ID.date	Date of interview 17/01/20
ID.start	Time interview started 14:28:56
ID.endDate	Completion date of interview 17/01/20
ID.end	Time interview ended 14:47:29
ID.time	Duration of interview 18.55

Start of new case

Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?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Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?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If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?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 would be good to incude more detail on what to include in DSAR response. You provide the standard definition of personal data, but more examples/scenarios to identify what to include in a DSAR.response would be very useful. For example, if a search on emails to respond to a request produces a thousand emails; guidance on which emails to include and which to exclude.

Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?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If no or unsure/don’t know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.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, more scenarios on how to recognise what to include and what can be excluded. When the DSAR is accompanied by a discliplinary, gross misconduct, redundancy or grievance, often the data subject is looking for the 'smoking gun' email which simply doesn't exist. Enhanced guidance for the data subject on what to expect from the DSAR

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 would also like the commissioner to consider the drain on resources for a charity when completing a DSAR. When a search returns 30,000 emails, of which each one has to be read to determine if the email satisfies the criteria for inclusion. I have called the ICO helpline to ask if such a DSAR is excessive and was told no, because the actual result would consist of far fewer emails. What is a 'reasonable search' when a data subject requests 'everything you hold'? More clarification would be most useful

Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?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?

its a big step between moderately useful and very useful! if the there was a useful score I would have chosen it.

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.

To include my points above

Q9 Are you answering as:

- ( ) An individual acting in a private capacity (eg someone providing their views as a member of the public)
- (x) An individual acting in a professional capacity
- ( ) On behalf of an organisation
- ( ) Other

Please specify the name of your organisation:

macmillan cancer support

What sector are you from:

charity/third sector

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: