



Information Fair Trader Scheme

Verification of commitment to information fair trading

Her Majesty's Stationery Office
May 2007

Unlocking the potential of public sector information



<u>PART ONE: INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>PART TWO: KEY CHANGES</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>PART THREE: HIGHLIGHTS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>PART FOUR: PROGRESS</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED ACTIONS</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED ACTIONS</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>APPENDIX 2: REVIEW OF STANDARD LICENCE TERMS AND CONDITIONS</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>APPENDIX 3: IFTS WEBSITE ASSESSMENT</u>	<u>23</u>

Visit: May 2007

Published: August 2007

© Crown copyright 2007

PART ONE: INTRODUCTION

Information Fair Trader Scheme

1. The Information Fair Trader Scheme (IFTS) is the best practice model for public sector bodies wishing to demonstrate compliance with the Re-use of Public Sector information Regulations 2005. IFTS ensures that re-users of public sector information can be confident that they will be treated reasonably and fairly by public sector information providers.
2. The Controller of HMSO recognises that HMSO itself should be subject to the same verification process as other organisations. She has made a commitment to trading fairly in information, and is dedicated to the principle that HMSO processes for trading information should set standards for the public sector. She has therefore asked for a verification to be undertaken. This report outlines the findings and conclusions of that verification of HMSO itself.
3. This is the third verification of HMSO. The last verification took place in August 2005. A number of recommendations were made to HMSO as a result of that verification, and part of the work of this verification has been to review progress in their implementation.

Second verification

4. At the second verification, the team found that overall HMSO demonstrated commitment to, and evidence of, fair trading. Processes and procedures were in place to facilitate compliance with the information fair trader principles. There were, however, some instances where there were incomplete evidence trails for licensing decisions and it was recommended that decision making should be recorded.

Re-verification

5. Re-verification is important as organisations change and staff move on. It is also an opportunity for OPSI to ensure that the recommendations of the last verification have been fully implemented. The frequency of re-verification is based on several risk factors including the complexity of the licensing system, how critical the information is and the standard of compliance at the previous verification. This organisation is assessed as being high risk.

Licensing Activity at HMSO

6. The Director of OPSI in her role as Controller and Queen's Printer has been appointed by HM the Queen to manage all copyrights owned by the Crown. The Director of OPSI is also the Queens Printer for Scotland. The verification team reviewed the licensing functions of the Office of the Queen's Printer for Scotland as part of the re-verification process. The Controller has delegated her authority to Trading Funds to license the re-use of material which they originate. HMSO retains responsibility for licensing on behalf of organisations which do not have delegated authority.
7. Other public sector bodies, such as the NHS and Local Authorities, own the copyright in material they generate. They have their own procedures for managing this copyright. The role of HMSO in these circumstances is an advisory one, encouraging consistency and good practice. HMSO has also published guidance notes and standard documents on its website for organisations to use and re-use as appropriate.
8. HMSO uses a Click-Use licensing system, which enables customers to take out three different online licences for a wide range of material. The first type of licence, the PSI licence (formerly known as the Core licence), covers Crown copyright information and Public Sector Information. The second is a Parliamentary licence covering Parliamentary copyright information, and the third is a Value Added licence, covering Value Added Crown copyright information.
9. There is no charge for the PSI licence or the Parliamentary licence. There may be a charge for the Value Added licence depending on the type and amount of Crown copyright information being re-used.
10. Some Crown copyright material is covered by waiver conditions. This covers material where copyright is asserted, but waived. Waiver material can be re-used free of charge without requiring a formal licence provided that it is:
 - acknowledged
 - not used in a misleading way
 - reproduced accurately and kept up to date

11. Before making a licence application, a potential re-user must decide which category of material it is that they intend to re-use; all information necessary to help them decide is contained on HMSO's website.
12. The re-user must then register with the system for a user account. Registration is free and with their username and password they can then login to their account to apply for licences and check what licences they have. The requests are dealt with as quickly as possible by the Information Policy Advisers who are also on hand to deal with any queries when a re-user is having difficulties deciding which licence they should apply for.

Overall Assessment

13. Overall, HMSO is open in allowing re-use of its information. The main restriction to openness is the time taken to process some requests to re-use information. Although this is not always the fault of HMSO, delays sometimes occur due to the amount of time spent answering queries that are not directly relevant to the department. HMSO's policy is that customers should always be treated the same for the same type of re-use, which is good practice. There are, however, still a number of legacy licences in place which require termination to ensure that customers operate under the same terms and conditions. HMSO should also reduce the level of judgement used to determine whether material is core or value added, to ensure fairness across re-users.
14. The website and licence terms are models of best practice. However, there are some inconsistencies in the way material originated by some Government departments such as the Office for Government Commerce and the Food Standards Agency is handled, and the reasons for this are not transparent.
15. The Information Policy Team is close-knit, with good working relationships and on-the-job training. Coaching has been used as formal induction to new starters. However, as the team expands across three locations, other induction and training methods should be considered. Spot checks on files could be introduced to ensure consistency across the team, particularly for new Advisers.
16. Currently it is not possible for HMSO to establish the cost of producing each of the documents it licenses for re-use. As such, there is a possibility that it could be under or over charging for re-use of information. This policy should be reviewed.
17. HMSO has a complaints process which has been in place for some time. It is published on the website and there was evidence that this was followed and works effectively. This is a model of best practice.

PART TWO: KEY CHANGES

18. There have been many changes since the last verification, particularly in personnel and organisation structure. The Information Policy Manager is relatively new to the post, after being promoted from Information Policy Adviser in 2006. In addition, there are three new Information Policy Advisers and an Information Policy Consultant. The team is based in three offices; Norwich, London and Kew.
19. The Re-Use of Public Sector Information Regulations (PSI Regulations) had only been in force for a short period of time when the previous verification took place and had, therefore, had little impact on HMSO. The Regulations have now had a major impact on HMSO in terms of a shift in policy focus, resource implications, a change of direction and responsibility. Forming part of a larger Information Group, the Information Policy team have been instrumental in raising awareness of the PSI Regulations, and have a thorough understanding of how the Regulations impact upon HMSO.
20. In addition, HMSO merged with The National Archives in November 2006 to enable the combined organisation to provide strong and coherent leadership for the development of information policy across government and the wider public sector.

PART THREE: HIGHLIGHTS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Openness

21. HMSO itself creates very little material which it licenses for re-use. Most of its information is published on its website, which organisations can re-use under a waiver notice whereby there is no need to request permission. Instead, it licenses re-use on behalf of a large number of other public sector organisations, whose material is generally of a non-commercial nature. HMSO plays a key role in facilitating re-use of a large amount of public sector information, and acts openly in doing so.

22. During the verification it became evident that, on occasions, openness was restricted due to the length of time taken from initial request to the licence being issued. This was, however, not generally the fault of HMSO, but rather the department originating the material. During the licensing file reviews, there was some evidence of customers asking why their licence has been delayed. It is important that licensing requests are processed in a timely fashion to ensure that value-added products and services can be developed to fulfil the key driver behind the PSI Regulations, which was economic. **Recommendation: HMSO takes steps to improve the process to reduce the amount of time taken to issue licences to ensure openness is not compromised.**

23. Currently, a great deal of time is spent responding to queries in the licensing inbox and the licensing enquiries telephone line which should not be directed to the Information Policy Team. Examples include:

- calls from schools requesting copies of the National Curriculum, when these calls should be directed to the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority
- questions about local services such as where is my local tax office?
- questions about information that is readily available on the OPSI website, such as how to obtain a Statutory Instrument

Figures quoted are as high as fifty to sixty percent of queries. The time taken answering these queries means that the Information Policy Advisers are not able to deal efficiently with relevant licensing requests. One possibility for reducing the number of queries would be to direct callers to the Contact Centre at the National Archives. The Contact

Centre could then distribute callers to the relevant department and enable the Information Policy Advisers to focus on their key responsibilities, **Recommendation: HMSO considers whether redirecting telephone and website enquiries to a central point to enable the Information Policy Advisers to concentrate on handling genuine licensing requests.**

Fairness

24. In general, HMSO treats its customers fairly. HMSO is not the originating department for the information concerned and does not retain any licensing income. There are some instances of incomplete files and records, which makes it difficult for the Information Policy Manager to ensure that customers are treated the same for the same type of re-use request. This is becoming increasingly important now that the team is based in three locations.
25. There are some circumstances where legacy licences have not been terminated. This could lead to unfairness as customers could be operating under different terms and conditions. The development of “back office” functionality within the Click-Use licensing system has yet to be delivered. This would have facilitated the easy updating of licence records that are terminated. **Recommendation: HMSO should conduct an audit to ensure that all legacy licences have been terminated and that customers have been moved onto current terms. Recommendation: OPSI/HMSO should restart the development of the “back office” functionality of the Click-Use licensing system.**
26. HMSO uses two types of Click-Use Licence for re-use of Crown copyright material: the PSI licence that covers core government information and the Value added licence covering value added information produced by government. The licence type used is dependent on an assessment of whether the information is core or value added. Making this assessment often involves discussion with the originating department and checking whether the material in question matches the definitions and characteristics for core or value added material. This involves discussion within the team and a high level of judgement. Our concern is that the emphasis on personal judgement could lead to inconsistencies of treatment. We advocate

that the definitions and lists of characteristics of core and value added should be reviewed in order to minimise the amount of personal discretion and judgement. **Recommendation: HMSO should review the current definitions of core and value-added to ensure that they are fit for purpose.**

Transparency

27. HMSO is unlike many other PSIHS that license re-use in that it does not produce/originate most of the information that it licenses. That information is drawn from right across central government. In addition, this means that the range of information licensed is much more varied than from the typical PSIHS. Identifying the cost of collecting and producing the thousands of documents would involve significant resources not only from HMSO but from every department that produces the documents being licensed. Consequently, HMSO applies a standard charging system based on terms which are applied across the publishing industry. Our concern is that these terms may not necessarily reflect the charging criteria set out in Regulation 15 of the Re-Use of Public Sector Information Regulations. We understand that TNA is planning to recruit an economist. One key task for the economist would be to advise on the most effective model for HMSO to adopt. **Recommendation: The economist should be given the task of examining the basis on which HMSO charges for re-use with a view to ensuring consistency with Regulation 15.**

28. Material produced by the OGC is of a more commercial nature than material published by other departments. OGC operates under a separate standard pricing and licensing model. As such, a large proportion of the Information Policy Manager's time is spent dealing with OGC. This is a situation that has evolved over time, and OGC has become the only department for which HMSO uses a separate model. For other commercial products, HMSO issues a delegation of authority to give organisations the flexibility to set their own licence terms and prices. A delegation of authority could be offered to OGC, which would then be monitored under the Information Fair Trader Scheme. **Recommendation: HMSO should consider offering OGC either a limited or full delegation of authority to give them the flexibility to set suitable terms and conditions and prices.**

29. The Nutrient Databank is a product produced by the FSA. The product is an extremely valuable commodity used widely by such diverse entrepreneurs as nutritionists and personal trainers. This has meant that the product has been used over the years in some particularly innovative ways. There are essentially two activities involved: the supply, by e-mail, of food data sets and charging for the data including the issue of an end user licence; and licensing the re-use. This dual role has caused confusion amongst customers who wrongly believe that HMSO, in distributing the data also produces it. This therefore leads to time consuming queries whereby the Information Policy Adviser attempts to answer questions which are not in their sphere of expertise. This is the only material for which HMSO is responsible for supplying the material as well as licensing re-use.. **Recommendation: HMSO should pass the Nutrient Databank back to the Food Standards Agency for them to distribute the product to customers itself.**

30. As part of the verification process, a licence review has been completed by an independent licensing specialist and lawyer. The HMSO Click-Use licence is a model of best practice, and there are relatively few suggested amendments to the licensing terms and conditions. **Recommendation: HMSO amends its standard licences in line with the suggestions made in Appendix 2.**

31. The team also conducted a website review. The HMSO website is a model of good practice. Licences are available on-line, as are standard charges. There is an Information Asset Register, which is easy to find and use. The website is written in Plain English, which makes it easy to read and understand. **The full website review with recommendations can be found in Appendix 3.**

32. The team undertook a licence file review. HMSO does not have an electronic records management system, therefore paper files are maintained. There were several instances of an incomplete paper trail, therefore it was difficult to understand why some licensing decisions had been made, and could potentially lead to unfairness. HMSO should ensure that files are maintained to a high standard to ensure that there is a clear paper trail to track licensing decisions. It was not always clear when reviewing licensing files on what basis decisions had been made and why some exceptions had been used.

Recommendation: The basis of licensing and pricing decisions should be retained and placed on file.

Compliance

33. Until recently, the Information Policy team has been a close-knit team based in one location: Norwich. However, following the recent merger with the National Archives, members of the team have been recruited to London, in addition to a new member of the team being based in Kew. As the team recruits further staff, there is a possibility that these could be based in London or Kew. Training of new staff has been done 'on-the-job', which has worked well as new team members liaise directly with the existing team to resolve any queries. However, as the team expands, a more formal induction and training plan will be necessary to ensure fairness and consistency across licensing decisions. There is a document entitled 'how to issue a licence' but this has not been reviewed for some time and would be a useful starting point. **Recommendation: HMSO puts together a formal induction and training plan for new team members, including the possibility of developing a licensing manual. HMSO should consider other ways of engaging with licensing team members, such as adopting a classroom based approach to training.**

34. Every member of the Information Policy team has an objective to license material within the principles of IFTS. This shows that HMSO takes IFTS seriously and understands its importance. This is an example of best practice.

35. As mentioned in paragraph 32 in Transparency, files are not always maintained fully and decisions are not always recorded. Currently there is no formal system in place for moderating files to ensure consistency. **Recommendation: The Head of Information Policy and Information Policy Manager should look at a sample of files each month to ensure that decisions are being made consistently and files are maintained fully.**

Challenge

36. HMSO has only received one complaint about licensing. This complaint was investigated fully, using the correct procedure.

37. The issue of complaints was brought up at each interview, and each

Information Policy Advisor was aware of the central point within HMSO to whom complaints should be directed. There are several means of making complaints, and these are outlined clearly on the website. This is good practice.

PART FOUR: PROGRESS

Recommendations of first verification and if they have been met (copy and paste table from previous report)

Summary of Recommended Actions

This is a summary of the recommended actions to remedy the weakness identified, and strengthen the commitment to Information Fair Trading.

REFERENCE	SUMMARY OF ACTION	PRIORITY AND COMMENTS
COMMITMENT:		
	No recommendations	
OPENNESS:		
	No recommendations	
FAIRNESS:		
Paras 40 -42	We recommend that there should be a review of the pricing process for OGC material, and a robust justification made available on the website with regard to it.	M – OGC is currently working on a final draft of a new pricing document. The deadline for completion is the end of May and HMSO will then be given a copy.

TRANSPARENCY:		
Paras 43 – 44	<p>We recommend that the evidence for the basis of decisions should be retained for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • application of discretion on decisions relating to core as opposed to value-added material • the proportion of Crown copyright content, and hence the basis of charging • the basis of pricing calculations. 	M – Some of these decisions are matters of fine judgement and staff are trusted to use their discretion. However, HMSO accepts that the basis for decisions could be more thoroughly documented.
Para 45	We recommend that files should be maintained in as complete a form as possible, including correspondence and the basis for pricing.	M – Each member of staff has a personal responsibility to make sure that files are complete.
Para 46	We recommend revision of the description of OPSI to provide a clearer explanation of its roles and activities.	M – The website now clearly explains OPSI's role and where HMSO fits into this.
Para 47	We recommend the inclusion of a number of internal links on the website, including for example the introduction of an explicit link from the Application or Register sections of the Click-use area to the IAR or Inforoute.	L – Complete
COMPLIANCE:		
Para 49	We recommend that the response our previous recommendation on the introduction of a formal programme of sample case review by	M – While a formal case review process has yet to be established, most value-add licences are

	management should be reconsidered.	checked by the Information Policy Manager. This is a by-product of the work of new members of staff needing to be checked.
CHALLENGE:		
Para 51 - 53	We recommend revision of the complaints process to clarify the different complaints streams.	M - Complete
APPENDIX 1:		
Appendix 1	We recommend that further action should be considered with regard to a number of matters raised in our previous verification report.	M - Complete

APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

This is a summary of the recommended action to:

- remedy the weakness identified; and,
- strengthen the commitment to Information Fair Trading.

Principle	Ref	Recommendation	Priority
Openness	22	HMSO takes steps to improve the process to reduce the amount of time taken to issue licences to ensure openness is not compromised.	High
	23	HMSO considers whether redirecting telephone and website enquiries to a central point to enable the Information Policy Advisers to concentrate on handling genuine licensing requests.	Medium
Fairness	25	HMSO should conduct an audit to ensure that all legacy licences have been terminated and that customers have been moved onto current terms. HMSO should make use of the Click-Use licensing system “back office” functionality to carry out this exercise.	Medium
	26	HMSO should develop more stringent definitions of core and value added to ensure that customers are not treated unfairly.	High
Transparency	27	The economist should be given the task of examining the basis on which HMSO charges for re-use with a view to ensuring consistency with Regulation 15.	High
	28	HMSO should consider offering OGC either a limited or full delegation of authority to give them the flexibility to set suitable terms and conditions and prices.	Medium
	29	HMSO should pass the Nutrient Databank back to the Food Standards Agency for them to distribute the product to customers itself.	Medium
	30	HMSO amends its standard licences in line with the suggestions made in Appendix 2.	Medium

	32	The basis of licensing and pricing decisions should be retained and placed on file.	Medium
Compliance	33	HMSO puts together a formal induction and training plan for new team members, including the possibility of developing a licensing manual. HMSO should consider other ways of engaging with licensing team members, such as adopting a classroom based approach to training.	Medium
	35	The Head of Information Policy and Information Policy Manager should look at a sample of files each month to ensure that decisions are being made consistently and files are maintained fully.	Medium

APPENDIX 2: REVIEW OF STANDARD LICENCE TERMS AND CONDITIONS

REVIEW OF

Three licences, the PSI licence, the value added licence and the Parliamentary licence. Links below:

<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/licenceterms/CCWPS03-00.pdf>

http://www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/licenceterms/ValueAddedLicence_template.pdf

http://www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/licenceterms/ParliamentaryLicence_01-00.pdf

Evaluation Criteria

1. Clarity of licence terms

Check for clarity of language, jargon, legalistic language, plain English

- HMSO is defined differently in all 3 licences
- Only the value added licence has plain English approval
- The wording in the click-use has obviously been revised to bring it into 'plain English' the Parliamentary licence hasn't and would benefit from it eg clause 16.2 – an easy project since both have many clauses in common
- Intranet with a capital 'I' is mentioned with no definition Click Use clause 6.1 and Parliamentary clause 7.1
- Click Use clause 5.9 Intellectual Property Rights has capitals but is not defined
- For consistency of punctuation Click Use clause 9.9 should end with a semi-colon
- IFTS logo appears on value added licence but not on the others
- It would be helpful to number the pages for the Click Use and Parliamentary licences
- Parliamentary licence has an edition date on page one the others don't
- Value added definition of Official Source is only half the definition used in

the other licences – I think that this is a typo

- Value added definition of product refers to a Schedule C – there isn't one in the version that I downloaded
- The reason for the red square and heading isn't made clear – at first I thought that the * delete as appropriate referred to them. Who deletes what? Customer or HMSO?
- Value added clause 5 11th bullet I think should read the same as clause 9.8 of the Click Use
- Value added - the punctuation of the bullets in clause 5 is inconsistent the last bullet under a red heading sometimes has a semi-colon and sometimes has a full stop. I think that the full stop is the more correct (my preference is not to put anything at the end of each bullet then you don't have the problem)
- Value added Clause 11 is headed Forms and formats..... Since there is a definition of Forms does it refer to Forms as defined or forms in general?
- Value added - no where is it explained why or in what circumstances there might be a charge
- Parliamentary definition 3.5 is unclear – is it referring to the Annexes attached to the terms or to the Application Form?
- Assignment (clauses 13, 15 and 16) is worded differently in the Click Use from the other two and the wording is better - less legal language
- Click Use clause 3.2 last sentenceit will last for 5 years..... from when?

2. Comprehensiveness of licence terms

Are there any significant omissions? Does the licence contain terms that you would not expect to find in a licence?

- Value added clause 5 and Parliamentary clause 12.10 Your Obligations 4th bullet refers to DPA but what about Human Rights, EU Directive and so on
- Value added clause 3 Grant refers to rights in Schedule A – what rights? I don't see any
- The Parliamentary licence does not have a clause 'not to use The Material that is in anyway likely to mislead others (12.13 missing?)
- The obligations clauses -in the click use the licensee obligations state 'you must', whereas HMSO's only state 'we aim to' which seems a little biased -

the other two licences only contain licensee obligations

- Termination - this can be done in writing, but to whom?
- Click use - the governing law scenarios don't seem particularly clear compared to the others or is it intended to delete the inappropriate ones?

3. Fairness

Does the licence contain terms that are unfair or unnecessarily discriminates between different user groups?

No

4. Consistency

Does the licence contain any terms which are inconsistent and contradictory?

No

5. Practical Arrangements

Is it clear what the process is for making payments, amending terms for example?

- Parliamentary does not contain a helpful clause on how to get Further Information – see clause 15 of Click Use, which does
- Value added clause 4 Period – why have an initial term and then in next sentence say that the licence terminates only when one party terminates it? It also makes clause 13 1st bullet seem odd

6. Restrictiveness of terms

Are any of the terms unnecessarily restrictive?

No

7. Additional Comments

The licences would benefit from being consistent in their definitions. The Parliamentary would benefit from being put into Plain English. The Value Added with its pick and mix approach is less clear than the others. Perhaps separate version for the different scenarios would be better.

APPENDIX 3: IFTS Website Assessment

Organisation: Her Majesty's Stationary Office

Site available at: <http://www.opsi.gov.uk/>

Score: 231

- 1.1 Does the website have an Information Asset Register? **Yes**
- 1.2 If yes, how many clicks is it from the homepage? **0-1**
- 1.3 How long did it take to find? **<1 minute**
- 1.4 If there is no IAR, is there other guidance on what information is available? **N/A**

Please provide a link for the IAR page, along with comments on how easy it was to use.

<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/iar/index.htm>

- 2.1 Does the PSB use standard licences? **Yes**
- 2.2 Are these published in full on the website **Yes**
- 2.3 If yes, how many clicks are they from the homepage? **2**
- 2.4 How long does it take to find? **<1 minute**
- 2.5 How many standard licences are there? **3-5**
- 2.6 Is there an explanation of what different licences are for and is it clearly understood? **Yes**

Please provide a link to the standard licences here. If there are a large number of standard licences, are they proportionate to the volume of licensing carried out?

<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/index.htm>

- 3.1 Is there any charge made for licences? **Yes** – For value added not PSI or parliament
- 3.2 Is there an explanation of the charges? **Yes**
- 3.3 Is there an explanation of how charges are drawn up? **Yes**
Please provide a link to the charges here, along with any explanation of the way they are drawn up.

<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/value-added-licence-information/charging-value-added-material.doc>

- 4.1 Is there an IFTS commitment on the website? **Yes**
- 4.2 How many clicks is it from the homepage? **2**
- 4.3 How long does it take to find? **<1 minute**
Please provide a link to the IFTS commitment

<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/about/ifts-commitment.htm>

- 5.1 Is there clear and precise information on how to apply for a re-use licence? **Yes**
- 5.2 Are there a variety of methods for applying for licences? **No**
- 5.3 Is it possible to apply online for a licence? (Including emailing a form) **Yes**
- 5.4 Does it specify a timescale to grant licences? **No** 5.5 If yes, what is that timescale (in working days)? (N/A)

<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp>

In order to see the information concerning licence timescales it appears you must first register with the on line licensing system.

- 6.1 Does the PSB have a procedure for complaints regarding licensing decisions? **Yes**
- 6.2 How many clicks is it from the homepage? **2**
- 6.3 How long does it take to find? **<1 minute**
- 6.4 Does it mention that if the complainant is unhappy they can refer to OPSI or APPSI? **Yes**
Please provide a link to the complaints page. If there is no separate licensing complaints page, please link to the general complaints section.

<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/about/contact-us/complaints/complaints-procedure.htm>

7.1 Does the website explain what information is not available? **Yes**

7.2 If Yes, does it explain why? **Yes**

7.3 How many items are listed? **7+**

Please provide a link to the page with this explanation. What is the nature of the unavailable items? Please comment if the nature of the PSB's activity would require a larger/smaller number of exceptions than would be expected. Are the exceptions listed specific, or cover a category?

<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/licenceterms/CCWPS03-00.pdf>

This information was very difficult to find. It appears to be only contained in the standard licence template rather than in a separate document it is also not clearly labelled as the heading used is 'items falling outside of the scope of this licence'.

8.1 Does the website outline any exceptions to normal licensing policy? **Yes**

8.2 If Yes, does it explain why that exception has been made? **Yes**

8.3 How many exceptions are there? **4+**

What is the nature of the exceptions? Are the exceptions specific? Please provide a link to the page

<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/licenceterms/CCWPS03-00.pdf>

Found under Terms & Conditions; Delegated responsibility, legislation i.e. FOI & DPA etc.

9.1 Does the website have a Crown Copyright notice? **Yes**

9.2 Is it linked to from every page? **Yes**

9.3 How many clicks is it from the homepage? **0-1**

9.4 How long does it take to find? **<1 minute**

9.5 Is OPSI/HMSO mentioned, with contact details? **Yes**

- 10.1 Does the website have an electronic search facility? **Yes**
10.2 If yes, how many clicks is it from the homepage? **0-1**
10.3 How long did it take to find? **<1 minute**
Please provide a link for the search page, along with comments on how easy it was to use. If it is not present, does it say why?

<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/>

Easy to use and access. Finds multiple pages which could lead you to related topics.

- 11.1 Is the material available by electronic means? **Yes**
11.2 Is it possible to download direct from the website? **Yes**
11.3 If data is not available electronically, is there an explanation of how to obtain it? **Yes**
11.4 If data is sent via email, is there a specified timescale for delivery? **N/A**
11.5 If yes, what is the timescale **N/A**
Please state any other methods of receiving data. If a timescale is published, to what extent do they meet that commitment?

- 12.1 Does the PSB outline its responsibilities under IFTS on their website?
Yes – all
12.2 Does the website explain what IFTS is aiming to achieve? **Yes**
12.3 Are the benefits of IFTS explained? **No**
12.4 Is the PSB using IFTS logos on their website and actively mentioning they are a member of the scheme? **Yes**
- 13.1 Does the PSB outline its policy towards its trading of PSI? **Yes**
13.2 Does the PSB explain how it arrives at decisions? **No**
13.3 Does the website have an explanation of what re-use is? **No**
13.4 Does the website explain what Crown Copyright is? **Yes**
13.5 Does the website explain why licences are sometimes needed to re-use information? **No**
13.6 Does the website explain the difference between FOI and re-use? **No**
13.7 Does the website explain what a trading fund and delegated authority is? **No**
Please provide a link to any explanations here.

Please enter any comments that you may have about the website, and how it promotes re-use of PSI, explains the processes of licensing and what it says about IFTS.

This is a well organised and informative site. Navigation is good and everything is easily accessible mostly within 3 clicks. Plain English is used throughout so that content is easily understood. It promotes the re-use of government information by providing links to all relevant material including access to info route.

The only short coming is that the distinction between FOI and re-use is not given and the reason for licensing re-use is not explained.