

EASE 2026/2179: nine public resources disclosed, no DPIA held by DG CONNECT, substantive review pending

On 16 July 2026, almost three months after my initial access-to-documents request, DG CONNECT issued its initial decision concerning the EU Age Verification Solution.

I had requested access to:

- any existing Data Protection Impact Assessment
- documentation of data protection by design and by default
- documentation concerning passport data, facial images and biometric processing during onboarding and verification
- internal reports, assessments or technical documentation addressing risks of identification, correlation or tracking

DG CONNECT identified nine documents and granted full access to all of them. However, all nine entries concern publicly available material:

- the EUDI Wallet Architecture and Reference Framework
- a general discussion paper on privacy risks and mitigations
- a discussion paper on authentication of the user to the device
- a discussion paper on pseudonyms and privacy-enhancing technologies
- pages from the public EU Age Verification Blueprint portal
- the public architecture and technical specifications
- the public Age Verification Profile
- an overview linking to public source-code repositories

Documents 6 and 7 in the decision appear to point to the same “Overall architecture” page.

No application-specific DPIA was disclosed. No internal dataflow, controller-role assessment, threat model or application-specific privacy-by-design assessment was identified.

DG CONNECT stated that it does not hold a DPIA because responsibility for conducting one lies with the entity that will publish the application, which it considers to be the controller.

My concern is not based on an assumption that DG CONNECT was necessarily required to conduct a DPIA.

The issue is that this reasoning does not establish whether an adequate search for existing documents was carried out. Whether DG CONNECT was legally required to prepare a DPIA is distinct from whether the Commission holds or has received a DPIA, draft, screening assessment or related documentation prepared by another Commission service, contractor, consortium member or pilot participant.

Nor does the publisher-only reasoning exclude possible responsibilities connected with Commission-led development, contracted work, demonstrations, hosted test services or pilot testing. The allocation of controller responsibilities requires an activity-specific factual assessment.

This is particularly relevant in light of the Commission President’s statement of 15 April 2026 that the application was “technically ready”, would be set up using a passport or identity card, was “completely anonymous” and that users could not be tracked.

Statements of that strength would reasonably be expected to have a documented basis, such as dataflows, privacy-by-design assessments, controller-role analysis, threat models and technical evidence supporting anonymity and unlinkability.

Saying that the future publisher will be the controller does not explain what assessments supported the Commission's own public claims during Commission-led development, contracted work, demonstrations and pilot testing.

The disclosed public material itself presents a more qualified picture.

It describes the white-label application as a reference implementation that is not feature complete and requires further integration before production deployment. The public demo is expressly intended for testing and illustration and is not described as a production-ready solution.

The architecture envisages passport reading, document-authenticity checks, liveness detection and facial comparison. At the same time, some of these services are not included in the supplied implementation and must be provided by individual implementers.

The documents also do not appear fully aligned regarding the present implementation of zero-knowledge proofs. Some public material states that unlinkability is achieved through ZKP, while other sections describe ZKP as recommended, experimental or intended for a later version.

On 17 July, the Secretariat-General closed my earlier confirmatory application concerning the Commission's failure to provide its initial reply within the statutory time limit. It considered that the late decision of 16 July had replaced the implied refusal.

That closure does not conclude the substantive dispute.

My submission against DG CONNECT's decision has been registered as a new confirmatory application under Regulation 1049/2001. The current deadline is 10 August 2026.

I have requested:

- a renewed search across relevant Commission services, project and procurement files, contractor records, pilot documentation and technical repositories
- clarification of whether any DPIA screening, draft DPIA, controller assessment, dataflow, threat model, security assessment or privacy-by-design analysis is held
- fixed copies or precise version information for the nine public and continuously updated resources
- clarification of an apparent inconsistency in the decision, which states both that full access was granted and that parts of documents were withheld under Article 4

Attached are redacted copies of DG CONNECT's initial decision of 16 July and the Secretariat-General's closing letter of 17 July. My postal address, electronic signature fields and the names of individual officials have been redacted. My own name remains visible.

The procedural complaint about the delayed initial reply has therefore been closed. The substantive review remains pending.

So what documented basis supported the Commission's strong public claims about technical readiness, complete anonymity, unlinkability and the impossibility of tracking?



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR COMMUNICATIONS NETWORKS, CONTENT AND
TECHNOLOGY

The Director-General

Brussels, 16 July 2026
CNECT.R.4.001

Mr Morten Larsen



Subject: Your application for access to documents – EASE 2026/2179

Dear Mr Larsen,

We refer to your request for access to documents pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents (hereinafter ‘Regulation 1049/2001’), which was registered on 26 April 2026 under the abovementioned reference number. We also refer to our holding reply, dated 21 May 2026, our reference Ares(2026)5169511 whereby we informed you that the time limit for handling your application was extended by 15 working days pursuant to Article 7(3) of Regulation 1049/2001.

1. SCOPE OF YOUR APPLICATION

You request access to the following document:

‘I am writing to request access to documents pursuant to Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001. This request concerns documents held by the European Commission relating to the EU age verification application developed in the context of the EU Digital Identity Wallet framework. I request access to the following documents:

- any existing Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) relating to the application*
- any documents or reports describing how data protection by design and by default (Article 27 of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725) is implemented in the application*
- any documents describing the processing of biometric data (including passport data and facial images) in relation to onboarding and verification*
- any internal reports, assessments, or technical documentation addressing risks of identification, correlation, or tracking in the application [...]*

2. DOCUMENTS FALLING WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE REQUEST

We have identified the following documents as falling within the scope of your application:

- EUDI Wallet - Architecture and Reference Framework, ('Document 1');
- Data protection by design, ('Document 2');
- Biometric data processing in onboarding and verification, ('Document 3');
- Pseudonymization, selective disclosure, privacy enhancing cryptographic mechanisms, ('Document 4');
- EU Age Verification blueprint, dedicated technical portal, ('Document 5');
- Architecture and technical specifications, ('Document 6');
- General design principle, ('Document 7');
- Data model, ('Document 8');
- Source code, ('Document 9').

3. ASSESSMENT UNDER REGULATION 1049/2001

Following an examination of the identified documents under the provisions of Regulation 1049/2001, we have arrived at the conclusion that full access can be granted to the nine documents. For a part of your request, DG CONNECT does not hold any document falling within the scope of your request.

A. Full disclosure

Documents 1-9 are being fully disclosed.

Please note that Document 1 is publicly available via the following link;

<https://eudi.dev/2.8.0/architecture-and-reference-framework-main/>

Please note that Document 2 is publicly available via the following link;

<https://github.com/eu-digital-identity-wallet/eudi-doc-architecture-and-reference-framework/blob/main/docs/discussion-topics/a-privacy-risks-and-mitigations.md>

Please note that Document 3 is publicly available via the following link;

<https://github.com/eu-digital-identity-wallet/eudi-doc-architecture-and-reference-framework/blob/main/docs/discussion-topics/r-authentication-of-user-to-device.md>

Please note that Document 4 is publicly available via the following link;

<https://github.com/eu-digital-identity-wallet/eudi-doc-architecture-and-reference-framework/blob/main/docs/discussion-topics/e-rr-pseudonyms-including-user-authentication-mechanism.md>

Please note that Document 5 is publicly available via the following link;

[EU Age Verification Blueprint — the dedicated technical portal](#)

Please note that Document 6 is publicly available via the following link;

[Overall architecture - EU Age Verification Blueprint — the dedicated technical portal](#)

Please note that Document 7 is publicly available via the following link;

[Overall architecture - EU Age Verification Blueprint — the dedicated technical portal](#)

Please note that Document 8 is publicly available via the following link;

[AV Profile - EU Age Verification Blueprint — the dedicated technical portal](#)

Please note that Document 9 is publicly available via the following link;

[Overview - EU Age Verification Blueprint — the dedicated technical portal](#)

B. No documents held

We regret to inform you that DG CONNECT does not hold any documents that would correspond to the description given in the first indent of your application, i.e Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA). Please note that the responsibility for conducting a DPIA lays with the data controller which is, for the present case, the entity that is going to publish the application. Since DG CONNECT is not controller, no related DPIA is held.

As specified in Article 2(3) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, the right of access as defined in that regulation applies only to existing documents in the possession of the institution.

Given that no such documents, corresponding to the description given in your application, are held by DG CONNECT, DG CONNECT is not in a position to fulfil your request.

4. OVERRIDING PUBLIC INTEREST IN DISCLOSURE

The exceptions laid down in Article 4(2) and Article 4(3) of Regulation 1049/2001 apply, unless there is an overriding public interest in the disclosure of documents. Such an interest must, firstly, be a public interest and, secondly, outweigh the harm caused by disclosure. We have examined whether there could be an overriding public interest in the disclosure of the parts of the documents which are being withheld but we have not been able to identify such an interest.

5. REUSE OF DOCUMENTS

You may reuse public documents which have been produced by the European Commission or by public and private entities on its behalf based on the [Commission Decision on the reuse of the Commission documents](#). You may reuse Documents 1-9 free of charge and for non-commercial and commercial purposes provided that the source is acknowledged and that you do not distort the original meaning or message of the documents. Please note that the Commission does not assume liability stemming from the reuse.

6. CONFIRMATORY APPLICATION

In accordance with Article 7(2) of Regulation 1049/2001, you are entitled to make a confirmatory application requesting the Commission to review this position.

Such confirmatory application should be addressed within 15 working days upon receipt of this letter to the Secretariat-General of the Commission **by asking for a review via your**

portal ⁽¹⁾⁽¹¹⁾ **account** (available only for initial requests submitted via the portal account), or via at the following address:

European Commission
Secretariat-General
Transparency, Document Management & Access to Documents (SG.C.1)
BERL 7/076
B-1049 Bruxelles,

or by email to: sg-acc-doc@ec.europa.eu

Yours sincerely,

Electronically signed



⁽¹⁾⁽¹¹⁾ <https://www.ec.europa.eu/transparency/documents-request>



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Secretariat-General

Directorate A – Corporate governance, Transparency and Resources

SG.A.2 - Document Management and Access to Documents

Brussels,

Morten Larsen

Subject: Your confirmatory application for access to documents under Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 – EASE 2026/2179

Dear Mr. Larsen,

I am writing in reference to your confirmatory application registered on 18 June 2026, submitted in accordance with Article 7(4) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents ¹ [hereafter 'Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001'].

Your confirmatory application was submitted in relation to your initial application of 26 April 2026, in which you requested access to:

[...] documents held by the European Commission relating to the EU age verification application developed in the context of the EU Digital Identity Wallet framework. [...]:

- any existing Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) relating to the application*
- any documents or reports describing how data protection by design and by default (Article 27 of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725) is implemented in the application*
- any documents describing the processing of biometric data (including passport data and facial images) in relation to onboarding and verification*
- any internal reports, assessments, or technical documentation addressing risks of identification, correlation, or tracking in the application*

The initial request was assigned to the Directorate-General for Communications Networks, Content and Technology. As you did not receive an initial reply within the statutory time limits, you submitted a confirmatory application on 18 June 2026.

¹ OJ L 145, 31.5.2001, p. 43.

In the meantime, the initial reply in question was sent to you on 16 July 2026 [under reference number Ares(2026)7096052].

Against this background, the Secretariat-General will close your confirmatory application related to the lack of initial reply.

Please note that the explicit initial decision you received on 16 July 2026 substituted the implied negative decision, which can thus not form the subject of an action for annulment under Article 263 TFEU².

You remain entitled to submit a new confirmatory application in accordance with Article 7(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001, should you wish to request a review of the initial reply of 16 July 2026.

Yours sincerely,



² Order of the General Court of 14 April 2025, *Molitorisová v Commission*, T-353/24, paragraph 39, upheld by Judgment of the Court of Justice of 4 June 2026, *Molitorisová v Commission*, C-396/25 P, ECLI:EU:C:2026:457.