

ID. Date of interview
date 05/02/20

ID. Time interview started
start 11:26:40

ID.end Completion date of interview
Date 05/02/20

ID.end Time interview ended
11:37:43

ID. Duration of interview
time 11.05

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Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?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

The ICO website is unhelpful in that it does not give examples in one place. eg: what is a reasonable admin fee; in some instances, this has to include staff time. It is far too simplistic not to account for this in regulations and guidance.

Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?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If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

The ICO website is unhelpful in that it does not give examples in one place. eg: what is a reasonable admin fee; in some instances, this has to include staff time. It is far too simplistic not to account for this in regulations and 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Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?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If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.

Different sectors eg: schools and where there are different context eg: budget cuts / staffing cuts. Far too simplistic to treat all context in the same way; it's a bit like universal credit!

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 requests made out of spite / anger - ICO needs to account for this. eg: a parent / carer will be very unhappy if their child is excluded from school, it all too easy for the parent / carer to submit a SAR and the school, most probably short staffed, to struggle. More thought required. Much better would be for the ICO to come into schools to satisfy SARs.

Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?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

Q6 Why have you given this score?

Because ICO lacks practical understanding and, sadly, credibility

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

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

It needs a re-think.

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:

A school

What sector are you from:

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: