PAB(25)35 – 4th meeting minutes Issued: 4th November 2025

THE POSTCODE ADDRESS FILE ADVISORY BOARD (PAB)

Minutes of meeting held at 13:00 on 16 October 2025

At the offices of GeoPlace, Smith Square, London SW1P 3HZ

And by video conference

Present

Ian Beesley	Chairman
Richard Hartland	Data8
Paul Cresswell	Experian
Stuart Watt	GB Group
Nick Chapallaz	GeoPlace
Ron Wilkinson	Improvement Service, Scotland

In attendance (Items 2-6)

Ian Evans	AMU
Kim Winter	AMU

Attending by video link

Rob Parker	CACI
Neil Haydock	Independent Consultant
Ian Paterson	Mail Competition Forum

Apologies

Paul Brough	Mail Users' Association
Vicky Groombridge	Sagacity

Secretariat

Paul Roberts

1. PAB members restricted meeting

1.1 Influencing PAF pricing (PAB(25)27)

THE BOARD discussed implementation of its decision of April 2025 to give proactive advice to the AMU before the annual Royal Mail (RM) review of PAF prices. It endorsed the strategic approach proposed in the paper and agreed to discuss preliminary advice for 2026/27 at its next meeting.

1.2 Parcel lockers (PAB(25)28)

THE BOARD discussed the pros and cons of including the addresses of locker banks in PAF. It agreed to recommend their inclusion in PAF and invited the Chairman to write to the AMU accordingly.

2. Market Developments

2.1 Analysis of reasons for licence cancellation

The AMU presented the limited evidence available on why customers change their PAF licensing, including users who had switched providers, changes due to the consolidation of business, and those who had stopped subscribing to PAF data.

The information available was limited due to the indirect selling of PAF via Solution Providers (SPs) and THE BOARD recommended further work to establish trends, including as full a spread of PAF users as is possible,

2.2 PAF P&L

The AMU presented the PAF P&L for 2024/25. Revenue levels were slightly higher than in 2023/24, with increases in transactional use and Public Sector Licences. When averaged over the last five years, revenues had increased at approximately 3% per annum.

Costs in 2024/25 were also higher compared to the previous year, mostly due to a significant increase in legal costs involved in enforcing PAF licensing conditions.

THE BOARD stressed that to support the market positioning of PAF as a premium addressing product it was important to retain a focus on data quality.

THE BOARD also invited the AMU to provide trend data for PAF profit excluding the impact of centrally allocated overhead costs.

2.3 Protection of PAF intellectual property rights

The AMU advised that in the recent legal case involving compliance with PAF licensing provisions, the Court had ruled in RM's favour in a judgement dated 10 October.

THE BOARD welcomed the judgement and expressed the hope that publicity around the case would help to drive compliance with the end-user licensing terms for PAF.

2.4 Business names

The AMU gave a brief presentation on activity over recent months to collect further details of business name changes. Processing of business name changes had increased in the first half of 2025/26 compared to the same period in 2024/25.

2.5 Salesforce Implementation

The AMU updated the PAB on the issues, first discussed at the July PAB Meeting, resulting from the implementation of a new RM-wide CRM system which affected the AMU team in Doxford. The team was currently struggling to reduce the backlog of emails (most notably those from local authorities) created in the 2-3 months after the system change.

Additional staff had been secured, and the AMU were continuing to work closely with local authorities and other stakeholders to communicate their progress to affected parties.

3 AMU Engagement with RM Operations

3.1 Journey of an item

The planned walk-through of the journey of a mail item, to be facilitated by RM Operations, was deferred to the January 2026 PAB meeting.

3.2 Delivery Office reporting of address changes

The AMU outlined that they were continuing to engage with the RM Operations leadership teams via the RM Operations Nerve Centre, which was using PAF updating performance as one of the key indicators for regional leadership teams.

In conjunction with the Nerve Centre team, the AMU had also introduced a weighted scoring system to make comparative performance reporting for Ops Regions more meaningful. The AMU reported further improvement in performance.

3.3 USO trial

The AMU shared information on the level of address changes reported by DOs currently in the trial of the new way of working. THE BOARD agreed to request that the AMU provide a further update on these numbers at the April 2026 Meeting.

3.4 Sources of PAF changes

The AMU explained that more work was needed to be able to provide accurate volumes of PAF changes by source (RM Operations notification, Local Authority notification, direct customer interaction).

THE BOARD requested that the AMU provide data for review at the January 2026 PAB meeting.

3.5 PAB membership – RM Operations vacancy

A nomination for RM Operational representation on PAB had not been received. THE CHAIRMAN would contact the RM Operations Director to seek a speedy formal nomination.

4 RM/ AMU SLA

4.1 AMU/Operations SLA

The AMU confirmed that, due to the other priorities within the team over the last two quarters, there had been no further progress on the agreement of a new SLA between the AMU and RM Operations.

THE BOARD were disappointed that no further progress had been made and encouraged the AMU to re-focus on this task as a priority.

4.2 Development of SLA performance measures

The AMU advised that they were still investigating whether any further performance measures were needed in a new SLA. THE BOARD requested a further report early in 2026.

5 Audit, Investigation and Product Development

5.1 DQM GRC weighting for PAF quality assessment.

Vicky Groombridge had provided a paper to the PAB (PAB(25)29), which highlighted that the current weightings appeared to support robust measurement of changes in PAF quality over time, but that there were still some questions around the underlying weighting methodology.

The AMU commented that measurement had been reviewed regularly with previous PAB members, and changes to methodologies would require considerable time investment to rebase historic information so that trends could subsequently be presented on a like-for-like basis.

THE BOARD requested that the AMU invite DQM/GRC to a discussion with PAB members on these matters as soon as practicable.

5.2 Audit costs and recovery

The AMU advised that, on average, circa 80% of missing revenue was recovered as a result of the compliance audits. While it was noted that the recovered revenue covered the cost of audits, the primary focus of the audits is to reinforce awareness and compliance with licensing conditions.

5.3 DQM GRC Q38 & Q39 reports

The AMU advised that these would be shared with the PAB following the PAB meeting.

5.4 PAF product development

THE BOARD asked what product development plans for PAF were available for discussion and for sight of an up-to-date PAF risk register.

The AMU advised that it was looking to provide information from its assessment of risks to PAF during December and would consider what part of its product development could be shared with the PAB.

6 Next Meeting

11:00, 15 January 2026, Royal Mail offices, 185 Farringdon Road, London, EC1A 1AA**.**