Decision
Diary no
2020-12-17
DI-2019-13117
Your diary no
ÅM2019-2062
The Prosecutor's Office
Box 5553
114 85 Stockholm
Supervision according to the Criminal Data Act (2018:1177) –
The Public Prosecutor's Office's procedures for handling
personal data incidents
Table of Contents
The Swedish Data Protection Authority's decision
Statement of the supervisory case
Applicable regulations
Applicable regulations
Justification of the decision

How to appeal	1	13	3
---------------	---	----	---

Postal address: Box 8114, 104 20 Stockholm

Website: www.datainspektionen.se

E-mail: datainspektionen@datainspektionen.se

Telephone: 08-657 61 00

1 (13)

The Swedish Data Protection Authority

DI-2019-13117

The Swedish Data Protection Authority's decision

The Swedish Data Protection Authority announces the following recommendations with the support of ch. 5.

Section 6 of the Criminal Data Act (2018:1177):

1.

The public prosecutor's office should regularly evaluate the effectiveness of the security measures taken to detect personal data incidents and, if necessary, revise these in order to maintain adequate protection of personal data.

- 2. The public prosecutor's office should regularly check that the routines for handling of personal data incidents is followed.
- 3. The public prosecutor's office should in the agency's routines for reporting of personal data incidents specify which data of an occurred incident to be documented as well as regularly checking that the procedures for documentation of personal data incidents are followed.
- 4. The public prosecutor's office should provide its employees with ongoing information and recurrent training in the handling of personal data incidents and about the reporting obligation.

The Swedish Data Protection Authority closes the case.

The Swedish Data Protection Authority

DI-2019-13117

Account of the supervisory matter

The obligation of the personal data controller – i.e. private and public actors - to report certain personal data incidents to the Swedish Data Protection Authority was introduced on 25 May 2018 through the Data Protection Regulation1 (GDPR).

The corresponding notification obligation was introduced on 1 August 2018 in the crime data act (BDL) for so-called competent authorities.2 The obligation to reporting personal data incidents (hereinafter referred to as incident) aims to strengthen privacy protection by the Data Inspectorate receiving information about the incident and may choose to take action when the inspection judges that it is needed for the personal data controller to handle the incident in one go satisfactory way and take measures to prevent something like that occurs again.

A personal data incident is according to ch. 1 § 6 BDL a security incident which leads to accidental or unlawful destruction, loss or alteration, or unauthorized disclosure of or unauthorized access to personal data. IN the preparatory work for the law states that it is usually an unplanned one event that affects the security of personal data in a negative way and which entail serious consequences for the protection of the data.3 One personal data incident can be, for example, that personal data has been sent to the wrong recipient, that access to the personal data has been lost, that computer equipment that stores personal data has been lost or stolen, that someone inside or outside the organization accesses information like that lacks authorization to.

A personal data incident that is not quickly and appropriately addressed can entail risks for the data subject's rights or freedoms. An incident can lead to physical, material or immaterial damage through, for example

REGULATION (EU) 2016/679 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on that free flow of such data and on the repeal of Directive 95/46/EC (general data protection regulation).

2 A competent authority is according to ch. 1 § 6 BDL an authority that processes personal data for the purpose of preventing, preventing or detecting criminal activity, investigate or prosecuting offences, enforcing criminal penalties or maintaining public order and security.

3 Prop.2017/18:232 p. 438

1

3 (13)

The Swedish Data Protection Authority

DI-2019-13117

discrimination, identity theft, identity fraud, damaged reputation,

financial loss and breach of confidentiality or confidentiality.

There can be many reasons why a personal data incident occurs. Of

Datainspektionen's report series Reported personal data incidents under

period May 2018 - December 2019 it appears that the most common causes

behind the reported incidents was i.a. the human factor, technical errors,

antagonistic attacks as well as deficiencies in organizational routines or processes.4

The Data Inspectorate has initiated this supervisory case against the Public Prosecutor's Office i

purpose of checking whether the authority has routines in place to detect

personal data incidents and whether the authority has and has had routines for

to handle personal data incidents according to the Criminal Data Act. In the review also includes checking whether the Public Prosecutor's Office has routines for documentation of incidents that meet the requirements of the crime data regulation (BDF) and whether the authority has implemented information and training efforts regarding personal data incidents.

The inspection began with a letter to the Public Prosecutor's Office on 4 December

2019 and was followed up with the request for completion on March 4, 2020.

The authority's response to the supervisory letter was received on 17 January 2020 and the supplement was received on March 25, 2020.

Applicable regulations

The person in charge of personal data must according to ch. 3. § 2 BDL, by appropriate means technical and organizational measures, ensure and be able to demonstrate that the processing of personal data is constitutional and that it

by means of these measures, shall not only ensure that

data subject's rights are protected. This means that competent authorities,

the data protection regulations are followed but must also be able to demonstrate that this is the case. Which technical and organizational measures required to protect

personal data is regulated in ch. 3. § 8 BDL.

See the Swedish Data Protection Authority's report series on Reported personal data incidents 2018

(Datainspektionen's report 2019:1) p 7 f; Reported personal data incidents January September 2019 (Data inspection report

2019:3) p.10 f. and Reported

personal data incidents 2019 (Datainspektionen's report 2020:2) p. 12 f.

4

4 (13)

The Swedish Data Protection Authority

DI-2019-13117

In the preparatory work for the law, it is stated that organizational measures referred to in § 2 are i.a. to have internal strategies for data protection, to inform and educate the staff and to ensure a clear division of responsibilities. Measures such as taken to show that the processing is constitutional can e.g. be documentation of IT systems, treatments and measures taken and technical traceability through logging and log follow-up. What actions that must be taken may be decided after an assessment in each individual case.5 The measures must reviewed and updated as necessary. The actions that it personal data controller must take according to this provision must according to ch. 3 § 1 BDF be reasonable taking into account the nature, scope, context and purpose and the particular risks of the processing. Of ch. 3 § 8 BDL states that the person in charge of personal data must take appropriate technical and organizational measures to protect them personal data that is processed, especially against unauthorized or unauthorized persons processing and against loss, destruction or other accidental damage. IN the preparatory work for the Crime Data Act states that the security must include equipment access protection, data media control, storage control, user control, access control, communication control, input control, transport control, recovery, operational security and data integrity. This one However, the enumeration is not exhaustive. As an example of organizational security measures may include the establishment of a security policy, checks and follow-up of security, training in data security and information about the importance of following current safety procedures. Routines for notification and follow-up of personal data incidents also constitute such actions.6

What circumstances should be considered to achieve an appropriate level of protection

is regulated in ch. 3. § 11 BDF. The measures must achieve a level of security which is appropriate taking into account the technical possibilities, the costs of the measures, the nature, extent, context and purpose of the processing, as well as the particular risks of the treatment. Special consideration should be given in which extent to which sensitive personal data is processed and how privacy-sensitive other personal data processed are.7 Violation of regulations i

5

6

7

Prop. 2017/18:232 p. 453

Prop. 2017/18:232 p. 457

Prop. 2017/18:232 p. 189 f.

5 (13)

The Swedish Data Protection Authority

DI-2019-13117

3 ch. §§ 2 and 8 BDL can lead to penalty fees according to ch. 6. 1 § 2 BDL.

The person in charge of personal data must according to ch. 3. § 14 BDF document all personal data incidents. The documentation must report the circumstances about the incident, its effects and the measures taken as a result of that. The personal data controller must document all incidents

incidents regardless of whether it must be reported to the Data Protection Authority or not.8

The documentation must enable the supervisory authority to

check compliance with the current provision. Failure to

documenting personal data incidents may result in penalty fees

according to ch. 6 § 1 BDL.

A personal data incident must also, according to ch. 3 § 9 BDL, reported to

Datainspektionen no later than 72 hours after the personal data controller became aware of the incident. A report does not need to be made if it is unlikely that the incident has caused or will cause any risk for improper intrusion into the data subject's personal privacy. Of ch. 3 Section 10 BDL states that the person in charge of personal data must inform it in certain cases data subjects affected by the incident. Failure to report a personal data incident to the Swedish Data Protection Authority can lead to administrative penalty fees according to ch. 6 § 1 BDL.9 Justification of the decision The Swedish Data Protection Authority's review In this supervisory matter, the Swedish Data Protection Authority has to take a position on The public prosecutor's office has documented procedures for detection personal data incidents according to the Criminal Data Act and if the authority has and has had routines for handling incidents since the BDL came into force. The review also covers the issue of compliance with the requirement for documentation of incidents in ch. 3 § 14 BDF. In addition, shall The Swedish Data Protection Authority will take a decision on whether the Public Prosecutor's Office has carried out Prop. 2017/18:232 p. 198 Liability for violations is strict. Thus, neither intent nor negligence is required to sanction fee must be leviable, see prop. 2017/18:232 p. 481. 8 9 6 (13)

The Swedish Data Protection Authority

DI-2019-13117

information and training efforts for its employees with a focus on

handling of personal data incidents according to BDL.

The review does not cover the content of the routines or training efforts

but is focused on checking that the reviewing authority has

routines in place and that it has carried out training efforts for

the employees regarding personal data incidents. The review includes

however, if the authority's procedures contain instructions to document them

information required under the Criminal Data Ordinance.

Procedures for detecting personal data incidents

The personal data that competent authorities handle within the framework of their

law enforcement and criminal investigation activities are largely off

sensitive and privacy-sensitive nature. The nature of the business sets high standards

demands on the law enforcement authorities' ability to protect them

information was recorded through the necessary protective measures in order to, among other things,

prevent an incident from occurring.

The obligation to report personal data incidents according to ch. 3 § 9 BDL

shall be interpreted in the light of the general requirements to take appropriate technical and

organizational measures, to ensure appropriate security for

personal data, which is prescribed in ch. 3 Sections 2 and 8. An ability to quickly

detecting and reporting an incident is a key factor. Because they

the law enforcement authorities must be able to live up to

the reporting requirement, they must have internal procedures and technical capabilities for

to detect an incident.

Based on the needs of the business and with the support of risk and vulnerability analyses

competent authorities can identify the areas where there is a greater risk

that an incident may occur. Based on the analyses, the authorities can then

use various instruments to detect a security threat. These can be

both technical and organizational measures. The starting point is that they
the security measures taken must provide sufficient protection and that incidents do not
shall occur.

Examples of technical measures include intrusion detectors that automatically analyzes and detects data breaches and use of log analysis tools to be able to detect unauthorized access (log deviations). An increased insight into the business's "normal" network 7 (13)

The Swedish Data Protection Authority

DI-2019-13117

traffic patterns help identify things that deviate from the normal the traffic picture against, for example, servers, applications or data files.

Organizational measures can, for example, be the adoption of internal strategies for data protection relating to internal rules, guidelines, routines and various types of steering documents and policy documents.10 Guidelines and rules for handling of personal data, routines for incident management and log follow-up11 constitute examples of such strategies. Periodic follow-up of assigned permissions are another example of organizational action. In a competent authority, there must be procedures for allocation, change, removal and regular control of authorizations.12 Information to and training of staff about the incident management rules and procedures to be followed are also examples of such measures.

The Swedish Data Protection Authority's assessment

The public prosecutor's office has essentially stated the following. The authority has one number of technical solutions and organizational routines to, on both technical level as at the user level, detect deviations in the IT environment. Based on it

the information they can discover what could constitute or imply
risk of a personal data incident. Regarding organizational measures
it appears from the investigation that the Public Prosecutor's Office has written procedures for
handling of personal data incidents and that information about this is available
on the authority's intranet. The authority has also carried out training for
its staff.

The Data Inspectorate can state that the Public Prosecutor's Office has routines to detect personal data incidents on the spot.

The duty to take security measures to detect

personal data incidents are not tied to a specific time but the actions must be continuously reviewed and, if necessary, changed. In order to

The public prosecutor's office must be able to maintain a sufficient level of protection of personal data over time recommends the Data Inspectorate, with the support of

5 ch. \S 6 BDL, that the authority regularly evaluates the effectiveness of the

Crime Data Act - Partial report of the Inquiry into the 2016 data protection directive Stockholm 2017, SOU 2017:29 p. 302

11 Competent authorities must ensure that there are routines for log follow-up, see prop.

2017/18:232 p. 455 f.

12 3 ch. § 6 BDL and supplementary provisions in ch. 3. § 6 BDF

10

8 (13)

The Swedish Data Protection Authority

DI-2019-13117

the security measures taken to detect personal data incidents and

that the authority updates these if necessary.

Procedures for handling personal data incidents

In order to live up to the requirements for organizational measures in ch. 3. Section 8

BDL, the personal data controller must have documented internal routines that

describes the process to be followed when an incident has been detected or

occurred, including how the incident will be contained, managed and recovered,

as well as how the risk assessment should be carried out and how the incident should be reported internally

and to the Swedish Data Protection Authority. The routines must include, among other things, what a

personal data incident is/can be, when an incident needs to be reported, and

information that should be provided within the framework of notification to

to whom, what must be documented, the distribution of responsibilities and which

The Swedish Data Protection Authority's control of procedures for handling personal data incidents refer to the time from the entry into force of the Criminal Data Act i.e. on August 1, 2018.

The Swedish Data Protection Authority's assessment

The Swedish Data Protection Authority.

The prosecutor's office has, among other things, stated the following. The authority has one documented routine for reporting personal data incidents. Like one the first stage of this routine includes internally reporting events that would could be a personal data incident to the authority's central office support function. The support function forwards the information to people in the authority's IT management group who then reassess the incident is a personal data incident and whether it should be reported to The Swedish Data Protection Authority. The public prosecutor's office has submitted the agency's routine for reporting personal data incidents dated 2018-07-09 (revised

2018-11-27) as well as an extract of information available on the authority's website intranet. The authority further states that it is followed in assessment and action the instructions published on the Swedish Data Protection Authority's website.

Taking into account the submitted documents and what appeared in the case, the Data Inspectorate states that the Prosecutor's Office from the time when the Criminal Data Act came into force has had and has routines to handle personal data incidents on site.

9 (13)

The Swedish Data Protection Authority

DI-2019-13117

To be able to handle detected personal data incidents correctly and counteract its effects and risks for the data subjects' personal lives integrity is important. The Swedish Data Protection Authority therefore recommends, with the support of 5 ch. § 6 BDL, that the Public Prosecutor's Office regularly checks that the routines for handling personal data incidents are followed.

Procedures for documentation of personal data incidents

A prerequisite for the Data Inspection Authority to be able to check compliance with the documentation requirement of incidents in ch. 3. § 14 BDF is that the documentation includes certain information that should always be included.

The documentation must include all details of the incident, including its reasons, what happened and the personal data affected. It should also contain the consequences of the incident and the corrective actions that it takes taken by the data controller.

The Swedish Data Protection Authority's assessment

The public prosecutor's office has mainly stated the following. The authority's decisions are documented and kept in a diary in the Public Prosecutor's Office diarium and the authority refer to their procedures for handling personal data incidents. The routine shows that if you suspect that a personal data incident has occurred, this must be reported to without delay

their central support function. This applies regardless of whether the incident has occurred in administrative or law enforcement activities. In this way the reported incidents are also documented. Then do the authority's IT department an assessment of whether the incident should be reported further to the Data Protection Authority. If the assessment means that the incident does not must be reported, the reason for it must be justified and documented in writing.

The public prosecutor's office further states that the assessment support used for Incidents that have occurred are what can be found on the inspection's website, i.a.

The Data Inspectorate's form for reporting personal data incidents according to BDL.

The Data Inspectorate states that the Public Prosecutor's Office has an IT system for that i.a. report incidents related to personal data. In addition, it appears from the authority's routine for reporting personal data incidents that everyone incidents must be documented regardless of whether they are reported to the inspection or not. However, the Data Inspectorate notes that the current routine lacks one description of which information the documentation must cover.

1 0 (13)

The Swedish Data Protection Authority

DI-2019-13117

Being able to document personal data incidents that have occurred in an accurate manner way and thus counteract the risk of the documentation becoming deficient or incomplete is important. Insufficient documentation can lead to the incidents are not handled and remedied correctly, which can get impact on privacy protection. The Swedish Data Protection Authority therefore recommends, with the support of ch. 5 § 6 BDL, that the Prosecutor's Office's routines for reporting of personal data incidents is supplemented with a description of

which details of an incident to be documented. In addition

the Public Prosecutor's Office should carry out regular checks of the internal

the documentation of personal data incidents.

Information and training regarding personal data incidents

The staff is an important resource in security work. It's just not enough

internal procedures, rules or governing documents if users do not follow them.

All users must understand that handling of personal data must take place in one

legally secure way and that it is more serious not to report an incident yet

to report e.g. a mistake or an error. It is therefore required that all

users receive adequate training and clear information about data protection.

The person in charge of personal data must inform and train his staff in matters

on data protection including handling of personal data incidents. Of

Datainspektionen's report series Reported personal data incidents under

period 2018-2019, it appears that the human factor is the most common

the cause of reported personal data incidents. 13 These mainly consist of

individuals who, knowingly or unknowingly, do not follow internal procedures at

processing of personal data or committed a mistake in the handling of

personal data. About half of the incidents are due to it

the human factor is about misdirected letters and e-mails.

According to the Swedish Data Protection Authority, this underlines the importance of

internal procedures and technical security measures need to be supplemented with

ongoing training, information and other measures to increase knowledge and

awareness among employees.

Report 2019:1, report 2019:3 and report 2020:2. Similar conclusions have been drawn by MSB

its annual report for serious IT incidents, i.e. that most of the incidents are due to

human mistakes, see https://www.msb.se/sv/aktuellt/nyheter/2020/april/arsrapporten-forallvarliga-it-incidenter-2019-ar-slappt/

1 1 (13)

The Swedish Data Protection Authority

DI-2019-13117

The Swedish Data Protection Authority's assessment

When asked how information and training about incidents is provided employees, the Public Prosecutor's Office has stated i.a. following. A collective information on personal data processing can be found at the Public Prosecutor's Office intranet. The authority has also informed about the procedures for handling personal data incidents to chief administrators and IT coordinators in it operational activities. Furthermore, it is stated that special webinars have

Against the background of what appears from the investigation, the Data Protection Authority believes that the Public Prosecutor's Office has shown that the authority has provided information and training on handling personal data incidents to its employees.

To maintain competence and ensure that new staff get

training, it is important to have recurring information and training

carried out for different professional categories within the authority.

the employees and hired personnel. The Swedish Data Protection Authority recommends, with support of ch. 5 § 6 BDL, that the Public Prosecutor's Office provides the employees on an ongoing basis information and recurring training in the handling of

This decision has been made by unit manager Charlotte Waller Dahlberg after

presentation by lawyer Maria Angelica Westerberg. At the final

personal data incidents and the obligation to report them.

IT security specialist Ulrika is also handling the case

Sundling and the lawyer Jonas Agnvall participated.

Charlotte Waller Dahlberg, 2020-12-17 (This is an electronic signature)

Copy for the attention of:

The Prosecutor's Office's data protection officer

1 2 (13)

The Swedish Data Protection Authority

DI-2019-13117

How to appeal

If you want to appeal the decision, you must write to the Swedish Data Protection Authority. Enter in the letter which decision you are appealing and the change you are requesting.

The appeal must have been received by the Swedish Data Protection Authority no later than three weeks from the day the decision was announced. If the appeal has been received in time the Swedish Data Protection Authority forwards it to the Administrative Court in Stockholm for examination.

You can e-mail the appeal to the Swedish Data Protection Authority if it does not contain any privacy-sensitive personal data or information that may be covered by secrecy. The authority's contact details appear on the first page of the decision.

1 3 (13)