

# **MEDIN's Response to the Data Policy Study Report,**

## **November 2010**

### **Contents**

1. Introduction
2. Overview (D Cotton)
3. Detailed Comments (M Osborne)  
*High priority Recommendations (Ranked 4,5)*  
*Recommendations ranked 1-3*

### **1. Introduction**

The Marine Environmental Data Information Network (MEDIN) commissioned an independent study to investigate and report on available guidance and approaches to data policy in the marine sector in relation to the wider re-use of marine environmental data. The study was undertaken by The GeoData Institute and The Crown Estate between May and August 2010 and involved interviewing 21 public bodies, 6 private companies and 1 charity.

The MEDIN Executive Committee considered a draft (version 3) of the study report on 3 Sep 2010. Given the sensitivity of the study and the likely importance of its findings with regard to MEDIN's aims and priorities, the committee considered that a formal response to the study's findings was warranted. The study's recommendations and MEDIN's response are contained in this document.

The study and this response are being used to inform the MEDIN business plan for 2011-2014 and as input to discussions around whether MEDIN should take on the development of an information policy for UK marine science, as requested by the Marine Science Coordination Committee (MSCC). Such a policy could form part of the Marine Policy Statement (UK) which is presently under consultation.

The following sections summarise the study's recommendations that are divided into key areas covering:

1. Access policies
2. Operational approaches
3. Best practice initiatives
4. Licensing and pricing

Section 2 of this paper contains a brief initial response with an indication of which MEDIN Work Stream will take up any necessary further action.

Section 3 contains a more detailed commentary, provided by Mike Osborne

## 2. Overview ( D Cotton)

Access Policies		Who/ What
1.	Pan Government Marine Data Plan	<b>WS 7 MEDIN Exec Team:</b> Could be included in Marine Data Strategy the MEDIN is proposing to generate for MSCC consideration
2.	MEDIN partners each to produce data asset list, identifying which data they hold are Public Task (PSI)	<b>WS 3 /2 MEDIN Portal / stds:</b> Does this recommendation need to be revised in the light of the new govt requirement to make all data generated by public funding openly available? Could be established whilst collecting metadata information on data holdings? Should it be included in discovery metadata information?
3.	Coordination with other data publication initiatives	<b>WS 7 MEDIN Exec Team / Core Team:</b> To ensure coordination
4.	Clarify correct DAC contacts within metadata	<b>WS 1 / 2MEDIN DAC / portal:</b> To ensure DACS have correct arrangements and contact information is correctly entered.
5.	Provision of no charge, freely available, quality assured national datasets e.g. bathymetry and wrecks	<b>WS 5 Resources and Applications:</b> To follow up
6.	Clear definition of data policy within data organizations and consistent application	<b>WS 7 MEDIN Exec Team</b> Partnership agreement requires partners define and apply clear data policy. UKLP working towards a set of common definitions
7.	Need a process to raise issues on access to public data	<b>WS 7 MEDIN Exec Team</b> Issue to pass to MSCC? Could be included in data strategy

Operational Approaches		Who / What
1.	Tools and support to ensure compliancy with INSPIRE requirements	<b>WS 2 Standards / WS 7:</b> WS2 has developed metadata tools, and is following INSPIRE implementation. DC is following developments on UKLP
2.	Clear overview of different portals and links between them	<b>WS 2 Standards:</b> Medin portal review could include a wider look at external portal capabilities and links? Use of DACS and their adoption of OGC standards will help significantly.
3.	Make it a contractual requirement for contractors to lodge data within MEDIN DACs	<b>WS1 DACs/ WS 7 Exec Team:</b> Is included in partnership agreement and data clause. Need to ensure DACs can accept data and that cost implications (to data suppliers) are understood
4.	Hold standardized versions of frequently requested datasets	<b>WS 1 DACs/ WS 5 Res &amp; Apps:</b> Need DACS to consider how this fits with existing arrangements. Need WS 5 to consider how it applies to reference data.
5.	Data enquiry pages to request user information	<b>WS1 DACs WS3 Portal:</b> Not currently planned, do we need to reconsider? DACs keep information on requests (e.g. what requested and by who, and if they are prepared to say, why using)

Best Practice Initiatives		Who / What
1.	Single INSPIRE compliant common metadata standard probably is used across the sector	<b>WS 2 Standards:</b> Done. Now need to encourage adoption across sector.
2.	Coordination with other relevant standards and provision of translation tools	<b>WS 2 Standards:</b> Part of the WS plans. Links to translation tools are provided on the web site, but MEDIN does not plan to create translation tools. Note that International Standards should conform to ISO anyway.

Pricing and Licensing		Who / What
1.	Pan-government terms to avoid ongoing unrealistic charges for licensing their data to other government organisations.	<b>WS 7 Exec Team / MSCC:</b> Some ongoing initiatives. How does MEDIN influence?
2.	Ensure consistency / transparency for recouping marginal costs for data provision	<b>WS 1 DACs / WS 7:</b> DACs could publish these in annual MEDIN reports? More complicated issue for derived products.
3.	Data Charging and competition law	<b>WS 7:</b> MEDIN to date has been agnostic on data charging policies. Something that could be raised in the Data Strategy paper for MSCC?

### 3. Detailed Comments –Mike Osborne

MEDIN’s response is included as a separate column with some general comments and conclusions presented at the end the document.

The recommendations are ranked from 1 to 5 with 1 being low priority and 5 being high. Ranking values are based upon the author’s opinion based on comments during interviews. Those ranked 3 to 1 are in Annex 7 of the report.

#### *High priority Recommendations (Ranked 4,5)*

#### **1. Access policies**

No.	Report recommendation	MEDIN response
1.	Putting a pan-government marine data plan in place will lever the importance of marine data management. Rank = 5.	<p>MSCC has asked MEDIN to consider whether there is the need for a marine data strategy and these deliberations are ongoing. Such a strategy would define the plan but strong leadership, resources and the cooperation of all parties would be required for it to be successfully implemented.</p> <p>The MEDIN Business Plan is in effect the marine data plan. Such a strategy / plan could form part of the Marine Policy Statement (UK) which is presently under consultation. MMO or Defra could lead. Scope – to provide and compile national data layers; to establish common data sharing policies and licence(s) to allow for improved data exchange. Cooperation by marine data group MoU?</p>
2.	Organisations to declare what data they hold is PSI (Public Task) on an asset list with INSPIRE compliant metadata. This might usefully be the extension of the Information Asset Register (IAR) and co-ordination of information relevant to Freedom of Information Act (2000) Publication Scheme compliance and the Environment Information Regulations. Common standards should be used to present such IAR and related information so that interoperable searches can be generated. If all of an organisation’s data is PSI then this should be clearly stated. Equally, other information that is produced (either in raw form or post processed) that is deemed to fall outside these publication or re-use obligations needs to be identified. Raw public data has no intellectual property rights. It is important to clarify who is adding value and what that value is. For example, if data is not PSI, such as MCA Automatic Information System (AIS; ship track and	<p>MEDIN is encouraging public bodies to comply with their obligations under FOI, EIR and ROPSI, including identifying public data sets that are of interest to the marine community, working with data providers to release this data in a coordinated way (preferably under the new Government Open Licence), distinguishing between raw and value added data sets. It is also providing the standards and tools to support the creation of metadata, and the means to publish this data via the MEDIN portal. To avoid replication, integration of the MEDIN and data.gov.uk portals (which will now include the UK Location portal) is essential.</p> <p>The MEDIN Business Plan identifies greater collaboration between MEDIN and wider Government data sharing initiatives and the creation of core reference and other essential datasets. Both will help identify where data is held and encourage its release.</p>

No.	Report recommendation	MEDIN response
	<p>other information) data, then a record is available of the reasoning so that every time this issue is raised the process of investigating it does not need to be repeated. Rank = 5.</p>	
3.	<p>Investigation to be completed into the most efficient and cost effective method of improving access to and disseminating marine (and other data theme types). There must be many sector-specific organisations like MEDIN focussing on themed data, is this the most efficient way to work or is the data.gov.uk approach a better model? Coordination of similar activities is paramount. This is probably a UKLP or LWEC task. Rank = 5.</p>	<p>It is true MEDIN is focussed on meeting the needs of the marine sector and, having done so for many years, is arguably ahead of initiatives such as UKLP and data.gov.uk, whose aims are similar and encompassed within the MEDIN aims. The marine sector is mentioned in the UK Location Strategy and MEDIN was involved in the development of the conceptual design for the UK Location Infrastructure.</p> <p>Presently, MEDIN is represented on the UKLP Interoperability Board (D Cotton) and User Group (M Osborne). Through these groups and directly MEDIN is promoting the marine sector's interests is these and helping to ensure that applications and resources are interoperable and wherever possible re-used.</p> <p>MEDIN is best placed to consult and advise on the needs of the marine sector. It has the expertise and knowledge to define the sources and specifications for reference data (for example) and is in touch with users to monitor improvements in a way that cross-sectoral initiatives cannot.</p> <p>The MEDIN Business Plan identifies the importance of coordinating effort and development with UKLP and Defra's Data Sharing and Evidence Group generally.</p>
4.	<p>Despite metadata records of the data distributor these may not reflect the current position or contact unless metadata is updated, especially if the data is passed to DACs with existing metadata, yet the DAC becomes the point of contact. There is a need to make clearer the correct contacts for obtaining data and for data specific records of licence terms where there are restrictions beyond a simple licence condition (i.e. third party rights). In the larger disparate organisations this can be problematic and issues such as time taken to locate the right person, and senior staff not being involved in the data release process when they should have been. This could be done from a web page with a generic contact email. This would also ensure that internal procedures for approval of data release are channelled through the correct individuals. Rank = 5.</p>	<p>It is true that data management practices within many organisations, not just in the public sector, are along way from what is required. This is exacerbated by a lack of knowledge and expertise and little recognition of the importance of data management at director level. MEDIN is attempting to change this by promoting the benefits of best practice and data sharing, including promoting the need for common and published licensed terms (such as those of the Open Government Licence released by the National Archive based on Creative Commons) and providing the tools and means for organisations to produce, publish and update their metadata.</p> <p>The MEDIN Business Plan includes encouraging the creation and publication of metadata (which includes contact information) by marine data holders as a key aim.</p>

No.	Report recommendation	MEDIN response
5.	<p>The provision of no charge, freely available, quality assured national datasets e.g. bathymetry and wrecks, would be of great value to the public and private sector alike. These 'core geospatial data' have been highlighted by the APPSI as essential components to leverage use of thematic data. The key themes for core geospatial data may be similar to those promoted by the INSPIRE annexes, including oceanographic features, administrative boundaries etc. For example, in some cases, rather than purchasing a SeaZone licence, publically available bathymetry datasets serve their purpose but they are not the UK's official dataset. Also, some public datasets, such as wrecks, are only available from SeaZone which significantly limits usage. UK public bodies and companies should be using UK datasets. It is possible that with more raw data being made available that numerous bodies might process the same data for similar processes but end up with slightly different outputs. This should be coordinated to avoid such an outcome and duplication of efforts. For example, if the MMO requires a seasonal sea surface temperature map based on the last 10 years of BODC records who produces the temperature map? Who is going to maintain it? If multiple organisations require these data layers then collaborative funding could realise it and it then becomes publically available for no charge as opposed to selling that map repeatedly on the justification of the value add. Rank = 5.</p>	<p>The identification and provision of core reference geographies is highlighted within the UKLP and elsewhere as being central to the success of an information economy. The benefits of being able to refer to a consistent set of reference data and link other datasets to it are only slowly being recognised, despite the best efforts of some practitioners over many years and the emergence of the semantic web.</p> <p>Many consider that the importance of core geographies means that they should be freely available at no cost to the user. MEDIN agrees with this principle as long as it does not compromise quality and sustainability.</p> <p>MEDIN has identified a set of reference data (or core geographies) for the marine sector which are used by most user most of the time and are essential to all existing and emerging applications e.g. marine planning. However, because of some historical and parochial, as well as commercial imperatives (of the trading funds for example), these datasets do not meet the standard required.</p> <p>MEDIN concurs that opening up of raw data may instigate the creation of similar competing data products. This is a contentious issue and on the face of it may be contrary to the Government efficiency agenda for these products to be either <u>directly or indirectly</u> publicly funded. MEDIN agrees that strong leadership and greater coordination is required to achieve this aim.</p> <p>Contrary to this is the premise of the information economy; i.e. allowing the private sector to add value to PSI and create wealth through innovative <u>and chargeable</u> products and services, including back to the public sector.</p> <p>Immediately then, there is a conflict between what is considered reference data, unique and created at public expense, and what is non-core value added product created by the private sector with the aim of making a profit. The scope of what is considered reference data and whether public sector bodies should add value with the aim of covering costs or making a profit are key issues that MEDIN cannot avoid.</p> <p>The MEDIN Business Plan includes the generation of reference data as a key aim. As much of this data is intended to be made available at no cost to the end user. However, it is important that these datasets are properly supported, maintained and improved to meet the changing needs of users.</p> <p>Note: It is incorrect that wrecks data is only available from SeaZone; the company does not have an exclusive arrangement with UKHO. The</p>

No.	Report recommendation	MEDIN response
		release of UKHO wreck data as a core reference geography would be of considerable benefit.
6.	When data management personnel change the incoming staff can have different drivers. This results in inconsistency in application of policy and hence the services provided. Increased effort must be made to ensure that policy is clearly defined and is transparent for all involved. A common way of working would ease the flow of data. Rank = 4.	MEDIN promotes the uptake of best practice data management and standards, as reflected in the MEDIN Business Plan. Documenting and embodying these within organisational procedures will help to provide consistency over time. It is interesting that the Cabinet Office is now calling for data sharing to be added to organisations' public task.
7.	The process for raising issues in obtaining data from public sector organisations should be made clear to the whole community, e.g. AIS data from the MCA. There is need for greater awareness of the OPSI role in supporting unlocking of PSI, or in supporting application of the regulations and the escalation process of the APPSI. Issues relating to the sensitivity of some of the related data could be acknowledged by providing a scaled down but definitive version of these data, with justification as to what could not be provided. Rank = 4.	MEDIN is promoting the need for organisations to be more open and consistent with regard to their data and to see data as not only there to meet their own internal needs but as a valuable public resource that should be shared. This is consistent with the current Government's transparency agenda and individual departments' data sharing initiatives (e.g. with Defra).  The MEDIN Business Plan identifies the need for departments to cooperate and help deliver MEDIN aims.

## 2. Operational approaches

No.	Report recommendation	MEDIN response
1.	Making existing datasets INSPIRE compliant will require significant resources which is a big issue for some organisations. Support, guidance and tools will for expediting this process would be valued. Rank = 5.	MEDIN is providing tools and standards that are commonly used in data management in collaboration with those being developed under the UK Location Programme.  The MEDIN Business Plan aim to identify the applications and resources that are commonly required and develop these as a central resource.
2.	Many data researchers would prefer as few portals as possible to find and obtain data and formats which are ready for re-use rather than an excel spreadsheet or a pdf for example. This is obviously complex as one user may want completely different products and formats to another. In the absence of such a portal a clearer explanation and interoperation of existing portal initiatives is needed. Rank = 5.	The launch of the MEDIN portal may be seen as exacerbating this problem. However, great care is being taken to ensure that services developed elsewhere are re-used (e.g. NERC data grid, UKLP).  Whilst no single portal could possibly be tailored towards or meet the needs of all users – even across one sector – MEDIN agrees that coordination and interoperability between portals is essential, not only within the UK but including those funded by the EU and other bodies.  The MEDIN Business Plan calls for rationalising portal development, including UKDMOS and

No.	Report recommendation	MEDIN response
		MAGIC, and commits to the sharing of metadata (and data) between MEDIN and the UK Location portals.
3.	Make it a contractual requirement for contractors to post data to MEDIN DACs or similar. Rank = 5.	MEDIN has instigated the data clause that now should be being used in all Government contracts. MEDIN supports extending the data clause to commercial contracts, especially where the data is being used to support a lease or licence application.
4.	To reduce repeat extracting of datasets from an organisation's database, hold standard extracted basic underlying datasets centrally either by the organisation for future dissemination or by a central government portal. This will make more data available to pick up 'off the shelf' without going to the counter and 'asking' for it. From large datasets individuals can then extract what they need. Rank = 4.	<p>A MEDIN aim is to coordinate the production of reference data from raw data. Most users only access raw data to process it into product where no suitable product exists or is too expensive. An approach is to undertake this work centrally, although who should do this value added activity and how it is funded is open to debate (see arguments value added data above).</p> <p>The development of the MEDIN and DAC portals should automate this process so it is quicker and less labour intensive i.e. less costly to operate.</p> <p>The MEDIN Business Plan includes improving access to raw data as well as coordinating and supporting the production of value added reference data sets.</p>
5.	It would be beneficial for data enquiry web pages to request standard information regarding the user and the intended use of the data. At present they can be basic, therefore, a better structure would help all involved; the requestor would be able to better explain their intended usage and the provider could make a more informed analysis of the query and deal with it appropriately. Recording who and for what purpose data is downloaded can feed back into service provision and improve interfacing, but the use of personal data needs to be notified to the downloader. Rank = 4.	<p>MEDIN does not provide a specification for the DAC portals. It is left to the DACs to define the requirements. MEDIN could capture information on users accessing the MEDIN portal but this may be seen as an invasion of privacy and slowing the process of data discovery and access. A voluntary scheme may be preferable or capturing this information periodically from partners.</p> <p>The MEDIN Business Plan requires MEDIN to assess its performance against objectives and solicit feed back from users and considers whether statistics on usage could be captured and published.</p>

### 3. Best practice initiatives

No.	Report recommendation	MEDIN response
1.	That a single common metadata standard probably INSPIRE compliant is used across the sector as far as is practicable. Changing metadata standards once adopted is extremely costly and time	The MEDIN metadata standard was one of the first domain specific profiles based on ISO19115 to adopted and has been updated to comply with UK Gemini 2 standard. It already has wide use including by the international community. That

No.	Report recommendation	MEDIN response
	<p>consuming. The adoption of MEDIN metadata is a central component of the data submission policy but needs wider dissemination and support to encourage the wider marine data community to adopt this as a minimum requirement. Rank = 5.</p>	<p>said, MEDIN believes there is now a need to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Provide tools to make the creation and validation of metadata based on the MEDIN standard as easy as possible for the whole community (and promote the further use of this standard)</li> <li>2) Ensure compatibility between the MEDIN and other ISO based profiles so that metadata harvested on the MEDIN system may be ingested elsewhere e.g. data.gov.uk.</li> <li>3) Extend MEDIN metadata standard to services and provide tools for users to evaluate (and access) data they discover.</li> </ol> <p>The actions above are included in the MEDIN Business Plan.</p>
2.	<p>Work with the European Commission and its working groups setting metadata and data descriptions and to ensure that they are complementary to standards that members of the WMO already have and use which would entail a lot of cost and duplication. A potential solution would be the development of metadata translator software between common standards. Rank = 4.</p>	<p>MEDIN has an international profile and the core team is involved in an umber of international data related initiatives. That said MEDIN agrees that it should promote and actively towards greater interoperability and adoption of standards internationally.</p> <p>WS4 of the MEDIN Business Plan addresses this issue.</p>

#### 4. Pricing and licensing

No.	Report recommendation	MEDIN response
1.	<p>Pan-government terms to avoid ongoing unrealistic charges for licensing their data to other government organisations. Rank = 4.</p>	<p>MEDIN supports such an agreement as it fits well with its aims for reference data and is willing to assist with the effort needed to negotiate such an agreement, probably playing a coordinating or technical advisory role. Any agreement should reflect current Government data sharing and licensing policies.</p> <p>MEDIN is aware that there is an initiative within Defra which if successful would result in an agreement. However, MEDIN is not involved and the status of this initiative is unknown.</p> <p>MEDIN believes there is a need to consider the scope of such any agreement, expanding it to include other departments, NDPBs, NGOs etc, thereby providing easy access to consistent reference data, a key aim for MEDIN and the UKLP.</p>
2.	<p>Marginal costs should be compared across marine public sector organisations by OPSI to see if they are comparable and consistent. The basis for calculating marginal costs should be transparent and equitable between organisations; the</p>	<p>Marine PSI holders are already under pressure to make more of their data freely available, some at no cost.</p> <p>MEDIN's preference is to work with data holders to improve data management practices, create consistency and interoperability especially</p>

No.	Report recommendation	MEDIN response
	<p>IFTS appears to offer an approach, through its audit methods, to encourage consistent approaches between organisations. The charging for data also may need to consider competition law where a commercial organisation may sell equivalent products. However this issue is only likely to occur for products generated outside public task and for derived products rather than raw data, which are still liable for access and RPSI regulations. However this issue is only likely to occur for products generated outside public task and for derived products rather than raw data, which are still liable for access and RPSI regulations. Rank = 4.</p>	<p>between and within reference datasets and to ensure that datasets are supported, maintained and 'strengthened' to meet existing and future user demands.</p> <p>The above aims are included in the MEDIN Business Plan.</p>
3.	<p>The charging for data also may need to consider competition law where a commercial organisation may sell equivalent products. However this issue is only likely to occur for products generated outside public task and for derived products rather than raw data, which are still liable for access and RPSI regulations. Rank = 4.</p>	<p>Clarification and coordination is required to differentiate and document raw data and value added products and services. As stated above, this is a complex area with a fine line between provide the climate for competition and achieving a consistent set of unique reference data, preferably free of charge at the point of use.</p>

### Recommendations ranked 1-3

#### Access policies

No.	Report recommendation	MEDIN response
1.	That limitations on academic information being used for commercial activities are relaxed for public bodies by improving the understanding of what these data will be used for and the public benefits of doing so. Rank = 3.	<p>NERC is in the process of revising its information strategy. MEDIN is involved in the consultation on this and is, according to its aims, requesting that data be made more accessible as early on in the research process as possible. The same is true for Defra funded research and MEDIN is engaging with other departments to adopt a similar position.</p> <p>Interestingly, MEDIN is aware that the Cabinet Office is also looking at ways of freeing up scientific data as part of the Government's Transparency Agenda.</p> <p>The MEDIN Business Plan addresses this through the development of a marine data strategy.</p>
2.	For PSI there ought to be a standard set of procedures across all of government. It is recognised that OPSI and the Cabinet Office have proposed this and Trading Funds have been trying to comply with it. Such procedures should recognise the commercial aspects of Trading Funds. Rank =3.	MEDIN is aware of this and supports its aims. MEDIN will encourage its partners and the marine community in general to adopt a common position within Government following the government's open licensing framework announced by The National Archive on 1 Oct 2010.
3.	Guidance to clarify the overlap in compliance with regulations i.e. ROPSI, EIR, INSPIRE to state that if you are compliant with one are you compliant with others. A matrix would be a useful way of presenting these relationships. Rank = 3.	This audit work is being undertaken by UKLP as part of the UK's response to the EC on INSPIRE. MEDIN proposes to liaise with UKLP on the performance of marine related bodies but does not have the resources to undertake this work itself.
4.	To add marine spatial planning as an objective for UKHO's corporate plan the question should be raised with Secretary of State for Defence. The Secretary of State for the Environment should potentially become involved to advocate this change. Rank = 3.	<p>The UKHO is not the only body not to put a high priority on the sharing and wider use of its data. The objective should be on recognising the value of data to the wider community (not only to support internal delivery) and to put in place means of accessing that data generally, not just for marine planning.</p> <p>The policy and legislation to achieve these aims are in place so it should only be a matter of time for internal procedures to be changed accordingly. MEDIN is already encouraging its partners to adopt this change in policy and providing practical help for them to do so.</p> <p>Another approach, which has been suggested, is for organisations with a stake in marine planning to make the information (i.e. evidence) available to support their position in the marine planning process.</p>
5.	Provide a classification of the business model status of the organisations for the data / information worker for acquiring data including the associated obligations	As stated above the adoption of an Information Asset Register, Publication Scheme and submission of metadata to the MEDIN portal and elsewhere should aid this process.

No.	Report recommendation	MEDIN response
	under which they are required to operate. Centrally held by TNA (OPSI) and listed or linked from MEDIN and data.gov.uk websites. Rank = 2.	

### Operational approaches

No.	Report recommendation	MEDIN response
1.	Small or poorly funded organisations would benefit from a centralised data portal system that they could lean on to reduce the data queries that they deal with by pointing to the portal. Rank = 2.	MEDIN is supporting this approach through the DAC framework. In addition, DASSH (for example) already publishes metadata on behalf of other data providers. The need to find resources to support and maintain data is a key issue and is covered by the review on DAC funding currently in preparation.

### Best practice initiatives

No.	Report recommendation	MEDIN response
1.	A standardised data policy or small set of policies to allow for differences in the nature of the organisations for all public bodies would benefit all organisations and those trying to obtain data. Such a document would be well understood with less effort spent on scrutinising multiple policies. This is planned within UKLP. Rank = 3.	This would be covered by a marine data policy and strategy currently being considered. Such a strategy would interlock with the UKLP (and other) policies.  The preparation of such a policy is included in the MEDIN Business Plan.
2.	It is important to pitch information and guidance on regulations at the right at that level (manager and technical level). It would be very useful to know what their key requirements are to educate those involved in marine data as to which documents they should be referring to. For example, for data security the Suffolk Matrix was produced which defines the security level of data compliancy for different regulations (see cabinet office website). A list of drivers behind the obligations would be useful for management discussions. Rank = 3.	MEDIN supports this idea but is careful not to replicate the work of the UKLP. Reference has been made to the Suffolk Matrix and this suggestion will be considered in more detail as the MEDIN Business Plan is implemented.

### Pricing and licensing

No.	Report recommendation	MEDIN response
1.	Review the way that OPSI use the scheme to regulate not only PSI but also Crown copyright. Rank = 3.	MEDIN's aim is to make all marine data accessible including that covered by its partners' and other bodies' public tasks (declared or otherwise) and crown and other copyright. MEDIN agrees that being able to access details of public task would be a useful resource to clarify licensing issues and aid dispute resolution. Education and encouragement is MEDIN's preferred approach but is engaged with the issue via the UKLP and other initiatives (e.g. Defra Data Sharing). Interestingly the Cabinet Office has announced that it would like to see public tasks include the freeing up of data (Shadbolt, Sep 2010).
2.	If a public body cannot state that data it is not going to be used for commercial purpose then bodies involved should agree a way forward which might require OPSI involvement. Rank = 3.	

3.	<p>Public bodies and most private consultancies and companies have template licences which are invariably drafted internally and approved by the legal departments. A standard set of these would be very useful as it would ensure that the correct clauses were included and that all parties involved in data exchanging would be familiar with the contents and not require repetitive and expensive analysis and approval. It could be based on the data.gov.uk click-use licence with a single licence and minor deviations from it as required. The faster the data.gov licensing terms converge with the OPSI Click-use licensing terms, the more clarity organisations would have to release data. Rank = 3.</p>	<p>MEDIN is encouraging standardisation and adoption of standard licensing terms by its partners. Preference is being given to the Open Government Licence released by The National Archive on 1 Oct 2010.</p>
4.	<p>If a complicated licensing process has been resolved between a Trading Fund and research body / institute / university then the process and arrangement i.e. precedent, should be available to save others from repeating the enquiry process. Rank = 2.</p>	<p>MEDIN encourages the open publication of such outcomes and, importantly, the adoption of such outcomes in standard licensing terms.</p>