Date

2018-10-31

Compilation of the results from

the review of data protection officers in public

and private sector

Summary of the results

The audit shows that the majority of the audited authorities and

the private actors have notified and appointed a data protection officer in time.

The Swedish Data Protection Authority has identified deficiencies in approximately 16 percent of those just above

350 businesses included in the review. There is a marginal difference in

compliance with the rules between authorities and private actors.

Out of a total of 66 supervisory cases, the Data Inspectorate has decided to give

reprimands in 57 cases. In two cases, the objects of supervision have received an injunction and

seven cases have been closed without action.

Introduction

At the end of May 2018, the Swedish Data Protection Authority started an examination of

data protection officer appointed within a number of businesses. This is a

compilation of the results from the review.

According to Article 37 of the General Data Protection Regulation1 (GDPR), an authority or a

public body obliged to appoint a data protection officer. Also private actors

has such an obligation under the article if the core business involves a

regular, systematic surveillance of individuals on a large scale

or that the core business involves the treatment of sensitive

personal data or information about crimes on a large scale. According to the same

article there is also an obligation to notify the data protection officer

contact details for the Swedish Data Protection Authority.

Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on protection for natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and if the free flow of such data on the repeal of Directive 95/46/EC (general data protection regulation)

Postal address: Box 8114, 104 20 Stockholm

Website: www.datainspektionen.se

Reporting of the results from the inspection

E-mail: datainspektionen@datainspektionen.se

Telephone: 08-657 61 00

1 (6)

2 (6)

The cases handled within the framework of the supervision project can be divided into two categories: state administrative authorities and private actors. The private ones the actors represent six industries. These are banks, telecom operators, insurance companies, trade unions, public transport companies and healthcare providers. A total of 362 businesses have been checked, 66 businesses have been audited more closely, of which 35 authorities and 31 private actors.2

The compilation of the supervisory cases shows that there are four different types of errands. The first category is the items that were done right from the beginning and there appointed and notified data protection officer no later than 25 May 2018. The the second category is objects that have appointed a data protection officer and/or notified the contact details for the Data Inspectorate only after 25 May 2018 but during the review ie. made a supervisory decision before the inspection. The third the category is the objects that are still at the time of the supervisory decisions not appointed a data protection officer and/or communicated the contact details to

The Swedish Data Protection Authority. In addition, there is a fourth category that includes a case where the inspection found that there is no obligation for the object to appoint a data protection officer.

Supervisory cases in categories one and four have been closed without action. They have either done right from the start or the Data Protection Authority has established that there is no obligation to appoint a data protection officer for it personal data controller. Seven of the supervisory cases belong to this category.

In addition, all the activities that were included in the documentation belong there

The Swedish Data Protection Authority has chosen not to initiate a special supervisory case for this one the category. In total, there are 303 businesses out of the 352 included in the database that belong to this category.

2

The selection process started with the project group identifying over 400 activities for which the starting point was that there was an obligation to appoint one data protection officer. Of these over 400 businesses, Datainspektionen has selected 362 paragraphs that have been checked against the notifications by data protection officers who the inspection received. The 66 businesses that were finally examined in special supervisory matters are those where the notification has not been made to the inspection when the review was initiated. As can be seen below under the results of the inspection, there are a couple of the subjects of supervision who, despite the review of the reports, have shown that they appointed and notified an agent in time.

3 (6)

The cases in category two have been concluded with the supervisory objects assigned to each reprimand for the violation. Not having appointed and notified data protection officer of the Data Protection Authority can cause an administrative sanction fee.3 The main reason why the decisions stopped at a

reprimand instead of an administrative penalty fee is relatively short
which has expired since 25 May 2018.
In total, there are 57 cases in category two, which are distributed according to
following;
31 authorities
3 banks
4 insurance companies
1 public transport company
4 telecom operators
12 unions
2 private caregivers.
Cases in category three, i.e. the two objects still at the time of
the supervisory decision has not appointed a data protection officer and/or notified
the contact details for the Swedish Data Protection Authority, has ended with
the objects of supervision have each been assigned an injunction for the violation.
Conclusions on regulatory compliance
It is interesting to compare how well the authorities and the six different ones
the industries comply with the requirement to appoint a data protection officer in light of the immediate
over 350 authorities and private actors that Datainspektionen was involved in

the selection process. It gives an indication both of how it looks in total and how well, the authorities as a group and the respective industry follow the requirement to appoint a data protection officer.

Of the objects that were included in the selection, the Data Inspectorate has identified deficiencies in 16.3% (59 out of 362) of the just over 350 businesses included in the review. Broken down by category and industry, it looks like this:

3

Authorities: Of the 210 authorities that were included in the sample,

The Swedish Data Protection Authority found deficiencies in 33 cases. Calculated as a percentage corresponds to the number of cases with deficiencies of approximately 16 percent.

Private actors: of the 152 private actors that were included in the sample have

The Swedish Data Protection Authority found deficiencies in 26 cases. Calculated as a percentage corresponds to the number of cases with deficiencies of just over 17 percent.

Article 83 p. 4 (a) data protection regulation and ch. 6 Section 2 of the Act (2018:218) re supplementary regulations to the EU data protection regulation

4 (6)

The private actors are distributed as follows:

Banks: Of the 40 banks that were included in the sample,

The Data Inspectorate found deficiencies in 3 cases.

Insurance company: Of the 42 insurance companies that were included in the sample the Data Inspectorate has found deficiencies in 4 cases.

Public transport: Of the 8 companies in public transport that were included in
the selection, the Data Inspectorate has found deficiencies in 1 case.
Telecom operators: Of the 8 telecom operators that were included in the sample have
The Data Inspectorate found deficiencies in 4 cases.
Unions: Of the 45 that were included in the selection, the Data Inspection Authority has
found deficiencies in 12 cases.
Private caregivers: of the 9 private caregivers that were included in the sample
the Data Inspectorate has found deficiencies in 2 cases.
Of the businesses that have been audited in particular in supervisory matters,
The Swedish Data Protection Authority notes that many have chosen to comply
requirements during the ongoing review. Only in two cases does it remain
deficiencies, which led to injunctions.
It can also be stated that the difference in compliance between
authorities and private actors is marginal. Some industries stand out
however negative4. This particularly applies to telecom operators, where four out of eight companies did not exist
up to the requirements. Trade unions also stand out negatively in a comparison
with the cut.
/The project group
Attachments:
Overview of supervised objects and corrective authority, etc.

In light of the fact that the number of objects in certain categories is relatively low, there are

reason to be cautious when interpreting the percentage distribution.

4

DI-2018-8755

DI-2018-8756

DI-2018-8757

DI-2018-8759
DI-2018-8760
DI-2018-8761
Measure
Reprimand
No action
No action
Reprimand
Reprimand
Order
Order
Reprimand
Reprimand
DI-2018-8762
DI-2018-8763
Reprimand
Reprimand
The board against discrimination
The Patent Ombudsman Board
Regional Ethics Review Board in Gothenburg
Regional Ethics Review Board in Linköping
Regional Ethics Review Board in Stockholm
Regional Ethics Review Board in Umeå
The Legal Aid Authority
The Sami school board
The National Accountability Board

The Norwegian Center for Architecture and Design
The state's defense history museums
The State Accident Commission
DI-2018-8764
DI-2018-8765
DI-2018-8766
DI-2018-8767
DI-2018-8775
DI-2018-8776
Reprimand
State service center
The Norwegian Claims Settlement Board
DI-2018-8777
DI-2018-8778
Reprimand

Reprimand
The State Office
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
DI-2018-8779
DI-2018-8780
Reprimand
Reprimand
Örebro University
DI-2018-8781
Reprimand
Art department
The Royal Library
Royal Academy of Arts
The Royal Academy of Music in Stockholm
Central University
The authority for participation
The Authority for Family Law and
parenting support
The authority for cultural analysis
The Authority for Accessible Media
DI-2018-8769
DI-2018-8770
DI-2018-8771
DI-2018-8772
DI-2018-8773
DI-2018-8774

Reprimand
Reprimand
6 (6)
Private actors
Case number
Measure
DI-2018-8783
DI-2018-8785
DI-2018-8786
Reprimand
No action
DARAG Insurance AB
Solid Försäkringskattiebolag
DI-2018-8789
DI-2018-8790
DI-2018-8791
DI-2018-8792
DI-2018-8793
Public transport
Norrbottens busstrafik AB
DI-2018-8794

No action
DI-2018-8795
DI-2018-8796
No action
Reprimand
DI-2018-8797
DI-2018-8798
DI-2018-8799
DI-2018-8800
DI-2018-8801
Reprimand
Reprimand
No action
Reprimand
Reprimand
DI-2018-8803
DI-2018-8804
DI-2018-8806
DI-2018-8807
DI-2018-8808
DI-2018-8812
DI-2018-8813
Reprimand
Reprimand
Reprimand
Reprimand

Reprimand
Reprimand
Reprimand
Reprimand
Reprimand
DI-2018-8814
DI-2018-8815
DI-2018-8816
DI-2018-8818
Reprimand
Reprimand
Reprimand
No action
DI-2018-8819
DI-2018-8820
Reprimand
Reprimand
Banks
Forex bank limited company
Resurs bank limited liability company
Tjusbygdens Sparbank bank joint stock company
Insurance company
Danica Pension Insurance joint stock company
Idun Life Insurance AB
Accept Insurance Company
Västtrafik AB

Svealandstrafiken AB
Telecom operators
Tele2
Telia Sonera Sweden
A3 Private AB
Fello AB
My Beat
Trade union
FTF - the union for insurance and finance
SLFF Swedish Locomotive Drivers' Association
Sweden's university teachers and researchers
The Swedish Veterinary Association
SACO – the association for traffic and railways
Sweden's architects
National Association of Sellers
The Swedish Dental Association
The union for academics in
community-supporting professions
National Firefighters' Association
The Church's Association of Academicians
Hotel & restaurant union
The Financial Association
Private healthcare providers
Children's hospital Martina AB
Barnbördshuset i Stockholm AB
DI-2018-8809

Reprimand	
Reprimand	
Reprimand	
Reprimand	
Reprimand	

DI-2018-8811

Reprimand