

<p style="text-align: center;">Artykuły RODO, które będą przedmiotem dyskusji w dniu 23 kwietnia 2013 r.: <i>Stanowisko IAB Polska</i></p>		
Obecne brzmienie	Proponowana zmiana	Komentarze
<p><i>Article 22 Responsibility of the controller</i></p> <p>1. Taking into account the nature, scope and purposes of the processing and the risks for the (..) rights and freedoms of data subjects, the controller shall (...) implement appropriate measures to ensure and be able to demonstrate that the processing of personal data is performed in compliance with this Regulation .</p>		
2. (...)		
<p><u>2a. Where proportionate in relation to the processing activities , the measures referred to in paragraph 1 shall include the implementation of:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>appropriate data protection policies by the controller ;</u></p> <p>(b) <u>mechanisms to ensure that the time limits established for the erasure and restriction of personal data are observed .</u></p>	<p>2a. Where proportionate in relation to the processing activities , the measures referred to in paragraph 1 shall include the implementation of:</p> <p>(c) appropriate data protection policies by the controller ;</p> <p>(d) mechanisms to ensure that the time limits established for the erasure (...) of personal data are observed .</p>	<p>Przepis w zaproponowanym brzmieniu jest niezrozumiały. Mając na uwadze treść ust. 1 należy uznać, że administrator jest zobowiązany wprowadzić rozwiązania, za pomocą, których będzie mógł wykazać ograniczenia w korzystaniu z przetwarzanych danych. W konsekwencji na administratora nakłada się obowiązek dowodzenia braku innych możliwości przetwarzania posiadanych danych, co jest zadaniem sprzecznym logicznie. Z tego względu postulat usunięcia tego obowiązku.</p>
3. (...)		
4. (...)		

<p>Article 23 Data protection by design and by default</p> <p>1. Having regard to the state of the art and the cost of implementation and taking account of the risks for rights and freedoms of individuals posed by the nature, scope or purpose of the processing—, the controller shall, both at the time of the determination of the means for processing and at the time of the processing itself , implement (...) technical and organisational measures (...) appropriate to the activity being carried on and its objectives , including the use of pseudonymous data, in such a way that the processing will meet the requirements of this Regulation and ensure the protection of the rights of (...) data subjects.</p>		
<p>2. The controller shall implement <u>appropriate measures</u> for ensuring that, by default, only (...) personal data (...) which are necessary for each specific purpose of the processing <u>are processed</u>; (...) <u>this applies to the amount of (...) data collected</u>, (...) the <u>period</u> of their storage <u>and their accessibility</u>. In particular, those mechanisms shall ensure that by default personal data are not made accessible to an indefinite number of individuals <u>without human intervention</u>.</p>		
<p>2a. <u>The controller may demonstrate compliance with the requirements set out in</u></p>		

<p><u>paragraphs 1 and 2 by means of a certification mechanism pursuant to Article 39.</u></p>		
<p>3. (...)</p>		
<p>4. (...)</p>		
<p><i>Article 24 Joint controllers</i> 1. (...) Joint controllers shall determine their respective responsibilities for compliance with the obligations under this Regulation, in particular as regards the (...) <u>exercising of the rights of the data subject and their respective duties to provide the information referred to in Articles 14 and 14a</u> , by means of an arrangement between them <u>unless the respective responsibilities of the controllers are determined by Union or Member State law to which the controllers are subject</u> .</p>		
<p>2. <u>The data subject may exercise his or her rights under this Regulation in respect of and against each of the joint controllers.</u></p>	<p>2. The data subject may exercise his or her rights under Article 16, 17, 19 of this Regulation in respect of and against each of the joint controllers.</p>	<p>Wydaje się, że przepis dotyczy wyłącznie sytuacji, gdy każdy ze współadministratorów posiada taki sam zestaw danych o podmiocie oraz przetwarza je w podobnym celu. Praktyk obrotu wskazuje jednak, że są to sytuacje wyjątkowe. Najczęściej, dane jak i cele pokrywają się jedynie w pewnym zakresie. Z tego względu dany współadministrator nie ma faktycznej możliwości spełnić niektórych żądań podmiotu danych (np. prawo dostępu do danych). Niemniej mając na uwadze współpracę jaką prowadzą współadministartorzy, podmiot danych powinien mieć możliwość skierowania wobec</p>

		każdego z nich żądania o zrealizowanie prawa do poprawiania danych, do bycia zapomnianym i zgłoszenia sprzeciwu ze skutkiem wobec drugiego ze współadministratorów.
<i>Article 25 Representatives of controllers not established in the Union</i>		
1. In the situation referred to in Article 3(2), the controller shall designate <u>in writing</u> a representative in the Union .		
2. This obligation shall not apply to: (a) a controller established in a third country where the Commission has decided that the third country ensures an adequate level of protection in accordance with Article 41 ; or (b) an enterprise employing fewer than 250 persons <u>unless the processing it carries out involves high risks for the rights and freedoms of data subjects, having regard to the nature, scope and purposes of the processing</u> ; or (c) a public authority or body ; or (d) (...) .		
3. The representative shall be established in one of those Member States where the data subjects whose personal data are processed in relation to the offering of goods or services to them, or whose behaviour is monitored, reside.		
<u>3a. The representative shall be mandated</u>		

<p><u>by the controller to be addressed in addition to or instead of the controller by in particular supervisory authorities and data subjects, on all issues related to the processing of personal data, for the purposes of ensuring compliance with this Regulation.</u></p>		
<p>4. The designation of a representative by the controller shall be without prejudice to legal actions which could be initiated against the controller itself.</p>		
<p><i>Article 26 Processor</i> 1. (...) The controller shall <u>use only</u> a processor providing sufficient guarantees to implement appropriate technical and organisational measures (...) in such a way that the processing will meet the requirements of this Regulation (...).</p>		
<p>2. [<u>Where the processor is not part of the same group of undertakings as the controller</u> ↓ the carrying out of processing by a processor shall be governed by a contract <u>setting out the subject-matter and duration of the contract, the nature and purpose of the processing, the type of data and categories of data subjects</u> or other legal act binding the processor to the controller and</p>		

<p>stipulating in particular that the processor shall:</p> <p>(a) process the personal data only on instructions from the controller (...), unless required to do so by Union or Member State law to which the processor is subject;</p> <p>(b) (...);</p> <p>(c) take all (...) measures required pursuant to Article 30;</p> <p>(d) <u>determine the conditions for enlisting another processor (...)</u>;</p> <p>(e) as far as (...) possible, <u>taking into account</u> the nature of the processing, <u>assist the controller in responding</u> to requests for exercising the data subject's rights laid down in Chapter III;</p> <p>(f) <u>determine</u> the extent to which— the controller <u>is to be assisted</u> in ensuring compliance with the obligations pursuant to Articles 30 to 34;</p> <p>(g) (...) not process the personal data <u>further after the completion of the processing specified in the contract or other legal act, unless there is a requirement to store the data under Union or Member State law to which the processor is subject</u>;</p> <p>(h) make available to the controller (...) all information necessary to <u>demonstrate</u> compliance with the obligations laid down in this Article.</p>		
<p>3. The controller and the processor shall</p>	<p>3. The controller and the processor shall</p>	<p>Wprowadzanie wymogów, co do formy,</p>

<p><u>retain in writing or in an equivalent form</u> the controller's instructions and the processor's obligations referred to in paragraph 2 .</p>	<p>retain (...) controller's instructions and the processor's obligations referred to in paragraph 2 .</p>	<p>zachowania ustaleń pomiędzy administratorem a przetwarzającym może skutkować wyłącznie ograniczeniem swobody prowadzenia działalności gospodarczej. Nie zmienia tego nawet nowo zaproponowane rozwiązanie o formie równoważnej. Zwracamy uwagę, że takie rozwiązanie będzie oceniane przez prymat przepisów krajowych. Tak więc w Polsce będzie mogła to być forma elektroniczna weryfikowany za pomocą ważnego kwalifikowanego certyfikatu. Takie rozwiązanie jest nadal znacznym obciążeniem, szczególnie finansowym, dla MSP. Utrzymanie takiego wymogu będzie prowadziło do dalszego ograniczenia możliwości redukcji kosztów poprzez przenoszenie określonych usług np. do chmury obliczeniowej.</p>
<p>4. (...).</p>		
<p>4a. <u>The processor shall inform the controller if the processor considers that an instruction by the controller would breach the Regulation</u> .</p>	<p>4a. (...)</p>	<p>Nie jest rolą ani zadaniem przetwarzającego ocena czynności podejmowanych przez administratora. Przetwarzający odpowiada wyłącznie za realizację zadań zleconych przez administratora. Wprowadzenie tego przepisów rzeczywistości skutkowało by koniecznością powoływania w przetwarzających zespołów do oceny działań administratorów, co dodatkowo zwiększyłoby koszty działania, w szczególności po stronie MSP.</p>
<p>5. (...)</p>		

<p><i>Article 27 Processing under the authority of the controller and processor</i> (...)</p>		
<p><i>Article 28 <u>Records of categories of processing activities</u></i></p> <p>1. Each controller (...) and, if any, the controller's representative, shall maintain <u>a record regarding</u> all <u>categories of processing activities</u> under its responsibility—. This <u>record</u> shall contain (...) the following information:</p> <p>(a) the name and contact details of the controller <u>and</u> any joint controller (...), <u>controller's representative</u> <u>and data protection officer</u>, if any;</p> <p>(b) (...);</p> <p>(c) the purposes of the processing (...);</p> <p>(d) a description of categories of data subjects and of the categories of personal data relating to them;</p> <p>(e) the (...) <u>regular</u> categories of recipients of the personal data (...);</p> <p>(f) where applicable, <u>the categories of transfers of personal data</u> to a third country or an international organisation, (...) [and, in case of transfers referred to in point (h) of Article 44(1), the <u>details</u> of appropriate safeguards]-;</p> <p>(g) a general indication of the time limits for erasure of the different</p>		

<p>categories of data ; (h) (...)-.</p>		
<p><u>2a. Each processor shall maintain a record of all categories of processing activities carried out on behalf of a controller, containing:</u></p> <p><u>(a) the name and contact details of the processor and of each controller on behalf of which the processor is acting, and of the controller's representative, if any;</u></p> <p><u>(b) the name and contact details of the data protection officer, if any;</u></p> <p><u>(c) the categories of processing carried out on behalf of each controller;</u></p> <p><u>(d) where applicable, the categories of transfers of personal data to a third country or an international organisation and, in case of transfers referred to in point (h) of Article 44(1), the documentation of appropriate safeguards.</u></p>	<p>2a. Each processor shall maintain a record of all categories of processing activities carried out on behalf of a controller, containing:</p> <p>(a) the name and contact details of the processor and of each controller on behalf of which the processor is acting, and of the controller's representative, if any;</p> <p>(b) the name and contact details of the data protection officer, if any;</p> <p>(c) the categories of processing carried out on behalf of each controller;</p> <p>(d) where applicable, the categories of transfers of personal data to a third country or an international organisation and, in case of transfers referred to in point (h) of Article 44(1), the documentation of appropriate safeguards, provided that processor is the transferring such data.</p>	<p>Treść zaproponowanego przepisu należy doprecyzować w ten sposób, że procesor powinien przechowywać dokumentację związaną z transferem danych, tylko w przypadku, gdy to właśnie ten procesor zainicjował taki transfer.</p>
<p>3. <u>On request, the controller and the processor and, if any, the controller's representative, shall make the record available (...) to the supervisory authority .</u></p>		

<p>4. The obligations referred to in paragraphs 1, (...) to 3 shall not apply to:</p> <p>(a) (...)</p> <p>(b) an enterprise or a body employing fewer than 250 persons that is processing personal data only as an activity ancillary to its main activities ; or</p> <p>(c) <u>categories of processing activities which by virtue of the nature, scope or purposes of the processing are unlikely to represent high risks for , the rights and freedoms of data subjects</u></p>	<p>4. The obligations referred to in paragraphs 1, (...) to 3 shall not apply to:</p> <p>(a) (...)</p> <p>(b) an enterprise or a body employing fewer than 250 persons that is processing personal data only as an activity ancillary to its main activities ; or</p> <p>(c) categories of processing activities which by virtue of the nature, scope or purposes of the processing are unlikely to represent (...) specific risks for, the rights and freedoms of data subjects, pursuant to Article 33(2).</p>	<p>Treść zaproponowanego przepisu należy doprecyzować poprzez zawarcie odwołania do Art. 33 ust. 2, w którym scharakteryzowane są procesy przetwarzania, które mogą nieść za sobą „szczególne ryzyko”.</p>
<p>5. (...)</p>		
<p>6. (...)</p>		
<p>Article 29 Co-operation with the supervisory authority (...)</p>		

<p><i>Article 33 Data protection impact assessment</i></p> <p>1. Where the processing, taking into account the nature, scope or purposes of the processing, is likely to present specific risks for the rights and freedoms of data subjects, the controller or processor shall, prior to the processing, carry out an assessment of the impact of the envisaged processing operations on the protection of personal data. (...).</p> <p>2. The following processing operations (...) present specific risks referred to in paragraph 1:</p> <p>(a) a systematic and extensive evaluation (...) of personal aspects relating to (...) natural persons (...), which is based on automated processing and on which <u>decisions</u> are based that produce legal effects concerning (...) <u>data subjects</u> or adversly affect <u>data subjects</u>;</p> <p>(b) information on sex life, health, race and ethnic origin (...), where the data are processed for taking (...) decisions regarding specific individuals on a large scale ;</p> <p>(c) monitoring publicly accessible areas, especially when using optic-electronic devices (...) on a large scale ;</p>	<p>(a) a systematic and extensive evaluation (...) of personal aspects relating to (...) data subjects (...), which is based on automated processing and on which decisions are based that produce legal effects concerning (...) data subjects or adversely affect data subjects ;</p> <p>(b) processing of information on sex life, health, race and ethnic origin (...), where the data are processed for taking (...) decisions regarding specific individuals on a large scale ;</p> <p>(c) monitoring publicly accessible areas, especially when using optic-electronic devices (...) on a large scale ;</p>	<p>Pierwsze dwie propozycje mają charakter wyłącznie redakcyjny.</p> <p>Natomiast trzecia zmiana jest konieczna w celu zachowania „jednolitego rynku”. Dodatkowym skutkiem pozostawienia jej w niezmiennym kształcie będzie „forum shopping”, czyli zjawisko, które miało zostać wyeliminowane właśnie Rozporządzeniem. Przedsiębiorcy w celu uniknięcia konieczności dokonywania oceny skutków w zakresie ochrony danych będą na swoje siedziby wybierać państwa, gdzie organy nadzorcze są bardziej liberalne lub nie są nastawiona na regulowanie określonych gałęzi działalności</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>(d) personal data in large scale processing systems containing genetic data or biometric data ; (e) other <u>operations where (...) the competent supervisory authority considers that the processing is likely to present specific risks for the fundamental rights and freedoms of data subjects .</u></p>	<p>(d) personal data in large scale processing systems containing genetic data or biometric data ; (e) (...).</p>	
<p><u>2a. The supervisory authority shall establish and make public a list of the kind of processing which are subject to the requirement for a data protection impact assessment pursuant to point (e) of paragraph 2. The supervisory authority shall communicate those lists to the European Data Protection Board.</u></p>	<p>(...)</p>	<p>Propozycja jest konsekwencją zmiany zaproponowanej powyżej.</p>
<p><u>2b. Prior to the adoption of the list the supervisory authority shall apply the consistency mechanism referred to in Article 57 where the list provided for in paragraph 2a involves processing activities which are related to the offering of goods or services to data subjects in several Member States, or to the monitoring of their behaviour, or may substantially affect the free movement of personal data within the Union.</u></p>	<p>(...)</p>	<p>Propozycja jest konsekwencją zmiany zaproponowanej powyżej.</p>
<p>3. The assessment shall contain at least a</p>		

<p>general description of the envisaged processing operations, an assessment of the risks <u>for</u> rights and freedoms of data subjects, the measures envisaged to address the risks , safeguards, security measures and mechanisms to ensure the protection of personal data and to demonstrate compliance with this Regulation , taking into account the rights and legitimate interests of data subjects and other persons concerned .</p>		
<p>4. (...)</p>		
<p>5. Where a controllers is a public authority or body– and where the processing pursuant to point (c) <u>or (e)</u> of Article 6(1) <u>has a legal basis in Union law or the law of the Member State to which the controller is subject</u>, paragraphs 1 to 3 shall not apply, unless Member States deem it necessary to carry out such assessment prior to the processing activities.</p>		
<p>[6. The Commission shall be empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 86 for the purpose of further specifying the criteria and conditions for the processing operations likely to present specific risks referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 and the requirements for the assessment referred to in paragraph 3, including conditions for scalability,</p>		

verification and auditability. In doing so, the Commission shall consider specific measures for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises.		
7. The Commission may specify standards and procedures for carrying out and verifying and auditing the assessment referred to in paragraph 3. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 87(2) .]		
<i>Article 34 Prior (...) consultation</i> 1. (...)		
2. The controller or processor shall consult the supervisory authority prior to the processing of personal data where a data protection impact assessment as provided for in Article 33 indicates that <u>the processing is</u> likely to present a high degree of specific risks . (...)	2. The controller or processor may consult the supervisory authority prior to the processing of personal data where a data protection impact assessment as provided for in Article 33 indicates that the processing is likely to present a high degree of specific risks :	Jednym z podstawowych założeń Rozporządzenia było zmniejszenie liczby obciążeń administracyjnych nałożonych na administratorów. O ile z zadowoleniem należy przyjąć możliwość konsultacji z organem nadzoru, nie sposób zgodzić się z ich obligatoryjnym prowadzeniem, nawet jeżeli dotyczy ono tylko i wyłącznie przypadków wskazanych w art. 33. Przeciwnie rozwiązania usankcjonuje faktycznie zakaz prowadzenia w/w kategorii przetwarzania bez zgody/zatwierdzenia organu.
3. Where the supervisory authority is of the opinion that the intended processing		

<p>referred to in paragraph 2 <u>would</u> not comply with this Regulation, in particular where risks are insufficiently identified or mitigated, it shall <u>within a maximum period of 6 weeks following the request for consultation</u> (...) make appropriate <u>recommendations to the data controller or processor</u> . <u>This period may be extended for a further month, taking into account the complexity of the intended processing.</u> <u>Where the extended period applies, the controller or processor shall be informed within one month of receipt of the request of the reasons for the delay</u> .</p>		
<p><u>3a. During the period referred to in paragraph 3, the controller [or processor] shall not commence processing activities</u> .</p>	<p><u>3a. The controller may commence processing activities upon making a request for consultations.</u></p>	<p>Nie można zaakceptować rozwiązania, zgodnie, z którym przetwarzanie danych, objęte konsultacjami nie będzie się mogło rozpocząć przed ich zakończeniem. Warunkiem formalnym rozpoczęcia przetwarzania jest spełnienie wymogu legalności wynikającego z art. 6, a nie zakończenie konsultacji. Dodatkowo, wprowadzenie takiego rozwiązania będzie miało bardzo niekorzystne skutki dla prowadzenia działalności gospodarczej z uwagi na możliwość przedłużania czasu konsultacji lub faktycznych możliwości organu nadzorczego.</p>
<p>4. (...)</p>		
<p>5. (...) 6. <u>When consulting the supervisory authority pursuant to paragraph 2,</u> the</p>		

<p>controller or processor shall provide the supervisory authority, on request, with the data protection impact assessment provided for in Article 33 and any (...) information requested by the supervisory authority (...).</p>		
<p>7. Member States shall consult the supervisory authority during the preparation— of (...) legislative <u>or regulatory measures which provide for the processing of personal data and which may significantly affect categories of data subjects by virtue of the nature, scope or purposes of such processing (...).</u></p>		
<p>[8. The Commission shall be empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 86 for the purpose of further specifying the criteria and requirements for determining the high degree of specific risk referred to in point (a) of paragraph 2.]</p>	<p>(...)</p>	<p>Nawiązując do poprzednio zgłaszanych postulatów usunięcia delegacji dla Komisji, wnosimy o usunięcie również i tego przepisu.</p>
<p>9. (...)</p>		