

ADVISORY BOARD

THE POSTCODE ADDRESS FILE

Minutes of the meeting held at 13.30 on Thursday, 18<sup>th</sup> March 2010

At Royal Mail

Stukeley Street  
London, WC1V 7AB

PRESENT

Ian Beesley	Chairman
Kelly Allison	Google
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

Also in attendance

Peter Allies	Allies Computing
Miranda Dodd	AMU items 4-6
Ian Evans	AMU items 4-6
Samantha Hardy	Minute taker

Apologies

Terry Hiles	Capscan
Jan Challis	Royal Mail
Philip Groves	Postcomm

1. MATTERS ARISING:

P&L

Tim Drye confirmed he would report back to the Board on the PAF P&L drivers at the next PAF Advisory Board meeting.

PAF Consultation

The Chairman reported that he had not received notification when the results of the consultation would be made public.

The Chairman confirmed he had published the PAB response document on the PAF Advisory Board website.

Postzon Licence

The Chairman reported that Royal Mail had confirmed a new Postzon Licence would not now be launched on the 1<sup>st</sup> April

2. CHAIRMAN'S UPDATE:

Board Members

The Chairman reported that:

Kelly Allison, was moving to new responsibilities and would be standing down from the Board. The Chairman had interviewed a potential successor, Cynthia Kwon, a Google VC based in Zurich who was currently working on the response to the OS consultation, had been at Google for over 5 years and was a key member of the Maps Content Acquisition team. He had impressed on Cynthia that an appointment would be on a personal basis - her knowledge of the PAF market related to mapping would add to the range of expertise at the Board. She would be expected to represent a wider range of interests than her current employing company. Cynthia had confirmed her willingness to comply with these requirements and her ability to be in London for the Board meetings. The Board expressed its thanks to Kelly for his contribution and took note that Cynthia would start to attend meetings from May.

Jan Challis was also moving to new responsibilities and as a consequence would be standing down. The Board recorded its warm thanks to Jan for her contribution which had represented not only Royal Mail operations but had shown an awareness of the wider postal operator market. A replacement would be sought in due course.

Pay Pal had expressed an interest in contributing to the PAF Advisory Board, the Chairman would interview any eventual nominee to assess their potential contribution to the Board.

### National Address Register

The Board discussed the benefit of the National Address Register and the possibilities of Royal Mail and Local Government working together to produce a robust Register. The Chairman would follow up these possibilities with local government representatives.

### UPU

Charles Prescott, a lawyer from the United States, had written to the Chairman regarding the UPU International Forum, a body comprised of organizations with a shared interest in International Addressing. Emma Gooderham confirmed she had joined the steering group for the forum and would feed back to the PAF Advisory Board where appropriate.

### 3. PAF Quality

The Board had a presentation by the chairman of the Quality Working Group (PAF(10)8)

Items reported on were:

- PAF Architecture and Ancillary datasets
- Market Survey on additional data items
- Improvement in Business names
- UDPRN integrity

Also discussed was a paper circulated by the DNAS representative - PAF(10)9. The following main points were made in discussion:

- (a) The DNAS paper helpfully identified four dimensions of quality - Strategic quality; Data Quality; Procedural quality; and System Quality- encompassing 19 indicators. Together with the elements of BS 7666 they would provide a framework into which the specific projects to be looked t by the Quality Working Group could be fitted.
- (b) At the strategic level, the origins of the PAF database as a postal delivery tool had been overtaken by the wider use of the postcode in commercial transactions and its linkage with geographical data to define location. The database quality in these later uses, where users tended to equate it with an address database, was sub-optimal and Royal Mail's contention that the database should remain a list of delivery points was open to challenge.
- (c) Even as a database for postal delivery purposes the PAF file was supplemented at delivery office level with additional local information such as 'house with a big dog' or 'long drive to house' – which meant that there was no single definitive comprehensive delivery point database.
- (d) Deficiencies in the listing of business names restricted the usefulness of the database for 'business to business' transactions.

The Board invited the Quality working Group to use the DNAS quality framework to identify opportunities for improvement in PAF and agreed to return to the subject in the context of

how Royal Mail was proposing - to invest in PAF Quality, including the possibility of Royal Mail working with Local Government on production of the National Address Register. The Board discussed PAF(10)4 which listed reported teething troubles with the 2010 licence. The following points were made in discussion:

#### 4 2010 Licence

- (a) Royal Mail confirmed that AMU would monitor how returns under the new licence differ from the assumptions in the revenue neutrality modeling. The information would be used to inform future price change decisions.

Royal Mail reported that the Bureau Licence was on a tiered structure to take into account the size of a bureau and their usage of PAF; the total size of the bureau was used to calculate the fee due as this ensured that the licence for Data Cleansing was admin light. Board members were concerned that there may have been a misunderstanding over the records kept by bureau operators who, they believed, would have been capable of identifying the actual use of PAF for data cleansing. The use of total data cleansing volumes as a proxy for this could be misleading. The Board felt the need for Royal Mail to produce a multi layered model under which a Bureau that could identify how many records had been cleansed against PAF would be assessed for fees only on this component. If a Bureau couldn't do this then the fee should be calculated based on the total number of records processed. This arrangement should be applied retrospectively. At a later stage the Board should consider setting up a specialist Working Group to examine the operation of the bureau licence.

- (b) White Labeling - The Board confirmed that the licence should be technology neutral. Royal Mail should develop a flowchart/decision diagram before the 1<sup>st</sup> April to show how various scenarios would be assessed and should include the information in the FAQ's
- (c) Side Letters – AMU confirmed that the various side letters issued with the 2010 licence had not been shown to the Board before they were issued. They had not done so because they did not think that the letters contained new material. The Board expressed regret over this omission and requested that Royal Mail - send the side letters to the Chairman for circulation to the PAB as soon as possible.
- (d) Bankruptcies - Royal Mail confirmed that their direct customers did not receive credit for the purchase of PAF. All fees had to be paid in advance. By inference, therefore, it was a commercial decision for an SP whether to give more than a normal 30-day invoice credit and the associated risk should lie with the SP not with Royal Mail. However, Royal Mail would be prepared to look at individual cases in the light of the circumstances of the time if the default in payment to an SP was material. An alternative would be to encourage SPs to sell on the basis of a transaction model for high risk customers. The Board invited the AMU to reflect on the points made and to report back how the 2010 licence could be amended *en courant* in the light of these and other points that might arise.

5. Government Licence

Royal Mail confirmed the Government Licence would be implemented on the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011 and that they would be starting to prepare it shortly

6 FUTURE MEETING DATES

20 <sup>th</sup> May	Room 1, Mail Media Centre, London
8 <sup>th</sup> July	Venue tbc'd
23 <sup>rd</sup> September	Venue tbc'd
18 <sup>th</sup> November	Open meeting – date to be rearranged