



35th Executive Committee meeting: 14 February 2017

Agenda and
Compilation of meeting papers
Tuesday 14 February 2017

Dialling Instructions

New Zealand	France	Canada	Morocco	Hong Kong
+649 379 4086	+649 379 4086	+649 379 4086	+649 379 4086	+649 379 4086

Once connected enter Conference call code: 859 701 8468 followed by #
For operator assistance at any time please dial *0

	14 February 2017
New Zealand	23:00 (NZDT)
France	11:00 (CET)
Canada	05:00 (EST)
Morocco	10:00 (WET)
Hong Kong	18:00 (HKT)

Item 1: Formalities: Apologies/ adopt agenda

ICDPPC Executive Committee Agenda

35th meeting of ICDPPC Executive Committee

14 February 2017

Meeting scheduled for 60 minutes

Agenda

1. Formalities: Apologies/ adopt agenda
2. Previous meeting (December 2016): Approve minutes of 34th meeting, review action points
3. 39th Conference: Shortlisting or selection of closed session topic (Chair)
 - Report on membership survey (Secretariat)
4. Updates on projects/work already under way:
 - a. 39th Conference: brief update from host (HK)
 - b. Working group on future size and membership of Conference (Chair/Secretariat)
5. Discussion of workplans of tasks allocated at December meeting but yet to get under way
 - a. Internationally comparable metrics (NZ)
 - b. Tasks arising from International enforcement cooperation (2016) resolution (CA)
 - c. Global privacy and data protection awards (Secretariat)
6. Accreditation: Update on process to be followed in 2017 (Secretariat/MA)
7. 40th Conference in 2018 (Secretariat): Recommendation from sub-committee
8. General business
9. Next meeting
In person meeting at IAPP Global Privacy Summit on 19 April 2017, Washington, DC (venue and time to be confirmed)

Action points from previous meeting intended to be completed by February meeting

Task	Committee Member	Notes
Secretariat to report on accreditation process	Secretariat	Complete
Secretariat to report on progress made on future membership and size of the Conference	Secretariat	Complete
Secretariat to report on the process and timing for the global privacy and data protection awards	Secretariat	Complete
CA to report on the scope of work on the task from the resolution on International Enforcement Cooperation (2016) Including residual tasks from 2014 resolution	CA	Complete
NZ to report on the scope of work arising from the resolution on internationally comparable metrics	NZ	Complete
Secretariat to update the terms of reference of the future size and membership of the Conference working group	Secretariat	Complete
Secretariat to survey membership for closed session topics	Secretariat	Completed
Assessment subcommittee to submit recommendation to Committee	Subcommittee (CA and NZ)	In progress
Secretariat to notify applicants of Committee's decision of endorsing their events as ICDPPC recognised enforcement cooperation meetings	Secretariat	Complete
Secretariat to circulate confirmed dates of meetings to Committee after members confirm their availability	Secretariat	

Action points from previous meeting intended to be completed by April meeting

Task	Committee Member	Notes
FR to report on how representation arrangements might be made more effective	FR	
NZ to report on scope of work arising from the resolution on human right defenders	NZ	
CA to report on develop common approaches and tools	CA	

Item 2: Previous meeting (December 2016): Approve minutes of 34th meeting, review action points

ICDPPC Executive Committee Minutes

34th Meeting of ICDPPC Executive Committee 21/ 22 December 2016

Chair: John Edwards, New Zealand
 Secretariat: Blair Stewart, Vanya Vida, New Zealand
 Canada: Daniel Therrien, Barbara Bucknell, Brent Homan, Miguel Bernal-Castillero
 France: Nicolas De Bouville
 Hong Kong: Stephen Wong, Fanny Wong, Aki Cheung, Ivan Chan
 Morocco: Lahoussine Aniss

Meeting opened: 10:55 (NZST)

Apologies: Isabelle Falque-Pierrotin (FR), Said Ihrari (MA)

1. **Previous meeting** (18 October 2016):
Minutes were approved.
2. **Committee tasks 2017:**
 - a. **General allocation**
Tasks were allocated as follows.

Tasks	Member	Brief notes
Standard tasks (principally arising from the rules, earlier resolutions)		
1. Accreditation	MO	Secretariat to submit a paper on the accreditation process
2. Assessing proposals to host 41 st Conference	Secretariat/Hong Kong	
3. Representation at meetings of International Organisations: Coordination	FR and MA	FR to submit report to April meeting
4. Representation at meetings of International Organisations: OECD, Council of Europe delegates	FR	
Tasks from the strategic plan		
Making resolutions more effective	CA and Secretariat	To be included in the scope of future size and membership of Conference project
Collaboration to share research efforts		Due to resource constraints FR will not be able to take on the task. Task deferred to next year.
5. Develop common approaches and tools	CA and FR	CA taking principal responsibility to complete the task. CA to submit report to next meeting
Tasks from resolutions adopted at the 38th Conference		
6. Internationally comparable metrics	NZ and MA	NZ to submit paper on scope of work at next meeting
7. Human Rights Defenders	NZ	NZ to report to April meeting
8. International Enforcement Cooperation (2016)	CA and MA	CA to submit a report on the scope of work to next meeting
Tasks from discussions at 38th Conference		
9. Future membership and size of the Conference	Chair	Secretariat to report on progress to next meeting
Miscellaneous		

10. Global Privacy and Data Protection Awards	Chair	Secretariat to submit a report to next meeting
---	-------	--

Action: Secretariat to report to next meeting on:

- accreditation process;
- progress made on future membership and size of the Conference to the next meeting;
- the process and timing for the global privacy and data protection awards.

Action: FR to report to April meeting on how representation arrangements might be made more effective to the Committee at the April meeting

Action: CA to:

- report on the scope of work on the task from the resolution on International Enforcement Cooperation (2016) including residual tasks from 2014 resolution to next meeting;
- report on develop common approaches and tools to a future meeting.

Action: NZ to:

- report to next meeting on the scope of work arising from the resolution on internationally comparable metrics at next meeting;
- report to April meeting on scope of work arising from the resolution on human right defenders.

b. Future size and membership of Conference

The Committee commented upon the chair's proposal regarding the process for work on the future size and membership of the Conference. In summary, changes agreed included:

- seeking to have surveying and questionnaire analysis completed in April rather than May if possible;
- including express reference to the purpose of the Conference and contribution of members and observers;
- considering matters bearing upon the adoption or effectiveness of Conference resolutions to be within scope.

Action: Secretariat to update the Chair's proposal in light of ExCo discussion to act as working group's terms of reference.

3. 39th Conference closed session theme:

In an initial brainstorming session, members proposed several topics to consider for in-depth discussion at the closed session. Topics suggested were algorithmic transparency, anonymization /de-identification, applications for millennials, blockchain, free movement of personal data in an emerging age of localisation, how DPAs can multiply their resources through cooperation, internet governance and data protection, multi-stakeholder

engagement, safe government information sharing, sensitive data: discrimination and risk management, sexual privacy and smart cities.

The Secretariat will survey the membership for reaction to those ideas and for further suggestions.

Action: Secretariat to survey membership for closed session topics

4. Conference in 2018:

The Secretariat updated the Committee and the evaluation of proposals to host the 40th Conference. A recommendation by the subcommittee will be made to the Committee by circular before the next meeting.

Action: Assessment subcommittee to submit recommendation to Committee in advance of next meeting.

5. Transparency of Committee proceedings:

The Committee discussed how the minutes and other Committee publications should record discussions and votes. The Committee agreed that it would continue to seek consensus on proposals, but should the Chair be required to call the vote, the different points of view discussed and the vote tally would be reflected on the minutes without attribution to the individual members. The Committee agreed to amend its Policy on Publishing Executive Committee minutes accordingly and to apply this to all its publications.

6. Annual cycle for host selection:

The Committee endorsed the Secretariat's proposal to place host selection onto an annual cycle with an annual deadline for proposals to be set each year by the Secretariat in early March.

7. ICDPPC recognised enforcement cooperation meetings:

The Committee endorsed the events to be held in Sydney, Australia (13 July 2017) and Montevideo (9-10 August 2017) as ICDPPC-recognised Enforcement Cooperation Meetings.

Action: Secretariat to notify applicants of Committee's decision.

8. General business

Schedule of meetings: MA mentioned that they would not be available on the date proposed for the meeting in August.

Action: Secretariat to circulate confirmed dates of meetings to Committee after members confirm their availability.

Next meeting:

14 February 2017 by teleconference.

Meeting closed: 12:14 (NZST)

**Item 3: 39th Conference: Shortlisting or selection of
closed session topic (Chair)**

- **Resource: Report on membership survey
(Secretariat)**

Note from Secretariat: Membership survey on closed session discussion topics

To assist the Executive Committee in its task of identifying a suitable in-depth discussion topic for the 39th Conference closed session, the Secretariat circulated a membership survey in January soliciting ideas for suitable topics. The survey also sought reactions to the topics emerging from the Committee's brainstorming session in December. Twenty-five responses were received.

Reactions to topics earlier identified by Committee

Members were invited to indicate 'I like' or 'I don't like' to a series of topics emerging from the brainstorming session or suggested by the Secretariat. The ideas were listed in a random order. There was no explanation of any topic but merely a summary description. Inadvertently one topic was left off leaving a duplicated topic in the survey.

The tabulated results were as follows:

	I like it	I don't like	Total
Safe government information sharing	85.00% 17	15.00% 3	20
Smart cities	73.68% 14	26.32% 5	19
How can DPAs multiply their resources through cooperation	73.68% 14	26.32% 5	19
Anonymisation/ De-identification	72.73% 16	27.27% 6	22
Sensitive data: Discrimination based upon personal characteristics. Risk management	70.59% 12	29.41% 5	17
Blockchain	68.75% 11	31.25% 5	16
Free movement of personal data in an emerging age of localisation	66.67% 12	33.33% 6	18
Internet governance and data protection	57.89% 11	42.11% 8	19
Sexual privacy	56.25% 9	43.75% 7	16
Internet governance and data protection	42.86% 6	57.14% 8	14
Applications for millennials	41.18% 7	58.82% 10	17
Multi-stakeholder engagement	25.00% 3	75.00% 9	12

The Secretariat recommends that the ExCo take account of the like/dislike responses in shortlisting topics. ExCo members need to bear in mind that the levels of 'likes' and 'don't like' can move up and down independently of each other and that the total number of responses vary and so it may not be desirable to use these figures to draw a hard line to reject proposals. The 'algorithmic transparency' topic was inadvertently left off the survey question and so is listed with other new ideas arising from

the survey. With these considerations in mind, the Secretariat suggests using the like/dislike results as follows:

Focus principally upon these topics	Topics not supported by survey
<p>Front runner (>80% like; <20% dislike) Safe government information sharing</p> <p>Mid rank (>70% like; <30% dislike) Smart cities How DPAs can multiply resources through cooperation Anonymisation/ de-identification Sensitive data: Discrimination and risk management</p> <p>Others (>60% like; <40% dislike) Blockchain Free movement of data in emerging age of localisation</p>	<p>Limited support, Substantial dislikes Sexual privacy Internet governance and data protection*</p> <p>Bottom two (more dislikes than likes) Applications for millennials Multi-stakeholder engagement</p> <p>* In error scored twice</p>

New topic suggestions and observations

The following additional ideas emerged:

- algorithmic transparency
- Connected cars
- Certification and privacy seals
- Person Information Economy (PIE)
- Non-personal data analytics
- Digital Infrastructure
- Big data in public sector
- UN's SRP's task forces

Item 4: Updates on projects/work already under way

- **4a: 39th Conference: brief update from host (HK)**

HK to submit update at the meeting.

- **4b: Working group on future size and membership of Conference (Chair/Secretariat)**

Note from Secretariat: Working group on future size and membership of Conference

Since the December meeting the Secretariat has:

- Issued a [call for volunteers](#) for the working group.
- Assembled a [resource page](#) on the website.
- Acknowledged working group volunteers.

There has been a slight delay in finalising the membership but it will be settled before the February meeting.

**Item 5: Discussion of work plans of tasks allocated at
December meeting but yet to get under way**

- **5a: Internationally comparable metrics (NZ)**

Plan of work for implementing Resolution on developing new metrics of data protection regulation

Lead: New Zealand

Reference and mandate: [Resolution on developing new metrics of data protection regulation](#)

Time frame: 2 years

Potential lines of activity:

- *Direct action:* Play a part suited to the character and resources of the ICDPPC to help to develop internationally comparable metrics in relation to data protection and privacy.
- *Collaboration:* To support the efforts of other international partners to make progress in develop internationally comparable metrics in relation to data protection and privacy.
- *Advocacy:* To identify ways in which the Conference can encourage the development of internationally comparable metrics.
- *Coordination:* Promoting common core questions in national surveys.
- *Dissemination:* Collation of data, calculation of benchmarks, publication of resources.

International partners known to be active (others may be identified):

- OECD Joint SPDE/MADE Group of Experts on “Improving the Evidence Base for Security and Privacy Policy Making”
- APPA Working Group on Comparative Privacy Statistics

Steps under way

- Secretariat preparing a ‘Census of DPAs’ in collaboration with OECD Secretariat
- Secretariat has called for volunteers for a working group
- Initial planning begun for a joint OECD-APPA-ICDPPC roundtable on margins of 39th Conference

Principal tasks

Work in the following areas is anticipated.

1. A major DPA ‘Census’ will start the work with a flourish. The census would be designed to:
 - create baseline information to provide an in-depth snapshot of current DPAs onto which data from subsequent surveys would build creating a longitudinal record,
 - include some questions from previous and concurrent surveys allowing direct comparisons and enriching the results of both the census and those other surveys.
 - include some topics not previously surveyed thus filling gaps in knowledge.
 - include some questions that reference topics that are or have been a focus for the Conference or international partners.
2. Detailed identification of where ICDPPC is best placed to be effective in this area. Outputs are not identified at this stage as they would be the subject of advice from the Executive Committee and working group.
3. Cooperate with the OECD in relation to a September roundtable.

4. Develop recommended common core questions for surveys. This would have phases of research, analysis and consensus-building as well as the development of a methodology for promulgating the recommended questions.
5. Some implementation work involving the website may be required.

It is anticipated that the work run over two years given the lead times. It is desirable that activity continues into implementation work and not just the design of methodologies and this cannot all be completed by September 2017.

The planned working group would have a role in tasks 2, 3 and 4 at least. The plan is to get the census under way before the working group is assembled but with a 2 year work plan it is anticipated that the working group would have a key role in reviewing the first census and devising a second one for 2018.

Timeline

Date	Tasks/deliverables (bold)	Involves	Notes
2017			
January	Prepare Census	NZ/Secretariat	Completed
January - August	Planning for joint OECD-APPA-ICDPPC roundtable	NZ	
February	Call for working group volunteers	Secretariat	Completed
March	Establish working group	NZ	
	Release of Census for response	Secretariat	Allow 3 weeks for completion
April	Provisional Census results available for analysis	Secretariat/ WG	Secretariat to follow up seeking as close as possible to 100% response rate, final results available in May
March - July	WG deliberations	NZ/WG	
May	Initial Census report published	NZ/WG/ Secretariat	In addition to initial report, further ongoing analysis e.g. at regional level possible
	Meeting of OECD Joint SPDE/MADE Group of Experts	NZ	NZ to share Census findings and other interim WG deliverables
July	WG/ExCo to complete common core questions and related methodology	WG/ExCo	
	Prepare reports and resolutions for 39 th Conference	WG	
September	Presentation of reports and resolutions for 39th Conference		
	OECD-APPA-ICDPPC roundtable	WG	Side meeting involving WG and attending members of OECD experts group and APPA WG
July – December	Review 1 st Census and design new one	WG	
2018			
February	2nd Census	WG	
Rest of year	Implementation and any new work	WG	

- **5b: Tasks arising from International enforcement cooperation (2016) resolution (CA)**

Report to the ICDPPC Executive Committee:

Enforcement Cooperation Matters

Canada is co-leading, in conjunction with New Zealand and Morocco, on matters arising out of the 2016 Enforcement Cooperation Resolution ([Appendix A](#)). We are pleased to provide a brief update on the tasks therein:

1. **Group of Experts on Legal and Practical Solutions for Cooperation:** In our capacity as liaison between the Group of Experts (co-chaired by the UK and Dutch DPAs, with our Office's assistance) and the Executive Committee, we wanted to provide a brief update on the Group's work to date.

Participants: We are pleased to relay that the Group has now been constituted. There are 13 participant authorities, with a reasonable geographic cross-section of representation – i.e. Europe (Belgium, UK, Netherlands, Hungary, Germany Federal and Rhineland-Palatinate Laender), North America (Canada, FTC, and Mexico), South America (Argentina), Africa (Mali and Ivory Coast) and Asia (Hong Kong).

First Call of the Group of Experts: On December 21st, the Group held its first teleconference. The main purpose of the call was to: (i) introduce the Group's primary (legal principles) and secondary (pragmatic measures) tasks; and (ii) discuss logistics, including the Terms of Reference and Calendar of work.

Terms of Reference and Calendar: Subsequent to that call, a revised Terms of Reference ([Appendix B](#)) and Proposed Calendar ([Appendix C](#)) were shared with the Group by the co-chairs. You will note that the calendar provides for gathering research (answers to a short survey) from the Group as a starting point for discussion. There will be a first substantive call in late February, followed by a first Group meeting in Toronto in April (OPC-Canada agreed, at the co-chairs' request, to host this meeting) and subsequent meetings and calls as outlined in the Calendar to finalize the Group's work product by July, for presentation in Hong Kong. These documents are pending finalization.

Next steps: The Co-Chairs and OPC-Canada are in the process of reviewing the survey responses provided by the Experts (e.g., provisions in national or other law which are impeding/promoting data protection and privacy authorities' cooperation) in order to establish a clear and fully up-to-date evidence base for the work. The Co-chairs will work with OPC-Canada to develop a structured first draft outline of the two work streams in February, which will inform the substantive discussions that are slated to commence late February.

The Group has identified the need for a password-protected online space for sharing reference materials and working documents. The UK (as Secretariat of the Group) approached OPC-Canada to discuss the need to implement a technical solution by mid-February, latest. Mindful that a password protected space does not currently exist on the ICDPPC website, OPC-Canada has determined that it would be feasible to set up a separate, password-protected shared space on the GPEN website. The space would be accessible only to members of the Group of Experts,

and not to other GPEN members. We have received positive feedback from the Group Co-chairs and the GPEN Committee and recently raised the proposal with the ICDPPC Executive Secretariat with a view to moving forward with implementation.

2. **Nominating Regional Leader Participants**: The OPC-Canada is prepared to volunteer to be the nominee for North America. We are also prepared to reach out to participants, by region, to identify nominees for South and Central America, Europe, Asia-Pacific and Africa, albeit that as we have indicated to our Executive Committee colleagues in New Zealand and Morocco, we would be happy to work with them in respect of identifying nominees for the latter two regions.
3. **Discussions with GPEN and other networks re practical projects**: We note that GPEN has included in its 2017 Annual Plan (published on the GPEN website) an objective to seek to work with other networks (including ICDPPC) to create a new tool like that referenced in Paragraph 3 the resolution, to capture information regarding privacy enforcement authorities (e.g., enforcement powers, jurisdiction, ability to cooperate). We will keep the Executive Committee apprised when and if GPEN is ready to proceed with this project.

We note as well that the shared space proposed in Item 1, above, could offer an excellent example of practical cooperation between networks.

We welcome any questions or comments the Executive Committee may have with respect to any of the items above.

Appendix B

**Draft Terms of Reference
Group of Experts on Legal and Practical Solutions for Cooperation**

Background

At the ICDPPC 2016 in Marrakech, Morocco, the International Conference of Data Protection and Privacy Commissioner (ICDPPC) adopted a new resolution on International Enforcement Cooperation, one in a series of past conference resolutions which makes progress on this important work stream in the Conference's strategic work plan. The Resolution mandates the establishment of a new Group of Experts on the theme of international enforcement cooperation.

The relevant paragraph outlining the work of the new Group of Experts is self-explanatory and reads as follows:

'1) To mandate a new Working Group of Experts comprised of interested International Conference members and ideally, representative of the Conference membership from across the different global regions to develop a proposal for key principles in legislation that facilitates greater enforcement cooperation between members. The principles could be adapted by individual members to their national, regional and local needs. The principles would be accompanied by an explanatory memorandum that can be presented to national governments by individual members and where appropriate, observers. In addition, the Working Group is encouraged to suggest other measures that it feels may improve effective cross-border cooperation in the short or long term. The Working Group is encouraged to work in cooperation with other networks of privacy enforcement authorities active in cross-border enforcement cooperation, and to consult with networks of enforcement bodies from other sectors where appropriate, and is directed to report back to the 39th Conference on the product of its work.'

Title of the established entity

The Group of Experts shall be known as (full title) the Group of Experts on Legal and Practical Solutions for Cooperation, hereafter referred to in these Terms as 'the Group'.

This document sets out the Terms of Reference for all members of the Group. Each Member of the Group agrees to abide by these Terms in their contribution to the Group's activities.

Mission

The Group is a data protection and privacy working group of data protection and privacy enforcement authorities. Designated Experts have volunteered their time and expertise to carry out the mandate provided by the ICDPPC Resolution as outlined in the section 'background'.

Group Members tasked with applying and enforcing data protection and privacy regulation will use this focused and time-limited project space to build on past efforts to ultimately facilitate greater enforcement cooperation between members.

Length of mandate

The expected duration of activities undertaken by the Group will be December 2016 – September 2017. If any additional time is to be requested, the extension of the Mandate given to the Group by the ICDPPC would be at the discretion of the 2017 edition of the ICDPPC in Hong Kong.

The Members should therefore make all best efforts to try to come up with a distinct product for presentation at the 39th ICDPPC in Hong Kong in 2017.

Chairperson(s)

The Group shall agree on two Co-chairs to steer the activities of the Group. The Chair's Mandate shall be for the length of mandate that the ICDPPC granted to the Group i.e. until September 2017.

The Co-chairs shall mutually agree on a reasonable arrangement to share the work of chairing the group. This arrangement should facilitate the timely and effective delivery of the products of the Group to the ICDPPC.

The Chairs shall be nominated and agreed at the first meeting of the Group.

It is possible for a Group Member to be appointed to lead a specific area of the group's work, working in collaboration with the Co-chairs and with the same goal of ensuring an effective output.

Composition – Members of the Group

Any ICDPPC member should be able to participate. The aim will be to ensure regional diversity in the composition of the working group. Each participant comes to this equally. It is also voluntary for conference members to participate.

Each Expert shall have satisfactory expertise to come equipped with the knowledge of the different advantages of different laws, and ideally, of international enforcement cooperation in practice. Prospective Members shall also confirm at application to become a member of the Group that they possess a level of decision making authority, or ready access to such authority, in order to promote momentum and progress.

Experts from jurisdictions that do not have specific intentions to update their national law can still be part of the Group and contribute to a wider global initiative to encourage governments to improve cooperation in a like-minded way according to the direction provided by the Group's work.

Those interested to become a member of the Group should apply to the Secretariat with:

- their expression of interest
- contact details
- confirmation that they meet the Criteria outlined in these Terms of Reference
- confirmation that they agree to abide by the Terms of Reference.

Termination of membership

Any Member wishing to terminate their Membership to the Group should indicate their wish to the Chair(s) giving 14 days' notice.

Organisation of tasks

The Group shall meet face-to-face and virtually e.g. by teleconference on at least three occasions.

The dates for the face-to-face meetings (a calendar roadmap for the work) shall be agreed at, or shortly after, the first meeting with agreement of the Chair(s).

The Group can decide, by agreement with the Chairs to establish sub-groups to deal with specific work streams which can meet in person, or virtually, by agreement.

Tasks

The Group of Experts will focus primarily on the development of recommended legislative principles, and three associated documents:

- One set of legislative principles.
- One explanatory memorandum explaining the rationale for the legislative principles.
- A short piece of practical guidance for ICDPPC members on how to use the documents with their legislators/governments at national level.

Such work could also include, should time and resources be available: development of a plan to raise awareness of the need to update national legal frameworks, making the Group's work available to shortlisted entities to be decided later, such as the UN.

The Group of Experts will also work, secondarily, on the development and suggestion of other pragmatic measures that it feels may improve cross-border cooperation. Specifically, this could include but not be limited to an alternative wording of certain paragraphs of the Global Cross Border Enforcement Cooperation Arrangement, which might allow for increased participation therein.

Secretariat

The Information Commissioner's Office of the United Kingdom will act as Secretariat to the Group for the duration of its activity unless decided otherwise by the Chair(s).

The Secretariat shall:

- act as a contact point for the Group's members.
- Provide assistance and advice to the Chair(s) and Members as required for development of agendas, useful materials etc. for the Group.
- Prepare any external communications required by the Chair on behalf of the Group
- Minute-taking for meetings
- Organize teleconferences and in-person meetings

The Information Commissioner's Office shall bear the costs of running the Secretariat.

Costs

Each Member bears their own costs for participation in the Group's activities.

Appendix C

PROPOSED CALENDAR FOR THE GROUP OF EXPERTS ON LEGAL AND PRACTICAL SOLUTIONS FOR COOPERATION

2016 – 2017

Date	Event and objective
October 2016	IEC Resolution adopted at the ICDPPC in Marrakech
November 2016	ICO liaison with other leading authorities. Draft of the scoping document and preliminary draft of Terms of Reference. ICDPPC member call to action in liaison with ICDPPC ExCo.
21 December 2016	First 'preliminary' teleconference of the Group of Experts. Introductions for the Group and familiarisation with the concept of the Group of Experts Agreement on Group Terms of Reference.
January 2017	Coordination meeting(s) between Co-chairs and preparation of draft documents/arrangements for first face-to-face meeting. Conduct research on existing provisions in law and other agreements on international enforcement cooperation
February 2017	Co-chairs work on a first draft of the principles to formulate a basis for discussion at the February teleconference
28 February 2017	Second teleconference of the Group of Experts Co-chairs to run the call from The Hague Discussion of the first draft produced by the co-chairs and identify work subgroups

March 2017 (beg)	<p>Teleconferences for sub-groups established by the Group of Experts</p> <p>First drafts of work stream outputs.</p>
11 April 2017 (confirmed by Host OPC)	<p>First face-to-face meeting of the Group of Experts – Toronto, Canada</p> <p>Discuss and propose amendments of first draft of work from each subgroup</p>
17 or 18 or 19 May 2017 (tbc)	<p>Second face-to-face meeting of the Group of Experts - Paris, France</p> <p>Meeting of the Group as many authorities from around the world will be present in Paris for the OECD meetings and the WP29 meeting with other international networks. Fine-tune the principles Embark on the work on the Explanatory Memorandum</p>
May – beg June 2017	<p>Teleconferences for sub-groups established by the Groups of Experts</p> <p>Aim: Take into account comments received post face-to-face meeting</p>
June 2017 (mid)	<p>Submission of updated drafts of both principles and Explanatory Memorandum (by email to Secretariat for distribution to Group)</p>
21 or 22 June 2017 (tbc)	<p>(if necessary) Third face-to-face meeting of the Group of Experts – GPEN Enforcement Practitioners’ Event – Manchester, UK</p> <p>Aim: finalisation of draft output for each work stream</p>
July 2017 (end)	<p>Final teleconference ahead of submission of documents to the ICDPPC ExCo Secretariat for the Hong Kong 2017 Conference</p>

Item 5c: Global privacy and data protection awards
(Secretariat)

Note from Secretariat

ICDPPC Global Privacy and Data Protection Awards

Including Chair's Overall Award for Innovation in a Data Protection Authority

Central idea

An awards programme to showcase innovation, good practice and effectiveness in data protection regulation. It is a simple and low cost means to 'accentuate the positive' and acknowledge leadership efforts amongst the DPA community both at domestic and international level. It will generate positive publicity for the ICDPPC, awardees and the underlying projects. It should be fun.

Organisational approaches

The plan is that the awards programme be arranged simply and cheaply. There will be no prizes – the award is the formal recognition by one's peers and the public acknowledgement. Awardees will get certificates and ICDPPC website acknowledgment. No separate awards ceremony is anticipated although the awards would be suitably acknowledged during the 39th Conference. The rules and arrangements will be kept as simple and flexible as possible.

Four categories

Entries would be invited in the following 4 categories for member initiatives in 2016 or any time up until the closing date:

- Innovation
- Dispute resolution, compliance and enforcement
- Education and advocacy
- Use of online tools

Judging

The Chair will make the selection for the 4 category awards based upon submitted entries. If he needs assistance he will call for it, if need be from external independent sources. For at least one of the awards, but perhaps for all of them, the Chair may ask the Secretariat to arrange an online vote amongst ICDPPC members to add some fun and drama to the exercise.

In addition to the 4 category awards, there will be an overall 'Chair's Award' for which entries in any category will be eligible.

Timing

- February/March – Secretariat to call for entries
- 21 April – deadline for entries
- May onwards – summary of entries displayed on website, featured in newsletters, etc.
- June-August – judging, including if feasible online voting
- September – awards announced (in advance of or during 39th Conference)

Item 6: Accreditation: Update on process
(Secretariat/MA)

Accreditation assessment checklist: Members

To be completed by secretariat	
Applicant contact	
Name of Authority and country/economy	
Description of Authority	

To be completed by principal assessor (Morocco/ another ExCo member)	
<i>Recommendation (select appropriate recommendation): Applicant meets criteria, or Applicant does not meet criteria</i>	
1. Is the applicant a public entity created by an appropriate legal instrument? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Brief comments</i>
2. Does the applicant have the supervision of the implementation of the legislation on the protection of personal data or privacy as one of its principal regulatory mandates? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Brief comments</i>
3. Is the legislation under which the applicant operates compatible with the principal international instruments dealing with data protection or privacy? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Brief comments</i>
4. Does the applicant have an appropriate range of legal powers to perform its functions? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Brief comments</i>
Does the applicant have appropriate autonomy and independence? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Brief comments</i>

To be completed by ExCo member other than principal assessor (CA/ FR/ HK/ NZ)
--

I agree with the principal assessor's evaluation that the applicant (tick the statements that apply)	
1. is a public entity created by an appropriate legal instrument	
2. has the supervision of the implementation of the legislation on the protection of personal data or privacy as one of its principal regulatory mandates	
3. has a legislation under which it operates is compatible with the principal international instruments dealing with data protection or privacy	
4. has an appropriate range of legal powers to perform its functions	
5. has appropriate autonomy and independence	
Brief comments	
Name of ExCo member	

The table below will only appear if an ExCo member disagrees with the principal assessor's evaluation.

To be completed by ExCo member other than principal assessor (CA/ FR/ HK/ NZ)	
I disagree with the principal assessor's evaluation that the applicant (tick the statements that apply)	
1. is a public entity created by an appropriate legal instrument	
2. has the supervision of the implementation of the legislation on the protection of personal data or privacy as one of its principal regulatory mandates	
3. has a legislation under which it operates is compatible with the principal international instruments dealing with data protection or privacy	
4. has an appropriate range of legal powers to perform its functions	
5. has appropriate autonomy and independence	
Brief comments	
Name of ExCo member	

Notes:

1. Where more information is required from the applicant the principal assessor should get the relevant information from the applicant.
2. Principal assessor's recommendation will be circulated via email to ExCo members. Where the ExCo agrees with the principal assessor's recommendation the secretariat will notify the applicant of the ExCo's decision.
3. If any member of the ExCo disagrees with the principal assessor's recommendation the relevant application/s will be discussed at the following ExCo meeting.

**Item 7: 40th Conference in 2018 (Secretariat):
Recommendation from sub-committee**

This note is to facilitate discussion at the Committee meeting and for the Committee to arrive at a recommendation. The Secretariat would want members to review all the information provided and come prepared to the meeting with a clear recommendation and reasons to support it.

Introduction

The Executive Committee delegated the evaluation of the 2018 hosting proposals to the evaluation sub-committee of Canada and the Secretariat.

Three hosting proposals were received from

1. [REDACTED],
2. [REDACTED], and
3. [REDACTED].

Process

The sub-committee evaluated the three hosting proposals against the criteria released on [26 July 2016](#) to guide authorities submitting hosting proposals.

The criteria focusses on the overall strengths of the proposal, closed and public session and side events, organisational ability, location and venue, financial ability and key matters addressing the objectives of the Conference. A new addition was made to the criteria asking applicants to comment on the general situation for human rights.

Proposals were evaluated with the information supplied and where matters needed further clarity the Secretariat sought additional information from authorities. Additional information was obtained from all the three applicants. A series of clarifications were sought from [REDACTED] on their proposal given certain complicating features of their jointly hosted proposal.

Shortlisting

All three proposals were well thought out and credible. Following a scoring process the sub-Committee was agreed that the [REDACTED] was not as strong when judged against the published criteria as the other two proposals.

Accordingly the Subcommittee recommends that the Committee limit its choice to the proposals by [REDACTED]

Subcommittee could not agree a final recommendation

The Subcommittee could not reach consensus on which of the remaining two proposals should be recommended. While the scoring process provided a useful objective filter to exclude the weakest of

the three proposals it did not suffice on this occasion (as it did on the two previous occasions the methodology has operated) to clearly differentiate the stronger of the two front runner proposals. This is because there is always a subjective element in such scoring processes and the Secretariat and CA viewed the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals differently.

[REDACTED], there was a consensus on the Subcommittee that both proposals were seen as strong and viable.

The subcommittee seemed to differ on its rating of the proposals in two respects:

[REDACTED] Level of detail in a programme for a public conference [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED].

[REDACTED] Possible conflict between events being held [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Conference: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Additional considerations

The Subcommittee limited its reflections to the considerations outlined in the guidance to authorities wishing to host an annual meeting. The Committee should also, of course, have serious regard to those considerations. However, there are additional matters that the Committee might reasonably consider when looking at two strong candidates that have both been evaluated as scoring strongly on the published criteria.

Without limitation a few such considerations might include:

- [REDACTED].
- [REDACTED].
- The desirability of progressively moving the Conference around different geographic locations is not a clear cut choice, noting:
 - [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
 - [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

- Measured from the preceding host city (Hong Kong) it is 9380 km to [REDACTED] and 14,120 km to [REDACTED].

Action required

The Committee must make a choice as to which proposed host to recommend to the Conference membership for the 2018 annual meeting.

Item 8: General business

Next meeting: 19 April 2017 at IAPP Global Privacy Summit, Washington, DC (venue and time to be confirmed)