



PERSONAL INFORMATION PROTECTION ACT
Breach Notification Decision

| | |
|--|--|
| Organization providing notice under section 34.1 of PIPA | GlaxoSmithKline Inc., ViiV Healthcare ULC, and ID Biomedical Corporation of Quebec (the Organizations) |
| Decision number (file number) | P2019-ND-042 (File #004589, #004590, #004612) |
| Date notice received by OIPC | December 19, 2016 |
| Date Organization last provided information | March 6, 2017 |
| Date of decision | March 4, 2019 |
| Summary of decision | There is a real risk of significant harm to the individuals affected by this incident. The Organizations are required to notify those individuals whose personal information was collected in Alberta, pursuant to section 37.1 of the <i>Personal Information Protection Act</i> (PIPA). |
| JURISDICTION | |
| Section 1(1)(i) of PIPA “organization” | I have jurisdiction because the Organizations are “organization[s]” as defined in section 1(1)(i) of PIPA. |
| Section 1(1)(k) of PIPA “personal information” | <p>The incident involved the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• employee name,• employee ID number,• mid-year performance rating (2016), and• year-end performance rating (2015). <p>This information is about identifiable individuals and is “personal information” as defined in section 1(1)(k) of PIPA. To the extent this information was collected in Alberta, PIPA applies.</p> |
| DESCRIPTION OF INCIDENT | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> loss <input type="checkbox"/> unauthorized access <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> unauthorized disclosure | |
| Description of incident | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In May and November 2016, an Excel spreadsheet was distributed via email for the purpose of “conducting performance rating calibration meetings with people managers”. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A hidden tab/sheet that contained the information at issue was inadvertently included in the spreadsheet. As a result, the recipients of the emails inadvertently received the personal information of employees for whom they were not the intended recipients. • The incident was discovered when two recipients of the email discovered the hidden tab/sheet and logged incident reports on November 17, 2016. |
| Affected individuals | The incident affected 529 employees, 26 of whom are located in Alberta. |
| Steps taken to reduce risk of harm to individuals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the email senders attempted to recall each of the emails. • Conducted an investigation. • Met with staff involved in the incident and enhanced policies and procedures. • Each of the recipients confirmed that they deleted the email from their respective inboxes and deleted Item folders as well as any copies saved to their computers. |
| Steps taken to notify individuals of the incident | Affected individuals were notified by March 3, 2017. |
| REAL RISK OF SIGNIFICANT HARM ANALYSIS | |
| Harm Some damage or detriment or injury that could be caused to affected individuals as a result of the incident. The harm must also be “significant.” It must be important, meaningful, and with non-trivial consequences or effects. | The Organizations reported “It is unlikely that identity theft, negative effects to a credit record and/or damage or loss of property will occur ... as the personal information disclosed did not contain any financial information and was only disclosed internally to other...employees”. However, the disclosure “...could potentially create a risk of humiliation and/or reputational risk to affected individuals...”. I agree with the Organizations’ assessment. A reasonable person would consider that it is unlikely the employment information at issue could be used to cause the harms of identity theft or fraud. However, this information could be used to cause the significant harms of hurt, humiliation, embarrassment and reputational harm. |
| Real Risk The likelihood that the significant harm 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. | The Organizations reported “The likelihood that harm could result to the affected employees as a result of the 2016 Incident is low. The ...Incident was accidental and did not involve malicious intent on the part of any person, all recipients of the e-mail containing the 2016 Spreadsheet have confirmed deletion of the e-mail (attaching the 2016 Spreadsheet), and [there is] no indication that the 2016 Spreadsheet was further disseminated beyond the original internal recipients”. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | In my view, a reasonable person would consider that the risk of harm is decreased as the incident resulted from human error and not malicious or deliberate action. Further, all unintended recipients of the personal information confirmed deleting it. However, given the personal/professional relationships that might exist between the affected individuals and the unintended recipients, there is a real risk of hurt, humiliation, embarrassment and reputational harm. |
|--|---|

DECISION UNDER SECTION 37.1(1) OF PIPA

Based on the information provided by the Organizations and given the circumstances of the incident, I have decided that there is a real risk of significant harm to the affected individuals.

A reasonable person would consider that it is unlikely the employment information at issue could be used to cause the harms of identity theft or fraud. However, this information could be used to cause the significant harms of hurt, humiliation, embarrassment and reputational harm. The risk of harm is decreased as the incident resulted from human error and not malicious or deliberate action. Further, all unintended recipients of the personal information confirmed deleting it. However, given the personal/professional relationships that might exist between the affected individuals and the unintended recipients, there is a real risk of hurt, humiliation, embarrassment and reputational harm.

I require the Organizations to notify the affected individuals whose personal information was collected in Alberta, in accordance with section 19.1 of the *Personal Information Protection Act Regulation* (Regulation).

The Organizations reported that all affected individuals were notified by March 3, 2017. The Organizations are not required to notify affected individuals again.

Jill Clayton
Information and Privacy Commissioner