

ID. Date of interview
date 12/02/20

ID. Time interview started
start 16:02:02

ID.end Completion date of interview
Date 12/02/20

ID.end Time interview ended
16:11:41

ID. Duration of interview
time 9.65

new case

ICO consultation on the draft right of access guidance

Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?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Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?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If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?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If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.

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).

Requests for 'all emails with my name on [or my initials]'. For a large organisation such as a University with up to 6000 staff and 39000 students each year, and hundreds of thousands of former staff/students, enquirers and business contacts, there are likely to be many individuals with the same/similar name; technical centralised searches for a name across the entire network are not feasible as the system (& search) would fail and this may be excessively intrusive (picking up irrelevant data potentially containing sensitive information about third parties); and computer systems are incapable of distinguishing personal data from non-personal data, only a human can do this.

Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?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 type="radio"/> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q6 Why have you given this score?

Q7 To what extent do you agree that the draft guidance is clear and easy to understand?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

Higher Education

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: