

1. Email exchange between Royal Mail and the Geospatial Commission (GC)

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 29, 2024 5:47 PM
To: Chambers, Chris (DSIT) <Chris.Chambers@[REDACTED]>
Subject: Info as discussed

Hi Chris

I'm sure this is probably the page you were looking at anyway, but [here's the full price list](#) from the last price increase announcement. (the prices on the right hand side have been effective since 1st Oct 2023)

As discussed, Transactions are purchased in blocks of 100 so £1.68 in the price list equates to 1.68p per transaction.

[REDACTED]

Thanks for all your help and support with getting our story across on this. Finally, I've had the OK to forward the text of what we'd sent to [REDACTED] on Wednesday morning (attached)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

2. Internal GC exchange on pick up of the amendment

Hi [REDACTED]

Yes, thanks, we're aware and actively engaging within Gov.

Kind regards,

Chris

Chris Chambers

Deputy Director, Geospatial Commission

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 9:29 AM
To: [REDACTED]; Carter-McGrath, Catherine (DSIT) <catherine.mcgrath@[REDACTED]>; Clark2, Jamie (DSIT) <Jamie.Clark2@[REDACTED]>; Hodgetts, Sarah (DSIT) <sarah.hodgetts@[REDACTED]>; Chambers, Chris (DSIT) <Chris.Chambers@[REDACTED]>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: HoL Postcode Address File (PAF)/ Address data amendment to Data Protection and Digital Information Bill

Hi all

I picked this up over the weekend in catching up on reading. I'm checking that we're aware, as I didn't hear any mention of it?

<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3430/stages/18402/amendments/10012219>

<https://takes.jamesomalley.co.uk/p/the-house-of-lords-could-liberate>

Note that VC was tagged in a tweet about it.

<https://twitter.com/Psythor/status/1760752532685488400>

Thanks, [REDACTED]

3. Internal HMG exchange on who leads on the response to the open addressing Amendment

From: Hodgetts, Sarah (DSIT) <sarah.hodgetts@[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 11:33 AM
To: Chambers, Chris (DSIT) <Chris.Chambers@[REDACTED]>
Cc: Clark2, Jamie (DSIT) <Jamie.Clark2@[REDACTED]>; Carter-McGrath, Catherine (DSIT) <catherine.mcgrath@[REDACTED]>; [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: For ACTION: UK address data - DPDI Amendment

Thanks, Chris.

We spoke.

This needs to be dealt with by the sponsor of Royal Mail not the data team.

It's their privately owned asset.

[REDACTED]

This needs to be resolved today. I'd like to see the lines please before close (that's 1830 for me today)

Sarah

Sarah Hodgetts

Director | Geospatial Commission

[REDACTED]

From: Chambers, Chris (DSIT) <Chris.Chambers> [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 7:49 PM
To: Hodgetts, Sarah (DSIT) <sarah.hodgetts> [REDACTED]
Cc: Clark2, Jamie (DSIT) <Jamie.Clark2> [REDACTED]; Carter-McGrath, Catherine (DSIT) <catherine.mcgrath> [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: For ACTION: UK address data - DPDI Amendment

Hi Sarah.

You'll see that the open address amendment came in to us from Cabinet Office, and that we have said that response should be from DBT due to their role overseeing Royal Mail. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- 1) Leave for DBT to explore this internally;
- 2) I go back on the chain with the main logic of why the amendment is a bad idea;
- 3) We formally block the amendment (though not sure on the process to do this).

Do you have a preference? The narrative I would use with DBT / if we block directly is (and thanks to Jamie's notes for this):

1. We highlight it as a risk in that it will commit government to a blank cheque, as because as drafted it does not transfer IP or require anything of Royal Mail or GeoPlace in fact. To make this work HMG would then need to reach an agreement with both RM and GeoPlace, both of whom are not required to provide anything under this drafting, but also know that HMG could not get this from anywhere else. As a result HMG would be left with one of following options, none of which are appealing:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

2. As drafted the amendment commits HMG to a completely uncosted commitment that it can only deliver at huge cost or via breaking existing laws.

[Redacted]

Kind regards,

Chris

Chris Chambers

Deputy Director, Geospatial Commission

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]

Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 4:12 PM

[Redacted]

Subject: Re: For ACTION: UK address data - DPDI Amendment

Hi [Redacted]

I have looped in [Redacted]

[Redacted] I will let them advise or direct around looping in other people from DDaT.

[Redacted]

[REDACTED]

Regards,

From: [REDACTED]

Date: Friday, February 23, 2024 at 3:22 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Chambers, Chris (DSIT)

[\[REDACTED\]](mailto:Chris.Chambers)

Subject: Re: For ACTION: UK address data - DPDI Amendment

Hi [REDACTED]

Please can you confirm receipt of my email - given the deadline of Tuesday to have this drafted and cleared.

The ODI weekly newsletter refers to this (below) so the team may need to do extra diligence in addition to the NoA rebuttal

As the Data Protection and Digital Information Bill makes its way through parliament, and amendment to the bill in the Lords could require a list of UK addresses to be [made freely available for reuse](#), which could in turn support businesses, consumers and public services.

While the amendment has a long way to go to get included in the bill, and while the bill has a long way to go before it finally passes...campaigners are pretty excited about getting this far.

Thanks,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

On Thu, 22 Feb 2024 at 16:58, [Redacted] wrote:

Hi All,

That approach works for me.

[Redacted] (I hope you're the right DBT contact) - would you be ok to take a look at this DPDI amendment (email chain refers) and lead on writing the NOA as policy owners for Royal Mail, with the rest of us reviewing and feeding into it. please?

Many thanks,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

On Thu, 22 Feb 2024 at 14:14, [REDACTED] wrote:

Hi [REDACTED] -

Thanks for the email below, which [REDACTED] has forwarded on to me.

[REDACTED]

Our view is that this should be rejected. However, although the Geospatial Commission own the contract for public sector access to PAF data, we don't oversee postal services and Royal Mail would be the main body affected here. The lead department for this is DBT.

[REDACTED]

Does this work? Happy to talk through if helpful.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2024 11:22 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: For ACTION: UK address data - DPDI Amendment

Hi [REDACTED]

Oh brilliant, thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

On 16 Feb 2024, at 09:11, Clark2, Jamie (DSIT) <Jamie.Clark2> wrote:

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Thanks

Jamie

Jamie Clark

Deputy Director

[Redacted]

5. An email chain between DBT and the Geospatial Commission related to the House of Lords debate on DPDI Bill amendments - redacted

From: Chambers, Chris (DSIT) <Chris.Chambers@dsit.gov.uk>

Date: Wednesday, 28 February 2024 at 08:35

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: Rowland, Owen (DSIT) <owen.rowland@dsit.gov.uk>

[REDACTED] Hodgetts, Sarah (DSIT)

<sarah.hodgetts@dsit.gov.uk>

Porteous2, Robert (DSIT) <Robert.Porteous2@dsit.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: URGENT RE: For ACTION: UK address data - DPDI Amendment

Hi [REDACTED] et al.

This is complex policy area, with multiple departments as stakeholders, but it is worth noting that there would be a direct impact on Royal Mail if this amendment were to be passed;

1. RM's revenue from the PAF would be undermined [REDACTED]
2. The RM PAF IP that is contained within Local Authority address data would be made open.

We should discuss in longer time - but worth you knowing that that whilst we in the Geospatial Commission may licence back the PAF on behalf of the public sector uses, but it does not make us the policy lead here.

However, to expedite a Government response, may I suggest the following line to block the amendment:

“High quality, authoritative address data for the UK is already accessible for a reasonable fee from Local Authorities and Royal Mail, with prices starting at £95 for national coverage. The Government also makes this data available free at the point of use to over 6,000 public sector organisations, as well as postcode, unique identifier and location data available as open data – available free for anyone to use for any purpose. There is also free access to Local Authority and Royal Mail address data for businesses to innovate in the market. At this time, the Government does not see the economic case to go beyond this.”

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]

Date: Monday, February 26, 2024 at 11:33 AM

To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Rowland, Owen (DSIT) <owen.rowland@dsit.gov.uk> Chambers, Chris (DSIT) <Chris.Chambers@dsit.gov.uk>

[REDACTED]

Hodgetts, Sarah (DSIT) <sarah.hodgetts@dsit.gov.uk>

[REDACTED]

Subject: Re: URGENT RE: For ACTION: UK address data - DPDI Amendment

Hello all,

[REDACTED] engaged with me as the open data lead in CDDO prior to her email. My understanding was that there was a complex situation regarding this data with substantial commercial interests (which Chris and [REDACTED] have thankfully expanded upon), and that whilst it is desirable to have open address data for reasons mentioned by [REDACTED] this amendment would be a blunt and counterproductive instrument to try to achieve that result, should government wish to pursue it.

Regards

[REDACTED]

From: Rowland, Owen (DSIT) <owen.rowland@dsit.gov.uk>

Date: Monday, 26 February 2024 at 11:27

To: Chambers, Chris (DSIT) <Chris.Chambers@dsit.gov.uk>, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Hodgetts, Sarah (DSIT) <sarah.hodgetts@dsit.gov.uk>

[REDACTED] Porteous2, Robert (DSIT) <Robert.Porteous2@dsit.gov.uk>

Tones, Oliver (DSIT) <oliver.tones> [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: URGENT RE: For ACTION: UK address data - DPDI Amendment

Also copying in Robert Porteous and Oliver Tones.

Owen

Owen Rowland
Deputy Director, Head of Data Protection Policy

owen.rowland [REDACTED]

www.gov.uk/dsit |

<https://twitter.com/SciTechgovuk>

From: Chambers, Chris (DSIT) <Chris.Chambers> [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 11:12 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Hodgetts, Sarah (DSIT) <sarah.hodgetts>

Rowland, Owen (DSIT)

<owen.rowland> [REDACTED]

Subject: URGENT RE: For ACTION: UK address data - DPDI Amendment

Importance: High

Hi [REDACTED]

URGENT – this matter relates to significant negative revenue impacts on Royal Mail, and therefore needs to be answered by the team within DBT who oversees them **today** (before deadline for amendment passes). Can you please pass to them, and in parallel let us know who they are?

For background (adding Sarah H – Director for GC, Owen R – DD for DPDI Bill) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

4. The amendment as drafted poses a significant risk of committing government to a blank cheque, as because as drafted it does not transfer IP or require anything of Royal Mail or GeoPlace in fact. To make this work HMG would then need to reach an agreement with both RM and GeoPlace, both of whom are not required to provide anything under this drafting, but also know that HMG could not get this from anywhere else. As a result HMG would be left with one of following options, none of which are appealing:

[REDACTED]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Kind regards,

Chris

Chris Chambers

Deputy Director, Geospatial Commission

[Redacted]