

# ICO consultation on the draft updated data sharing code of practice

Data sharing brings important benefits to organisations and individuals, making our lives easier and helping to deliver efficient services.

It is important, however, that organisations which share personal data have high data protection standards, sharing data in ways that are fair, transparent and accountable. We also want organisations to be confident when dealing with data sharing matters, so individuals can be confident their data has been shared securely and responsibly.

As required by the Data Protection Act 2018, we are working on updating our **data sharing code of practice**, which was published in 2011. We are now seeking your views on the [draft updated code](#).

The draft updated code explains and advises on changes to data protection legislation where these changes are relevant to data sharing. It addresses many aspects of the new legislation including transparency, lawful bases for processing, the new accountability principle and the requirement to record processing activities.

The draft updated code continues to provide practical guidance in relation to data sharing and promotes good practice in the sharing of personal data. It also seeks to allay common concerns around data sharing.

As well as legislative changes, the code deals with technical and other developments that have had an impact on data sharing since the publication of the last code in 2011.

Before drafting the code, the Information Commissioner launched a call for views in August 2018. You can view a summary of the responses and some of the individual responses [here](#).

If you wish to make any comments not covered by the questions in the survey, or you have any general queries about the consultation, please email us at [datasharingcode@ico.org.uk](mailto:datasharingcode@ico.org.uk).

Please send us your responses by **Monday 9 September 2019**.

## Privacy Statement

For this consultation, we will publish all responses except for those where the respondent indicates that they are an individual acting in a private capacity (e.g. a member of the public). All responses from organisations

and individuals responding in a professional capacity will be published. We will remove email addresses and telephone numbers from these responses; but apart from this, we will publish them in full.

For more information about what we do with personal data please see our [privacy notice](#).

## Questions

Note: when commenting, please bear in mind that, on the whole, the code does not duplicate the content of existing guidance on particular data protection issues, but instead encourages the reader to refer to the most up to date guidance on the ICO website.

Q1 Does the updated code adequately explain and advise on the new aspects of data protection legislation which are relevant to data sharing?

Yes

No

Q2 If not, please specify where improvements could be made.

The code speaks about "data sharing agreement", however it would be better to speak about "contract" to make it clearer that this should be legally binding.

On page 4: the sentence "This code covers the sharing of personal data between organisations which are controllers" is misleading to suggest that the sharing of data only takes place between controllers given the following sentence.

On page 4: the sentence "You must identify at least one lawful basis for sharing data from the start" should be amended to "before any data sharing begins" to make it clearer.

Under data sharing covered by this code on page 16, the two sentences "This means giving personal data to a third party, by whatever means; and includes when you give a third party access to personal data on or via your IT systems. For the purposes of this code, it does not include sharing data with employees, or with processors." are confusing and

unclear when put together. It would be worth reiterating after "with processors, such as third party IT service providers."

There are some inconsistencies in the code regarding data processors that need to be addressed and specified.

Page 17: on the list showing what data sharing could cover, does that include third party data controller given that the scope says it excludes processors? Following this, the real-life data sharing example of a retailer providing customer details to a payment processing company, is an example of data sharing with a data processor while it was said above that this was out of scope.

If this is indeed out of scope then this example should be removed otherwise the section above needs to be amended accordingly.

Page 19: there is a paragraph on a sharing data with a processor whereas it repeatedly says before that sharing data with a data processor is out of scope. We would also suggest to move this section up to the relevant scoping point.

We would recommend that the last paragraph on page 17 is included in the summary for completeness.

On the list on page 21 on the need to do a DPIA, criminal offence data is included in the special category data so we wonder why the code calls this out separately? If necessary it would be better to say, "special category data, such as criminal offence data".

On page 25, the first paragraph under "in more details" should state "it is good practice to have one in place 'if there is no formal contract already in place'."

On page 27, it is written that "if you are using consent as a lawful basis for disclosure, then your agreement could provide a model consent form". The sentence should be amended and say "your agreement **SHOULD** provide a model consent form" on the basis that this forms part of the evidence assessed in DPIA.

On page 34, on the role of the Data Protection Officer (DPO) in a data sharing arrangement, in some organisations, like Marie Curie, information governance is separate from the DPO so it may be more appropriate to say "the DPO ensures compliance with data protection law, provides advise to staff faced with decisions about data sharing and work with colleagues to ensure information governance requirements are met" instead of "the DPO advises everyone on information governance..." as stated in the code.

On page 37, under lawful basis for sharing personal data – at a glance, instead of saying “beforehand”, we would suggest write “before any data sharing took place”

On page 60, regarding the legal powers for private and third sector organisations, the sentence “if you are a private sector organisation...” is not clear as this also applies to third sector. Marie Curie has, for example, regulatory and contractual requirements for compliance with NHS DSPT, Gambling Commission RTS, PCI DSS.

The section “data sharing in an urgent situation or in an emergency” should be put further forward in the code to emphasis its importance and that data protection is not a blocker.

It also needs to acknowledge the 'smaller' emergencies and give examples, e.g. a vulnerable child is at risk out of hours and local authority needs to share info with charity than can assist.

Q3 Does the draft code cover the right issues about data sharing?

Yes

No

Q4 If no, what other issues would you like to be covered in it?

On page 26 regarding the benefits of a data sharing agreement, it says that drafting and adhering to an agreement does not in itself provide the parties with any form of legal indemnity from action under the data protection legislation or other law. This is a really important point that needs to be made in the summary at the beginning of the code so that people understand the options and risks of doing a data sharing agreement rather than a formal contract. Whilst the latter doesn't provide indemnity from action either, it does address who is at fault and rectification, indemnities, etc.

The section on due diligence when sharing data following mergers and acquisitions should include a statement that makes it clear that if there is mergers and acquisitions and later it is found that the acquired company had a data breach, it is the acquiring company that is liable. It would also be good to provide an example, such as Talk Talk.

Q5 Does the draft code contain the right level of detail?

Yes

No

Q6 If no, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft code?

On page 13, the section about sharing data with people's consent does not mention the specifics of sharing data without people's consent, which would be highly relevant for the code to comment on. This section should specifically reference that "there are other legal basis, one of which involves carrying out a legitimate interests assessment".

On the same page, having an example on the possibility of sharing data in an emergency would be useful, e.g. such as a vulnerable child's safety being at risk if the information is not shared.

Regarding the examples the code provides under "the benefits of data sharing" (page 13), they are all related to patients, health and social care. Whilst this is very relevant for us, the code should provide some examples for other sectors as alluded to in the introductory summary. The next section has a good example for inclusion that will apply to many organisations on third party IT service providers that can remotely access an organisation's systems to provide support.

On page 29 under the paragraph on when to review a data sharing agreement, it says that it should be reviewed on a regular basis. What does regular mean? Is there a recommendation of no less than once per year or is it up to each organisation? For instance, could one determine that 'regular' means every 5 years?

Q7 Has the draft code sufficiently addressed new areas or developments in data protection that are having an impact on your organisation's data sharing practices?

Yes

No

Q8 If no, please specify what areas are not being addressed, or not being addressed in enough detail

The draft code presents the data protection principles but does not cover some important areas of fundraising, for instance the possibilities to fundraise on social media or using Facebook ads which are not GDPR compliant. It would be useful if the code could address these data protection issues as it is relatively hard to remain competitive while ensuring GDPR is respected.

In addition, a case study related to the deep mind sharing should also be included as an example of healthcare working with Google and other AI companies. Related to this, the code should address data sharing that occurs with the use of Alexa.

The code should also present cases of data sharing of charities working with health and social care where the same lawful basis doesn't apply.

Q9 Does the draft code provide enough clarity on good practice in data sharing?

Yes

No

Q10 If no, please indicate the section(s) of the draft code which could be improved, and what can be done to make the section(s) clearer.

The flow of the document isn't always particularly helpful. As stated above, data sharing in an urgent situation or in an emergency should be put further forward in the document to emphasis its importance and that data protection is not a blocker. It also needs to acknowledge the 'smaller' emergencies and give examples, e.g. a vulnerable child is at risk out of hours and local authority needs to share info with charity than can assist.

Q11 Does the draft code strike the right balance between recognising the benefits of sharing data and the need to protect it?

Yes

No

Q12 If no, in what way does the draft code fail to strike this balance?

For a charity like Marie Curie, it is not commercially viable not to use social media marketing due to data protection laws. For instance, Marie Curie does not use Facebook ads to look for new donors as Facebook does not respect data protection law. However, by respecting the data protection law, this puts the charity at a clear disadvantage against other charities that do use those ads or other means to reach out to more people on social media. The code should address those challenges recognising that charitable work depends on fundraising activities on social media.

Q13 Does the draft code cover case studies or data sharing scenarios relevant to your organisation?

Yes

No

Q14 Please provide any further comments or suggestions you may have about the draft code.

The draft code could add a reference section or appendix directing people to approved sources of industry sector and specific guidance, such as NHS Information Governance Alliance and NHS Secondary Use Data Governance Tool at <https://data.england.nhs.uk/sudgt/> , the Direct Marketing Association's Code <https://dma.org.uk/the-dma-code>, Fundraising Regulator Code, section 5 <https://www.fundraisingregulator.org.uk/code/personal-information>

Q15 To what extent do you agree that the draft code is clear and easy to understand?

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Q16 Are you answering as:

An individual acting in a private capacity (e.g. someone providing their views as a member of the public of the public)

An individual acting in a professional capacity

On behalf of an organisation

Other

Please specify the name of your organisation:

Marie Curie

Thank you for taking the time to share your views and experience.