

Collaborative Discussion 3 – Received Response 2 – Aldo Madrid

Thank you Michael for your interesting post about this case of study.

According to the GDPR any individual which personal data is collected have the right to be informed about the purpose of its personal data being collected and used. From this principle, the concept of ‘privacy information’ is remarked, which states that organisations have the obligation to inform individuals the purpose of processing their personal data, the time it will be retained and with who it will be shared. This information must be presented in a concise, transparent, accessible and easy to understand manner to the individuals (ICO, 2020). In the case of study, it is clear that the company “The Dublin Mint Office Limited” was not compliant with the right of being informed and privacy information.

Another GDPR related principle to this case of study is the ‘purpose limitation’ principle, according to Hahn (2021), it states that personal data must be recollected for purposes clearly defined and it should not be used in a way that results incompatible with those purposes. By recollecting personal data such as telephone numbers and not being transparent with the purpose of using that information the after mentioned company was not compliant with this principle.

As it was stated in your post companies should be more careful describing the real purposes of all requested personal data and not using it in a way that benefits them such as using it for marketing purposes.

References:

CO (2020) Guide to the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Available from: <https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/guide-to-data-protection/guide-to-the-general-data-protection-regulation-gdpr/> [Accessed 20 January 2022].

Hahn, I. (2021) Purpose Limitation in the Time of Data Power: Is There a Way Forward? European Data Protection Law Review (EDPL) 7(1): 31-44