

**ALBERTA**  
**OFFICE OF THE INFORMATION AND  
PRIVACY COMMISSIONER**

**P2013-ND-05**

**TD Waterhouse Canada Inc.**

January 18, 2013

(Case File #P2232)

**I. Introduction**

[1] Under s. 34.1 of the *Personal Information Protection Act* (“PIPA”), an organization having personal information under its control must, without unreasonable delay, notify me of any incident involving the loss of or unauthorized access to or disclosure of the personal information where a reasonable person would consider that there exists a real risk of significant harm to an individual as a result of the loss or unauthorized access or disclosure.

[2] On December 21, 2012, TD Waterhouse Canada Inc. (the “Organization”) provided notice of an incident involving the loss of personal information. For the reasons that follow, I have decided that there is a real risk of significant harm to the individual as a result of the incident. I require that the Organization notify the individual to whom there is a real risk of significant harm.

**II. Jurisdiction**

[3] Section 37.1 of PIPA authorizes me to require an organization to notify individuals to whom there is a real risk of significant harm as a result of an incident. It states:

37.1(1) Where an organization suffers a loss of or unauthorized access to or disclosure of personal information that the Organization is required to provide notice of under section 34.1, the Commissioner may require the Organization to notify individuals to whom there is a real risk of significant harm as a result of the loss or unauthorized access or disclosure

(a) in a form and manner prescribed by the regulations, and

- (b) within a time period determined by the Commissioner.
- (2) If the Commissioner requires an organization to notify individuals under subsection (1), the Commissioner may require the Organization to satisfy any terms or conditions that the Commissioner considers appropriate in addition to the requirements under subsection (1).
- (3) The Commissioner must establish an expedited process for determining whether to require an organization to notify individuals under subsection (1) in circumstances where the real risk of significant harm to an individual as a result of the loss or unauthorized access or disclosure is obvious and immediate.
- (4) The Commissioner may require an organization to provide any additional information that the Commissioner considers necessary to determine whether to require the Organization
  - (a) to notify individuals under subsection (1), or
  - (b) to satisfy terms and conditions under subsection (2).
- (5) An organization must comply with a requirement
  - (a) to provide additional information under subsection (4),
  - (b) to notify individuals under subsection (1), or
  - (c) to satisfy terms and conditions under subsection (2).
- (6) The Commissioner has exclusive jurisdiction to require an organization
  - (a) to provide additional information under subsection (4),
  - (b) to notify individuals under subsection (1), and
  - (c) to satisfy terms and conditions under subsection (2).
- (7) Nothing in this section is to be construed so as to restrict an organization's ability to notify individuals on its own initiative of the loss of or unauthorized access to or disclosure of personal information.

[4] PIPA applies to organizations, defined in section 1(1)(i) of PIPA as follows:

1(1) (i) "organization" includes

- (i) a corporation,
- (ii) an unincorporated association,
- (iii) a trade union as defined in the *Labour Relations Code*,
- (iv) a partnership as defined in the *Partnership Act*, and
- (v) an individual acting in a commercial capacity,

but does not include an individual acting in a personal or domestic capacity;

[5] The Organization is an extra-provincial corporation registered and operating in Alberta. I have jurisdiction in this matter because the Organization is an “organization” as defined in section 1(1)(i) of PIPA.

[6] The Organization reported the incident involved a share certificate belonging to 1 customer (the “Affected Individual”). The share certificate contained the following information:

- name,
- address,
- account number, and
- a driver’s license photocopy.

[7] This information qualifies as “personal information” as defined in section 1(1)(k) of PIPA.

### **III. Background**

[8] On January 7, 2013, my Office requested the Organization provide additional information. The additional information was provided by the Organization on January 7, 2013.

[9] The circumstances of the incident as reported to me by the Organization are as follows:

- On November 16, 2012, a mail courier was the victim of an armed robbery outside of one of the Organization’s branches located in Calgary. The courier’s mail bag was stolen.
- An envelope containing the share certificate was in the mail bag.
- The Organization reported the theft to the Calgary Police Service.
- The mail bag was not recovered.
- The Affected Individual was notified by telephone and letter on November 21, 2012.

- The Organization offered a subscription to a credit bureau monitoring service to the Affected Individual. The Affected Individual’s profile was flagged and a new account number was issued.

**IV. Is there a real risk of significant harm to individuals as a result of the incident?**

[10] In considering whether to require the Organization to notify the Affected Individual, I am mindful of PIPA’s purpose, legislative principles, and the relevant circumstances surrounding the reported incident.

[11] Pursuant to section 37.1 of PIPA, I have the power to require the Organization to “notify individuals to whom there is a real risk of significant harm as a result of the loss or unauthorized access or disclosure.” In determining whether or not to require the Organization to notify the Affected Individual, I must consider if there is a “real risk of significant harm” to the Affected Individual as a result of the incident.

[12] In order for me to require that the Organization notify the Affected Individual, there must be some harm – some damage or detriment or injury – that could be caused to the Affected Individual as a result of the incident. The harm must also be “significant.” It must be important, meaningful, and with non-trivial consequences or effects.

[13] The Organization reported that the incident did pose a risk of significant harm because the information was stolen. The personal information is highly sensitive. The Organization stated that the incident may result in identity theft or fraud.

[14] The personal information at issue is highly sensitive. It includes the name, address, account number, and a photocopy of the Affected Individual’s driver’s license. The type of harm that could result from unauthorized access to the personal information in this instance is identity theft and fraud. In my view, these are significant harms.

[15] In order for me to require the Organization to notify the Affected Individual, there must also be a “real risk” of significant harm to the Affected Individual as a result of the incident. This standard does not require that significant harm will certainly result from the incident, but the likelihood that it will result must be more than mere speculation or conjecture. There must be a cause and effect relationship between the incident and the possible harm.

[16] In deciding whether there exists a “real risk” of significant harm in this case to the Affected Individual, I considered the following factors:

- The personal information is highly sensitive.
- The type of information involved could be used to commit identity theft and fraud.
- The information was stolen and has not been recovered.

[17] Breach notification decisions P2011-ND-005 and P2013-ND-01 involved similar circumstances in which highly sensitive personal information of a similar nature was stolen and not recovered. In these cases, it was decided that a real risk of significant harm, identity theft and fraud, existed to the Affected Individuals.

[18] Based on the above and given the circumstances of the incident, I have decided that there is a real risk of significant harm to the Affected Individual as a result of this incident.

**V. Decision**

[19] I require the Organization to notify the Affected Individual in accordance with section 19.1 of the *Personal Information Protection Act Regulation* (the “Regulation”).

[20] I understand that the Organization has notified the Affected Individual in accordance with the Regulation in a phone conversation and by letter on November 21, 2012. Therefore, I will not require the Organization to notify the Affected Individual again.

Jill Clayton  
Information and Privacy Commissioner