ICO consultation on the draft right of access guidance

The right of access (known as subject access) is a fundamental right of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). It allows individuals to find out what personal data is held about them and to obtain a copy of that data. Following on from our initial GDPR guidance on this right (published in April 2018), the ICO has now drafted more detailed guidance which explains in greater detail the rights that individuals have to access their personal data and the obligations on controllers. The draft guidance also explores the special rules involving certain categories of personal data, how to deal with requests involving the personal data of others, and the exemptions that are most likely to apply in practice when handling a request.

We are running a consultation on the draft guidance to gather the views of stakeholders and the public. These views will inform the published version of the guidance by helping us to understand the areas where organisations are seeking further clarity, in particular taking into account their experiences in dealing with subject access requests since May 2018.

If you would like further information about the consultation, please email SARguidance@ico.org.uk.

Please send us your response by 17:00 on **Wednesday 12 February 2020**.

Privacy statement

For this consultation, we will publish all responses received from organisations but we will remove any personal data before publication. We will not publish responses received from respondents who have indicated that they are an individual acting in a private capacity (e.g. a member of the public). For more information about what we do with personal data see our privacy notice.

Please note, your responses to this survey will be used to help us with our work on the right of access only. The information will not be used to consider any regulatory action, and you may respond anonymously should you wish.

Please note that we are using the platform Snap Surveys to gather this information. Any data collected by Snap Surveys for ICO is stored on UK servers. You can read their Privacy Policy.

Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?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Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?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 you 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).

To the contrary, we are often sent out a seemingly standard letter from many NHS bodies stating the client 'may not have understood' (despite a signed consent form stating they agree to full release) how much a full release of medical records entails.
Perhaps the guidance ought to have a more specific section on guidance as it relates to solicitors, particularly criminal solicitors, and that if a signed consent to full records is sent in the body is to comply and not to second guess a signed written consent without good cause (if they believe it to be false, fine, but they need good cause as they will likely be sued by us if they allege fraud on our part without good evidence).

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
☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

Q6 Why have you given this score?

It is clear and detailed, however to be a 5 it would need to address specifically criminal law. We have extreme trouble with NHS bodies even with the current BMA guidance about compliance with requests being in existence.
Our letter head makes it clear what type of firm we are, so without stating it explicitly, it is clear to a reader that when we ask for a medical record we do because a person is involved in some way in criminal proceedings. However most law dealt with by the NHS is civil, often against them, so there appears to be a bias against assisting.
I would suggest a separate paragraph on criminal solicitors requesting documents that specifically states something along the lines of 'due to the nature of such proceedings a full medical record is often required for expert defence witnesses, but the details of this request cannot be shared with the record holder, as such if a signed consent to full records is enclosed with a letter from criminal solicitors these are to be sent to the solicitors in full without further delay or extra confirmation with the patient unless you have good cause to believe the consent is fraudulent'.

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
☐	☐	☐	☐	☒

Q8 Please provide any further comments or suggestions you may have about the draft guidance.

See Q6.

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:

The Purkiss Partnership

What sector are you from:

Lawyers

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.