
THE GLOBAL REGULATORY DEVELOPMENTS JOURNAL

Editor's Note: Antimicrobial Resistance

Victoria Prussen Spears

Addressing Antimicrobial Resistance: A Review of Global Public Policy and Legislative Approaches

Lincoln Tsang, Greg Levine, Katherine Wang, Julie Kvedar, Ling Xu, and Helen Ryan

Electric Vehicles and Data Collection: A Tour of Several Jurisdictions

Barbara Li, Steve Tam, Elle Todd, Sarah L. Bruno, Michael J. Rubayo, Bryan Tan, and Eng Han Goh

A New European Commission Proposal on Foreign Direct Investment Screening: Toward Greater Harmonization?

Karl Stas, Cyriel Danneels, and Jean-Baptiste Blancardi

China Issues Rules to Clarify and Relax Cross-Border Data Transfer Controls

Jenny "Jia" Sheng, Chunbin Xu, and Wenjun Cai

The EU and UK Introduce New Security Standards for Internet of Things

Steven Farmer, Scott Morton, and Mark Booth

Three Points for Employers About Collective Bargaining in Mexico Under the New U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement Rules and the Labor Reform

Germán de la Garza De Vecchi

More Countries Join the Digital Nomad Visa Club: A Four-Step Employer's Guide to International Remote Work Requests

Nazanin Afshar, Jack O'Connor, and Nan Sato

UK Government Unveils Remote Work Rules for Short-Term Visitors

Paige Edwards, Claire D Nilson, and Abilio Jaribu

Monitoring Workers in the United Kingdom

Claude-Étienne Armingaud and Sophie F. Levitt

The Global Regulatory Developments Journal

Volume 1, No. 4

July–August 2024

- 225 Editor’s Note: Antimicrobial Resistance**
Victoria Prussen Spears
- 229 Addressing Antimicrobial Resistance: A Review of Global Public Policy and Legislative Approaches**
Lincoln Tsang, Greg Levine, Katherine Wang, Julie Kvedar, Ling Xu, and Helen Ryan
- 253 Electric Vehicles and Data Collection: A Tour of Several Jurisdictions**
Barbara Li, Steve Tam, Elle Todd, Sarah L. Bruno, Michael J. Rubayo, Bryan Tan, and Eng Han Goh
- 267 A New European Commission Proposal on Foreign Direct Investment Screening: Toward Greater Harmonization?**
Karl Stas, Cyriel Danneels, and Jean-Baptiste Blancardi
- 275 China Issues Rules to Clarify and Relax Cross-Border Data Transfer Controls**
Jenny “Jia” Sheng, Chunbin Xu, and Wenjun Cai
- 281 The EU and UK Introduce New Security Standards for Internet of Things**
Steven Farmer, Scott Morton, and Mark Booth
- 287 Three Points for Employers About Collective Bargaining in Mexico Under the New U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement Rules and the Labor Reform**
Germán de la Garza De Vecchi
- 291 More Countries Join the Digital Nomad Visa Club: A Four-Step Employer’s Guide to International Remote Work Requests**
Nazanin Afshar, Jack O’Connor, and Nan Sato
- 297 UK Government Unveils Remote Work Rules for Short-Term Visitors**
Paige Edwards, Claire D Nilson, and Abilio Jaribu
- 303 Monitoring Workers in the United Kingdom**
Claude-Étienne Armingaud and Sophie F. Levitt

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Steven A. Meyerowitz

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

Victoria Prussen Spears

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

Tyler Bridegan

Attorney

Wiley Rein LLP

Paulo Fernando Campana Filho

Partner

Campana Pacca

Hei Zuqing

Distinguished Researcher

International Business School, Zhejiang University

Justin Herring

Partner

Mayer Brown LLP

Lisa Peets

Partner

Covington & Burling LLP

William D. Wright

Partner

Fisher Phillips

THE GLOBAL REGULATORY DEVELOPMENTS JOURNAL (ISSN 2995-7486) at \$495.00 annually is published six times per year by Full Court Press, a Fastcase, Inc., imprint. Copyright 2024 Fastcase, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner.

For customer support, please contact Fastcase, Inc., 729 15th Street, NW, Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20005, 202.999.4777 (phone), or email customer service at support@fastcase.com.

Publishing Staff

Publisher: Leanne Battle

Production Editor: Sharon D. Ray

Cover Art Design: Morgan Morrisette Wright and Sharon D. Ray

The photo on this journal's cover is by Gaël Gaborel—A Picture of the Earth on a Wall—on Unsplash

Cite this publication as:

The Global Regulatory Developments Journal (Fastcase)

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

Copyright © 2024 Full Court Press, an imprint of Fastcase, Inc.

All Rights Reserved.

A Full Court Press, Fastcase, Inc., Publication

Editorial Office

729 15th Street, NW, Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20005

<https://www.fastcase.com/>

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE GLOBAL REGULATORY DEVELOPMENTS JOURNAL, 729 15th Street, NW, Suite 500, Washington, D.C. 20005.

Articles and Submissions

Direct editorial inquiries and send material for publication to:

Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.,
26910 Grand Central Parkway, #18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, smeyerowitz@
meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541.

Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to international attorneys and law firms, in-house counsel, corporate compliance officers, government agencies and their counsel, senior business executives, and others interested in global regulatory developments.

This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but the publisher, the editors and the authors are not rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the Editorial Content appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please contact:

Leanne Battle, Publisher, Full Court Press at leanne.battle@vlex.com or at
866.773.2782

For questions or Sales and Customer Service:

Customer Service
Available 8 a.m.–8 p.m. Eastern Time
866.773.2782 (phone)
support@fastcase.com (email)

Sales
202.999.4777 (phone)
sales@fastcase.com (email)

ISSN 2995-7486

Monitoring Workers in the United Kingdom

Claude-Étienne Armingaud and Sophie F. Levitt*

In this article, the authors summarize some steps that employers should prioritize in light of recent guidance for employers on monitoring workers published recently by the UK's Information Commissioner's Office.

The UK's Information Commissioner's Office (ICO)¹ has recently published guidance for employers on monitoring workers² lawfully, transparently, and fairly. The guidance aims to protect workers' data protection rights and help employers to build trust with workers, customers and service users. With artificial intelligence (AI) on the rise, the temptation may be strong for employers to leverage those emerging technologies in that space. This article summarizes some specific steps employers should prioritize in light of the ICO guidance.

Basic Data Protection Considerations

Any worker-monitoring process will likely entail the processing of personal data and, as a consequence, will require employers to duly assess the most relevant (and sole possible) legal basis for the processing operation, among the six allowed under the UK's implementation of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). These are:

- That the monitoring is necessary for:
 1. The performance of a contract;
 2. Compliance with a legal obligation;
 3. Preserving the vital interests of an individual;
 4. Carrying out a public task; or
 5. Pursuing a legitimate interest (which will need to be balanced against the rights of the data subjects); and
 6. Consent, albeit consent is always a questionable legal basis in the employment realm, especially when it

comes to monitoring, due to the perceived inequality in negotiating power between employer and employee.

Furthermore, should the monitoring involve special categories of data as set out in Article 9 UK GDPR, alternative legal bases may need to be assessed, and these are most likely to create conflict with the workforce. This will notably be the case when monitoring employees' behavior through biometrics (e.g., fingerprints, iris scanning, facial or voice recognition) used for the purpose of uniquely identifying an individual. In these circumstances, employers should document their reasons for relying on biometric data, including any consideration of other less intrusive means and why they think they are inadequate. Employers should be clear about their purpose and why using biometric data is necessary. If a reasonable alternative option to using biometric data is possible, they should be able to justify why this method was not chosen. This must all be documented in a data protection impact assessment (DPIA).

In addition, prior to the implementation of any new monitoring process, employers will need to inform their staff, either through direct information or by updating any employee privacy notice already in place.

This article now lists some of the key takeaways from the new ICO guidance.

Using Monitoring Tools That Use Solely Automated Processes

Where monitoring would rely exclusively on automated decision-making, and considering the outcome of such monitoring would lead to a legal or similarly significant effects on individuals, employers will need to keep in mind that Article 22 UK GDPR³ provides for additional safeguards, namely the right for the individuals to opt out from that processing, and in order to effectively opt out, be informed of such automated decision-making.

Various Monitoring Methods

Remote Working

The rise in remote/home working in a post-COVID society has led to an increase in monitoring workers remotely. Workers'

expectations of privacy are likely to be higher at home than in the workplace, especially when using personal information technology infrastructure to connect to the company's network. Employers should factor in the risks of inadvertently capturing family and private life information when implementing monitoring systems for remote workers. Employers should do this as part of a DPIA as well as in their legitimate interest assessment (LIA) when legitimate interest would be the chosen legal basis for the processing operation. LIA focuses on assessing legitimate interests, that is, whether the processing is necessary to achieve its purpose and whether such interest is overridden by data subjects' rights, whereas a DPIA assesses both impacts and risks of a processing operation and ways to mitigate them.

Monitoring Phone Calls

According to the ICO, it is not usually proportionate to monitor the content of calls. Business calls could be monitored if it is necessary to provide evidence of business transactions, or for training or quality control purposes.

If an organization changed the way they monitored calls as a result of information gathered during call monitoring, they should revisit their DPIA and carefully consider the implications of increased levels of monitoring.

Employers must inform workers of any call monitoring in their privacy information document, as well as informing the other individuals involved in the phone conversation, as required by Article 13 UK GDPR.⁴

Monitoring Emails and Messages

The purpose of monitoring emails and messages must be clear, that is, employers should make sure they have a legitimate reason to monitor their employees (such as assessing performance and productivity in order to improve it) and any monitoring must be necessary and proportionate to the purpose. Workers must be informed of the purpose of any monitoring.

If employers are considering monitoring emails and messages, the ICO mandates that a DPIA be completed, taking into account the disproportionate risks to the rights and freedom of the individuals, as well as the risk of capturing special categories of personal

data in the process (e.g., correspondence with trade union representatives or healthcare providers).

Final Considerations

Before deploying any worker-monitoring technologies, employers must take steps to properly (1) assess the contemplated technology and its proportionality for the purpose for which it is being used, and (2) inform their personnel of the nature and extent of, as well as the reasons for, such monitoring.

Notes

* Claude-Étienne Armingaud (claude.armingaud@klgates.com) is a partner in the Paris office of K&L Gates LLP. Sophie F. Levitt (sophie.levitt@klgates.com) is a trainee solicitor in the firm's London office.

1. <https://ico.org.uk/>.
2. <https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/uk-gdpr-guidance-and-resources/employment/monitoring-workers/>.
3. <https://uk-gdpr.org/chapter-3-article-22/>.
4. <https://uk-gdpr.org/chapter-3-article-13/>.