

THE POSTCODE ADDRESS FILE ADVISORY BOARD (PAB)

Minutes of meeting held at 11:00 on 18 January 2024

At the offices of Auctane, 200 Grays Inn Road, London, WC1X 8XZ

And by video conference

Present

Ian Beesley	Chairman
Neil Haydock	Auctane
Richard Hartland	Data8
Nick Chapallaz	GeoPlace
Ron Wilkinson	Improvement Service, Scotland
Ian Paterson	Mail Competition Forum
Charles Neilson	Mail Competition Forum
Paul Brough	Mail Users' Association

In attendance

Ian Evans	AMU
Tom Foyle	AMU

Attending by video link

Rob Parker (items 1-3)	CACI
Paul Cresswell (items 3-9)	Experian

Apologies

Tim Drye	Direct Marketing Association
Stuart Watt	GB Group

Secretariat

Paul Roberts

1 New PAB Member

The Board welcomed Richard Hartland, COO of Data8, as a new PAB member. Richard is a former member of the PAF User Group (the predecessor to the PAB). At Data8 he currently leads on solutions production, data governance and legal compliance.

2 Matters Arising

a. Link between PAF and Postcode Finder

The AMU reported that the daily update process had been revised and there had been no further failures to update PAF daily. A new early warning system was now in place to identify potential issues. The Board requested that an 'early warning' process also be put in place for Postcode Finder.

b. AMU and Geo Place joint working

The AMU and GeoPlace were currently evaluating six geographical areas to assess whether national gazetteer products could help with PAF updating on the prompt transfer of newly occupied addresses from the not yet built file (NYB) and also whether the same source could help identify redundant addresses on PAF.

ACTION: The Board invited the AMU and Nick Chapallaz to provide a further update at the July 2024 PAB meeting

c. Solutions Provider (SP) requirements from PAF

At the request of the Board (PAB (23) 4th meeting minutes, item 1c) Allies Computing had produced a paper on the PAF data quality expectations for use in SP packages. It suggested that the approach recommended in ISO 19157:2013 related to geospatial data quality may be appropriate to use for PAF, including assessment of quality in the Alias file.

The Board agreed that the paper provided a useful reference for future discussions on development of the Alias file and also as input to dialogue with Ofcom.

3 Chairman's Update

AMU & RM Ops Service Level Agreement (SLA)

The PAB SLA Working Group met during November and December, including discussion of the PAB members' recommendations for a new SLA. The recommendations had stressed the importance of clear ownership of Ops actions supporting PAF quality, including formal identification of a named senior individual who took responsibility for the Ops element in the SLA and designation of key people to deliver the necessary actions; ongoing management of the agreement; and establishment of key data to help target areas needing attention.

The PAB members had also recommended the expansion of independent quality assurance as soon as possible.

The AMU advised they were currently reviewing the PAB recommendations and confirmed they were putting emphasis on engagement with RM Ops staff and obtaining buy-in to the importance of PAF quality for efficient operational working from the Director of Quality. This would be followed by a renewed programme of activity designed to ensure Delivery Office staff at all levels understand the importance of PAF quality and their role in promoting it.

The AMU also confirmed that should a new SLA not be in place by the start of 2024/25 the existing agreement would roll forward into the start of the financial year, but that there would be opportunities to revise the agreement in-year.

ACTION: The Board invited the AMU to produce a summary of metrics that could be used to measure the effectiveness of the SLA (and for targeting future action where appropriate), together with an assessment of potential data sources for the measures, for early discussion at the Working Group.

4 The Inter-PAB Report

Board members fed back on the current inter-PAB report, issued between each PAB meeting. Whilst the report contained some useful information, Board members felt that there may be more value in an update that focused on progress against key target outcomes.

ACTION: The Secretary to schedule an initial meeting between the Chairman and AMU to discuss future options.

5 Measuring the Success of the PAF awareness Campaign

The AMU informed the PAB they had sought feedback from a sample of 200 Delivery Office managers on the initial Work Time Learning campaign held in the last quarter of 2023 to reinforce PAF quality messages. The feedback received suggested that, although the key messages were generally understood, the overall impact of the campaign had had to compete with important messages on health & safety and the aftermath of industrial action.

Mail Competition Forum (MCF) representatives (Charles Neilson and Ian Paterson) advised they would be representing the MCF at a wider group forum session with Royal Mail leaders in February and could use this meeting to reinforce the PAF quality focus and key messages. This was supported by the PAB, with the AMU also supporting the offer.

ACTION: The Board invited the MCF representatives to provide an update to the PAB following the February meeting.

6 Licensing Trends 2022/23

The AMU shared a brief presentation on licensing trends during 2022/23.

The Board commented that continuing movement to transactional licensing presented both a revenue risk and opportunity, due to its potential volatility.

The Board questioned what revenues would look like if PSL customers were licensed as per commercial customers. The AMU advised that such an analysis is difficult because one of the simplifications offered under the PSL is the removal of the need for PSL organisations to count Users .

ACTION: The Board invited the AMU to share details of the number of SPs who take the Alias file from the AMU, and what is known about the incorporation of data from the file into SP offerings.

7 Quarterly Data Quality Update

The AMU shared a brief presentation of the Q32 DQM data quality audit.

Two local issues were identified, and these were being addressed with the local Delivery Office

The Board welcomed the prompt action by AMU to involve the local Delivery Office in addressing the problems encountered

The AMU advised that, as part of the surveying methodology, more focus would be placed on areas that might generate higher instances of issues or problems, with new-build developments being an example of this.

The Board also felt that it would be useful to be able to quantify the cost of addressing issues to RM and its customers

8 PAB Priorities

The Chairman suggested four PAB priorities for 2024.

Continuation of existing priorities:

1. Focus on addressing quality
2. Pursuit of an effective SLA between the AMU and RM Operations

New Priorities:

3. The identification and mitigation options for risks to PAF usage
4. Potential enhancements to PAF products.

The Board agreed to continue with existing priorities and would return to discussion of new priorities at its forthcoming meetings.

9 Next Meeting

18 April 2024, 13:00 – 15:30. In-person venue: Experian, Cardinal Place, 6th Floor, 80 Victoria Street, London, SW1E 5JL