ID. Date of interview date 11/02/20

ID. Time interview started

start <sub>15:31:06</sub>

ID.end Completion date of interview

Date <sub>11/02/20</sub>

ID.endTime interview ended

15:50:47

ID. Duration of interview

time <sub>19.68</sub>

## new case

ICO consultation on the draft right of access guidance

| Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?      |
|---|
| ○ Yes   |
| ○ No  |
| O Unsure / don't know   |
| If no or unsure/don't know, what other issues would you like to be covered in it? |

Q1

I appreciate that the GDPR does not set out formal requirements for a valid request, but some further guidance regarding what could be considered a valid request where there is a dispute about whether a request was actually made and what evidence would be required would be useful. Guidance about disclosing information that would be considered business sensitive (that does not fit one of the exemptions) is needed. This is particularly relevant to financial services where customers use SARs as a way of finding out confidential information relating to pricing for insurance purposes. Further guidance is needed in relation to the crime and taxation exemption in the instance where a fraudulent application is made and the victim makes a SAR or the person attempting to commit fraud.

| Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?   |
|--|
| O Yes  |
|  |
| O Unsure / don't know  |
| If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?   |
| Further detail taking into account the wider body of law, such as requests that are motivated by obtaining information for litigation would be useful for a more rounded view on how to respond to requests. |
|  |
|  |

Q2

| Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?   |
|--|
| O Yes  |
|  |
| O Unsure / don't know  |
| If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.               |
| I would like to see some examples where the ICO would consider the disclosure of third party information to be reasonable. |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Q3

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).

A customer suspected of insurance fraud making numerous legal threats aimed at particular individuals with the company repeatedly asking for information to be provided to them with a view to finding out how potential fraudulent applications are analysed.

| Q5 | On a scale of 1-5 how useful is   | the draft guid              | dance?                 |                               |                    |                      |  |
|----|---|-----------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--|
|    |   | 1 - Not at all<br>useful    | 2 – Slightly<br>useful | 3 –<br>Moderately<br>useful   | 4 – Very<br>useful | 5 – Extremely useful |  |
| Q6 | Why have you given this score It is very useful as a basis for privacy professionals going fu | understand<br>orther and in | cluding ex             | amples of c                   | ase law tl         | nat is               |  |
|    | applicable or ICO decisions water to individuals.   | ouid aid uiid               | erstanding             | i and enable                  | e better e         | хріапацопѕ           |  |
|    |   |                             |                        |                               |                    |                      |  |
|    |   |                             |                        |                               |                    |                      |  |
|    |   |                             |                        |                               |                    |                      |  |
|    |   |                             |                        |                               |                    |                      |  |
| Q7 | To what extent do you agree that the draft guidance is clear and easy to understand?          |                             |                        |                               |                    |                      |  |
|    |   | Strongly disagree           | Disagree               | Neither agree<br>nor disagree | Agree              | Strongly agree       |  |
|    |   |                             |                        |                               |                    |                      |  |

| Q8 | Please provide any further comments or suggestions you may have about the draft guidance.  |  |  |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|    | As above, further examples and ICO decisions would improve the 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:  Saga Group  What sector are you from:  Insurance/Travel |  |  |  |  |  |

| Q10 | How did you find out about this survey? |
|-----|---|
|     | O ICO Twitter account                   |
|     | O ICO Facebook account                  |
|     | O ICO LinkedIn account                  |
|     | O ICO website                           |
|     | O ICO newsletter                        |
|     | O ICO staff member                      |
|     | Colleague                               |
|     | Personal/work Twitter account           |
|     | Personal/work Facebook account          |
|     | Personal/work LinkedIn account          |
|     | Other                                   |
|     | If other please specify:                |