

Appeal to the IESG irt. RFC 6852

JFC MORFIN

This is an appeal to the IESG concerning its application of the provisions of RFC 2026 section 4.2.3 to the publication of RFC 6852.

- It is individually introduced by J-F C. Morfin and represents concerns expressed by Civil Society, the Private Sector, the international normalization area, and governments' members and representatives that are starting to be known as **OpenUse** concerns.
- This appeal wishes to comply with the IESG guidance provided in the response to a previous appeal that any individual making an appeal to the IESG is strongly encouraged to provide a clear, concise, and focused text that includes a description of the action already taken, the reasons for the disagreement with the action taken, and their preferred remedy.

It, therefore, focuses on general lines without a detailed documentation of these concerns. In cases where the situation cannot be remedied by the IESG response, a subsequent appeal to the IAB could further detail it all and, if necessary, an appeal to ISOC could proceed to a previous, more systematic, review.

However, a graduated approach is necessary, because:

- This appeal to the IESG focuses on a better documentation process
- An appeal to the IAB would probably call for a clarification of the content
- If engaged, the appeal to ISOC should then put the whole networking standardization process in the context of the Information Society context.

1. the action already taken,

An agreement has been signed between IEEE, ISOC, IAB, IETF, and W3C over what it calls the "OpenStand" principles. It has been published as an RFC in the IAB stream. This is certainly a great and a good idea due to the universal free access to RFCs.

2. the reasons for the disagreement with the action taken,

However, not using the possibilities provided by RFC 2026 section 4.2.3. (A.1.) has introduced a confusing seed of major instability within:

- the Internet Community (A.2.)
- its standardization organizations (A.3.)
- the Internet operations (A.4.)
- the RFC edition system (A.5.).

As a consequence, the target of this appeal is:

- to identify (A) the cause of the incurred risks and limitations brought to a general endorsement of the published IEEE, ISOC, IAB, IETF, and W3C agreement.
- to obtain a clear definition (D) of the terminology being used.
- to get this cause corrected (R) through the concerted guidance of the IESG, IAB, and ISOC and the help from the whole Internet Community and its multiple stakeholders.

3. the preferred remedy

The sought, preferred remedy is the publication of an RFC 6852bis that properly introduces :

- RFC6852 within its whole digital ecosystem (WDE) context (R.1.)
- the project of a multiconsensual compendium of the Internet technical concordance (R.2) supported by an all network area wiki of reference (i.e. a multitechnology/multiservice IANA)

A. Identification of the cause of the incurred risks and limitations brought to its endorsement
--

Not using the possibilities provided by RFC 2026 section 4.2.3. has introduced a confusing seed of major instability.

A.1. Possibilities offered by RFC 2026 section 4.2.3.

The point is not to argue about the details, but rather to understand which protection of the extensive IETF experience, which it has gathered in its standardization process, that has not been considered and, therefore, is the source of the encountered further difficulties.

Several convergent points are to be considered.

NB: RFC quotes are in italics; Appeal comments are interspersed.

RFC 2026 section 4.2.3 states:

To ensure that the non-standards track Experimental and Informational designations are not misused to circumvent the Internet Standards Process, the IESG and the RFC Editor have agreed that the RFC Editor will refer to the IESG any document submitted for Experimental or Informational publication

which, in the opinion of the RFC Editor, may be related to work being done, or expected to be done, within the IETF community.

|| In what follows, it is accepted that the responsibilities of the RFC-Editor to the IESG are assumed by the Author who is the IETF Chair (and now the IAB Chair) and publishes an act that he cosigned in this capacity.

The IESG shall review such a referred document within a reasonable period of time, and recommend either that it be published as originally submitted or referred to the IETF as a contribution to the Internet Standards Process.

|| This is the appealed IESG decision. There was a Last Call, called by the IAB Chair, the IAB approved the document, but there was no IETF due process. It would be apart of the remedial proposition to insert the introduced text as part of a BCP.

If (a) the IESG recommends that the document be brought within the IETF and progressed within the IETF context, but the author declines to do so,

|| This seems to be de facto the case.

or (b) the IESG considers that the document proposes something that conflicts with, or is actually inimical to, an established IETF effort,

|| The Chair of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) at the IETF 84 Administrative Plenary in Vancouver, when introducing RFC 6852 described them as representing *"our core values and our principles. We will ask other SDO's (Standards Development Organizations) to follow along... Signatories will be standards development organizations, as well as organizations that believe standards should be developed according to these principles."*

|| However, the core values of the IETF are differently documented in the RFC 3935 IETF Mission Statement as:

RFC 3935: 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.

|| Likewise, the RFC 3935 defines the mission of the IETF, which is posted all over the websites of the IETF,

RFC 3935: 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. These documents include protocol standards, best current practices, and informational documents of various kinds.

RFC 3935, therefore, does not qualify in what case something is better. The text presented in RFC 6852 explains it when it states:

RFC 3935: We embrace a modern paradigm for standards where the economics of global markets, fueled by technological advancements, drive global deployment of standards regardless of their formal status.

The same RFC 3935 documents five cardinal principles, which are:

- Open process
- Technical competence
- Volunteer Core
- Rough consensus and running code
- Protocol ownership.

While the text introduced in RFC 6852 calls for adherence to five other fundamental principles of standards development, which are:

- Due process
- Broad consensus
- Transparency
- Balance
- Openness.

There is no other objection being raised here to these principles except that they are not those of the IETF consensus and, therefore, need to be assessed, discussed, and consensually accepted by the IETF community.

The publication of this informational document, therefore, concerns matters that are dealt through the Internet Standards Process (that, actually, are the Internet Standard Process) and that may, therefore, possibly be inimical to the established IETF effort.

As such, the Appeal claims that its matter falls under this RFC 2026 section.

However, the Appeal accepts the possibility offered by RFC 2026:

the document may still be published as an Experimental or Informational RFC.

This is the case, since the RFC 6852 is published as Informational in the IAB stream. However, the RFC 2026 again states:

In these cases, however, the IESG may insert appropriate "disclaimer" text into the RFC either in or immediately following the "Status of this Memo" section in order to make the circumstances of its publication clear to readers.

The IESG has not taken advantage from this possibility either in using a disclaimer, or in linking an external document or RFC where it would explain the underlying coherence with the apparent discrepancies or simply in mentioning them in the introduction.

A.2. Risks of instability among the Internet Community

The introduction of this text at IETF84 and the Last Call initiated by the IAB Chair has shown that IETF leaders (as per RFC 3935) have contradicting readings of the purpose of RFC 6852 and attach to this RFC notions related to political influence and contradicting strategies.

This enlightens a cultural problem internal to the IETF that should be kept at its lowest water mark, or addressed through an RFC 3774bis. This problem results from the divergence with:

1. the positions documented by the IAB in RFC 3869 regarding the sponsoring of the Internet R&D and the underlying question of the conflicts of interests:

The general ambiance of the RFC 6852 text and the economic practices of ISOC, IEEE, and W3C should have been better introduced, in comparison to the IAB RFC 3869 which states:

*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.*

2. The general lack of understanding of the World Summit on the Information Society and the UN image among many IETF participants, leading to a misrepresentation of the ITU role and of the importance of RFC 6756.

In not documenting RFC 6852 in relation with the WSIS Multistakeholderism and RFC 6756 general lines, the IESG has enlarged the divide and opposition between the North American and non-North American visions of the internet stewardship instead of reconciling them over a new open standardization paradigm. This is to be remedied, as it was certainly not its intent or the intent of the author and signatories.

A.3. Risks of instability among the standardization organizations and innovation research

The internet is at an architectural technical, economic, and political crossroad as more and more authorities of a very different nature get involved in the global internet emergent stewardship.

It is of the essence that the technical architecture develops independently from other influences. This is what is generally referenced to as “network neutrality” under many different forms. This neutrality depends on research. As everything else in the “information society”, the four main classes of stakeholders (Governments, Civil Society, Private Sector, and International Organizations) are involved in research, applied research, and standardization.

Until now, a status-quo was based upon the judicious opinion of IAB as expressed in RFC 3869:

[[The IAB believes that it would be helpful for governments and other non-commercial sponsors to increase their funding of both basic research and applied research relating to the Internet, and to sustain these funding levels going forward.

This position gave an acceptable framework of reference in order to:

- Accept the sponsoring provided for two decades by the private sector
- Acknowledge the normative role of major standardization bodies
- Welcome the participation of Government grants and infrastructural test-beds
- Mostly ignore the grassroots contributions of Civil Society.

RFC 6852 testifies that things have progressively changed, with the major market based SDO having reached a leading position in the internet concordance, i.e. the emergence of the network of multi-conceptually accepted standardization complexity.

Among the existing leading global stewardship experiences, the ITU is the oldest, ISO/IEC JTC1, IEEE and W3C are leading ones, and IETF is probably the most open and productive and the IGF is a paradigmatic mirror of the resulting societal evolution. It is of the essence to capitalize on their experiences. A major and leading success is the RFC system documented by RFC 4844 and 4845 which is to extend to new streams of contributors and to carefully protect.

The RFC 6852 management process has suffered from its lack of positioning in the general RFC context and, therefore, in the desirable general SDO context.

- Within the IETF community itself, because it was published:
 - Without a RFC 2026 permitted (advisable in this case) disclaimer as previously noted
 - In the IAB stream as underlined in its foreword, while:
 - It deals (cf. infra) with BCP matters RFC 4845 reserves to the IETF stream
 - The IAB Chair stated during the Last Call that he had initiated: *“AFAIK this document is not being considered for publication as an RFC (at least within the IAB stream), so RFC 4845 does not apply”*.
- Outside of the IETF community because there is no explanation of the context in which the Leading Global Standards Organizations are going to establish their own relations of cooperation with other standards organizations, governments, corporations, and technology

innovators globally in a borderless commerce, competition, and “global communities” framework.

As a facilitator of an effort to bring a Civil Society contribution to the Internet end to end standard and develop a concordance over the fringe to fringe intelligent use, I do not have enough information to endorse RFC 6852, and I feel confronted by astroturfing.

RFC 6852 is a snow-ball endorsement by a leading expert organization representing the judgment of a group whose collective experience exceeds that of any individual civil servant or internet lead and end users around the world, and whose judgments are generally free of the sort of subjective factors that vary from individual to individual.

Therefore, the US law states that an *“organization’s endorsement must be reached by a process sufficient to ensure that the endorsement fairly reflects the collective judgment of the organization”* (in this case, the signatories and each of the standards organizations, governments, corporations, and technology innovators members wherein the endorsement is requested). Candidly, the information provided by RFC 6852 on the environment of the presented text, is not sufficient to establish a collective judgment which has not been carried at the IETF itself, which also engages the liability of the endorsers.

A.4. Risks of instability in the Internet operations

RFC 6852 necessarily calls for an OpenStand coordination, i.e. mutually agreed cross-interaction and common and public information at the usual three planes of:

- **Operance:** how to document the best common practices for operating the Information and communication system.
- **Governance:** how to organize cooperation between the signatories’ standard organizations.
- **Concordance:** the underlying technical vision and long-term framework permitting compatibility between the documented standards.

This coordination will have to be integrated into the IETF information channel which is composed of different channels, including:

- The RFC edition system, which will be dealt with in the next section.
- The IANA, which is considered in this part.

The IANA services are documented by RFC 2860, the intent of which *“is exclusively to define the technical work to be carried out by the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority on behalf of the Internet Engineering Task Force and the Internet Research Task Force. It is recognized that ICANN may, through the IANA, provide similar services to other organisations with respect to protocols not within IETF’s scope (i.e. registries not created by IETF or IRTF action); nothing in this MOU limits ICANN’s ability to do so.”*

It certainly is in the interest of the IETF, ICANN, and the rest of the Internet Community that the widest set of internet related standards and parameters can be gathered at a common portal. RFC 6852 provides an opportunity for this.

- It would be advisable that ICANN supports the RFC 6852 statement and *“provides similar services to other organizations with respect to protocols not within the IETF’s scope”*.
- This underlines a major flaw in the RFC 6852 statement which is to not describe the scopes and borders between the signatories’ standardization organizations. This does prevent organizations such as the one I pioneer to endorse or support RFC 6852.

As a consequence, RFC 6852 is a seed of confusion both calling for the endorsement of technology innovators who can possibly explore new scopes, with other kinds of technical obligations (for example in a networking environment there may be necessities to strive for cooperation rather than fostering competition), without:

- Defining the existing scopes.
- Confusing global and general values, the first ones applying in every case and the later ones having variances, exceptions, and equivalences in some cases.

There are therefore, missing Security and IANA sections dealing with the scope (area of responsibility) of each possible IANA service provided by ICANN (perceived as common by users and end-users), and the resulting security issues in case two SDOs propose conflicting standards and/or parameters.

A.5. Risks of instability in the RFC edition system

As previously documented, the RFC publication system has shown to be inadequate to address a safe publishing of the RFC 6852. In this case, the RFC 2026 appeal mechanism allows you to easily discuss the raised problem.

In the legitimate and advisable case where the IETF strives to establish the RFC-Editor as the common editor of the network standards through streams dedicated to acknowledged SDOs, the confusion experienced in the RFC 6852 case should be better dealt with.

This experience should serve to still enhance and open the RFC edition mechanism:

- To make sure that every RFC proposition, whatever the stream, be approved by the other streams as consistent with their visions and documentation strategy.
- To restore the rule previously applied by Joyce K. Reynolds: to freeze the publication of an RFC under appeal until the appeal is resolved should be restored. In this case, much time

could have been saved and beneficial cooperation established over an open inter-SDO debate.

- To establish a clear framework for an appeal, in cases such as this one, where the appeal is against a lack of decision that should have happened that only becomes visible through the enforcement of an objected document.

D. Document clear terminology

In everything there is a first need, identified by Clausewitz as the need to “*clarify concepts and ideas that have become, as it were, confused and entangled. Not until terms and concepts have been defined can one hope to make any progress in examining the question clearly.*”

RFC 3935 (section 4.4.) states: “*The IETF uses the English language for its work is because of its utility for working in a global context*”.

I have never been sure of the meaning of that statement; however, what I observe is that, in their multinational, multitechnological, multistakeholder, and multiorganizational context, several terms of RFC 6852 are confusing because they are not explained (as RFC 3935 does for the terms it uses) while they may have different meanings in different Internet and English semantic contexts.

This concerns, in particular, terms such as (being used [standard print], not used [in italics] or documented in the RFC 3935 context [bold]):

- **Competition**
- Consensus
- *cooperation fostering*
- *development*
- *end-users*
- Foster
- Global
- Innovation
- Interoperability
- **Mission**
- Open
- **Open process**
- *OpenUse*
- Paradigm
- **Participants**
- **Protocol ownership**
- **Quality**
- **Relevant**
- resiliency
- **Rough consensus and running code**
- scalability
- stability
- *stakeholder*
- **Standard**
- Standard vs. norm
- **Technical competence**
- **The Internet**
- users
- voluntarily accepted
- **Volunteer Core**

R. To remedy this cause

Through the respective guidance of the IESG, IAB, and ISOC and the help from the whole Internet Community and its multiple stakeholders, a proposed remedy is introduced in the two following sections.

R.1. Open discussion of an RFC6852bis.

The charter of this RFC 6852bis would be to place the RFC6852 in the multistakeholder context of the whole digital ecosystem (WDE). Some of the points being covered should be:

- The Information Society Source Code, as per the resolutions and documents of Geneva and Tunis.
- The Internet experience.
- The multi-standardization paradigm and its internal coordination:
 - The **Governments'** implications: through the UIT, whose mission it is to protect their citizen along with the laws that they democratically established.
 - The **Civil Society**: through new initiatives such as WhatWG, FLOSS, IUTF, etc.
 - The Private Sector: now documented through the RFC 6852
 - The international organizations: through OSI, WIPO, WTO, etc.
- An homogeneous IAB Internet concordance strategy:
 - RFC 6756: Internet Engineering Task Force and International Telecommunication Union – Telecommunication Standardization Sector Collaboration Guidelines.
 - RFC 6852 calls for the endorsement of other existing and innovative sectors organizations: what are the guidelines as far as standards already issued or jointly discussed with international organizations such as:
 - **Other signatories** such as :
 - Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE)
 - World Wide Web Consortium (W3C)
 - **Non-signatories**
 - International Standardization Organization (ISO)
 - International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC)

- JTC1
- Unicode
- Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards (OASIS)
- Object Management Group (OMG)
- Open Mobile Alliance (OMA)
- The Open Group (TOG)
- Web3D Consortium (Web3D)

- **New sectors:**

How to initiate new organizations whose scope is in between the existing scopes or shared by two or more existing organizations. For example, the ONF (Open Network Foundation for OpenFlow), IETF whose scope is the OpenUse multitechnology's fringe to fringe area or a future INTF I am interested in, whose scope will be the Intelligent Network.

- The technical convergence process :
 - A mechanism of "concertation meetings" (European meaning).
 - a procedure of appeal against architectural and technical immediate or expectable concordance, along with RFC 3869 principle of simplicity and the precaution duty I plead to consider.

R.2. Wikipendia.net project

The project would be to document and publish an "OpenComp - OpenPract", i.e. the emergent multiconsensual set of thematic cross Internet Normative Compendia and Best Practices concordances, of which the text would be refreshed from the new standards, BCPs and RFCs.

This would be completed by a "wikiana.net" (wiki for all network areas) that would be maintained by the cooperating SDOs, and also support an "all network area", i.e. the cross-technologies concordance of names and numbers.
