Evaluation of the LED under Article 62 – Questions to Data Protection Authorities / European Data Protection Board

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Background

The Data Protection Law Enforcement Directive (LED)\[1\] entered into force on 6 May 2016 and the Member States had to transpose it by 6 May 2018\[2\]. It applies to the domestic and cross-border processing of personal data by competent authorities for the purposes of preventing, investigating, detecting or prosecuting criminal offences and executing criminal penalties, including safeguarding against and preventing threats to public security. The LED is the first instrument that takes a comprehensive approach to data protection in the field of law enforcement, including by regulating ‘domestic’ processing. It is therefore a significant development compared with the earlier Framework Decision (which covered only transmission between Member States) that it repealed and replaced.

By harmonising the protection of personal data by law enforcement authorities in EU and Schengen countries, it contributes to increased trust and data exchange between authorities for law enforcement purposes, provided such exchange is based on a law, while at the same time ensuring that the rights of individuals are effectively protected.

As required by the LED\[3\], the Commission shall present to the European Parliament and to the Council a first report on the evaluation and review of the Directive by 6 May 2022\[4\]. Following the review the Commission shall, if necessary, submit appropriate proposals for amendments, in particular taking account of developments in information technology and in the light of the state of progress in the information society\[5\].

The LED stipulates that the Commission shall take into account the positions and findings of the European Parliament, of the Council and of other relevant bodies or sources\[6\]. The Commission may also request information from Member States and supervisory authorities. The Commission has already started a dialogue with the Member States through the Council Working party on Data Protection. A dedicated questionnaire has also been sent to civil society organisations by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA).

For the purpose of the evaluation and review the Commission shall in particular examine the application and functioning of the LED provisions on international data transfers\[7\]. Besides, this questionnaire seeks to cover other aspects with particular relevance for the supervisory authorities, such as the exercise of their tasks and powers and their cooperation with each other, as well as the consistent application of the LED in the EU.
As this questionnaire intends to contribute to evaluating the LED, in your replies please provide information on your activities (e.g. as regards the decision-making, awareness-raising, training etc.) which fall under the scope of the LED.

We would be grateful to receive the replies to this questionnaire in its online form in English, before 5 November 2021, so that they can be sent to the European Commission as part of the EDPB contribution to the LED review by 17 December 2021

Please note that your replies may be made public.

When there are several DPAs in your Member State, please provide a consolidated reply at national level.

When replying, please take into account that the questions below concern the period from the date when the LED was transposed in your Member State to 5 November 2021, unless otherwise specified.

Following the input from other stakeholders, it is not excluded that we might have additional questions at a later stage.


QUESTIONNAIRE

We kindly ask the countries that have more than one SA to send us one consolidated reply.

* Select your Country

   Hungary

Powers

* Q1: In your opinion, did the LED strengthen your investigative powers / corrective powers?
   - Yes
   - No

* Q2: Please list your investigative powers
   - To obtain, from the controller and the processor, access to all personal data and to all information necessary for the performance of its tasks
   - To obtain access to any premises of the controller and the processor, including to any data processing equipment and means, in accordance with Union or Member State procedural law
   - To carry out investigations in the form of data protection audits
   - Other(s)
Q3: Do you consider your investigation powers effective

- Yes
- No

Q3.2: If needed, please provide more details below:

These tools are quite effective tools because they allow individual circumstances to be considered in a particular case so a tailor-made decision shall be concluded at the end of the procedure.

Q4: Do you face any practical difficulties in applying your investigative powers?

- Yes
- No

Q4.1: Which kind of difficulties - for instance, have you been prevented from accessing information on the grounds of protection of sensitive information?

The absence of identification of the controller is a persistent problem. Another problem is that the data controller does not provide enough information related to the case in many times.

Q5: Have you conducted investigations and/or inspections on your own initiative or only on the basis of complaints?

Multiple replies are possible
- On our own initiative
- On the basis of complaints

Q6: Do you have all the powers listed under Article 47(2)(a), (b - including rectification, erasure, restriction) and (c) LED?

- Yes
- No

Q7: Do you have the same corrective powers towards all law enforcement authorities?
Q8: Do you consider your corrective powers effective?
- Yes
- No

Q9: Have you used your corrective powers?
- Yes
- No

Q9.1: Which corrective powers have you applied and in how many cases? [Please list the powers used according to article 47(2)(a), (b) and (c) LED. Amongst those cases, how many were related to the supervision of SIS II[1] and VIS[2]?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIS II and VIS</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47(2)(a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47(2)(b)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47(2)(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Q9.1.5: Art.47(2)(b) : Number of other cases NOT related to the supervision of SIS II and VIS:

- 3

Q9.2: Have the competent authorities or processors complied with the decisions that you issued in the exercise of your corrective powers?
- Yes
- No

Complaints

Q10: Has there been an increase in complaints following the LED transposition in your Member State?
- Yes
- No

Q10.1: Please indicate approximate increase in percentages.
In 2018 we had 18 complaints, in 2019 we had 36, and in 2020 we had 41 and in 2021 there were 46 complaints. As comparison 2018 with 2019, the number of complaints has doubled. In 2019 this number indicates a slow rise with average increase of 12%. In this extent, the number of complaints obviously increased significantly but we do not have exact data before 2018 regarding to this matter. Therefore, it is advisable to examine the number of complaints on a yearly basis.

Q11: Please indicate the issues raised the most in these complaints, in particular as regards data subject rights.

- The respect of the proportionality and necessity principle (Article 4 LED)
- The respect of the purpose limitation principle, including for subsequent processing
- Data minimisation principle (Article 4 (1)(c) LED)
- Accuracy of the data (Article 4 (1)(d) LED)
- Storage limitation principle (Article 4 (1)(e) LED) and appropriate time limits (Article 5 LED)
- Accountability of the controller (Article 4(4) LED)
- The determination of the legal basis (Article 8 / Article 10 LED)
- The conditions related to the processing of special categories of personal data (Article 10 LED)
- Automated individual decision-making, including the right to obtain human intervention in automated individual decision-making (Article 11 LED)
- Modalities for exercising the rights (Article 12 LED)
- The right to information (Article 13 LED)
- Right of access by the data subject and limitations to this right (Articles 14 and 15 LED)
- The right to rectification or erasure of personal data (Article 16 LED)
- Exercise of the data subject’s rights in the context of joint controllership (Article 21 LED)
- Data protection by design and by default (Article 20)
- The obligation to keep track of the logs and purposes of processing regarding the logs (Article 25 LED)
- The obligation to conduct a data protection impact assessment (Article 27 LED)
- The obligation to ensure the security of processing, including data breaches (Articles 4(1)(f), 29 LED)
- Other

Q11.2: The respect of the purpose limitation principle, including for subsequent processing- raised issues:

00000

Q11.3: Data minimisation principle (Article 4 (1)(c) LED)- raised issues:
Q11.4: Accuracy of the data (Article 4 (1)(d) LED) - raised issues:

Q11.5: Storage limitation principle (Article 4 (1)(e) LED) and appropriate time limits (Article 5 LED) - raised issues:

Q11.6: Accountability of the controller (Article 4(4) LED) - raised issues:
Q11.8: The conditions related to the processing of special categories of personal data (Article 10 LED) - raised issues:

Q11.10: Modalities for exercising the rights (Article 12 LED) - raised issues:

Q11.11: The right to information (Article 13 LED) - raised issues:
Q11.12: Right of access by the data subject and limitations to this right (Articles 14 and 15 LED) - raised issues:

Q11.13: The right to rectification or erasure of personal data (Article 16 LED) - raised issues:

* Q11.19: Other- please specify:
Q12: Are you following up on all complaints?

- Yes
- No

Q13: Have you received complaints by organisations representing data subjects under Article 55 LED?

- Yes
- No

Consultations and advisory powers

Q14: Have competent authorities utilised the prior consultation procedure in accordance with Article 28 (1)(a) or (b) LED?

- Yes
- No

Q15: Have you established a list of processing operations subject to prior consultation pursuant to Article 28(3) LED?

- Yes
- No

Q16: Does your national parliament / government consult you during the preparation of legislative or other regulatory measures with a data protection dimension?

- Not at all
- Occasionally
- Systematically

Q17: How many opinions under Article 47(3) LED, other than prior consultations pursuant to Art 28 (1) LED, have you issued upon request or on your own initiative?

From 2018 to 2021 the overall number of opinions issued are 84 for the governmental bodies upon request, and 7 on own initiative in accordance with LED.
Q18: Please indicate the types of issues on which competent authorities have approached you for advice (e.g. data breach notifications, handling of data subjects' requests, security).

[Multiple replies are possible – please note that as regards consultations in the context of DPIAs relevant replies should be made to Questions 17 and 18]

- The respect of the proportionality and necessity principle (Article 4 LED)
- Storage limitation principle (Article 4 (1)(e) LED) and appropriate time limits (Article 5 LED)
- Accountability of the controller (Article 4(4) LED)
- The determination of the legal basis (Article 8 / Article 10 LED)
- Processing of special categories of personal data (Article 10 LED)
- Types of processing, in particular, using new technologies, mechanisms or procedures (Article 27 / Article 28 (1)(a) LED)
- Processing for purpose of research and/or innovation (Article 9(2) LED)
- Automated individual decision-making, including profiling (Article 11 LED)
- Modalities for exercising the rights (Article 12 LED)
- Handling of data subjects requests in relation to the exercise of their rights (Chapter III LED)
- Joint controllership, including on the arrangements of the joint controllers’ responsibilities (Article 21 LED)
- Controller / processor arrangements (Article 22 LED)
- Data protection by design and by default, including anonymisation and pseudonymisation (Article 20 LED)
- The obligation to keep track of the logs and purposes of processing regarding the logs (Article 25 LED)
- Appropriate security measures (Article 4(1)(f) and Article 29 LED)
- Other

Q18.2: Storage limitation principle (Article 4 (1)(e) LED) and appropriate time limits (Article 5 LED) - raised issues:

00000

Q18.3: Accountability of the controller (Article 4(4) LED) - raised issues:

00000
Q18.4: The determination of the legal basis (Article 8 / Article 10 LED) - raised issues:

00000

Q18.5: Processing of special categories of personal data (Article 10 LED) - raised issues:

00000

Q18.6: Types of processing, in particular, using new technologies, mechanisms or procedures (Article 27 / Article 28 (1)(a) LED) - raised issues:

00000

Q18.8: Automated individual decision-making, including profiling (Article 11 LED) - raised issues:
Q18.9: Modalities for exercising the rights (Article 12 LED) - raised issues:

Q18.10: Handling of data subjects requests in relation to the exercise of their rights (Chapter III LED) - raised issues:

Q18.13: Data protection by design and by default, including anonymisation and pseudonymisation (Article 20 LED) - raised issues:
Q18.15: Appropriate security measures (Article 4(1)(f) and Article 29 LED) - raised issues:

Awareness-raising, training and guidance

* Q19: Have you issued guidance and / or practical tools supporting competent authorities or processors to comply with their obligations?
  
  - Yes
  - No

* Q19.1: Please list them below

  The Authority issues announcements on a regular basis in order to facilitate the enforcement of data subjects’ rights and inform the public. There are many but most of them related to the GDPR not to the LED. The latest one is: Guidance concerning certain data processing operations related to the measurement of body temperature during the period of epidemiological readiness introduced with ordering a health emergency in the view of the novel coronavirus pandemic.

  The Authority also issued a public a list of processing operations for which DPIA is required. This is an exhaustive list which contains f.e. processing large amounts of personal data for law enforcement purpose.

* Q20: Have you provided training to / carried out awareness-raising activities for competent authorities and / or processors (DPOs included)?
Q20.1: how many and on which topics?

According to Privacy Act Section 25/N the conference of data protection officers is intended to maintain a professional relationship between the Authority and the DPO-s, its goal is to develop a consistent legal practice with regard the protection of personal data and access to data of public interest. It is held once every year organised by the Authority. Last year one of the actual hot topics was f.e.: public camera surveillance.

Data breach notifications

Q21: How many data breach notifications have you received?

In 2018: 0, in 2019: 9, in 2020: 18, and in 2021: 17, altogether 44.

Q22: In what proportion have you followed up with investigations? (%)

100 %

Q23: In what proportion have you advised or ordered competent authorities to take measures mitigating the risks? (%)

Mitigating risks is an important obligation of the data controller. The data breach notification form expressly contains the measures to be taken by the data controller to mitigate the risks. In most of the cases the Authority ordered this measure.

Q24: In what proportion has the communication to the data subject been delayed, restricted or omitted on the grounds set out in Article 13(3) LED? (%)

Even though this restriction is applicable according to Privacy Act but not transposed to sectoral laws yet. This discrepancy was indicated by the Authority to the legislator. That is the reason why this measure is not applicable now.

Power pursuant to Article 47(5) LED

Q25: Have you exercised your power to
Exercise of data subjects’ rights through the SA

• Q27: How many requests under Article 17 LED have you received?

0

• Q27.1: What were the outcomes of the cases?
Multiple choices are possible
- Request declared inadmissible
- All or some data requested provided to data subject
- SA informed data subject that it has conducted all necessary verifications or a review
- Controller ordered to provide (partial) access to the personal data
- Controller ordered to rectify personal data
- Controller ordered to erase personal data
- Controller ordered to restrict the processing of personal data
- SA applied other corrective powers (e.g. a ban on processing and/or fines)
- Others

• Q27.1.2: Other - Please specify:

This is not applicable.

• Q28: Did you face difficulties in exercising this power?

- Yes
- No

• Q28: Did encounter any particular problems?

- Yes
- No
International transfers

• Q29: Have you encountered cases where a controller transferred personal data based on a ‘self-assessment’ pursuant to Article 37(1)(b) LED?
  - Yes
  - No

• Q30: Have you carried out any investigations into data transfers based on derogations, in particular those set out in Article 38(1)(c) and (d) LED?
  - Yes
  - No

• Q31: Have you received any information pursuant to Article 39(3) LED about data transfers based on Article 39(1) LED?
  - Yes
  - No

• Q32: Have you carried out activities to promote the awareness of controllers/processors (specifically) with respect to their obligations under Chapter V of the LED?
  - Yes
  - No

• Q33: Have you exercised your advisory powers towards the government and/or competent authorities with respect to data transfers under Chapter V of the LED, for instance as regards the level of appropriate safeguards under Article 37(1)(a), (b) LED?
  - Yes
  - No

• Q34: Have you provided (or been asked to provide) assistance to Member States in assessing and, where necessary, reviewing their international agreements involving international data transfers (for instance, relating to mutual legal assistance, police cooperation) that were concluded prior to 6 May 2016?
  - Yes
  - No

• Q35: Have you received/handled complaints (by data subjects and/or bodies, organisations or associations in accordance with Article 55) specifically addressing the issue of data transfers?
  - Yes
  - No

• Q36: Have you exercised your investigative and/or enforcement powers with respect to data transfers?
  - Yes
  - No
• Q37: Have there been cases in which you have cooperated with foreign data protection authorities (for instance, exchange of information, complaint referral, mutual assistance)?
  ○ Yes
  ○ No

**Judicial review**

• Q38: Have data subjects / competent authorities / processors contested your decisions (or inaction) before national courts?
  ○ Yes
  ○ No

• 38.1: Please indicate the number of cases respectively for data subjects and competent authorities /processors:

  2

• 38.2: What was the outcome?
  Multiselection is possible
  - [✓] Complaints declared inadmissible
  - [ ] Decisions upheld
  - [ ] Decisions overturned

**Cooperation**

• Q39: Have you used the mutual assistance tool under Article 50 LED?
  ○ Yes
  ○ No

• Q40: Have you encountered any obstacles (e.g. of an administrative nature) when requesting or providing assistance to another DPA?
  ○ Yes
  ○ No

• Q40.1: Please describe them as well as possible solutions.
In our view, different procedural law in each member state is a crucial obstacle even LED provides a general framework of mutual assistance. Another problem is that definition of “competent authorities” means different bodies in each member state. This different interpretation could easily lead to confusion. General legal standards would be a practical tool for uniformization.

Human, financial and technical resources

Q41: How many persons (in full time equivalents) in your DPA (respectively EDPB Secretariat) work on issues that fall within the scope of the LED specifically?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number (FTE)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q42: How would you assess your DPA’s resources for its work on the LED from a human and financial point of view?

- Sufficient
- Insufficient

Q43: Do you face any specific challenges when supervising competent authorities in terms of expertise (criminal law / technical / IT) and IT resources?

- Yes
- No

Q43.1: what are the challenges you are facing?

- Insufficient expertise in criminal law
- Insufficient expertise in working methods and practices of law enforcement authorities
- Insufficient expertise in international cooperation in criminal matters
- Insufficient expertise in technologies used in the area of law enforcement
- Insufficient IT resources
- Others challenges
Q43.1.4: Insufficient expertise in technologies used in the area of law enforcement- please provide more details below:

Sometimes lack of practice at competent authorities during usage of technical devices is a big challenge.

Q43.1.5: Insufficient IT resources-please provide more details below:

Another challenge is interoperability of technical systems which makes the communication channels more difficult between the communicating parties.

Horizontal questions

• Q44: In your opinion, what has been the main impact(s) of the transposition of the LED in your Member State?

On the one hand general principles of transparency and accountability of data controllers under LED became more enforceable. On the other hand rights and restrictions of data subjects are widened which created a number of obligations towards competent authorities.

• Q45: Have you identified any specific challenges regarding the application of the LED in relation to new technologies? Please explain?

☑ Yes
☐ No
**Q45.1: Please explain.**

Law enforcement authorities apply available technical solutions more often for the purposes of the prevention, investigation, detection or prosecution of criminal offences (f.e. FRT technologies). Using emerging technologies require increased control over these activities from data protection aspect.

Another challenge is to be mentioned that adoption of new regulations follow the technology with significant delay. This results a gap in legislation.

**Q46: Have you identified any important problems regarding the transposition of the LED in your Member State?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**Q46.1: Please explain.**

Many times data controllers are unaware of GDPR-LED dual regime and as a consequence they are uncertain related to the applicable rules and regulations.

**Q47: Is there anything else you would like to mention relevant for the LED evaluation that is not covered in this questionnaire?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No