

Bonn/Berlin, June 17, 2020

Press release 13/2020

BfDI presents activity reports

On June 17, 2020, the Federal Commissioner for Data Protection and Freedom of Information (BfDI), Professor Ulrich Kelber, presented the 28th activity report on data protection and the 7th activity report on freedom of information to the President of the German Bundestag.

Many of the topics covered in the reports remain highly topical: over the past few months, we have seen how hasty initiatives and hasty draft laws have shaken the public's trust. I would wish that the legislator would take the time to provide intensive advice, especially in the case of large projects with an enormous impact on our society. Digitization in healthcare, for example, can only succeed with a high level of data protection and data security, because it is designed to process large amounts of sensitive healthcare data. Here, laws must ensure that digitized health data is not misused by private or government agencies and does not lead to stigmatization or health profiling.

Overall, the BfDI has also been in greater demand since the introduction of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Nevertheless, Professor Kelber draws a positive balance: The main goals pursued with the GDPR have been achieved: In addition to harmonization of data protection law, there is increased awareness of data protection among companies, authorities and citizens. In addition, the supervisory authorities have been given more effective sanction options, which they are making increasing use of. For example, the BfDI issued fines for the first time at the end of 2019.

Despite the overall positive balance of the GDPR, the BfDI still sees room for improvement: The GDPR plans to be evaluated by the European Commission after two years. However, it is still too early for far-reaching changes to the GDPR. The European Data Protection Board issued this recommendation to the European Commission. Enforcement of data protection remains difficult, especially in relation to large, international IT companies; cooperation between the European data protection supervisory authorities is not yet working here.

In its 7th activity report on freedom of information, the BfDI provides information about its activities and the relevant topics in terms of state transparency: I see considerable need for modernization at the IFG: I consider the further development of a federal transparency law and the revision of the protective provisions to be just as necessary as the expansion of my Ombudsman function on the Environmental Information Act.

The report on data protection was written for the first time in the annual cycle specified by the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). The report on freedom of information documents the activities of the BfDI in 2018 and 2019. From 2021 both activity reports will be combined and published as one document.

Activity Reports - Download

28th Activity Report on Data Protection 2019⁷. Activity Report on Freedom of Information 2018 - 2019

Attachment to the press release - summary Topics activity reports

Attachment to the press release for the 28th annual report on data protection and the 7th annual report on freedom of information - selected topics

Activity Report (English translation of the activity report on data protection) - Download:

28th Annual Activity Report (2019)

contact finder

Here you can find out in just a few clicks who is responsible for your inquiry or complaint about data protection.

public bodies

The term public body not only includes the traditional administrative authorities, but also courts, parliaments and public foundations. This also includes social insurance, such as health insurance.

company

Private companies are mostly supervised by state authorities, but there are some exceptions. Private organizations such as clubs and associations also fall into this category.

Press, radio, church

Special responsibilities apply in these areas. Churches and public broadcasters have e.g. B. via their own data protection officers. The federal and state supervisory authorities are not responsible for other organizations either.