

ADVISORY BOARD

THE POSTCODE ADDRESS FILE

Minutes of the meeting held at 13.30 on Thursday, 20th May 2010

At Royal Mail

Stukeley Street
London, WC1V 7AB

PRESENT

Ian Beesley	Chairman
Emma Gooderham	Allies Computing
Alan Halfacre	Mail Users' Association
David Heyes	Wigan BC
Iain McKay	DNAS
Michael MacClancy	The DX Group
Ian Paterson	UK Mail
Tim Drye	Direct Marketing Association
Stuart Johnston	QAS
Terry Hiles	Capscan

Also in attendance

Ian Evans	AMU
Scott Childes	AMU
Samantha Hardy	Minute taker

Apologies

Kelly Allison	Google
---------------	--------

Absent

Philip Groves	Postcomm
---------------	----------

The Advisory Board sent their deepest best wishes to Miranda Dodd whose young son had been undergoing tests for a serious illness. Steve Rooney from Royal Mail would take over Miranda's role while she took a break to be with her family.

Kelly Alison of Google would be rejoining the Advisory Board as Cynthia Kwon was not now available.

1. MATTERS ARISING:

Codepoint Open had become operational. The hits on the website had not yet been monitored, due to the newness of the service. Royal Mail confirmed that they had negotiated a satisfactory commercial deal with OS and that they were satisfied that PAF IPR was protected.

Postzon licences had been extended for 6 months until the end of October 2010, as Royal Mail was waiting to evaluate the market response to Codepoint Open. They would update the Advisory Board at the July meeting.

It was confirmed that the withdrawal of delivery point count information referred only to the hitherto free information. Data would continue to be available in PAF and part-PAF.

2. CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE:

The Chairman and Alan Halfacre had met with Charles Prescott, an American lawyer who specialised in addressing and was chairman of the UPU Consultative Committee - a body which represented the wider postal industry sector at the UPU, including the DMA and other marketing associations and associations that represented express couriers, postal system suppliers, equipment manufacturers, and envelope manufacturers.

The Board had its attention drawn to paragraph 4.5 of the Postcomm report of 2007 on management of PAF. This indicated that any excess profits above the 8-10% guideline should either be returned to the market in the shape of lower prices or invested in improving PAF through a programme to be agreed with the Advisory Board. Royal Mail confirmed that they would report on the 2009-2010 P&L account at the July meeting and would include information about investment plans.

3. PAF QUALITY

The Quality working group reported that they had provisionally identified 12 issues to be addressed and were embarking on a survey to seek market views on priorities for development. Royal Mail confirmed they were happy for the survey to be posted on the AMU website. A fuller report would be made at the July Board meeting. At present it seemed that the working group's main focus would be on: UDRPN, Business names and the market survey.

4. PAF P&L

Tim Drye presented an alternative approach to pricing for PAF, based on the drivers of cost. He argued that it was changes to PAF that gave rise to most of its costs, yet those who caused the changes did not usually bear the cost of updating the file. A radically different

approach would be to shift costs on to those causing changes in the file such as developers of new property, changes to business or vanity addresses etc. Users of PAF would then only be charged the transmission costs of providing data.

On the other hand Board members argued that the basic postal address system was akin to a public utility and should be financed by the general population with premium services being financed by charges to users. Additionally there were doubts about the practicality of raising charges from those causing changes to the file. In Switzerland, it was understood a charge was made for connection to the postal network akin to connection to power supply or water and sewerage.

The Board took note and agreed to look more closely at the scope for raising revenue from the PAF cost drivers when analyzing the 2009-2010 P&L account.

5. LICENCE UPDATE

The SP working group had not met since the launch of the licence on the 1 April 2010 but anecdotal evidence suggested that a number of third party SP's had not signed up for PAF under the new licence as they felt the terms to be unreasonable. The SP's had spent a considerable amount of time on licence queries and, as most of their customers were on rolling licences, the requirement was likely to continue.

Further anecdotal evidence suggested an increasing risk of inconsistency in the way different account managers were interpreting the licence conditions. The Board requested that AMU should provide it with notification of significant interpretations so that these could be posted on its web site and so bolster licence consistency.

The Chairman reported that the Data Council had signaled a number of worries about the licence and these would be forwarded to the AMU for comment.

The Board also sought further details of AMU plans for revamping its procedures for auditing compliance with the licence.

7. POSTCOMM REVIEW OF THE CODE OF PRACTICE FOR CHANGING POSTCODES

The results of the Postcomm review were overdue and would be chased. (NB: The results were released shortly after the meeting and were circulated as PAF(10)11).

8. DATA SUPPLY

Royal Mail confirmed that they had appointed a new supplier for the physical production and supply of the PAF information. AMU expected improvements in the quality of the data file and the process of distribution to follow.

9. FUTURE MEETING DATES

8th July Room 1, Mail Media Centre, London. Martin Taylor would attend as the new Royal Mail representative, taking the place of Jan Challis. The Board would invite Steve Rooney.

23 rd September	Board Room, QAS, Clapham
8 th December	Open meeting – venue to confirmed