered as a better incentive to maintain the intercompatibility between IETF tables and usage related tables.

An additional important suggestion was received and confirmed by several persons, including end

users, politicians, and journalists: the IUCG should develop and maintain one or several well identified models of the Internet and the digital ecosystem. Once their differences with the legacy IETF model are well identified, comments and suggestions could be made easier to understand, discuss, and to be compared when introduced within their contextual framework(s)

The Charter will reflect these two points.

Practical inability to cope with RFC 4052

There are three main reasons as to why it seemed that RFC 4052 was not appropriate. The main point of IUCG should be to interface the IETF vision, culture, way of thinking, core values (as per RFC 3935), Internet standardization process, IANA, etc. with "user-diversity" :

- on the users' side, the main difficulty is the lack of resources, time, and, therefore, the stability to participate to the IETF in a proper way. We are hardly able to select and retain a person as a liaison. Moreover, in having no established process to that end, the legitimacy and hence the credibility of such a liaison would probably be challenged.
- the magnitude of user-diversity is probably only met by the magnitude of the possible subject diversity. A single or structurally limited number of liaisons would most probably never be knowledgeable enough to get the users' message and contribution through.
- the whole idea in having the IUCG is also to have the most dedicated users informed and trained so that they might directly contribute to the IETF working groups. An IETF liaison through the IAB would only introduce an artificial barrier. Moreover, on occasion IETF Members might want to directly share a debate on the IUCG side in order to directly better understand the users' needs, constraints, and flexibility.

Documenting precaution duty as an IETF cardinal principle

When IETF was created, its Members were mostly engineers administrating their own machines. For that reason, IETF external documents are of two main different kinds (RFCs by engineers and BCP by users) that are discussed by the same IETF Members. This certainly ensures their common consistency but leaves many inputs pushed aside, which are only considered outside the IETF process and are protected by patents instead of being made an open standard.

"The IETF has traditionally been a community for experimentation with things that are not fully understood, standardization of protocols for which some understanding has been reached, and publication of (and refinement of) protocols originally specified outside the IETF process." [RFC 3935]

This has resulted in sound solutions but also in lateness and rigidity in delivering solutions that had to be further adapted to the present market conditions, to match further innovation, or to circumvent patents protecting ideas that were first introduced by users. The target of the IUCG in interfacing lead users, and possibly ordinary users (or at least their representatives), with the IETF are:

- a faster and more flexible transmission of external innovative "prior and rough understandings" to the IETF.
- under a "multiconsensual" form. This means that various ways of approaching a subject should be contributed, filtered through sub-group consensus that have different propositions, and completed by thinking about their mutual interoperability.

Such a fruitful possibility has to be practically permitted. This means that no decision should be made by the IETF that could put at a risk innovative thinking or constrain usage development or conflict with possible solution already under exploration or partial operation.

- the IUCG should be one of the ways to make the IETF aware, through its debates, reports, and IETF-Drafts.
- the IETF adheres to the RFC 3935 defined cardinal principles. These principles imply, but do not explicitly state, such a "precaution duty". There is no guidance on the ways to respect it.

IUCG will most probably use tools and procedures in line with the common users' ways, such as

surveys to gather their contributions and protests and a wiki to articulate "rough multiconsensual prior understandings". It will attempt to present them structured in parallel to the IETF WGs structure and to their benefit. A tool is planned to build IUCG IETF_Drafts reporting on the collected users' contributions. from "IUCG Wiki Pages" (IWP).

A practical way to enforce a precaution duty could be to optionally include in RFCs a "precaution section", just as there is presently a "security section". This section would discuss the RFC in comparison with users' contributions. Experience would tell whether this suggestion, which leaves the Internet standard process unchanged, is of interest and under which conditions.

Matter of the appeal

My IESG appeal, the IESG response, and all of the above being considered, I call upon the IAB in requesting that the IESG is corrected or at least commented on as follows:

- the response to point one of my initial appeal is correct. The WG Chair was, in his own right, calling on a strict respecting of the charter. However, in a global IETF point of view, just as IESG is pushing me to consider, it is inappropriate to impeach a WG, in which the IETF will benefit from side, yet interoperability related, inputs and/or parallel thinking from the Internet community.

There should be a precaution duty accepted as an IETF cardinal principle that must then supersede the Charter at the WG-Chair or AD decision. In case of doubt, WG should more liberally call for IAB guidance. They could often find a response when wording the terms of a problem that is to be submitted to the IAB.

- the advice I received from the AD about a liaison with the IETF and then from the IESG about a way to address the problem of the contribution of the users to the IETF were pertinent and have been used with the creation of the iucg@ietf.org mailing list and site, as well as the way that this appeal is written. However, to still best address the specifics of this particular case:
 - they should be completed by a request to the WG-Chairs to make sure the precaution duty is being considered. This might mean that any matter related to the WG Charter areas, or projects considering direct, indirect, or future interoperability with WG deliverables should be accepted as "on topic". This would be moreover the case, if they are considered in other IETF working groups, drafts, and mailing lists including the Internet Users Contributing Group . The same WG Chairs should be suggested to consider a section that is dedicated to the precautions taken in order to preserve present and future interoperabilities as well as users' requests.
 - WG and IETF Mailing List Chairs could be suggested to help the IUCG to maintain succinct yet comprehensive information for the users and concerning their exploitation of the architectural and technical issues documented by their Charter.
- the advice from the IESG to consider RFC 2418 should be built upon by the IESG : IUCG, as a permanent channel to collect users' position should be permitted to comment on the existing consumer level of interest and/or existing contributions when creating a new working group.

ANNEX A - APPEAL TO THE IESG

APPEAL TO THE IESG CONCERNING THE WAY AT LARGE INTERNET LEAD USERS ARE NOT PERMITTED TO ADEQUATELY CONTRIBUTE TO THE IETF DELIVERABLES

BY JFC MORFIN

Abstract

The mainly analytical approach of IETF does not appeal to most of the @large Internet lead users who might volunteer there, because they prefer a more systemic approach that will be more in line with their global daily experience and their expectation of a very short time to full and real operations. This means that the innovation, documentation, experimentation mix is to be fully imbricated. This appeal to the IESG and IAB is to be formally answered if the IETF is interested in considering the opportunity this approach and its possible hosting may represent, or not.

Preliminary note

This appeal is no ordinary appeal. It supports no particular contribution and is not in opposition to anyone's position. To the contrary, it fully respects the positions of the Members of the WG-IDNABIS, of its Charter, of its Chair Vint Cerf, of its AD Lisa Dusseault and of Russ Housley the IETF Chair. It is precisely because it respects these positions, which fully comply with the IETF rules, and because it is believed that every member of the IETF community will agree with them, that it can raise the problem that certain stances do not permit the IETF to plainly fulfill its RFC 3935 mission "to produce high quality, relevant technical and engineering documents that influence the way people design, use, and manage the Internet in such a way as to make the Internet work better."

This appeal starts from a case that concerns a fundamental issue for the necessary multilateral evolution of the Internet in order to address the diversity of our globally distributed world: multilingualization of the semantic namespace and any multilingual version or usage of the DNS (named here ML-DNS). It turns out that the perfect respect, by all the concerned parties of the IETF rules, leads to a situation where a certain class of contributors are prevented from informing the IETF of the impact on the matter being discussed by their WG of their own parallel exploratory work in the same area but from a wider perspective.

This class of contributors is the class of the Internet lead users, who are also called "@larges" in Internet jargon. This is because that class of contributors does not have the same working method and language, time to implementation, financial sponsoring and motivations as their other fellow Members of the IETF. As a result the IESG Chair himself, when contacted as part of the appeal process, regrets not being informed of that work and being subsequently confused about it.

This case exemplifies that the IETF, which "has traditionally been a community for experimentation with things that are not fully understood, standardization of protocols for which some understanding has been reached, and publication of (and refinement of) protocols originally specified outside the IETF process" (RFC 3935) should adapt to the evolution of the Internet, and possibly revise its core values, if it is to continue helping the Internet work better.

This adaptation consists in accepting that the design, usage, and management of a global complex system such as the Internet must also be approached on equal footing and in a systemic manner, and not exclusively via the RFC 1958 analytic engineering manner (and thereby along its principle of constant change). The claim is that usage must be given, through the Internet lead users' contribution (@large) and other possible contributions, its full place within the Internet architectural process, with its own characteristics and human, technical, societal, economic, cultural, ethical, political, democratic and polycratic, legal, educational, etc. concerns, rights, and constraints, either within, or in adequate relation with the IETF in order to not split or balkanize the Internet's very structure, while the world evolves towards the people centric information society that was consensually declared by the WSIS (World Summit on Information Society) where we sorely missed the IETF's participation.

This appeal seeks to make acknowledged that the adaptation of Internet to world evolution must proceed from an iterative concerted process of standardization, experimentation, and innovation, along the same commonly concerted network architectural model. This means that new protocols must be specified as much as possible at the outset within an innovation integrated adapted IETF

environment if we want a complex multilateral and semantic Internet that works better.

The need for an ML-DNS

From the inception of the WG-IDNABIS proposition I was uncertain about the IETF target while as an "@large" Internet lead user, I want, and need, the kind of Multilingual Internet that will uphold the form of people-centric Information Society the WSIS has consensually declared.

The core of such a deployment is a true "ML-DNS", that is a non-predetermined open DNS solution to be analysed, discussed, documented, tested, and deployed that will guarantee the same or better QoS, in every script and language, just as the DNS does for ASCII and English.

Either this is the immediate or future target of IDNA, i.e. either IDNA is a step ahead in this direction aiming, minimally or plainly, at allowing International English access to foreign language sites and e-mails, or IDNA is for me a pure strategic waste of time such as discussed by IAB in RFC 3869.

In the second case, however extremely late, IDNA is to be perceived as an ML-DNS first/default fully interoperable option. This means that the ML-DNS development must be rushed in in parallel by the IETF or, if we are in the latter case, as an IGF emergent issue that is clearly out of the IETF scope.

WG-IDNABIS

In every case, we need a clean, simple, robust, and stable IETF/WG-IDNABIS IDNA as soon as possible.

Questions to the Chair about the operational target of the WG deliverable

This is why I asked several other @large users to join the WG-IDNABIS to help to expedite its process. To consensually identify the IDNABIS target we prepared and circulated, among usage oriented and IGF mailing lists, a set of questions that we would pose to Vint Cerf (Chair of the WG-IDNABIS).

His, and the WG-IDNABIS, response was clear. The WG-IDNABIS does not aim at delivering the ML-DNS solution that we need through any form of planned evolution, either now or in the future. Its only target is to describe a better version of IDNA than the one that was negatively reviewed by the IAB RFC 4960. However, it could create a specialized mailing list in order to explore the ML-DNS concept.

Experience shows that @large cannot afford to discuss the ML-DNS in an IETF way: we just want to use one, who ever specifies it, including ourselves if no one else wants to do it. In that case, for us this means trying to work it out, in our own lead users' way. Therefore, I first reported to the WG in June that we will strive to keep our ML-DNS project IDNA compatible. In particular, we will use the same ISO 3166 basis for country, script, and language name codes, and the very LS 640 Open Source Table that is the basis for ISO 639-6, which is yet to be published. This way we will stay compatible with other ML-DNS grouped or individual efforts that contacted us through our <http://ml-dns.org> site.

Blocking point, root of this appeal

On July 11, Vint Cerf asked me to stop referring to ML-DNS the way that I did in my second mail on this engaged work.

At 13:28 11/07/2008, Vint Cerf wrote: ML-DNS is not the topic of this Working group. Whatever it may be it is not part of a relevant argument for any particular parsing of IDNA documents. Please do not continue to send emails about ML-DNS on this list.

Positions of the WG-IDNABIS Chair and Applications Area Director

I objected and indicated that I intended to appeal against this demand. I, therefore, communicated with Vint Cerf as the WG-Chairman, Lisa Dusseault as the AD and Russ Housley as the IETF Chair. Their positions are as follows:

- Vint Cerf: "The purpose behind charters of WGs is to limit their scope and allow

the WG to focus on its work. ML-DNS is NOT within the IDNAbis charter. The methods of IETF say you need to establish visible interest in your topic, e.g. through a BOF at an IETF. If there is sufficient apparent interest, then you can find an Area Director to support the work and develop a charter which will have to be agreed by the prospective working group participants and the IESG. If you don't want to do those things you can try to find another venue. Asking the IESG or the IAB to overturn the scope of a WG makes no sense, given the basic rules of operation of the IETF, in my opinion."

- Lisa Dusseault: "If you want to participate in some other activity with the IETF aegis, you are welcome to drum up participation around your proposed activity. You can start a mailing list for ML-DNS and draft a WG charter or submit Internet-Drafts. If you want a more formal organizational relationship with the organization responsible for ML-DNS and the IETF, I informed you that the IAB is in charge of liaison relationships. None of these are dependent on any action from me, I believe. The first two are entirely within your hands, and for the last one you need to contact the IAB."
- Russ Housley: "The IETF has a clear process for new work projects. You have approached the Applications AD and been told that the IDNAbis WG is not the place for the work you propose. You have also been told that a demonstration of a constituency for the work and a demonstration of people willing to do the work is necessary. I do not see anything in your note that demonstrates either one of these. Your claim that the ill-defined ML-DNS work is needed is not sufficient justification for anyone else to do the work. I suggest that a BOF is the best way to demonstrate that there is (or is not) a constituency for the work and demonstrate that there are (or are not) people willing to do the work."

Appeal

I wish to appeal this on three separate grounds.

1) First:

I agree that ML-DNS is not a part of IDNA because it seems obvious that IDNA is a part of any ML-DNS work, as an option to the whole. I disagree that the rigidity of the IETF Charter genuinely prevents the WG from considering the consequences of some parallel work by some of its members, on the interoperability and the future usage of what it is working on.

Comment:

This is why the way in which I discussed our ML-DNS work was obviously not to make it specified by the WG-IDNABIS, but rather to make sure that the IDNA as specified by the WG-IDNABIS could be interoperable with any future formulation of any ML-DNS by any working group inside or outside the IETF.

2) Second:

These WG-Chair and AD positions seem fully in line with the IETF process at the WG and Area levels. The comment that was made by the IESG Chair clearly considers the practicalities of the possibility of a new work to be performed in an unpredictable future, along an IETF process, rather than our engaged work that aims at a start of deployment prior to the end of the year, and which may be within a perspective that may differently engage the evolution of Internet usage. However, in the meanwhile:

- the IETF is not sufficiently addressing our users' needs, not even in the most simple way that we and the WSIS expressed them.
- these needs are not considered as important or urgent enough, after eight years without a proper answer, to adapt the Internet standardization process so as to permit the contribution of lead users
- the direct and indirect impacts on the Internet of an ML-DNS that is contributed by the users are not evaluated as making it worthwhile to consider interoperability at the

- IDNA design stage as is the case with Unicode.
- we ourselves do not have the time, resources, interests, and competence to productively engage in an IETF process : we will not have the time, resources, interests, and competences to engage in an external and formal IETF relation establishment and continuation process at the IAB level. We can however proceed at specialised WGs and Draft publication level and possibly at a usage architecture level.

This means that the issue is to be addressed by the IESG and IAB. This justifies an appeal in order to have it publicly considered and answered, because " The IETF is always in a state of change." (RFC 4677).

Comments:

a) I object to the concept of "another venue" outside of the IETF.

An ML-DNS technology creep is probable. Our evaluation shows that a smooth transition towards a full Multilingual and Semantic Internet may be obtained through:

(1) complete revamping of most of the Internet building blocks along a new architecture like GENI might be doing.

(2) what we identify as an iterative evolution between usage experience and infrastructural progress. This is what Google is currently organizing in a private industrial manner as a consistent user oriented system. This is what the Community punctually did with NATs, and what IETF tries to do with IDNA: making user level applications/middleboxes to patch architectural lagging.

As a lead user, I consider things from a usage necessity perspective: the diversity of the more or less coordinated ways of surviving and a better use of the "as-is" Internet by each of the 6.5 billion of us, based on our "multi-consensus and living mode". From a user point of view, solutions and/or problems come from the IETF along with many other aspects that may conflict with them, which the IETF is never interested in learning. The IETF Cartesian RFC 1958 analytical approach does not sufficiently consider the Internet as a system (or it only does so in a network-centric manner).

For a user, the Internet is a global system to be considered in a people-centric way. This is why we are not interested in re-engineering the Internet building blocks, one by one, and cannot bear the costs and delays that this represents within the IETF. We just want be able to use them as some of the parts of a much more global and complex system.

This being said, we have no practical problem in creating this so-called "other venue" in order to document the better ways to use the digital convergence, multilateral stabilization, and semantic emergence that the ML-DNS is to support. However, we fully realize that if we are to do this as an interim replacement for the IETF without agreeing on interoperability and technical return for the IETF, this may either lead to a waste of effort, an alternative technology source, or a technology balkanization if others do the same in an effort to address the same imperatives.

We, also, have no specific problem in reporting our work through Draft in an IETF form, but this is not our priority when compared with our current reaserach and development effort. Moreover if this leads to drastic changes in the vision of the same Internet and leads to debate that we cannot sustain in a foreign language.

b) This is why such an @large oriented "other venue" should be organized within the IETF.

It will bring about the Information Society's "people centric" paradigm (WSIS declaration). In 1986, IETF was just that: the gathering of the Internet users community of the time to make their common network of networks work better. Today, this community includes billions of people with their own networks on the network of networks. This community needs to organize itself one step further, in an

appropriate manner.

Such an appropriate manner consists, most probably, in:

- maintaining a stable yet adaptive Internet ontology of reference
- being documented by complementary and closely related special interest groups
- working on a multi-consensus basis, i.e. detailing the interoperability between the various consensuses that may exist.
- being interested in:
 - what the Internet is used for
 - the ethical obligations resulting from its technology
 - how they are technically met
 - which global architectural model is used
- being permanently "inter-tested" together with their intergovernance solutions, based on community agreement defining how the internet can be used as its own operational test-bed.

UDHR, Art 27, 1: "Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits". I think it could also be an advisable technical R&D management guideline.

3) Third:

The WG-Chair and AD positions are justified due to the possibility that "another venue" could liaise with the IETF at the IAB level. I perceive the imposed implicit condition ("If there is sufficient apparent interest [in the IETF, not among lead users' volunteers]) and the lack of formal support in establishing this liaison ("you need to contact the IAB") to be in contradiction with IAB's RFC 3869.

Comments

The motives that @large Internet lead users have in contributing to the Internet Research and Development as non-commercial volunteers are the same as those that are expressed by the IAB in its RFC 3869 along with the desire to assist the community with all of the extensive experience that they may have gathered.

They are in agreement with RFC 3869:

"In our current challenging economic climate, it is not surprising that commercial funding sources are more likely to primarily fund research that leads to a direct competitive advantage." (RFC 3969) They want to balance the business centric commercial funding with their unpaid time and non-commercial funding to the advantage of people centric autonomous usages and to protect them from potential unethical commercial creeps.

"The principal thesis of this document is that if commercial funding is the main source of funding for future Internet research, the future of the Internet infrastructure could be in trouble. In addition to issues about which projects are funded, the funding source can also affect the content of the research, for example, towards or against the development of open standards, or taking varying degrees of care about the effect of the developed protocols on the other traffic on the Internet." [RFC 3869] The principal thesis of this appeal is that lead user contribution is a broad source of expertise and innovation that the future of the Internet could very well depend on and should not be excluded but rather a complement of the number, methods, traveling capacity, and technical culture of the commercially funded participants.

"While it is theoretically possible for there to be too much funding for Internet research, that is far from the current problem. There is also much that could be done within the network research community to make Internet research more focused and productive, but that would belong in a separate document." (RFC 3869)

The intent of this appeal is to obtain a formal IETF position on a way to foster of an Internet research and innovation that is more focused and productive.

The expected return of this appeal

This appeal is to ensure that IAB pursues its RFC 3969 request for R&D funding while considering what "practical expertise funding" by dedicated innovative people can contribute in addition to the "moneyfunding" that it difficultly gather. The IESG and IAB answers will then be the so-called "separate document" above.

Their response will state as to how the IETF wants to adequately welcome the help offered by Internet lead users.

This means respecting rather than banning them, trying harder to understand what they are saying, accepting their language diversity as a world reality to be technically supported, learning the specifications of the deliverables from them that they and common users expect, interactively advising the way they build, use, enhance, and operate the real Internet, taking advantage from a common inter-testing that involves real life network user community and WSIS originated governance. This real life context imbricates so many usages and constraints that in turn impact the Internet as well as its technical needs and that the IETF currently, use to disregards. The expected result here would be to permit more demands for adequate and diversified IETF solutions to hit the market in-time in order to be accepted and deployed more easily and broadly.

Their response may alternatively explain how they want to adequately liaise with an @large Internet lead users "other venue" and accordingly assist it to thereby deploy.

Their response may also disregard this offered assistance. This will result in a separate "other venue" that will have to separately engage in ML-DNS documentation, deployment and governance with all the architectural creep that this engineer/user, analytic/systemic, English/Multilingual, unilateral/multilateral dichotomy would necessarily imply and against which I have fought for years but would then have to accept, respecting the IETF IESG/IAB decision.

ANNEX B - Response of the IESG

- * To: jefsey at jefsey.com
- * Subject: ML-DNS Appeal Response
- * From: IESG Secretary <iesg-secretary at ietf.org>
- * Date: Mon, 29 Sep 2008 10:00:01 -0700 (PDT)
- * Cc: ietf-announce at ietf.org

The IESG has received an appeal from JFC Morfin. The title of this appeal is "Appeal to the IESG Concerning the Way At Large Internet Lead Users Are Not Permitted to Adequately Contribute to the IETF Deliverables". The text of this appeal can be found at the following URL:
<http://www.ietf.org/IESG/APPEALS/appeal-morfin-ml-dns.pdf>

The claim presented in Section 4.1 of the appeal is rejected. It is rejected because it does not identify a specific WG decision or action that the appellant wishes to have reversed or remedied. Therefore, the claim is not actionable.

The claim presented in Section 4.2 of the appeal is rejected. It is rejected because it does not identify a specific WG decision or action that the appellant wishes to have reversed or remedied. Therefore, the claim is not actionable.

The claim presented in Section 4.3 of the appeal is rejected. It is rejected because it does not identify a specific WG decision or action that the appellant wishes to have reversed or remedied. Therefore, the claim is not actionable.

Although the appeal does not specifically recommend any remedial action, it strongly encourages the IETF to initiate some work. The appellant is directed to RFC 2418 for instructions on how to initiate work in the IETF.