

**UNC Workgroup 0468 Minutes
Unique Property Reference Number (UPRN) Population by Gas
Transporters**

Monday 20 January 2014

Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3QQ

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HC)	Joint Office
Adam Pearce	(AP)	ESP
Alex Ross-Shaw	(ARS)	Northern Gas Networks
Anne Jackson	(AJ)	SSE
Beverley Viney	(BV)	National Grid NTS
Bryan Hale*	(BH)	EDF Energy
Cher Harris*	(CH)	SSE Pipelines
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Hilary Chapman	(HC)	Xoserve
Jane Johnson	(JJ)	Ordnance Survey
Jenny Rawlinson	(JR)	GTC
Kiera Samra	(KS)	RWE npower
Marc Hobell	(MHo)	GrontMij
Maria Hesketh	(MHe)	Scottish Power
Matt Hartley	(MHa)	C&C Group
Neil McKeown	(NM)	C&C Group
Roger Hunt	(RH)	Ordnance Survey
Shaun Bennett	(SB)	Ordnance Survey
Trevor Peacock*	(TP)	Fulcrum Pipelines

* *via teleconference*

Copies of all papers are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0468/200114

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 17 April 2014.

1.0 Review of Minutes and Actions

1.1 Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

1.2 Actions

1101: E.ON UK (CB) to invite Ordnance Survey to attend a meeting and provide an end-to-end process presentation which also highlights timelines and how the compressor stations, churches, pumping stations, airside meters at airports and instances where the developer changes the scope of the property at the development stage, are expected to be managed.

Update: Ordnance Survey provided a presentation on the process. **Complete**

2.0 Ordnance Survey Process Review

CB summarised the background to raising the modification to incorporate the use of UPRNs within the gas industry. She explained when setting up a new development, Meter Point Reference Numbers (MPRNs) are assigned to properties in readiness for customers moving in and setting up the address with the correct meter asset details. It is hoped that with the use of the UPRN the difficulties encountered with identifying plots and plot updates will be reduced. It is anticipated that the UPRN will anchor any address changes and correctly identify properties and MPRNs.

DA suggested that the use of the UPRN might not eradicate some of the problems encountered as there might still be some misallocation. JR concurred that the UPRN would assist tying address data together but was unsure if this would completely overcome the discrepancies encountered.

DA wished to gain an understanding within the modification of the service expectations required from Xoserve.

RH summarised the requirement by the Government for Ordnance Survey to maintain a database including new developments and associated addresses.

SB provided an overview of the Ordnance Survey process for assigning UPRNs using several data sources to create an address. DA enquired at what point a plot number is assigned a door number. SB advised that the Local Authority updates/creates the address details during the planning process.

JR believed the key to the process would be to understand changes to provisional addresses. SB explained the use of provisional UPRNs during the planning stages, which stays with a property until confirmed at the survey stage. If at the construction stage a property is not built by a developer the UPRN stays assigned to the proposed property and in this scenario the UPRN would not be confirmed by the survey. SB explained the difference status of UPRNs from provisional, under construction, surveyed and confirmed. It was recognised local authorities have a significant input to the process and although the process has no mandatory SLAs, parties are working on making improvements. SB explained that only those Authorities technically capable undertake the end-to-end process, some authorities only have the ability to survey and confirm so in some cases provisional prebuild data is not always available.

MH believed the maximum period for the amendment to or creation of an address is 6 weeks (worse case scenario) to be reflected in system updates. However, this does depend on the local authority involved, as some operate differently. He reiterated that the UPRN might not be created at the planning stage it may be created when building has commenced. MHa suggested the worse case scenario could in theory become 12 weeks if there is an update during the 6 weeks cycle.

SB explained that Ordnance Survey maintain postcode data, post office location address and geographical co-ordinates. The post office address is maintained by the Royal Mail where as the geographical is maintained by the local authority.

It was suggested/asked if Ordnance Survey were able to work closer with developers to obtain provisional planning data from developers. RH believed this would be worth considering.

MHa believed the use of the UPRN would better assist the identification of properties towards the back end of the process. The Workgroup recognised there could still be some discrepancies where provisional UPRNs like MRPNs become unused/dormant due to a change in site layout but these should be more of an exception.

AP asked the DNs to clarify the process used for releasing MPRNs. JW also asked if the home owner would be given the UPRN when moving into a property to assist home owners.

AJ enquired how Ordnance Survey manages the renumbering of plots and if planned/physical properties keep the same UPRN, when the address (house numbering) may change along with geographic co-ordinates. MH explained that the address would not change after the on-site survey as the UPRN at this point becomes confirmed, though it may move physically prior to survey.

CH asked what the ball-park figure would be for Ordnance Survey services and how the data is provided (ie. application). SB explained the data is supplied as a series of text files. RH and JJ confirmed Ordnance Survey would need to consider the intended use of the UPRN, the sharing/use of the UPRN data and the requirement for parties to buy licences to use or pass through data.

MH asked about the provision of data to Transporters and whether this can be shared with Shippers and Suppliers. JJ explained each party wanting the data would probably need to have a licence and contract for the use of the data. JJ explained how the UPRN data and its planned use for smart metering and DCC. She clarified the use of UPRN data would be ring-fenced through DCC and that data cannot be shared outside the confines of DCC. To provide a realistic charge for the use of the UPRN Ordnance Survey would need to understand how the data would be used. JH explained consideration would need to be given to who is getting value of the UPRN to improve processes. If the process was ring-fenced and the UPRN was only used for the Transporter's assurance (assuming the correct data has been used in S&M) then the Transporters would only need licencing. If the data were to be shared to the industry for other purposes, Ordnance Survey would need to consider the extent of its use and appropriate management of licences to use the data. DA wanted to understand the service being offered by Ordnance Survey for smart metering roll out and the provision of certain data items. He explained that the gas industry is restricted by data protection not to release certain data items that may be specific to a consumer..

JJ explained that once Ordnance Survey have a firm understanding of what the UPRN would be used for, they would look at how this could be provided. She suggested a solution may be to look at a project/market type pricing/cost mechanism rather than suggesting a separate figure where each recipient pays a fee.

RH indicated the current individual licence fee for an all incumbent service would be in the region of £174,000 per year.

JJ wished to have a clear understanding from the Workgroup how the data is going to be used, the minimum requirements for the modification and then an indication of additional elements that would be nice to have.

DA believed that Transporters would simply use the UPRN to correctly match an address and MPRN. If this data is used outside the process registration of setting up new addresses for new developments ie site transfer, this would be outside the scope of the modification.

CB provided a scenario where a customer enquiry could result in an address being created on S&M with a new MPRN but the address already exists with an MPRN under a plot address, therefore creating a duplicate. It was anticipated that the cross-reference to UPRN could improve this process as it provides a physical link to the property. CB believed there could also be an ancillary benefit for meter asset data particularly for meter reading agencies using hand held devices that may have GPS functionality.

CB explained that the intent of this modification didn't extend to cross-matching gas, water and electricity industry data, it was simply about the updating of plot addresses to S&M to reduce the likelihood of duplicates.

JJ wished to understand the process for issuing MPRNs and what in the process now is going wrong.

The Workgroup discussed the MPRN issue process. When a developer decides to build, they obtain local authority planning consent. Once planning consent is provided the developer will then look at the infrastructure requirements. MPRNs are provided when the infrastructure is designed and installed against plot numbers utilising a dummy postcode. There may be issues should a site be renumbered or site layout changed. MPRNs are provided for each address and loaded into S&M with a pending address. Some Shippers/iGTs have close contact with the developer through their connection side of business and proactively update addresses. Xoserve also update addresses on post office address file updates, which are checked. However, the process can produce duplicate MPRNs where a new property owner is not aware of the property as a plot address so a new MPRN is created against the actual address. It was envisaged the UPRN would improve the updating of plot numbers to full postal address as it provides a link between planned development and actual using a physical location, therefore the system will update the plot address to actual address.

AJ explained that customers through general billing enquires can flag up discrepancies when providing their address details, MPRN from the label within their property and the meter details. AJ explained addresses can be switched without the Shipper knowledge.

JR suggested to ensure Transporters operate consistently there may need to be an obligation within UNC / business rules around the allocation of the UPRN against addresses/MPRNs.

AJ expressed that the biggest problem is that the UPRN, the address, and the MPRN can all be fluid data. Anything prior to a confirmed UPRN the property address is not locked down.

JJ clarified that the UPRN stays with a property. Until the survey is undertaken to confirm the UPRN the geographical location of that address and property numbering could change.

The Workgroup considered how the process could work for multi-metered sites.

MH suggested that the use of the UPRN service might not be the only alternative to improving address data.

The Workgroup agreed to consider today's discussions further and review the modification at the next meeting on 11 February 2014.

Post Meeting Note - Additional observations:

JJ agreed to provide an idea of the percentage of UPRNs that change between the provisional and confirmed stages.

JJ clarified that a number of UPRNs are allocated to a proposed development but at that stage are not specific to plots. Once the house numbers are known the UPRNs are allocated to the specific house numbers. If the house number transpires to be incorrect the UPRN changes with the house number and away from the plot. Therefore, the UPRN is not derived by co-ordinates.

JJ and RH agreed to attend the meeting scheduled for 11 February.

Action 0101: To create a process flow to manage address creation.

Action 0102: Ordnance Survey to provide a view on likely licence requirements.

Action 0103: E.ON to consider required business rules.

Action 0104: Ordnance Survey to provide an idea of the percentage of UPRNs that change between the provisional and confirmed stages.

3.0 Any Other Business

None.

4.0 Diary Planning for Review Group

Further details of planned meetings are available at: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

Time / Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:30 Tuesday 11 February 2014	Consort House, 6 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3QQ	Development of business rules.
March 2014	TBC	TBC

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
1101	08/11/13	2.0	To invite Ordnance Survey to attend a meeting and provide an end-to-end process presentation which also highlights timelines and how the compressor stations, churches, pumping stations, airside meters at airports and instances where the developer changes the scope of the property at the development stage, are expected to be managed.	E.ON UK (CB)	Complete
0101	20/01/14	2.0	To create a process flow to manage address creation.	Xoserve (DA)	Pending
0102	20/01/14	2.0	Ordnance Survey to provide a view on likely licence requirements.	Ordnance Survey (JJ/RH)	Pending
0103	20/01/14	2.0	E.ON to consider required business rules.	E.ON (CB)	Pending
0104	20/01/14	2.0	Ordnance Survey to provide an idea of the percentage of UPRNs that change between the provisional and confirmed stages.	Ordnance Survey (JJ)	Pending