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# Background to the STAR project

The STAR project (*Support Training Activities on the data protection Reform*) will provide support to the training activities of European Union (EU) Data Protection Authorities (DPAs) and data protection officers (DPOs) on the EU data protection reform, especially the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). The GDPR requires these two categories of data protection actors to undertake training activities (Arts 57(1) and 39(1)(b)). Each DPA developing such materials in isolation increases the overall cost, risks undermining the harmonising effect of the GDPR and puts greater pressure on its consistency mechanisms. STAR will thus provide them with necessary and efficient training materials and resources. In particular, STAR will:

1. formulate the training topics in close cooperation with stakeholders,
2. author the actual training materials,
3. validate and test them in pilot trainings.

This output will be freely and publicly available in a digital form. STAR is directly addressed to EU DPAs and DPOs; it also offers a benefit to other privacy professionals in the EU and beyond.

STAR supports the legal obligations of DPAs and DPOs to undertake training activities and, in order to facilitate their work, will provide them with ready-made, easy-to-customise and easy-to-run training materials, easily adaptable to specific training situations. STAR will also provide to the European Data Protection Board (EDPB) the common training programmes (Art 70 GDPR). The main outputs are thus the training materials and resources themselves. While their exact format and nature will be refined in cooperation with stakeholders, the following will at least be included:

1. Training scenarios for each training category,
2. A Seminars’ Topics List, based on the training scenarios,
3. Seminar Material for each one of the seminars,
4. Webinars (selected from the Seminars’ Topics List),
5. A training Handbook,
6. A takeaway reference GDPR checklist,
7. A ten-point GDPR introductory list.

# Executive summary

To harmonize the work between the STAR consortium partners coordination meetings are organized and held on a regular basis. Respectively, this deliverable presents the minutes of 6 coordination meetings concerning Work Package 3, held in 28 June 2018, 16 July 2018, 19 July 2018, 11 October2018, 19 November 2018 and 17 January 2019. The meetings were necessary to align the work of the partners during the second main stage of the project (i.e. developing the training materials for DPAs and DPOs), furthermore to discuss the general requirements and specificities of the deliverables (i.e. the training materials and supporting documents) in Work Package 3. During the meetings the topics of the materials to be developed were divided among partners and the details of the presentations, with special attention to inter alia the structure, layout, supporting texts, respective bibliography, length, depth, etc.

# List of Abbreviations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| STAR | Support Training Activities on the data protection Reform |
| DPA | Data Protection Authority |
| DPO | Data Protection Officer |
| EAB | External Advisory Board |
| GDPR | General Data Protection Regulation |

# Minutes from the first coordination meeting of Work Package 3

## Date and place

**Date:**

Thursday, 28 June 2018, from 15:00 till 15:30

**Place:**

Teleconference via Skype

## Participants

1. **István Böröcz**, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB) – Research Group on Law, Science, Technology & Society (LSTS)
2. **David Barnard-Wills**, Trilateral Research Limited (TRI)
3. **Filippo Marchetti,** Trilateral Research Limited (TRI)
4. **Gábor Kulitsán,** Nemzeti Adatvédelmi és Információszabadság Hatóság (NAIH)
5. **Renáta Nagy,** Nemzeti Adatvédelmi és Információszabadság Hatóság (NAIH)

## Minutes of the meeting

* **Agenda item 1 - Opening remarks and the adoption of the agenda**

The meeting was chaired by István Böröcz (VUB-LSTS). After preliminary remarks and the introduction of the participants, he invited participants to provide comments on the agenda, if any. No issue was raised, so the agenda was adopted.

* **Agenda item 2 – Structure of the presentations**

As this was the first telco after the conclusion of WP2 partners discussed the findings of the work package and elaborated on the upcoming steps. István provided a summary on the status of the project with special attention to the submitted deliverables and the forthcoming deadlines. David and Filippo provided a summary of the deliverables and the partners discussed how the training materials should address them. In particular, they discussed the structure of the Microsoft PowerPoint presentations. Partners discussed that there should be separate sections within the topic. It was argued that this separation would facilitate a clear overview of the topic and would assist trainers to differentiate between the difficulties of the subtopics, respectively to the audience. Partners discussed after that the comment feature should be used for every slide to provide assistance and guidance to the trainers. Partners agreed on the tentative formulation and extent of guidance in terms of the topics to be covered in the comments:

* aim and objective of the slide,
* pedagogic strategies and guidance,
* timing (importance) of the slide,
* an indication of the slide’s degree of difficulty [i.e. whether it is suited for data protection beginners or not],
* its target audience [everyone vs authorities, lawyers, data protection officers, etc.],
* list of respective legal provisions,
* list of respective case law,
* list of respective additional reading,
* further notes,
* its degree of importance [whether it is essential to deliver it, or if it can be removed without impacting the effectiveness of the training].

Partners also agreed on the importance of exercises, examples and draft questions which could be discussed during the lectures. As this was a short telco (partners had other commitments to fulfill), partners agreed to elaborate on the structure of the presentations and discuss it in July.

# Minutes of the second coordination meeting of Work Package 3

## Date and place

**Date:**

Monday, 16 July 2018, from 13:00 till 14:00

**Place:**

Teleconference via Skype

## Participants

1. **István Böröcz**, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB) – Research Group on Law, Science, Technology & Society (LSTS)
2. **Lina Jasmontaite,** Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB) – Research Group on Law, Science, Technology & Society (LSTS)
3. **David Barnard-Wills**, Trilateral Research Limited (TRI)
4. **Filippo Marchetti,** Trilateral Research Limited (TRI)
5. **Gábor Kulitsán,** Nemzeti Adatvédelmi és Információszabadság Hatóság (NAIH)
6. **Renáta Nagy,** Nemzeti Adatvédelmi és Információszabadság Hatóság (NAIH)

## Minutes of the meeting

* **Agenda item 1 - Opening remarks and the adoption of the agenda**

The meeting was chaired by István Böröcz (VUB-LSTS). After preliminary remarks and the introduction of the participants, he invited participants to provide comments on the agenda, if any. No issue was raised, so the agenda was adopted.

* **Agenda item 2 – Continuation of the project**

Partners discussed the possible platforms for dissemination: István suggested CPDP, Lina suggested the IAPP conferences, Gábor mentioned the annual DPO day organized by NAIH. Filippo pointed out that dissemination will be important only once materials are ready and the consortium has a clearer picture on the actual materials. Following up on the discussions in the mailing list, David agreed on the timeline: elaborating on the main topics in July-August and delve in to the details between September and January.

* **Agenda item 3 – Continuation of the project**

Filippo raised concerns on the number of topics to be developed. He explained that given that there are two addressees and seven trainee groups developing a separate set of materials for each group (i.e. 7X11 presentations) would be overwhelming and probably unnecessary. István pointed out that according to the grant agreement overlap among the presentations is possible. David said that differentiating and/or marking the target audience in each specific topic could be beneficial and useful.

Filippo raised the issue of consistency and the importance of review. The goal would be to have harmonised, consolidated slides. He asked the order and timeline of reviews. He said that 2-3 rounds of reviews could be necessary. Partners agreed that the process is important and the timeline and the details of the review (i.e. who is reviewing which topic) should be clarified. István said he will send a follow-up email with a respective excel sheet.

Partners agreed on to have another call in the upcoming days to continue the discussion with more details on the timeline, division of tasks, etc.

# Minutes of the third coordination meeting of Work Package 3

## Date and place

**Date:**

Thursday, 19 July 2018, from 13:00 till 14:00

**Place:**

Teleconference via Skype

## Participants

1. **István Böröcz**, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB) – Research Group on Law, Science, Technology & Society (LSTS)
2. **David Barnard-Wills**, Trilateral Research Limited (TRI)
3. **Filippo Marchetti,** Trilateral Research Limited (TRI)
4. **Gábor Kulitsán,** Nemzeti Adatvédelmi és Információszabadság Hatóság (NAIH)
5. **Renáta Nagy,** Nemzeti Adatvédelmi és Információszabadság Hatóság (NAIH)

## Minutes of the meeting

* **Agenda item 1 - Opening remarks and the adoption of the agenda**

The meeting was chaired by István Böröcz (VUB-LSTS). After preliminary remarks and the introduction of the participants, he invited participants to provide comments on the agenda, if any. No issue was raised, so the agenda was adopted.

* **Agenda item 2 – training scenarios**

István shared an email with the planned timeline on 16 July 2018:

* Mid-september: preparation of general materials (slides and list of handouts) for the 11 topics described in D2.4 (VUB, revision: TRI/NAIH)
* Mid-/end of september: list of corresponding national data protection acts and sector-specific laws (examples for public sector in the GA: ministries of justice or home affairs; for the private sector: telecom and financial industry)
* Mid-/end of october: development of training scenarios
  + plan/structure of the lecture,
  + objectives,
  + key issues,
  + ideas for discussion,
  + use-cases,
  + examples,
  + group tasks,
  + differences between training experts and non-experts,
  + etc. (to be discussed)
* November-February: refining and consolidation

David asked if VUB wants to provide the first iteration of the slides. István confirmed and argued that given VUB affiliates who also work on STAR conduct similar trainings and their materials could be used as a basis. Filippo raised again the issue of consistency and revision. After this, partners discussed the topics and the suitability of the presentations to be used as the basis. Partners had a brief discussion on the potential content and extent of scenarios. With the lead of Filippo partners discussed what scenarios should look like. According to him the goal would be to have ready-to-use suites, including scenarios, which identify a situation (training environment) and adapts the training materials. István gave some examples, such as timeframe, size of the group, format of the presentations, possible discussions and tasks. Filippo also gave an example: he expects the scenario to be different while teaching experts and beginners. The use of scenarios would facilitate the adaption of slides. The scenario influences the methodology of tailoring down the materials, thus the widest range of audience can be reached. István suggested that the clear indication on the target audience per slide would be one general slide – one slide for a specific audience. He also asked whether the consortium should provide to each target audience a separate set of materials. David argued that similar clusters could be given a similar set of materials with the adequate indication (e.g. to lawyers and judges who have a similar level of expertise). Partners agreed that the training scenarios should be further discussed only after the development of the presentations.

* **Agenda item 3 – Further action points**

David noted that the action points didn’t include the training handbook – including guidance, materials, how to use the materials – the GDPR checklist and the one page instruction to the GDPR. Partners discussed that these will be developed additionally to the training materials to complete the training suite.

* **Agenda item 4 – National laws**

Partners had a brief discussion on the difficulties to elaborate on sector-specific laws (i.e. topic 11). Given that sector-specific laws are national, covering them all (28 laws per sector) would be beyond the scope of the project. Gábor suggested to leave the space blank for national aspects but indicate nonetheless that it should be emphasized. Partners agreed to remain on EU-level and focus solely on the GDPR but indicate the importance of national provisions wherever deemed necessary. Respectively, David emphasized the importance of D2.4 and to rely on the findings thereof.

As the conclusion of the telco, partners discussed their availability during summer and summarized the action points to be carried out.

# Minutes of the fourth coordination meeting of Work Package 3

## Date and place

**Date:**

Thursday, 11 October 2018, from 14:00 till 15:00

**Place:**

Teleconference via Skype

## Participants

1. **István Böröcz**, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB) – Research Group on Law, Science, Technology & Society (LSTS)
2. **David Barnard-Wills**, Trilateral Research Limited (TRI)
3. **Filippo Marchetti,** Trilateral Research Limited (TRI)
4. **Gábor Kulitsán,** Nemzeti Adatvédelmi és Információszabadság Hatóság (NAIH)
5. **Renáta Nagy,** Nemzeti Adatvédelmi és Információszabadság Hatóság (NAIH)

## Minutes of the meeting

* **Agenda item 1 - Opening remarks and the adoption of the agenda**

The meeting was chaired by István Böröcz (VUB-LSTS). After preliminary remarks and the introduction of the participants, he invited participants to provide comments on the agenda, if any. No issue was raised, so the agenda was adopted.

* **Agenda item 2 – Structure of presentations**

David elaborated on the importance of the ‘notes’ section because it can provide additional information for trainers. It can be used to share the rationale of the slide, sample questions, answers, further references, etc. Given that the audience will be different, tailored-down guidance would be needed. István suggested to create a master presentation (Topic 1 as the sample with the agreed structure) to be used for consolidation and the development of the slides. He also suggested to put legal text in the comment, among the notes. They agreed that the clear or explained line of thinking is of utmost importance. Filippo added that the message, to be conveyed to the audience, could be written in the notes section as well. this would facilitate adaptability. He explained that indication via colours (i.e. flagging) for the trainees could be a used to suggest the target audience, their expertise. The goal would be to reduce the workload for trainees regarding the adaptation process.

István reiterated a previously discussed question: is there a need for a set of slides for every audience? He illustrated this with the already prepared topic 1, in particular the history of privacy, which might be important for judges but less interesting for the private sector. David suggested a marker for each slide based on its general nature of special topic and the specific audience. David also suggested that several slides could be ‘hidden’. For example: if a slide is not so important for an audience, it could be hidden but should be kept in the overall presentation to show the trainer every possibility and let him or her customize. István said that the topic 1 draft presentation should be used as an example and if everyone agrees on the structure, flagging, hidden slides, etc. it can be used for the other topics as well.

* **Agenda item 3 – Handbook**

Partners discussed what should be in the handbook. David explained that he received numerous handbooks and each of them relates to something different – slides, best practices, etc. He suggested to elaborate on the rationale of slides, best practices, scenarios. It is not intended to contain factual information about the GDPR but should contain guidance, how to best use the slides. For example, the summary of comments under the respective slides. A possible goal would be to make the handbook usable without the slides. the handbook could contain areas of discussion, misconceptions, etc.

* **Agenda item 4 – Depth of slides**

István raised an issue concerning security measures and technical and organizational measures and the depth of the slides. Partners discussed that these topics are very wide and require technical expertise, over legal. They agreed that pointing towards them including practical examples could be enough for the audiences. David emphasized that this is an area filled with misconceptions. David promised to provide some feedback on this matter. István referred to international companies, such as Nymity, and their solutions, advice on this topic. The question for data controllers is “what is appropriate” regarding technical and organizational measures.

* **Agenda item 5 – Public sector topics**

István elaborated on the need to define the subtopics of Topic 11. He suggested that the Criminal Justice Data Protection Directive should be mentioned as it is usually missing from the training materials. Filippo elaborated on the difficulties of adaptability, because of the number of subtopics, multiplied by the number of target audiences. Partners discussed that existing CJEU judgements could be an indication on the limitation of topics.

* **Agenda item 6 – Forthcoming tasks**

István discussed with the others the timeline concerning the development of the materials. He explained that within a week will finalize topic 1 as the example, including the features, comments, etc., discussed previously. David stressed the importance of a clear view during the development.

* **Agenda item 7 – Dissemination**

Partners discussed how the materials would be disseminated. István suggested to contact every DPA and DPO identified in WP2, send them the materials and ask for their feedback via a form. Furthermore, the materials will be available on the website and will be shared via social media platforms. David raised the concern of the lack of response. Specific events could be also targeted for dissemination purposes. They discussed the potential in workshops and webinars. Filippo pointed out that there is budget for travel in Work Package 4, thus dissemination could be done on various events. David pointed out that the materials should be used, not only evaluated. Filippo mentioned that during the interviews the intention of interviewees to use the slides has been identified. He also explained that consortium partners should not be the presenters but rather participate on events/trainings where the materials are used. Partners discussed that the travel budget in Work Package 4 allows the attendance on these events.

# Minutes of the fifth coordination meeting of Work Package 3

## Date and place

**Date:**

Monday, 19 November 2018, from 13:30 till 14:30

**Place:**

Teleconference via Skype

## Participants

1. **István Böröcz**, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB) – Research Group on Law, Science, Technology & Society (LSTS)
2. **David Barnard-Wills**, Trilateral Research Limited (TRI)
3. **Filippo Marchetti,** Trilateral Research Limited (TRI)
4. **Gábor Kulitsán,** Nemzeti Adatvédelmi és Információszabadság Hatóság (NAIH)
5. **Renáta Nagy,** Nemzeti Adatvédelmi és Információszabadság Hatóság (NAIH)

## Minutes of the meeting

* **Agenda item 1 - Opening remarks and the adoption of the agenda**

The meeting was chaired by István Böröcz (VUB-LSTS). After preliminary remarks and the introduction of the participants, he invited participants to provide comments on the agenda, if any. No issue was raised, so the agenda was adopted.

* **Agenda item 2 – Feedback on the draft presentations**

István explained that he revised and updated the topics, added further notes and reading materials. Overall introduction is from D2.4, outline is added, room for questions and the supportive materials among the comments (timing, objectives, etc.). Filippo reviewed and noted that the improvement is noteworthy, in particular the relevance for the specific target audiences. He noted the importance of visualization and adaptability. He asked how to assess the suitability of the slides for the specific audience. David noted the utilization of PowerPoint, such as hiding slides, sections, etc. István agreed that hiding could be an option and all the slides should be available for trainers, so they can make the decision on what to hide and what to present. Filippo pointed out the length of the presentations as they might be too long, given the number of slides per topic. István said that it is up to the trainer. Some trainers like to rush with slides, others like to spend 10-15 minutes on each slides. A possible solution could be the indication of the main takeaways from the presentation. With this information trainers would know what are the main points to be elaborated during the presentation and it is up to him or her, how to actually deliver the information.

David stressed the importance of examples and provisional questions, because, for the time being, the slides are rather “dry”. Scenarios, examples, visualisation could really help. István suggested to have one general but quite complex use case which could be used over the different topics and analysed from various points of view, like “Fakebook”. Might be better than referring to different cases with different names, etc.

Filippo asked is the consortium should ask someone for the visualisation and to develop a STAR layout. After a short discussion partners decided that the task will be carried out within the consortium. After all, trainers are free to change layout. Filippo suggested an initial slide which would give instruction to trainers how to change layout. The goal is to make the slides easy to navigate.

Partners discussed whether it would make sense to upload different set of slides with different hidden slides, based on the target audience. Partners agreed to leave this as an option an delve into it if the feedback of DPAs and DPOs suggest it.

* **Agenda item 3 – Division of topics**

Partners discussed who should focus on which topic. They divided it in accordance with the foreshadowed PMs to be spent in Work Package 3. The division of topics was the following:

* VUB
  + Topic 1 - Introduction to the European Union Data Protection Regime
  + Topic 2 - Purposes and legal grounds for processing personal data
  + Topic 3 - The rights of the data subject and their exercise
  + Topic 4 - Responsibilities of data controllers and processors
  + Topic 7 - Technical and organisational measures
* TRI:
  + Topic 8 – Risk-based approach to data protection
  + Topic 9 – Data Protection Impact Assessments
  + Topic 10 – Data Protection Communication
* NAIH
  + Topic 5 - Role of the DPO
  + Topic 6 - Role of the DPA
  + Topic 11 - It's not just the GDPR - GDPR related laws and special provisions

Partners agreed on to have a preliminary draft by the beginning of January 2019.

# Minutes of the sixth coordination meeting of Work Package 3

## Date and place

**Date:**

Monday, 17 January 2018, from 13:00 till 13:30

**Place:**

Teleconference via Skype

## Participants

1. **István Böröcz**, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB) – Research Group on Law, Science, Technology & Society (LSTS)
2. **David Barnard-Wills**, Trilateral Research Limited (TRI)
3. **Filippo Marchetti,** Trilateral Research Limited (TRI)
4. **Gábor Kulitsán,** Nemzeti Adatvédelmi és Információszabadság Hatóság (NAIH)

## Minutes of the meeting

* **Agenda item 1 - Opening remarks and the adoption of the agenda**

The meeting was chaired by István Böröcz (VUB-LSTS). After preliminary remarks and the introduction of the participants, he invited participants to provide comments on the agenda, if any. No issue was raised, so the agenda was adopted.

* **Agenda item 2 – Final changes on the slides**

Partners discussed the structures they used in their slides. David and Filippo explained to the others that they added some practical information at the beginning of the presentation, which should be removed before delivering it. They used the draft of Topic 9 – DPIA to present it to the others. Filippo introduced a colour-based system to differentiate between the difficulty of the slides. With using these colours (as small circles on the top-right corner of the slides) presenters will be able to customize the slides to address the specific needs of the audience while considering their respective expertise. Gábor suggested that notes in the comments should be used to further foster the usability of the slides. Given that every presentation “tells a tale” it is of utmost importance to clarify for the presenter what is the goal and understanding of the respective slide.

Filippo explained that he added a ‘Credits’ slide at the end of the presentation which provided information about the STAR project.

* **Agenda item 3 – To do list until the submission**

István told the others that for remaining time available the main emphasis is on the consolidation of the presentations. He suggested a timeline concerning the finalization of slides, the consolidation, the layout, the reading materials and the supporting materials. David said TRI will prepare the supporting documents, while VUB and NAIH will focus on the consolidation of presentations and development of the deliverables (D3.1 and D3.2). They also discussed that communication through email should be sufficient for the remaining time and if anything unexpected comes up, a further skype meeting can be held.