

ID. Date of interview
date 10/02/20

ID. Time interview started
start 10:13:58

ID.end Completion date of interview
Date 10/02/20

ID.end Time interview ended
10:15:28

ID. Duration of interview
time 1.50

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Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?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

- What is covered under supplementary information when responding to a SAR? - When using a processor to process personal data, would the processor respond to their part of the SAR, or would the controller receive the information from the processor to respond direct to the requester? - Is a child considered over the age of 13? - What about duplicated data? If data is duplicated in back up, would the duplicated data have to be provided in the response to the SAR? - Examples of legal privilege and litigation privilege would be appreciated, and perhaps an example of what is not legal privilege.

Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?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If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

See above in Q1

Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?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If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.

See above in Q1

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).

Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?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

See above at Q1

Q7 To what extent do you agree that the draft guidance is clear and easy to understand?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

BMW Financial Services (GB) Limited & Alphabet (GB) Limited

What sector are you from:

Financial Services

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: