

Subject:Re: Moderation - [to moderation committee] request for fititnt case: publish links in exact context + archived copy of deleted content

Date:Mon, 20 Feb 2023 10:03:20 -0500

From:Allan Mustard <allan.mustard@osmfoundation.org>

Organization:OpenStreetMap Foundation

To:redacted

CC:osmf-talk-owner@openstreetmap.org

Dear redacted,

Please check your spam folder. I have previously replied to you via Anonymouse. You apparently have either not read or perhaps not found the messages in your spam folder, if they are not in your inbox. Attached are screenshots of outgoing messages to you.

Now, as to your two questions (which I have already answered via Anonymouse, but repeat here):

1. URLs to the messages you requested have been provided in a PDF appended to the web page devoted to your case, per your request. You may find that PDF at https://wiki.osmfoundation.org/wiki/File:Appendix_to_violations_by_fititnt.pdf

2. I have been informed by the administrators of the Discourse forum at community.openstreetmap.org that your message #11 was not deleted. It was flagged as inappropriate by another member of the community, and in response to that flag was "hidden" by the forum governance team, which determined that your message #11 indeed is inappropriate. That action is within the scope of authority of the forum governance team. You have the right to appeal that decision to the OpenStreetMap Foundation Board of Directors.

I have set the "return receipt" flag on this message and respectfully request that you acknowledge receipt of this message, since you assert that you have received none of my previous communications via Anonymouse e-mail. I also respectfully request that if you intend to continue communication with the moderation team, that you continue to use the group address, and not respond directly to me.

For the moderation team,
Allan Mustard

On 2/20/2023 1:15 AM, redacted wrote:
Hi.

I just noticed there's a change on https://wiki.osmfoundation.org/wiki/Moderation_team_for_talk_and_osmf-talk_mailing_lists/Votes/Etiquette_Violations_by_fititnt_-

[A vote whether to ban his participation on community.openstreetmap.org and the mailing lists](#), however I didn't receive the email here.

Also, I actually need a reply with both requests or (which is an option) at least the moderation committee **officially** refuses to do it in my case. My contact email is **redacted**.

Still waiting since 2023-02-06,
redacted

----- Forwarded message -----

De: **redacted**

Date: sex, 17 de fev de 2023 20:37

Subject: Re: Moderation - [to moderation committee] request for fitnt case: publish links in exact context + archived copy of deleted content

To: <osmf-talk-owner@openstreetmap.org>

Hello again, moderation committee.

I am still waiting for the deleted content written by me on community.openstreetmap.org. I've been asking this since 2023-02-06 after notified about the suspension and perceived content was missing (but it is not viable to get email copy from private messages when silenced on Discourse, which is my case right now there), so since 2023-02-13 I've been doing it via email here to be more sure.

For forensic proposes, one example of the known links that was online for public but is no more is the reply number 11 of thread 6676 which roughly would respond to this URL <https://community.openstreetmap.org/t/lets-close-this-latam-community/6676/11>). This one even has comments from others about it.

Still waiting,
redacted

On Mon, Feb 13, 2023 at 6:45 PM **redacted** wrote:

I'm **redacted**. This request is for members of the moderation committee (seems to not exist a contact point without also admins of some of the email lists, so I'm sending to this one).

TL:DR: It's two requests (which by the way even the previous public committee decisions had similar approach for online/removed content, but are not followed on mine):

1. On the Wiki web page
<https://wiki.osmfoundation.org/wiki/Moderation_team_for_talk_and_osmf-talk_mailing_lists/Votes/Etiquette_Violations_by_fitnt_-_A_vote_whether_to_ban_his_participation_on_community.openstreetmap.org_and_the_mailing_lists> which explodes my case, it be edited to actually have links for the online content, so general public can actually see them in context,

including source of the specific replies with quoted text from me. *Rēs ipsa loquitur*.

2. Write a small comment on link from 1 about be willing to send archived version copy any message written by me which was deleted in community.openstreetmap.org. I'm especially interested in the threads with links cited on 1 (but these deleted messages are not quoted at all in the decision). To start, I'm the first one to request the deleted archives from my case.

That's it for the "too long; didn't read". Below are extra explanations of why (in addition to coherence with past cases) I'm asking this.

The rationale is the following. It's not just that is hard to anyone coming to committee decision see the actual exact messages to know context, but in special in the very same thread with meta discussion on the LATAM community (the one previous moderator asked to close the subforum, so no surprise things are escalated), as it is, one deleted content wrote by me last year (not mentioned at all in your committee decision, but not available anymore in public) plus (as genuine coincidence) lack of I'm temporarily not be able to update my recent post before the suspension to clarify it better, make it seems I'm against interest of my region.

I'm a man of honor. When I understand I did some harm, I have a strong tendency to do my best to correct, even if means appear weak in public or go after the root that made me believe and fix it. If I'm bound to any commitment that could conflict, I make it very clear, often explicitly upfront. This approach is stable, works great in the long term and even those who strongly oppose know what to expect or not. It's consistent. However, the selectiveness of what is completely deleted or not without notice (including long after written) on community.osm.org by someone under suspension/ban from the committee (even if all committee members are fully aware) is manipulative. It's a bad precedent.

This modus operandi, without changes, is likely to make it far easier to "win" argument: it makes harder to see actual sources, so it could work in the short term whatever be the decision. However, such use erodes trust at institutional level; it's not sustainable in the medium and long term. And without stopping to actually discuss the text of the decision itself now, yes, the source does have far more context, including acknowledgements from respected members from OpenStreetMap about the problems I was whistleblowing.

To finish, these very focused 2 requests, since are not an appeal at all of the content, are not something to ask to the OSMF Board of Directors. In fact, it would mean expecting them to research from where evidence comes from.

Waiting for response,
redacted

--

redacted

Full stack developer at **redacted**

Transdisciplinary researcher at **redacted**

Member of **redacted**
Member of **redacted**