

Morrison & Foerster Client Alert.

January 23, 2013

China's Legislature Weighs in on Online Data Privacy; Other Recent Privacy Developments in China

By Paul McKenzie, Jingxiao Fang and Yunzhu Huang

On December 28, 2012, the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress ("NPC"), China's legislature, weighed in on the subject of data privacy with its promulgation of the *Decision on Reinforcing the Protection of Network Information* (《全国人民代表大会常务委员会关于加强网络信息保护的决定》), the "Decision". For the most part, the Decision merely affirms legal obligations already put in place by prior legislation. The most significant aspect of the Decision in regard to data privacy is the fact it was issued by the NPC, as China's legislature, signaling the importance being placed on data privacy at the highest level of China's law making system. More notable however are provisions unrelated to data privacy, which seek to enhance governmental control on freedom of communications over the internet.

This Alert briefly introduces the main provisions of the Decision and then highlights some other recent developments in China in regard to data privacy.

DECISION

Scope of Parties Covered

The Decision includes a broad statement of principle that *no organization or individual* shall steal or otherwise unlawfully obtain a citizen's electronic information or sell or illegally provide the same to third parties. More substantive provisions of the Decision govern "network service providers" and "other enterprises and organizations".

The term "network service provider" is not defined in the Decision but would seem in the context to be broad enough to capture not only companies that would count as internet service providers as that term is used in other jurisdictions but also telephone companies and indeed companies operating websites. The Decision's use of this broad term, and its reference also to "other enterprises and organizations", means that the scope of application of the Decision is very broad.

Prior regulations issued by China's Ministry of Industry and Information Technology ("MIIT"), the *Several Regulations on Standardizing Market Order for*

Beijing

Jingxiao Fang 86 10 5909 3382
Paul D. McKenzie 86 10 5909 3366

Brussels

Joanna Łopatowska 32 2 340 7365
Karin Retzer 32 2 340 7364

Hong Kong

Eric Dickinson 852 2585 0812
Gordon A. Milner 852 2585 0808

London

Ann Bevitt 44 20 7920 4041
Deirdre Moynihan 44 20 7920 4164
Anthony Nagle 44 20 7920 4029

Los Angeles

Michael C. Cohen (213) 892-5404
David F. McDowell (213) 892-5383
Purvi G. Patel (213) 892-5296
Russell G. Weiss (213) 892-5640

New York

Madhavi T. Batliboi (212) 336-5181
John F. Delaney (212) 468-8040
Matthew R. Galeotti (212) 336-4044
Sherman W. Kahn (212) 468-8023
Mark P. Ladner (212) 468-8035
Michael B. Miller (212) 468-8009
Suhna N. Pierce (212) 336-4150
Marian A. Waldmann (212) 336-4230
Miriam H. Wugmeister (212) 506-7213

Northern Virginia

Daniel P. Westman (703) 760-7795

Palo Alto

Christine E. Lyon (650) 813-5770
Bryan Wilson (650) 813-5603

San Francisco

Roland E. Brandel (415) 268-7093
Anna Ferrari (415) 268-6728
Jim McCabe (415) 268-7011
James R. McGuire (415) 268-7013
William L. Stern (415) 268-7637

Tokyo

Daniel P. Levison 81 3 3214 6717
Gabriel E. Meister 81 3 3214 6748
Jay Ponazrecki 81 3 3214 6562
Toshihiro So 81 3 3214 6568
Yukihiko Terazawa 81 3 3214 6585

Washington, D.C.

Nicholas A. Dattowe (202) 887-1590
Richard Fischer (202) 887-1566
D. Reed Freeman, Jr. (202) 887-6948
Julie O'Neill (202) 887-8764
Obrea O. Poindexter (202) 887-8741
Cynthia J. Rich (202) 778-1652
Robert A. Salerno (202) 887-6930
Andrew M. Smith (202) 887-1558
Nathan David Taylor (202) 778-1644

Client Alert.

Internet Information Services (《规范互联网信息服务市场秩序若干规定》, the “**Internet Regulations**”), issued on December 29, 2011, govern so-called “Internet Information Service Providers”, which include only operators of websites. We reported on the Internet Regulations [in a client alert at the beginning of last year](#). Our understanding is that the Decision casts a wider net than the Internet Regulations.

Obligations Under the Decision

The Decision provides for a number of obligations that governed entities must comply with in the course of their business, including:

- Adopting a similar approach to the Internet Regulations, the Decision provides that the collection and use of citizens’ electronic personal data must be on the basis of informed consent and individuals must be notified about the purpose of data collection, the method and the scope. Policies in relation to the collection and use of electronic personal information must be publicly available.
- Commercial information may not be sent to individuals via telephone, mobile phone or personal email without the concerned person’s consent or request or if the person has expressly refused such delivery. This provision expands upon rules already in place governing email spam.
- Like the Internet Regulations, the Decision imposes an obligation to keep electronic personal data in strict confidence and not to illegally disclose or sell such information to any third party.
- Governed entities must take technical and other measures to ensure the security of electronic personal data, and in the event of the leakage or destruction of such data, take remedial measures. This provision mirrors language of 2005 regulations governing operators of computer networks connected to the internet.

Take-Down and Other Compliance Requests

The Decision provides that if a citizen identifies information available online that infringes on his or her privacy, such citizen person has the right to ask the network service provider to delete the relevant information or take any other necessary measures to stop such infringement.

Internet Censorship

The Decision affirms existing obligations on governed entities to police information posted on a website or transmitted over a network. It also affirms the obligation to require users to register for service using their true identities.

Penalties

The Decision provides broadly that competent authorities have the authority to take enforcement actions for breaches of the Decision, including warnings and/or fines, confiscation of illegal gains, revocation of licenses and shut down of websites. MIIT has these powers in relation to analogous provisions of the Internet Regulations and we anticipate that MIIT, Ministry of Public Security and other agencies will issue further administrative regulations implementing these regulatory powers in regard to the broader circumstances provided for by the Decision.

Client Alert.

OTHER LEGAL DEVELOPMENTS ON PERSONAL INFORMATION PROTECTION

Recent months have also seen moves to legislate on matters of protection of personal information at a local level. Xiamen City, Hebei Province, Hunan Province and Guangdong Province have joined Jiangsu Province in enacting local measures to protect personal information.

- On November 19, 2012, *Xiamen Regulation on Personal Information Protection in Software and Information Service Industry* (《厦门市软件和信息服务业个人信息保护管理办法》) was passed at the 14th meeting of the Xiamen government and will take effect on April 1, 2013.
- On September 26, 2012, *Hebei Province Informatization Measures* (《河北省信息化条例》) was passed at the 32nd session of the 11th Standing Committee of Hebei People's Congress and took effect on January 1, 2013.
- On May 31, 2012, the *Amendment to Hunan Province Informatization Measures* (《湖南省信息化条例(2012修订)》) was passed at the 29th session of the 11th standing committee of Hunan People's Congress and took effect on September 1, 2012.
- On May 24, 2012, *Guangdong Province Informatization Promotion Measures (Draft)* (《广东省信息化促进条例(送审稿)》) was published for public comment.

Each of these local regulations adopt a broadly similar approach to that taken by the Decision and the Internet Regulations in regard to protection of personal information and require informed consent for the collection and use of personal information and also prohibit unauthorized disclosure of the same.

We previously reported a December 2011 statement by the Shenzhen municipal government indicating its intention to issue local regulations governing personal information protection (please refer to [prior Morrison & Foerster alert](#)). According to a news report, a year later, on December 12, 2012, the survey conducted by Shenzhen Lawyers Association for the purpose of drafting such regulations was discussed at a meeting of the Standing Committee of the Shenzhen People's Congress. According to that news report, drafting of the regulations is still at a consultation stage and enactment of the regulation may still be two years away.

About Morrison & Foerster:

We are Morrison & Foerster — a global firm of exceptional credentials. Our clients include some of the largest financial institutions, investment banks, Fortune 100, technology and life science companies. We've been included on *The American Lawyer's A-List* for nine straight years, and *Fortune* named us one of the "100 Best Companies to Work For." Our lawyers are committed to achieving innovative and business-minded results for our clients, while preserving the differences that make us stronger. This is MoFo. Visit us at www.mofo.com.

Morrison & Foerster has a world-class privacy and data security practice that is cross-disciplinary and spans our global offices. With more than 60 lawyers actively counseling, litigating, and representing clients before regulators around the world on privacy and security of information issues, we have been recognized by *Chambers* and *Legal 500* as having one of the best domestic and global practices in this area.

Client Alert.

For more information about our people and services and the resources we offer such as our treatise setting out the U.S. and international legal landscape related to workplace privacy and data security, "*Global Employee Privacy and Data Security Law*," or our free online Privacy Library, please visit: <http://www.mofo.com/privacy--data-security-services/> and "like" us on Facebook at <http://www.facebook.com/MoFoPrivacy>.

Because of the generality of this update, the information provided herein may not be applicable in all situations and should not be acted upon without specific legal advice based on particular situations. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.