

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Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?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Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?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If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?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If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.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 would be good to have an example related to solicitors who act on behalf of patients appealing against their Continuing Healthcare funding decision, as this is something that clinical commissioning groups receive on a daily basis.

- 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).
- Some examples of requests for all records held by a GP would be beneficial, as GPs have become inundated with SARs since the implementation of GDPR. Examples of third party requests from PI / claims solicitors on behalf of a patient to a GP practice is a common situation, whereby the third party has not limited their request to a particular period of care or a particular condition.

- Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?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

The health sector, particularly primary care has been hit very hard by the impact of GDPR on SARs. Some examples directly related to health would be beneficial.

- Q7 To what extent do you agree that the draft guidance is clear and easy to understand?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Q8 Please provide any further comments or suggestions you may have about the draft guidance.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:
- NHS Norwich Clinical Commissioning Group

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