

2008-09-15

**Bisnodes reply to the European Commission on the Re-Use of Public Sector Information Directive.**

**Bisnode**

Bisnode AB is one of Europe's leading providers of digital business information, including credit reports, company and consumer information, direct marketing tools and market information for the general business-to-business market. The core mission is to help its customers find, maintain and develop relationships with their customers.

Bisnode has companies in 19 countries and 3200 employees (2007 ). The turnover last year was 4.055 million SKR ( 580 million SKR in profit ). More information about Bisnode is published at [www.bisnode.com](http://www.bisnode.com).

A large part of the information that Bisnode use to produce information services originates from the public sector. The PSI Directive is important for our business and we welcome the possibility to send our views on the implementation and application of the PSI Directive.

Bisnode is also a member of the PSI Alliance and we refer to the reply from the Alliance in addition to this reply. Examples from the Swedish market is included in the reply from the Alliance.

This is a reply from Bisnode AB and our contact person is Rolf Nordqvist, Bisnode Venture & Development , tel +46 8 55 80 5948 and e-mail [rolf.nordqvist@bisnode.com](mailto:rolf.nordqvist@bisnode.com).

**1. Implementation and impact of the Directive**

**Question 1. In your opinion, has the Directive been properly implemented and applied in your country and beyond? If so, please indicate ways in which public sector bodies are contributing to facilitating access and re-use of their information. If not, please give indications on what kind of problems you are encountering when wishing to re-use public sector information.**

The Directive is implemented in Sweden and included in a special government regulation ( SFS 2008:31 ). This regulation does not contain any more detailed regulations than the Directive. The Swedish PSI Holders (PSIHs) continues to sell information the same way as they did before the Directive. Information is available in many different areas but prices are high and the PSIHs often sell their information by themselves and in parallel to the re-users.

The main problems are

- no specific **information** is easily available about data held by the PSIHS
- **attitudes** from the authorities towards the re-users could be much better. There is a main problem among the civil servants to understand the business in the information industry
- **charging policies** differs from authority to authority. The Directive makes it possible to include any kind of cost in the price ( even costs for the sales people at the PSIHS are sometimes included in the cost )
- the PSI Holders **compete** with the re-users ( sometimes in an unfair way )
- **copyright** is used as an argument to make conditions for reusers. This often prohibits the development of new services .

**Question 2. Has the implementation of the Directive resulted in a revised charging policy by public sector bodies? If so, has this had any impact, e.g. on the volume of information downloaded, number of hits, number of re-users registered, etc?**

No . We have not seen any changes in the charging policies.

## **B. Scope of the Directive**

**Question 3. In your opinion would it be appropriate to include cultural establishments, education and research organisations and public service broadcasters, within the scope of the Directive?**

Yes. That could result in new business for companies in the information industry.

**Question 4. What would be the impact and societal benefits of including these sectors within the scope of the Directive? What are the problems these excluded sectors may encounter should they be included within the scope of the Directive?**

We don't have any business in that field to day and therefore we have no detailed experiences from selling that kind of information.

### C. Looking ahead

**Question 5. What technical, organisational, legal and practical measures could be established by national administrations and/or at European level to optimise the re-use of PSI (e.g. efficient dispute settlement mechanisms)?**

We suggest a more specific and sharpened Directive and also a sharper Swedish governmental regulation containing

- a must statement when it comes to PSIHs **information about the information** that they have for re-use
- a general **marginal cost principle** for the charging of information
- a **neutral organisation** in every country that can help the re-users with the licencies and that can take care of the re-dressing and complaints
- the principle of **selling “raw data” from the PSIHs** instead of value added data. The value added process should be done by the re-users.

**Question 6. Should legislative amendments be introduced in the Directive to make it more efficient? If so, which ones and why? Would guidelines on proper implementation and application of the Directive be useful?**

Yes, the legislation must be sharper and more precise. The countries are also in need for guidelines concerning the implementation and application of the Directive.

### Summary:

There is a lot to be done in the implementation and application of the PSI Directive. The main problem is the definition of the public task. What is the main purpose for a governmental body? Where does the public task stop and where does the re-use of public information in the information industry start? If the government leave the selling of information to the private companies and the producing of “raw data “ to the authorities we will see an increased product development, marketing and selling of information from a lot of private companies. “Raw data” normally means that no copyright is connected to the information . It also means a possibility to use marginal cost based pricing ( marginal distribution cost ). The result will be lower prices and less restrictions from the PSIHs, making it possible to build businesses in many different markets based upon public information.