



**PERSONAL INFORMATION PROTECTION ACT**  
**Breach Notification Decision**

<b>Organization providing notice under section 34.1 of PIPA</b>	Alora in Sunset Ridge Condominium Corporation 081451990 (Organization)
<b>Decision number (file number)</b>	P2017-ND-66 (File #003885)
<b>Date notice received by OIPC</b>	September 7, 2016
<b>Date Organization last provided information</b>	February 22, 2017
<b>Date of decision</b>	July 13, 2017
<b>Summary of decision</b>	There is a real risk of significant harm to the individual affected by this incident. The Organization is required to notify the individual pursuant to section 37.1 of the <i>Personal Information Protection Act</i> (PIPA).
<b>JURISDICTION</b>	
<b>Section 56 of PIPA “non-profit organization”</b>	The Organization is constituted under the <i>Condominium Property Act</i> and is an organization as defined in s. 1(1)(i) of PIPA.
<b>Section 1(1)(k) of PIPA “personal information”</b>	<p>The incident involved the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• name,</li><li>• unit number,</li><li>• email address,</li><li>• telephone number,</li><li>• generic statements about financial situation,</li><li>• details of a complaint and personal opinions about a third party contractor.</li></ul> <p>The information above is about an identifiable individual and is “personal information” as defined in section 1(1)(k) of PIPA. The information was collected in Alberta.</p>
<b>DESCRIPTION OF INCIDENT</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> loss <input type="checkbox"/> unauthorized access <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> unauthorized disclosure	

<p><b>Description of incident</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On or about August 5, 2016, the Organization’s property management company forwarded an email thread containing the information at issue to a third party contractor.</li> <li>• On August 14, 2016, the Organization was contacted by the affected individual with a complaint that the property management company had forwarded her original emails to the third party contractor.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Affected individuals</b></p>	<p>The incident affected one (1) individual who is a resident of Alberta.</p>
<p><b>Steps taken to reduce risk of harm to individuals</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirmed the third party contractor deleted the emails, had not forwarded them to anyone else, and that all hard copies had been destroyed.</li> <li>• Provided the contractor with an edited version of the email that redacted some but not all of the individual’s personal information.</li> <li>• Confirmed it would no longer forward emails containing resident information to third party providers, in accordance with the Organization’s privacy policy.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Steps taken to notify individuals of the incident</b></p>	<p>The Organization wrote to the individual on August 23, 2016, and August 26, 2016, informing her of the steps it had taken to resolve her complaint and prevent incidents like this from occurring in the future.</p>
<p><b>REAL RISK OF SIGNIFICANT HARM ANALYSIS</b></p>	
<p><b>Harm</b> Some damage or detriment or injury that could be caused to affected individuals as a result of the incident. The harm must also be “significant.” It must be important, meaningful, and with non-trivial consequences or effects.</p>	<p>The Organization reported that in its view, the sensitivity of the information that was disclosed was low; that names are not sensitive information and the email address alone could not identify the individual.</p> <p>In my view, the contact, complaint and opinion information at issue in this matter could be used to cause the harms of hurt, humiliation, embarrassment, and verbal or legal retaliation. These are significant harms.</p>
<p><b>Real Risk</b> The likelihood that the significant harm will result must be more than mere speculation or conjecture. There must be a cause and effect relationship between the incident and the possible harm.</p>	<p>The Organization submitted that the risk of harm was low as minimal information was disclosed.</p> <p>In my view, there is a real risk of harm resulting from this incident. Although the Organization obtained assurances from the third party contractor that the original emails were deleted, had not been forwarded, and hard copies were not made, the contractor is nonetheless already aware of the identity of the affected individual.</p>

**DECISION UNDER SECTION 37.1(1) OF PIPA**

Given the information reported by the Organization, in these particular circumstances, I have concluded that there is a real risk of significant harm to the affected individual in this case.

The contact, complaint and opinion information at issue in this matter could be used to cause the significant harms of hurt, humiliation, embarrassment, and verbal or legal retaliation. These are significant harms. Although the Organization obtained assurances from the third party contractor that the original emails were deleted, had not been forwarded, and hard copies were not made, the contractor is nonetheless already aware of the identity of the affected individual.

I require the Organization to notify the affected individual in Alberta in accordance with section 19.1 of the *Personal Information Protection Act Regulation* (Regulation). I understand the Organization wrote to the affected individual on August 23, 2016 and August 26, 2016 informing her of the steps it had taken to resolve her complaint and prevent incidents like this from occurring in the future. Given this, the Organization is not required to notify the affected individual again.

Jill Clayton  
Information and Privacy Commissioner