

Opinion of the Board (Art. 64)



Opinion 7/2018

on the draft list of the competent supervisory authority of Greece

regarding

**the processing operations subject to the requirement of a data protection
impact assessment (Article 35.4 GDPR)**

Adopted on 25th September 2018

Contents

1. Summary of the Facts	4
2. Assessment	5
2.1 General reasoning of the EDPB regarding the submitted list	5
2.2 Application of the consistency mechanism to the draft list	6
2.3 Analysis of the draft list.....	6
Reference to the Guidelines	6
Biometric data.....	6
Genetic data.....	6
Large scale.....	7
Processing for scientific or historical purposes without consent	7
Exceptions to information to be provided to the data subject according to article 14.5 GDPR	7
Processing carried out with the aid of an implant.....	7
3. Conclusions / Recommendations	7
4. Final Remarks.....	8

The European Data Protection Board

Having regard to Article 63, Article 64 (1a), (3) - (8) and Article 35 (1), (3), (4), (6) of the Regulation 2016/679/EU 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 the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (hereinafter “GDPR”),

Having regard to the EEA Agreement and in particular to Annex XI and Protocol 37 thereof, as amended by the Decision of the EEA joint Committee No 154/2018 of 6 July 2018,

Having regard to Article 10 and 22 of its Rules of Procedure of 25 May 2018,

Whereas:

(1) The main role of the Board is to ensure the consistent application of the Regulation 2016/679 (here after GDPR) throughout the European Economic Area. In compliance with article 64.1 GDPR, the Board has to issue an opinion where a supervisory authority intends to adopt a list of processing operations subject to the requirement for a data protection impact assessment pursuant to article 35.4 GDPR. The aim of this opinion is therefore to create a harmonized approach with regard to processing that is cross border or that can affect the free flow of personal data or natural person across the European Union. Even though the GDPR doesn't impose a single list, it does promote consistency. The Board seeks to achieve this objective in its opinions firstly by requesting SAs to include some types of processing in their lists, secondly by requesting them to remove some criteria which the Board doesn't consider as necessarily creating high risks for data subjects, and finally by requesting them to use some criteria in a harmonized manner.

(2) With reference to Article 35 (4) and (6) GDPR, the competent supervisory authorities shall establish lists of the kind of processing operations which are subject to the requirement for a data protection impact assessment (hereinafter “DPIA”). They shall, however, apply the consistency mechanism where such lists involve processing operations, which are related to the offering of goods or services to data subjects or to the monitoring of their behaviour in several Member States, or may substantially affect the free movement of personal data within the Union.

(3) While the draft lists of the competent supervisory authorities are subject to the consistency mechanism, this does not mean that the lists should be identical. The competent supervisory authorities have a margin of discretion with regard to the national or regional context and should take into account their local legislation. The aim of the EDPB assessment/opinion is not to reach a single EU list but rather to avoid significant inconsistencies that may affect the equivalent protection of the data subjects.

(4) The carrying out of a DPIA is only mandatory for the controller pursuant to Article 35 (1) GDPR where processing is “likely to result in a high risk to the rights and freedoms of natural

persons”. Article 35 (3) GDPR illustrates what is likely to result in a high risk. This is a non-exhaustive list. The Working Party 29 in the Guidelines on data protection impact assessment¹, as endorsed by the EDPB², has clarified criteria that can help to identify when processing operations are subject to the requirement for a DPIA. The Working Party 29 Guidelines WP248 state that in most cases, a data controller can consider that a processing meeting two criteria would require a DPIA to be carried out, however, in some cases, a data controller can consider that a processing meeting only one of these criteria requires a DPIA.

(5) The lists produced by the competent supervisory authorities support the same objective to identify processing operations likely to result in a high risk and processing operations, which therefore require a DPIA. As such, the criteria developed in the Working Party 29 Guidelines should be applied when assessing whether the draft lists of the competent supervisory authorities does not affect the consistent application of the GDPR.

(6) Twenty-two competent supervisory authorities have submitted their draft lists to the EDPB. A global assessment of these draft lists supports the objective of a consistent application of the GDPR even though the complexity of the subject matter increases.

(7) The opinion of the EDPB shall be adopted pursuant to Article 64 (3) GDPR in conjunction with Article 10 (2) of the EDPB Rules of Procedure within eight weeks from the first working day after the Chair and the competent supervisory authority have decided that the file is complete. Upon decision of the Chair, this period may be extended by a further six weeks taking into account the complexity of the subject matter.

HAS ADOPTED THE OPINION:

I. Summary of the Facts

The Hellenic Data Protection Authority (hereafter Greek Supervisory Authority) has submitted its draft list to the EDPB. The decision on the completeness of the file was taken on 10th July 2018. This period until which the opinion to be adopted has been extended until the 25th of September taking into account the complexity of the subject matter considering that at the same time twenty-two competent supervisory authorities submitted the draft lists and thus the need for a global assessment arose.

¹ WP29, Guidelines on Data Protection Impact Assessment and determining whether processing is “likely to result in a high risk” for the purposes of Regulation 2016/679 (WP 248 rev. 01).

² EDPB, Endorsement 1/2018.

2. Assessment

2.1 General reasoning of the EDPB regarding the submitted list

Any list submitted to the EDPB has been interpreted as further specifying Art 35.1, which will prevail in any case. Thus, no list can be exhaustive.

In compliance with article 35.10 GDPR, the Board is of the opinion that if a DPIA has already been carried out as part of a general impact assessment in the context of the adoption of the legal basis the obligation to carry out a DPIA in accordance with paragraphs 1 to 7 of article 35 GDPR does not apply, unless the Member State deems it necessary.

Further, if the Board requests a DPIA for a certain category of processing and an equivalent measure is already required by national law, the Greek Supervisory Authority shall add a reference to this measure.

This opinion does not reflect upon items submitted by the Greek Supervisory Authority, which were deemed outside the scope of Article 35.6 GDPR. This refers to items that neither relate “to the offering of goods or services to data subjects” in several Member States nor to the monitoring of the behaviour of data subjects in several Member States. Additionally, they are not likely to “substantially affect the free movement of personal data within the Union”. This is especially the case for items relating to national legislation and in particular where the obligation to carry out a DPIA is stipulated in national legislation. Further, any processing operations that relate to law enforcement were deemed out of scope, as they are not in scope of the GDPR.

The Board has noted that several supervisory authorities have included in their lists some types of processing which are necessarily local processing. Given that only cross border processing and processing that may affect the free flow of personal data and data subjects are concerned by Article 35.6, the Board will not comment on those local processing.

The opinion aims at defining a consistent core of processing operations that are recurrent in the lists provided by the SAs.

This means that, for a limited number of types of processing operations, that will be defined in a harmonised way, all the Supervisory Authorities will require a DPIA to be carried out and the Board will recommend the SAs to amend their lists accordingly in order to ensure consistency.

When this opinion remains silent on DPIA list entries submitted, it means that the Board is not asking the Greek Supervisory Authority to take further action.

Finally, the Board recalls that transparency is key for data controllers and data processors. In order to clarify the entries in the list, the Board is of the opinion that making an explicit reference in the lists, for each type of processing, to the criteria set out in the guidelines could improve this transparency. Therefore, the Board considers that an explanation on which

criteria have been taken into account by the Greek Supervisory Authority to create its list could be added.

2.2 Application of the consistency mechanism to the draft list

The submitted draft list by the Greek Supervisory Authority relates to the offering of goods or services to data subjects, relates to the monitoring of their behaviour in several Member States and/or may substantially affect the free movement of personal data within the Union mainly because the processing operations in the submitted draft list are not limited to data subjects in this country.

2.3 Analysis of the draft list

Taking into account that:

- a. Article 35 (1) GDPR requires a DPIA when the processing activity is likely to result in a high risk to the rights and freedoms of natural persons; and
- b. Article 35 (3) GDPR provides a non-exhaustive list of types of processing that require a DPIA,

the Board is of the opinion that:

REFERENCE TO THE GUIDELINES

The board is of the opinion that the analysis done in the Working Party 29 Guidelines WP248 are a core element for ensuring consistency across the Union. Thus, it requests the different Supervisor Authorities to add a statement to the document containing their list that clarifies that their list is based on these guidelines and that it complements and further specifies the guidelines.

As the document of the Greek Supervisory Authority does not contain such a statement, the Board recommends the Greek Supervisory Authority to amend its document accordingly.

BIOMETRIC DATA

The list submitted by the Greek Supervisory Authority for an opinion of the Board envisages that the processing of biometric data for the purpose of uniquely identifying a natural person, in conjunction with at least one other criterion, requires a DPIA. On this point, the Board acknowledges that the list aligns with the aim of consistency.

GENETIC DATA

The list submitted by the Greek Supervisory Authority for an opinion of the Board envisages that the processing of genetic data, in conjunction with at least one other criterion, requires a DPIA. The Board is of the opinion that the processing of genetic data on its own is not necessarily likely to represent a high risk. However, the processing of genetic data in conjunction with at least one other criterion requires a DPIA to be carried out. The Board takes note of the inclusion of this criterion in the list of Greek Supervisory Authority.

LARGE SCALE

The GDPR does not precisely define what constitutes large-scale. In the WP29 guidelines on Data Protection Officer and on DPIA, both endorsed by Board, it has recommended to take in account several specific factors when determining whether a processing is carried out on a large scale.

The Board is of the opinion that those factors are sufficient to assess whether the processing of personal data is undertaken on a large scale. Therefore the Board requests the Greek Supervisory Authority to amend its list accordingly, by deleting the explicit figures in its list, and making reference to the previously mentioned definitions of large scale.

PROCESSING FOR SCIENTIFIC OR HISTORICAL PURPOSES WITHOUT CONSENT

The Board is of the opinion that the processing of personal data for scientific or historical purposes on its own is not necessarily likely to represent a high risk. However, the processing of personal data for scientific or historical purpose in conjunction with at least one other criterion does require a DPIA to be carried out. The list submitted by the Greek Supervisory Authority for an opinion of the Board states that this type of processing in conjunction with at least one other criterion falls under the obligation to perform a DPIA. The Board takes note of the inclusion of this criterion in the list.

EXCEPTIONS TO INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED TO THE DATA SUBJECT ACCORDING TO ARTICLE 14.5 GDPR

The Board is of the opinion that types of processing activities that could deprive the data subjects from their rights do not represent a high risk on their own. Therefore, a processing activity conducted by the controller under article 14 GDPR and where the information to be given to the data subjects is subject to an exemption under article 14.5 (b)-(d) could require a DPIA to be carried out only in conjunction with at least on other criterion. The list submitted by the Greek Supervisory Authority for an opinion of the Board states that this type of processing in conjunction with at least one other criterion falls under the obligation to perform a DPIA. The Board takes note of the inclusion of this criterion in the list.

PROCESSING CARRIED OUT WITH THE AID OF AN IMPLANT

The Board is of the opinion that, the processing of non-health data with the aid of an implant does not require a DPIA in every instance. The list submitted by the Greek Supervisory Authority for an opinion of the Board does currently not clarify that a DPIA is to be done for the processing of health data with the aid of an implant. As such, the Board requests the Greek Supervisory Authority to amend its list accordingly, by stating that in any event the processing of health data with the aid of an implant requires a DPIA to be carried out.

3. Conclusions / Recommendations

The draft list of the Greek Supervisory Authority may lead to an inconsistent application of the requirement for a DPIA and the following changes need to made:

- Regarding the reference to the guidelines: the Board requests the Greek Supervisory Authority to amend its document accordingly.
- Regarding the notion of large scale: the Board requests the Greek Supervisory Authority to amend its list by deleting the explicit figures in its list, and making reference to the definitions of large scale mentioned in the WP29 guidelines on Data Protection Officer (WP243) and on DPIA (WP248).
- Regarding processing carried out with the aid of an implant: the Board requests the Greek Supervisory Authority to amend its list by stating that only the processing of health data with the aid of an implant requires a DPIA to be carried out.

4. Final Remarks

This opinion is addressed to the Hellenic Data Protection Authority (Greek Supervisory Authority) and will be made public pursuant to Article 64 (5b) GDPR.

According to Article 64 (7) and (8) GDPR, the supervisory authority shall communicate to the Chair by electronic means within two weeks after receiving the opinion, whether it will amend or maintain its draft list. Within the same period, it shall provide the amended draft list or where it does not intend to follow the opinion of the Board, it shall provide the relevant grounds for which it does not intend to follow this opinion, in whole or in part.

For the European Data Protection Board

The Chair

(Andrea Jelinek)