The article, Prior post and reviews has clearly shown that the educational organisation did not only violate the Section 4 of the Data Protection Acts 1988 and 2003 but equally not fully updated as to what responsibilities are required of all the organisation operating on CCTV as required by GDPR.

With respect to the delay tactics been applied, It could easily be argued that they (the organisation) has failed to act in line with Data protection commission’s (DPC) position which clearly states, “that upon receipt of an access request relating to CCTV footage from a specific day, a data controller is obliged to preserve any such footage from that day pending resolution of the access request”. And more so data controller should be aware as highlighted that treating a further clarification which may occurred as a result of the choice of data been requested by the complainant as  a new request undermines the complainant right to access personal data hence data should be preserved pending the resolution of the access request.

In an agreement with the discussion, I believe imposing hefty fines as a penalty for non- compliance organisation will not only bring the much needed change when it comes to effective data protection and privacy but also demonstrates how seriously the information commissioner’s office takes GDPR and it’s expectation for all organisations.
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