

PRIVACY ISSUES IN INTEGRATED PUBLIC SERVICES

Charles D. Raab
University of Edinburgh
c.d.raab@ed.ac.uk

**ESRC RESEARCH PROJECT:
PRIVACY AND DATA-SHARING IN
MULTI-AGENCY WORKING
(RES/000/23/0158)**

**Christine Bellamy & Perri 6
(Nottingham Trent University)**

**Charles Raab (University of
Edinburgh)**

GOVERNMENT POLICIES

- **Joined-up government/better delivery of public services**
 - Intensive and extensive use of personal data, including sharing across boundaries**
- **Protecting personal data/human rights**
 - Greater personal control of information, including government transparency**

TENSIONS?

- **Not inevitable: some say that good privacy protection can mean good information-sharing and good joined-up government**
- **But in practical decision-making contexts (e.g., health and social care, including child protection), there are tensions and conflicts between privacy and data sharing, and between running opposing *risks***

WHAT ARE THE TENSIONS BETWEEN DATA-SHARING AND PRIVACY IN MULTI-AGENCY WORKING?

- Intensification of information sharing:
 - Commitment to major extension of e-government, ‘joined-up government, service and data integration
 - Identity cards and population register (Citizen information Project), comprehensive database on children
 - Preventive approaches to managing risk
 - Targeted social intervention programmes
 - Desire for resource efficiency and effectiveness through discriminating judgments in social policies
 - Enhanced emphasis on citizen obligations
- Laws for privacy protection:
 - Implementation of European Directive 95/46/EC
 - Implementation of Data Protection Act 1998
 - Human Rights Act 1998
 - Common law of confidentiality

WHAT ARE THE RISKS OF SHARING OR NOT SHARING DATA?

- Risks to dignity and risks to justice
- *'False negative'* judgment errors: no action taken, but ought to have been taken (if information had been shared): sometimes with adverse consequences
- *'False positive'* judgment errors: action taken, but ought not to have been taken (if privacy had been respected): sometimes with adverse consequences
- Current shift to intolerance of *'false negative'* judgment errors and preference for action even if *'false positive'* judgments are made

HOW ARE THEY BEING MANAGED?

- **Horizontal Strategies (generic, across government)**
 - DPA 1998 and Information Commissioner**
 - PIU Report (2002)**
 - DCA's 'Toolkit' (2003)**
 - Data standards and quality**
- **Vertical Strategies (specific, within sectors and partnerships; diversity)**
 - Protocols**
 - Codes of practice**
 - Professional ethics**
 - Training, roles and culture change**

DCA'S 'TOOLKIT'

- Legal guidance on *vires* for sharing without consent
- Model protocol
- Codes of practice
- 'Trust Guarantee'
- Analytical Framework/Privacy Impact Assessment

DEVELOPMENTS IN HEALTH CARE (UK)

- **NHS Information Authority (NHSIA, to 4/05); now Connecting for Health; response to patchy ability to share patients' data in and around NHS; overcome legacy systems, poor implementation, non-integration**
- **National Programme for IT (NPFIT): many systems/procurements; centralised; £2.3 bn; IT and data standards; cradle-to-grave 'spine' summary patient record; Care Records Service, and other e-functions planned (booking, prescriptions, clinical decision tools); => sharing of records**
- **Confidentiality and privacy?**

KEY ISSUE: PURPOSES

- Are purposes specified so broadly that they may fall foul of the Data Protection Act 1998?
- How are purposes communicated to patients?
- Integration of care and non-care purposes?

KEY ISSUE: CONSENT

- **How can informed consent be ascertained?**
- **Costs of obtaining consent**
- **Segmented consent ('sealed envelope')**
- **Consistency of practice across sites**

KEY ISSUES: NECESSITY AND PROPORTIONALITY

- **Who needs to know, and why?**
- **How much do they need to know?**
- **Routine access to databases**

PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY IN THE NHS: (I)

- **Modern health practice requires new rules; doctor/patient confidentiality outmoded**
- **Caldicott Guardians in NHS agencies (1997; also in Social Care, 2001 +): senior staff in the NHS and social services appointed to protect identifiable patient information; protocols; 6 principles:**
 - **justify purpose**
 - **absolute necessity to use**
 - **minimum necessary**
 - **access strictly ‘need to know’**
 - **awareness of responsibilities**
 - **understand and comply with law**

PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY IN THE NHS (II)

- **Confidentiality: NHS Code of Practice (2003):** privacy friendly ‘confidentiality model’ - addresses ‘key issues’; disclosure (sharing) rules for different purposes (health care, non-health care, non-NHS); consent; ‘sealed envelope’; ‘no surprises’
- ‘Role-Based Access Control’ (RBAC)
- ‘Care Record Guarantee’
- Subject Access (‘MyHealthSpace’)
- Patient Information Advisory Group (PIAG) and research use of information (Health and Social Care Act 2001, 60)
- Information Commissioner’s guidance (2002)

LIMITS AND PROBLEMS

- Pressure on data protection principles from the way in which ‘proportionality’ and ‘need to know’ are construed in sharing information, and how consent is obtained
- In multi-agency working, potential inconsistency through ‘vertical’ variations in eliciting consent
- Gateways for data sharing are separate vertical settlements
- Uncertainty about need for primary legislation to grant powers to share
- Overtaken by events: further pressure for sharing and tolerance for ‘false positive’ judgment errors (e.g., in child protection)
- No settled ‘horizontal’ regulatory framework: *practitioners’ judgments are inescapable*

VARIATIONS IN JUDGMENTS

- Codes, protocols, rule interpretations inevitably leave room for judgment by practitioners
- Preliminary research findings in health, social care and policing show that sharing/confidentiality (privacy) judgments are shaped by variable (local) organisational settings, which influence the salience of rules and norms governing sharing/non-sharing of personal data
- Different propensity to take 'false positive/false negative' risk also affects these decisions

WIDER ISSUES

- **Rules for data-sharing and privacy: too much and too formal?**
- **Blame: conflicting pressures on professionals?**
- **Data processing and sharing: too much for public trust?**

CONCLUSION

- To understand privacy and data-sharing in the public services (e.g., health), we need to know much more than what the laws require, permit or forbid
- We need to understand (and explain) *decision-making behaviour*; the constraints and opportunities within the decision-making contexts; why and how these vary; and what the consequences are for reconciling tensions between privacy and the sharing of personal information