ID.date	Date of interview 12/02/20
ID.start	Time interview started 13:36:57
ID.endDate	Completion date of interview 12/02/20
ID.end	Time interview ended 13:40:35
ID.time	Duration of interview 3.63

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Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?

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Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?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If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

It needs more guidance around what format to supply SARs data in, i.e. cctv footage and needs more guidance around redaction of third parties in cctv video footage.

Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?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If no or unsure/don’t know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.

As above comment, should contain examples for cctv camera operators.

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've found that a good example of manifestly unfounded and excessive requests could include length of cctv footage. For instance, if an individual requests footage in which they are not present, this is manifestly unfounded. An example of excessive in this instance could be requesting footage over 24 hours in length, if this needs to be redacted it can cost over £80,000 to be processed.

Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?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 would be very useful to extremely useful in my opinion if it contained more detail

Q7 To what extent do you agree that the draft guidance is clear and easy to understand?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Q8 Please provide any further comments or suggestions you may have about the draft guidance.

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:

Technology

Q10 How did you find out about this survey?

- [x] 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: