

## Analysing the “Draft Privacy Bill”

### What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- “Srikrishna committee” was mandated to draft a law for “privacy protection”  
\n after widespread study and consultations.

\n

- The committee has now released its report and the draft law, but it has opened to mixed reviews and several loopholes have been pointed out.

\n

\n\n

### What are the positives of the draft bill?

\n\n

\n

- “Draft Personal Data Protection Bill 2018” displays the principles to be followed in protecting an individual's fundamental right of privacy.

\n

- **What** - The bill is progressive as it seeks to clearly recognize the importance of privacy and defines personal data broadly (beyond the current metrics).

\n

- Personal data now includes - passwords, financial data, health data, official identifier, sex life, sexual orientation, biometric data, genetic data, transgender status, intersex status, caste or tribe, and religious or political affiliation.

\n

- Importantly, “location” is one critical indicator that hasn’t been considered sensitive by the draft bill.

\n

- **Consent** - The bill seeks to make data processing “fair and reasonable” by permitting for only limited personal data to be collected.

\n

- It mandates that data aggregation needs to be done only for a clearly specified lawful purpose, with the explicit consent of the concerned person.

\n

- Nonetheless, broad exemptions granted within the bill are a serious setback

to this provision and the envisioned overall privacy structure.

\n

\n\n

## What are the major concerns with the bill?

\n\n

\n

- **Deletion** - The rights of correction, updating, and data portability are included in the draft, but the “right to be forgotten” is only vaguely articulated.

\n

- Further, there is no apparent “right of deletion or right to object processing”.

\n

- **Transparency** - The envisioned “Data Protection Authority” would have the powers to decide if data breaches are to be disclosed at all to affected users.

\n

- This is in contrast to the expectations that hoped that the law would mandate the disclosure of all data base breaches to the concerned public.

\n

- **State Snooping** - No attempt has been made to curb government surveillance and the push for “data localisation” might actually aggravate this.

\n

- Notably, the government has been empowered to classify any information as “critical personal data” and mandate its storage and processing within India.

\n

- Significantly, the controversial case of “Aadhar” hasn’t been discussed in the bill as the matter is under the judicial scanner.

\n

- **Broad Exemptions** - Data may be collected without consent for compliance with legal orders, for employment related aspects, and for emergencies.

\n

- Further, it has been stated that data might also be collected for ‘functions of the state’, which is a broad and discretionary a category.

\n

\n\n

## How does the draft fare overall?

\n\n

\n

- It is a pity that the consultative process was opaque, with submissions to the committee kept confidential.

\n

- Further, unlike with most draft bills, there is no apparent provision for feedback from stakeholders after the release of the draft.

\n

- Therefore, areas of serious concern may not be addressed before the bill is signed into law, thereby making the bill non-inclusive.

\n

- The draft makes a beginning in terms of affording data protection to citizens but it falls short of the envisioned goal by a huge margin.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: Business Standard**

\n

