

ID. Date of interview  
date 31/01/20

ID. Time interview started  
start 10:21:56

ID.end Completion date of interview  
Date 31/01/20

ID.end Time interview ended  
11:23:42

ID. Duration of interview  
time 61.77

**Start of new case**

Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?

Yes

No

Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, what other issues would you like to be covered in it?

Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?

Yes

No

Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?

Yes

No

Unsure / don't know

If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.

You need to include clear examples on what is NOT a DSAR. As a business all our documents contain some form of personal information; customers will ask for copies of documents - but the purpose of the customer asking for the document is to see the costs within documentation and NOT to see their own personal information. If we were to consider all requests as a DSAR we would be unable to cope with volumes - you need better and clear guidance for both businesses and data subjects on what constitutes a rights request. so an actual example relevant to both parties

Q4 We have found that data protection professionals often struggle with applying and defining 'manifestly unfounded or excessive' subject access requests. We would like to include a wide range of examples from a variety of sectors to help you. Please provide some examples of manifestly unfounded and excessive requests below (if applicable).

We have historic records that we are obligated to keep for 20 years due to potential litigation; sometimes we have issue of recalling from storage > secure transportation > manual review given they are old paper records > photocopy (sometimes up to 20 storage boxes) > scan to our data rights team > they then need to review > extract all PII > compile report.

Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?

1 - Not at all useful	2 - Slightly useful	3 - Moderately useful	4 - Very useful	5 - Extremely useful
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6 Why have you given this score?

I feel its more of a reiteration than clarification - you are still being too open to interpretation

Q7 To what extent do you agree that the draft guidance is clear and easy to understand?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q8 Please provide any further comments or suggestions you may have about the draft guidance.

Q9 Are you answering as:

- An individual acting in a private capacity (eg someone providing their views as a member of the public)
- An individual acting in a professional capacity
- On behalf of an organisation
- Other

Please specify the name of your organisation:

What sector are you from:

legal

Q10 How did you find out about this survey?

- ICO Twitter account
- ICO Facebook account
- ICO LinkedIn account
- ICO website
- ICO newsletter
- ICO staff member
- Colleague
- Personal/work Twitter account
- Personal/work Facebook account
- Personal/work LinkedIn account
- Other

If other please specify: