## Government Bureaux / Departments (Summary of incidents involving leakage of personal data for last 3 years up to 22 May 2008)

| B/D involved            | Summary of the incident   | Affected citizens         | Informed<br>affected<br>citizens<br>(Yes/No) | Informed Privacy Commissioner (Yes/No) | Informed<br>Police<br>(Yes/No) | Reason for not inform related parties                                       |
|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|---|
| Civil Service<br>Bureau | Civil Service Bureau reported that a portable electronic storage device containing information on two disciplinary inquiries was reported missing on 23 April 2008. The names and post titles of 25 serving civil servants were stored in the storage device. | 25<br>(Civil<br>servants) | Yes  | Yes                                    | Yes                            | Not applicable.   |
| Department<br>of Health | A Medical and Health Officer of the Tuen Mun Child Assessment Centre (TMCAC) reported loss of a portable USB drive at her office cum consultation room in TMCAC. The USB device contained working files and identifiable personal data of clients.            | 668                       | Yes  | Yes                                    | Yes                            | Not applicable  |
| Education<br>Bureau     | A local press reported a data leakage incidence in November 2006 that an alumni list of about 200 teachers with information including the teacher's name, school name, school telephone   | About 200                 | Yes  | Yes                                    | No                             | Information theft was not involved and no intrusion to information systems. |

| B/D involved                                     | Summary of the incident  | Affected<br>citizens | Informed<br>affected<br>citizens<br>(Yes/No) | Informed Privacy Commissioner (Yes/No) | Informed<br>Police<br>(Yes/No) | Reason for not inform related parties   |
|--|--|----------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|---|
|  | number and e-mail address was found on the EDB website. The list was uploaded with written consent of the concerned alumni to facilitate communication and professional interflow among themselves and did not carry serious implication. The information was removed immediately. |                      |  |  |                                |   |
| Food and Environmental Hygiene Department Case 1 | The case is related to a food-related complaint. The incident occurred in April 2007. When issuing an enquiry letter to a member of the public, the officer inadvertently attached to it other personal data.  | 1                    | Yes  | Yes                                    | No                             | No criminal offence was involved for all cases and the affected citizens of two cases accepted the explanation and apologies from the department. |
| Case 2   | The case occurred in August 2007 and was also related to a food-related complaint. The officer used some   | 1                    | Yes  | No                                     | No                             |   |

| B/D involved           | Summary of the incident   | Affected citizens | Informed<br>affected<br>citizens<br>(Yes/No) | Informed Privacy Commissioner (Yes/No) | Informed<br>Police<br>(Yes/No) | Reason for not inform related parties  |
|------------------------|---|-------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|--|
|                        | used paper for printing a letter which was sent to a member of the public. It was later noticed that the overleaf of the letter contained the name and address of a third party.  |                   |  |  |                                |  |
| Case 3                 | The incident happened in October 2006. In sending two letters to two prosecution witnesses in connection with a littering offence, a staff mixed up the envelopes. One of them thus noted the name and address of the other person; while the latter noted the similar information and means for communication of the former. | 2                 | Yes  | No                                     | No                             |  |
| Immigration Department | The Immigration Department was informed by the media on 7 May 2008 that some confidential information of the department could be found through the search engine of a file sharing software on the Internet. After investigation, it was identified that a new Immigration Officer has copied a                               | 14                | No   | Yes                                    | No                             | Due to insufficient contact information or restriction on use of the information, the affected citizens were not informed. |

| B/D involved                             | Summary of the incident   | Affected citizens | Informed<br>affected<br>citizens<br>(Yes/No) | Informed Privacy Commissioner (Yes/No) | Informed<br>Police<br>(Yes/No) | Reason for not inform related parties |
|--|---|-------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|  | number of sample documents from<br>two senior officers to his home's PC in<br>order to familiarize the daily<br>operations. It was suspected that this<br>caused the leakage of information.              |                   |  |  |                                |                                       |
| Intellectual Property Department         | In a report on 1 April 2007, a local newspaper reported that some personal data, including a photocopy of a passport, was uploaded through the IPD's system to the Internet where the public can read it. | 180               | Yes  | Yes                                    | No                             | Not applicable.                       |
| Leisure and Cultural Services Department | On 6 May 2006, LCSD was informed that the personal data about some guardians of participants of the 2009 East Asian Games Slogan Competition were found on the Google search engine.                      | 4                 | Yes  | Yes                                    | Yes                            | Not applicable.                       |
| Police Force<br>Case 1                   | In December 2006, the Police became aware that someone had uploaded non-sensitive personal data (including staff number, post title and office telephone number) of several                               | About 700         | Yes  | Yes                                    | N/A                            |                                       |

| B/D involved                 | Summary of the incident   | Affected citizens | Informed<br>affected<br>citizens<br>(Yes/No) | Informed Privacy Commissioner (Yes/No) | Informed<br>Police<br>(Yes/No) | Reason for not inform related parties  |
|------------------------------|---|-------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|--|
|                              | hundreds of police officers and more<br>than 20 old crime alert messages onto<br>the Internet.  |                   |  |  |                                |  |
| Case 2                       | In early April 2008, the Police became aware that some Police's internal documents could be found on the Internet through the search engine of the peer-to-peer sharing software. The Technology Crime Division in the Commercial Crime Bureau started investigation immediately.   | About 20          | Yes  | Yes                                    | N/A                            |  |
| Post Office                  | The case involves a public complaint that 25 notification cards for the collection of Registered and Recorded Delivery items, which were torn apart but had not been destroyed by irreversible means (e.g. via a paper shredder), were found in a rubbish bin outside the rear entrance of On Ting Post Office in Tuen Mun. | 25                | No   | Yes                                    | No                             | The case was not crime related and there was insufficient information to contact affected users. |
| Social Welfare<br>Department | In a staff's personal blog, names of 29<br>Comprehensive Social Security  | 29                | No   | Yes                                    | Yes                            | PCO and Police were informed of the incident. The personal blog                                  |

| B/D involved | Summary of the incident  | Affected<br>citizens      | Informed<br>affected<br>citizens<br>(Yes/No) | Informed Privacy Commissioner (Yes/No) | Informed<br>Police<br>(Yes/No) | Reason for not inform related parties  |
|--------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|--|
|              | Assistance recipients appeared in 26 episodes. In some of these episodes, information like their age and educational background was mentioned.   |                           |  |  |                                | was deleted shortly after the case was reported to the Police.   |
| Treasury     | In January 2007, 15 e-Payslips were suspected to have been mis-directed to un-intended recipients. Subsequently, only 4 were confirmed to have been mis-directed. Matter has since been rectified. | 15<br>(Civil<br>servants) | Partly<br>informed                           | No                                     | Yes                            | Computer fraud was not involved. The Hong Kong Identity Card and bank account numbers on the payslips were partially masked. |
| Total        | 14 cases   | About<br>1,884            |  |  |                                |  |

## Public Organisations (Summary of incidents involving leakage of personal data for last 3 years up to 22 May 2008)

| Organisation involved               | Summary of the incident   | Affected citizens | Informed<br>affected<br>citizens<br>(Yes/No) | Informed Privacy Commissioner (Yes/No) | Informed<br>Police<br>(Yes/No) | Reason for not inform related parties           |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|---|
| City University                     | A staff member of the University transferring inadvertently the personal data to a public server. The data involved the name, sex, HKID no, address, employment background, and education and professional background of applicants for admission of BEng(Hons) Building Engineering (Modern Structural Engineering) in 2005. | 68                | No   | Yes                                    | No                             | No criminal offence was involved.               |
| Hospital<br>Authority<br>(10 cases) | Since 1 April 2007, HA has received 10 reports of loss of electronic devices which contain or might contain patient data. These cases concern six   | 15 878            | Yes<br>Yes                                   | No<br>(8 Cases)<br>Yes                 | Yes                            | PCO is following-up the cases.  Not applicable. |
|                                     | hospitals/clinics. Of these 10 cases, eight were reported to have taken place within hospital/clinic and two outside hospital/clinic premises. The electronic devices lost included five USB memory sticks, one palm handheld device, one MP3 player, one Central Processing  |                   | 103  | (2 Cases)                              | 103                            | тос аррисаоте.                                  |

| Organisation involved                  | Summary of the incident  | Affected<br>citizens  | Informed<br>affected<br>citizens<br>(Yes/No) | Informed Privacy Commissioner (Yes/No)     | Informed<br>Police<br>(Yes/No) | Reason for not inform related parties  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--------------------------------|--|
|  | Unit, one laptop computer and one digital camera. Seven of the ten cases are suspected to be theft-related while lost of devices were involved in the remaining three cases.   |   |  |  |                                |  |
| Hong Kong<br>Institute of<br>Education | On 5 March 2007, when announcing the 2007 Non-JUPAS offer list, application data of 204 non-JUPAS applicants of year 2006 was inadvertently included and uploaded to the Internet.   | 204   | Yes  | No (PCO approached the institute actively) | No                             | No criminal offence was involved. The information was removed about 30 minutes after announcement. |
| Hong Kong<br>University<br>Case 1      | On 10 October 2007, a staff member of the University unintentionally pressed the wrong key and printed the content of a CD given by his friend through the University Computer Centre's network printer. The printed documents were believed to have contained the personal data of a number of non-HKU persons. | Insufficient information (The University did not own the information) | No   | Yes  | Yes                            | The University did not own the information. The Police was investigating the case.                 |
| Case 2                                 | On 13 March 2006, a data file containing the personal data of some of  | 68  | No   | Yes  | No                             | The leaked information was deleted immediately.  |

| Organisation involved                 | Summary of the incident   | Affected citizens | Informed<br>affected<br>citizens<br>(Yes/No) | Informed Privacy Commissioner (Yes/No) | Informed<br>Police<br>(Yes/No) | Reason for not inform related parties                                |
|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|--|
|                                       | the University's students was found to<br>be accessible by the public through the<br>Internet. The file was uploaded by a<br>student to his personal web directory for<br>printing purpose but forgot to remove it<br>after printing.   |                   |  |  |                                |  |
| Independent Police Complaints Council | As reported by the media on 10 March 2006, the personal information about 20,000 people who complained against the police to the Independent Police Complaints Council (IPCC) were found on the Internet.   | 26 341            | Yes  | Yes                                    | Yes                            | Not applicable.  |
| Polytechnic<br>University             | The oversight of a technical staff to suspend a regular computer job before the scheduled time for sending the examination result notification to students led to system irregularities. As a result, some 1,780 students wrongly received emails containing other students' results. | 1 780             | Yes  | Yes                                    | No                             | Only information within the University was involved in the incident. |
| Total                                 | 16 cases  | 44 339            |  |  |                                |  |