

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Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?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Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?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If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?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If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.

It is useful to see examples relating to the various exemptions there are, however I feel there is a lack of clarity as to what may class as a 'manifestly unreasonable or excessive' request. I appreciate it may be difficult to provide relevant examples but some would be useful.

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).

In my experience my organisation has never refused a SAR for the purposes referred to, mostly because of a lack of clarity and guidance. An example may be, where we have considered it, where a data subject submits a SAR due to an ongoing dispute they have with the organisation. Despite thousands of documents being released the data subject bombards the organisation saying information is missing. Furthermore, the data subject is part of an 'action group' where numerous members have all submitted SARs for the same reason. If FOI, it is likely they would be refused as vexatious. Should there not be a stance where, if a data subject submits a SAR purely because they are in dispute and are fishing for information that may further their cause (regardless of whether it actually exists), that it should be refused? In my view, it is not what the right of access was intended for.

Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?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

Overall the guidance is very useful, common questions I have faced from colleagues are covered in the guidance and would allow me to answer.

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 type="radio"/>	<input checked="" 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:

Barnsley MBC

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

Thank you for taking the time to complete the survey