Leeds City Council Response to the CLG Consultation:

"Policy Options for geographic information from Ordnance Survey"

1   Introduction

Purpose of Response

Leeds City Council (LCC) welcomes the opportunity to respond to the proposed options for providing some levels of free Ordnance Survey (OS) data. LCC is a large consumer of OS data with a workforce of around 35, 000 employees and a corporate GIS that is used to plan for service delivery and to capture real-world change or proposals for change with map data playing a fundamental part to the process.

LCC is focused on delivering a multitude of services to its population of 761,124 citizens through the most efficient means at its disposal. The use of mapping data and tools assists several key directorates in providing key services. LCC is also committed to working together with other partner agencies to provide joined up services and sharing spatial data across partnerships is a key enabler to providing a modern and efficient service.

2   Leeds City Council Response - People Involved

Name	Job Title	Directorate
Malachi Rangecroft	Corporate Intelligence Manager	Business Transformation
Richard Johnston-Hughes	Spatial Information Officer	City Development
John Kent	Principal GIS Officer	ICT Services
Andrew Chapman	Product Service Manager	ICT Services
Anke Otto	Principal GIS Officer / ALO	ICT Services
Philip Ogden	Information & Research Officer	Environment & Neighbourhoods
Andy Wood	Principal GIS Officer	City Development

3   Consultation Questions and Answers

3.1   **Question 1**: What are your views or comments on the policy drivers for this consultation?

- LCC is concerned that the timing of this consultation is in danger of de-railing the (R)Mapping Service Agreement (MSA) process that all Local Authorities (LA) and local government partner agencies rely upon Ordnance Survey (OS) data for service delivery. LCC would not like to be in a state of flux by April 2011 (end date for the current MSA) and would like to be assured that licensing for current OS products in the current MSA will not be adversely affected by this consultancy process.

- It also appears as though the 'derived data[1]' discussions & consultation have been shelved in preference to the current OS Free consultation. Derived data is one of the biggest issues affecting LA's. LCC would have liked to see a continuation of discussions around derived data issues or for it to have been included in the current consultation process. Whilst LCC welcomes the current consultation, if the derived data issue is not resolved then little progress will have been made in truly moving forward with the innovative use of spatial data, regardless of whether a few raster datasets are made free or not.

- LCC are also concerned that we (and other local government colleagues) could be paying more for less in regards to data not included in the current consultancy. It is estimated that the data referred to in the consultancy paper only reflects around 10% of the overall MSA costs, and there is the potential that to fund the proposed free data will be at the expense of increased costs for other data.

- LCC has seen an emergence of advancing geospatial technologies which appear to be ahead of current methods of OS data delivery. With the emerging web technologies, some of which are either 'free' or available at a competitive licensing framework, LCC need to be more adaptable in the technology it chooses to provide value for money services, including mapping data and technology. OS need to reflect the changing market and offer more competitive and adaptable data and technology.

---

[1] Derived data – where data is created against an Ordnance Survey map back-drop, OS claim intellectual property rights on the data created. This then limits the ability to share the data without being adversely affected by confusing and restrictive licensing regulations. Only one mention is made in the consultancy paper (p.49) with reference to the issue being reviewed in light of the current consultation.

- LCC innovation is being hampered by bureaucracy (particularly licensing, copyright and derived data). LCC, as well as other Local Authorities, will always looks at ways to get around licensing issues which are restrictive and hampering innovative.

- OS is not competitive for some data such as aerial photography, which is a licensed model as compared to a perpetual license. This makes it unsustainable for LCC to enter into restrictive licensing agreements where once out of license for data, it must be removed from applications with potential issues regarding residual licenses. This is not a sustainable model for purchasing OS data outside of the MSA.

3.2 **Question 2: What are your views on how the market for geographic information has evolved recently and is likely to develop over the next 5-10 years?**

- There have been several enabling technologies that have resulted in a proliferation of spatially based technologies, such as Google Maps, Bing maps and tools such as GPS enabled navigation devices such as Tom Tom, which have all helped to change the perception of GIS and use of spatial data particularly by the public.

- The innovative use of spatial data has also emerged within education, such as Leeds Grammar school which has presented at National GIS conferences with their innovative use of mapping and data. As GIS and spatial data becomes mainstream in education and part of the national curriculum, there is an expectation of LA's to work closely with schools which would include the sharing of data.

- LCC would expect to see a continuation of the release of spatial data for public use, along the same lines of data.gov.uk, and LCC would like the opportunity to explore the freeing up of internal datasets for the public to use as they see fit (commonly known as 'mash-ups'). Currently, LCC is hampered by the derived data issue and would welcome a resolution to this barrier to innovation.

- Limitations placed upon the use of spatial data have resulted in several innovations being removed or amended to meet restrictive licensing rules. LCC feel that innovation is being limited by arcane derived data and copyright issues and would welcome a more flexible approach over the coming years.

- There will always be a need to a very accurate mapping level and currently OS MasterMap (OSMM) Topographic provides the detailed mapping required for some service areas with LCC.

- There are emerging data, such as UK Map, which could be seen as a direct rival to OS OSMM. UK Map is vector data and scaleable for use within the web environment. Whilst currently limited in geographical coverage, it is cheaper to license compared to OSMM and appear to be more market driven in regards to what it delivers.

- Future access to services will see an increase and expectation for citizens to access services through mapping services:
    o A recent SOCITM report highlighted the benefits of using spatial data and maps – the majority of websites that gained a positive review had user friendly access to mapping information;
    o Services via the web, such as find my nearest, need to be further developed and linked to other services across the partnerships;

- GPS enabled technology including mobile tools, will demand effective and adaptable ways of delivering data to citizens, including people on the move. The data and mapping technology spatial will need to keep pace with emerging technologies.

- Citizens have started recording issues with a spatial element – such as reporting a pot-hole or a faulty street light along with a lat/lon coordinates.

3.3   **Question 3**: What are your views on the appropriate pricing model for Ordnance Survey products and services?

- LCC has seen OS fee's double in the last 20 years.
    o Costs go up year on year. Shouldn't technology have reduced costs over the years? LCC feels as though there has been no attempt to pass on cost reductions as a primary consumer of OS data.

- OS appear to have a monopolised, non-competitive model with data restrictions linking back to derived data.

- Local gov and private are different consumers – LCC are answerable to the taxpayer and cannot sell the spatial data they create or sell to a third party as it is usually derived from OS base mapping.
  - LCC believes that as a public agency Ordnance Survey should differentiate between public and private sector customers and consider the appropriateness of charging such sums for data which is critical to the delivery of the overall Public Task.

- The current MSA should be more streamlined and efficient for LA's (including things such as OSMM 'lite')
  - OSMM 'lite' could be a derivative of the full specification OSMM but with selectable features that LA's could pick and choose (similar to selecting elements from OS Points of Interest);
    - This could result in a reduced cost for the flagship product;
    - The future development of OSMM could be driven by demand as OS has sought little feedback from customers as to what should be captured in detail;
    - OSMM 'lite' would be leaner and easier for LA's to handle, store and distribute.

- Private sector should be prepared to pay for high quality but with more flexibility

- An appropriate pricing model is an area LCC would like explored more thoroughly through an independent, expert body.

3.4 **Question 4**: What are your views and comments on public sector information regulation and policy, and the concepts of public task and good governance as they apply to Ordnance Survey?

- LCC cannot fulfil objectives set-out by INSPIRE due to licensing restrictions. LCC can provide the metadata but to fully exploit the INSPIRE vision for agencies across Europe to exchange data; this element cannot be implemented under current licensing regulations.

- The Public Task needs clearly defining – are they a National Mapping agency and if so, what are they tasked to do? Should OS work more closely with LA's to define what the requirements for service delivery are? Existing platforms (such as LGIH's LoGGIC board) appear to make little impact on the way OS responds to LA requests for change.

- LCC would like to see OS being clear and transparent about the costs to produce products so that benchmarking could be used to compare and contrast against other products. It is not clear if LA's are obtaining value for money for the products without indication of the investment and development costs that OS incur.

- (As per the Yorkshire and Humber response): Public sector organisations may be encouraged to work in partnership with Ordnance Survey as a producer of Geographic Information. There are a variety of activities which a local authority undertakes which could assist in further improving the quality of information produced by Ordnance Survey (much of which would fall into the category of 'core reference geography') and could effectively be used in a partnership agreement to help subsidise the release of core reference data for free.

3.5 **Question 5**: What are your views on and comments on the products under consideration for release or free re-use and the rationale for their inclusion?

- LCC regard the range of products as a good selection for the public. For Local Government, an additional dataset should be considered (large scale Vector mapping).

- Does not include or mention the vector mapping including the latest OS Vector mapping product;
  - The exclusion of large scale vector data (1:10 000 or above) is extremely unfortunate and should be addressed, as this is the most appropriate data for web mapping.
  - The data should include a vector mapping product to truly benefit particularly with web enabled GIS applications.

- There are continuing concerns with derived data and how this will affect data sharing outside of the aforementioned product list. OS Free and the products is a good start, but the derived data issue should be included as fundamental part of the debate.

3.6 **Question 6**: How much do you think government should commit to funding the free product set? How might this be achieved?

- Given pressures on local authorities to deliver more for less, funding be met by central Government for OS Free.

3.7 **Question 7**: What are your views on how free data from Ordnance Survey should be delivered?

- It would very much depend upon volume of data but the data listed in OS Free should be manageable via web delivery.
    o Could existing 'clouds' be utilised or the G-Cloud utilised? Could it be made available via data.gov.uk?

- An API (e.g. OS OpenSpace) may restrict use of data and is **not** acceptable.

- Change only updates to data as well as complete data sets should be made available;
    o It should be clear through the use of metadata to let user know what has changed for change only updates.

- Data archiving needs to be considered as it is a extremely important consideration for the ever evolving landscape and should be included in the consultation:
    o OS no longer maintain more than a couple of years of OSMM data so a detailed picture of the UK is continuously lost;
    o LCC has had to recreate mapping bases for several years of Mastermap from scratch for ah-hoc projects looking at development of the city over time;
        ▪ This was time-consuming to the extreme, but we do not have the storage space to hold an on-line archive of mapping data;
    o LCC is not aware of a digital / spatial mapping archiving strategy in place for the UK;
    o There is a danger that the UK will loose access to historic mapping data now that all data is created, stored and manipulated digitally;

- o LCC has undertaken a map project with the West Yorkshire Archive Service (WYAS) where old paper maps were routinely archived, catalogued, scanned in and can be made available to the public via web services. This should be emulated at a national level.

3.8 **Question 8**: What are your views on the impact Ordnance Survey Free will have on the market?

- There are already 'free' alternatives and many Local Authorities are moving away from using OS data and instead moving to maps that are similar to OS products but delivered through Google Maps or Microsoft Bing.
  - o This trend will continue and increase if there is no change with OS derived data and licensing issues.

- Resellers may be adversely affected and reduce innovation
  - o It may also **increase** innovation by providing specific targeted maps for different activities

3.9 **Question 9**: What are your comments on the proposal for a single National Address Register and suggestions for mechanisms to deliver it?

- LCC does not regard the OS as the appropriate organisation to compile a list of addresses and instead this should be done through the NLPG, although issues of ownership for various parts of the address should be resolved. The NLPG is a Government initiative and should be promoted as the single National Address Register.
  - o The existing model and technological infrastructure could be utilised and built upon to fulfil the requirements of all users of address data in the UK which should include partner organisations such as the Police and Fire authorities. Given the public expenditure which has already funded its development, the NLPG must be exploited fully for the public good.
  - o In addition to the creation of new addresses, local authority transactions provide the required sources of change information throughout the lifecycle of a property, making local government the logical owners of a National Address Register.

- The mechanism for delivery is already in place (as provided by Intelligent Addressing) and this just requires refining as opposed to creating a new method.

3.10 **Question 10**: What are your views on the options outlined in this consultation?

- LCC propose that the options should clearly identify the different markets and the options should reflect the customer base – there is a distinct difference between local government and private sector customers of the data.
    - Option 1 – not acceptable and too limited by derived data;
    - Option 2 – the preferred initial process – but more clarification needed for use of large scale data. LCC would also like to see some fixed timescales against this option and the impact upon the forthcoming MSA. LCC do not want to be in a position of being out of license whilst the options are being considered or worked on.
        - We would like complete clarification of customer needs for Option 2 (private / LA split);
        - Base geography should be free as per LGA response;
        - We would like to see consideration for other options including a revised MSA or free levels of data not in OS Free, such as 'lite' version of OSMM.
        - Burden of cost for delivery cannot be met by Local Government – as reduction of central funding will not allow for LCC to support OS Free.
    - Option 3 – could this be a natural progression from option 2 in the future?

3.11 **Question 11**: For local authorities: What will be the balance of impact of these proposals on your costs and revenues?

- LCC feels there is a danger that other data, such as OSMM costs increasing to cover costs of OS Free.

- As the data described in the proposal only represent a small % of the overall cost of the MSA, there will not be a significant savings although intangible costs could be realised.

- LCC would like to explore other avenues such as providing real-world change directly to OS for a greatly reduced charge for products outside of OS Free.

  - LCC is responsible for addressing of new properties through the statutory duty of the Street Naming and Numbering function;
  - New property information could be provided to OS directly, reducing the burden upon OS to re-survey new build;
  - A more formal transaction method should be investigated for all Local Authorities in the same vein as the NLPG in respect to having a central body to collate real world change and then provide the OS with the relevant map changes.

- Burden of cost for delivery cannot be met by local government and should be met by central government.

3.12 **Question 12**: Will these proposals have any impact on race, gender or disability equalities?

- OS Free data should be made available in black and white as an alternative option.

- With the issues around derived data, LCC is currently restricted on what is delivered but this is regardless of race, gender or disability.