

THE POSTCODE ADDRESS FILE

ADVISORY BOARD

RESULTS OF CONSULTATION ON THE COUNTY INFORMATION IN PAF

Note by the Chairman

Please find below the numerical analysis of the 29 replies received to our recent consultation:

	Keep	Drop	No reply
Traditional	18	10	1
Admin	24	4	1
F/Postal	10	18	1

Qualitative comments:

Some customers prefer unchanging county designations (postal or traditional) for non-mail purposes (medium sized SP)

The provision of three county names is confusing; there should be only one (mailer)

Put more effort into improving the accuracy of Traditional and Admin designations (small SP)

We do not use county data (credit rating body)\

Data quality needs to be improved (small SP)

Any change would bring problems (medium SP)

We don't know how clients use the data (small SP)

Former postal counties are thoroughly confusing (Hull resident)

A London Borough has no admin county

This is a waste of time; users should take responsibility (medium SP)

Change means re-programming (small SP)

We discourage the use of counties (medium SP)

I completely disagree with the option to drop the provision of all county information in PAF®. That would appear to be Royal Mail taking the decision that a county name is not applicable, that is not Royal Mails decision to make. (Local authority)

Ian Beesley
Chairman