

To: iesg@ietf.org
From: r&d afrac <rd@frac.org>
Subject: RE: appeal to IESG against AD decision: one must clear the confusion opposing the RFC 3066 Bis consensus.
Cc: "Martin Duerst" <duerst@it.aoyama.ac.jp>, "Randy Presuhn" <randy_presuhn@mindspring.com>, "LTRU Working Group" <ltru@ietf.org>, sah@428cobrajet.net
Bcc:
Attached:

Dear IESG Members,
A confusion develops over the implementation of RFC 3066 Bis. This confusion leads to a probable disrespect of the WG-LTRU consensus and IESG approbation. I opposed the RFC 3066 Bis "built-in" confusion and the resulting harm I foresaw to the community and I observed to my own work. With pains a consensus has resulted into a rather clearer and structured document I can survive.

However a lapsus calami, I asked in vain the Chairs and the AD to correct, introduces new confusions. I am now paradoxally to defend the WG-LTRU and the ESG 15/11/2005 decision against those who engaged a PR-action against me for having supposedly disrupted its building consensus process, while I actually lead it (may be this why they do not want to respect the text we eventually agreed).

The impact of that confusion is such that, if was not corrected, I would have to appeal to the IAB in fully documenting the issue. This means that I would have to introduce the language naming system experimental registry, and its IETF oriented ietf-languages@jefsey.com preparation and management mailing list in annex of my appeal.

1. I introduced a request to correct a damaging lapsus calami. At 19:39 11/02/2006, r&d afrac wrote:

Dear Scott, Randy and Martin,
I note from different debates, there is a rising confusion between:
- the RFC 3066 registration process and the RFC 3066 Bis Language Subtag and Extensions Registries,
- the Language Tag Reviewer appointed by the Application AD and the Language Subtag Reviewer appointed by the IESG
- https://datatracker.ietf.org/public/nwg_list.cgi assigns the purpose of "Review of language tag registrations, and language tag issues. See RFC 3066." to the ietf-languages@alvestrand.no mailing list. It does not assigns it any role in language subtag and extension registration and language subtag and tag extension registries issues.

This confusion opposes the consensus of this WG-LTRU, leads to a IANA matrix inappropriate description, legitimates a bitterness which is detrimental to the whole effort of this WG and to the image of its created IANA registries. I track this confusion in particular to the very page header of RFC 3066 Bis. Over the years of preparation of RFC 3066 Bis it became common to refer to the "languages tags" as "langtags" and to the RFC 3066 IANA registration as "Language Tag Registry" (a term not used in RFC 3066) or to "langtags-registry". This may explain the lapsus calami no one noticed in the RFC 3066 Bis page header: "langtags-registry" should be "langtags-subtag-(and-extension?)-registry".

I do not know how this lapsus can be corrected. But what was presented as a "typo" has been changed. I therefore formally introduce the request of the correction of this obvious lapsus.

jfc

NB. I also trace the confusion in the enforcement of a Draft by the IANA, by-passing the normal completion of the Internet standard process cycle. We all know the kind, the origin and the reasons of pressures (now applied to the IESG itself) which lead to this, when the IANA strived to better efficiency under a new Director. I can only blame them and regret their consequences.

2. Having no reply I had to appeal the AD. Sent: Monday, February 20, 2006 10:14 AM

Dear Scott,
I am sorry to be obliged to introduce another appeal.

I submitted a formal request to have an RFC 3066 Bis lapsus calami to be corrected on Feb. 11th, 2006.

1. the text of that mail is attached.
2. I did not even receive an acknowledgment.
3. the confusion introduced mares the WG-LTRU consensual RFC 3066 Bis application process, resulting in confusion by the IESG (Chair, AD, Members) and propositions opposing the RFC 3066 Bis text. For this reason I copy the IESG list.

Thank you for your consideration of this much needed and urgent correction.
jfc

3. I received the following decision: at 6:31 20/02/2006, Scott Hollenbeck wrote:

The request of this appeal appears to be a challenge to the page header found in this document:
<http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-ietf-ltru-registry-14.txt>
The header text in question is the "langtags-registry" abbreviation.

Correct.

The title of this document is "Tags for Identifying Languages". The abstract further states:

"This document describes the structure, content, construction, and semantics of language tags for use in cases where it is desirable to indicate the language used in an information object. It also describes how to register values for use in language tags and the creation of user defined extensions for private interchange."

I find that the current abbreviation is consistent with both the title of the document and the text that describes its purpose. Appeal denied.
-Scott-

The document describes two things:

1. a language tag system to indicate the language used in an information object.
 2. the registries (plural) to be used in forming the tags of this system.
- None is a single "langtags-registry".

This means that RFC 3066 Bis __obsoletes__ the RFC 3066 IANA Language tags Registry. And creates 2 new Registries.

The IANA numbers.html where all the concerned Registries are to be listed, now includes

accordingly:

<quote>

[Language Tags - OBSOLETE](#) RFC-ietf-ltru-registry-14.txt No further registrations in this registry.
[Language Tags Directory - OBSOLETE](#) RFC-ietf-ltru-registry-14.txt No further registrations in this registry.

[Language Subtag Registry](#) RFC-ietf-ltru-registry-14.txt Expert Review (Michael Everson)

[Language Tag Extensions Registry](#)

</quote>

We are now in a situation where :

- the RFC 3066 Bis documents tells it is about an OBSOLETE registry,
- the IANA respects the RFC 3066 Bis text and creates a "Language Subtag Registry" and a "Language Tag Extensions Registry" (as per RFC 3066 Bis which specifies that "language tags extensions" are made of language tags and of subtag extensions),
- the IETF Chair confuses the two different ietf-languages mailing lists (the ietf-languages@alvestrand.no one to support the OBSOLETE Registry, the ietf-languages@iana.org one to support the new registries),
- everyone confuses the obsolete registry Language Tag Reviewer and the new Language Subtag and Tag Extension Registries Language Subtag Reviewer.
- this confusion extends to the Obsolete Registry Language Tag Reviewer who still discuss the mission of Language Tag Reviewer when proposed the mission of Language Subtag Reviewer. He is obviously not aware that the subtags do not really involve languages (except as already approved or reviewed by ISO) nor scripts (except as already approved or reviewed by himself as ISO 15924 author). It also seems that he has not realised that the new Registries would jump from 72 in 10 years to several tens of thousands items in one to three years.
- the Area Director finds consistent the abbreviation at the origin of this confusion.

These issues are very serious for the text and contents industries and the Internet economic model. I object his humour or his decision.

jfc