

ID. Date of interview
date 12/02/20

ID. Time interview started
start 16:38:56

ID.end Completion date of interview
Date 12/02/20

ID.end Time interview ended
16:57:27

ID. Duration of interview
time 18.52

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Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?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

Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?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If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

Page 11-12 - Can a request be made on behalf of someone? Comment about mental capacity and those appointed by the Court of Protection. The existing ICO SAR code of practice makes reference to a Property and Affairs Deputy having appropriate authority to make a SAR on behalf of an individual. When I have spoken with staff from the Court of Protection, their view was that the other type of Deputy (Personal Welfare) would be appropriate to make a SAR, rather than a Property and Affairs Deputy. Given the conflicting information and potential risks, it would be helpful if the guidance could be specific as to which Court of Protection Orders are considered appropriate authority to make a SAR. Page 30 - In what format should we provide the information Comment about the onus on the controller to provide the information to the individual, and the individual not having to take action to receive the information. When responding to a SAR electronically, we tend to provide the documents under a link to a secure website. As part of this security measure, we request the recipient contacts us for the password, as we would lack another means of sharing the password. Our view is that this is not onerous for the recipient, and is part of how we meet the security principle. Would be helpful if you could consider the acceptability of this in the 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Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?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If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.

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

Q6 Why have you given this score?

Guidance is comprehensive, well explained and laid out.

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:

What sector are you from:

Charity

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: