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Harkins is an outlier; he is not just an example of Corinne Cath-Speth's 'loud men talking loudly' in her 'IETF Culture Wars' piece i.e. taking confidently and passionately about the positions they understand and believe -- but Harkins is an out-and-out bully conducting ad-hominem attacks. His bullying behaviour goes back years, with years of attendant complaints to the IESG.

Key Take-Away

We Don’t Do Politics, and not just in HRPC.
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An IETF anthropologist

Am I lost?
ABOUT US

Anthropologists are everywhere, we study "up" (i.e. powerful people) and "at home" (i.e. our own societies.)
What, How, Why of Anthropology

What?
Study of human cultures and social behavior

How?
Participant observation, interviews, fieldwork

Why?
How cultural conditions shape society
Research Context

Human Rights advocates in the IETF & IRTF
Human Rights Protocol Considerations Group

https://hrpc.io/
Human Rights Advocacy in the HRPC: a brief overview
Privacy Considerations for Internet Protocols

Abstract

This document offers guidance for developing privacy considerations for inclusion in protocol specifications. It aims to make designers, implementers, and users of Internet protocols aware of privacy-related design choices. It suggests that whether any individual RFC warrants a specific privacy considerations section will depend on the document’s content.

Status of This Memo

This document is not an Internet Standards Track specification; it is published for informational purposes.
Policy Considerations for Internet Protocols
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Early RFCs research

Privacy by design: Networked computing, 1969–1979

Sandra Braman
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, USA

Abstract
Discourse analysis of the technical document series that records the internet design history, the RFCs, shows that those involved during the first decade saw privacy as a multi-dimensional and interactive problem requiring use of a suite of solutions at the network, individual, and data levels that had to take into account the need to balance privacy against experimentation and innovation. Internet designers were sophisticated in their pragmatic thinking about privacy when evaluated vis-a-vis theoretical developments since that time, viewing privacy as a contextual matter involving boundary setting, and using information architecture and metadata as tools for privacy protection. Those in the social science and legal communities think about the privacy effects of communication on humans, while those in the technical design community must focus on privacy as a set of logistical problems. Bringing these diverse communities into a single conversation can considerably enrich and strengthen the work of all.
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Policy as an Evergreen ?
Human Rights in the IETF / IRTF
Key Take-Away reshash

We Don’t Do Politics, and not just in HRPC.
“So, for example, I agree it would be wrong for the IETF to start taking positions on economics. Saying that we need an anti-capitalist IETF would be kind of stupid, right? Uhm. It’s never going to happen anyways. So, for the credibility of the organisation, for its sponsors, for the people here who make use of the technologies developed, it would make no sense to do very overtly political things.”

--Interviewee
Pervasive Monitoring Is an Attack

Abstract

Pervasive monitoring is a technical attack that should be mitigated in the design of IETF protocols, where possible.

Status of This Memo

This memo documents an Internet Best Current Practice.

This document is a product of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF). It represents the consensus of the IETF community. It has received public review and has been approved for publication by the Internet Engineering Steering Group (IESG). Further information on BCPs is available in Section 2 of RFC 5741.

Information about the current status of this document, any errata, and how to provide feedback on it may be obtained at http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc7258.
HRPC IMPACT?
LONG ARCH OF IETF PUBLIC INTEREST TECH WORK
Quo Vadis?
Thank you!