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Local government in England and Wales

- 375 local authorities in England Wales
- further 88 organisations
  - including police forces, fire and rescue services, passenger transport authorities and national parks
- over 10,000 town, parish and community councils.

- to give some estimate of size of local authorities:
  - local authorities spend over £100 billion a year
  - employ over two million people.
  - local authorities undertake around 700 different functions
Contractual background

- individual autonomous organisations
- made collective decision to work together
- all need mapping products and services
- local government commissioned LGIH to provide central management
- through Mapping Services Agreement (MSA) which every local authority have joined
- Intelligent Addressing – Service Provider within the MSA
The gazetteers –
Aims and objectives

• National Land and Property Gazetteer (NLPG)
• National Street Gazetteer (NSG)

• created under statutory duty placed on local government in England and Wales
  – local authorities have a statutory duty to create street names and number properties

• local government decided to work together to pool this information
• this has created a valuable national resource

• the MSA provides the contractual framework to underwrite an essentially co-operative process
How it works in practice

[Diagram showing data flow between NLPG, Gazetteer Licensees/statutory users, NSG, LLPG, and LSG]
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## Use of the gazetteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Savings obtained locally</th>
<th>Type of improvement</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£150,000pa</td>
<td>Using NLPG for back-office linkage and corporate IT applications.</td>
<td>Plymouth City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£250,000</td>
<td>Using UPRN to verify address data on green waste collection service</td>
<td>Shepway District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£155,000pa</td>
<td>Using NLPG matched to the VOA list to collect more property tax</td>
<td>Huntingdonshire District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£20,000pa</td>
<td>Using the NLPG to optimise refuse collection routes (plus subsequently £110,000pa saving of one vehicle)</td>
<td>Teignbridge Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£350,000pa</td>
<td>Using the NLPG and NSG to rationalise school transport over 4,500kms of roads</td>
<td>East Riding of Yorkshire Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£250,000pa</td>
<td>Improved public information handling and notifications using elements of the NLPG</td>
<td>Blackpool Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Savings extrapolated nationally?

- Extrapolated throughout local government savings could equate to over £350 million pa from just these activities
- ONS is spending £10 million on trying to rationalise the three different address databases
- In the last Census, a study showed that the Census failed to count 14,000 addresses in Manchester
  - with a resultant population under-count of about 30,000;
  - worth £100 million of funding to Manchester over the lifetime of the Census
- Many public sector projects will be impossible without a single centralised register:
  - Authentication
  - Rolling Census
Stakeholders

• **Local Government Information House**
  a wholly owned subsidiary of the IDeA, who manage the licensing and contractual framework associated with both the NLPG, NSG and the MSA

• **Creating authorities**
  authorities who create the information

• **Intelligent Addressing Ltd**
  manage the central hub

• **Users of the data**
  other local authorities that use the data
  (including country councils, utility organisations, fire and police, national parks etc)
SDI governance

MSA Project Board
LG Association reps
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Creators and Users
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Communication

• regional representatives
• quarterly meetings
• centrally funded
• procedure for issue escalation
• heavy use of web 2.0 technology
• Community of Practice websites
• monthly eZine
• annual conference (around 400 delegates)
• case study development
• sharing best practice
• Help Desk
• training for custodians and users
• guidance documents
User requirements

• large diverse user community
• important to capture user requirements across community
• current governance structure and communications assist this
• introducing improved user requirements process and project working
  – defined stakeholder process
  – stakeholder involvement
  – defined user roles and responsibilities
  – service driven by business need
  – clear management of requirements
  – project management to drive the technical project development
  – robust change control mechanism
  – allows for changing requirements in a dynamic environment
What we have achieved is ...

- breadth and flexibility in the system
- street and property information recorded according to standards created by experts and based on national/international best practice
- a reduction of costs in data duplication and data processing
- a central quality data hub
- interoperability through data sharing and compatibility
- a common understanding and terminology at point of creation and use
- a future-proofed investment
- a basis for excellent data quality and consistency
- a well recognised and trusted source of reference
- the opportunity to develop robust processes for the creation and maintenance of data
Key success factors

- local government organisations willingness to work together
- governance framework and contractual commitment
- statutory drivers
- collaborative working across all partners
- daily operational use of the information
- dedication to the programme
- working to one set of standards
- communication