

Organisation (if applicable):

CycleStreets Ltd

Ofcom may publish a response summary:

Yes

I confirm that I have read the declaration:

Yes

Additional comments:

Question 3.1: We welcome views from stakeholders on whether the setting of quality targets for PAF would be constructive. If so, would stakeholders find the publication of achievement against those targets helpful? Please state why:

Question 6.1: Do stakeholders agree with our analysis of the options for cost recovery against the principles of cost causation, and our proposal on cost recovery? Please give reasons for your response:

Question 7.1: Do stakeholders agree with our proposed approach to the terms on which PAF is made available, and our guidance on those terms? Please give reasons for your response:

No. We believe the PAF should be Open Data licensed under the Open Government Licence (OGL). The current proposals are out of line with the thrust of government policy. It is now an anachronism that what is now such a key requirement of the national infrastructure should still be subject to such restrictive availability.

We note the irony that, having invented the postcode system for its own convenience, and strongly encouraged everyone to use it, Royal Mail has effectively created a new monopoly market beyond its original intentions, that everyone is effectively locked-in to.

The current licensing arrangements are effectively a tax that particularly affects newly-starting businesses and not-for-profit organisations.

The opening up of basic postcode data was, for us as a not-for-profit social enterprise, a major boost to the services we could offer. We were not in a financial position, as a start-up, to offer even a basic postcode lookup. The opening up of that data, at such a small cost to the public purse, will surely have meant that a large number of organisations like our own have benefited, to the overall benefit of public efficiency.