

ID. Date of interview
date 30/01/20

ID. Time interview started
start 16:15:55

ID.end Completion date of interview
Date 30/01/20

ID.end Time interview ended
16:55:28

ID. Duration of interview
time 39.55

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Q1 Does the draft guidance cover the relevant issues about the right of access?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

Q2 Does the draft guidance contain the right level of detail?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If no or unsure/don't know, in what areas should there be more detail within the draft guidance?

Q3 Does the draft guidance contain enough examples?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If no or unsure/don't know, please provide any examples that think should be included in the draft guidance.

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).

Students commonly request "all personal data". Depending on the length of study and course studied this could cover several years and include a vast amount of personal data. As students usually ask for personal data related to a specific issue, a broad request of this nature would include personal data that they neither contemplate nor would not want e.g. all library book loans. The touch points of students across the University are many and the search necessary to identify all personal data is excessive in these circumstances. Without exception, when we have explained this to the requestor they have narrowed their search.

Q5 On a scale of 1-5 how useful is the draft guidance?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

Q6 Why have you given this score?

It is an articulation and explanation of the legislation without much more, which is useful for someone not familiar with the legislation but less use to a practitioner who is already familiar with 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Q7 To what extent do you agree that the draft guidance is clear and easy to understand?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
<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.

The guidance that time is not paused when you seek clarification is concerning. We have proceeded on the basis that where a request is not clear or is excessive and we have to seek clarification or a narrowing of the request that time is paused and restarts from the date of receipt of the clarification or narrowing. If this is not the case, the legislative timeframe may expire before clarification or narrowing is received, which is highly unsatisfactory and in our view does not reflect the legislation.

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:

teesside 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: