PAF (19) 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting

Issued: 19<sup>th</sup> June 2019

# THE POSTCODE ADDRESS FILE ADVISORY BOARD (PAB)

Minutes of meeting held at 13:00 on 30<sup>th</sup> May 2019

# At the offices of Experian, 160 Blackfriars Road, London, SE1 8EZ

#### <u>PRESENT</u>

| Ian Beesley        | Chairman                      |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| Ian Paterson       | Mail Competition Forum        |
| lain McKay         | Improvement Service, Scotland |
| Carolyn Valder     | CACI                          |
| Charles Neilson    | Mail Competition Forum        |
| Darren McDonnell   | Mail Users Association        |
|                    |                               |
| Also in attendance |                               |
| Ian Evans          | AMU                           |
| Tom Foyle          | AMU                           |
|                    |                               |
| Apologies          |                               |
| Paul Malyon        | Experian                      |
| Dan Cooper         | Allies Computing              |
| Tim Drye           | Direct Marketing Association  |
| Jason Goodwin      | Landmark Group                |
|                    |                               |

#### Secretariat

Paul Roberts

#### 1. Matters Arising

The Chairman reported that one PAB member had commented on the circulated stakeholder mapping. A revised analysis had been passed to the AMU.

Pending the refreshed membership of the PAB, the proposed strategy day had been put on hold for the immediate future.

ACTION: The PAB took note.

#### 2. Chairman's Update

#### Chairman

#### Ofcom Meeting

The Chairman reported that he had met that morning with Marina Gibbs and Kelly Forbes of OFCOM for the annual review of PAB business. Topics discussed included the priority being given by the PAB to the speed with which new addresses appear on PAF, about which OFCOM expressed support; the market inconvenience of the PSL agreement having only a twelve month duration even though the expectation was this would be rolled over each year; the AMU contribution to searching for a solution to postal addresses for the homeless; the PAB hope that a formal cap on profit would not re-instated; and the proposed refreshment of PAB membership.

Responding, OFCOM advised that profit above 10 percent would be likely to be regarded as excessive. A recent review on the treatment of overheads would be concluded shortly. Looking ahead, OFCOM expected to conduct two new studies: a review of user needs affecting Royal Mail, including the scope of the Universal Service Obligation, and a wider ranging review of Royal Mail efficiency which would include benchmarking with other European postal authorities and was aimed at assessing the sustainability of the Royal Mail business.

#### Refreshing the PAB - Membership

The CHAIRMAN reported that David Green of the GB Group would be joining the PAB shortly and that he would be having a conversation with another potential candidate the following day. Board members' suggestions were to explore possible representation from the mapping and public sector licence communities.

**ACTION**: The Chairman to follow up suggestions for potential PAB membership.

## 3. Business Data Quality - Address & Names

The AMU shared a presentation detailing the activity they undertook in 2018 to improve business data quality on PAF. The AMU had mailed 831k business addresses over the last year to check on the accuracy of their business names and had received 161k responses. Of the responses received, 49% required no change to PAF, 41% required some form of address change and 10% identifying a different use of the delivery point address.

The AMU shared a new, simplified, business address survey form, designed to reduce the level of responses that don't add value to PAF ensuring only key address data was being captured. Board members advised a further refinement of the form to ensure only responses that required changes to PAF were received, streamlining onward processing of changes.

There was discussion between board members and the AMU about the need for Business Name information to be held in PAF. The AMU highlighted that there were instances where the Business Name was not required to deliver the mail, as well as situations (such as multiple delivery points in the same building) where the Business Name was a critical part of the address.

Board members suggested that it may be worthwhile commissioning an external research project (similar to that carried out for Not Yet Built in 2018) to help understand business name anomalies across datasets, providing potential improvements for 'matching' software systems and driving education about the importance of business names.

**ACTION**: The Board invited Ian Paterson to draft potential terms of reference for a research project, to be reviewed by the Board.

A copy of the presentation shared by the AMU is included at Annex A.

## 4. Addressing – Mailmark Failures

Further to an action from the March 2019 PAB meeting. Charles Neilson advised he had met with Royal Mail Group representatives to determine how Mailmark errors caused by addressing could be identified and improvements put in place.

Royal Mail had agreed (via the Mail Competition Forum) that a prospective business mailing customer be identified and for its mailing over a sample period to be produced using Mailmark, the mailing would then be sent straight to a mail centre for images to be captured and discrepancies that would have invalidated the mail for the wholesale mail discount be sent to the AMU for investigation.

Some logistical challenges had still to be addressed but the intention was to press ahead. If successful, the approach may be expanded to include other mailings.

**ACTION**: The Board invited Charles Neilson to produce a paper outlining what the proposition entailed and the analytical action expected, that could be reported on the PAB website.

## 5. NYB to PAF Project Update

Further to previous updates from PAB meetings, the AMU shared a presentation with the Board on further progress of NYB project actions.

The Board commended the AMU for their work in this area and asked to be kept informed of future developments.

### 6. Scottish Census Trial Outputs

Further to previous PAB minutes and actions on AMU support for the 2019 Scottish Census trial. The Board requested that a report of improvements delivered through the trial be shared with the Board, together with an onward view from the AMU on if and how the approach might be rolled across different areas of the UK as appropriate.

**ACTION**: The Board invited the AMU and the Improvement Service Scotland to share an output report from the trial for potential wider circulation to the market.

## 7. Market Sector Review

The AMU advised they were currently updating profiles of the Solution Provider community- identifying the types of services provided across different areas of the community, specialisms etc. for later presentation to the PAB.

**ACTION**: The Board invited the AMU to provide a full presentation at the July 2019 PAB meeting, noting the requirement for anonymity in not identifying specific solution providers.

**ACTION**: The Board invited the AMU to produce a summary of the range of services offered across the Solution Provider community, for discussion at the July 2019 PAB meeting.

#### 8. MP Queries

The AMU shared detail on how and why MPs may make enquiries to Royal Mail in relation to addressing. Queries were usually raised on behalf of customers or specific stakeholders.

The AMU reported they received 1-2 queries per quarter on average, with most queries concerning why certain addresses were assigned to one post-town rather than another, or similarly why a certain postal locality had been assigned rather than another. Replies centred on required use of the addressing code of practice and how addresses were initially constructed by local authorities.

The Board asked whether the AMU had received any questions from MPs regarding PAF and its ownership or use. The AMU advised they had not received any queries on the subject and would now expect such questions to be raised via the Geospatial Commission in the first instance.

#### 9. 60<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Postcode

The AMU reported that the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Postcode would be commemorated during June 2019 and shared a draft short video that Royal Mail would be sharing through various channels in the coming weeks and months. The video was about the postcode in general but also referred to PAF and it's importance in supporting the wider UK interests. It would be aimed at organisations to help reinforce the importance and value of the postcode for their own and customers education.

The Board expressed disappointment that the commemoration was so limited as the UK postcode system was still regarded as the world leader.

**ACTION**: The Board invited the AMU to provide a further update once channels and timescales for communications had been confirmed.

### 10. New Business Address Flyer

Following the suggestion of PAB members at the March 2019 meeting, the AMU had produced a draft flyer, designed to be circulated to businesses moving into a new area/ address, commercial letting agencies, developers, and some retailers if appropriate. In keeping with the previously developed new home flyer, the handout was designed to help businesses understand what they needed to do and what support was in place to ensure their business address was effectively registered and activated.

Methods for targeting and circulating were still to be confirmed.

The Board advised that it would be essential for the flyer to be made available electronically via various access channels.

**ACTION**: The Secretary to circulate the draft flyer to PAB members for input prior to a final version being produced.

## 11. AMU Restructuring

The AMU shared a revised AMU operating structure with the Board, outlining the key capability alignment designed to ensure continuity of service and maximum added value for their customers.

The Board took note.

## 12. Developer Licence Update

The CHAIRMAN asked for an update on the take-up and subsequent actions of those taking up the licence.

ACTION: The Board invited the AMU to provide an update at the July PAB meeting

#### 13. Next meeting

13:00 on 18<sup>th</sup> July 2019.

At the offices of Royal Mail Group, Room F4-08,  $4^{\rm th}$  Floor, 185 Farringdon Road, London, EC1A 1AA

Annex A – AMU Business Data Quality Presentation



# **Business and Vacant Mailings**

# **Business & Vacant Mailing**

| • | Number of business Names on PAF | 1.3m |     |
|---|---------------------------------|------|-----|
| • | Number of Vacant Orgs           | 0.3m |     |
| • | Mailed out 18-19                | 831k |     |
| • | Response Card Received          | 161k | 19% |

# Response Cards Received

| • | No change to PAF | 79.1k | 49% |
|---|------------------|-------|-----|
| • | Change to PAF    | 66.2k | 41% |
| • | DP Usage         | 16.1k | 10% |



PUBLIC

# **Business and Vacant Mailings**

# The Current Business Response Card

Below is the address we hold for your business.

|           | Royal Mail details:   | Please indicate if your address has changed, giving the new  | 7 |
|-----------|---|--|---|
|           | Post Office Ltd Supply Chain<br>Slindon Street<br>PORTSMOUTH<br>PO1 1AA | details below:- Yes  Business name: Address: Postcode:   |   |
| 1000010   | Finance Retirement Home Emplo<br>Post Office Public Utilities Govern    | tegories:-<br>pency Services Hospitality Garages Farms<br>yment Agency Medical Leisure Legal<br>nment Depts. Religious Education Other<br>post the card back to us, no stamp is required |   |
|           |   |  |   |
| 2014 PAF" | POW BREDRYPAF.COM   | PUBLIC   |   |

**Business and Vacant Mailings** 

# The Proposed Business Response Card

Below is the address we hold for your business.

| Royal Mail details: | Please indicate if your address has changed, giving the new |
|---------------------|---|
|                     | details below:- Yes 🗆                                       |
|                     | Business name:  |
|                     | Address:  |
|                     |   |
|                     | Postcode:   |

Thank you for your help - please post the card back to us, no stamp is required



PUBLIC