

EDITOR'S NOTE: FEDERAL, STATE AND INTERNATIONAL PRIVACY REGULATORS MOVE FORWARD

Victoria Prussen Spears

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION SETTLES WITH IHEALTH.IO GENETIC TESTING FIRM OVER ALLEGED PRIVACY AND SECURITY VIOLATIONS Haley N. Bavasi, Tracy Shapiro, Maneesha Mithal, Hale Melnick and Yeji Kim

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION LAUNCHES PRIVACY AND DATA PROTECTION TASK FORCE

Megan L. Brown, Kathleen E. Scott and Kyle M. Gutierrez

THE CORPORATE TRANSPARENCY ACT: BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP INFORMATION REPORTING CHECKLIST

Megan L. Jones and Brent A. Morowitz

MAINTAINING THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE STATE AS PART OF A RESPONSE TO AN RFP OR RFQ

Thomas J. Cafferty, Nomi I. Lowy, and Lauren James-Weir

CLAIM UNDER ILLINOIS BIOMETRIC INFORMATION PRIVACY ACT ACCRUES WITH EACH SCAN OR TRANSMISSION OF PRIVATE INFORMATION, ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT RULES

David C. Layden, Caroline L. Meneau and Annie Kastanek

THE NIS2 DIRECTIVE: TOWARDS A FIRMER EU-WIDE CYBERSECURITY FRAMEWORK Bart Lieben

### UK'S UPDATED DATA PROTECTION REFORM PROPOSALS

Huw Beverley-Smith, Charlotte H. N. Perowne and Jeanine E. Leahy

## Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report

VOLUME 9	NUMBER 7	September 2023
Move Forward	te and International Privacy Regulator	
Victoria Prussen Spears		221
Over Alleged Privacy and	•	
Haley N. Bavasi, Tracy Shap	piro, Maneesha Mithal, Hale Melnick an	d Yeji Kim 224
Federal Communications Protection Task Force	Commission Launches Privacy and Da	ıta
Megan L. Brown, Kathleen	E. Scott and Kyle M. Gutierrez	228
The Corporate Transparen Reporting Checklist	acy Act: Beneficial Ownership Informa	tion
Megan L. Jones and Brent A	A. Morowitz	233
Maintaining the Confiden Part of a Response to an R	itiality of Information Provided to the	State as
-	. Lowy, and Lauren James-Weir	238
	netric Information Privacy Act Accrues rivate Information, Illinois Supreme C	
	L. Meneau and Annie Kastanek	243
<b>The NIS2 Directive: Towa</b> Bart Lieben	rds a Firmer EU-Wide Cybersecurity F	ramework 247
UK's Updated Data Protec	ction Reform Proposals	
	lotte H. N. Perowne and Jeanine E. Leah	y 253



#### QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the <b>Editorial Content</b> appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please contact: Alexandra Jefferies at
Customer Services Department at
Your account manager or

ISBN: 978-1-6328-3362-4 (print) ISBN: 978-1-6328-3363-1 (eBook)

ISSN: 2380-4785 (Print) ISSN: 2380-4823 (Online) Cite this publication as:

 $[author\ name],\ [\textit{article\ title}],\ [vol.\ no.]\ PRATT'S\ PRIVACY\ \&CYBERSECURITY\ LAW\ REPORT\ [page\ number]$ 

(LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Laura Clark Fey and Jeff Johnson, *Shielding Personal Information in eDiscovery*, [1] PRATT'S PRIVACY & CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT [82] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license.A.S. Pratt is a trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2023 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

An A.S. Pratt Publication Editorial

Editorial Offices 630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800 201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200 www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW **\ODER** 

## Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

#### EDITOR-IN-CHIEF STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

#### **EDITOR**

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

#### **BOARD OF EDITORS**

EMILIO W. CIVIDANES

Partner, Venable LLP

CHRISTOPHER G. CWALINA

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

RICHARD D. HARRIS

Partner, Day Pitney LLP

JAY D. KENISBERG

Senior Counsel, Rivkin Radler LLP

DAVID C. LASHWAY

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

CRAIG A. NEWMAN

Partner, Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler LLP

ALAN CHARLES RAUL

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

RANDI SINGER

Partner, Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP

JOHN P. TOMASZEWSKI

Senior Counsel, Seyfarth Shaw LLP

TODD G. VARE

Partner, Barnes & Thornburg LLP

THOMAS F. ZYCH

Partner, Thompson Hine

Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report is published nine times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2023 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974.

# UK's Updated Data Protection Reform Proposals

#### By Huw Beverley-Smith, Charlotte H. N. Perowne and Jeanine E. Leaby\*

In this article, the authors discuss a new Data Protection and Digital Information Bill introduced recently by the UK government.

The UK government recently introduced a new Data Protection and Digital Information (No. 2) Bill (the New Bill). The reforms are intended to update and simplify the UK's data protection framework and reduce burdens on organizations, while maintaining high data protection standards.

The New Bill replaces the original Data Protection and Digital Information Bill introduced in July 2022 (the Previous Bill). Much of the original drafting remains the same in the New Bill. However, there are some key changes to the proposals, outlined below.

#### RECORD KEEPING

The New Bill proposes significant changes to record-keeping requirements. The Previous Bill required all businesses, except for small organizations that do not carry out high-risk processing, to maintain records of processing activities. The New Bill relaxes the requirements further. Controllers and processors will share record-keeping duties and will only need to keep records of processing where their personal data processing activities are likely to result in a high risk to the rights and freedoms of individuals, regardless of the size of their business. Whether processing is likely to be considered high risk will depend on the nature, scope, context and purposes of the processing. The Information Commissioner will also be required to publish guidance providing examples of high-risk processing to add clarity for businesses.

#### LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The New Bill maintains the general position under the Previous Bill of "recognized" legitimate interests that will automatically be considered acceptable without a balancing test, covering limited areas such as national security, emergencies and crime prevention security. The New Bill goes further and introduces in its operative provisions a non-exhaustive list of examples of processing which might be considered necessary for the purposes of conducting a legitimate interests assessment, including direct marketing, intra-group transmission of personal data where necessary for internal administrative purposes, and ensuring the security of network and information systems.

<sup>\*</sup> Huw Beverley-Smith (huw.beverley-smith@faegredrinker.com) is a partner in the London office of Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP. Charlotte H. N. Perowne (charlotte.perowne@faegredrinker.com) is an associate and Jeanine E. Leahy (jeanine.leahy@faegredrinker.com) is a trainee solicitor at the firm.

These examples are not part of the list of "recognized" legitimate interests and data controllers will still be required to carry out a balancing test to ensure their interests are not outweighed by the data subject's rights and interests. This potentially results in greater confusion where businesses are seeking to rely on legitimate interests as a lawful basis for their processing.

It creates, in effect, a three-tiered structure of:

- 1. "[R]ecognized" legitimate interests (requiring no balancing test);
- 2. The necessary examples listed in the New Bill (requiring a balancing test); and
- 3. Any other potentially necessary activities considered by businesses to be legitimate commercial activities (also requiring a balancing test).

#### **AUTOMATED DECISION MAKING AND AI**

Under the Previous Bill, restrictions on the use of automated decision making were only to apply to decisions that are a result of automated processing without "meaningful human involvement." The New Bill expands on this by expressly stating that the extent to which the decision is reached by means of profiling must be taken into account.

#### INTERNATIONAL DATA TRANSFERS

The Previous Bill proposed a new approach to assessing international data transfers and assessing the adequacy of the third country and conducting transfer impact assessments. The threshold would be met provided data protection standards in a given third country were not "materially lower" than in the UK. The New Bill confirms that data transfer mechanisms lawfully entered into under the current UK GDPR, before the bill takes effect will continue to be valid.

#### SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH PURPOSES

The New Bill contains an updated, broader definition of "scientific research purposes," relevant for the existing exceptions that apply when processing for such purposes. The definition includes (as it did under the Previous Bill) research "that can reasonably be described as scientific," while adding that such research may be carried out for the purposes of commercial or non-commercial activity (whether publicly or privately funded). This explicit inclusion of commercial activity is likely a welcome development in the New Bill for businesses looking to rely on this exception. The New Bill also includes a non-exhaustive, illustrative list of types of scientific research, and clarifies that research into public health is only considered scientific research if it is in the public interest.

#### COOKIES, ONLINE TRACKING AND MARKETING

Some of the more significant divergences from the EU in the Previous Bill related to use of cookies and other online tracking. One such proposed change was the expansion of the marketing opt-out under the Privacy and Electronic Communications Regulations (PECR) to include non-commercial organizations for charitable, political or other non-commercial objectives.

The New Bill, however, expands the obligations on providers of electronic communications networks such that they would be required to notify the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) (or as it will be called, the Information Commission) of suspected contravention of direct marketing rules, with the risk of fines for non-compliance. This is likely to result in increased enforcement of these rules and will sit alongside an increase in the level of fines for PECR breach to GDPR-levels, which had already been set out in the Previous Bill.

#### COMMENT AND NEXT STEPS

Overall, the New Bill makes relatively few substantive changes to the Previous Bill. Amendments to simplify record keeping, to expand the scope of using personal data for scientific research, and to clarify the position on several other key areas such as international transfers, are welcome.