



# ICLG

The International Comparative Legal Guide to:

## Data Protection 2015

**2nd Edition**

A practical cross-border insight into data protection law

Published by Global Legal Group, with contributions from:

A.G. Erotocritou LLC

Adsuar Muñiz Goyco Seda & Pérez-Ochoa, P.S.C.

Affärsadvokaterna i Sverige AB

Brinkhof

Cuatrecasas, Gonçalves Pereira

Dittmar & Indrenius

ECIJA ABOGADOS

ELIG, Attorneys-at-Law

Eversheds

Gilbert + Tobin

Gorodissky & Partners

Herbst Kinsky Rechtsanwälte GmbH

Hogan Lovells BSTL, S.C.

Hunton & Williams LLP

Juridicon Law Firm

Jurisconsul

Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law

Matheson

Mori Hamada & Matsumoto

Opice Blum, Bruno, Abrusio

& Vainzof Advogados Associados

Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP

Pachiu & Associates

Pestalozzi

Portolano Cavallo Studio Legale

Subramaniam & Associates (SNA)

Wigley & Company

Wikborg, Rein & Co. Advokatfirma DA

**GLG**

Global Legal Group

**Contributing Editor**  
Bridget Treacy,  
Hunton & Williams

**Head of Business Development**  
Dror Levy

**Sales Director**  
Florjan Osmani

**Commercial Director**  
Antony Dine

**Account Directors**  
Oliver Smith, Rory Smith

**Senior Account Manager**  
Maria Lopez

**Sales Support Manager**  
Toni Hayward

**Sub Editor**  
Amy Hirst

**Senior Editor**  
Suzie Levy

**Group Consulting Editor**  
Alan Falach

**Group Publisher**  
Richard Firth

**Published by**  
Global Legal Group Ltd.  
59 Tanner Street  
London SE1 3PL, UK  
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720  
Fax: +44 20 7407 5255  
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk  
URL: www.glgroup.co.uk

**GLG Cover Design**  
F&F Studio Design

**GLG Cover Image Source**  
iStockphoto

**Printed by**  
Ashford Colour Press Ltd.  
May 2015

Copyright © 2015  
Global Legal Group Ltd.  
All rights reserved  
No photocopying

**ISBN**  
ISSN 2054-3786

**Strategic Partners**



**General Chapter:**

<b>1</b>	<b>Legislative Change: Assessing the European Commission's Proposal for a Data Protection Regulation</b> – Bridget Treacy, Hunton & Williams	<b>1</b>
----------	--	----------

**Country Question and Answer Chapters:**

<b>2</b>	<b>Australia</b>	Gilbert + Tobin: Peter Leonard & Michael Burnett	<b>7</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Austria</b>	Herbst Kinsky Rechtsanwälte GmbH: Dr. Sonja Hebenstreit & Dr. Isabel Funk-Leisch	<b>17</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Belgium</b>	Hunton & Williams: Wim Nauwelaerts & David Dumont	<b>28</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Brazil</b>	Opice Blum, Bruno, Abrusio & Vainzof Advogados Associados: Renato Opice Blum & Renato Leite Monteiro	<b>36</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Canada</b>	Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP: Adam Kardash & Bridget McIlveen	<b>45</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>China</b>	Hunton & Williams LLP Beijing Representative Office: Manuel E. Maisog & Zhang Wei	<b>54</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Cyprus</b>	A.G. Erotocritou LLC: Alexis Erotocritou	<b>60</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Finland</b>	Dittmar & Indrenius: Jukka Lång & Iris Keino	<b>68</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>France</b>	Hunton & Williams: Claire François	<b>76</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Germany</b>	Hunton & Williams: Dr. Jörg Hladjk	<b>84</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>India</b>	Subramaniam & Associates (SNA): Hari Subramaniam & Aditi Subramaniam	<b>93</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Ireland</b>	Matheson: John O'Connor & Anne-Marie Bohan	<b>104</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>Italy</b>	Portolano Cavallo Studio Legale: Laura Liguori & Federica De Santis	<b>115</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>Japan</b>	Mori Hamada & Matsumoto: Akira Marumo & Hiromi Hayashi	<b>123</b>
<b>16</b>	<b>Lithuania</b>	Juridicon Law Firm: Laimonas Marcinkevicius	<b>133</b>
<b>17</b>	<b>Luxembourg</b>	Jurisconsul: Erwin Sotiri	<b>140</b>
<b>18</b>	<b>Mexico</b>	Hogan Lovells BSTL, S.C.: Mario Jorge Yanez V. & Federico de Noriega O.	<b>148</b>
<b>19</b>	<b>Netherlands</b>	Brinkhof: Quinten Kroes & Tineke van de Bunt	<b>156</b>
<b>20</b>	<b>New Zealand</b>	Wigley & Company: Michael Wigley	<b>167</b>
<b>21</b>	<b>Norway</b>	Wikborg, Rein & Co. Advokatfirma DA: Dr. Rolf Riisnæs & Dr. Emily M. Weitzenboeck	<b>173</b>
<b>22</b>	<b>Portugal</b>	Cuatrecasas, Gonçalves Pereira: Leonor Chastre	<b>183</b>
<b>23</b>	<b>Puerto Rico</b>	Adsuar Muñoz Goyco Seda & Pérez-Ochoa, P.S.C.: Alejandro H. Mercado & Shylene De Jesús	<b>193</b>
<b>24</b>	<b>Romania</b>	Pachiu & Associates: Mihaela Cracea & Ioana Iovanesc	<b>199</b>
<b>25</b>	<b>Russia</b>	Gorodissky & Partners: Sergey Medvedev Ph.D., LL.M	<b>209</b>
<b>26</b>	<b>South Africa</b>	Eversheds: Tanya Waksman	<b>219</b>
<b>27</b>	<b>Spain</b>	ECIJA ABOGADOS: Carlos Pérez Sanz & Lorena Gallego-Nicasio	<b>226</b>
<b>28</b>	<b>Sweden</b>	Affärsadvokaterna i Sverige AB: Mattias Lindberg	<b>235</b>
<b>29</b>	<b>Switzerland</b>	Pestalozzi: Clara-Ann Gordon & Dr. Michael Reinle	<b>243</b>
<b>30</b>	<b>Taiwan</b>	Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law: Ken-Ying Tseng & Rebecca Hsiao	<b>252</b>
<b>31</b>	<b>Turkey</b>	ELIG, Attorneys-at-Law: Gönenç Gürkaynak & İlay Yılmaz	<b>260</b>
<b>32</b>	<b>United Kingdom</b>	Hunton & Williams: Bridget Treacy & Anita Bapat	<b>269</b>
<b>33</b>	<b>USA</b>	Hunton & Williams LLP: Aaron P. Simpson & Chris D. Hydak	<b>277</b>

Further copies of this book and others in the series can be ordered from the publisher. Please call +44 20 7367 0720

**Disclaimer**

This publication is for general information purposes only. It does not purport to provide comprehensive full legal or other advice. Global Legal Group Ltd. and the contributors accept no responsibility for losses that may arise from reliance upon information contained in this publication. This publication is intended to give an indication of legal issues upon which you may need advice. Full legal advice should be taken from a qualified professional when dealing with specific situations.

# Switzerland



Clara-Ann Gordon



Dr. Michael Reinle

Pestalozzi

## 1 Relevant Legislation and Competent Authorities

### 1.1 What is the principal data protection legislation?

Federal Act on Data Protection as of 19 June 1992 (Data Protection Act, hereinafter “DPA”). As Switzerland is not a member of the EU, it does not have to comply with the EU Data Protection Directive or any other directives applicable in this field of expertise.

### 1.2 Is there any other general legislation that impacts data protection?

Any Swiss canton has its own data protection statutes with respect to data processing of cantonal public authorities.

### 1.3 Is there any sector specific legislation that impacts data protection?

The Swiss banking secrecy and guidelines thereto impact data protection when bank customer data are processed. Furthermore, secrecy obligations such as patient secrecy regarding health data as set out in article 321 of the Swiss Criminal Code have an impact when respective data is processed.

### 1.4 What is the relevant data protection regulatory authority(ies)?

The Federal Data Protection and Information Officer (“FDPIC”) is the relevant authority if personal data are processed by federal authorities, individuals and legal entities. The Cantonal Data Protection and Information Officer is the relevant authority if personal data are processed by public authorities of the respective canton.

## 2 Definitions

### 2.1 Please provide the key definitions used in the relevant legislation:

- **“Personal Data”**

All information relating to an identified or identifiable natural or legal person (articles 3 lit. a and b DPA).

- **“Sensitive Personal Data”**

Data on: 1) religious, ideological, political or trade union-related views or activities; 2) health, the intimate sphere or racial origin; 3) social security measures; and 4) administrative or criminal proceedings and sanctions (see article 3 lit. c DPA).

- **“Processing”**

Any operation with personal data, irrespective of the means applied and the procedure, and in particular the collection, storage, use, revision, disclosure, archiving or destruction of data (see article 3 lit. e DPA).

- **“Data Controller”**

There is no statutory definition, as the term is not explicitly used in the DPA. The FDPIC defines “Data Controller” or “Data Exporter” in its template outsourcing agreement as follows: the natural or legal person, public authority, agency or any other body established in Switzerland which alone or jointly with others determines the purposes and means of the processing of Personal Data and which transfers such data (to another country) for the purposes of its processing on his behalf.

- **“Data Processor”**

There is no statutory definition as the term is not explicitly used in the DPA. The FDPIC defines “Data Processor” or “Data Importer” in its template outsourcing agreement as follows: natural or legal person, public authority, agency or any other body (established in another country) which agrees to receive Personal Data from the Data Exporter for the purposes of processing such data on behalf of the latter after the transfer in accordance with his instructions.

- **“Data Owner”**

The term used in the DPA is “Controller of the Data File”, which is any private person or federal body that decides on the purpose and content of a data file (see article 3 lit. i DPA).

- **“Data Subject”**

Natural or legal persons whose data is processed (see article 3 lit. b DPA). It is important to emphasise that the DPA does not only protect personal data of natural persons as most other data protection laws, but also personal data of legal persons.

- **“Pseudonymous Data”**

There is no statutory definition. Pseudonymous data are data for which the relation to a natural or legal person is not entirely removed, but rather replaced by a code, which can be attributed based on a specific rule to the respective natural or legal person. Anonymous data are data for which the relation to a natural or legal person is entirely removed.

- **“Direct Personal Data”**  
DPA does not differentiate between direct personal data and indirect personal data.
- **“Indirect Personal Data”**  
DPA does not differentiate between direct personal data and indirect personal data.
- *Other key definitions*
- **Personality Profile:** a collection of data that permits an assessment of essential characteristics of the personality of a natural person (see article 3 lit. d DPA).
- **Data Files:** Any set of personal data that is structured in such a way that the data is accessible by the data subject (see article 3 lit. g DPA).

### 3 Key Principles

#### 3.1 What are the key principles that apply to the processing of personal data?

- **Transparency**  
The collection of personal data and in particular the purpose of its processing must be evident to the data subject (see article 4 para. 4 DPA).
- **Lawful basis for processing**  
Personal data may only be processed lawfully (see article 4 para. 1 DPA).
- **Purpose limitation**  
Personal data may only be processed for the purpose indicated at the time of collection, that is evident from the circumstances, or that is provided for by law (see article 4 para. 3 DPA).
- **Data minimisation**  
There is no such principle set out in the DPA.
- **Proportionality**  
Data processing must be carried out in good faith and must be proportionate (see article 4 para. 2 DPA).
- **Retention**  
This is not a key principle set out in the DPA. However, the principle of proportionality requires that personal data are only retained as long as it is necessary with respect to the purpose of the data processing. General data retention requirements are not set forth in the DPA, but rather in the Swiss Code of Obligations or sector-specific regulation.
- *Other key principles*  
There are none.

### 4 Individual Rights

#### 4.1 What are the key rights that individuals have in relation to the processing of their personal data?

- **Access to data**  
Any person may request information from the controller of a data file as to whether data concerning them is being processed (see article 8 para. 1 DPA; exceptions are mentioned in article 9 DPA).
- **Correction and deletion**  
Any data subject may request that incorrect data be corrected or deleted (see article 5 para. 2 DPA).

- **Objection to processing**

Data Subjects may request (in a civil litigation) that data processing be stopped, that no data be disclosed to third parties, or that the personal data be corrected or destroyed (see article 15 para. 1 DPA). It is important to note that data processing may be blocked by preliminary injunctions.

- **Objection to marketing**

In addition to the objection to data processing for marketing purposes as set out above, there is a special regulation regarding mass emails (i.e. marketing newsletters) in article 3 lit. o of the Unfair Competition Act.

- **Complaint to relevant data protection authority(ies)**

The Commissioner may investigate cases in more detail on his own initiative or at the request of a third party (see article 29 para. 1 DPA).

- *Other key rights*

There are none.

### 5 Registration Formalities and Prior Approval

#### 5.1 In what circumstances is registration or notification required to the relevant data protection regulatory authority(ies)? (E.g., general notification requirement, notification required for specific processing activities.)

**Cross-Border Data Transfer:** If personal data is transferred to a country that has no appropriate data protection laws in force, additional safeguards are necessary. Safeguards are, for example, data transfer agreements or group-wide data protection policies (for transfers within a group of companies). FDPIC must be informed about these safeguards (see article 6 para. 3 DPA). If the standard contractual clauses of the EU or the FDPIC are used, it is sufficient to inform the FDPIC about this use in a general way.

**Registration of Data Files with the FDPIC:** Federal Bodies must register their data files with the FDPIC in any case (see article 11a para. 2 DPA). Private persons must register their data files with the FDPIC only if: 1) they regularly process sensitive personal data or personality profiles; or 2) they regularly disclose personal data to third parties (see article 11a para. 3. DPA). Exceptions from the registration duty are set out in article 11a para. 5 DPA (for example, if the respective legal person has appointed an internal data protection officer who monitors compliance with data protection laws).

#### 5.2 On what basis are registrations/notifications made? (E.g., per legal entity, per processing purpose, per data category, per system or database.)

See the answer to question 5.1 above. The registration of data files is made per data file.

#### 5.3 Who must register with/notify the relevant data protection authority(ies)? (E.g., local legal entities, foreign legal entities subject to the relevant data protection legislation, representative or branch offices of foreign legal entities subject to the relevant data protection legislation.)

The data controller who transfers personal data pursuant to the DPA abroad (see definition in the answer to question 2.1 above); the controller of the data files (see definition in the answer to question 2.1 above).

Foreign entities domiciled outside of Switzerland may be qualified as controller of data files in the sense of the DPA. However, FDPIC is not able and does not enforce the DPA in the case of a foreign legal entity domiciled outside of Switzerland because of the principle of territoriality. In the case that a foreign legal entity is controller of a data file involving personal data of Swiss data subjects, FDPIC may investigate whether a legal entity in Switzerland is co-controller of the respective data file. The representative or branch office of a foreign controller of the data file is not automatically subject to the registration obligation. The representative or branch office of a foreign entity is usually not to be qualified as controller of the data file, as they do not often have the power to decide on the content or purpose of a data file.

---

**5.4 What information must be included in the registration/notification? (E.g., details of the notifying entity, affected categories of individuals, affected categories of personal data, processing purposes.)**

---

Regarding the information in connection with cross-border transfers: no detailed information is required if the standard contractual clauses of the EU or the FDPIC are used. Otherwise, the copy of the respective contract clauses must be disclosed to the FDPIC.

Regarding the registration of data files: information regarding the notifying entity, contact person for information requests, categories of personal data, categories of data subjects, categories of data recipients, categories of persons having access to the data files, and processing purposes must be disclosed. FDPIC provides a template registration form in its website. The registration may also be executed electronically.

---

**5.5 What are the sanctions for failure to register/notify where required?**

---

On complaint, the respective entities or individuals may be fined if they infringe the registration obligation wilfully (see article 34 para. 2 DPA). The fine can be up to Swiss francs 10,000.00.

---

**5.6 What is the fee per registration (if applicable)?**

---

There is no fee for the registration of data files.

---

**5.7 How frequently must registrations/notifications be renewed (if applicable)?**

---

The registration must be renewed as soon as the notified information changes. There is, however, no strict deadline.

---

**5.8 For what types of processing activities is prior approval required from the data protection regulator?**

---

There is no such obligation. Regarding federal and cantonal authorities, such approval obligations may arise out of special public regulation.

---

**5.9 Describe the procedure for obtaining prior approval, and the applicable timeframe.**

---

See the answer to question 5.8 above.

---

## 6 Appointment of a Data Protection Officer

---



---

**6.1 Is the appointment of a Data Protection Officer mandatory or optional?**

---

It is optional.

---

**6.2 What are the sanctions for failing to appoint a mandatory Data Protection Officer where required?**

---

There are no sanctions.

---

**6.3 What are the advantages of voluntarily appointing a Data Protection Officer (if applicable)?**

---

Data files must not be registered with the FDPIC anymore (see article 11a para. 5 DPA).

---

**6.4 Please describe any specific qualifications for the Data Protection Officer required by law.**

---

Independence (performs its function without instructions of the controller of the data files); sufficient resources with respect to skills and time; and sufficient personal and organisational power (as he must have access to all data files, data processing and information thereto) (see article 12a para. 2 and 12b para. 2 of the Ordinance to the DPA).

---

**6.5 What are the responsibilities of the Data Protection Officer, as required by law or typical in practice?**

---

Monitoring the processing of personal data and suggesting correction measures if data protection regulations should not be complied with; maintaining a list of all data files (see article 12b para. 1 of the Ordinance to the DPA).

---

**6.6 Must the appointment of a Data Protection Officer be registered/notified to the relevant data protection authority(ies)?**

---

Yes (see article 12a para. 1 lit. b of the Ordinance to the DPA).

---

## 7 Marketing and Cookies

---



---

**7.1 Please describe any legislative restrictions on the sending of marketing communications by post, telephone, e-mail, or SMS text message (E.g., requirement to obtain prior opt-in consent or to provide a simple and free means of opt-out.)**

---

With regard to marketing communications distributed by post and telephone, article 3 lit. u of the Unfair Competition Act prohibits the sending of such communication if the recipient has declared in the official telephone registry or directly at the mail box that he does not wish to receive such communication.

Article 3 lit. o of the Unfair Competition Act requires, regarding emails and SMS text messages, that such communication may only be sent with the prior consent of the recipients and with the information relating to a simple opt-out procedure. An exception is made if the entity received the contact information in connection

with the sale of products or services and if the customer was informed at the moment of the data collection about the simple opt-out procedure. In that case, information regarding similar products or services may be sent without prior consent.

---

### 7.2 Is the relevant data protection authority(ies) active in enforcement of breaches of marketing restrictions?

---

No, they are not.

---

### 7.3 What are the maximum penalties for sending marketing communications in breach of applicable restrictions?

---

On complaint, the respective entity may be sanctioned in case of intentional misconduct with prison for up to three years or a monetary penalty of up to Swiss francs 1,080,000.00 (see article 23 of the Unfair Competition Act). The effective sanctions would, of course, be much lower than the maximum penalties. There is no penalty in case of a negligent misconduct.

---

### 7.4 What types of cookies require explicit opt-in consent, as mandated by law or binding guidance issued by the relevant data protection authority(ies)?

---

Swiss law does not require an explicit opt-in regarding cookies. It is sufficient to inform the website users about cookies, the data processed by cookies, the purpose of processing, and about opt-out mechanisms (see article 45c of the Swiss Telecommunication Act).

---

### 7.5 For what types of cookies is implied consent acceptable, under relevant national legislation or binding guidance issued by the relevant data protection authority(ies)?

---

Neither implied nor explicit consent is necessary for cookies.

---

### 7.6 To date, has the relevant data protection authority(ies) taken any enforcement action in relation to cookies?

---

No. The FDPIC investigates new trends regarding cookies on a regular basis, but did not take any actions, as the main regulation regarding cookies is not in the DPA.

---

### 7.7 What are the maximum penalties for breaches of applicable cookie restrictions?

---

A fine not exceeding Swiss francs 5,000.00 (see article 53 of the Telecommunication Act).

## 8 Restrictions on International Data Transfers

---

### 8.1 Please describe any restrictions on the transfer of personal data abroad?

---

International or transborder disclosure means any provision of personal data abroad, including allowing examination (e.g. of an online database), transfer or publication (see article 3 lit. f DPA). Personal data must not be disclosed abroad if the personal integrity of the persons concerned would thereby be seriously harmed (see

article 6 para. 1 DPA). A serious violation of personal integrity is assumed if there is no legislation ensuring appropriate protection in the country where the data are disclosed.

The conditions covering disclosure of data abroad are applicable irrespective of whether the transfer takes place within the same corporate body or to another legal entity.

---

### 8.2 Please describe the mechanisms companies typically utilise to transfer personal data abroad in compliance with applicable transfer restrictions.

---

The assumption that personal integrity is violated by a disclosure of personal data to a country without appropriate data protection laws can only be refuted if at least one of the minimum conditions stipulated in Article 6 para. 2 lit. a to lit. g DPA is present. However, the possibility of justifying the admissibility of the international data transfer on the general grounds for justification (according to Article 13 DPA) is not available.

It can be stated as a rule of thumb that all those countries which have either ratified the ETS 1082 agreement or have implemented the EU directive on data protection comply with Swiss legislation.

In addition, FDPIC has prepared a non-binding list of those countries whose data protection legislation should ensure appropriate protection.

However, those who want to be sure that the disclosure of personal data abroad is compatible with Swiss data protection laws, should always take additional precautions according to Article 6 para. 2 DPA.

The disclosure of data abroad within a group of companies is also permissible in countries without adequate legislation, if the companies concerned are subject to group-wide data protection regulations which ensure appropriate protection. This regulation privileges international data transfer within a group of companies (Article 6 para. 2 lit. g DPA).

Data protection regulations which ensure appropriate protection must at least contain the elements recommended by the FDPIC for international data transfer, namely:

- listing of purposes of use split according to data categories;
- binding agreement on disclosing data for indicated purposes only;
- protection of the rights of the persons concerned (in particular, rights to information and rectification);
- ban on transfer of data to a third party;
- ensuring data security in accordance with the sensitivity of the data; and
- stipulation of compensation liability of the data recipient for violation of contract.

If there is both inadequate legislation in the recipient country as well as insufficient data protection regulation, international data transfer among affiliated companies in the group is still permitted, provided one of the minimum requirements of Article 6 para. 2 lit. a to f DPA is satisfied:

- sufficient guarantees ensure appropriate protection by the agreement of data protection clauses in contracts or by voluntary adherence to control bodies, such as the “Safe Harbor Privacy Framework”;
- the person concerned has given permission in the individual case and following appropriate information;
- processing is in immediate association with the conclusion or execution of a contract and it concerns personal data of the contracting party;

- disclosure in the individual case is essential for the preservation of an overriding public interest or for the determination, exercise or enforcement of legal claims before the court;
- disclosure is necessary in the individual case in order to protect the life or physical integrity of the person concerned; or
- the person concerned has made the data generally available without explicitly prohibiting its processing.

Most legal entities use the EU standard contractual clauses as sufficient safeguards in the sense of art. 6 para 2 lit. a DPA. The use of the EU standard contractual clauses also facilitates the notification of the cross-border transfer to the FDPIC (see the answer to question 8.3 below).

---

### 8.3 Do transfers of personal data abroad require registration/notification or prior approval from the relevant data protection authority(ies)? Describe which mechanisms require approval or notification, what those steps involve, and how long they take.

---

There is no general requirement to register or notify or apply for approval. The FDPIC has to be notified only in two instances:

The FDPIC has to be informed of the fact that an adequate contractual guarantee (Article 6 para. 2 lit. a DPA) has been concluded or that data protection regulations within the group of companies (Article 6 para. 2 lit. g DPA) have been implemented. As long as the contractual guarantee is in line with the provisions in the EU standard clauses, then the respective data protection agreement does not have to be submitted. Also the group internal policy does not need to be submitted. In both instances it suffices to just inform the FDPIC of the fact that this has happened.

## 9 Whistle-blower Hotlines

---

### 9.1 What is the permitted scope of corporate whistle-blower hotlines under applicable law or binding guidance issued by the relevant data protection authority(ies)? (E.g., restrictions on the scope of issues that may be reported, the persons who may submit a report, the persons whom a report may concern.)

---

There is no specific legislation or provisions under Swiss law on whistleblowing as such. Any whistleblowing hotlines must, however, comply with the general requirements of the DPA. There are currently attempts to regulate the prerequisites of justified whistleblowing and the development of a more comprehensive protection of the whistleblower (see the answer to question 16.2 below).

Accordingly, the protection of the employee (whistleblower) is very weak. The employee (unfortunately) is exposed to civil (e.g. termination of his/her job) and criminal (e.g. offences due to false allegations, industrial espionage) sanctions. There are also no restrictions as such as to what can be reported on the whistleblowing hotline.

Moreover, there is no duty to notify or register the Helpline with the respective authorities *per se*. However, collections of sensitive personal data must be registered with the respective authorities, even if the persons concerned are aware of the processing. Excluded from this are data collections by companies, which have appointed an internal data protection officer (see the answers to section 6 above).

Swiss doctrine is mainly of the opinion that companies with whistleblower hotlines do not have to register the respective data collections, because there is usually no sensitive personal data or personality profiles of employees among such data and, if there is such sensitive personal data, it is not processed on a regular basis.

Whistleblowing is mainly discussed in Switzerland in connection with the loyalty and confidentiality duties of the employee, the provisions regarding justified termination, and the employer's duty to take care of its employees. The employer generally has to implement all necessary measures in order to ensure that the personality rights of the whistleblower are not infringed. Accordingly, the employee must be informed transparently and comprehensively about all aspects of the whistleblowing hotline (where it is operated, who is operating it, etc.) and the consequences her/his whistleblowing activities can have, before using the hotline.

---

### 9.2 Is anonymous reporting strictly prohibited, or strongly discouraged, under applicable law or binding guidance issued by the relevant data protection authority(ies)? If so, how do companies typically address this issue?

---

There are no provisions prohibiting or discouraging anonymous reporting. In practice it is, however, often recommended not to report anonymously. The main argument in favour of non-anonymous reports is the transparency principle in art. 4 para. 4 DPA (see the answer to question 3.1 above). An employee suspected of misconduct in a whistleblowing report must be informed about the report, the whistleblower and the alleged misconduct. It is, however, accepted that the information of the suspected employee may be delayed in order to facilitate investigations.

---

### 9.3 Do corporate whistle-blower hotlines require separate registration/notification or prior approval from the relevant data protection authority(ies)? Please explain the process, how long it typically takes, and any available exemptions.

---

See the answer to question 9.1 above: there is no requirement for registration/notification of whistleblower hotlines *per se*.

## 10 CCTV and Employee Monitoring

---

### 10.1 Does the use of CCTV require separate registration/notification or prior approval from the relevant data protection authority(ies)?

---

No, there is no general requirement to register/notify or obtain prior approval for the use of CCTV. However, if a CCTV also records activities on public ground (if the CCTV records, for example, activities on a private parking lot, but covers at the same time the nearby public walkway), cantonal or local data protection laws may require separate approval by the cantonal authorities.

---

### 10.2 What types of employee monitoring are permitted (if any), and in what circumstances?

---

The employee must generally be previously and transparently informed about the type and method of the electronic monitoring, the scope and period of timeframe of the monitoring and the purpose therefore.

The anonymous monitoring (including monitoring against search strings) of e.g. employees' use of company-provided information

technology in order to check on compliance with e.g. the email and Internet user guide or other policies in force, is permissible.

With regard to pseudonyms (i.e. an abbreviation for an employee known only to a very limited group of persons), only spot checks are permissible.

In both cases the employees need to be informed of the fact that their information technology use can/will be monitored. The information obligation is usually complied with by monitoring policies.

Systematic and permanent monitoring of the information technology use of specific employees is not permitted, unless: (a) the employee has consented thereto; or (b) if there is no consent, then the following prerequisites have to be fulfilled (i) justified suspicion of criminal offence, (ii) monitoring and reading of emails is urgently necessary to confirm or dispel suspicion, (iii) such is necessary for the conservation of evidence, and (iv) there is no overriding interest of the employee. If there is an overriding interest, then the consent of the employee has to be obtained. Please note that any evidence not collected in compliance with the applicable law/rules mentioned above, may possibly not be admissible in court.

Accordingly, the use of so-called spyware which clandestinely monitors the conduct of a specific employee in the workplace (e.g. computer screen movements) is not permitted and would infringe the applicable Swiss law. According to the FDPIC this applies to so-called content scanners (if done clandestinely). A content scanner is a software which evaluates/scans sent and received emails in accordance with pre-defined keywords and reacts accordingly (cancellation or blocking of emails, etc.).

Clandestine and not pre-announced monitoring is prohibited and cannot be justified by an overriding interest of the employer.

### 10.3 Is consent or notice required? Describe how employers typically obtain consent or provide notice.

See the answer to question 10.2 above: yes, prior transparent information is required, however consent is generally not necessary.

### 10.4 To what extent do works councils/trade unions/employee representatives need to be notified or consulted?

There is no duty to consult work councils/trade unions/employee representatives. However, in practice it is recommended to at least inform them.

### 10.5 Does employee monitoring require separate registration/notification or prior approval from the relevant data protection authority(ies)?

No, there is no such duty.

## 11 Processing Data in the Cloud

### 11.1 Is it permitted to process personal data in the cloud? If so, what specific due diligence must be performed, under applicable law or binding guidance issued by the relevant data protection authority(ies)?

Yes, it is permitted. There are no specific statutory provisions, however. Generally, the provisions of the DPA have to be complied with, e.g. the data subjects must be transparently informed about the fact that the data is processed in the cloud; the necessary security and organisational

measures must be implemented. Furthermore, the transfer to and processing of personal data in the cloud must be qualified pursuant to the FDPIC as data processing outsourcing in the sense of art. 10a DPA. Art. 10a DPA requires that a written data processing agreement is executed between the data controller and the provider of the cloud. The written agreement must include instruction, monitoring and audit rights on behalf of the data controller. It is generally recommended that the EU standard contractual clauses regarding data controller to data processor transfer, or the template data processing outsourcing agreement of the FDPIC, be used as both template agreements comply with art. 10a DPA.

Moreover, the FDPIC has issued a guidance which, in a nutshell, suggests that the cloud provider must be chosen carefully and instructed and monitored accordingly. The appropriate technical and organisational necessities must be implemented, and adequate protection must be guaranteed (in particular with data transfers to countries which do not have the same level of data protection).

Finally, the right to obtain information and the right to have data deleted or corrected must be respected.

### 11.2 What specific contractual obligations must be imposed on a processor providing cloud-based services, under applicable law or binding guidance issued by the relevant data protection authority(ies)?

There are no requirements which relate specifically to providers of cloud-based services. The provisions of the DPA, in particular the provisions relating to security measures, will be likely applicable to these kinds of providers.

## 12 Big Data and Analytics

### 12.1 Is the utilisation of big data and analytics permitted? If so, what due diligence is required, under applicable law or binding guidance issued by the relevant data protection authority(ies)?

Yes, the utilisation of big data and analytics is permitted. Also here the general provisions of the DPA must be complied with. There is no specific law or binding guidance relating to big data and analytics.

## 13 Data Security and Data Breach

### 13.1 What data security standards (e.g., encryption) are required, under applicable law or binding guidance issued by the relevant data protection authority(ies)?

Article 7 para. 1 DPA states that “personal data must be protected against unauthorised processing through adequate technical and organisational measures”.

Moreover, article 8 of the Ordinance to the DPA gives the following details on the level of security: anyone who, as a private individual, processes personal data or provides a data communication network shall ensure the confidentiality, availability and integrity of the data in order to ensure an appropriate level of data protection.

- (1) In particular, he shall protect the systems against the following risks:
  - a) unauthorised or accidental destruction;
  - b) accidental loss;
  - c) technical faults;
  - d) forgery, theft or unlawful use; and

- e) unauthorised alteration, copying, access or other unauthorised processing.
- (2) The technical and organisational measures must be adequate. In particular, they must take account of the following criteria:
  - a) the purpose of the data processing;
  - b) the nature and extent of the data processing;
  - c) an assessment of the possible risks to the data subjects; and
  - d) the current state of the article.

- (3) These measures must be reviewed periodically. Finally, article 9 of the Ordinance to the DPA states:
  - (1) The controller of the data file shall, in particular for the automated processing of personal data, take the technical and organisational measures that are suitable for achieving the following goals, in particular:
    - a) entrance control: unauthorised persons must be denied access to facilities in which personal data is being processed;
    - b) personal data carrier control: unauthorised persons must be prevented from reading, copying, altering or removing data carriers;
    - c) transport control: on the disclosure of personal data as well as during the transport of data carriers, the unauthorised reading, copying, alteration or deletion of data must be prevented;
    - d) disclosure control: data recipients to whom personal data is disclosed by means of devices for data transmission must be identifiable;
    - e) storage control: unauthorised storage in the memory as well as the unauthorised knowledge, alteration or deletion of stored personal data must be prevented;
    - f) usage control: the use by unauthorised persons of automated data processing systems by means of devices for data transmission must be prevented;
    - g) access control: the access by authorised persons must be limited to the personal data that they required to fulfil their task; and
    - h) input control: in automated systems, it must be possible to carry out a retrospective examination of what personal data was entered at what time and by which person.
  - (2) The data files must be structured so that the data subjects are able to assert their right of access and their right to have data corrected.

**13.2 Is there a legal requirement to report data breaches to the relevant data protection authority(ies)? If so, describe what details must be reported, to whom, and within what timeframe. If no legal requirement exists, describe under what circumstances the relevant data protection authority(ies) expects voluntary breach reporting.**

No, there is no statutory duty to do so. However, based on the general principles of the DPA, e.g. the transparency principle, it is advisable to notify the data subjects about such a breach.

**13.3 Is there a legal requirement to report data breaches to individuals? If so, describe what details must be reported, to whom, and within what timeframe. If no legal requirement exists, describe under what circumstances the relevant data protection authority(ies) expects voluntary breach reporting.**

See the answer to question 13.2 above.

**14 Enforcement and Sanctions**

**14.1 Describe the enforcement powers of the data protection authority(ies):**

Investigatory Power	Civil/Administrative Sanction	Criminal Sanction
Monetary penalty notices	This is not applicable.	This is not applicable.
Recommendations	The FDPIC can investigate cases and request the production of files, obtain information and arrange for processed data to be shown to him. If the investigation reveals that the DPA are being breached, the FDPIC can recommend that the federal body concerned change the method of processing or abandon the processing. He informs the department concerned or the Federal Chancellery of his recommendation. If a recommendation is not complied with or is rejected, he may refer the matter to the department or to the Federal Chancellery for a decision. The decision is communicated to the data subjects in the form of a ruling. If the FDPIC reveals in an investigation that a legal person does not comply with the DPA, it may render recommendations as well. Upon 30 days of the receipt of the recommendation, the legal person must inform the FDPIC on whether it accepts and implements the recommendation or on whether it rejects it. In the case of a rejection, the FDPIC may bring the case to the Swiss Federal Administrative Court.	This is not applicable.
Enforcement Notices	This is not applicable.	This is not applicable.
Prosecution	This is not applicable.	This is not applicable.

**14.2 Describe the data protection authority's approach to exercising those powers, with examples of recent cases.**

The FDPIC issues on a regular basis his recommendations and publishes them on his website (see the answer to question 16.1 below regarding current cases).

**15 E-discovery / Disclosure to Foreign Law Enforcement Agencies**

**15.1 How do companies within Switzerland respond to foreign e-discovery requests, or requests for disclosure from foreign law enforcement agencies?**

It depends on whether these requests are made during pending proceedings or outside of such proceedings.

During pending proceedings the companies cannot (directly) respond to such requests. The foreign law enforcement agency must contact the competent Swiss authorities within the international judicial assistance (in civil or criminal matters) system. The Swiss authority then collects and transfers the respective information by way of judicial assistance to the foreign authority. The DPA is not applicable in the case of judicial assistance proceedings (see art. 2 para. 2 lit. c DPA).

If a Swiss legal person is directly approached by a foreign law enforcement agency, the request must be qualified as outside of a pending proceeding and the DPA must be complied with. The legal person may only disclose the information and personal data to the foreign authority if the DPA is complied with. Important is, in particular, art. 6 DPA regarding cross-border data transfers.

More important than the data protection laws are, however, the so-called Swiss blocking statutes (e.g. articles 271 and 273 of the Swiss Criminal Code). Because of the blocking statutes companies within Switzerland cannot just simply comply with foreign e-discovery requests (even if the disclosure abroad were in compliance with the DPA). It must be decided on a case-by-case basis whether such requests can be complied with or whether a specific waiver from the competent authorities must be obtained (if applicable). If Swiss legal person violates the blocking statutes, its members of the boards might be sanctioned with penalty or prison.

### 15.2 What guidance has the data protection authority(ies) issued?

The FDPIC has issued a guidance regarding this subject matter. Basically, the guidance comes to the same conclusions as set out in the answer to question 15.1.

## 16 Trends and Developments

### 16.1 What enforcement trends have emerged during the previous 12 months? Describe any relevant case law.

There are several decisions of the Swiss Federal Administrative Court dealing with the access right to personal data collected and processed by federal authorities. Data protection law was, however, in the respective cases not the main legal source for the access right.

More relevant with regard to data processing by natural and legal persons are the following two cases:

- On 17 September 2014, FDPIC published a recommendation pursuant to art. 29 DPA concerning the implementation of the access right by a company named X. AG. FDPIC received several complaints by data subjects from Germany against X. AG with a registered office in Switzerland. X. AG sold personal data to third companies for marketing purposes. The data subjects were approached by those third parties with marketing communications. Upon request by the data subjects, the third parties disclosed that they received the personal data from X. AG. Thereinafter the data subjects requested access to their personal data with X. AG. X. AG did, however, not react to the access requests. Data subjects asked thereafter FDPIC for support. Upon a request by FDPIC, X. AG provided information regarding its data collection and deleted the data subjects from its data files. However, FDPIC received soon after new complaints involving X. AG. FDPIC decided to initiate an official investigation and came to the conclusion that X. AG infringed the access right pursuant to art. 8 DPA (access and information must be provided within 30 days upon request), the right to reject any data processing pursuant to art. 12 para. 2 lit. b DPA, and the obligation to register data files with the FDPIC (art. 11a para. 3 lit. b DPA). Upon receipt of the recommendation, X. AG had a deadline of 30 days to inform the FDPIC whether it accepted and would implement the recommendation. If X. AG rejects the recommendation, FDPIC may bring the matter to the Swiss Federal Administrative Court. It is unknown at the time of writing whether X. AG has accepted the recommendation.
- On 6 August 2014, the sole judge at the Commercial Court in Zurich had to decide on a request for preliminary injunctions in connection with the disclosure of personal data to US

authorities. The disclosure was requested in connection with the programme “FOR NON-PROSECUTION AGREEMENTS OR NON-TARGET LETTERS FOR SWISS BANKS”. The claimants asked the sole judge to prohibit the respondent, a Swiss bank, from disclosing its personal data to the US authorities. The claimants provided services for foreign clients of the respondent and the respondent informed claimants that it would disclose claimants’ personal data to the USA. The respondent argued that it has an overriding public and private interest for the disclosure. It cited several publications of Swiss authorities in connection with the disclosure of personal data by Swiss banks to the USA. The claimants argued, however, that their private interest prevails. The sole judge supported the arguments of the claimants and (preliminarily) prohibited the disclosure of personal data by the respondent. The sole judge held that the strict prosecution of its tax laws and arrests all over the world by US authorities are notorious. The sole judge also held that previous activities of the US authorities demonstrated that their primary goal is not to receive bank customer data, but rather to prosecute banking institutes and bank employees. The disclosure of the personal data to the USA would therefore result in a limitation of the mobility of the claimants. The sole judge further held that a disclosure of the personal data would be irreversible, whereas it is not sufficiently clear how the US authorities would react to preliminary injunctions. A disclosure would therefore *prima facie* infringe art. 6 DPA and the personality rights of the claimants.

### 16.2 What “hot topics” are currently a focus for the data protection regulator?

The following topics are hot:

- Big Data.
- Data tracking by apps (e.g. fitness apps).
- Data protection and personalised healthcare.
- Data protection and drones used by individuals for private purposes.
- Dashcams (small video recorders often used in cars).
- Right to be forgotten.
- Cloud Computing.

A further hot topic is currently being discussed by the Swiss parliament. The Swiss government proposed a revision of the Swiss Code of Obligations in connection with whistleblowing hotlines. The aim of the revision was better protection of employees when they blow the whistle. The result of the consultations with interest groups was, however, negative. As a consequence, the Swiss government decided not to introduce new protection measures for whistleblowers in the Code of Obligations. It rather reduced the revision and solely proposed provisions outlining the requirements for a legally permitted whistleblowing. The requirements set forth that an employee must in the first instance address issues internally. Only if the employer does not or not adequately react to the notification, is the employee permitted to notify the authorities. Yet, notification to the authorities shall only be permitted in the case of criminal conduct or infringements of public law. In exceptional circumstances, for example if the employee must expect that the internal notification will be without effect, that he may be fired, or if there is an imminent and immediate threat to his health or life, to the public safety or to the environment, may the employee directly notify the authorities. The whistleblower may only inform the general public if the authorities do not react within 14 days.

The Swiss State Council debated the proposed new provisions regarding whistleblowing and supported the draft proposal of the government in September 2014. However, the State Council rejected a proposition that would have permitted anonymous whistleblowing. Internal notification may therefore not be made anonymous. The draft provisions must now be debated by the Swiss National Council.



### Clara-Ann Gordon

Pestalozzi  
Loewenstrasse 1  
8001 Zurich  
Switzerland

Tel: +41 44 217 92 80  
Fax: +41 44 217 92 17  
Email: clara-ann.gordon@pestalozzilaw.com  
URL: www.pestalozzilaw.com

Clara-Ann Gordon graduated from the University of Berne and was admitted to the bar in 1997. Thereafter, she attended the University of London, Queen Mary & Westfield College and graduated in 1998 (LL.M. in intellectual property). Before she joined Pestalozzi, she worked for several years in another Zurich business law firm. She is regularly quoted by Chambers, Best Lawyers, Legal500, Who's Who Legal and EuroMoney's Guide to leading Information Technology Lawyers.

In 2009 she became a partner of Pestalozzi. Clara-Ann's areas of expertise are intellectual property, IT, telecommunications and media law.

She is a member of various national and international organisations, such as AIJA, AIPPI, ASUT, IBA, INGRES, INTA, ITechlaw and LES. Moreover, she is a member of the LPD Council of the IBA and Vice-Chair of the Arbitration, Mediation and Dispute Resolution Committee of ITechLaw. Further she is a member of the INTA Enforcement Committee and an IT mediator/arbitrator with SGOA.



### Dr. Michael Reinle

Pestalozzi  
Loewenstrasse 1  
8001 Zurich  
Switzerland

Tel: +41 44 217 92 48  
Fax: +41 44 217 92 17  
Email: michael.reinle@pestalozzilaw.com  
URL: www.pestalozzilaw.com

Michael Reinle's fields of expertise include intellectual property, unfair competition, data protection, and contract law. In addition, he has experience in the area of food and healthcare law as well as sports law. Michael Reinle deals with both commercial and litigious matters. He publishes in the field of intellectual property law and acts as a speaker in his field of expertise on a regular basis. Furthermore, he is a member of the AIPPI Working Group Q212 regarding general trademark laws.

Michael Reinle graduated from the University of St. Gallen in 2001 (*lic. iur.*) and 2007 (*Dr. iur.*). He was admitted to the bar in 2004. He earned a degree from the University of Chicago Law School in 2010 (LL.M.). Before rejoining Pestalozzi in 2010 as an associate, he worked as an associate for a law firm, as an academic assistant at the University of St. Gallen and as a junior associate for Pestalozzi.



Pestalozzi supports international and domestic clients in all aspects of Swiss law from our offices in Zurich and Geneva. The firm is known for integrity, the highest quality standards, and proven effectiveness.

Clients benefit from the know-how of over 150 partners, attorneys and support staff. With practice groups and expertise in all areas of business law, Pestalozzi forms customised teams to meet every challenge. Pestalozzi's contacts include an international network of lawyers who give you access to top-quality law firms in jurisdictions worldwide.

The care of clients is the focus of everything we do at Pestalozzi, supported by the diversity of our people and a dynamic company culture that ensures a creative, practical and effective response in every case.

Pestalozzi's main clients are large domestic and foreign corporations. We also assist medium-sized companies and private individuals. The broad range of sectors it serves includes financial services as well as a vast array of industries ranging from automobiles to watches.

## Other titles in the ICLG series include:

- Alternative Investment Funds
- Aviation Law
- Business Crime
- Cartels & Leniency
- Class & Group Actions
- Competition Litigation
- Construction & Engineering Law
- Copyright
- Corporate Governance
- Corporate Immigration
- Corporate Recovery & Insolvency
- Corporate Tax
- Data Protection
- Employment & Labour Law
- Environment & Climate Change Law
- Franchise
- Gambling
- Insurance & Reinsurance
- International Arbitration
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Lending & Secured Finance
- Merger Control
- Mining Law
- Oil & Gas Regulation
- Patents
- Pharmaceutical Advertising
- Private Client
- Private Equity
- Product Liability
- Project Finance
- Public Procurement
- Real Estate
- Securitisation
- Shipping Law
- Telecoms, Media & Internet
- Trade Marks



59 Tanner Street, London SE1 3PL, United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720 / Fax: +44 20 7407 5255  
Email: [sales@glgroup.co.uk](mailto:sales@glgroup.co.uk)

[www.iclg.co.uk](http://www.iclg.co.uk)