

# The Postcode Address File Advisory Board

## PAB Licence Working Group

Minutes of a meeting held at 13.30 on 13<sup>th</sup> March 2013 at GB plc Offices, Dysart Street, EC2A 2GU

Present

Terry Hiles (GB) in the chair

Ian Beesley, PAB chairman

Joel Curry (QAS)

Tim Drye (Datatalk)

Ian Evans (AMU)

Callum McInnes (AMU)

Miranda Sharp (Minutes)

### 1. Welcome

Miranda Sharp was welcomed to the Working Group (WG).

### 2. Membership of the Licence Working Group

The WG agreed the need to recruit another (non Solutions Provider) member, ideally a user whose knowledge extended beyond their own specific use.

### 3. Actions/Matters Arising Previous Meeting (18/10/12)

The Ofcom Consultation was discussed as agenda item 5.

Responses to the PAB licence Consultation will be made available on The Board website,.  
Progress on the Public Sector was discussed as agenda item 4.

### 4. Public Sector Licence

IE updated the WG that user terms for the new Public Sector Licence (PSL) were to be published to the PAB and the SP community in the week commencing 18<sup>th</sup> of March. The anticipated length of the document is 12 pages, one third of which is definitions, with some terms dictated by the PSMA on which BIS have based the licence. As The Board have been kept informed during the negotiation of the PSL, IE was confident that the finished document reflects the points raised. In particular, there are reduced terms governing website use with fewer restrictions on database cleansing, on data creation only the passing on of data is prevented.

In a lesson learned from OS and the PSMA, there is to be an up scaling of audit activity in the public sector so that AMU can demonstrate the value of PAF®.

Customers will be required to accept both the new agreement and Addressbase licence agreement.

The WG noted that the process of acceptance of the PSL would go from being a financial transaction, typically managed by purchasing, to a compliance and legal undertaking and as such efforts should be made to ensure that the appropriate level of authority and area of sign off was being achieved.

The working group noted that the options for pro-rata payment and for increased payment in the event of usage growth were yet to be agreed.

There was some debate as to whether appropriate, sufficient or excessive resource was available to AMU to undertake the administrative tasks under the new PSL.

### 5. Ofcom Report

The WG noted that Angela Latta is due to attend PAB on 21 March, the highest ranking official to do so to date.

# PAB(L)(13) 1st MEETING

---

It was agreed that the report was an argument for the highest data quality if the market was to grow in the cash and time deprived sphere of SME businesses.

## 6. Moving forward

The Working group confirmed its objectives for a PAF® licence in light of Ofcom proposals:

- Simplify terms
- Encourage wider use of PAF®
- Safeguard IPR
- Safeguard revenues
- Reduced costs of administration

The conclusion was reached that innovation was desirable but only if, supporting the point referred to in (3) above, the licence could be simplified significantly. To this end, actions were agreed.

### Action;

- i. **IE to assess whether a new PAF® licence can be permissive rather than restrictive in its approach**

The WG chair circulated copies and comments on different End User Licences from the USA, Ireland, Australia and Canada. The documents formed a spectrum from lengthy and legalistic at one end to inappropriate in terms of IPR protection and commercial application at the other. There was an appealing balance struck by the North American examples, including a splitting of the end user and SP contract. The WG agreed to seek further examples including Australia.

### Action

- ii. **IE to provide specimen licence documentation from BIS and the Met Office where data is charged for.**
- iii. **JC to research changes in the Australian market**

Various possible changes to the licence model were discussed in some detail including discussion of the pricing models that might be applied given the Ofcom recommendation that the 8%-10% profit cap on the PAF should be removed yet the price to end users should not increase significantly. Options discussed included:-

- Charging those who initiate changes (the “polluter pays” model)
- Charging companies based on a verifiable metric such as number of employees or size of customer base, possibly differentiated by sector
- Charging on the basis of use and differentiating between look ups and data cleansing. (Noting that such a change would force the postal operators to bear a significant increase.)
- Simplification of purchasing for decentralised companies, in line with the single payment approach taken by government. (However it was noted that The Board would want to see government contractually committed to long term funding of the file.)
- Moving control of licensing from AMU to SP’s who would make a payment based on their turnover on PAF based solutions
- Per click price only
- Alternative licence models and their applicability to the UK market as shown in the International Survey commissioned by Royal Mail

Having agreed that an April implementation date was preferable, the WG considered that proposals needed to be in place for review in the summer.

### Action

- iv. **AMU to provide data on the number of End Users and SP’s by size band to enable evaluation of the various models**
- v. **TD and IE to calculate a per click price based on available data on house moves (TD) and Royal Mail data (IE)**
- vi. **IE to assess the current PAF® Licence against the Ofcom proposals.**

## PAB(L)(13) 1st MEETING

---

vii. **Data Advance to be invited to the next meeting to present conclusions and options for licensing based on the International report**

8. Possible dates for the next meeting had been circulated

**Action**

viii. **Members to respond to TH's email on dates**

The meeting closed at 16.30.

Draft