Warsaw, 23 January 2020

Communication from the UKNF
on information processing by supervised entities
using public or hybrid cloud computing services

I. Definitions

1. The following terms have been used solely for the purpose of this communication, considering the specific nature of cloud-based information processing:

   (1) **supervised entity** – an entity subject to financial market supervision under Article 1(2) points 1–8 of the Act of 21 July 2006 on financial market supervision;

   (2) **information protected by law** – information relating to secrets in the financial sector listed in sector-specific statutory laws, namely:
      (a) the Act of 29 August 1997 – the Banking Law;
      (b) the Act of 29 July 2005 on trading in financial instruments;
      (c) the Act of 27 May 2004 on investment funds and management of alternative investment funds;
      (d) the Act of 26 October 2000 on commodity exchanges;
      (e) the Act of 11 September 2015 on the business of insurance and reinsurance;
      (f) the Act of 15 December 2017 on insurance distribution;
      (g) the Act of 28 August 1997 on the organisation and operation of pension funds;
      (h) the Act of 4 October 2018 on employees’ capital pension scheme;
      (i) the Act of 19 August 2011 on payment services;
      (j) the Act of 5 November 2009 on credit unions;

   (3) **cloud** – a shared pool of configurable computing resources available ‘on demand’ through IT networks (e.g. networks, servers, mass storage, applications, and services) that can be rapidly delivered or released with minimum management effort or service provider interaction;

   (4) **public cloud** – a cloud available to the public, owned or directly managed by a cloud service provider;

---

¹ National Institute of Standards and Technology, Definition of Cloud Computing, Special Publication 800–145.
(5) **private cloud** – a cloud available to a single entity, owned or directly managed by that entity;

(6) **hybrid cloud** – a cloud working as a combination of two or more cloud models (public, private, community clouds) where, with standard application rules and an appropriate technology, information processing operations can move between the clouds;

(7) **community cloud** – a cloud that is used exclusively by a specific group of entities related by shares or under a cooperation agreement, with pre-defined common rules and requirements, including in the area of compliance and security of information processing, owned or managed directly or indirectly by an entity or entities in the group;

(8) **cloud service provider** – an entity that owns infrastructure and software necessary to provide cloud computing services and provides such services (sometimes referred to as vendor);

(9) **cloud service** – standardised ready-to-use computing resources used to process information, pre-configured and delivered by a cloud service provider; they may be delivered directly to a supervised entity or offered as part of services of another provider at a different point of the outsourcing chain;

(10) **cloud-based outsourcing** – means any agreement between a supervised entity and a cloud service provider under which the cloud service provider provides to the supervised entity a cloud service to support the execution of a process, service or task the supervised entity would execute using own resources if the cloud service was not available;

(11) **special cloud-based outsourcing** – means cloud-based outsourcing in which a supervised entity entrusts a cloud service provider with the performance, by means of a cloud service, of those activities and/or functions of the supervised entity which – if lacking or interrupted due to a failure or violation of the rules of safe cloud computing – would, according to the supervised entity:

(a) materially affect the continuous fulfilment by the supervised entity of the requirements underlying its licence to run or conduct supervised activities, or
(b) pose a material threat to the supervised entity’s financial performance, or to the reliability or continuity of its supervised business;

(12) **documented process** – a set of related, regularly performed operations which are applied and described, at a level of detail sufficient for the supervised entity, in external and/or internal documents; the outcomes of those activities are recorded, and the records are stored so as to demonstrate that the activities have been completed in accordance with the requirements;

(13) **value of information** – a consequence of materialisation of the risk of unauthorised disclosure, modification or destruction of information, arising for the business of a supervised entity;

(14) **data at rest encryption** – encryption of data at rest (e.g. storing back-up copies, information in a database, file systems);

(15) **data in transit encryption** – encryption at the time of data transmission (e.g. at the time of transmission of data from/to a cloud);

(16) **outsourcing chain** – a relationship which consists in:
   (a) a cloud service provider entrusting certain activities (performed to deliver a cloud service to a supervised entity) to its subvendor and further subvendors, or
   (b) a relationship which consists in a cloud service provider providing a cloud service to another provider that uses the cloud service to provide its own service to a supervised entity;

(17) **subvendor** – an entity which provides services to a cloud service provider for the purpose of providing the could service to a supervised entity and has or may have identified access to information processed by the supervised entity;

(18) **SLA** – Service Level Agreement, an agreement on the guaranteed level of the cloud service;

(19) **tenant** – a cloud service instance assigned to a supervised entity. The key property of a tenant is its default logical separation (in terms of configuration and information processing) from other tenants. Each supervised entity may have multiple tenants with the same cloud service provider, provided that all the requirements concerning tenant separation are met;
(20) **MFA** – the Multi-Factor Authentication method;

(21) **DPC** – data processing centre;

(22) **SIEM** – Security Information and Event Management;

(23) **disclosure of information** – subject to the meaning of the mandatory provisions of law, a situation where information is processed in a cloud:
    (a) as non-encrypted data, or
    (b) as encrypted ‘data at rest’ or ‘data in transit’ but the encryption keys or information encrypted with such keys is accessible to the cloud service provider or its subvendor in the outsourcing chain.
II. Introduction

1. The technological development in the area of cloud computing raises doubt among supervised entities as to the possible application of that technology and – where such solution is allowed – as to the outsourcing rules, in particular at the time of processing of information protected by law.

2. The Polish Financial Supervision Authority (hereinafter: ‘UKNF’ or ‘Supervisor’) recognises the lack of standardisation in the use of cloud services in relation to the same information categories by supervised entities in the financial sector, which may lead to significant differences in the assessment of technology risk, thus leading to an increase in sector risk.

3. The cloud-based information processing service consists in entrusting the task of processing and – depending on the categories of information processed and the processing operations actually executed – it may be treated as cloud-based outsourcing or special cloud-based outsourcing. This communication does not prejudice the application of the mandatory rules on this subject but it aims to explain the Supervisor’s understanding of those rules.

4. The Supervisor treats safe processing of information relevant for the processes or activities of supervised entities and information protected by law as a top priority. The application of inappropriate legal regimes in this respect may have a negative impact on the functioning of financial markets and affects the ability to supervise information processing effectively. The relevant rules applicable in the European Economic Area (EEA), in particular:

   (1) Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation), and

   (2) Regulation (EU) 2018/1807 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 November 2018 on a framework for the free flow of non-personal data in the European Union respond to a number of demands and objectives regarding proper protection of information. Considering the above circumstances, the UKNF recommends that information should be processed in DPCs located in the territory of EEA countries.

5. This communication supplements and specifies certain recommendations on outsourcing formulated in:

   (1) Recommendation D on the management of information technology and ICT environment security at banks;

   (2) Recommendation D-SKOK on the management of information technology and ICT environment security at credit unions;

   (3) Guidelines on the management of information technology and ICT environment security at general pension societies;
(4) Guidelines concerning the management of information technology and ICT environment security at insurance and reinsurance undertakings;
(5) Guidelines on the management of information technology and ICT environment security at investment fund management companies;
(6) Guidelines on the management of information technology and ICT environment security at capital market infrastructure entities;
(7) Guidelines on the management of information technology and ICT environment security at investment firms.

The supervised entities to which the above recommendations and guidelines do not apply should apply the provisions of this communication directly.

6. This communication outlines the national approach to cloud-based outsourcing of information processing for the financial sector (a reference model). Therefore:
   (1) This communication supersedes in its entirety Communication from the UKNF of 23 October 2017 on the use of cloud computing services by the supervised entities;
   (2) The supervised entities that process information using cloud services in accordance with Communication from the UKNF of 23 October 2017 should adapt their operations to the requirements of this communication by 1 August 2020;
   (3) The guidelines, recommendations and any other document outlining the position of the European Banking Authority, the European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority and the European Securities and Markets Authority which pertain to public or hybrid cloud computing do not apply to the supervised entities in that respect.

7. A common use of cloud services by supervised entities may create a risk that the processing of information protected by law held by a significant portion of the financial market will be concentrated physically in the same facilities (data processing centres) or as part of cooperation between supervised entities and a limited number of cloud service providers. Cloud-based processing of information protected by law also generates a risk associated with the protection of information that is being processed, regardless of the nature of the outsourcing process. Due to those risks, the Supervisor expects the supervised entities to notify the UKNF of their intention to process information using cloud services, in accordance with the rules laid down in this communication.
III. Reference model
1. In order to provide support to the supervised entities and to avoid uncertainty of interpretation, the UKNF has defined a reference model for cloud services, as the following set of rules described in this communication:
   (1) guidelines for application;
   (2) guidelines for classification and assessment of information;
   (3) guidelines for risk assessment;
   (4) the minimum requirements for cloud-based information processing;
   (5) the rules for notification of cloud-based information processing, or of the intention to start cloud-based information processing, to the UKNF.

IV. Guidelines for application
1. In order to ensure the proper functioning, stability and safety of the financial market, pursuant to Article 4(1) of the Act on financial market supervision, the Supervisor expects the supervised entities to apply this reference model in their activities relating to the preparation, implementation and completion of cloud-based information processing and to treat the model as a specification of the existing legal requirements, without prejudice to such requirements, where:
   (1) information processed is information protected by law as defined in this communication, or
   (2) information processing represents special cloud-based outsourcing as defined in this communication,
   and where information is processed in a public cloud or a hybrid cloud (to the extent it is based on a public cloud model).

2. The main task of a supervised entity when processing information in a cloud is to ensure information security and compliance of the method and scope of the processing operations with the legal requirements. This communication should be applied with due regard for the principle of proportionality and for the reference model. The principle of proportionality should be put into practice at the stage of measuring the risk associated with the planning of processing operations, with due consideration of the adequacy of the information security arrangements applied. The UKNF emphasises that the principle of proportionality should not be understood as an authorisation of minor supervised entities to apply any security arrangement for information processing which is less effective than the security arrangements described in this communication.

3. The Supervisor underlines that the requirements described in this communication should be applied by the supervised entities before they start processing information in a cloud computing environment.

4. To ensure proper application of this communication, a supervised entity should determine, for each cloud service used or to be used:
   (1) whether information processing operations involve information protected by law, and
   (2) whether a processing operation may be defined as special cloud-based outsourcing.
5. Where an operation is categorised into two or more classes according to the above matrix, a more stringent requirement should be adopted.

6. Nevertheless this communication does not apply where a relevant special provision of law:
   (1) excludes the possibility of cloud-based processing of specific information, or excludes the possibility of cloud-based execution of certain processing operations;
   (2) imposes the obligation to meet certain technical or organisational requirements on the processing of certain information which would exclude the possibility to comply with this communication.

7. This communication needs not be applied when designing and using cloud test/development environments, unless such environments are used to process information protected by law.

8. This communication does not apply to information processing in a private cloud.

V. **Guidelines for classification and assessment of information**

1. A supervised entity should categorise information into the following classes in a documented categorisation process:
   (1) information protected by law, as defined in this communication;
   (2) information protected under legal rules other than those considered in this communication;
   (3) information which is not protected by law.

2. Information is assessed for eligibility for cloud computing, in particular considering:
   (1) compliance with legal requirements and contractual provisions and obligations specific to sectors or supervised entities;
   (2) the scope, type and priority of categorised information;
   (3) the value of information for the supervised entity.

3. In categorising and assessing information, the supervised entity should consider:
   (1) the scale of its activities;
   (2) the corporate, group or any other models or methods of assessment and categorisation which take into account the above-mentioned guidelines and are common for the group of entities the supervised entity is part of;
   (3) the supervised entity’s responsibility for information processed.
4. The supervised entity should recategorise and reassess information if:
   (1) the entity intends to process a new type of information;
   (2) the entity intends to use a new cloud service;
   (3) an amendment to the legislation, rules, regulations or provisions of agreements
       the supervised entity is a party to affects or may affect the compliance of the
       supervised entity’s conduct in terms of cloud-based information processing;
   (4) the scale of processing is materially increased or reduced;
   (5) the value of information processed increases materially.

5. The supervised entity should regularly (at least annually) review and confirm the
   validity of the classification and assessment of information to adapt it to the current
   conditions surrounding its activities.

VI. Guidelines for risk assessment
1. The supervised entity should have in place a documented process for comprehensive
   risk assessment (identification, analysis and assessment of threats, their potentiality
   and the impact of their occurrence on the supervised entity), based on the current
   edition of PN-ISO 27005 (Information Security Risk Management) or its equivalent in
   the European standardisation system, or based on any other structured approach\(^2\). Risk
   assessment should be a continuous process, considering the practical implementation
   of the principles of the PDCA cycle (Plan–Do–Check–Act).

2. In the process of risk assessment, in the context of the results of the classification and
   assessment of information processed in a cloud, the supervised entity should consider,
   as a minimum:
      (1) general threats to the application of a cloud:
          (a) geographical location of information processed, especially in term of
              ensuring compliance of processing with the legislation, internal
              regulations, contractual obligations, declarations and other rules;
          (b) the risk of non-compliance of the supervised entity’s conduct with the
              legal rules (including the existing licences and/or authorisations) due to
              the cloud being used unintentionally or due to diversion from its
              intended use;
          (c) access to information available to employees and collaborators (e.g.
              subvendors) of the cloud service provider;
          (d) access to information, guaranteed by the jurisdiction of the country in
              which information is processed physically (the location of the data
              processing centre), in particular a reference to the list of situations
              (and/or entities) in which information or access to it may be requested
              without the express consent of the

\(^2\)Risk assessment may be based on a well supported and implemented method, considering the standards
or other specified approach, e.g. the model of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Special
Publication (SP) 800-37 Rev. 2, Risk Management Framework for Information Systems and Organizations: A
System Life Cycle Approach for Security and Privacy.
supervised entity, both by the authorities of national and international administrations;

(e) technological incompatibility between the services of various cloud service providers, causing ‘attachment’ to a single cloud service provider due to the limitation or lack of possibility to move (use identical) services or information processed (vendor lock-in);

(f) failures of the mechanisms isolating the resources used to provide cloud services;

(g) vulnerability of interfaces used to manage the services offered by cloud service provider;

(h) limited possibilities of affecting the scope, form and changes in the services, including in particular information retention and deletion once the processing is completed;

(i) limited control of the cloud service provider and its subvendors, including limited direct verification of physical, technological and organisational security arrangements and control of the provision of the cloud service;

(j) distribution of responsibility for information security between the cloud service provider and the supervised entity;

(2) specific threats to each (defined) cloud service:

(a) the potentiality of services being used inconsistently with the intentions of the supervised entity or in an environment which is beyond the control of the supervised entity (e.g. private mobile devices, access from private or public networks);

(b) the potentiality of the technical terms of use (in particular the parameters of the service and the configuration rules) being changed unilaterally;

(c) using default or publicly available configuration parameters for services, without proper verification and assessment of adequacy for the supervised entity’s needs;

(d) the existing verification mechanisms and their vulnerabilities;

(3) specific threats associated with the supervised entity’s resources:

(a) the required and actual resources, including human resources with defined competences;

(b) technological compatibility of the existing IT environment and the cloud computing environment, in particular the integration arrangements;

(4) the value of information for the supervised entity as well as direct and indirect effects of the loss of control over information processing;

(5) the Supervisor’s position on encryption according to which:

(a) encryption does not reduce the value of information or change its categorisation or assessment;

(b) encryption and proper management of encryption keys prevent disclosure of information;

(c) there is no guarantee of recognition of a given encryption algorithm as ‘completely safe.’ The Supervisor recommends encryption algorithms which – according to publicly available information (e.g. technical papers, reports from cybersecurity and cryptography units) – have not been recognised as compromised. Where an algorithm recognised as compromised is used, the supervised entity should promptly take action to ensure information security;
(d) information processed in a cloud should always be encrypted, where it is technologically and – according to the supervised entity – economically feasible;

(e) information protected by law must always be encrypted as data ‘at rest’ and data ‘in transit’; The Supervisor allows for a situation where information protected by law is encrypted as data ‘at rest’ immediately after it is sent to the cloud, as long as data in transit encryption is also applied and such situation is not treated as disclosure of information;

(f) The Supervisor allows for a situation where a supervised entity entrusts its service provider (including a cloud service provider) with the generating and management of the encryption keys used to encrypt information processed as part of the cloud services delivered by another cloud service provider; in assessing risk, the supervised entity should consider the risk of losing its access to encryption keys;

(6) the Supervisor’s position on the creation of an outsourcing chain according to which:

(a) the creation of an outsourcing chain should be each time assessed by the supervised entity in the light of special legal rules concerning specific cloud computing operations, in particular:
   i. an outsourcing chain may only be created within the scope of activities of the supervised entity within the limits prescribed by law;
   ii. an outsourcing chain may only be created outside the scope of activities of the supervised entity if this is not explicitly prohibited by legal or contractual provisions;

(b) the scope of responsibility of the cloud service provider and its subvendors towards the supervised entity may only be limited or excluded under special provisions of law regulating the supervised entity’s activities; however the Supervisor is critical of such exclusions or limitations if:
   i. as part of the cloud service, information protected by law is processed using encryption keys provided or managed by the cloud service provider or its subvendor, or
   ii. the processing represents special cloud-based outsourcing;

(7) the Supervisor’s position on the services (of cloud service providers) which are used by direct providers of supervised entities to provide their own services, according to which:
(a) the supervised entity should ascertain to what extent the service provided by the direct provider uses cloud computing, in particular whether there occurs cloud-based processing of information protected by law;
(b) irrespective of the actual use of cloud services and the scope of information being processed, the supervised entity should ensure that information is processed with due account for this communication;
(8) the Supervisor’s position on the governing law of the agreement between the cloud service provider and the supervised entity, according to which:
(a) the governing law of the agreement is the law of the Republic of Poland or the law of any other EU Member State, unless the parties to the agreement submit the agreement to the law of a third country and the law of a third country allows for the effective implementation of:
   i. the contractual provisions;
   ii. all the requirements of the Polish law imposed on the supervised entity;
   iii. the Supervisor’s guidelines, including with regard to this communication;
(b) where the agreement is submitted to the law of a third country, the supervised entity should obtain in writing a legal opinion ascertaining that under the governing law of the agreement concerned all the provisions of the agreement between the supervised entity and the cloud service provider fulfil the legal requirements applicable to the supervised entity and the requirements of this communication;
(9) any other material risks the supervised entity identifies in connection with the use of cloud computing.

3. In assessing risk, the supervised entity should consider the potentiality of:
   (1) using verified updated sources of information about the risks specific to the application of cloud services, including in relation to concrete (defined) services;
   (2) using the support from entities or individuals with specialised competences in the areas of both cybersecurity and cloud services, especially where such competences are missing in the supervised entity’s own organisation;
   (3) reviewing the available results of external audits of cloud service providers with regard to cloud services and information security management, extending the scope of the review with available certificates issued to the cloud service provider to confirm the fulfilment of the requirements;
   (4) prior testing of the cloud services, also using stress test scenarios, both with regard to how the service works and to its configuration.
4. Based on the results of risk assessment, the supervised entity manages such risk, considering in particular:

(1) the requirements under the laws, internal rules and regulations, and contractual provisions;
(2) the organisational complexity, the distribution of competences and responsibility of the supervised entity, the existing agreements and other similar factors in the groups of companies or the group’s organisation, or in an association the supervised entity is part of;
(3) the effectiveness of the existing control and monitoring arrangements, especially in relation to:
   (a) the identification of new risks;
   (b) changes in the current cloud service or the mode and scope of its application;
   (c) changes in the relationship with the cloud service provider, including the possibility of unexpected termination of cooperation by both the supervised entity and the cloud service provider;
(4) the supervised entity’s technical competences and organisational capacities, in particular in terms of the safe use of cloud computing and the performance of contractual provisions;
(5) the supervised entity’s capacities and legal compliance necessary to transfer the identified risk or accept the assessed risk level.

5. The results of risk assessment should provide grounds for concluding that the cloud service will be delivered in accordance with the legal requirements applicable to the supervised entity, the external and internal rules and regulations as well as the standards adopted by the supervised entity.

6. The results of risk assessment should be formally approved and periodically reviewed and updated. The approval should include the supervised entity’s decision on:

(1) the cloud services to be used by the supervised entity;
(2) the type and scope of information processed as part of such services.

VII. Minimum requirements for cloud-based information processing
1. These minimum technical and organisational requirements for cloud-based information processing represent a reference that the supervised entity should verify for the appropriateness for the results of risk assessment and to ensure that the requirements are fulfilled.

2. The technical means and organisational resources use to ensure information security should result from the completed risk assessment process but – regardless of the results of such assessment – they must not ‘soften’ the above requirements.

---

3 The periodic verification and updates should follow the practice and rules adopted by the supervised entity but their frequency should not be less than once a year.
3. Ensuring competence

3.1. The supervised entity should ensure, in a documented process, appropriate competences for the intended or ongoing information processing operations in a cloud computing environment. The competences should result from the requirements concerning education, training, skills and experience of the supervised entity’s employees and collaborators engaged in the planning, implementation, testing and maintenance of cloud-based information processing, and the requirements to conclude and review the related agreement.

3.2. The supervised entity should also ensure proper understanding of the consequences of using a certain cloud computing architecture, the configuration rules, the distribution of responsibility for information security, according to the scope and type of the intended or existing cloud computing environment and the service model, considering the requirements on business continuity for the supervised entity and its IT infrastructure. The understanding of consequences of a given choice should be reflected in the risk assessment documentation, the guarantee of appropriate resources both in qualitative and quantitative terms as well as in all the works (and agreements) related to the development or upgrade of software to be used in the cloud and in the integration of services based on the supervised entity’s own resources.

3.3. The competences of the supervised entity’s employees and/or collaborators responsible for security and planning, configuration, management and monitoring of cloud services should be confirmed by an appropriate training documentation and personal certificates regarding the relevant scope of the applicable cloud services (or they should follow from the skills and experience), including specific services or services configured specifically to the relevant cloud service provider. That requirement also applies to the competences of individuals responsible for the review or verification of audit documents, certificates and other documents of the cloud service provider, including agreement for the provision of the cloud service as well as technical documents.

4. Agreement with the cloud service provider

4.1. The supervised entity should have a formal agreement (and other documents, including statements, rules, terms of use, including in electronic version) with the cloud service provider which – where appropriate in relation to the services and scope of information processing – contains or indicates a source of information about:

- a clear distribution of responsibility for information security, considering the service model, the service continuity (including the RTO and RPO\(^4\) parameters, where appropriate) and declared SLA together with the measurement and reporting method;

\(^4\)RTO – Recovery Time Objective, the time from a failure of an IT system until its recovery.

RPO – Recovery Point Objective, maximum length of time from the last data backup until a failure of the cloud service. This also means a potential risk (accepted by the supervised entity) that the results of information processing might be lost for a specified duration of time.
(b) a clear definition and indication of location\(^5\) of information processing and verification as well as securing compliance through at least a reference to appropriate documents, description of configuration, methods and tools;

(c) the governing law of the agreement (including the competent court and dispute resolution rules);

(d) confirmation of compatibility of personal data processing with the EU legislation, if applicable;

(e) ownership of information during the term and after termination (expiration, dissolution) of the agreement, even if unplanned;

(f) guarantees, implied warranties, insurance (insurance policy of the cloud service provider), liquidated damages, definition of force majeure, events treated as force majeure, and the procedures to be followed in such situations, if applicable;

(g) definition of the scope of responsibility for damage caused to the customers of the supervised entity (if applicable), in accordance with the legal requirements imposed on the supervised entity;

(h) a clear indication of subvendors (name, location, scope of operations) of the cloud service provider and the requirements for granting rights of access to information processed by the supervised entity;

(i) a clear indication of the rules according to which the tasks and the scope of authorisation, responsibility and accountability of subvendors of the cloud service provider are transparent and clearly identified by the supervised entity;

(j) sources of authorised information on the expected changes in the standards applicable to the relevant cloud services (including technical changes);

(k) the sources of technical documentation and declarations of conformity (including compliance with applicable laws), and cloud service configuration manuals;

(l) the scope of additional information and documentation submitted by the cloud service provider in connection with the provision of the cloud service;

(m) the supervised entity’s right to conduct inspections at locations where information is processed, including the right to conduct an audit of the other party or third party at the request of the supervised entity (provided this is required following risk assessment);

(n) the Supervisor’s right to perform inspection duties, e.g. to check the premises and the documentation pertaining to the processing of information of the supervised entity, the processes and procedures, the organisation, management and certificates of compliance;

\(^5\) A precise indication of location of the data processing centre (DPC) may pose a threat to the physical security of information but, as a minimum, one should use terms such as ‘availability zone’, ‘region’ or any other equivalent term, specifying at least the country and approximate location of the DPC, which terms are used by the cloud service provider in the standard communication, e.g. by specifying the city/town or region of the country. Where such specification is not possible or – due to the scale of activities and the number of locations where information is processed – inappropriate, an EEA area (for the European Economic Area) or any other equivalent description should be provided.
(o) the licensing rules (including the right to update the security of software or its components) and intellectual property rights, including – if applicable – the right to handle information which is being processed;
(p) the rules for amending the agreement, including the technical parameters of the relevant cloud services;
(q) the rules for terminating the agreement, including the rules and time limits for deleting information which is being processed;
(r) the rules regarding support, including the scope and time slots (e.g. time zones), the methods and procedures for reporting issues with cloud services;
(s) the rules for sharing information, including in particular regarding safety and management of current incidents, applicable to both the staff of the supervised entity and of the cloud service provider, and – in the case of material exposure to the impact of a given incident – also to other parties (e.g. customers, subvendors), to ensure the appropriateness of procedures to the weight of the incident.

4.2. Without prejudice to legal requirements or to this communication, the supervised entity may use framework agreement forms made available by the cloud service provider, especially where the agreement concerns cloud services developed for a group of entities (including the supervised entity) as part of corporate or group agreements, including community cloud services.

In that case, the supervised entity should:

(a) determine to what extent the framework agreement and related documents, the results of risk assessment as well as the legal, organisational and technical requirements take into account the provisions of this communication and are appropriate for the supervised entity’s circumstances and intentions regarding cloud-based information processing;
(b) assess if it is necessary and possible to apply the requirements of this communication independently, to the extent that is incompatible with the framework agreement and related documents.

5. Planning in cloud-based information processing

5.1. Based on the results of risk assessment, the supervised entity should draw up a documented plan of cloud-based information processing, including at least:

(a) the type (description) of information to be processed and, if applicable, information about pseudonymisation and/or anonymisation;
(b) the method of encryption and the location (or method) of encryption key management;
(c) information on who has access to information that is being processed and how such access is granted, managed, denied and controlled;
(d) the date of conclusion of the agreement with the cloud service provider and references thereto (Ref. No, term, date of renewal or amendment, start dates of services) and – where the agreement has not been concluded yet – the expected date of conclusion;
(e) the governing law of the agreement;
(f) the description of the task to be performed by means of the cloud service and information on whether it is special cloud-based outsourcing as defined in this communication, or if the task involves processing of information protected by law.

5.2. Before the cloud service goes live, a testing period is needed, during which the test data (machine-generated or otherwise random-generated data) are used, in a documented process, to test scenarios appropriate for the assessed risk.

5.3. The supervised entity should have in place a documented and tested plan for withdrawing its engagement in information processing as part of cloud services of a given provider (also in an emergency), without prejudice to the compliance of the entity’s conduct with the legal requirements and other rules, including in particular the rules concerning the existing licences or authorisation to conduct specific activities.

5.4. The supervised entity should have in place a documented business continuity plan considering a potential loss of control over information being processed by a given cloud service provider and the potential interruption of the service. For a continuity plan regarding a service based on two or more clouds, or two or more cloud service providers, the supervised entity should regularly review its capacity to retain the declared objectives, in particular the compliance of service configuration and reproducibility of the IT environment, especially following technological changes on the part of any of the cloud service providers.

6. Requirements for cloud service providers

6.1. According to the actual scope and scale of the cloud services, the cloud service provider should meet the requirements for compliance with the following standards or their equivalents in the Polish or European standardisation system, unless the supervised entity accepts (based on the results of risk assessment) that it is not necessary to meet such requirement in whole or in part:

(a) PN-ISO/IEC ISO 20000 on IT service management;
(b) PN-EN ISO/IEC 27001 on information security management;
(c) PN-EN ISO 22301 on service continuity management;
(d) ISO/IEC 27017 on cloud information security;
(e) ISO/IEC 27018 on the code of practice for protection of personally identifiable information (PII) in clouds.

6.2. The DPC of the cloud service provider should meet the requirements of PN-EN 50600 (Data centre facilities and infrastructures) as a minimum for Class 3 or ANSI/TIA-942 for Tier III, or any other appropriate recognised standard for the evaluation of DPCs, or any DPC-related standard, and the supervised entity may accept (in duly justified cases and following risk assessment) non-compliance with certain requirements.

The requirements should be considered by the supervised entity in its approach to the application of cloud services, in particular in risk assessment.
6.3. The Supervisor recommends that the DPC should be located in the territory of an EEA country. This provision is subject to the rule that the supervised entities that:

(a) have been recognised, by decision, as key service operators as defined in Article 5(2) of the Act of 5 July 2018 on the national cybersecurity system, and that use a cloud service to deliver a key service, or

(b) are critical infrastructure operators as defined in the Act of 26 April 2007 on crisis management, and that use a cloud service to perform the tasks of critical infrastructure operation

should use, in the first place, the DPCs located in the territory of the Republic of Poland, unless – in the supervised entity’s view – the proposed contractual, financial, operational, SLA-related or functional terms and conditions are at least as good as those applicable to the DPCs located outside the territory of the Republic of Poland.

6.4. A cloud service provider should ensure, as part of its rules of procedure, a documented rule for protection of information processed by the supervised entity against unauthorised access or use by the entity’s staff or subvendors, at least by:

(a) applying a default rule of no access to information processed by the supervised entity;

(b) applying a default rule of no administrator or user account on virtual machines of the supervised entity or in any cloud services that are being launched;

(c) applying the rule of the ‘necessary minimum’ requirements for service account rights, to be granted only where it is necessary to perform operations required by the supervised entity (e.g. troubleshooting) and only for the duration of such operations, based on a service request made by the supervised entity; the whole management and execution process may be carried out after log-in; The applicable operation procedures may also be confirmed by a relevant certificate (e.g. SOC\textsuperscript{7} 2 Type 2) issued by an independent certification body accredited in line with the European accreditation standards;

(d) making available guidelines, model configuration, descriptions of rules, etc., which should clearly define separation in information processing and indicate methods of verifying the correctness of configuration;

(e) launching a new default environment (or cloud service) separated from other tenants, with ‘secure-by-default’ settings\textsuperscript{8}.

6.5. The fulfilment of the requirements may be confirmed with appropriate certificates of conformity issued by independent certification bodies accredited in line with the European accreditation standards.

\textsuperscript{7} System and Organization Controls.

\textsuperscript{8} A default configuration of a cloud service which considers the requirements for security of information processing, mainly to prevent accidental (unintended) disclosure of information that is being processed.
7. **Cryptography**

7.1. The supervised entity should ensure that information processed in a cloud is encrypted in accordance with the rules laid down in this communication. In particular, the supervised entity should make sure that:

(a) it has access to up-to-date detailed cloud configuration manuals and methods of verification of the correctness of configuration and operation, in particular in the area of encryption;

(b) it has adequate competences to set up proper configuration of cloud services in line with the guidelines submitted by the cloud service provider, including in terms of encryption;

(c) it uses dedicated configuration settings – or settings recommended by the cloud service provider – that increase the safety of the cloud services concerned;

(d) information protected by law is encrypted both as data ‘at rest’ and data ‘in transit.’

7.2. The supervised entity should ensure that information is encrypted with the keys generated and managed by the supervised entity, unless the risk assessment shows that it is acceptable or advisable to use encryption keys generated or managed by the cloud service provider.

7.3. Where the risk assessment reveals the need to keep and manage encryption keys when using hardware security modules (HSM\(^9\)), the HSMs may be provided by the cloud service provider, considering that element in the risk assessment. The HSMs should meet the requirements of FIPS\(^{10}\) 140-2 Level 2 or equivalent.

7.4. The supervised entity should have in place a documented process to manage and control the generation, use (including access rules), protection and destruction of keys.

7.5. The encryption key management process should include keeping, within one’s own infrastructure, copies of the encryption keys that have been generated or managed by the cloud service provider and are used in special cloud-based outsourcing, unless the risk assessment has shown that this is not necessary.

8. **Monitoring information processing in the cloud computing environment**

8.1. The supervised entity should have in place documented rules for collecting logs relating to cloud-based information processing, according to the scope of cloud services, information that is being processed, and the results of risk assessment.

8.2. The supervised entity should protect the logs against unauthorised access, modification or deletion for a period of time specified in the security rules following from the risk assessment and the applicable special rules.

---

\(^9\) HSM – Hardware Security Module, a device that safeguards and manages cryptographic keys.

\(^{10}\) Federal Information Processing Standard – publicly announced standards for the U.S. non-military government agencies. In this context: an international standard for security of cryptographic modules.
8.3. Authorised members of the supervised entity’s staff should review the logs in accordance with the documented security rules and procedures, and – depending on the scale of activity, type and number of incidents logged, and the security architecture – the Supervisor recommends the use of specialised software to correlate log data on events (Security Information and Event Management – SIEM) as well as a regular review and update of correlation rules.

8.4. Requirements applicable to the supervised entity in the area of management of service providers that have remote access to the cloud services used by the supervised entity:

   (a) the supervised entity should ensure that specific IT systems and/or specific parts of the IT structure may only be accessed by the authorised staff of the service provider;
   (b) the supervised entity should require that the service provider’s staff use multi-factor authentication (MFA), with the type and scope being determined by the results of the risk assessment;
   (c) the supervised entity should ensure that administrative and privileged user access is restricted to trusted networks of the supervised entity and/or service provider and controlled (including by recording sessions and session parameters, and then by analysing the correctness and purpose of each operation), unless the risk assessment has shown that this is not necessary.

9. Documenting the operations of the supervised entity

9.1. Where appropriate, depending on the scope and type of information processed, the applicable rules and regulations adopted in an organisation (considering corporate and group relations, if any) and the results of risk assessment, and considering the principle of proportionality, the supervised entity should have documentation outlining:

   (a) the organisation of employees and collaborators responsible for cybersecurity, including positions and roles relevant to the monitoring, analysis and reporting of incidents involving information processed in a cloud, with descriptions of the required competences, powers and responsibilities;
   (b) the architecture of the network, systems, applications and contact points between internal networks of the supervised entity and untrusted networks, including the architecture of the cloud computing solution, considering test environments and contingency plans;
   (c) the rules for categorisation of information and/or systems for the purposes of cloud-based processing or a reference to the current classification, if applicable;
   (d) the rules of the existing technological protection measures and organisational arrangements;
   (e) the rules of business continuity management;

---

11 The requirements apply to a situation where a supervised entity orders its service provider to carry out operations on the supervised entity’s resources uploaded to the cloud (e.g. to update software or to carry out servicing work). The requirements do not apply to the support services offered by the cloud service provider in respect of the servicing standards under the agreement for the provision of the cloud service.
(f) the rules of protection of information on an ongoing basis and in case of expected or unexpected termination of cooperation with the cloud service provider;

(g) the rules for management of legal compliance (e.g. software licensing processes), including compliance with regulatory requirements;

(h) the rules for the review and management verification of the security system used for cloud computing;

(i) the rules for reporting, review and verification of quality parameters of the cloud service;

(j) agreements with cloud service providers as well as additional statements, if they are necessary to confirm compliance with the relevant requirements;

(k) the processes, procedures and/or manuals concerning:
   i. risk analysis and risk assessment, including sources of information about threats specific to the respective cloud services and to the financial sector;
   ii. the management of the IT environment (networks, systems, applications, databases, etc.), considering cloud services, including planning, development and maintenance;
   iii. log management;
   iv. encryption key management;
   v. security incident management;
   vi. internal audits of IT security, considering the specific nature of cloud computing.

9.2. The documentation must be protected against unauthorised access, unauthorised modification, damage and destruction. The rules of documentation management should be defined by the supervised entity within the organisation management system.

VIII. Rules for notification of cloud-based information processing, or of the intention to start cloud-based information processing, to the UKNF

1. For special cloud-based outsourcing or processing of information protected by law, the supervised entity should indicate to the UKNF, within 14 days\textsuperscript{12} before the commencement of cloud-based information processing (and where processing is already under way – by 1 August 2020):
   (1) the type and scope of information to be processed / that is being processed in a cloud;
   (2) the name of the cloud service provider and the type of cloud services to be used / that are being used;

\textsuperscript{12} Unless a special provision of law pertaining to the supervised entity’s activity sets a different time limit for notification.
(3) the date of signature and the term of the agreement with the cloud service provider, and where the agreement has not been concluded yet – the expected date of conclusion;
(4) the location (country, region or any other equivalent information) of the data processing centre (DPC) that provides the cloud service;
(5) the fulfilment of the requirements described in this communication;
(6) contact persons/roles for the application of cloud computing at the supervised entity.

2. The document of notification should be signed by an authorised representative of the supervised entity and submitted to the UKNF in the form set out in Annex No 1 to this communication.
Annex No 1 to
Communication from the UKNF on
cloud-based information processing

Notification from a supervised entity
concerning cloud-based information processing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation of entity (name, address, Tax ID (NIP), Statistical designation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As required in Communication from the UKNF on information processing by supervised entities using public or hybrid cloud computing services, we hereby inform the UKNF that we intend to process / that we process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and scope of information processed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name and address of the cloud service provider:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names/types of cloud services:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of the data processing centre (DPC) (country, region):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of signature of the agreement with the cloud service provider or the expected date of conclusion:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The term of the agreement with the cloud service provider:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact persons for the application of cloud computing at the supervised entity (name, position, phone number, e-mail):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We declare that the provisions of Communication from the UKNF on information processing by supervised entities using public or hybrid cloud computing services have been complied with and successfully implemented.

Place, date

Signatures of representatives of the supervised entity
EXAMPLE OF ANNEX NO 1 FILLED IN

Notification from a supervised entity concerning cloud-based information processing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation of the supervised entity (name, address, Tax ID (NIP), Statistical Number (REGON))</th>
<th>BANK S.A., ul. Polska 11/11, 00–001 Warsaw, Tax ID (NIP): 1234567890, Statistical Number (REGON): 987654321</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As required in Communication from the UKNF on information processing by supervised entities using public or hybrid cloud computing services, we hereby inform the UKNF that we intend to process / that we process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type and scope of information processed:</th>
<th>Information on complaints from the bank’s customers: customers’ personal data, recorded calls from the helpline, decisions in the complaint handling process, letters of complaint and responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name and address of the cloud service provider:</td>
<td>Dostawca Chmury S.A., ul. Chmurowa 90, 00–001 Warsaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names/types of cloud services:</td>
<td>Virtual servers, storage, virtual networks, CRM application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of the data processing centre (DPC) (country, region):</td>
<td>Warsaw, Wroclaw, Frankfurt (Germany), Dublin (Ireland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of signature of the agreement with the cloud service provider or the expected date of conclusion:</td>
<td>October 2020 – expected date of conclusion of the agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The term of the agreement with the cloud service provider:</td>
<td>For a period of 3 years from the date of conclusion of the agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact persons for the application of cloud computing at the supervised entity (name, position, phone number, e-mail):</td>
<td>Jan Kowalski, Administrator, tel. 22 00 000 00, e-mail: <a href="mailto:jan.kowalski@domena_banku_sa.pl">jan.kowalski@domena_banku_sa.pl</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We declare that the provisions of Communication from the UKNF on information processing by supervised entities using public or hybrid cloud computing services have been complied with and successfully implemented.

Warsaw, 1 August 2020
Member of Management Board  Holder of commercial proxy

Place, date  Signatures of representatives of the supervised entity