



Information Fair Trader Scheme

Verification of commitment to information fair trading

Met Office
September 2007

Unlocking the potential of public sector information



PART ONE: INTRODUCTION	3
PART TWO: KEY CHANGES	5
PART THREE: HIGHLIGHTS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT	6
PART FOUR: PROGRESS	10
APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED ACTIONS	15
APPENDIX 2: LICENCE REVIEW	16
APPENDIX 3: IFTS WEBSITE ASSESSMENT	20

Visit: September 2007
Published: February 2008
© Crown copyright 2008

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. IFTS is also the mechanism by which the Controller of HMSO regulates those Crown bodies with a delegation to administer their own licensing. All such bodies with a delegation must remain accredited to the Scheme. The Met Office has a delegation.

First verification

3. The Met Office was first verified in November 2004 and was accredited to the Scheme.

Re-verification

4. 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 Met Office was last re-verified in November 2005 and was re-accredited to the Scheme. The recommendations made at that verification and the progress the Met Office has made in meeting them can be found in Part Four.
5. The frequency of re-verification is based on several risk factors. These include the complexity of the system that is in place to licence public sector information, how critical the information is to the body in question, the standard of compliance with recommendations from the previous verification, and the degree of policy change that is envisaged. The Met Office is assessed as being medium risk.

Licensing Activity at the Met Office

6. The Met Office makes a distinction between information that is classed as a) "public task" - much of the data which it categorises as "raw" data and its catalogue of standard "value-added" data products and b) its overtly commercial services, many of which involve the provision of "competed", "bespoke" services.
7. Central to the Met Office's public task is its role as the UK's National Meteorological Service, delivering the National Meteorological Programme and the Public Meteorological Service. While some work that it does for government bodies is competed, its non-competed activity includes the provision of services to the MoD and other departments. There is then a separate activity, the commercial business of the Met Office, all of which is competed. It maintains accounting separation so that the commercial strand is not given an

advantage and there is a detailed agreement in place which documents the terms on which wholesale data is supplied and the prices that the commercial division is charged for it.

8. The focus of our verification work on this visit was the wholesale, value-added and bespoke material that the Met Office produces built around weather forecasting. However, historical climate change information is becoming increasingly important and the IFTS team would expect to look in more detail at how the licensing of this material is carried out at its next visit.

Overall Assessment

9. The Met Office's overall approach to making information available for re-use is to be commended. In making a clear separation between information that is classed as part of its public task and that which forms part of its overtly commercial services, it is able to provide the potential re-user with a degree of confidence that information will be supplied externally on the same basis as it is supplied to its commercial division.
10. In terms of specific recommendations which were made to support the principles of IFTS at the previous verification, a number of these have been dealt with since our last visit and in others the direction of travel is positive. There remain a small number of ongoing recommendations and a few arising from this visit, as detailed in this report. We are also happy to note a number of instances of good practice.
11. Based on the team's assessment, the Met Office is re-accredited to IFTS and should be re-verified in 2-3 years.

PART TWO: KEY CHANGES

12. Since our last visit, the Met Office has been relatively stable in terms of its organisational structure and policy stance.
13. The acting Chief Executive, who was in post at the time of our last visit, remained in post until the last day of this visit and the policy of separating public task and non-public task activities has been maintained during this period. There is now a new permanent Chief Executive who we are advised will be briefed on the requirements of IFTS.
14. The Intellectual Property Rights Manager, a new role responsible for the day-to-day administration of IP issues within the Met Office, has now been in post for two years.
15. A new Head of Legal and Procurement was appointed in January 2007.
16. It was pointed out that it is the external policy landscape which is more volatile as the Met Office seeks to gauge the impact of the OFT Commercial Use of Public Information (CUPI) report, the Power of Information review, the research that has been commissioned on Trading Fund charging policy, the ongoing revision of Treasury guidance on fees and charging, and the implementation of the INSPIRE Directive.

PART THREE: HIGHLIGHTS AND AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Openness

17. The Met Office takes a positive approach to making information available for re-use. It makes a clear separation between information that is classed as “public task” – much of the data which it categorises as “raw” data and its catalogue of standard “added-value” data products and its overtly commercial services, many of which involve the provision of a “bespoke” product.
18. There is a considerable amount of documentation available to staff involved in the licensing of data and numerous references to treating the commercial part of the Met Office in the same way as an external private sector customer. This philosophy was borne out in the interviews that were conducted. Interviewees demonstrated a high level of awareness of the distinction between the public task and commercial activities of the Met Office and we were given an overview of how information is broken down and costed to support this approach. We also saw a detailed agreement which documents the terms on which wholesale data is supplied, and the prices that are charged, to the commercial division.
19. We found that all the people we spoke to were happy to answer our questions and supply us with any documentation that we asked for. This suggests a working environment where staff are open to scrutiny.
20. The Met Office makes a large amount of material available on its website for prospective re-users of information. In the case of the data that it makes available through ECOMET, it redirects prospective customers to that organisation’s internet pages. Although it does not have a formal Information Asset Register (IAR), its comprehensive catalogue and supporting information serves as a useful resource for those seeking to re-use data.

Fairness

21. In terms of the time taken to process applications for licences, the evidence that we saw was that these are dealt with according to reasonable timescales. Where there are delays, these generally occur for two reasons. Firstly, in the provision of wholesale data, prospective licensees are given the opportunity to evaluate data prior to signing a formal agreement and this can take some time. Secondly, in its provision of bespoke services, if there are novel requirements, these need to be evaluated and developed on a project basis. This can be time-consuming as the proposal works its way through the project management cycle. There are few instances of complaints being raised about timeliness of delivery. Therefore we find that the Met Office operates well in expediting the provision of information for re-use.
22. As far as the “wholesale” data is concerned, pricing of these products is standardised and made available on fixed terms and conditions.

Once the cost of the data components has been set, the price of a particular contract is determined by a piece of software which calculates the cost according to which variables are input. There are discounts available, by volume, for example, but they are standardised.

23. At the time of our last report, the Met Office was planning to make some changes to the way raw data was charged for. The delivery charge for raw data was a straight 20% of the licence fee. The drawback of this approach was that there was no direct link to individual delivery cost. The proposal was to move to a volume based delivery charge. Since then, the Met Office has carried out further internal analysis of this question and recommendations have been put forward for decision at executive level. It has been decided not to change the delivery charge for raw data. **It is recommended that the Met Office shares its analysis of the question of delivery charges for raw data with OSPI.**
24. The Met Office's approach to commercial pricing and discounting is discussed in more detail below at paragraph 25. **We recommend that the Met Office reviews its policy of giving account managers discretion to discount within a percentage banding based on length of contract and considers a standard discounting scale. It should also look at defining the criteria for trial period extensions more precisely.**

Transparency

25. In the realm of commercial pricing, the Met Office's marketing managers set prices for particular products or services based on a system of Target Average Pricing (TAP) within an expected minimum and maximum range. They will not generally depart from this approach unless there are sound market reasons for doing so, and such exceptions normally need to be approved by the Price Controller. However, in terms of discounting, account managers have a banding within which they can work to offer discounting according to length of contract. The trial period of the licence can also be extended, subject to approval by the Head of Business Management. As such, the Met Office takes a relatively consistent approach to the pricing of such material and it has protocols in place to deal with unusual cases, including reference to its Bid and Investment Appraisal Committee (BIAC).
26. The Met Office would argue that, having classified such material as outside of its public task, and being careful to avoid exclusive arrangements and the unnecessary restriction of competition, it need not maintain a rigid pricing structure or publish a breakdown of precisely how it formulates its prices in this area. We can certainly confirm that marketing managers receive detailed internal guidance to ensure that they comply with the provisions of the Public Sector Information Regulations and competition law. However, taking into account the commercial sensitivities that apply to this part of its work, **we recommend that the Met Office considers publishing more information about its approach to commercial pricing, including a**

fuller description of its Target Average Pricing (TAP) model. This will promote transparency about what we regard as a model that supports consistency of pricing.

Compliance

27. There is a well-defined process for formally delegating authority within the Met Office and this, in the sphere of licensing policy and administration, helps to ensure that risk is well-managed and that the process is dealt with in a timely way. Similarly, there are detailed procedures in place for employees to escalate pricing decisions and contractual questions to the appropriate point of contact. There was a high degree of awareness of the delegation process and a good knowledge of which people should deal with pricing and licensing questions. During the course of our licence file reviews we found a number of instances of referrals being made to IPR staff for advice and positive interventions by them to modify draft contracts.
28. While the Met Office has made very good progress in recent years in establishing a strong framework to promote consistent pricing and licensing decisions, our previous report found that the systematic review of these by managers was not always possible during busy periods. It was not clear that the day-to-day application of policies was being pro-actively quality assured. In April of 2007 an internal report was produced. The Head of Business Management had commissioned a “health check” of commercial pricing by an audit firm. This was with a view to assessing whether there was any inconsistency in commercial pricing policy and practice. The review identified some problems in defining the price controller role of marketing managers, the operation of the mechanics of Target Average Pricing (TAP), and ensuring that price lists are updated, circulated and implemented on a consistent cycle. An action plan was drawn up and significant progress against this action plan has already been made.
29. We welcome the approach that the Met Office has adopted in commissioning the above review. **We regard it as an example of good practice, indicative of an organisation constantly seeking to improve its processes.**
30. Progress is being made towards recording and storing licence file records more consistently. The Met Office is gradually migrating its records to its electronic records management system called Goldmine and has an approach which corporately rewards its use. However, some files continue to be stored locally and where they are recorded on a database, not all the fields are fully populated. While the information that we reviewed as part of our licence file work on site demonstrated compliance with good licensing policies, more comprehensive and accessible records would support the further evidencing of this state of affairs. **We recommend that the Met Office reviews the consistency of its records as part of the process of migrating information to Goldmine.**

31. One aspect of promoting a good level of compliance with published procedures is to foster the development of in-house expertise in intellectual property as a basis for good quality training and development. The Met Office has continued to do this since our last report. Corporate responsibility for licensing is held by the Head of Legal and Procurement, a qualified solicitor who has been with the Met Office since January 2007. It has an Intellectual Property Rights Manager who has been in post for two years. The IPR Manager has been mentored by an intellectual property specialist based at the MoD and is about to embark on a course of study to gain a certificate in intellectual property, leading ultimately to part qualification as a patent attorney. The Licensing Advisor is also studying law. **We find the Met Office's development of licensing expertise and its support for the gaining of professional qualifications to be examples of good practice.**
32. We have carried out a licence review using examples of licences that are in use within the Met Office. This appears as Appendix 2 to this report. **It is recommended that the Met Office reviews the points raised in the licence review, including the suggestion that the criteria for deciding upon the required terms of payment should be clearly defined.**
33. We have carried out a website review, as reported in Appendix 3. **We recommend that, looking at its website, the Met Office considers:**
- **Providing indicative timescales for the supply of its data or services**
 - **making use of the IFTS logo, which it is entitled to use, and offering more information about the perceived benefits of IFTS**
34. We note that at the time of our website review, the IFTS commitment was signed by the last permanent chief executive. This has now been amended to show the name of the current chief executive.

Challenge

35. The Met Office has a sound process in place for dealing with complaints and recording positive feedback. It is well documented, including a flow chart which supports the process of evaluating complaints properly and referring them to the right parts of the organisation for action.
36. Those we spoke to were aware of who complaints should be referred to. While there could be a potential resource issue in dealing with the volume of complaints, which have slightly increased in recent months, those which related to licensing were handled appropriately and on reasonable timescales. Both the complaints and licensing sections of the website state that where the Met Office's complaints procedure has been exhausted, licensing complaints can be referred to OPSI. Efforts have also been made to promote awareness of OPSI's complaint-handling role via the intranet and in training courses.

PART FOUR: PROGRESS

Recommendations of previous verification and if they have been met.

Principle	Ref	Recommendation	Priority	Action Taken	Status
Progress	Part Four	It is recommended that the Met Office implement all outstanding recommendations of the last verification (some of which are also covered in this report).	H	All outstanding actions from the last verification are regarded as having been implemented or rolled forward to this report.	Complete
Fairness	10	The Met Office should continue to ensure that any training programme makes it very clear to account managers that they need to treat all customers fairly and apply charges consistently.	L	The Met Office has trained fifty staff in the commercial area in PSI, contracts and IPR. All those in receipt of a sales delegation receive training including a PowerPoint presentation on the key points. Training has also been delivered to the research department and other relevant staff are in line for training..	Complete

11	It is recommended that the Met Office implement planned changes to the way raw data is charged for (specifically delivery charges) as soon as possible.	M	The Met Office has carried out further internal analysis of this question and recommendations have been put forward for decision at executive level. It has been decided to stick with the original method of charging for the delivery of raw data. This report contains a recommendation that the Met Office shares its analysis of the question with us.	Ongoing
12	It is important that the Met Office library includes Crown copyright notices stating that a licence is required. Alternatively, it may be that the account managers have misunderstood what the library is releasing, in which case this can be resolved by internal training.	M	This was a misunderstanding and the library and archives have been informed.	Complete

Transparency	16	<p>It is recommended that the Met Office make these suggested changes to the website.</p> <p>The website should state that the Met Office will respond to requests to re-use information within 20 working days as required under the PSI Regulations, (Regulation 8).</p> <p>The Met Office should consider referring to the PSI Regulations on the Licensing page.</p>	M	Changes have been made to the website.	Complete
	17	Met Office should work closely with OPSI to monitor development of the IAR and keep up to date with emerging policy in this area. The Met Office should be prepared to produce an IAR if necessary, as agreed with OPSI.	H	Dialogue on this question is ongoing. The Met Office feels that its catalogued information available on the internet meets many of the requirements of an IAR and OPSI is reviewing its policy in this area.	Ongoing
	19	It is recommended that the Met Office revise the wording of the licences in line with the comments in the Licence Review section.	M	This forms part of the Head of Customer Contracting's objectives and work is underway to tackle this issue with new contracts being issued with better wording.	Part complete

20	Adopt a co-ordinated approach to managing licensing files as soon as possible.	H	Now scanning all customer licences so they can be stored in one place. Staff are still using their own filing systems but the Met Office is improving this situation with more documents being stored in Goldmine, the organisation's electronic records management system.	Ongoing
21	It is recommended that the Met Office standardise its approach to customer filing in order to provide a clearer audit trail. It is recommended that files include clear procedure checklists and that procedures are standardised across the sales area in order to promote a clear audit trail.	M	The Met Office has a business management system, "Process Sales Orders" which effectively performs the function of a procedural checklist. The question of consistency of files will be addressed as part of the work to migrate information to Goldmine.	Ongoing
22	Where it is deemed necessary then it is important to ensure that the IPR clauses reflect Crown copyright policy and that there is nothing to conflict with IFTS or PSI principles.	M	All contracts are being passed through the IPR section. Anything non-standard goes to the IPR Manager.	Complete

Challenge	23	OPSI would be interested in seeing the results of the internal review of account managers as part of its monitoring of the implementation of the recommendations in this report.	M	An audit firm has carried out an internal review of commercial pricing policy and procedures, producing a report in April of 2007. OPSI has had sight of this report which generated an action plan that is in the process of being implemented.	Complete
	26	It is recommended that staff awareness be raised through a programme of training which should include elements on the PSI Regulations and IFTS.	H	This has been taken forward and new starters are made aware of the PSI Regulations and IFTS.	Complete
	27	Staff should be made aware that customer may refer their complaints to OPSI and should inform them of this if a complaint is received.	L	An announcement has been made on MetNet and during the training sessions, the trainer is emphasising the OPSI role.	Complete

APPENDIX 1: 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.

Principle	Ref	Recommendation	Priority
Fairness	23	It is recommended that the Met Office shares its analysis of the question of delivery charges for raw data with OSPI.	M
	24	We recommend that the Met Office reviews its policy of giving account managers discretion to discount within a percentage banding based on length of contract and considers a standard discounting scale. It should also look at defining the criteria for trial period extensions more precisely.	M
Transparency	26	We recommend that the Met Office considers publishing more information about its approach to commercial pricing, including a fuller description of its Target Average Pricing (TAP) model.	M
Compliance	30	We recommend that the Met Office reviews the consistency of its records as part of the process of migrating information to Goldmine.	M
	32	It is recommended that the Met Office reviews the points raised in the licence review, including the suggestion that the criteria for deciding upon the required terms of payment should be clearly defined.	M
	33	We recommend that, looking at its website, the Met Office considers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing indicative timescales for the supply of its data or services • making use of the IFTS logo, which it is entitled to use, and offering more information about the perceived benefits of IFTS 	L

APPENDIX 2: LICENCE REVIEW

REVIEW OF MET OFFICE STANDARD LICENCES

Licence reviewed: Standard Terms and Conditions

We last reviewed this document in January 2006. Since then the Met Office has replaced the American spelling of “license” with the English spelling “licence” in the heading of clause 5 and in clause 5.1.

Evaluation Criteria

1. Clarity of licence terms

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

The licence is written in plain English and avoids the use of legalistic language. In our previous review, we said that the definition of “Intellectual Property Rights” was quite long and suggested that the Met Office should consider having a separate definition of Crown copyright. The Met Office has decided not to include a separate definition of Crown copyright.

We pointed out in our previous review that clause 6.1 included a reference to “Consultancy Services” but this was not included in the list of definitions at clause 1. This is still the case.

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?

We suggested in our last review that at clause 5.4 “it would be more appropriate to change the acknowledgement to © Crown copyright [date]. Source: the Met Office”. The reason for this is that licensees will re-using Met Office data.

3. Fairness

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

The standard terms and conditions do not appear to favour any particular types of re-user. However, we commented last time that the Met Office has “absolute discretion” on whether payments for services are paid by invoice.

This could give rise to unfairness and the criteria for deciding upon the required terms of payment should be clearly defined.

4. Consistency

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

In our previous review of the standard terms and conditions, we drew attention to the fact that the definition of “Order” at Clause 1 covers requests made “verbally” but that Clause 2.2 says “accept an Order in writing”.

5. Practical Arrangements

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

It is not clear what the usual arrangements are for making payments.

6. Restrictiveness of terms

Are any of the terms unnecessarily restrictive?

There are no particularly restrictive terms. The “Permitted Use” is set out in a separate document which is attached to the individual licence. It is assumed that terms and conditions of each permitted use are consistently applied.

Date: 24 September 2007

REVIEW OF MET OFFICE STANDARD LICENCES

Licence reviewed: Commercial Licensing Agreement: Met Office's Earth System Modelling Software

This is an actual licence made 15 March 2007 between Met Office PWS and Met Office Commercial.

Note: The introduction to this licence states that in order to satisfy its obligations under the PSI Regs 2005 and to avoid potential challenges from competitors under competition legislation, and under articles of the the EC Treaty, the Met Office needs to maintain a strict separation between its public task and commercial activities. It also makes clear that, as the Met Office Commercial is not a separate legal entity, it is not possible to have a legally enforceable licence and that is why certain clauses "shall not apply".

This licence demonstrates that the Met Office is aware of the requirements of the PSI Regs.

The comments set out below are made as if we were commenting on a template software licence.

Evaluation Criteria

1. Clarity of licence terms

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

The licence is written in plain English and avoids the use of legalistic language. It contains clear and useful definitions at clause 1. There is a concise definition of "Commercial".

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?

There are no significant omissions. It contains all the terms and conditions you would expect to find in this type of licence.

3. Fairness

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

There do not appear to be any unfair terms. It shows that Met Office treats its commercial arm on the same basis as other potential customers.

4. Consistency

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

For greater consistency, the description of the parties on the front page should be changed so that the terms “the Met Office PWS” and “the Met Office Commercial” are used throughout.

5. Practical Arrangements

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

The licence does not state where payment should be sent as this is an internal agreement.

The licence has provision for the making of changes to its terms.

Clause 24 sets out arrangements for dispute resolution.

6. Restrictiveness of terms

Are any of the terms unnecessarily restrictive?

Clause 12.5 refers to “Ministry of Defence security grounds”. This is not unnecessarily restrictive but it should be made clear in clause 9 (Licensee Obligations) that the Licensee is required to comply with MoD security restrictions. These restrictions should be brought to the Licensee’s attention before the agreement is signed.

Date: 26 September 2007

APPENDIX 3: IFTS WEBSITE ASSESSMENT

Organisation: **Met Office**
Site available at: www.metoffice.gov.uk
Date assessed: **6th September 2007**

- 1.1 Does the website have an Information Asset Register? No
- 1.2 If yes, how many clicks is it from the homepage? (0-1) (2) (3) (4+) (N/A)
- 1.3 How long did it take to find? (<1 minute) (1-2 minutes) (2-4 minutes) (4+ minutes) (N/A)
- 1.4 If there is no IAR, is there other guidance on what information is available? *Yes. There are descriptions of the categories of information that the Met Office utilises to provide meteorological services to various sectors. There is a comprehensive catalogue of data available via a link to the ECOMET website of which the Met Office is a member*
- 2.1 Does the PSB use standard licences? Yes
<http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/legal/licences.html>
- 2.2 Are these published in full on the website Yes
- 2.3 If yes, how many clicks are they from the homepage? 3
- 2.4 How long does it take to find? 2-4 minutes
- 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
- 3.1 Is there any charge made for licences? Yes
*http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/legal/data_policy_POLOS.pdf
http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/legal/pricing_policy.html*
- 3.2 Is there an explanation of the charges? Yes
- 3.3 Is there an explanation of how charges are drawn up? Yes
- 4.1 Is there an IFTS commitment on the website? Yes. *Name of chief executive needs to be updated.*
- 4.2 How many clicks is it from the homepage? 3
- 4.3 How long does it take to find? 1-2 minutes
http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/legal/fair_trader.html
- 5.1 Is there clear and precise information on how to apply for a re-use licence?
Yes http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/legal/pricing_policy.html
- 5.2 Are there a variety of methods for applying for licences? Yes
- 5.3 Is it possible to apply online for a licence? Yes
http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/legal/repro_licence.html
- 5.4 Does it specify a timescale to grant licences? Yes
- 5.5 If yes, what is that timescale (in working days)? *Within 20*

- 6.1 Does the PSB have a procedure for complaints regarding licensing decisions? Yes
- 6.2 How many clicks is it from the homepage? 4
- 6.3 How long does it take to find? 1-2 minutes
- 6.4 Does it mention that if the complainant is unhappy they can refer to OPSI or APPSI? Yes
http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/legal/pricing_policy.html
- 7.1 Does the website explain what information is not available? Yes
http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/legal/data_policy_POLOS.pdf
- 7.2 If Yes, does it explain why? Yes
- 7.3 How many items are listed? 3
Footnote explains reasons for exceptions or potential exceptions.
- 8.1 Does the website outline any exceptions to normal licensing policy? Yes
http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/legal/pricing_policy.html
- 8.2 If Yes, does it explain why that exception has been made? Yes
- 8.3 How many exceptions are there? 4
- 9.1 Does the website have a Crown Copyright notice? Yes
http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/legal/index.html
- 9.2 Is it linked to from every page? Yes
- 9.3 How many clicks is it from the homepage? 0
- 9.4 How long does it take to find? <1 minute
- 9.5 Is OPSI/HMSO mentioned, with contact details? *Yes, via a link to the OPSI website*
- 10.1 Does the website have an electronic search facility? Yes
- 10.2 If yes, how many clicks is it from the homepage? 0
- 10.3 How long did it take to find? <1 minute
Present on homepage and all subsequent pages.
- 11.1 Is the material available by electronic means? Yes
- 11.2 Is it possible to download direct from the website? *Some material, for educational and research purposes, is viewable online or downloadable*
- 11.3 If data is not available electronically, is there an explanation of how to obtain it? N/A
- 11.4 If data is sent via email, is there a specified timescale for delivery?
Data that is used commercially is usually transferred electronically as opposed to being e-mailed
- 11.5 If yes, what is the timescale (In working days)? *Text indicates that this is a very fast process once set up. An indication of how long it takes to establish access could be useful*
- 12.1 Does the PSB outline its responsibilities under IFTS on their website? Yes
- 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? *Not using the IFTS logo*
- 13.1 Does the PSB outline its policy towards its trading of PSI? Yes
http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/legal/pricing_policy.html
- 13.2 Does the PSB explain how it arrives at decisions? Yes
http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/legal/data_policy_POLOS.pdf
- 13.3 Does the website have an explanation of what re-use is? Yes
<http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/legal/licences.html>
- 13.4 Does the website explain what Crown Copyright is? *Yes, via a link to the OPSI website*
- 13.5 Does the website explain why licences are sometimes needed to re-use information? Yes
http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/legal/data_policy_POLOS.pdf
- 13.6 Does the website explain the difference between FOI and re-use? *Not as such, but it does detail the two concepts separately on its website.*
- 13.7 Does the website explain what a trading fund and delegated authority is? Yes
<http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/corporate/legal/framework.pdf>

This is a comprehensive website operating in line with the principles of the Information Fair Trader Scheme. It has useful information on intellectual property rights and the relevant legislation. It provides links to the OPSI website should users be searching for further information on Crown copyright. There are strong sections on the licensing policies of the Met Office and the range of products and services that are available. Where data is provided from its catalogue or as part of an established commercial service, it may be useful to provide indicative timescales in working days for setting up access/receiving the service. The Met Office could also consider making use of the IFTS logo, which it is entitled to use, and offering more information about the perceived benefits of IFTS.