**Notes Human rights review team 4 November**

*Present: Niels, Mallory, Shivan, Juliana, Gurshabad, Corinne*

Agenda:

*Reviews*

*Lessons learned*

*Guidelines draft updates (new version)*

*Gitlab*

*Reviews as rubberstamps (legitimacy of what we are doing?)*

*Reviews:*

Reviews done currently

1. Marnu
2. Meeting venue
3. Suit
4. Quic
5. Ipwave
6. Regex

Upcoming reviews

1. caports
2. doh/dot
3. WebRTC and MDNS

Question: How expanded do we make these reviews? NTo will do DoH/DoT in one, ESNI is a different discussion. Maybe we take the information from the DoH/DoT and turn it in an advocacy paper?

Question: Why review an RFC? Because it seems that it would be useful to apply our thumb on the scale. The DoH/DoT discussion is not yet resolved.

Question: Should we turn reviews into RFCs? Its dependent on the consensus in the group.

If we turn the reviews into RFCs that might also signal legitimacy for a potential issue paper.

Discussion: what it is the best strategy for doing advocacy at the IETF: issue paper or formal review. It’s easier to convince people with reviews than with an issue paper. But an issue paper might be relevant to do for wider community. And/and approach.

Discussion: audience for the reviews is a reoccurring topic of debate in our meeting.

Shivan mentions WebRTC and MDNS concerns: Mostly the draft is about privacy now but might have association and accessibility concerns. Right now, he has comments, unclear if it’s a good fit for a formal review.

*Lessons learnt:*

* With big and influential drafts, the interview/inductive/ethnographic approach works well.
* Gurshabad approach worked well (putting RFC 8280 next to the draft and match the different questions to different parts of the draft). See here for his approach: https://pad.riseup.net/p/fsEgWAHneHCS-keep

*Guidelines draft updates (new version):*

1. Are people engaging with it?
2. Are people still updating it?
3. Where is it going?

There are some changes to the guidelines – people who do human rights reviews should be updating the RFC 8280. When it was written RFC 8280 was all fiction and speculative, it was done without doing any reviews.

What is the projection for where this is going and how to we frame it for people?

Gurshabad suggested:

* Mentioning that we do other stuff besides protocols
* The preferable answers should be yes (and) to the questions (up for discussion)
* Guidelines could have an appendix with different review examples.

We should consider updating the guidelines with:

* NTo approach
* Gurshabad approach
* Amelia approach

Discussion: should we consider adding a “green consideration” for environmental impact of a protocol?

We can start thinking about new frames and flavors to bring in for reviews, like we did with feminism:

* UNGP
* SDGs
* Etc.

*Gitlab:*

Discussion: do we do each or some reviews as a project on gitlab? Maybe for big or collaborative ones have an issue tracker and tickets?

Because it would be a low entry place for interested people to have a look at what we do on a public repo and get involved. And means chairs and others don’t need to hassle people for what is going on with different reviews.

Maybe ask on the list if this is a good idea to:

* Open a ticket when you start you review
* Close it when you finish
* And upload it to gitlab

*Reviews as rubberstamps (legitimacy of what we are doing?)*

Discussion: why should people care about our reviews? This came up in response to some of the reviews we did. Where people questioned why they should care about our reviews. IRTF chair suggested some changes the introduction language of reviews. Right now: We find people who are doing good work and review that (that’s why we review MLS). But It’s harder to get legitimacy for bad drafts and to get people to care (Regex)

To do:

* Further conversation about issue paper on DoH/DoT
* Bring some of the discussion points to the HRPC discussion
* Talk more about who our audiences are for the reviews
* Further develop the draft guidelines (add NTo, Gurshabad, and Amelia approaches)
* Ask list what they think about doing reviews on gitlab
* Give more thought about what our legitimacy model is for reviews