

Worksheets Discussed to Date	Next Steps
<p data-bbox="203 594 724 663">Display of information of affiliated vs. accredited privacy / proxy providers</p> <p data-bbox="203 793 792 1020">Rr Comment: Yes, a briefing from a PPSAI IRT member would be helpful, and a DPIA on PPSAI is a good idea but not sure who should conduct that DPIA — ideally someone with experience and expertise in data privacy laws and impact assessments.</p>	<ol data-bbox="873 743 1419 1608" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="873 743 1419 1171">1. Proposed briefing by a member of the PPSAI IRT to assess how the EPDP Team’s work fits in with the IRT’s work – does the EPDP Team think this would be helpful? Additionally, another member of the small team requested a briefing regarding a data privacy impact assessment on the PPSAI program – does the EPDP Team agree to this briefing, and if so – who should provide this briefing?<li data-bbox="873 1222 1419 1411">2. If yes, following briefing from PPSAI IRT, EPDP Team to formulate question(s) for PPSAI IRT to obtain required information to determine next steps (via google doc)<li data-bbox="873 1461 1419 1608">3. Concurrently with Step 2, Legal Committee to review proposed draft legal questions and determine if they should be forwarded to Bird & Bird.

Legal vs. natural persons

1. Small Team proposed briefing from Bird & Bird re: legal vs. natural memo.
2. Legal Committee to review draft questions submitted to determine if they should be forwarded to Bird & Bird.
3. EPDP Team to confirm with ICANN Org expected next steps and timing to conduct and publish the study results.
4. EPDP Team or Sub-team to work with ICANN org on this study, including providing questions and/or relevant background to assist in informing the study by 1 July 2019.

City field redaction

Rr Comment: 1 here should not refer to legal vs natural, it should refer to city field redaction.

1. Small Team proposed briefing from Bird & Bird re: legal vs. natural memo.
2. Legal Committee to review draft questions submitted to determine if they should be forwarded to Bird & Bird.
3. Following receipt of legal advice, EPDP Team to further deliberate on this issue with other workstream 2 items, unless it is determined that it can easily be addressed through mailing list discussions.

<p>Data retention</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. EPDP Team to confirm with ICANN org when the review of all of ICANN org's processes and procedures to identify and document the instances in which personal data is requested beyond the life of domain name registration is expected to be completed. 2. Once ICANN's review is complete, EPDP Team to review the outcome and confirm whether the data retention requirements recommended in phase 1 are to be confirmed or whether updates are needed.
<p>Potential OCTO Purpose</p> <p>Rr Comment: Indeed, we do not need to know about what OCTO did more than a year ago, we need to know what they do now and what they plan to do in the future.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Further to Recommendation 2, EPDP Team to draft question to ICANN org, to inform next steps. (Note: one member of small team requested briefing by ICANN OCTO on the use of personal registration data prior to the adoption of the Temporary Specification, but this proposal did not receive broad agreement.) 2. If ICANN org notes it does process personal registration data in a research capacity, Legal Committee to review draft legal questions to Bird & Bird regarding qualified research position under GDPR. 3. Pending receipt of further legal advice (if any), EPDP Leadership to propose

	<p>outline of next steps for resolution of this issue.</p>
<p>Accuracy and WHOIS</p> <p>Feasibility of unique contacts to have a uniform anonymized email address</p> <p>Rr Comments: The uniform anonymized email was discussed in a meeting on June 17, it is incorrect to say no input was provided. We did not discuss accuracy requirements at that meeting. There were next steps identified at the meeting, including ICANN Staff to review F2F transcripts for what B&B said about how a unique identifier becomes PII, and there were legal questions added to the worksheet that need to be forwarded to B&B.</p> <p>The actions column for this topic says that we'll review after ICANN65 but it also has two points that do seem to be the correct next steps, so maybe these two topics (accuracy and whois vs. uniform anonymized email) should just be separated out in this next steps tracker, so we can track correctly that we do have next steps for the uniform anonymized email topic.</p>	<p><i>Meeting to be scheduled post ICANN65 to review worksheet – no input provided to date</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Legal Committee to review draft questions submitted to determine if they should be forwarded to Bird & Bird. 2. Following receipt of legal advice, EPDP Leadership to propose outline of next steps for resolution of this issue.