From: Viegas <<u>gviegas1@gmail.com</u>>
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2019 3:26 PM

To: privacyframework privacyframework@nist.gov
Subject: NIST Privacy Framework: Preliminary Draft Comments

Hi,

My comments in attached template.

-George Viegas

						Comment	Suggested Change	
						(Include	and an analysis of the state of	
Comment	Organization	Submitted By	Page	Line		rationale for		Type of Comment
#	Name	(Name/Email)	#	#	Section	comment)		(General/Editorial/Technical)
1	Individual	George Viegas/	21		Table2:	I don't see	While we are mapping user,	Technical
		gviegas1@gmail.com			IDENTIFY	data	systems and data actions to the	
						retention	actual data elements gathered, it	
						schedule in	is crucial that we also record at	
						this section	the same time, the data	
							retention for the data elements;	
							Suggest adding a new subsection	
							ID.IM-P9 or adding this change	
							to the end of ID.IM-P8	
2	Individual	George Viegas/	22		Table 2:	I don't see a	Some Privacy regulations will	
		gviegas1@gmail.com			GOVERN-	categorisation	differentiate in the treatment of	
					Р	for	employees v/s non-employees	
						organization	from a Privacy standpoint. This	
						approach to	can result in a separate data	
						privacy of the	processing prerogative or not. I	
						employees	would amend GV.PP_P1 to read	
						differentiated	"data processing, individuals" to	
						from that of	read as "data processing,	
						non	individuals, employees"	
						employees		
3	Individual	George Viegas/	24		Table 2:	I do not see	Most privacy regulations will	
		gviegas1@gmil.com			GOVERN-	any timeline	require a timeframe to respond.	
					P	for any of the	All the subcategories here can be	
						sub	achieved, but the question is can	
						categories	they be achevied in the	
						here	timeframe defined by the	
							privacy policies and procedures	
							established at GV.PP-P1?	
							Suggested appending "within	
							approved time frame" to GV.MT-	
							P5 and GV.MT-P7	