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Data Protection
Protection of Personal Data

• Art. 12 of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights:

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honor and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks

• Art. 7 EU Charter of Fund. Rights: respect for private and family life:

Everyone has the right to respect for his or her private and family life, home and communications.

• Art. 8 EU Charter of Fund. Rights: protection of personal data

1. Everyone has the right to the protection of personal data concerning him or her.
2. Such data must be processed fairly for specified purposes and on the basis of the consent of the person concerned or some other legitimate basis laid down by law. Everyone has the right of access to data which has been collected concerning him or her, and the right to have it rectified.
3. Compliance with these rules shall be subject to control by an independent authority.

• Protection of personal data increasingly important to customers
Information:
Governance & Security
Terms, Relationships & Threshold Task

Information Security (IS)
Data Protection/Privacy (DP)
Information Governance (IG)

Protection syn. with security (EU) -versus- Privacy syn. with secrecy (US)

**IS is the quintessential principle/concept of DP**
- IS equates to “integrity and confidentiality” principle(s) – See GDPR Article 5(1)(f)
- IS is integrated with, and oft-times serves as the compliance-prerequisite for, other DP concepts (e.g., insecurity can lead to unlawful International Data Transfers)

**IG allows organizations to first gauge data-risk, and then determine the appropriate level of IS**
- General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) – Article 32(1): “...[T]he controller and the processor shall implement appropriate technical and organizational measures to ensure a level of security appropriate to the risk...”
- Sensitive Data: What? (identify); Where? (locate); How? (valuate)

**IG is the starting point!**
ROOT of the Non-Compliance Problem

Tame the “Big Data” Beast:

**Volume to Relevance** (Information Governance)

_then Secure_ (Information Security)

---

**ROTten Fruit** (no use/duty)
[Redundant, Obsolete/Outdated, Trivial]

-**VS**-

**Crown Jewels** (valuable/sensitive)
[Prized Possession: “Data is the New Oil”]

---

65%

35%
Reality TV

Discovery Channel
Analogy #1: Gold-mining

Pay-dirt (volume)

Information-nuggets (relevance)

Wash-plant (mechanism)

Safe-guard (security)
Analogy #2: The Closet

Lost in The Closet (volume)

Organized The Closet (relevance)

Roll-up Sleeves, Shed BS T (mechanism)

Lock The Closet (secure)
Compliance
Jurisdiction of the EU Member States data protection authorities

- Real and effective activity
- Minimal activity sufficient e.g:
  - mainly directed at an EU Member State
    - properties
    - language
  - representative in an EU Member State
- **Weltimo (C-230/14)**

**Relevant legal sources:**

- General Data Protection Regulation (Directive), CJEU
- National law and case law
- Article 29 Working Party (European Data Protection Board): guidance
- National Data Protection Authorities: guidance and case law
International Data Transfers
Data Exportation/Importation

EU Data Protection Directive (95/46/EC)

General Data Protection Regulation (2016/679):

- Transfers only to non-EU countries with “an adequate level of data protection”.
- Commission may find that a non-EU country ensures an adequate level of protection.

Safe Harbour Decision

- Commission initially found that USA do not provide adequate legal protection.
Edward Snowden

• United States intelligence services established a programme called ‘PRISM’.

• Unrestricted access to mass data stored on servers in the US owned or controlled by internet and tech companies.
Max Schrems

• Head of privacy action group Europe v Facebook ("EvF").

• Main Objective:
  
  "We want to know if our fundamental rights are respected and enforced against tech giants like Facebook, or if our rights are only existing on the paper".

• Privacy NGO 'None of Your Business' to support consumer cases
No ‘adequate’ level of protection:
- General and unlimited derogation
- No reference to effective legal protection

• DPAs not absolutely bound by the decisions
• DPAs must investigate in light of factual developments

• Approval process 18 – 24 months
• Uncommercial terms
• Recognition
• Potential challenges
• Onward transfers - corporate group only

- Can be withdrawn at any moment
- **WP29 guide on transparency**: need to explicitly mention all third countries
Nexus Between Data Protection/Privacy & Trademark Law
An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

*Benjamin Franklin* [fire-safety advice?!?!!]
“I see [trademark issues]”

"I see dead people"

The Sixth Sense
Evidence of Sanity

✓ INTERNATIONAL TRADEMARK ASSOCIATION (INTA) hub of TM world
  ✓ Data Protection Committee-Vice Chair (Inaugural term launched 01/01/2016)
  ✓ General Session-panelist at Annual Meeting in Barcelona, Spain (05/21/2017)
  ✓ Table Topic-moderator at Annual Meeting in Barcelona, Spain (05/22/2017)
  ✓ Roundtable-participant in Fort Worth, Texas (10/27/2015)

✓ INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRIVACY PROFESSIONALS (IAPP) hub of DP world
  ✓ KnowledgeNet Meeting-moderator in Dallas, Texas (10/17/2016)

✓ COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN INTA & IAPP
  ✓ INTA Delegate to IAPP Global Privacy Summit in Washington, DC (04/19/2017)
Goodwill

Attract & Retain Customers

Tainting of Goodwill

Trademarks/Brands $\rightarrow$ Goodwill $\rightarrow$ Attract & Retain Customers

**Big Data Breach** (Payment Cards)
2013: Hackers decided to target global US-based retailer & gained access to corporate network, resulting in compromise of 130 million customers’ payment card data
Did the retailer suffer brand damage and reputational harm resulting in the loss of its customers’ trust in the retailer’s willingness or ability to *adequately protect sensitive payment card data*?

**First Administrative Complaints** (International Data Transfers)
2017: US Federal Trade Commission finalized consent agreements with three companies that deceived consumers by falsely claiming completion of certification process for EU-US Privacy Shield framework
Did the companies suffer brand damage and reputational harm resulting in the loss of customers’ trust in the companies’ willingness or ability to: *i) be honest; and ii) adequately protect exported sensitive personal data*?
Conclusions and Recommendations
Final Thoughts & Takeaways

• Need of legal certainty
• Far-reaching consequences
Final Thoughts & Takeaways (cont.)

“It’s All About the Benjamins”
Sean “P. Diddy” Combs - CEO of Bad Boy Records

“Intellectual + Property = Sentimental Value and Goodwill”

“It is time to shift from reactive programs to proactive strategies”
Shaun Donovan - former Director of US OMB
Q&A
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