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**Introduction**

The dynamics of information policy in digital privacy are evolving rapidly in attempts to keep innovative technologies in check. A significant issue is digital privacy discussions grow complex and vocal, requiring enhanced discourse as technology becomes pervasively interconnected in our lives. Kent Lambert identifies two complications disrupting effective discussion and the ability for individuals to “privately maintain presence, data, and dignity online” (2024). One is the adversities in ignorantly subjecting these discussions as a corporate compliance issue. Second is the complications technologists and policymakers have in engaging in comprehensive conversations to effectively collaborate their unique viewpoints. Lambert sees potential benefits in the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers’ (IEEE) Digital Privacy Model to aid in enhanced discourse.

**Policy Implications**

There are adverse policy implications from the growing and complex discussions on digital privacy due to the lack of effective holistic approaches. There are multifaceted perspectives that need to be effectively considered and incorporated as a result of technology continuing to make advancements and become more integrated into our lives. One of the complications that exacerbate the core issue is the lack of comprehension between policymakers and technologists. Despite having very different viewpoints that have interfered in reciprocated understanding amongst each other, the diverse perspectives are essential. The unique viewpoints are able to combine the unique inputs, experience, and expertise that can nurture an environment individuals feel provides adequate digital privacy. Policy implications that can result from a lack of their comprehensive discourse includes lags in policy, where technological advancement will continue to outpace relevant policies. Two political implications that pertain to this issue deal with technological innovation and policy lag. If technologist’s fail to discuss the emerging technologies, with feedback on experience and scope of capabilities to garner appropriate attention and legislation with the policymakers, there can be inadequate protection for individuals in the evolving digital landscape. If policymakers fail to emphasize the ethical concerns and consequences, technologists may be able to have more influence on policy decisions that overlook the broader public interest.

**Stakeholders and Involvement**

As aforementioned, a myriad of perspectives are essential to achieve ideal digital privacy that benefits instead of adversely impacts individuals. This extends beyond the technologists and policy makers. Without contributions of additional stakeholders, legislation may be influenced by bias and lack conscientious consideration. For example, there is a risk of narrow legislation when technologists and policy makers eagerly consider their own proposal yet lack consideration of substantial technical, financial or social barriers, obstructing their best intentions (Lambert, 2024). Lambert utilizes the IEEE Digital Privacy Model to demonstrate the diverse set of ideas and viewpoints necessary for achieving truly robust technical designs and social policies (Lambert, 2024).

Additional stakeholders to consider include government organizations, businesses and individuals. Technologists may be responsible for ensuring development of technologies that respect and enhance privacy. Policymakers may be tasked with creation and implementation of legislation. Government organizations can advocate and enforce regulations. Businesses need to respect and maintain privacy standards. Finally, individuals such as the end-users of technologies or digital products are end users whose diverse contexts and privacy needs to be considered. The IEEE digital privacy model helps acknowledge the different influences contributing to digital privacy, what they are tasked with, and encourages cross functional exchange and alignment in understanding of individuals’ expectation of privacy among all the actors engaged within this digital privacy ecosystem (Lambert, 2024). This model is a conscientious guide for enhanced discourse, aligning the understanding providing the diverse sets of expectations of privacy for individuals to receive trustworthy digital privacy.

**Personal Assessment of Issues**

This policy event is relevant in so many technologies. It is pertinent for the Internet of Things that further interconnect within our personal and occupational lives. There are many concerns that seem of little concern such as kitchens with integrated smart fridges, to smart cars that may keep track of our real time locations. The increasing services provided through online platforms such as in commerce sites for buying tickets having access to our payment methods and purchases, to mental health management and counseling having access to our conditions and vulnerable struggles necessitate as much legislation as their physical counterparts require. I appreciate the IEEE Digital Policy Model supporting the conscientious work from the several influences contributing to individual’s privacy.

An issue I recently explored in depth was dark patterns in online platforms. One dark pattern designers employed was privacy zuckering. Digital designers employing such techniques for websites and apps prioritize user engagement that overlooks individuals’ needs and expectations. Furthermore, this pattern manipulates and deceives users, compromising their digital privacy. A solution would be for legislation to become aware of the adversities and capabilities of these technologies, understanding not only how they enhance but also adversely impact users’ privacy. Individuals being able to advocate and share their expectations with government organizations have helped achieve legislation that outlaws such practices in the EU and UK (Woellner, 2022).

**Conclusion**

Lambert’s “Bridging the Technologist/Policymaker divide in Digital Privacy” and the aforementioned cases of outlawed dark patterns helps me observe effective and pertinent achievements of privacy expectations in the digital worlds that are pertinent to me. Individuals can voice their concerns and can benefit as a result with improved digital privacy protections. Policy makers are not the only thing that may voice concerns with technologies, as individual’s can voice concerns in other influences in the digital privacy ecosystem to ensure one influence will not bypass their expectations and needs. Finally, it supports that the digital privacy discourse should not be simply approached as a compliance issue. Information professionals should not simply make sure they are making it past legislation, but be considerate and conscientious of users and their needs.
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