

ID. Date of interview
date 06/01/20

ID. Time interview started
start 09:30:40

ID.end Completion date of interview
Date 06/01/20

ID.end Time interview ended
09:35:36

ID. Duration of interview
time 4.93

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Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?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

I believe there needs to be more practical advice given in terms of redacting documents for disclosure. Even more "rule of thumb" examples or overall principles. Specific examples around the wide scope of personal data would help too. Such as instead of just taking a person's name out, removing references they may also identify them such as "brother" or "father" etc. Often the people redacting documents are not data protection specialists and the panic that redaction can breed (even with training) is palpable.

Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?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If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?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If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.

See previous answer.

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).

I don't have any specially but a steer on the ICO's tolerance for refusing a request whole be helpful. I have never rejected one because SAR are part of the foundation of data protection. I think putting a clear view on whether or not this practise is tolerated would be helpful for others.

Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?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 checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6 Why have you given this score?

I think 4/5 is fair as there isn't enough on redaction. The rest is very good.

Q7 To what extent do you agree that the draft guidance is clear and easy to understand?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

university

What sector are you from:

higher education

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: