

Regulatory Action Policy

Contents

Commissioner's foreword	3
Overview	4
Aims of this policy	4
Objectives regulatory action	5
Legislative basis underpinning the ICO's regulatory activity	6
Our regulatory activity	7
Selecting the appropriate regulatory activity for breaches of information rights obligations	9
A hierarchy of regulatory action	13
International regulatory action.....	14
Working with others to take effective regulatory action	15
Statutory guidance in relation to how we will serve Assessment or Enforcement Notices and apply fines	16
Effectiveness of regulatory action.....	26
Evaluation and next steps	26

Commissioner's foreword

Information Commissioner Elizabeth Denham will write a foreword here.

Overview

Our Regulatory Action Policy sits under the umbrella of our Information Rights Strategic Plan for 2017-2021 which sets out the Information Commissioner's mission to increase the trust the public has in government, public bodies and the private sector: trust in transparency, in the digital economy and in digital public service delivery.

The purpose of this Policy is to provide direction and focus for those we regulate, the public and our staff about our chosen approach to regulatory action. This will help ICO achieve the goals we set out in our Strategic Plan which you can read in full here (link) In doing so, it complements our International Strategy 2017-2021 which you can read in full here (link).

This Policy sets out a risk-based approach to taking regulatory action against organisations and individuals that have breached the provisions of the upcoming Data Protection Act 2018, the General Data Protection Regulation, Privacy and Electronic Communications Regulations (EC Directive) Regulations 2003, Freedom of Information Act 2000 and related legislation. As with earlier versions of the policy it focusses on areas of highest risk and most harm and the principles we apply in exercising our powers.

The ICO's approach is designed to help create an environment within which, on the one hand, data subjects are protected, while ensuring that, on the other hand, business is able to operate and innovate efficiently in the digital age. We will be as robust as we need to be in upholding the law, whilst ensuring that commercial enterprise is not constrained by red tape, or concern that sanctions will be used disproportionately. We will work with others where it makes sense to do so, and where joint application of activity can achieve the best result and protection.

Aims

This Policy seeks to:

- set out the nature of the ICO's various powers in one place and to be clear and consistent about when and how we use them¹;

¹ Although see also the ICO Prosecution Policy Statement in relation to the prosecution of offences under the DPA. Last published in January 2013 and available here: https://www.cps.gov.uk/publications/docs/code_2013_accessible_english.pdf

- ensure that we take fair, proportionate and timely regulatory action with a view to guaranteeing that individuals' information rights are properly protected;
- guide the ICO and our staff in ensuring that any regulatory action is targeted, proportionate and effective; and
- assist delivery of the six goals of the Information Rights Strategic Plan and uphold information rights effectively for individuals in the digital age.

Objectives of regulatory action

When considering whether to take action, and in carrying it out, we will seek to meet the following five objectives:

Objective 1

To respond swiftly and effectively to breaches of legislation which fall within the ICO's remit, focussing on (i) those involving highly sensitive information, (ii) those adversely affecting large groups of individuals, and (iii) those impacting vulnerable individuals.

Objective 2

To be effective, proportionate, dissuasive and consistent in our application of sanctions, targeting our most significant powers for organisations and individuals suspected of repeated or wilful misconduct or serious failures to take proper steps to protect personal data; where formal regulatory action serves as an important deterrent to those who risk non-compliance with the law.

Objective 3

In line with legislative provisions, to support compliance with the law, including sharing information in relation to and otherwise contributing to the promotion of good practice and providing advice on how to comply with all aspects of legislation.

Objective 4

To be proactive in identifying and mitigating new or emerging risks arising from technological and societal change.

Objective 5

To work with other regulators and interested parties constructively, at home and abroad, recognising the interconnected nature of the technological landscape in which we operate and the nature of data flows in the expanding digital economy. Our aim is to establish effective networks with other regulators to cut down on regulatory burden and red tape.

We will implement these objectives by exercising our statutory powers in the following ways:

- we will take action proportionately, we will exercise discretion as to when, in what manner, and to what extent enforcement is required;
- we will be selective when exercising this discretion, looking at the features and context of each case, as well as applying our resources more broadly to the areas of greatest risk and potential or actual harm to the community;
- we will apply our fining powers where they are effective, proportionate and dissuasive;
- we will effectively deploy our intelligence products and technology to allow us to recognise and promptly tackle emerging threats; and
- we will seek to manage risks by sharing information effectively.

Where we are invoking our criminal prosecution powers we will do so by reference to the ICO's Prosecution Policy Statement.

In applying the regulatory principles we will ensure that we always seek to meet our obligations under the Regulators' Code², the Victims' Code³ and the Children Act 2004. We will also take account of the GDPR's requirements for greater consistency across Europe when determining the appropriate type and level of regulatory response in our data protection remit.

Legislative basis underpinning the ICO's regulatory activity

We are empowered to take various regulatory actions for breaches of the following legislation:

- Data Protection Act 2018 (DPA);
- General Data Protection Regulation⁴ (GDPR);

² Published in April 2014 and laid before Parliament in accordance with section 23 of the Legislative and Regulatory Reform Act 2006.

³ The Code of Practice for Victims of Crime, also known as the Victims' Code, was established by the Domestic Violence, Crime and Victims Act 2004 and came into effect in 2006. It was revised in 2013 to reflect the commitments in the EU Victims' Directive 2012/29/EU, and updated again in 2015. The Victims' Code also reflects parts of the Human Trafficking and Child Sexual Exploitation EU Directives.

⁴ Regulation (EU)2016/679

- Privacy and Electronic Communications (EC Directive) Regulations 2003⁵ (PECR);
- Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA);
- Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (EIR)⁶;
- Environmental Protection Public Sector Information Regulations 2009;⁷
- Investigatory Powers Act 2016;
- Re-use of Public Sector Information Regulations 2015⁸;
- Enterprise Act 2002;
- Security of Network and Information Systems Directive (NIS Directive)⁹; and
- Electronic Identification, Authentication and Trust Services Regulation (e-IDAS)^{10, 11}

Our regulatory activity

Our regulatory activity (and activity in support of regulatory activity) includes:

- conducting assessments of compliance with the DPA and GDPR (which we refer to as the 'data protection legislation'), PECR, e-IDAS, the NIS Directive, FOIA and EIR;
- as part of an investigation into compliance with the data protection legislation, issuing information notices requiring individuals, controllers or processors to provide information. An 'urgent' information notice may be used in appropriate cases to require a response on no less than 24 hours' notice. If the recipient of an information notice does not provide a full and timely response, the ICO may apply for a court order requiring compliance with the information notice;
- producing codes of practice about data sharing and direct marketing, and any other codes of practice that we are required to produce under the legislation we cover;

⁵ S.I. 2003/2426

⁶ S.I. 2004/3391

⁷ S.I. 2009/3157. Also known as the INSPIRE Regulations 2009.

⁸ S.I. 2015/1415

⁹ Directive (EU) 2016/1148

¹⁰ Regulation (EU) 910/2014

¹¹ Readers should bear in mind that this list may be extended as new legislation is introduced following the publication of this Policy.

- conducting assessments of cross-border data transfers and corporate groups' binding corporate rules;
- overseeing data protection impact assessments;
- conducting data protection audits of data controllers and processors;
- overseeing the establishment of data protection certification mechanisms;
- encouraging the development of codes of conduct, and accrediting bodies to monitor compliance with codes of conduct;
- requiring a data controller or digital service provider to inform an individual of a personal data breach;
- issuing a warning where proposed action threatens non-compliance with data protection legislation;
- issuing a reprimand for infringements of relevant data protection legislation;
- issuing a decision notice detailing the outcome of an ICO investigation into an individual's case under FOIA or EIR;
- issuing enforcement notices, warnings, reprimands, practice recommendations and other orders requiring specific actions by an individual or organisation to resolve breaches (including potential breaches) of data protection legislation and other information rights obligations. An 'urgent' enforcement notice may be used in appropriate cases to require action or require action to resolve breaches or potential breaches of the data protection legislation, on no less than 24 hours' notice;
- certifying contempt of court should an authority fail to comply with an information notice, decision notice or enforcement notice under FOIA and EIR;
- administering fines by way of penalty notices in the circumstances set out in clause 152 of the DPA;
- administering fixed penalties for failing to meet specific obligations (e.g. a failure to pay the relevant fee to the ICO); and
- prosecuting criminal offences before the courts.

The DPA contains a provision for the ICO to issue an 'assessment notice'¹². This is, essentially, a notice which is issued by the ICO to a data controller or data processor to allow us to investigate whether the controller or processor is compliant with data protection legislation. The notice may, for example, require

¹² clause 144 of the DPA

the data controller or data processor to give us access to premises and specified documentation and equipment. An 'urgent' assessment notice may require access to non-domestic premises on less than 7 days' notice, which in effect may allow the ICO to carry out a no-notice inspection.

The DPA also contains a criminal offence of destroying or falsifying information and documents etc, once a person has been given an information notice or assessment notice¹³. This offence acts a deterrent against a person taking such steps with the intention of preventing the ICO from viewing or having access to information or documents, once they are on notice of the ICO's interest. It is a defence if the data would have been deleted anyway, for example as part of an automated archiving system.

A person in receipt of an 'urgent' information notice, assessment notice or enforcement notice, may apply to court to overturn the urgency of that notice. The court may uphold the urgency, or decide on a different time frame for compliance, for all or parts of the notice.

We will provide a suite of guidance to organisations and individuals about how to comply with the law and support this with advice. This can take the form of letters of advice, compliance meetings, presentations, conferences and advice sessions, in addition to advice provided via our telephone contact centre, web chat and on our website.

The full range of our enforcement powers, together with the regulatory actions associated with those powers, and the legislation we regulate, is set out on our website [link].

Selecting the appropriate regulatory activity for breaches of information rights

We will adopt a selective approach to the action we take. When deciding how to respond to breaches of information rights obligations, we will consider criteria including¹⁴:

- the nature and seriousness of the breach or potential breach (including, for example, whether any critical national infrastructure or service is involved);

¹³ Clause TBC of the DPA

¹⁴ Note that this set of criteria is not intended to be exhaustive.

- where relevant, the categories of personal data affected (including whether any special categories of personal data are involved) and the level of any privacy intrusion;
- the number of individuals affected, the extent of any exposure to physical, financial or psychological harm, and, where it is an issue, the degree of intrusion into their privacy;
- whether the issue raises new or repeated issues, or concerns that technological security measures are not protecting the personal data;
- the gravity and duration of a breach or potential breach;
- whether the organisation or individual involved is representative of a sector or group, raising the possibility of similar issues arising again across that group or sector if not addressed;
- the cost of measures to mitigate any risk, issue or harm;
- the public interest in regulatory action being taken (for example, to provide an effective deterrent against future breaches or clarify or test an issue in dispute);
- whether another regulator, law enforcement bodies or competent authority is already taking (or has already taken) action in respect of the same matter; and
- in relevant cases, the expressed opinions of the European Data Protection Board.

We also reserve the right to take into account any aggravating or mitigating factors where relevant, for example¹⁵:

- whether the attitude and conduct of the individual or organisation concerned suggests an intentional, wilful or negligent approach to compliance or unlawful business or operating model;
- whether relevant advice, warnings, consultation feedback, conditions or guidance from the ICO and/or the Data Protection Officer (for data protection cases) has or has not been followed;
- any action taken by a relevant individual or organisation to mitigate or minimise any damage (including delay) suffered by individuals;
- in data protection cases, whether the relevant individual or organisation is certified by a body that has been accredited under Article 43 of the GDPR or has followed/failed to follow an approved or statutory code of conduct;

¹⁵ As above, it should be noted that this list of factors is not intended to be exhaustive.

- the relevant individual or organisation's prior regulatory history, including pattern, number and type of complaints about the issue;
- the vulnerability, if any, of the individuals affected, in particular by virtue of their age or other protected characteristic under the Equality Act 2010;
- the state and nature of any protective or preventative measures and technology available, including by design;
- the manner in which the breach or issue became known to the ICO and, if relevant, to what extent the relevant individual or organisation notified the ICO of the breach or issue; and
- any financial (including budgetary) benefits gained or financial losses avoided by the relevant individual or organisation, directly or indirectly.

With regard to information notices, we may use these at our discretion in any investigation. We will take into consideration the following criteria:

- the risk of harm to individuals or the level of intrusion into their privacy potentially posed by the events or data processing under investigation;
- the utility of requiring a formal response within a defined time period;
- the utility of testing responses, by the fact that it is an offence to deliberately or recklessly make a false statement in a material respect in response; and
- the public interest in the response.

In addition, when deciding whether or not to issue an 'urgent' information notice or 'urgent' assessment notice, and in deciding the period for compliance with such notices, we will consider whether urgent investigation is appropriate and proportionate having regard to criteria including:

- the extent to which urgent investigation may prevent or limit the risk of serious harm to individuals or serious intrusion into their privacy. For example requesting an early report on a serious data security breach in order for the ICO to advise the controller on and validate appropriate notification to data subjects and appropriate mitigation of the breach.
- the extent to which urgent investigation may prevent the sanitisation, alteration, destruction, concealment, blocking, falsifying, or removal of relevant evidence of data processing;
- the scope of the notices, that is the scope of questions or requests in an information notice, or the scope of the assessment notice;
- the additional burden on the recipient in having to comply with a notice urgently;

- the impact on the rights of the recipient, should the ICO obtain information under an urgent information notice (which may be by court order), prior to an appeal being heard by the Information Tribunal;
- the impact on the rights of the recipient should the ICO gain access to its premises and data processing activities without notice, and without the opportunity to appeal;
- the length of time of the investigation. For example, it may be appropriate and proportionate to issue an urgent information notice during a long running investigation where the questions are limited and the response may bring the investigation closer to completion; and
- the comparative effectiveness of other investigatory powers of the ICO.

If a recipient of an information notice does not fully respond within the applicable time period, whether urgent or not, the Commissioner will endeavour to promptly apply for a court order requiring a response. The Commissioner may decide not to make such application, having regard to criteria including:

- the reasons for non-compliance with the information notice;
- any commitments given by the recipient to responding to the information notice;
- whether the information has been or is likely to be obtained from another source;
- the comparative effectiveness of other investigatory and enforcement powers of the ICO. For example, the ICO may decide it has sufficient evidence to move to an enforcement action in any event; and
- the public interest.

In addition, when deciding whether or not to issue an 'urgent' enforcement notice, and in deciding the period for compliance with such notice, we will consider whether urgent action by the recipient (to take specific steps or to stop specific processing of personal data) is appropriate and proportionate having regard to criteria including:

- the extent to which such urgent action may prevent or limit the risk of serious harm to individuals or serious intrusion into their privacy. For example requesting a controller stops using personal data for a specific purpose or takes action to protect personal data from security breaches;
- the scope of the enforcement notice;
- the additional burden or impact on the recipient in having to comply with an urgent enforcement notice within the period specified; and
- the comparative effectiveness of other enforcement powers of the ICO.

As a matter of course, we will typically invite comments from those we regulate¹⁶ about the application of regulatory action, save where it is inappropriate to do so (for example, where a matter is particularly urgent or there is a need for wider protection of others from harm).

In line with our commitment to transparency and accountability, we will be as open as possible about our regulatory, and, where relevant, enforcement work. We will normally publish details about the volume and types of cases we pursue and the outcomes we achieve. In particular, we will report on those relating to corrective measures, sanctions, fines or civil monetary penalties, enforcement notices or orders, fixed penalty notices and prosecutions. We may also publish case study examples to illustrate good practice or learning.

We will be particularly careful to ensure that redaction of confidential, personally sensitive or commercially sensitive information is properly considered when publishing details of specific cases. We will also set our internal service performance measures to focus on impacts and outcomes rather than any prescribed sanction or regulatory activity levels.

A hierarchy of regulatory action

We will consider each case on its merits and within the context of any compliance breach (or risk of such breach). However, as a general principle, the more serious, high-impact, intentional, wilful, neglectful or repeated breaches can expect stronger regulatory action. Breaches involving novel issues, technology, or a high degree of intrusion into the privacy of individuals can also expect to attract regulatory attention at the upper end of the scale.

Our regulatory approach generally represents a range of measures. This spans observation, intelligence gathering and monitoring through to individual case and appeal considerations, as well as application of audit/assessment or inspection powers to better understand an issue, and, then, finally investigation and sanction where we need to look at and address the detail of an incident.

In this way, as issues or patterns of issues escalate in frequency or severity then we will use more significant powers in response. This does not mean however that we cannot use our most significant powers immediately in serious or high-risk cases where there is a direct need to protect the public from harm.

Our approach will also encourage and reward compliance. Those who self-report, who engage with us to resolve issues and who can demonstrate strong

¹⁶ Such representations are invited from individuals and organisations against whom the ICO is considering taking enforcement action, rather than from complainants.

information rights accountability arrangements, can expect us to take these into account when deciding how to respond.

We will also provide opportunities for innovative products, services or concepts to be tested with appropriate regulatory oversight and safeguards, so that innovation and development is not over-burdened.

International regulatory action

Given the extent of international data flows and their importance to the economy¹⁷, as well as the extra-territorial nature of the GDPR, we will take action in support of our International Strategy and in line with our cooperation and consistency mechanism obligations under the GDPR.

This approach means that in cases involving cross-border information flows we will liaise internationally with other supervisory authorities. We will do so to identify the most appropriate regulatory response, including identifying any lead authority or other concerned supervisory authorities under the GDPR (usually where the data controller's 'main establishment' is based), as well as to share information to assist investigations, provide mutual aid and secure appropriate regulatory outcomes.

We already have a significant international standing, being an active participant in the:

- Article 29 Working Party¹⁸;
- European Data Protection Board [when established]
- British Islands and Irish Data Protection Authorities network;
- Common Thread Network;
- Global Privacy Enforcement Network;
- International Conference of Data Protection and Privacy Commissioners;
- International Conference of Information Commissioners;
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development;
- Unsolicited Communications Enforcement Network (formerly known as the London Action Plan); and
- Council of Europe Convention 108 signatories.

¹⁷ *The exchange and protection of personal data, A future partnership paper*, HMSO 2017

¹⁸ Directive 95/46/EC

More details about these groups and their role is on our website [link]

In addition, we have direct contact with a range of data protection authorities on individual cases and systemic issues (such as the privacy issues arising from app development or connected toys). We share intelligence, information, threat analyses, tactics, guidance and learning with these groups. Where appropriate we coordinate our investigative and evidence gathering activity with these partners; this may be either jointly or individually depending on the circumstances of the case.

We also have operational protocols and memoranda of understanding with our international partners in support of this policy, and we will continue to keep these updated. We publish more information about them on our website [link].

Working with others to take effective action

In addition to our international work we often work with a range of other regulators and agencies to deliver our remit. This includes:

- National Cyber Security Centre, in our role as a NIS Directive competent authority, and in the immediate response phase to cyber-attacks which lead to breaches of personal data;
- other NIS Directive competent authorities, such as the Drinking Water Authority, Office of Communications, and Civil Aviation Authority;
- law enforcement, including the National Crime Agency, in cases involving the theft or criminal misuse of personal data;
- sector regulators, including Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services, National Police Chief's Council, Care Quality Commission, Financial Conduct Authority, Solicitors Regulation Authority, Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation, Phonepaid Services Authority and the Gambling Commission; and
- consumer regulators, including the Competition and Markets Authority.

As with our international work we share intelligence, threat analyses, insight, and tactics with these groups, and we refer relevant cases where they fall within their jurisdiction as well as our own. Where we undertake joint regulatory or investigative work we coordinate our activity to ensure a proportionate burden on those being regulated (e.g. minimising duplication of evidence gathering/information requests). These arrangements are set out in protocols and memoranda of understanding published on our website.

We also do additional work in support of our regulatory action where it is necessary to give effect to that action. For example, where a company seeks to

avoid a financial penalty through complex liability structures or by dissolution, we will pursue matters via winding-up orders or by referral to the Insolvency Service. We have achieved success in obtaining disqualification of directors and winding-up orders to disrupt those who repeatedly break the rules, and we will expand our work in this area.

Statutory guidance in relation to how we will serve Assessment or Enforcement Notices and apply fines.

The DPA provides that we should set out how we will apply many of our powers.¹⁹

This section provides that detailed summary for that purpose.

When we will issue Assessment Notices

We serve an assessment notice where we deem it necessary to gauge compliance with the provisions of the DPA or the NIS Directive because:

- we have conducted a risk assessment or other regulatory action, which indicates a probability that personal data is not being processed in compliance with the DPA, together with a likelihood of damage or distress to individuals; or
- it is necessary to verify compliance with an enforcement notice; or
- communications with or information (e.g. news reports, statutory reporting or publications) about the controller or processor suggest that they are not processing personal data in compliance with the DPA; or
- the controller or processor has failed to respond to an information notice within an appropriate time.

When determining the risks of non-compliance we will consider one or more of the factors for regulatory action. We will also consider other relevant information, such as reports by whistleblowers, and any data privacy impact assessments that may have been carried out.

Assessments of documents, including handling of health and social care records

We require access to the specified documents and information, or classes of documents and information, which define and explain how obligations have

¹⁹ Clause 157 of the Data Protection Bill

been met under the legislation, and the governance controls in place to measure compliance.

Although not an exhaustive list this could include, for example:

- Strategies
- Policies
- Procedures
- Guidance
- Codes of practice
- Training material
- Protocols
- Frameworks
- Memoranda of understanding
- Contracts
- Privacy statements
- Privacy impact assessments
- Control data
- Job descriptions

We may also need access to specified personal data or classes of personal data, and to evidence that it is being handled in compliance with the policies and procedures which ensure compliance with the legislation. The level of access will only be enough to assess compliance.

We do not require access to information which is subject to legal privilege. Where we receive legally privileged information we will respect the confidentiality of this information and any particular sensitivities.

Nor do we require access to information which:

- has a high level of commercial sensitivity;
- is exempt information as defined by section 23 FOIA (information supplied by, or relating to bodies dealing with security matters); or
- is exempt from the DPA, by virtue of a national security certificate²⁰.

We recognise that there might also be legitimate concerns about other information which relates to issues of national security, international relations or sensitive activities. In these cases it will generally be possible to audit data protection compliance without access to such information. Where it is necessary and appropriate, we will ensure that properly vetted members of staff inspect

²⁰ Clause 27 of the Data Protection Bill

such information. We have memoranda of understanding with relevant agencies to provide access and understanding of this type of material.

Individuals can contact us to request that, if an assessment notice requires access to such information, this access be limited to the minimum required to adequately assess their compliance with the legislation. They may also request other access conditions. Such requests must be made within 28 days of the notice date.

We may need to view health and social care records. If we do, we will respect the confidentiality of this data, and will limit access to the minimum required to adequately assess compliance. We will not take the content of these off-site, neither will we copy or transcribe them into working notes, and we will not include them in any reporting of the assessment.

Inspection and examinations during assessments

Inspections and examinations are key review elements of the assessment. They help us to identify objective evidence of compliance, and how policies and procedures have been implemented.

These reviews of personal data, and associated logs and audit trails, may consider both manually and electronically stored data, including data stored centrally, locally and on mobile devices and media.

We use these reviews to evaluate how an organisation:

- obtains, stores, organises, adapts or alters information (eg policies and procedures) or personal data;
- ensures the confidentiality, integrity and availability of the data or service it provides;
- retrieves, consults, or uses the information or personal data;
- discloses personal data by transmitting or disseminating or otherwise making the data available; and
- weeds and destroys personal data.

The review may also cover management/control information, to monitor and record how personal data is being processed, and to measure how a data controller meets their wider obligations under the legislation.

The review may evaluate physical and IT-related security measures, including how personal data is stored and disposed of.

The review and evaluation process may take place on site as part of a discussion with staff to demonstrate 'practice', or independently by way of

sampling by auditors. If information is held electronically we may require the data controller to provide manual copies or facilitate direct access.

Any direct access would be limited to the identified records, would only be done locally and would be for a limited and agreed time.

Data reviewed as part of the review and evaluation process, but not specifically identified in the assessment notice, may only be taken off the data controller's site with the data controller's permission.

Interviews carried out during assessments

Interviews will consist of discussions with:

- staff and contractors;
- any data processor's staff; and
- staff of relevant service providers as specified in the assessment notice.

We conduct interviews to develop further understanding of working practices and/or awareness of regulatory obligations. Departmental managers, operational staff, support staff (e.g. IT staff, security staff) as well as staff involved with information and information governance may be interviewed.

Where possible we will schedule and agree interviews with the before the on-site audit. We will give a schedule of areas to be covered before the audit, and will discuss and agree the level and grade of staff to be interviewed (e.g. managers, operational staff etc.). Individuals should be advised by the target organisation in advance of their required participation.

We will use questions to understand individual roles and processes followed or managed, specifically referring to the handling of personal data and its security. Some questions may cover training and awareness, but they will not be framed as a test, nor are they intended to catch people out.

Interviews may be conducted at an individual's desk or in a separate room dependent upon circumstances, and whether there is a need to observe the working environment or examine information and records. Interviews will normally be 'one-to-one', but sometimes it may be appropriate to include a number of staff in an interview – where, for example, there are shared responsibilities. Auditors will take notes during the interviews.

Given the nature of interviews we do not consider it necessary for interviewees to be accompanied by third parties, but we will not object where it is reasonably recommended.

We will make every effort to restrict interviews to staff identified within the agreed schedule. But when it becomes clear during an audit that access to additional staff may be necessary, we will arrange this with the consent of the data controller. Similarly, the schedule will not prevent us having confirmatory conversations with a consenting third party, for example where the third party is close to a desk-side discussion.

Interviews are to help in assessing compliance. They do not form part of, or provide information for, any individual disciplinary or criminal investigation. Should evidence of criminal activity by an individual emerge during an interview, the interview will be halted.

Individuals' names may be used in distribution lists and the acknowledgements sections of reports, but they will not be referenced in the body of any report. Job titles may be used where appropriate.

Publication of assessment reports

We will follow the procedure set out in our Communicating our Regulatory and Enforcement Activity Policy [[link](#)] when publishing assessment reports.

When we will issue Enforcement Notices

Enforcement notices may be issued in the circumstances set out in [clause 146 of the Data Protection Bill] (e.g. where a data controller or processor has breached one of the data protection principles, where a certification provider or monitoring body for a code of conduct is failing to meet their obligations, or where a digital service provider has suffered a notifiable incident under the NIS Directive).

The purpose of an enforcement notice is to mandate action (or halt action, such as processing or transfer) to bring about compliance with information rights and/or remedy a breach. Failure to comply with an enforcement notice invites further action, including the possibility of the ICO issuing a civil monetary penalty.

Enforcement notices will usually be appropriate where specific correcting action (or its prevention) may be required. Although this is not an exhaustive list, an enforcement notice may be required in such circumstances as:

- repeated failure to meet information rights obligations or timescales for them (e.g. repeatedly delayed subject access requests);

- where processing or transfer of information to a third country fails (or risks failing) to meet the requirements of the DPA;
- where there is an ongoing NIS Directive incident requiring action by a digital service provider;
- there is a need for the ICO to require communication of a data security breach to those who have been affected by it; or
- there is a need for correcting action by a certification body or monitoring body to ensure that they meet their obligations.

The notice will set out:

- who is required to take the action and why;
- the specifics of the action to be taken;
- how to report that the action has been taken; and
- the timescales that apply for that action.

When deciding whether to issue an enforcement notice, we will have regard to the factors set out above, including the presence of any mitigating or aggravating factors.

Timescales set out in an enforcement notice will usually reflect the imminence of proposed action that could lead to a breach of obligations, the severity and scale of any breach/failings, and the feasibility (including lead times) of any correcting measures or technology. Appeal timescales will also be considered when setting out timings in a notice.

Penalty Notices

The ICO's aim in applying penalty notices is to ensure compliance with legislation and information rights obligations. To do this, penalties must provide an appropriate sanction for any breach of information rights or legislation, as well as act as an effective deterrent.

Our decision whether to impose a penalty at all; **and** the decision as to the amount of the penalty in a case will involve consideration of the following factors:

- the nature, gravity and duration of the failure;
- the intentional or negligent character of the failure;
- any action taken by the data controller or data processor to mitigate the damage or distress suffered by the data subjects;

- the degree of responsibility of the data controller or data processor, taking into account technical and organisational measures implemented by the controller or processor in accordance with [clause 57, 66, 103 or 107 of the Data Protection Bill];
- any relevant previous failures by the data controller or data processor;
- the degree of co-operation with the Commissioner, in order to remedy the failure and mitigate the possible adverse risks of the failure;
- the categories of personal data affected by the failure;
- the manner in which the infringement became known to the Commissioner, including whether, and if so to what extent, the data controller or data processor notified the Commissioner of the failure;
- the extent to which the data controller or data processor has complied with previous enforcement notices or penalty notices;
- adherence to approved codes of practice or certification mechanisms;
- any other aggravating or mitigating factor applicable to the case, including financial benefits gained, or losses avoided, as a result of the failure (whether directly or indirectly);
- whether the penalty would be effective, proportionate and dissuasive.

When a Penalty Notice will be appropriate

In the majority of cases we will reserve our powers for the most serious cases, representing the most severe breaches of information rights obligations. These will typically involve wilful, deliberate or negligent acts, or repeated breaches of information rights obligations, causing harm or damage to individuals. In considering the degree of harm or damage we may consider that, where there is a lower level of impact across a large number of individuals, the totality of that damage or harm may be substantial, and may require a sanction.

This means that each case will be assessed objectively on its own merits. But our hierarchy and risk-based approach mean that it is more likely that a penalty will be imposed where, for example:

- a number of individuals have been affected;
- there has been a degree of damage or harm (which may include distress and/or embarrassment);
- sensitive personal data has been involved;

- there has been a repeated breach of obligations or a failure to rectify a previously identified problem or follow previous recommendations.;
- wilful action (including inaction) is a feature of the case;
- there has been a failure to apply reasonable measures (including relating to privacy by design) to mitigate any breach (or the possibility of it); and
- there has been a failure to implement the accountability provisions of the GDPR.

When oral representations will be appropriate

Before issuing a penalty we will advise the target that we intend to levy a penalty by issuing a notice of intent (NOI). The NOI will set out the circumstances of any breach, our investigation findings and the proposed level of penalty, along with a rationale for the penalty and any proposed enforcement notice requirements.

Representations will be taken from the proposed target about the imposition of the penalty and its level. The target will be allowed at least 21 calendar days to make these representations.

In addition, we may allow an organisation or individual subject to an NOI to submit representations orally during a face-face meeting at our office. However, this is discretionary and only relevant in cases that are considered by us to be exceptional. It is likely that these could be appropriate in circumstances where:

- the central facts of any breach or failing are in dispute;
- the integrity of any technical witness evidence is in dispute;
- there is a requirement to make reasonable adjustments under the Equality Act 2010; or
- the consideration of 'harm' elements of a case would benefit from evidence from those affected.

During these meetings, representatives of the target of the NOI are able to explain in person how the privacy concerns and breaches occurred, submit mitigating factors, what they have (or plan to do) to achieve compliance and the reasons why they believe that the ICO should not take the intended regulatory action. A request for a reduction in the size of the penalty may also be submitted during the oral representations.

If an organisation or individual thinks that their circumstances warrant oral representations of this nature, they can explain why they think this extra step is

justified in their written representations. In particular, the ICO will need to understand what oral representations will add to the regulatory process. We will then decide whether or not to invite the target to a face-face meeting.

However, it is unlikely that we will agree to take oral representations in a case that is principally technical in nature. In such cases, it is normally more appropriate to consider complex technical representations in writing.

Where appropriate, we will also have regard to representations (including from any Concerned Supervisory Authorities elsewhere in the EU where the ICO is the lead Supervisory Authority or the Data Protection Board itself) under the cooperation and consistency mechanisms of the GDPR in setting the final amount of any penalty. These representations will be taken after the consideration of representations of the target of the penalty but before the final setting of any penalty level and following the procedures set out in relevant Data Protection Board rules of procedure.

For very significant penalties (expected to be those over the threshold of £1M) a panel comprising non-executive advisors to the Commissioner's Office may be convened by the Commissioner to consider the investigation findings and any representations made, before making a recommendation to the Commissioner as to any penalty level to be applied. It will be the Commissioner's final decision as to the level of penalty applied. The panel may comprise technical experts in areas relevant to the case under consideration.

Once all representations have been fully considered we will confirm any penalty notice in writing. We will also advise those subject to penalties of any relevant rights of appeal that apply to their case.

What will be the amount of any penalty

Where we have discretion to set the amount of any penalty in the context of our regulatory work, we will approach setting any penalty level, within the legislative bands, on the basis of the following mechanism:

- Step 1.** An 'initial element' removing any financial gain from the breach.
- Step 2.** Adding in an element to censure the breach based on its scale and severity, taking into account the considerations identified at [clause 152(2)-(4) of the Data Protection Bill].
- Step 3.** Adding in an element to reflect any aggravating factors.

Step 4. Adding in an amount for deterrent effect to others.

Step 5. Reducing the amount (save that in the initial element) to reflect any mitigating factors, including ability to pay (financial hardship).

In data protection cases (including NIS cases) involving failures to meet data security obligations we will consider the breach separately from the failure to report. In all other cases we will adopt a 'whole' case' approach when setting the penalty level.

Generally, the amount will be higher where:

- vulnerable individuals or critical national infrastructure are affected;
- there has been deliberate action for financial or personal gain;
- advice, guidance, recommendations or warnings (including those from a data protection officer or the ICO) have been ignored or not acted upon;
- there has been a high degree of intrusion into the privacy of a data subject;
- there has been a failure to cooperate with an ICO investigation or enforcement notice; and
- there is a pattern of poor regulatory history by the target of the investigation.

Fixed penalties

Certain legislation provides for set penalties to be applied for failing to meet specific obligations (for example, a failure to pay the relevant fee to the ICO). Where those provisions apply, we will levy those penalties in accordance with the law.

For the purposes of [clause 155 of the Data Protection Bill], the fixed penalty payable by a data controller for any type of failure to comply with the Charges regulations in-

(a) tier 1 (micro organisations), is £400;

(b) tier 2 (small and medium organisations), is £600;

(c) tier 3 (large organisations), is £4,000²¹.

However, we reserve the right to increase this amount to a statutory maximum of £4,350²² for data controllers in tier 3 in respect of a failure to provide the ICO with sufficient information to determine the appropriate fee/exemption, depending on aggravating factors (for example, a failure to engage or co-operate with the ICO).

Cost recovery

We will not consider our own investigative or regulatory costs in the application of a penalty calculation. All monetary penalties will be payable for the benefit of HM Treasury and the Consolidated Fund.

The NIS Directive provides that the ICO should develop, by 2020, a mechanism to recover its costs in regulating Digital Service Providers (DSPs). The ICO will produce separate guidance on how it proposes to do this, in consultation with relevant DSPs.

Effectiveness of regulatory action

Our Information Rights Strategy sets out the measures we apply to the effectiveness of our work.

We will report annually to Parliament about our work, including our regulatory activity and, where needed, our formal enforcement actions. This may also include reporting on specific issues identified with individual organisations, sectors or public authorities where systemic information rights problems have been identified and addressed.

Evaluation and next steps

We will keep this Policy under review and evaluate it regularly and at least at the end of the Information Rights Strategic Plan timeline. We will update it to reflect any amendments to legislation, including any implementation of an updated e-Privacy Regulation, and once the final settlement between the EU and the UK post-Brexit is confirmed.

²¹ As defined in regulation 3 of the Charges regulations.

²² See clause 155(3) of the Data Protection Bill.

Annex 1: Regulatory Priorities 2018-19

Our approach, described above, is not only to respond to risk but to actively seek areas that raise potential for risk to individuals and take proactive action to mitigate any risks. We identify these areas by keeping abreast of technology advances, engaging with industry and the public sector, analysing patterns in complaints and concerns raised with us and reviewing practices through our audit programme. We also draw in learning from EU and wider international colleagues.

Each year we identify themes where we will pay particular regard in application of our regulatory resource. Sometimes this will be to understand more about the issue, other times this will be to 'head off' risks to the UK.

For the coming year, we have identified the following areas as priorities for our action.

1. Large scale data and cyber security breaches involving financial or sensitive information
2. AI, big data and automated decision making
3. Web and cross device tracking for marketing (including for political purposes)
4. Privacy impacts for children (including Internet of Things connected toys and social media / marketing apps aimed at children)
5. Facial recognition technology applications
6. Credit reference agencies and data broking
7. Use and sharing of law enforcement data, including intelligence systems
8. Right to be forgotten/erasure applications

Where there are decisions to be taken about application of our resources we will consider this list and prioritise our resource allocation accordingly.