

## **APPEAL TO THE IAB OVER IESG DISMISSED APPEALS**

**September 9, 2006**

**Jean-François C. (Jefsey) Morfin**

Dear IAB Chair and Members,  
you will in fact find not one, but rather three appeals in the same document.

- one regarding the decision to commence a PR-action Last Call, which was forwarded to the IESG on 2006/02/17 and dismissed on 2006/07/10
- one regarding the decision regarding the PR-action forwarded to the IESG on 2006/05/17 and dismissed on 2006/07/10.
- the first presented appeal (Part 1) deals with the lack of a published answer to the first appeal prior to initiating the PR-action. I suppose that this could be considered as a separate decision of the IESG, in which I should appeal to the IESG first, in spite the fact that it is the IESG decided timing of the consideration of an appeal they responded to. In order to avoid any procedural controversy, an appeal of this decision has been sent in parallel to the IESG Chair.

This document is organised for maximum legibility in logical interspersing:

- the texts of my appeals to the IESG are in standard characters after the mention "The IESG"
- the responses from the IESG and RFC quotes are in italic
- the text of my present appeal to the IAB is set in standard characters after the mention "Comment"
- external quotes are indicated and presented with an extra left hand margin.

### **Backgrounder**

---

To properly assess this appeal some background is imperative as stipulated by RFC 2026

#### **The defendant**

I am Jean-François C. (Jefsey) Morfin. I am the president of the non-profit organisation INTLNET. I created INTLNET in 1978 after joining Tymnet International in order to co-pioneer the International Network and to manage the international namespace. Its goal remains as the empowerment of network relational spaces through (a) reference information data collection, analysis, and dissemination, (b) governance catalysis in support, R&D, testing, project management areas, and (c) intergovernance assistance via think-tank, consulting, and secretariat services.

To fulfil its user information mission, INTLNET is engaged in the MDRS project. The R&D of this project is carried out through a French bench test (AFRAC). The MDRS is a multilingual distributed referential system project, which includes a metadata distributed registry system and its technology. This effort matches RFC 3869 non-commercial project expectations. It is connected with significant international analysis in its specific area.

The MDRS approach is user-centric, multilateral, multilingual, multimodal, and multitechnology. It sets out to provide each user, entity, and relational space with the parameters and information that they need to fully and equally benefit from their access to the Internet, without regard to language, origin, race, gender, or technology. Multilingual computable ontologies metaregistry compatibility, interoperability, R&D, and scalability, are its priorities to subsequently match the dynamic diversity of reality. It can be viewed as a distributed, highly diversified, and extended IANA project, enacting in turn a Multilingual Internet "by way of usage".

#### **The issues**

The ietf-languages @ alvestrand.no mailing list initiated the proposition to structure the globalization defined by IBM and Unicode (internationalization of the environment, localization of the ends) through a common classification and filtering tagging system, capitalising in turn on the language tag RFC 3066, and exclusively replacing it. This proposition failed its IETF Last Call not once, but twice. I

was active in the second case because the proposition's business applications and sponsors will have it implemented. For me, it had to be interoperable not only with the MDRS, but also with ISO, Dublin Core, etc. and multiple language oriented works, projects, and standards. It was still too confuse for that even technically limited as it is.

This is why I welcomed the idea of a serious IETF dedicated WG. I commented on its Charter, and I mailed the IESG my support as was requested by its intended Chair. I made it clear that I objected to the deficiencies in the Charter. The proposition is English centric and therefore not multilingual (localized globalization). As such, it suffers from a lack of scalability, confidentiality, and security. It also has a rigidity that is resultant from its exclusive commercial legacy, preventing it in turn from adapting to the current state of the art as well as to the demand, support innovation, and other applications than is the case with the W3C ones (in particular IDNs).

To be successfully deployed, it should be forced to influence, rule, or constrain the way that all the other projects, achievements, and standards are currently designed, used, and managed (cf. RFC 3935 below): ISO 3166, SIL, Linguasphere, ISO 15987 [locales], full ISO 639 series, ISO 11179 metadata registries, etc.. It calls for discriminating between languages and regions (cf. Jon Postel's RFC 1591: "the IETF is not in the business of deciding what is a country"). It would also need an information dissemination system that reaches far beyond the existent IANA ability, except maybe if taken over by a very large online source. An easy computation clearly shows that without a dedicated dissemination system (may be based on DNS) the load resulting from a reasonable usage in a few years time would be in the order of 5 Gigas per second. Multilingualisation I am interested in has by essence dramatically reduced pragmatic figures.

### **The opponents.**

These matters and the Charter were not studied. The first I-D was presented in a mere few hours and was in fact the above-mentioned twice LC failed document. The WG-LTRU was nearly a carbon copy (debate creeping from one list to the other) of ietf-languages @ alvestrand.no. The only responses to my technical points were ad-hominems, initiated by Harald Alvestrand who called me a troll. Harald Alvestrand is the author of the preceding RFCs on language support, owner of the ietf-languages @ alvestrand.no mailing list, now a Google employee, a Unicode BoD, the requester of a PR-action against me, and an active lobbyist (from his own reports) for the IESG to engage in this PR-action for months. Mark Davis (co-author of the document, President of Unicode, and now Google employee) co-sponsored this stance.

Their job consists in globalization, the removal of language barriers between English mammoths and their foreign users. My job calls for multilingualisation: localizing globalization for every language and every user.

We are billions, and one layer apart.

More than anything else, we are competitors, probably adversaries, even if they do not understand why we consider they contribute to linguistic genocides (for more information Google has 15.000 hits for "linguistic genocide") and an internet architecture harmful blocking. Their proposed Draft was to use the IANA to ascertain their market dominance, and to exclude other visions like mine that do not seek to constrain reality but rather to respect its ecology.

### **The solution I retained and obtained**

I concerted with various experts, content industries, and national/international cultural entities. I first found it difficult to have the dangers of incorrectly standardizing the core of the content to be readily perceived. Then, I found strong support (including schemes to disable the IETF). I cooled this down by way of conducting and reporting a weak to strong strategy. We wanted a consensus on a text that would be sufficiently comprehensible and documented in order to permit interoperability. We decided that should the WSIS declared that the current Internet was a US affair, and its development was to be lead through a global forum with multilingualism as a priority, it would be enough for us. We would then only need to be sufficiently astute to obtain the BCP 47 and RFC 4646 domain names.

This strategy succeeded. The IESG approved the RFC 4646 that I wanted just after the WSIS adopted the Internet US localisation and created the multilingualisation oriented IGF.

- RFC 3066 does not include an internal solution for interoperability (via IRI-tags for example). However, it is constrained enough (its text and the IESG answers to my appeal) for a stable external crosswalking to be developed by the MDRS and/or others.

- The IANA language subtags and extensions registries are to be discussed by an IANA created and published mailing list moderated by a Reviewer selected by the IESG. It will be easy, efficient, and acceptable for experts from all the concerned organisations to participate.
- we secured (today for RFC 4646) the needed domain names that we will use to document the technical and metatechnical interoperability issues involved

### The PR-action

What was planned in order to comfort a specific market dominance, and to prepare further controls through RFC 4646 Bis, would now ensure a stable, open to all, innovation oriented, IESG supervised solution.

It should eventually lead the IESG to select a Subtag Reviewer understanding and supporting the need of interoperability with others language registries and ontologies, like ours.

Oddly, this was the moment when Harald Alvestrand initiated a PR-action against me. His (unwillingly humorous but defaming) request and all the subsequent fuss it inspired, along with the appeals I had to forward, permitted his proprietary mailing list to be confirmed by the IESG, and to ban me thereof, as well as from the WG-LTRU, what could hamper cooperation and prevent me to contribute to the WG-LTRU rechartering (from day one, I had requested that we thoroughly read and respect the Charter).

The PR-action episode was, of course, displeasing. However, it lead many to think that the real issue was to avoid at all cost any and every technical debate with a winning competitor. This helped me in that it brought many fellow laughers to my side, and in turn saved much of my time - being banned is like being on a holiday at a time when direct mailing becomes largely more efficient.

### The purposes of this appeal

This appeal is for the IAB to help all of us in three areas:

- to correct the RFC 3683 errors. I agree with Brian Carpenter that it should be made Historic. However, solutions can be proposed out of my own experience (I documented them: closed jury, risks for the PR-actioneer, quick decision, user representation to review Charters and RFCs, ethic commission, etc.). I will most probably call on the ISOC Chair, if all this does not make the RFC 3683 virus quarantined.
- to clarify what are the core values along which RFC 3935 leads the IETF and its leaders to **influence** the way on design, use and manage the internet, and the real importance of the non-commercial R&D (RFC 3869) and of user needs..
- to have the RFC 4646 respected, and the RFC 4647 clarifications obtained through another appeal (unfortunately the messenger banning policy that was adopted by the IESG led them to not hear about the message itself, which forced me to continuously escalate it to the IAB and to the public, instead of having it discussed by the WG-LTRU).

I am sorry Harald Alvestrand chose to oppose us so deeply rather than cooperating, in which I on several occasions proposed to him for us to cooperate. I am sure that he was truly displeased to have to commence this action, and to further pursue it continuously once commenced. However, I actually cannot really see what he could have done differently, being considered his vision of the network and determination to lead it. A vision with very old roots (going back to Doug Engelbart) and supporters, along with my protracted opposition because my equally old experience of it has shown me that it does not scale.

What may have truly upset him the most is that I stated that it takes time to accept the obvious.

He has no real reasons for that, as one first must understand and support it, knowing that it is a long and complex process. This is why we are called researchers and engineers, not finders and builders. For a long period of time we accepted Ptolemy's model, before his circle paradigm was replaced by the ellipse paradigm.

Today the Plato's paradigm (the death, the living, and the pilot [kubernetes]) has to be completed by the Plato's extended paradigm (the pilots of a fleet, convoy, or shipping).

This is why we are called researchers and engineers, not finders and builders.

## Text of the Initial Mail from Application Area AD

Noting points in this text will assist the comprehension of some of the points raised in these appeals.

**At 13:34 18/01/2006, Scott Hollenbeck wrote:**

*The IESG has received a request from Harald Alvestrand to approve an RFC 3683 PR-action ("posting rights" action) for JFC (Jefsey) Morfin as a result of a pattern of prior warning and posting rights suspensions for off-topic postings to the LTRU working group and ietf-languages mailing lists that have not produced a change in behavior. This behavior has been characterized as a "denial-of-service" attack to disrupt the consensus-driven process as described in Section 1 of RFC 3683. A timeline of warnings and posting rights suspensions related to this request is included below.*

### Comment

This evaluation is based on the request from Harald Alvestrand, with co-signatories. It is documented by a list of quotes that only shows that I defend positions that differ from his. The total number of mails I posted on the LTRU mailing list amounts to ... 3 mails a day. This seems reasonable for an active WG that is debating key issues, wherein I document that the technical positions chosen are harmful to the Internet and the Internet community, on behalf of the needs of competition and non-US industry working groups.

*The IESG will consider this request. If approved, the PR-action described in Section 2 of RFC 3683 includes provisions to allow list administrators to suspend Mr. Morfin's posting rights to the LTRU working group and ietf-languages mailing list for at least one year. Maintainers of other IETF mailing lists may also remove posting rights to their mailing lists at their discretion.*

### Comment

Please note that the issue here is the adoption of this request. IESG in its response to my appeal will state that this **not** the case.

*The IESG plans to make a decision in the next few weeks, and solicits final comments on this action. Please send any comments to the [iesg@ietf.org](mailto:iesg@ietf.org) or [ietf@ietf.org](mailto:ietf@ietf.org) mailing lists by 17 February 2006.*

### Comment

Some might find it pleasant that for this Last Call period the duration was one month, while for the last call concerning the rechartering of WG-LTRU, it was only one week.

*For the IESG,  
Scott Hollenbeck  
Applications Area Director*  
-----

*Private warnings sent for LTRU working group mailing list postings:  
7 July 2005  
16 July 2005  
23 September 2005  
26 October 2005*

*Public warnings and suspensions for LTRU working group and ietf-languages mailing list postings:*

### **Comment**

Please note that this list is a list of smartly organised public warnings and suspensions put forth by my competition ... (see below)

*17 March 2005 (ietf-languages warning) <http://www.alvestrand.no/pipermail/ietf-languages/2005-March/003236.html>*

*5 April 2005 (LTRU warning) <http://www1.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ltru/current/msg00564.html>*

*12 May 2005 (LTRU suspension) <http://www1.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ltru/current/msg01737.html>*

*26 May 2005 (LTRU warning) <http://www1.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ltru/current/msg01897.html>  
(Used as basis for 4 July suspension.)*

*15 June 2005 (ietf-languages suspension) <http://www.alvestrand.no/pipermail/ietf-languages/2005-June/003474.html>*

*4 July 2005 (LTRU suspension) <http://www1.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ltru/current/msg02532.html>  
(Appealed to AD, appeal upheld, new warning given.)*

*5 July 2005 (LTRU warning) <http://www1.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ltru/current/msg02548.html>*

*15 September 2005 (ietf-languages suspension) <http://www.alvestrand.no/pipermail/ietf-languages/2005-September/003585.html>*

*26 September 2005 (LTRU warning) <http://www1.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ltru/current/msg03755.html>*

*7 October 2005 PR-Action request sent to IESG <http://www1.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ietf/current/msg38183.html>*

### **Comment**

(see above) ... yet it includes the request of Harald Alvestrand, which is what the IESG then omits to remember in its response.

*15 October 2005 (LTRU warning) <http://www1.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ltru/current/msg03941.html>*

*8 November 2005 (LTRU suspension) <http://www1.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ltru/current/msg04032.html>  
(Appealed to AD, appeal denied by AD.)*

*20 November 2005 (ietf-languages suspension) <http://www.alvestrand.no/pipermail/ietf-languages/2005-November/003811.html> (Appealed to AD/IESG, appeal denied by IESG, appealed to the IAB.)*

*13 January 2006 (ietf-languages suspension) <http://www.alvestrand.no/pipermail/ietf-languages/2006-January/003854.html>*

### **Comment**

It is noteworthy that none of the co-Chairs, AD, or IESG Members reported the conflicts of

interest that they have regarding their relations as Members or employees of the Unicode consortium.

## Part I

---

I forwarded the IESG an appeal against the initiation of a PR-action Last Call against me on 2006/02/17. That LC was carried, and four weeks later the IESG Minutes of 2006/03/16 report:

### ***"Minutes of the IESG Teleconferences 16 mars 2006***

#### *6.1 Decision on PR-Action against JFC Morfin (Brian Carpenter)*

*The management issue was discussed. The IESG approved an RFC 3683 PR-action for JFC (Jefsey) Morfin. Sam Hartman and Margaret Wasserman voted against this action. Mark Townsley and Alex Zinin abstained.*

----

#### *6.3 Approval of appeal response to JFC Morfin (Brian Carpenter)*

*The management issue was not discussed. Brian Carpenter withdrew the item at the start of the teleconference."*

That appeal was only answered on July 10, after a delay of twenty weeks. The text of the response states:

### **The IESG**

*"The IESG decided not to consider this appeal until after deciding the PR-action, and then not to do so until Mr Morfin's expected appeal against the PR-action".*

- this is not what the minutes say. They say that Brian Carpenter withdrew the item. This is a bizarre manner in which to make a decision.
- the IESG recently dismissed an appeal of mine on the grounds that I was (supposedly) opposing a future action of theirs. Would I have proceeded, would I have not simply followed their example?

### **RFC 2026 says:**

*"In all cases a decision concerning the disposition of the dispute, and the communication of that decision to the parties involved, must be accomplished within a reasonable period of time.*

*"[NOTE: These procedures intentionally and explicitly do not establish a fixed maximum time period that shall be considered "reasonable" in all cases. The Internet Standards Process places a premium on consensus and efforts to achieve it, and deliberately foregoes deterministically swift execution of procedures in favor of a latitude within which more genuine technical agreements may be reached.]"*

I do not think 20 weeks is a reasonable delay. I do not think that spending more time considering a PR-action versus considering first its legitimacy is accomplishing the disposition of the dispute within a reasonable period of time. I do not think this delay was used to reach a more genuine technical agreement, for the good reason that this debate never led to a response or a serious technical comment to my scores of technical points.

Moreover, the IESG minutes show that an answer was prepared 16 weeks prior to its announcement, and that the IESG Chair decided on his own to withdraw its discussion **before** the IESG approved the PR-action.

- No one can presume that the IESG Members would have by that time endorsed the text that they were presented with four months later on.

- No one can presume that this debate would not have led several IESG Members to change their mind, if they were to have known its content.

This only comforts my feeling that the IESG decision was "influenced" (as per RFC 3935) and the position of some were not the RFC 3683 reasons but rather subjective interests, as could be the same for the current further disrespect of the BCP 47 process by the IESG. I therefore submit that none of the IESG March 16th decisions (not to address my appeal, and to approve the PR-action) have been taken in conditions that were sufficiently transparent to all the IESG Members. I consider that this comes from the RFC 3683 system which allocates an IESG shepherd to the prosecution and not to the defence and from a general ignorance of the RFC 3683 by the IESG Members as documented below.

## Part II

---

I forwarded on 2006/02/17 the following appeal to the IESG.

### APPEAL TO THE IESG AGAINST AN IESG DECISION

I gave a chance to a resolution of this conflict in peace. I delayed this appeal to the maximum of the IESG decided calendar. I indicated in vain on which reasonable basis for the IETF and the concerned parties a solution could be found. I used an IESG appeal to force a beginning of dialog with Harald Alvestrand. I do not see what I could do more. So, let another appeal be, since everyone but me seems to enjoy.

On January 18th 2006 Scott Hollenbeck has notified by mail sent on the IETF mailing list that the IESG has decided to consider the request of Harald Alvestrand of a PR-action against me. I appeal against this decision, if I am correct, made for the IESG as per RFC 3683 by the quitting IETF Application AD.

#### The IESG

##### *Appeal by JFC Morfin dated 2006-02-17*

*<http://www.ietf.org/IESG/APPEALS/morfin-appeal-against-appeal.txt>*

*This is an appeal against the IESG's decision to issue a Last Call for a PR-action against Mr Morfin on 2006-01-18 at <http://www1.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ietf/current/msg40011.html>*

*The IESG decided not to consider this appeal until after deciding the PR-action, and then not to do so until Mr Morfin's expected appeal against the PR-action.*

#### 1. an illegal RFC

I am not interested in this part in the conformance of the IESG procedure with RFC 3683, nor in the particulars of the case. They are addressed in other parts. I am interested in the general conformance of RFC 3683 (as experimented through this case) with the Human Rights. From my experience RFC 3863 PR-actions are in violation of the most elementary rights of the persons.

"Article 10 - Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him."

- The IESG decides to prosecute and will be the jury. It is not impartial.
- Some IESG Members may have COI in the case. It is not independent.
- The prosecution benefits from a "shepherd", the defence not. There is no equality.
- Hearings are not public since IESG may receive mails not disclosed to the considered IETF participant.
- Hearings are not fair since the accused participant cannot contradict the charges (which have not even been investigated).

"Article 11 - Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence."

- from experience no public mail presumed innocence, none from IESG even discussing its possibility.
- RFC 3683 is a lynching under the IESG responsibility which permits ad hominem on a large scale
- the defence has no other right than to be insulted and to be explained how/why it will not be read.

"Article 12 - No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks."

- the RFC 3683 appears to be a license for arbitrary interference with privacy and personal business and for defamation and attacks upon the honour and reputation of the considered IETF participant.
- the IETF offers no protection such as secret of the mails sent on the case, banning of the public comments,

co-action in justice to protect the honour and reputation of its considered participants, responsibility of the plaintiff. PR-action seems to be a one way duel.

"Article 19 - Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontier"

- RFC 3683 permits to censor any minority position as off-topic or disruptive with no other proof needed than to declare it.

I wish to note that this case has developed because I am concerned by the good of the IETF. But I may disagree with its "affinity group" described by RFC 3774. My reasons are detailed by the IAB in RFC 3869. I therefore respect the Internet standard process and its appeal procedures. I shown I have no intent to harm the IETF, to the contrary. RFC 3869 is supposed to address real disrupters' cases. By essence, disrupters would be disrupters. They would take advantage from the flaws I experiment. I am in particular concerned by the negative result the publicity in media of an RFC 3869 case like this one. Also, by the devastation justice actions against defamers could represent: for the individual defamers, for their corporation when they use corporate mailnames, for the IETF which endorsed the proceedings. Also, by the impact on IETF participation when participants understand the IETF does not care about their reputation and honour when the way its "leaders" want to "influence the way people design, use, and manage the Internet" (RFC 3935) is at stake.

I proposed some remedies to these difficulties and I am ready to discuss them from my own experience. But even with such remedies the effect is limited to disrupters who accept the decisions of the IESG in their disfavour. I hardly call them disrupters

"Article 2. Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status."

- the whole concept of RFC 3683 is based upon the intent to protect WG from designated disrupters. This calls for a decision to know from the past if in the future a participant will be a disrupter and to decide preventive suspension. This is definitely discrimination on the origin.

- I note that in many occasions I met discrimination on language, opinion and R&D status basis. In no case the debate by the IETF on this issue has been up to now technical.

## **The IESG**

*1. The appeal asserts that RFC 3683 (BCP 83) is illegal, and specifically in conflict with certain provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In particular it cites Article 10 (right to public hearing), 11 (presumption of innocence), 12 (privacy and reputation), 19 (freedom of expression) and 2 (non-discrimination).*

*Firstly, any appeal against the approval of RFC 3683 was due within two months of that approval, i.e. by February 17, 2004.*

## **Comment**

This is ignoring the header of RFC 3683:

"This document specifies an Internet Best Current Practices for the Internet Community, and requests discussion and suggestions for improvements. Distribution of this memo is unlimited"

However, the point is not to appeal against the approval by the IESG, but to document that the document is in violation of the law. Unless IETF supercedes international treaties?

## **The IESG**

*Secondly, the IESG believes that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights does not apply to the IETF's internal rules. IETF participants are assumed to be aware of IETF process rules before*

*choosing to participate, and their participation is voluntary.*

*This part of the appeal is therefore rejected.*

## **Comment**

RFC 3935 says:

*"The mission of the IETF is 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."*

*"A very difficult issue in discussing the IETF's mission has been the scope of the term "for the Internet". The Internet is used for many things, many of which the IETF community has neither interest nor competence in making standards for.*

*The Internet isn't value-neutral, and neither is the IETF. We want the Internet to be useful for communities that share our commitment to openness and fairness. We embrace technical concepts such as decentralized control, edge-user empowerment and sharing of resources, because those concepts resonate with the core values of the IETF community. These concepts have little to do with the technology that's possible, and much to do with the technology that we choose to create."*

I do not think the IETF is to **influence** anyone.

I think that **culture**, **languages**, and **government** are areas that the IETF has neither the interest nor the competence in making standard for.

I was also interested in knowing the **core values** behind the technological choices of the IETF. Since that RFC 3935 was precisely written by the PR-action requester, I thought the IESG might help me understand if the IETF technology is based on values that I could choose and stand for.

I now have a response.

I think many now wish the IAB to confirm that response.

## **2. a PR-action can be a DoS against the IESG and the concerned participant.**

2.1. I have the feeling of being used as a fire ship against the IESG. In respecting the Internet standard process my only possibility is in mailing and appealing to the IESG. This way I increase their workload and mine. I bore them negatively. I get bored myself. All the more than I ignore the mails the IESG may receive.

2.2. the PR-action has triggered active and disrupting threads on the IETF mailing list. This was expectable. It led to a Draft to be discussed and a LC to be started. It is opposed. Let suppose my mailing had been worthless, what it was not. The total of time wasted by the PR-action since October, over the whole IETF is significantly more important than the total of time my own mailing could have made wasted. Yet, there is not risk for the PR-action requester to be held accountable for this waste if he is turned wrong.

2.3. If I am correct the PR-action request is to ban me from WG-LTRU and ietf-languages @ alvestrand.no, so they can perform their job. WG-LTRU should have concluded their work for a long (I was not involved in their current work, what lead to long blank time). This is why I have the distinctive feeling that the PR-action is actually to protect the ietf-languages @ alvestrand.no from being disbanded in application of the RFC 4646. Why to urgently ban me from two nearly defunct mailing lists? But then, how to disband a list one has painstakingly "protected" from its competition. As if I was the only one and the worst ....

I am supposed to have opposed the consensus driven process in being "off-topic"/"disruptive". I submit that I actually drove the consensus process (against me in most of the cases). This way, I obtained the IESG agreement I wanted, when I wanted it. This can easily be verified in considering the difference of Draft quality between its Dec. 2004 (I made to fail) and its IESG approved Nov. 2005 version. The number of comments registered by the Chair in his system can also demonstrate it. The time of approval, compared to the Tunis

agreement.

One may not share my point of view. One may not understand my Franglish (surprising on a list of foreign language experts). One may find my propositions too complex, stupid, etc. This does not mean I am off-topic and disruptive in the way documented by RFC 3869. But, I understand that one may be upset at having consensually decided in my favour. And not to be fair-play.

2.4. If some may doubt that I consensually obtained the points I wanted, here is a partial list:

- the IESG approved of an over constraining RFC 4646 ABNF limited to the intents of its authors
- the IANA opened the Language Subtag/Extension Registry, closing the ietf-languages @ alvestrand.no
- the WSIS confirmed the world's call for network multilingualisation and work on language codes.
- the Tunis agreement eventually made the Internet local to the USA as per the Congress resolution
- the IAB confirmed the need to seriously organise the non-WG mailing lists
- my intents on ethics, user representation, multilingualisation have not been opposed by the IAB/IESG.
- my RFC 4646 is a security warning and an interoperability proposition on the IETF site for ever.

The WG-LTRU is engaged in filtering issues and muddled in RFC 4646 limitations: My RFC 4251 proposition (refused to be considered by the Chair, AD and IESG - now in my appeal) could help them to address it. The DRS (distributed registries system) I work on will not be harmed by the constrained RFC 4646. It will provide an interoperability patch.

I was eventually able to kiss good-bye to the now purposeless ietf-language@alvestrand.no mailing list: But I had to wait for my posting rights to be restored...

2.5. I have two remaining interests:

- the appeal I introduced about RFC 4646. It would permit RFC 4646 to be accepted as an Internet local solution by other systems.
- the respect of the IESG authority resulting from RFC 4646. This concerns: (a) the creation, the publishing and the control of the ietf-languages @ iana.org by the IANA, (b) the regular procedure of appointment by the IESG of an independent and consensually accepted Languages Subtag (and Extension) Reviewer, competent in modern multimodal language issues, international affairs, network technology, applications development, and their marketing, political and societal extension.

### ***The IESG***

*2. The appeal asserts that a PR-action can be a DoS against the IESG and the participant concerned. Mr Morfin feels he is being used "as a fireship" against the IESG. The PR-action has triggered disruptive threads on the IETF list "since October." [Factual interpolation - this presumably refers to the discussion launched by Harald Alvestrand, since the IESG's Last Call took place in January.]*

### **Comment**

A simple glance at the IETF mailing list, ietf-languages @ alvestrand.no, and WG-LTRU shows that the issue has polluted these lists since my 61st birthday, on October 7, 2005.

### ***The IESG***

*It asserts that rather than disrupting discussions "I submit that I actually drove the consensus process (against me in most of the cases)." It asserts "I have the distinctive feeling that the PR-action is actually to protect the ietf-languages at alvestrand.no from being disbanded in application of the RFC 4646."*

*The IESG believes this is irrelevant to whether the IESG acted correctly in this case.*

### **Comment**

I am not sure, but this is supposed to be an appeal against IESG actions. Anyway the matter

is not relevant here.

### ***The IESG***

*Also, one should not confuse the email generated by the PR-action Last Call (which was not a large fraction of IESG email during the Last Call) with prior email in the community. The amount of email generated by the Last Call really does not amount to a DOS attack.*

### **Comment**

The concerned period is five months, not one month. The number of related mails that I had to send in order to answer all this attack, or to calm people over it, is rather impressive. I am glad to learn that this did not overload the IESG (I am sure they read all of them to make an informed decision). Anyone reasonable can observe that the load that this imposed on me, mostly due to public and private questions, attacks, defamations, and legitimate concerns about the IETF, went far beyond the mails that I sent to the WG-LTRU (they are supposed to be a DoS of mine) in order to obtain a consensus (i.e. a text that I could support).

I do not feel that this kind of response matches the standards of RFC 2026 which states:

"Disputes are possible at various stages during the IETF process. As much as possible the process is designed so that compromises can be made, and genuine consensus achieved, however there are times when even the most reasonable and knowledgeable people are unable to agree. To achieve the goals of openness and fairness, such conflicts must be resolved by a process of open review and discussion."

3. the discrepancies of the case

### ***The IESG***

*3. The appeal asserts certain discrepancies:*

3.1. The notification of the PR-action mentions that Harald Alvestrand has requested it. It does not even bother to quote this request. So I do not even have a quote of the act of accusation. Actually none had it during the whole LC which ends today. This means that the whole LC may have discussed many things but the LC matter.

This obviously voids the LC.

### ***The IESG***

*3.1. The Last Call does not quote Harald Alvestrand's request.*

*The IESG finds this irrelevant. The Last Call contained specific pointers to the alleged disruptive behavior. It did not depend on Harald Alvestrand's request.*

### **Comment**

This is of interest since the Last Call announcement states (see above): "*The IESG has received a request from Harald Alvestrand .... The IESG will consider this request.*" and thereafter quotes its URL.

Any casual reader would then suspect that the issue is irrelevant and that all of this could only be a set-up. I cannot imagine that the IESG did not bother to read its own last call?

3.2. No serious investigation on the allegations of that request has been carried (at least of the request I perused five months ago). There were some point I could alone to document in my interest. Many other I really need to be explained: I just do not understand them (I received a reasonable number of mails which show that I am not alone).

***The IESG***

*3.2. No serious investigation on the allegations of that request has been carried out.*

*This was unnecessary for the reason just given. The Last Call stood alone.*

**Comment**

This is annoying because we can clearly see that we are not speaking of the same PR-action. RFC 2026 implies that some serious attitude is to be brought to the response to an appeal.

3.3. the rationale of PR-action is not what I did, but actions undertaken against me by others upon motives they decided or decisions they took. This is a bizarre situation. This is the first time that I find something in the Internet architecture, which fully scales.

***The IESG***

*3.3. The rationale of PR-action is not what I did, but actions undertaken against me by others.*

*This is factually incorrect: again, the Last Call contained specific pointers to the alleged disruptive behavior.*

**Comment**

The IESG must decide if it did or not provide pointers to my alleged disruptive behaviour. It provided (see above) pointers to "Private warnings sent for LTRU working group mailing list postings:" and "Public warnings and suspensions for LTRU working group and ietf-languages mailing list postings". In this last part it quoted the request of Harald Alvestrand". All of these were actions that were taken against me by others. However, Harald's request in turn quotes alleged disruptive behaviours (the simple reading of which shows they are not, as several stated it on the IETF mailing list) and some slightly amusing defamations.

3.4. I note there are two kinds of suspension used to support the PR-action request:

3.4.1. suspensions by the WG-LTRU Chairs.

- what has Harald Alvestrand to do with the WG-LTRU management?
- the last quoted date is 8 Nov 2005 - a week before I obtained what I wanted (cf. supra) and I drop interest in WG-LTRU (except to assist them, in the case my appeals would result in requiring some text changes). My target was a competition harmless correctly made document adopted by consensus. I proposed to co-write. This was decided by the Chairs, with no debate, it would be a continuation of the twice LC failed Draft. Under the circumstances, I could only build a consensual propositions against me. This lead to a special situation, but it worked. I was actually leading the consensus driven process. An appeal to the IESG would have killed that efficient system. I only made clear that it would happen at the end of the process. Experience shows that it permitted me introduce a very limited appeal.

3.4.2. suspensions from Harald Alvestrand.

When it became clear they were part of a vision tending to oppose the IESG RFC 4646 authority and maintain a control on the IANA Languages Registries, I appealed of the current one. The IAB turned down the IESG confirmation. I appealed from the next one: it is under consideration.

### ***The IESG***

*3.4. Prior posting suspensions from both LTRU (a WG list) and ietf-languages (a non-WG list) are cited.*

*They are both IETF related lists. RFC 3683 is not specific to WG mailing lists.*

### **Comment**

The posting suspensions which ultimately lead to the Last Calls disregard the IAB decision.

### 3.5. Legitimacy of the request for PR-action

ietf-languages @ alvestrand.no is considered by the IESG as an IETF Mailing list (while the IAB calls for a clear status of the non-WG lists). Harald Alvestrand's request would not hold if there were not a formal IESG decision to that end. I did not find that decision, nor its date (prior to the date of the warning).

### ***The IESG***

*3.5. ietf-languages at alvestrand.no is not clearly an IETF list.*

*This is factually incorrect; it is functionally equivalent to the list mentioned in RFC 3066.*

### **Comment**

I am glad the IESG agrees with me. This list is functionally equivalent to the list mentioned in RFC 3066. The IESG approval of the RFC 4646 BCP obsoletes that mailing list and the corresponding IANA registries.

The IANA has closed the registries, respecting RFC 4646. IESG has not closed or reassigned the mailing list. The reason why I have been suspended is because I supported the desire to respect the RFC 4646. This means that a RFC 4646 Language Subtags and Extension Reviewer should be recruited by the entire IESG as the Moderator of the ietf-languages @ iana.org mailing list, managed and published by the IANA. RFC 4646 deals with that transition.

Once the RFC 4646 was approved by the IESG, the Moderator of this mailing list will not be Harald Alvestrand any longer. If that list was functional, Harald Alvestrand had no capacity to ban me.

### ***The IESG***

*In conclusion the IESG finds no defect in its decision to issue a Last Call for a PR-action against Mr Morfin on 2006-01-18, and rejects this appeal.*

### **Comment**

I hereby request this to be rescinded.

## Part 3

---

I forwarded on 2006/05/17 the following appeal to the IESG.

### **APPEAL AGAINST AN IESG DECISION DENYING ME IANA LANGUAGE REGISTRATION PROCESS BY WAY OF PR-ACTION**

Dear IESG Members,

This is a formal appeal to the IESG against the IESG decision below. This does not appeal the matter of the decision, which will be addressed by the market, since the case is widely accepted as being commercial and political.

#### ***The IESG***

#### ***Appeal by JFC Morfin dated 2006-05-17***

<http://www.ietf.org/IESG/APPEALS/iesg-pr-appeal-05-17-2006.pdf>

*The IESG understands this to be an appeal against its decision to approve a PR-action against Mr Morfin, announced on 2006-03-18 at <http://www1.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ietf-announce/current/msg02313.html>*

*As we understand them, the grounds of appeal are:*

It only considers the salient procedural and ethical aspects, and the political and commercial aspects through results of the published decision.

The IESG decision

"At 06:17 19/03/2006, IESG Secretary wrote:

The IESG has evaluated a request for an RFC 3683 PR-Action for JFC (Jefsey) Morfin. Please see the following URL for the corresponding Last Call message and associated information:

<http://www1.ietf.org/mail-archive/web/ietf/current/msg40011.html>

There was extensive discussion on the IETF list, and the IESG received additional feedback directly. After a careful evaluation of the feedback, mail archives, IESG minutes, and RFC 3683, the IESG has concluded that there is sufficient evidence that Mr. Morfin has engaged in behavior that is not acceptable on IETF mailing lists.

Therefore, the IESG has decided to approve the request for an RFC 3683 PR-Action for JFC (Jefsey) Morfin. The administrators of the LTRU working group and ietf-languages mailing lists are authorized to suspend his posting privileges under the terms described in Section 2 of RFC 3683. The administrators of other IETF mailing lists may suspend his posting privileges under the same terms at their discretion.

The IESG"

### **This decision is invalid**

The decision to consider the concerned PR-action is subject to a not yet addressed appeal.  
<http://www.ietf.org/IESG/APPEALS/morfin-appeal-against-appeal.txt>.

This appeal stipulates:

- that PR-actions as per RFC 3683 are a violation of the most elementary rules of rights
- that the most elementary defence rights have not been supported
- that the entire process is using defamatory documents in turn engaging the personal responsibility of some IETF participants and the common responsibility of the IETF/IESG/IAB.
- why it is that that particular PR-action is technically invalid.

### ***The IESG***

*1. That the IESG could not make a decision as the decision to Last Call the PR-action was under appeal at the time the decision was made.*

*The IESG finds nothing in RFC 2026 or RFC 3683 to suggest that appeals have inherent suspensive effect.*

### **Comment**

This position is covered by the first part of this appeal

In addition, this PR-action is based on the ietf-languages @ alvestrand.no suspension. <http://www.alvestrand.no/pipermail/ietf-languages/2005-November/003811.html> that has been voided by the IAB: <http://www.iab.org/appeals/2006-01-31-jefsey-response.html>

Other elements could have been utilised to show the IESG bias through the IESG response to a similar appeal in a similar case where the IESG disregards the IAB above-mentioned positions. <http://www.ietf.org/IESGAPPEALS/response-morfin-appeal-ietf-languages-list.txt>

### ***The IESG***

*2. That the IESG partly based the decision on a prior suspension that was voided (by IAB decision) prior to approval of the PR-action.*

*Note that it was voided only because RFC 3934 is written narrowly to apply only to WG mailing lists. See <http://www.iab.org/appeals/2006-01-31-jefsey-response.html>*

*RFC 3683 is not specific to WG mailing lists, so the IAB decision is beside the point.*

### **Comment**

The reason why it would be written as it is is irrelevant. The point is to know if it is respected and if the IAB thinks that its position is being respected or not.

Also, as indicated above:

- either ietf-languages @ alvestrand.no is the RFC 3066 mailing list and it is no longer an IETF active mailing list
- or the ietf-languages @ alvestrand.no functionally is the RFC 4646 list and Harald Alvestrand has no particular say in it. The Moderator is Michael Everson.

Whatever the situation, it is fine with me. But they cannot be both. And I am not banned unless Michael Everson appeals the lack of proper IESG decision (see below).

<http://www.ietf.org/IESG/Narrative/narrative-telechat-2006-03-16.html> reports that the decision was voted on, but that it was not the result of a consensus. This seems to be an ad hominem way in which to proceed, and is strictly opposed.

The reports states that "This decision passed and will be published with who voted which way », which was not the case. Until the text is published with the list of voters and the way in which they voted, the publication and its results are void.

### ***The IESG***

*3. The PR-decision was not properly announced. The short coming of the announcement is that it did not include the vote record.*

*The IESG is not obliged to make decisions by voting, although it did so in this case. The voting record was not included in the announcement, but is indicated in the IESG minutes for 2006-03-16. Note that the form of words used records who voted against or abstained, but fails to state the implied fact that all other ADs voted for the PR-action.*

*The IESG does not agree that this in any way invalidates its decision.*

### **Comment**

I thank the IESG to confirm that it **voted** the decision. This makes it inexistent. Except if it is a personal lynching, but then RFC 3683 should not be used as a cover.

#### ***RFC 3683 stipulates***

*"Regardless of whether the PR-action revokes or restores posting rights, the IESG follows the same algorithm as with its other actions:*

- 1. it is introduced by an IESG Area Director (AD), who, prior to doing so, may choose to inform the interested parties;*
- 2. it is published as an IESG last call on the IETF general discussion list;*
- 3. it is discussed by the community;*
- 4. it is discussed by the IESG; and, finally,*
- 5. **using the usual consensus-based process**, it is decided upon by the IESG.*

*Of course, as with all IESG actions, the appeals process outlined in [4] may be invoked to contest a PR-action approved by the IESG."*

NB. The IESG implied voting report system is noteworthy.

This decision is out of the scope of RFC 3683 (1)

RFC 3683 concerns cases where: "if a working group is unable to reach consensus, this is an acceptable, albeit unfortunate, outcome; however, if that working group fails to achieve consensus because it is being continuously disrupted, then the disruption constitutes an abuse of the consensus-driven process."

The point brought forth by the decision in turn makes it rather difficult to understand as to which consensus was impeached. Two could tangibly be considered from the confuse text of the PR-action. Neither one was impeached.

### ***The IESG***

*4. That the grounds for approving the PR-action are not valid as there was no IETF consensus to disrupt. If there was no consensus to disrupt then RFC 3683 is not applicable. Arguments for why this is true in regards to ietf-languages and LTRU are:*

1. Private list [ietf-languages@alvestrand.no](mailto:ietf-languages@alvestrand.no)

Matters involving this list have been discussed by the IAB. Action by the IESG was requested by the IAB. That action has not been undertaken, in which the IESG even chose to repeat a similar position. This was in a subsequent similar case, used as an alibi (some reported it as a "joke") to trigger the long pending PR-action <http://www.ietf.org/IESG/APPEALS/response-morfin-appeal-ietf-languages-list.txt> showing

- its disregard of the IAB decision.
- its disregard for the RFC 3683, which is not to retroactively address a long passed situation.

**The IESG**

*ietf-languages@alvestrand.no is not a valid argument as:*

*- The IESG has not addressed the recommendations from IAB.*

*This is factually incorrect. See <http://www.ietf.org/IESG/STATEMENTS/statement-disruptive-posting.txt>*

**Comment**

This will be up to the IAB to decide if this fulfils its demand for an obsoleted RFC 3066 mailing list or for an RFC 4646 mailing list of which the Moderator is the Reviewer.

Anyway, this mailing list is not concerned by RFC 3683 since it does not proceed by consensus but by comments made to a Reviewer. The PR-action, which was called for by the owner of that private list, is therefore void as far as his claims are concerned since RFC 3683 does not apply in the case of the modus operandi of his list.

**The IESG**

*- There is no consensus as this is a reviewer's list, and only operates as a source of advice to the reviewer. Thus based on the list's modus operandi RFC 3683 does not apply.*

*This is an interesting argument from a formal point of view. However, the fact that an IANA Expert Reviewer is not formally called upon by RFC 2434 to judge consensus does not mean that he or she will not prefer to obtain consensus if possible. In fact, RFC 2434 makes it clear that the expert is there to avoid IANA having to make a consensus judgement:*

*"In addition, the IANA cannot participate in all of these mailing lists and cannot determine if or when such discussions reach consensus. Therefore, the IANA cannot allow general mailing lists to fill the role of providing definitive recommendations regarding a registration question.*

*...*

*The designated expert can initiate and coordinate as wide a review of an assignment request as may be necessary to evaluate it properly."*

*It is clear to the IESG that the scope of RFC 3683 was intended to cover this type of case.*

**Comment**

The IESG quotes separated parts in a contradictory way. In being within his right to initiate and coordinate as wide a review as may be necessary he must expect to receive opposing positions. A review is not a debate. The position presented by the IESG is technical censorship.

## 2. WG-LTRU

The RFC 4646 document was approved by the IESG. It substantially differs on several key points with the initial text supported by the PR-action requesters. This results from consensus that I obtained to clarify a confuse text.

Being initially denied consensus access through an abuse of the consensus driven process by way of an identified affinity group, I obtained it in adopting a weak to strong strategy. I insisted on the deficiencies of the text to be positively documented so the project that I conduct (MDRS and its Langroot system – cf. <http://www.itu.int/ITU-T/worksem/multilingual/papers/s1paper-morfin.pdf>) could benefit from them. It was in this way that I obtained the negative consensual text of which I wanted to reduce its deficiencies. This was a boring process, but it delivered the consensual clarifications that I needed, together with those that I expected and obtained from my IESG appeal, from the US Congress, and from the Tunis World Summit agreement reached only a few hours prior to the IESG approval of the RFC 4646 text.

This means that no consensus failed to be achieved, in spite of the attitude of my opponents. I accept that some parts of the achieved consensus may not be what they desired. I can only assume such from the way the IESG disrespects the RFC 4646 consensus.

### ***The IESG***

*Mr Morfin also argues that RFC 3683 does not apply to his alleged disruption of the LTRU WG list as consensus was achieved, despite alleged attempts to prevent consensus by opponents to JFC's position.*

*The IESG does not find this argument relevant; the point is not whether consensus was eventually achieved, but whether Mr Morfin's postings made it unduly difficult to achieve.*

### **Comment**

This is erroneous. I am not stating that I did not prevent consensus. I am stating that I obtained it. The proposition initially supported by most of the WG-LTRU Members was the one that they had authored as ietf-languages @ alvestrand.no, in which I had be instrumental in making its second last call fail.

The final text that I had to fight to obtain was consensual.

I certainly agree that it was not saying the same thing on the points, that either I opposed or that it was now possible to externally circumvent. To reach such an agreement is precisely what a consensus driven process is. Some, like this one, are more difficult to obtain, when they defeat what some had initially **influenced** (cf. RFC 3935) the group into. If one engages into a PR-defamation each time a consensus has been clarified, I do not see what the IETF is about.

I certainly accept that RFC 4646 does not please Unicode, maybe no more than their initial proposition pleased me. I did not choose to forward the text that we reached, but the WG-LTRU co-Chairs and the AD who is the PR-action shepherd. They decided it consensual. I only find it litte for one mean to attempt to obtain through a PR-action what one was not able to consensually work out.

This decision is out of the scope of RFC 3683 (2)

RFC says:

"In many cases, applying those guidelines will produce the desired modification in behaviour. However, when those guidelines fail to provide the desired modification in behaviour, more drastic measures should be available to reduce or eliminate these attacks' impact on the IETF process." This implies - as has been repeated many times - that RFC 3683 is not about justice but rather protection management.

However, this decision is about what is "unacceptable", not about "disruptive" or "abusive" behaviour.

- unacceptable behaviour can be defined in considering that "political speech is given more leeway than commercial speech, and some forms of speech (e.g., egregious libel or incitement to violence) are considered unacceptable."
- RFC 3683 is about situations where desired modifications in disruptive and abusive behaviour cannot be executed. It is not about past disagreements concerning the way that a denied consensus was reached.

The situation at the time of the IESG decision was:

- "disruptions" concerning the RFC 4646 if they ever existed were well over, since it had been approved (with the consensuses I obtained) by the IESG four months prior.
- the WG-LTRU had found a "non-disrupted consensus" concerning one other accepted Draft (Registry) and was on its way to obtain another one (Filter). I had just provided a review of that Draft (which was personally thanked by the Chair) a few days prior to the IESG decision and... my subsequent suspension.
- I left the private ietf-languages @ alvestrand.no mailing list a month prior to the IESG decision (this list was closed if the RFC 4646 was to be respected).
- I had de facto left the WG-LTRU list after having obtained everything I needed from the WG-LTRU and entered a last comment a few days prior to the IESG decision.

Could there have ever been "unacceptable" behaviour: one way or another the Chairs still found a way to modify it. Therefore, RFC 3683 does not apply.

### ***The IESG***

*5. In addition Mr Morfin argues that RFC 3683 does not apply as there was no failure to modify behavior following earlier suspensions. At the time of the IESG decision the situation was:*

- *the contentious documents had achieved consensus.*
- *LTRU had achieved consensus on other documents.*
- *JFC had left the ietf-languages list*
- *JFC had de facto left also the LTRU list.*

*The IESG cannot admit this argument. There is inevitably a delay between the moment when a PR-action is initiated and the moment when it is decided. The Last Call for the PR-action pointed to a pattern of alleged disruption \*after\* multiple warnings and suspensions, and it is the status at the moment of the Last Call that is relevant.*

### **Comment**

May be the IESG has not consulted its calendar. The Last Call was issued on January 17. The consensus had been found **five** months before and the RFC 4646 approved by the IESG on November 15.

The contention used to motivate the LC was that Harald Alvestrand did not want to respect RFC 4646 making Michael Everson the person in charge (at least if I understand what the IESG responded me, Michael having not formally accepted the position). The contention with Harald Alvestrand was precisely his opposition to "EU" interests and policy. Something which is not in the IETF area.

Anyway the IESG does not object that:

- the contentious documents had achieved consensus.
- LTRU had achieved consensus on other documents.
- JFC had left the ietf-languages list
- JFC had de facto left also the LTRU list.

but that it is not an argument.

**RFC 3683 states:**

*A reasonable person might note that this memo describes a mechanism to throttle active denial-of-service attacks against the consensus-driven process used by the IETF.*

Not long **past** denial-of-service attacks at a 3 mails a day.

IESG violation of the RFC 4646 consensus

I took the time to appeal in order to allot everyone sufficient time to observe that:

- the IESG did not address the IAB decision quoted above.

**The IESG**

*The IESG does not believe other matters raised in the appeal are relevant to whether the PR-action decision was taken correctly.*

**Comment**

It is up to the IAB to decide if its decision was respected or not.

- they repeated a further response with a position and situation that was similar to the one opposed by IAB where the matter was my support of the European Union English (Eurospeak) with the “en-EU” tag, the indication that the MDRS Langroot would support it, and the need to preserve interoperability for the world leading economic language.

**The IESG**

*The IESG does not believe other matters raised in the appeal are relevant to whether the PR-action decision was taken correctly.*

**Comment**

See IESG point 5 above.

- this IESG document included a decision opposing the RFC 4646 consensus on the point that gives a leading commercial and political unfair advantage to Unicode over every other proposition like ours: “To clarify two additional points raised by this appeal, the IESG confirms that the list ietf-languages @ iana.org and the ietf-languages @ alvestrand.no are equivalent, as one is simply redirected to the other. This mailing list practice does not affect the role that the list plays in the IETF. We also confirm that the IETF language reviewer remains Michael Everson.”

**The IESG**

*The IESG does not believe other matters raised in the appeal are relevant to whether the PR-action decision was taken correctly.*

## Comment

This is the fundamental issue: the control of the IANA Languages Subtags and Extension Registry created by the RFC 4646. In saying so, the IESG has removed any right to the management of that list from Harald Alvestrand.

In that case, the IESG has no grounds to address his request for a PR-action and to quote his ban on me from that list.

- the only practical result of the PR-action is to permit its requester (a Member of the Unicode BoD) to ban me from his “[ietf-languages @ alvestrand.no](mailto:ietf-languages@alvestrand.no)”, denying the Manager of a competing project access to the RFC 4646 IANA Language Subtag and Extension Registries. This would not be the case if RFC 4646 was respected and the IANA Registries entries were discussed on the [ietf-languages @ iana.org](mailto:ietf-languages@iana.org).

## *The IESG*

*The IESG does not believe other matters raised in the appeal are relevant to whether the PR-action decision was taken correctly.*

## Comment

This is the very matter of the appeal. Through all the tricks above, the goal is only to impeach me, the manager of a competing proposition, to share in the IANA language Subtags and Extensions Registries.

- this decision permits the Language Tags Reviewer, a Unicode consultant appointed by the PR-action requester, to gain control of those IANA Registries without the proper IESG selection decided by the RFC 4646 consensus. It is noteworthy that the former Language Tag Registry reviewing is a substantially different task in the scope and responsibilities involved from the new Language Subtags and Extension Registries review.

## *The IESG*

*The IESG does not believe other matters raised in the appeal are relevant to whether the PR-action decision was taken correctly.*

## Comment

Common sense will decide if RFC 4646 procedure should prevail or not.

- the way the decision was made (as discussed above) casts suspicion on the decision as no one involved removed his/herself. Some may think it odd that by chance the R&D Manager of a language project is denied equal access to IANA resources while one can count among the people involved:
  - a BoD Member (PR-action requester),
  - the President (Author),
  - Members (Reviewer, WG-Co-Chair, Author),
  - Employees of Members (AD and PR-shepherd, IESG Chair conducting the case, IESG Members, Author),

of its main commercial and political competitor.

Therefore, any IESG Member that had a COI in this case should not have participated in any debate or decision that is related to this case.

### ***The IESG***

*The IESG does not believe other matters raised in the appeal are relevant to whether the PR-action decision was taken correctly.*

### **Comment**

This is such an obvious point that I will not comment on it.

This is certainly the kind of point that the press likes. Moreover than the Authors and the Requester attained new positions before the LC. Some asked if this is a result of that. This kind of issue is touchy. All the more if the IANA situation develops as I feel it might.

It would be advisable to kill suspicions here. Anyway, the decision process (vote) is invalid and definitely documents that there was no consensus.

### General comment

The debate over RFC 4646 may have seemed an apparent waste of time imposed on me by a disloyal competition. It however led to adverse results for them in which:

- many discovered the project in order to use the IANA to impose globalization and the CLDR project as well as to limit the number of languages in cyberspace to less than 150.
- it is generally accepted that the PR-action is a childish addition of defamations and Denial of Access to the IANA Registries action. This does not serve the IETF image well.
- it helped advertising and studying the need to deploy the multitechnology, multilingual, multi-authoritative, and referential system that we are working on to replace the mono-authoritative IANA.

This appeal is mostly to permit the IESG to restore the IETF image, and to clarify the confusion that some created. It also demands an IESG comment (silence would be perceived as a comment) about its current disrespect of the RFC 4646 IETF consensus regarding the [ietf-languages @ iana.org](mailto:ietf-languages@iana.org) mailing list, the IANA Language Subtags and Extensions Registries, and its technical and strategic consequences.

The Tunis WSIS agreement set forth as an imperative by the US Congress has made the Internet to be coordinated by ICANN and IANA as an "Internationalized US Internet", under the control of the US Government. This has also initiated the Multinational Internet under IGF governance.

The world now needs to know which of them the IETF would like to influence the design, use, and management (cf. RFC 3935). This is necessary in order to properly organise their stable, secure, and scalable interoperability. This is also necessary to know if the IETF doctrine in the multilingualization and globalization areas is subject to the IETF consensus or rather to an industry consortium.

### ***The IESG***

*The IESG does not believe other matters raised in the appeal are relevant to whether the PR-action decision was taken correctly.*

### **Comment**

That the IESG did not consider it does not change the fact that they are key to the issue.

### ***The IESG***

*The appeal is rejected.*

#### **Comment**

It should be rescinded. A proper procedure to be jointly discussed should replace it.

#### **On 2006/03/04 I added the following elements**

Subject: Addition to the Appeal concerning the PR-action LC  
Date: Sat, 04 Mar 2006 04:05:25 +0100  
From: Jefsey Morfin <jefsey@online.fr>  
To: iesg@iesg.org

Dear IESG Members,

I used this appeal to list experimented difficulties raised by the RFC 3683 and the way the could be addressed. I wish to add two more:

1. once a PR-action is engaged against someone, he starts being subject to trolls and insidious remarks. The target seems to get him respond in order to increase the feeling of an intense traffic. I suggest that, in a way or another, he could report such trolls to the IESG.

2. one of the signatoores of the PR-action request against me, pretends that the name of an another IETF participant (he seems to dislike) is an alias of mine. Such a double ad homina should not be tolerated. But more disturbing is the idea that a same PR-action could be used against several persons on this ground, and used as a tool against minority members. A solution could be to ask the concerned parties' passport. This would be a big change in the IETF praxis. And certainly a destabilisation of the IETF.

I thank you for your attention.

jfc morfin

#### **Comment**

This kind of indication that I offered with several others from experimentation shows that the running code of RFC 3683 does not match its specification.

---