

On-line privacy and data protection in the EU

Merijn Schik,
DG Information Society, European Commission

Disclaimer

**This presentation is provided for information purposes only
It does not constitute an official position of the European Commission. The Commission cannot
accept any responsibility or liability. The Commission is not the arbiter for interpretation
of Community law. Only the European Court of Justice can decide finally on the interpretation of
Community law.**



Introduction

- Actions taken by Member States 2006-2008 in the fight against spam, spyware and malware (stock taking exercise prepared by Timelex CVBA)
- Telecom Review proposals



Background : 2006 Communication on stepping up the Fight against spam, spyware and malware

Content

- Stakeholders actions to raise awareness
- Protective measures taken by industry/best practices
- Enforcement efforts by competent authorities
- State of international cooperation



2006 Communication on stepping up the Fight against spam, spyware and malware

Identified critical success factors for enforcement

- A strong commitment by central government
- Clear organisational responsibility
- Adequate resources for the enforcement authority



2006 Communication on stepping up the Fight against spam, spyware and malware

Action list

- Enforcement efforts should be stepped up
- Clear responsibilities for national agencies should be established and effective coordination should be ensured
- Knowledge and expertise of market players should be put to use
- Agencies should be adequately resourced
- International cooperation procedures should be put into practice
- Industry responsibility (filtering, information standards etc.)



The 2008 study: Examining the follow up of actions in Member States

Main findings of the Study

- Legislation to combat spam and online malware is in place in the EU. Enforcement has increased.
- There are informative websites and/or complaint channels in place in all Member States
- In general the industry has implemented and provides technical measures against spam and malware
- There are several examples of well organized cooperation between government agencies and with the industry



The 2008 study: Examining the follow up of actions in Member States

However the activity level and availability of information differs between Member States

- In general the level of cooperation between government agencies and with industry should be improved
- Effective sanctions are not always imposed and the number of cases prosecuted varies considerably
- Not enough cooperation schemes are in place at the international level
- More resources should be dedicated to competent authorities (budget and staff)



The 2008 study: Examining the follow up of actions in Member States

Examples

- More than 140 cases investigated in EU Member States (Spain (39), Slovakia (39) and Romania (20)) while some countries investigated only a handful of complaints.
- The highest fines were imposed in the Netherlands (€1 000 000), Italy (€570 000) and Spain (€30 000) while in other countries spammers received very modest fines ranging from several hundreds to several thousands of Euros
- Good examples of cooperation schemes such as Signalspam (France), eCops (Belgium), the Cybercrime Working group (the Netherlands)



The 2008 study: Examining the follow up of actions in Member States

Commission concludes

- Member States and all stakeholders should reinforce their efforts to fight on-line privacy threats from spam, spyware and malware
- Evidence shows that while progress has been made, we need to do more (resources, national/international cooperation)
- The Commission has already played a significant part by proposing new instruments in the Telecom Reform Package which will support these efforts once the new telecom rules are adopted



The Telecom Reform package

Better Regulation Directive

Framework

Access

Authorisation

Citizens Rights Directive

Universal service

ePrivacy

Regulation
on Authority

Recommendation
relevant markets
+ Explan Note

Digital Dividend
Communication

Review
Communication

Impact Assessment
+ Summary



Directive 2002/58 on privacy and electronic communications (ePrivacy Directive)

Art 13 of Directive 2002/58 (ePrivacy Directive) puts a ban on spam:

- Direct marketing using electronic mail (automated calls, e-mail, SMS, fax) is subject to prior consent of subscribers. There is a limited exception for communications sent to existing customers by the same person on its similar services or products
- > *This regime applies to subscribers who are natural persons, but Member States can choose to extend it to legal persons*
- Disguising or concealing the identity of the sender on whose behalf the communication is made is prohibited
- All e-mails must include a valid return address where to opt-out



Telecom Reform Package

Strengthening the existing rules on spam

- Including the sending of '**phishing**' messages in the activities banned by art. 13 by prohibiting the sending of e-mail that is in contravention of art. 6 of Directive 2000/31/EC;
- Introducing a new paragraph to art. 13 which provides natural or legal persons with a private **right of action** against spammers;
- Formalizing **cross border** enforcement **cooperation** mechanisms by including art. 13 in the EU Regulation on Consumer Protection Cooperation (CPC Regulation)



Directive 2002/58 on privacy and electronic communications (ePrivacy Directive)

Article 5 of Directive 2002/58 (ePrivacy Directive)

- Allows the storing of information/access to information stored in terminal equipment **using electronic communications networks** under specific conditions (prior information, right to refuse)



Telecom Reform Package

Strengthening the existing rules on spyware and malware

- Storing information/access to information stored in terminal equipment using spyware, malware is always illegal, irrespective whether this is installed using an electronic communication network **or from an "off-line" source** (CD-ROM, USB key etc.).



Other proposals included in the Telecom Reform Package: security

Stronger obligations for operators to ensure the integrity and security of their networks and services

- Consumer contracts to provide minimum of information related to security of electronic communications services
- Mandatory breach notification
 - to competent authority: significant impact on operation
 - to competent authority and consumers: personal data compromised



Other proposals included in the Telecom Reform: empowering national authorities

Increased enforcement capability

- Binding instructions on security measures (set at national or EU level)
- Better information
 - notifications
 - security audits
- Sufficient resources
- Better cooperation and support
 - CPC Regulation



References

- Commission Telecom Reform proposals:
<http://ec.europa.eu/ecomm>
- European Parliament legislative observatory:
<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/oeil/FindByProcnum.do?lang=2&procnum=COD/2007/0248>
- The Study:
http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/policy/ecomm/library/ext_studies/index_en.htm#2009

The press release: IP/09/1487 (Commission press room)

