

**Ad hoc conciliatory meeting about country code matters
(8 June 2007 in AFNOR)**

Attending:

Jaap Akkerhuis	(ICANN)	member of ISO 3166 MA
Bart Boswinkel	(ICANN)	ccNSO Liaison
Debby Garside	(GeoLang Ltd)	WG 2 expert to be confirmed by BSI
Marie-Martine Guillabert	(AFNOR),	ISO/TC 46 & TC 46/WG 2 Secretary, member of MoU/MG on e-business
G�rard Lang	(INSEE),	Convenor of ISO/TC 46/WG 2, Chair of ISO 3166/MA
Jean-Fran�ois Legendre	(AFNOR),	observer
Jean-Fran�ois Morfin	(INTLNET)	President, invited to the meeting by ISO/CS Moderator MLTF
Sheeba Mukadam	(BSI)	member of WG 2
Mary Lou P�laprat	(ISO/CS)	TC 46 Technical Secretariat

Purpose of the meeting

This meeting was called in order to reconcile a fundamental technical conflict between a user (INTLNET) who conformed to ISO 3166 Part 8, for her reading of the ISO 3166 implied a multilingualization doctrine, and an Internet specific undefined "internationalization" oriented NWIP, which was introduced by the BSI.

Chairwomanship of the meeting

The Chair, Ms. Guillabert, conducted it as an administrative meeting in turn disregarding the users' interests, interrupting the Intlnet President the few times he was permitted to speak, accepting the general claim of the participants' technical and historical ignorance of the matter at hand. As a result the definition of "globalization", "internationalization", "localization", language identification, differences between "administrative language", "language name", and "language" metadata in ISO 639 and ISO 3166 series were not evoked. The Unicode version that the work would use was not discussed.

Intlnet/MLTF

JFC Morfin, on behalf of Intlnet, clarified that Intlnet was a user service, information, think-tank and advocacy center that wanted to determine as to which solution was most adequate for their needs and those of their daily users, which Intlnet could in fact assist with its 30 years involvement in this specific area. He explained that they already had the column in their table to include the NWIP results.

ISO 3166/MA

The ISO 3166-1:2006 existing open resolution, which is already under open use to manage a need that the NWIP wants to address in a significantly more constrained manner, has not been evoked.

ISO 3166/MA Chair asked ICANN for the meaning of the word "mandated". JFC Morfin requested its answer to be recorded as "the simple choice of an external list", as an important conciliation result. He asked whether they used ISO 3166 alpha2 in reference to territories or local communities. This was left unanswered.

ICANN

ICANN clarified their independence from IETF, the RFCs quoted to justify the NWIP, IAB RFC 4690, and the current IETF/Unicode IDNAbis works. They noted their disinterest in the Intlnet work. JFC Morfin suggested ISO to establish a direct liaison with IAB and IETF.

ICANN also clarified their position with respect to the BSI NWIP because it would be pre-emptive of the ICANN process, and any resulting ISO standard should not be developed for the sole purpose of facilitating any perceived need by ICANN. ICANN nor any of its constituencies has been involved in the current initiative of BSI. ICANN nor any of its constituencies has opted for the use of an authoritative list in the context of IDN (cc)TLDs. This option and other options are and will remain under discussion. Intlnt, which shared the same concerns, fully supported this.

NWIP cosmetic

The rest of the meeting was mostly dedicated to the textual cosmetics of the BSI NWIP. This intent was that ISO TC46/WG2 Members and ICANN ccNSO/GAC Members could positively consider its project. The exercise consisted in presenting a project initially documented as Internet specific and justified by the urgency met by the Internet, as a non-Internet-specific project. This was further confused when "internationalized" was equated with "non-ASCII", and when the project was negotiated as an addition to the ISO 3166 series rather than an integrated extension, completed by an ISO 3166-4 part addressing ISO 3166 usage in a multilingual context.

JFC Morfin raised the point of the cost, and business plan, because they are key credibility factors of an extremely costly project. The point was denied as premature, in which the British Government was said to be footing the bill.

Closure of the meeting

The Meeting closed without a wrap-up when the Chair noted its matter was now reserved to ISO TC46/WG2 Members. ICANN and Ms. Garside were not appropriately registered, and JFC Morfin was a guest.

Report of the meeting

JFC Morfin received a Draft of the proposed minutes. He made numerous comments, which were called for. He has not received the final copy, but was consistently informed that a new NWIP had been produced as a reflect of the discussion of the meeting he attended and he was considered as having endorsed. JFC Morfin suspected this would be the case further to mail exchanges he continued until the the very morning of the meeting.

As a general statement,

JFC Morfin wishes to convey that:

- he approved nothing at all during this meeting, except for the open attitude of ICANN towards the most appropriate list being mandated by the Internet community.
 - he observes how ISO meets the same concerns as expressed by the IAB in RFC 3869. And ISO documents such as ISO 3166 may suffer security risk that MUST be addressed.
 - he will sponsor a private extended equivalent to ISO 3166 in order to match the users' general needs in terms of multilingualization, in respect of the civil, private, public, and international conclusions unanimously voted at the World Summit on the Information Society.
 - he continues to hope that ISO will join the WSIS process at its appropriate rank.
-

Comments having followed

The Draft above was sent to the participants for comments. As a result, JFC Morfin received:

1. the delayed copy of the AFNOR report. He answered:

"I thank you for eventually sending me the AFNOR report. I am afraid that you still forgot the text of the new NWIP. [] that version does not reflect the reality of the meeting, or any of my comments on the draft minutes. It [also] includes, in particular, the following statement:

"It was agreed that the scope should be more descriptive and explain the difference between part 1 and the NWIP, because the intent had been misinterpreted by some parties. The scope, purpose and justification were revised to reflect the discussions of the ad hoc working group. In addition, other potential applications and global relevance of this particular standard were identified and discussed."

"This confusing statement is, at least, a "misinterpretation" [] - one of our British members saw the new NWIP tonight. He says that anyone can easily understand that the NWIP was "disinterpreted" "to reflect the discussion of an ad-hoc working group" and not any change in Geolang's project."

2. the following pertinent remark from Debbie Garside:

"You may like to add an addendum to your account of the "ICANN/ISO/JFC" meeting on this web site informing readers that it bears no resemblance to the official ISO minutes."

This is the exact purpose of this non-biased report (any comment added by participants being included). Here is the text of the AFNOR originated report:

"ISO/TC 46/WG 2 N 449

Ad hoc conciliatory meeting about country code matters (8 June 2007 in AFNOR)

"Attending:

Jaap Akkerhuis (ICANN), member of ISO 3166 MA

Bart Boswinkel (ICANN), observer,

Jean-François Legendre (AFNOR), observer

G rard Lang (INSEE), Convenor of ISO/TC 46/WG 2

Marie-Martine Guillabert (AFNOR), secretary of ISO/TC 46 and TC 46/WG 2 and member of MoU/MG on e-business

Mary Lou P l aprat (Technical programme manager at ISO/CS),

Sheeba Mukadam (BSI), member of WG 2

Debby Garside (GeoLang Ltd), WG 2 expert nominated by BSI

Jean-Fran ois Morfin, invited to the meeting by ISO/CS

"This meeting was called to reconcile a conflict of interest between parties in discussion over the development of standards within TC 46/WG 2.

"In this meeting, the scope of the BSI NWIP for ISO 3166 "Internationalized code for the representation of names of countries and other significant geopolitical entities" was clarified. It was agreed that the purpose of this NWIP was not clear from the title and that the term "internationalization" needed to be defined.

"It was agreed that the scope should be more descriptive and explain the difference between part 1 and the NWIP, because the intent had been misinterpreted by some parties. The scope, purpose and justification were revised to reflect the discussions of the ad hoc working group. In addition, other potential applications and global relevance of this particular standard were identified and discussed.

"It was agreed that the revised NWIP will be circulated before June 15 for comment by WG 2, prior to submission to TC 46.

"ICANN clarified their position with respect to this project because it would be pre-emptive of the ICANN process and any resulting ISO standard should not be developed for the sole purpose of facilitating any perceived need by ICANN. ICANN nor any of its constituencies has been involved in the current initiative of BSI. ICANN nor any of its constituencies has opted for the use of an authoritative list in the context of IDN (cc)TLDs. This option and other options are and will remain to be under discussion.

"Mary Lou Pélaprat pointed out the need for experts of WG 2 to be either appointed by P-members, A- or D-Liaisons.

"BSI was requested to register the UK experts on the global directory.

"ICANN wondered whether membership of the 3166/MA made the representative also a member of TC46/WG2 and learned otherwise. ICANN will contact Mary Lou Pélaprat for information concerning possible A- and D-Liaisons and MoU with ISO."

3. Based upon the results of this meeting JFC Morfin has proposed the concerned parties to make the best from Debbie Garside's proposition and to accept Geolang as a pivotal source for interoperability (<http://mltf.org/070622-prop.pdf>). He then documented on the GNSO/GA ICANN mailing list the source of the difficulty that is commonly faced (<http://mltf.org/070712-aviation-languages.pdf>) by WLDC and MLTF.

He then received the following public mail:

"JFC

"I think we need a little clarification here as you seem to be very adept at taking other people's ideas and claiming them as your own. Wrt RFC4646, I believe you had been suspended and then permanently excluded from the IETF forum many months prior to RFC4646 being published. In any case most members of the forum had blocked you so any ideas you had would not have been received.

"Wrt MLTF (your spin-off because IETF excluded you) it is a one man band as are AFRAC and INTLNET and the many other entities you create. No doubt you will start an organization which will mean that you can "legitimately" use the domain name of "my" WLDC (www.wldc.org) that you are currently cyber squatting.

"The IETF RFC that you have written is again just you and there is not one other person that I can find within IETF who supports it.

"The reason for your being invited to the ISO meeting in Paris, to try to stop you from sending all the emails to ISO CS, AFNOR (30 a day) and the ISO TC46 WG involved with discussing the BSI's NWIP for Internationalized Country Codes. That is all. It was not in any way to include your "organizations" or your views in the ISO process.

"I count myself as fortunate that I work for myself otherwise my employer would be receiving a telephone call from the "President" of one of your organizations - others have not been so lucky causing them great distress.

"If you stopped the pretences JFC and stopped claiming other people's ideas as your own you may find that people would take you more seriously. I have told you this many times and still you keep doing the same thing. Post as yourself and leave me and my businesses out of it.

"Best
"Debbie"

He answered:

"Dear Debbie,

"I am rather sorry that you sent this mail. It is totally out of context with regard to my proposal and with the seriousness of our own work ("which does not exist"). You seem to want to deliberately confirm the idea that several have expressed that you do not know exactly where you are going.

"Anyway, as a consequence:

"1. the public business cooptation proposal that I made previously is now revoked: you lost the necessary credibility, at least among the MLTF community.

"2. you have also now lost the support that I privately campaigned in favor of your representing the @large at the top ICANN community levels.

"3. it must be clear that my proposition sought to correct, not to sponsor, the errors that populate your mails and documents (ex. "your" [you claim to be the author] ISO TC46 NWIP).

"4. the seasoned experts, normalizers, lawyers, and politicians we relate with, know that ad hominem are the technical responses of those having none. However, you might have, this time, gone one slander too far: the consequences of which will be examined in the coming weeks with the various entities that I consider affected by this slanderous, public mail of yours.

"You obviously did not understand the technical and human issues involved. This wholly confused your political and ethical approach.

"Sincerely,
"jfc

This was followed by the partial apologies of Debbie Garside:

"JFC

"You may say what you wish but it does not detract from facts. I find it unfortunate that you continually try to use my companies, my ideas and my name to further yourself. On occasions your behaviour becomes too much and I lose my professionalism and respond as I have today; for this I apologise unreservedly to the members of this forum. Please desist and let us get on with the business at hand. This is all I ask. As to slander, any statement I have made can be evidenced as fact; the same cannot be said of the numerous defamatory emails you have sent to my colleagues.
Debbie"

4. eventually on August 2, 2007, the text of the NWIP as part of a violent protest from a third party against its technical wording. This resulted into the following mail being sent to the ad-hoc meeting participants:

"August 8, 2007.

"Further to the June 8, 2007 meeting, a report was published by AFNOR. I was not copied and it did not address any of my remarks. I, therefore, prepared my own report and forwarded it to you. I thereafter received a copy of the AFNOR report. Further on, this meeting and the reasons of my attendance were debated on public lists by Debbie Garside, who signed her mails as the author of the BSI NWIP.

"1) I was not copied this NWIP, which was understood by all as , due to the AFNOR report, as reviewed and approved by me and ICANN, while ICANN was gone and I was not permitted to pursue the meeting I was invited to by ISO/CS. I had to wait for a copy to be sent to ISO TC36 Members, and for one of them to be furious at me for having approved a text with some blatant "technical stupidities". He was kind enough then to send me the text that I intend to check and review with other experts. I will subsequently publish an explanatory note if necessary.

"2) The comments I sent to AFNOR, the public online exchange with Debbie Garside, and this mail are now attached to the report. This report can be found at <http://mltf.org/070608-adhoc-intlnet.pdf>. I hope this clarifies my position regarding the NWIP text: I did not co-write nor approved it in any manner. Neither did ICANN.

"In regards to the ad-hominem mails from Mrs. Garside, to quote her, "The phrase: 'pot calling the kettle black' springs to mind!". At this stage, this kind of defamation actually furthers my positions among serene experts. With everyone, but may be a few, I can only call for the concilliation that ISO/CS tried to organise and that AFNOR, and then my coopetition proposition failed to obtain so far. The resulting stress, waste of time, delay in research and development work, relationnal confusion, additional work start being prohibitive. This now raises the question of the reasons why?
jfc"