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Background

- draft-association is one of the specific rights drafts after 8280, specific to rights of association and assembly
- Joe/Stéphane took editorial role after Neils and Gisela handed off at IETF104
- Engagement to have a new version. However Joe and Stéphane both transitioned to new engaging job and didn’t have time to follow-up.
- We also feel the need to have more discussions with previous authors and the research group about some choices made or to be made
- We propose here a “way forward”.

Summary of the Draft

- RQ: “How does the architecture of the internet enable and/or inhibit the right to freedom of assembly and association?”
- Methodology: “test the causal relationship” [protocols -> associate, assembly] through “typical and paradigmatic cases”.
- 7 “protocol cases”.
  - Why them?
Three issues we’d like to talk about

● What is the aim of the draft?
● Why these cases and not others?
  ○ Should we privilege “event case” than “protocol cases”?
● Literature review
Issue #1 : Aim of the document?

Two stated goals:

1. “The document seeks to deepen the relationship between the Internet architecture, protocols, and standards without creating new guidelines”
   - Shouldn’t we talk about “human rights” here?
   - Why “without creating new guidelines”?
2. “To test the relationship between protocols and association”?
   - What does it mean “to test”?
   - Are we interested in the relationship with “association” or the “right to assembly and association”? Are these different?

Most importantly: how is this document aimed at informing IETF?
Issue #2 : the cases

● Current cases :
  ○ 1) IRC; 2) Mailing lists; 3) WebRTC (conversing)
  ○ 4) P2P, 5) Versioning (Peer-To-Peer)
  ○ 6) DNS, 7) Autonomous Systems (Grouping Together)

● Why these cases? How are they “typical and paradigmatic”? It is not explained in the document.

● If not these cases, which ones?

● Should we address “event cases” (i.e. something that “socially” happened”)? Which ones?
Issue #3: Literature review

This is easier to deal with but:

- We need to be more systematic and explicit in our review of definitions of “The right to freedom of assembly and association”.
- What are the limits of this right?
- Should we better distinguish between enabling the capacity to assembly (positive right), and disabling it (negative right) ?
- What about the “right to exit” (or to “dissociate”)?
- Have other people worked on the relationship between “right to assembly and association” and digital technologies?
1. Introduction
2. Research goal and research question
3. Literature Review
   3.1. The Right to Association and Assembly
      3.1.1. Legal and philosophical definitions
      3.1.2. Legitimate limits to the right to association and assembly
      3.1.3. The right to dissociate
   3.2. Digital networks and the right to Association and Assembly: review of current analysis
      3.2.1. Right to privacy and the right to association and assembly
   3.3. Work on related concepts
      3.3.1. Interoperability
      3.3.2. Digital activism
      3.3.3. Network neutrality
      3.3.4. Right to disconnection
4. Internet Protocols and the Right to Association and Assembly
   4.1. Internet Protocols and enablers of association
      4.1.1. Case 1
      4.1.2. Case 2
      4.1.3. Case 3
   4.2. Internet Protocol as disablers of association
      4.2.1. Case 1: Gatekeepers? E.g., AppStore can remove FB, Twitter (but not IETF-relevant?)
      4.2.2. SMS (non-authenticated, non-confidential), add Signal (proprietary and non-interoperable).
      4.2.3. Case in Turkey: DNS Spoofing, and user reconfiguration, higher level (BGP).
5. Guidelines and recommendations for protocol development

Possible new draft outline?
The way forward?

- We need input: the draft has to be made collaboratively. We can not work alone on this.

- We propose 3 online workshops/seminars to work on this before next IETF:
  - Before mid-December
  - Mid-January
  - Mid or end of February

What do you think? Who’s in?