

THE POSTCODE ADDRESS FILE

ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of the meeting held at 13.00 on Thursday, 19th July

At QAS

George West Road, 2-3 Clapham Common North Side,

London, SW4 0QL

PRESENT

Ian Beesley	Chairman
Tim Drye	Direct Marketing Association
Emma Gooderham	Allies Computing
Terry Hiles	GB Group
Michael MacClancy	DX Group
Ian Paterson	UK Mail
Iain McKay	Improvement Services (Scotland)
Alan Halfacre	Mail Users' Association
David Heyes	Wigan BC

Also in attendance

Scott Childes	AMU)	
Ian Evans	AMU)	item 5

Apologies

Razia Ahamed	Google
Joel Curry	QAS
Stephen Green	Ofcom observer
Martin Taylor	Royal Mail
Steve Rooney	AMU

Guests

Zahid Deen	Ofcom)	item 4
Chris Rowsell	Ofcom)	

1. Matters arising

The project that Data Advance was undertaking to review the report on the economic value of PAF and to explain how expansion of the compliance centre might benefit the PAB had been delayed due to illness and Data Advance had sent their apologies for not attending the meeting as expected. The Board sent their best wishes for a good recovery.

2. Chairman's update

- The Chairman expressed a concern at the number of current activities concerning or close to PAF and felt uneasy about the adequacy of communications between the Board, Data services, and AMU and within Royal Mail. He would be closely monitoring these activities.
- The Chairman reported he had not received any communication from BIS since Sally Wolkowski had left and Sue Cope had been appointed

The Board took note

3. Licence Working Group

Terry Hiles reported on the Licence Working Group

- AMU had requested that minutes from the working group should be published by the PAB. AMU itself would establish a link from their website to the minutes on the PAB website.

ACTION: Terry Hiles should, however, first agree the minutes before publication.

- Paul Tatman-Madsen from AMU had acted as note taker at the first meeting; the Board appreciated the gesture from AMU but discussed and agreed to investigate options for an independent note taker. Meanwhile, the AMU offer of help from Paul Tatman-Madsen should continue to be accepted.

ACTION: The Chairman to consult with the AMU over funding for an independent note taker

- The working group had been supportive of the proposed Royal Mail consultation process timescale of 6-8 weeks. The Board also agreed in principle that the pre-consultation document PAF(12)18 identifying key questions about the licence revision should be circulated via a mail shot survey with the aim of securing 200-300 responses from PAF

users and non-users. They also agreed an investment was required to use a marketing company to source the list of organisations to survey.

ACTION: Board members to send their comments or suggestions for the consultation document PAF(12)18 to the chairman and Terry Hiles a.s.a.p.

4. Ofcom Review of PAF

Chris Rowsell and Zahid Deen distributed slides PAF(12)21 describing the scope and likely focus of the review. They would be in discussions with Board members individually and were planning to release a consultation document on the Ofcom draft regulatory decision later in the year.

Meanwhile the Ofcom team was looking to build up a better understanding of PAF, focusing on quality, cost reductions, and the PAF definition of a user with a view to achieving greater simplification in the licence and pricing.

Ofcom indicated that they would consult on draft regulatory proposals with PAF stakeholders, and outlined the following timescales for the processes

- Collection and analysis of data - under way
- Consultation paper – by the end of 2012
- Decision document – by April 2013

As an independent regulator established by statute Ofcom was not obliged to report its finding Ministers other than as one of the stakeholders in PAF. The regulatory decisions were theirs to take and did not require Ministerial approval.

In discussion Ofcom confirmed that their remit was to regulate PAF in accordance with the Postal Services Act. In this context a recommendation on the Ownership of PAF was within scope. Ofcom would also be researching possible substitutes for updating PAF. The PAB Address creation working group would be able to provide helpful data to Ofcom. Also, in the Ofcom confirmed that in its view, the PAF Advisory Board's status was unchanged by the switch from Postcomm to Ofcom.

In further discussion The Board emphasized that it represented the vast majority of users of PAF (especially as most users acquired PAF via Solutions Providers) and was a visible channel

for market views to be relayed to the AMU. It should be seen as supporting PAF rather than as rather than as support for the AMU. As such it was concerned to work under regulatory structure that encouraged economy in updating and distributing PAF, better systems to ensure timeliness and quality of data.

The Board took note.

5. AMU Update

- AMU confirmed that they were currently working with Ofcom on a tight timescale to provide accurate data on costings, quality assurance and sales, and to identify current issues for the review.
- AMU reported that BIS were finalising their business case which would be submitted to Ministers. AMU believed that BIS had defined how the funding within government would work and were now starting to work with AMU to agree implementation options.
- The Board reminded the AMU that it had argued from the outset that a strong promotion of the PSL would be required if PAF take-up was to increase and that it stood ready to assist in that process..

AMU Staffing

- AMU reported that they had recruited an Integrity Manager to drive validation performance, provide accurate data, and to manage a PAF component for the general postie induction process. The new role would report directly to Scott Childes, and they confirmed that the SLA's with Royal Mail operations would record improvements to Operations performance.

ACTION: Scott Childes to provide historical and continuing SLA data to the Board.

Developer licence

- AMU stated that they had received more interest than expected in the six weeks since the developer licence had gone live. There had been over twenty interested parties but as yet it had not been possible analyse respondents' characteristics

ACTION: AMU to analyse the interest, who and what they do, their intentions and report back at the September PAB meeting.

Multi Residence licence

- AMU reported that they were monitoring response to the multi residence licence and had received positive feedback so far. The intention was to continue with this data set as a non-regulated product. AMU are looking at the data within the file to make sure the 48k records were presented in a consistent way.

East Anglia pinpoint

- AMU reported that this activity was being undertaken by Royal Mail Data Services who would be required to pay PAF licence fees as a Solutions Provider. (It was subsequently confirmed that the Royal Mail Corporate Licence would not cover this activity.) The PAB aired their concerns regarding the supplying of similar information from two Royal Mail sources.

Investment tracking document

- Royal Mail explained that although this document seemed behind schedule, they were ready to progress it now they had the go ahead from the Board.

ACTION: AMU to update and circulate PAF(12)17

Quality Working Group

- Tim Drye presented slides outlining the investment programme. He expressed concerns that there were restraints on the investment programme, and felt the need to encourage Royal Mail to invest in Quality. To encourage this he was seeking help from individual Quality Working Group members to track and stimulate progress with individual items in the programme. The Board needed a clear understanding with Ofcom of what should be expected as AMU business as usual budget and what was legitimate to finance from the investment Budget. Tim Drye also recommended pursuing alternative PAF projects, for each of which the Board would need a short explanatory memorandum.

ACTION: Tim Drye to produce a short statement for recommended additional investment projects and to seek nominations from

Members of the Quality Working group to take ownership of projects

6. Address Creation Working Group

- David Heyes reported that the terms of reference had been discussed and agreed with AMU. He confirmed that sources of data being considered included Royal Mail, local government and alternative forms of data capture such as citizen updating and showed a breakdown of the sources of changes to PAF and the means by which the updated information was transmitted. AMU had discussed using a tailor-made web portal for updating PAF but the local government, Working Group felt this would Geospace updating if there was not to be confusion and nugatory work for local authorities.

ACTION: Chairman to follow up with Steve Rooney

7. Communications, Promotion and Education

- Emma Gooderham shared a draft Terms of reference - PAF(12)20 – for the working group. The working group was looking to appoint another member, possibly from the utility or consumer sector and asked the Board for their suggestions.

In discussion the Board welcomed the terms of reference subject to the following amendments:

- (a) Amend the opening line to read “To provide advice to the PAB on...”
- (b) Add a third bullet “To undertake such tasks as the PAB may remit to the Working Group”
- (c) to clarify who were the stakeholders referred to under rubric 3

ACTION: The Board invited the Working Group to investigate the case for a campaign later in 2012 for better addressing aimed at reducing the extent of mis-delivered and un-delivered mail.

8. Next Meeting

20th September – Venue TBC’d