



Report on the application of the GDPR under Article 97

Questions to Data Protection Authorities / the European Data Protection Board

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

1 Introduction

According to Article 97 of the GDPR, the Commission should submit a first report on the evaluation and review of the Regulation to the European Parliament and the Council by 25 May 2020, followed by reports every four years thereafter. The Commission's first report was adopted on 24 June 2020 (the '2020 report'). [1] The next report is due by mid 2024 (the '2024 report').

In this context, the Commission should examine, in particular, the application and functioning of:

- Chapter V on the transfer of personal data to third countries or international organisations with particular regard to decisions adopted pursuant to Article 45(3) of this Regulation and decisions adopted on the basis of Article 25(6) of Directive 95/46/EC; and
- Chapter VII on cooperation and consistency.

The GDPR requires that the Commission takes into account the positions and findings of the European Parliament and the Council, and of other relevant bodies and sources. The Commission may also request information from Member States and supervisory authorities.

Against this background, this document seeks to obtain the views of the European Data Protection Board on the abovementioned points. As was also done for the 2020 report, this document also seeks to obtain information from data protection authorities (DPAs) on their enforcement of the GDPR and on activities undertaken to promote awareness of data protection rights and obligations.

We would be grateful to receive replies to the below questions (in English) by **15 December 2023**.

In 2020, the European Data Protection Board provided a consolidated contribution of the individual replies of the DPAs to the questionnaire circulated in preparation of the 2020 report.[2] The Commission would be grateful if the Board would again provide such a contribution, in addition to providing the individual replies of DPAs. When there are several DPAs in a given Member State, please provide a consolidated reply at

national level. In the context of the preparation of the report, and following the input from other stakeholders, it is not excluded that we might have additional questions at a later stage.

Please note that your replies might be made public or may be disclosed in response to access to documents requests in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001.

[1] Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council, Data protection as a pillar of citizens' empowerment and the EU's approach to the digital transition - two years of application of the General Data Protection Regulation, 24.6.2020 COM(2020) 264 final.

[2] https://edpb.europa.eu/sites/default/files/files/file1/edpb_contributiongdprevaluation_20200218.pdf

2 Supervisory Authority

* 2.1 Select your supervisory Authority

- Austria
- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Croatia
- Cyprus
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- EDPS
- Estonia
- Finland
- France
- Germany
- Greece
- Hungary
- Iceland
- Ireland
- Italy
- Latvia
- Liechtenstein
- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Malta
- Netherlands
- Norway
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Spain

3 Chapter V

*** 3.1 In your view, should the data protection framework of any third country or international organisation be considered by the Commission in view of a possible adequacy decision?**

- Yes
 No

*** 3.3 The Commission is interested in the views of the Board on the third countries for which enforcement cooperation agreements under Article 50 GDPR should be prioritised, in particular in light of the volume of data transfers, role and powers of the third country's supervisory authority and the need for enforcement cooperation to address cases of common interest. Please mention the countries that, in your view, should be prioritised and the reasons.**

The Hungarian Authority does not have serious enforcement experience in relation to the activities of a controller/entity in a third country. In view of this, it is difficult to assess which third countries would justify the conclusion of an international cooperation agreement under Article 50, given the 'volume of transfers' or even the powers of the supervisory authority there.

3.4 Reasons for prioritisation if there should be any:

See above answer.

3.5 Are there any other suggestions or points you would like to raise as regards tools for international transfers and/or enforcement cooperation with foreign partners?

See above answer.

4 Chapter VII

In July 2023, the Commission adopted a proposal for a regulation laying down additional procedural rules relating to the enforcement of the GDPR.[1] The DPAs and the EDPB provided extensive input to the Commission during the preparation of the proposal and following adoption, the EDPB and the EDPS adopted a joint opinion on the proposal on 19 September 2023.[2] The questions below focus on DPAs' application and enforcement of the GDPR and do not seek DPAs' views on the proposal.

[1] Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down additional procedural rules relating to the enforcement of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, COM/2023/348 final.

[2] https://edpb.europa.eu/our-work-tools/our-documents/edpb-edps-joint-opinion/edpb-edps-joint-opinion-012023-proposal_en

4.1 Cooperation Mechanism

4.1.1 One-stop-shop (OSS) – Article 60 GDPR

The EDPB Secretariat will extract from IMI the numbers regarding the OSS cases where your DPA has been in the lead and concerned since 25 May 2018

The EDPB Secretariat will extract from IMI the numbers regarding whether your DPA has been in the situation of the application of the derogation provided for in Article 56(2) GDPR (so-called “local cases”, i.e. infringements or complaints relating only to an establishment in your Member State or substantially affecting data subjects only in your Member State).

4.1.1.1 Do you have any comment to make with respect to the identification and handling of local cases under Article 56(2) GDPR?

- Yes
- No

* 4.1.1.3 Did you raise relevant and reasoned objections?

- Yes
- No

*** 4.1.1.4 In how many cases did you raise relevant and reasoned objections?**

The Hungarian Authority raised relevant and reasoned objections in three cases.

*** 4.1.1.5 Which topics were addressed?**

Relevant and reasoned objections (RRO) raised by the Hungarian Authority are the following:

1.) The case is related to the draft decision of the Irish Authority (IMI number: 384973) which examined the data processing practices of Instagram (compliance with Articles 5-7, 9 and 12-14 of the GDPR).

Our objection concerned the legal basis of the processing: the Hungarian Authority is of the view that Meta, which operates Instagram, violated Article 6 (1) of the GDPR by referring to Article 6 (1) b) of the GDPR in relation to its data processing related to behavioural advertising since, according to the Hungarian Authority, the data processing in question was not absolutely necessary for the performance of the (online) contract between the controller and the data subjects. In this case, we referred to EDPB guidelines 2/2019 (points 52-53) and 08/2020 (point 49).

The LSA was of the view that the objection was not considered relevant and reasoned in accordance with Article 4 point 24 of the GDPR, so no consensus was reached. (However, we would like to mention that during the dispute resolution the EDPB classified the objection as relevant and reasoned and took its content into account when formulating its decision.)

2.) The other case in which the Hungarian Authority expressed an objection was initiated against the data processing of WhatsApp. The Irish Authority examined the compliance of the controller with the requirements in Articles 12-14 of the GDPR (IMI-172532).

The Hungarian Authority's objection concerned the infringement of Article 5 (1) a) and Article 5 (2) of the GDPR, the invalidity of consent, the personal data quality of non-users' phone numbers, the amount of the administrative fine and the 6-month grace period.

In the opinion of the Irish Authority the objection was not considered relevant and reasoned. The EDPB also found that the objection was either irrelevant or not sufficiently reasoned.

3.) In the third case, the draft decision was related to a personal data breach occurred due to a construction error. The Hungarian Authority objected to the amount of the administrative fine and ordered the Irish Authority to investigate whether Twitter violated Article 5(1)(f) and Articles 32 and 34 of the GDPR. The objection was not upheld by the EDPB.

*** 4.1.1.6 In how many did you reach consensus with the LSA?**

None but from the above listed cases, in the second case - as we mentioned above - during the dispute resolution the EDPB classified the objection as relevant and reasoned and took its content into account when formulating its decision.

4.1.2 Mutual assistance – Article 61 GDPR

*

4.1.2.1 Did you ever use Mutual Assistance - Article 61 procedure in the case of carrying out an investigation?

- Yes
 No

*** 4.1.2.3 Did you ever use Mutual Assistance - Article 61 procedure in the case of monitoring the implementation of a measure imposed in another Member State?**

- Yes
 No

*** 4.1.2.5 What is your experience when using Mutual Assistance - Article 61 procedure?**

The Hungarian Authority always found Art. 61 Mutual Assistance a reliable procedure to either receive information or initiate action with other authorities. In most cases we received satisfying answers using this procedure (there are 2-3 SAs which do not communicate reliably).

Although because of the nature of this procedure we usually try to reach out to other authorities via an Art. 61 Voluntary Mutual Assistance Notification procedure. If it fails we consider launching an Art. 61 Mutual Assistance.

4.1.3 Joint operations – Article 62 GDPR

*** 4.1.3.1 Did you ever use the Joint Operations - Article 62 procedure (both receiving staff from another DPA or sending staff to another DPA) in the case of carrying out an investigation?**

- Yes
 No

*** 4.1.3.3 Did you ever use Joint Operations in the case of monitoring the implementation/enforcement of a measure imposed in another Member State?**

- Yes
 No

*** 4.1.3.4 Could you explain why you have never used Joint Operations - Article 62 procedure for implementation/enforcement of a measure imposed in another Member State?**

The Hungarian Authority did not have any case where the application of Art. 62 procedure to implement or enforce a measure was necessary.

*** 4.1.3.5 What is your experience when using Joint operations - Article 62 procedure?**

The Hungarian Authority is currently working with several member state authorities in an Art. 62 procedure, but we would like to wait for the procedure to finalize first in order to evaluate the whole process.

4.2 Consistency mechanism

4.2.1 Urgency Procedure – Article 66 GDPR

*** 4.2.1.1 Did you ever adopt any measure under the urgency procedure?**

- Yes
- No

4.3 European Data Protection Board

The EDPB Secretariat will provide an indicative breakdown of the EDPB work according to the tasks listed in Article 70 GDPR and of the EDPB Secretariat resources allocated to complete the tasks listed in Article 75 GDPR, including on Article 64, 65 and 66 GDPR procedures, as well as on litigations.

4.3.1 How much resources (Full-time equivalent) does your DPA allocate to participation in EDPB activities?

	FTE
2020	5
2021	5
2022	5
2023	5
2024 (Forecast)	5+2

4.4 Human, technical and financial resources for effective cooperation and participation to the consistency mechanism

4.4.1 How many staff (full-time equivalent) has your DPA?

	FTE	Comments
2020	114	-
2021	117	-
2022	123	-
2023	123	-
2024 (Forecast)	123	-

4.4.2 What is the budget of your DPA? Please provide the figures (in euro)

	BUDGET (€)
2020	3 803 636 €
2021	4 166 753 €
2022	4 040 519 €
2023	4 219 481 €
2024 (Forecast)	4 224 156 €

* 4.4.3 Is your DPA dealing with tasks beyond those entrusted by the GDPR, including under the new EU legislation adopted under the Data Strategy?

- Yes
 No

* 4.4.4 Please provide an indicative breakdown between those tasks and those entrusted by the GDPR.

The Hungarian Authority's Department of Regulatory Issues and Supervision of Data Classification and Department of Freedom of Information are dealing with tasks not entrusted by the GDPR.

I.) The Department of Regulatory Issues and Supervision of Data Classification is dealing with procedures related to;

1) data processing for criminal investigation, national defence and national security purposes. (Since these three topics are not subject to the rules of the GDPR they continue to remain within the scope of national legislation, namely the Act CXII of 2011 on Informational Self-Determination and Freedom of Information.)

The Department of Regulatory Issues and Supervision of Data Classification conducts administrative procedures for the supervision of data classification.

2) regulatory issues;

The Department of Regulatory Issues and Supervision of Data Classification makes recommendations with respect to new laws and to the amendment of laws pertaining to the processing of personal data, the access to data of public interest and to data accessible on public interest grounds and it gives its opinion with respect to draft laws and to the amendment of laws.

3) participation in the joint supervisory activity of data protection authorities:

- Coordinated Supervision Committee (SIS, IMI, Europol, Eurojust)
- Visa Information System SCG
- Eurodac SCG
- Customs Information System SCG

The Department represents the Authority (as the National Supervisory Authority of Hungary) in the supervision coordination groups of the Schengen Information System, the Visa Information System, Eurodac

(European Dactyloscopy System), Europol, Customs Information System and cooperates with the European Data Protection Supervisor.

The Department cooperates with the organs and persons specified in Acts to represent Hungary in the common data protection supervisory bodies of the European Union and performs the tasks of the supervisory authority specified in Act CLXXXI of 2012 on the exchange of information in the framework of the second-generation Schengen Information System.

4) participation in the EDPB expert group's work:

The Department of Regulatory Issues and Supervision of Data Classification participates in the Borders, Travel and Law Enforcement (BTLE) Expert Group.

The Department performs the tasks specified for the supervisory authority in Directive (EU) 2016/680.

II.) The Department of Freedom of Information carries out the inquiries related to the fundamental right to freedom of information.

Pursuant to Act CXII of 2011 on the right to informational self-determination and on the freedom of information (hereinafter referred to as the InfoAct), the Authority also has the task of monitoring and promoting the fundamental right to access data of public interest and data accessible on public interest grounds. In the event of a breach of this right, the Authority may carry out an ombudsman-type inquiry (except for classified information, where the Authority may review the legality of a classification in an authority procedure).

There are basically three categories of notifications:

- the public authority/ any body or person carrying out public task refused to disclose data of public interest /data accessible on public interest grounds,
- the public authority/ any body or person carrying out public task charged a fee for fulfilling the request or the amount it charged is not acceptable,
- the public authority/ any body or person carrying out public task does not fulfill its duty to publish certain data of public interest specified in the InfoAct on its website,
- transparency proceeding.

To ensure compliance with the publication obligation regarding Central Information Register of Public Data, within the Department of Freedom of Information the Department of Transparency may commence authority procedure for transparency.

According to Hungarian law, any data processing by an organ performing public duties which is related to its activities and the performance of its duties is non-personal data as a general rule and is publicly available to anyone.

In addition to dealing with inquiry and consultation cases related to the freedom of information, NAIH Department for Freedom of information also investigates so-called border area cases, i.e. those concerning data protection, freedom of information and other rights to information and communication whether under inquiry procedures or authority procedures for data protection (in 2022, there were 71 cases of the latter type of procedure), response to requests for data of public interest received by the Authority, and keeps the registry of reports on rejected requests for data.

4.4.5 Please explain, if needed:

Tasks and powers concerning the new EU Data Strategy:

From the third quarter of 2023 the Hungarian Authority is preparing both organizationally and with new human resources & budget for the new tasks and areas resulting from the new EU data strategy. According to our current experience the Authority is aiming to be properly equipped to contribute to the new tasks and powers arising from the EU data strategy. Nevertheless, we are constantly monitoring our system to determine whether we need to request more resources. In 2024 further staff members must be allocated to the new areas, as we indicated this under 4.3.1 regarding resources.

4.4.6 How would you assess the sufficiency of the resources from your DPA from a human, financial and technical point of view?

	Sufficient	Insufficient
* Human Resources	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Financial resources	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Technical Means	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

*** 4.4.7 is your DPA properly equipped to contribute to the cooperation and consistency mechanisms?**

- Yes
- No

*** 4.4.8 How many persons (FTE) work on the issues devoted to the cooperation and consistency mechanisms?**

5 Enforcement

5.1 Complaints

5.1.1 The number of complaints (excluding requests for information) received by your DPA.

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Number of Complaints	50+625=675	240+1684=1924	263+2044=2307	274+2825=3099	355+1400=1755	268+1062=1330

5.1.2 The number of complaints where your DPA was in the lead

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
The number of complaints received directly from complainants	1	0	2	0	1	0
The number of complaints received from another DPA through the OSS.	0	1	4	1	1	1

5.1.3 The number of complaints received by your DPA and forwarded to the lead DPA.

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Number of Complaints	7	12	15	18	9	11

5.1.4 The number of complaints relating to national cases resolved through a decision adopted by your DPA.

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Number of Complaints	52	214	133	197	137	12

5.1.5 The number of complaints relating to cross-border cases, resolved through an Article 60 GDPR decision adopted by your DPA[1]. Please indicate a breakdown of the decisions adopted under Article 60(7), (8) or (9) GDPR.

[1] This does not include amicable settlements.

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Number of complaints resolved through an Article 60(7) GDPR decision	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of complaints resolved through an Article 60(8) GDPR decision	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of complaints resolved through an Article 60(9) GDPR decision	0	0	0	0	0	0

5.1.6 The total number of complaints resolved through amicable settlement

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Number of Complaints	625	1684	2044	2825	1400	1062

*** 5.1.7 What kind of communication or request do you qualify as a complaint?**

Generally: any kind of inquiry submitted to the SA concerning the (possible) infringement of personal data protection (or FOI) rights of the data subject.

According to our latest consideration of the matter our data protection cases where the GDPR is to be applied shall fall under the category of amicable settlement.

In administrative proceedings based upon both the GDPR and the Administrative Proceedings Act stricter admissibility rules apply (e.g. identification of the complainant etc.).

5.1.8 For complaints handled by your DPA which you consider to be closed, provide the average and the median time (in months) from receipt of the complaint (either directly from the complainant or from another DPA) to closure (e.g. by decision or amicable settlement).

	In months
Average Time	ca. 12-13
Median Time	no data

5.2 Own-initiative investigations

5.2.1 The number of “own-initiative” investigations launched by your DPA since 25 May 2018

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Number of Complaints	251	597	767	587	669	461

5.2.2 The number of these investigations that you consider to be closed. Provide the average and the median time (in months) from launch of the investigation to closure.

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Average Time	ca. 12-13	ca. 12-13	ca. 12-13	ca. 12-13	ca. 12-13	no data
Median Time	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data
Total number of closed investigations	Unfortunately only partial statistical data available.	no data	no data	no data	no data	no data

5.3 Corrective measures

5.3.1 The number of decisions in which you used your corrective powers [1]

[1] Please reply per number of decisions, not per number of corrective powers used per decision. For instance, if one decision ordered both a ban and a fine, please reply "1".

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Number of Decisions	22	113	86	105	170	96

5.3.2 The number of times you used any other corrective power than fines. Please specify the type of measure by reference to Article 58(2) GDPR

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Issue warnings to a controller or processor that intended processing operations are likely to infringe provisions of this Regulation	1	9	9	10	5	4
Issue reprimands to a controller or a processor where processing operations have infringed provisions of this Regulation	9	83	71	68	65	22
Order the controller or the processor to comply with the data subject's requests to exercise his or her rights pursuant to this Regulation	8	35	26	16	12	3
Order the controller or processor to bring processing operations into compliance with the provisions of this Regulation, where appropriate, in a specified manner and within a specified period	-	25	25	30	38	8
Order the controller to communicate a personal data breach to the data subject	-	5	2	1	2	-
Impose a temporary or definitive limitation including a ban on processing	-	16	4	9	3	-
Order the rectification or erasure of personal data or restriction of processing pursuant to Articles 16, 17 and						

18 and the notification of such actions to recipients to whom the personal data have been disclosed pursuant to Article 17 (2) and Article 19	3	8	5	13	8	3
Withdraw a certification or to order the certification body to withdraw a certification issued pursuant to Articles 42 and 43, or to order the certification body not to issue certification if the requirements for the certification are not or are no longer met	-	-	-	-	-	-
Order the suspension of data flows to a recipient in a third country or to an international organisation.	-	-	-	-	-	-

5.3.3 The number of fines you imposed

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Number of Fines	0	35	50	38	44	42

5.3.4 Please provide examples of the type of circumstances and infringements that normally resulted in a fine and include the provisions of the GDPR breached.

Examples of the infringements of the GDPR in which cases the Hungarian Authority imposed a fine in its decision:

Cases related to data security and data breaches: the Authority had several cases over the years (2018-2023) related to data security issues. Hacking of IT systems, data leakage from poorly protected servers or ransomware attacks make up most cases where the Authority concluded the violation of the GDPR's related articles (Art. 25., 32., 33. and 34.) and issued an administrative fine on the controller and/or the processor. The Authority also had several cases related to poorly applied or insufficient administrative measures meant to ensure data security.

Cases related to surveillance at the workplace: the Authority had several cases over the years (2018-2023) related camera surveillance at the workplace where the GDPR's violation was concluded. In most cases the violation stems from the camera's angle (constantly watching workers) or the place where it has been installed (eg. dining room, dressing room). The Authority also had a few cases with GPS tracking of service cars or trucks. In most cases ending with an administrative decision the violation of the GDPR's principles (Art. 5.), the legal grounds (Art. 6.) and information given to the data subjects (Art. 12-13) were concluded.

5.3.5 The average and median level of fines and the total amount of fines imposed by your DPA

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Total amount of fines (€)	0	298 016	808 098	178 307	1 297 355	1 024 074
Average level of fine	0	8515	16 162	4692	29 485	24 383
Median level of fine	0	2646	2646	2646	5291	5291

5.4 Challenges to decisions in national courts

5.4.1 How many of your decisions finding an infringement of the GDPR have been challenged in national courts? Please provide the absolute figure and the percentage.

	Absolute figure	%
Decisions finding an infringement of GDPR challenged in national court	136	8.35
Successful challenges	18	13.24

* 5.4.2 Where challenges were successful, what were the reasons of the national courts?

The main reasons for annulments was the lack of clarity of the facts or interference with the amount of the fine, however the court almost never deviates from the decisions of the Hungarian Authority on substantive issues.

6 Promoting awareness of rights and obligations

* 6.1 Provide details of activities undertaken (publication of guidance, publicity campaigns, etc.) to promote awareness of data protection rights and obligations among the public and data controllers and processors. Where relevant, provide links to materials.

The Hungarian Authority has always paid special attention to informing citizens, children, businesses and the public. With the entry into force of the GDPR, it was important to draw attention to the new rules and their practical application. The most important projects of the past years are presented below:

1.) STAR II project - support SMEs on the data protection reform II

The project focused on providing support to the training activities of DPAs and data protection officers on the EU data protection reform, especially the GDPR. There was a need to assist EU data protection authorities in raising awareness among businesses, especially small and medium enterprises, on the new EU legal framework for personal data protection, particularly the GDPR, and assist these SMEs in ensuring compliance therewith. The new law and its novelties created much confusion and uncertainty as to its practical application, magnified by its upcoming applicability (May 2018). Some 22 million European SMEs – the core of EU enterprise policy – not only faced distinctive challenges from data protection law, but also – despite specific, often protective regulation – rarely could afford professional legal advice. Thus they merited special support from public authorities. The STAR II project outputs included:

- An email hotline run by the HU SA (NAIH) in both Hungarian and English;
- A guidance document for DPAs on good practices in awareness-raising techniques among SMEs;
- A handbook for SMEs to help them comply with the GDPR.

These results prepared in consultation with stakeholders (especially via validation workshops and the External Advisory Board) and widely disseminated. The outputs are freely available, openly accessible and copyright-unrestricted, thus easily reusable and adaptable. STAR II was addressed to 40+ EU DPAs and millions of EU SMEs. It delivered tangible and long-term results to SMEs, directly assisting them in compliance with the GDPR

<https://naih.hu/projects-starii/general-information-on-the-star-ii-project>

2.) Freedom of information

The special project of the HU SA entitled "Mapping the domestic practice of freedom of information and increasing its efficiency" supports the exploration of the domestic situation of freedom of information and the mapping of its practice by carrying out 4 targeted, target group-specific analytical researches. Its purpose is to conduct a comprehensive, in-depth, and complex investigation of the practical implementation of the obligation to disclose laid down in domestic legislation, as well as to formulate recommendations for legislators based on domestic and international experience and to disseminate the results. In connection with the enforcement of freedom of information as a fundamental right, a broad examination of the domestic practice has become timely in order to surface possible problems and hindering factors, which, after identification, can improve accessibility and optimize processes by formulating targeted solutions and proposals.

<https://www.naih.hu/news/396-press-release-comprehensive-development-project-launched-by-the-hungarian-national-authority-for-data-protection-and-freedom-of-information-for-the-enhanced-enforcement-of-freedom-of-information>

3.) DPO Annual Conference

The Authority organizes the annual conference of Data Protection Officers every year. At the conference the most important results and experiences related to data protection and freedom of information are presented, link in Hungarian:

<https://naih.hu/2021-evi-dpo-konferencia/dpo-konferencia-2021-videok>

4.) Safer Internet Tent/ Awareness raising among children

As part of the children's day, the Safer Internet Tent is set up in the City Park every year, where the Authority is also represented. In the Safer Internet Tent, in addition to useful information materials, children and their companions can meet our employees who answer their questions about information rights, test their knowledge by completing a data protection test, crossword or puzzle, and participate in other adventure programs.

<https://www.gyermekmento.hu/Tartalmak/Hirek/varosligeti-gyermeknap-2023.-majus-27-28.---programok-terkep-infok>

5.) Representatives of the Authority give lectures on data protection and freedom of information at 6 universities in designated courses and specific training courses.

6.) Reshaping and content development of the website is in progress, the latest news, decisions, national and international projects, events and annual reports are published on our website: <https://www.naih.hu/about-the-authority> (English version of the website is in progress).

7.) In 2023 the Hungarian Authority hosted the Spring Conference in Budapest: <https://www.springconference2023.hu/>