# SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

#### **LEGISLATION COMMITTEE**

# **Exposure Drafts of Australian Privacy Amendment Legislation**

## **SUBMISSION**

SUBMISSION NUMBER: 28

**SUBMITTER** 

**Deliotte Touche Tohmatsu** 



Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu ABN 74 490 121 060

Grosvenor Place 225 George Street Sydney NSW 2000 PO Box N250 Grosvenor Place Sydney NSW 1220 Australia

DX: 10307SSE
Tel: +61 (0) 2 9322 7000
Fax: +61 (0) 9322 7001
www.deloitte.com.au

13 August 2010

Senate Finance and Public Administration Committee PO Box 6100 Parliament House Canberra ACT 2600 Australia

Dear Sir/Madam

#### Re: Australian Privacy Principles Exposure Draft

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the Federal Government's Australian Privacy Principles Exposure Draft and Companion Guide.

Overall, we are supportive of the development of the Australian Privacy Principles (**APPs**). We do have a number of comments that we have set out below.

#### **Australian Privacy Principle 5**

The Australian partnership of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu (**Deloitte Australia**) is an independent professional services firm that, with other member firms throughout the world, is a member of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited (**DTTL**), a UK private company limited by guarantee.

Deloitte Australia will, from time to time, disclose personal information to overseas recipients, including to other DTTL member firms in various locations around the world. The choice of location may depend on a client's needs or on Deloitte Australia's internal operations, and the location may change from time to time. Deloitte Australia considers that requiring it, each time it collects personal information from an individual, to notify the individual of the country in which an overseas recipient is likely to be located would create an undue administrative burden with marginal additional protection for the privacy of individuals. Furthermore, Deloitte Australia considers that there are adequate protections afforded to individuals by the adoption of the accountability principle in APP8.

Accordingly, Deloitte Australia recommends the omission of section 6(2)(j) from APP5.

#### Sections 20 and 9

Deloitte Australia submits that it is unclear how sections 20 and 9(1) interact. If a disclosing entity took the reasonable steps required by section 9(1) to ensure that an overseas recipient did not breach the APPs, but if the overseas recipient, despite these steps, engaged in non-compliant conduct, it appears that under section 20 the disclosing entity would be liable for the non-compliance just as if the disclosing entity had taken no reasonable steps at all. Although we support the accountability principle, we submit that the inconsistency identified above should be removed so that the disclosing entity would be liable under section 20 only if it did not take the reasonable steps required by section 9(1). In this context, we note that:

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited, a UK private company limited by guarantee, and its network of member firms, each of which is a legally separate and independent entity. Please see <a href="www.deloitte.com/about">www.deloitte.com/about</a> for a detailed description of the legal structure of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited and its member firms.

### **Deloitte**

Page 2 13 August 2010

- the ALRC report 108 For Your Information: Australian Privacy Law and Practice recommended that an entity should not remain accountable for information that is subject, among other things, to a contract that effectively upholds privacy protections substantially similar to the UPPs (now referred to as the APPs) (at 31.120); and
- under the APEC Privacy Framework, the accountability principle requires the consent of the individual to cross-border transfers or the exercise of due diligence and the taking of reasonable steps by the disclosing entity to ensure that the recipient person or organisation will protect the information consistently with the APEC Privacy Framework (at 26).

We would also submit that, further to section 9(2)(a), the Office of the Privacy Commissioner may wish to consider publishing a list of laws or binding schemes that operate in a way substantially similar to the way in which the APPs operate. In this respect, we submit that APP8 should expressly recognise that section 9(2)(a) is satisfied if the applicable law or binding scheme is on that list.

Please do not hesitate to contact me on (02) 9322 7875 if you have any queries about our comments.

Yours sincerely

Leslie E. Moore General Counsel Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu