

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

Thursday 23 April 2015

**at ENA, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road,
London SW1P 2AF**

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MB)	Joint Office
Alex Ross-Shaw	(ARS)	Northern Gas Networks
Andy Clasper	(AC)	National Grid Distribution
Andrew Margan	(AM)	British Gas
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Gareth Davies*	(GD)	National Grid NTS
Hilary Chapman	(HC)	Xoserve
Kirandeep Samra	(KS)	Npower
Kirsten Elliott-Smith	(KES)	Cornwall Energy
Lorna Lewin	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones*	(MJ)	SSE
Mark Lyndon*	(ML)	National Grid NTS
Paul Saker*	(PS)	EDF Energy

* *via teleconference*

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0468/230415>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 21 May 2015.

1.0 Review of Minutes and Actions

1.1 Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

1.2 Actions

0202: All parties to consider and provide a view on the benefits and organisational requirements of enhancing address services.

Update: The Workgroup agreed that this action would be covered during development of the Workgroup Report. **Closed**

0203: Ordnance Survey to consider the options for Licence requirements (following completion of action 0202).

Update: In the absence of an Ordnance Survey representative, CB advised that a licence is no longer required as the use of a UPRN is now deemed free of charge for public utilities companies to use the public mapping product and also explained that this matter has been the subject of tri-way discussions between herself, Ordnance Survey and Ofgem. However, whilst AM remains of the opinion that you cannot

obtain address information (i.e. address based products) without a licence, he does accept that UPRNs are issued free of charge. **Closed**

0501: Address Management – Xoserve (DA) to invite DECC to give its perspective on this area.

Update: Both CB and HC advised that whilst they had tried to contact DECC to invite them to provide a view (relating to public mapping agreement licencing issues which have in essence gone away anyway), they had as yet, been unsuccessful. In light of this, it was agreed to close the action. **Closed**

0601: Transporters (AR) and Xoserve (DA) to consider how best to develop an address related data structure provision built around the UPRN concept (including consideration of a move away from the current PAF related approach and possible matching to similar existing address information product lines).

Update: In advising that a set of draft business rules (based on the modification at that time) had previously been prepared, HC now wonders if this is not 'time expired' consideration anyway. CB then advised that she had incorporated the requirements within her recently amended draft version of the modification provided for consideration at this meeting. **Closed**

2.0 Workgroup Status Update

BF explained that whilst the Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the 21 May 2015 Panel meeting, Panel members have requested a view from the Workgroup on an appropriate reporting extension timeline.

2.1. Consideration of (draft) amended modification

During the onscreen review of the (draft) modification, CB made changes to the document inline with discussions.

In introducing her (draft) amended modification, CB advised that amendments had been undertaken following discussions with Ofgem around whether or not to await the recommendations from the UNC Data Quality (DQ) Workgroup (which is yet to be set up by Ofgem). The conclusion of the discussions being that it is prudent to continue to progress development of the modification, rather than await the DQ Workgroup output(s), hence the amended modification presented for consideration at this meeting. When CW suggested that the Workgroup would need to take into account the possible outcomes from the DQ Workgroup when developing the 0468 business rules, CB quoted an email from her contact within Ofgem.

BF advised that during discussions with the Electricity Data Quality Workgroup Chair, they confirmed that they (the electricity side) already have an optional UPRN field that would simply need to be made mandatory at some point in the future. At this point, CB pointed out that as far as 0468 is concerned, how the UPRN is actually utilised in any dual fuel scenario is 'out of scope' for this modification.

The discussions then focused on the business rules contained in 'Section 3 – Solution' during which CB advised that the consensus view of the Ordnance Survey is that adoption of UPRNs (as issued by the Land & Property Organisation) would improve site address information. (i.e. material improvements to information provisions).

There then followed a brief review of the proposed Business Rules, as follows:

Introduction Statement – CB pointed out that UPRNs are not necessarily specific to an address related product and confirmed that only one UPRN is provided by as by the Land & Property Organisation to a Local Authority (LA) per site/property for the LA to utilise and list in the Ordnance Survey address product. CB also advised that she has through discussion with both DECC and Ofgem, requested a more

consistent approach around when a Local Authority assigns the UPRN. It was noted that it is not unknown for a UPRN to 'move' geographical location on a site or within a property (e.g. changing use from a single to multiple dwelling or a change in the number of plots on a site etc.).

It was suggested that it would be necessary to define UPRN for Code purposes going forward and that the business rules would need to be correctly reconciled against the possible legal text provisions.

New Action 0401: E.ON (CB) to look to obtaining a meaningful definition for a UPRN from the Land & Property Organisation.

CB then pointed out that the Ordnance Survey representatives had previously provided a presentation relating to the UPRN life cycle – it was suggested that it would be beneficial to include this, possibly as an appendix, within the modification at some point. HC enquired as to whether or not it is the intention of the modification to specify that Transporters do not necessarily need to use a specific (address) product, they do need a UPRN based product to meet the requirements of this modification.

CB agreed to consider numbering the introduction as Business Rule 1 (including transitional requirements identified in the BR1 discussions below), and thereafter renumbering the subsequent BRs in a future amended version of the modification;

BR1 – When asked CB advised that she envisages that the 'reviewing' would be part of the standard BAU management of address updates.

HC suggested that transitions rules would be needed in order to migrate from the current PAF approach to one based on UPRNs. Acknowledging this, CB suggested that post implementation any new Supply Meter Points would need to be based on UPRNs with a certain amount of 'matching' required in order to resolve any potential gaps. CB suggested that the 'target' timeline should be to have the UPRN in the system within 3 months of creation of the Supply Point.

New Action 0402: Reference reviewing Supply Meter Point address data – Xoserve (HC) to double check whether or not Xoserve are able to accommodate the proposed UPRN update cycle (i.e. 6 week refresher).

When asked, CB indicated that she would be looking to amend the equivalent iGT modification (iGT056) once any proposed changes to 0468 had been assessed and agreed by this Workgroup;

BR2 – during a brief discussion, BF suggested that the current Code rules are suitable and questioned whether this rule was actually needed. The conclusion was to remove BR2 in its current form and to possibly add consideration of what is required to satisfy what happens once a meter that is capable of flowing gas has been fitted within one of the other BRs;

BR3 – CB provided a brief resume of the Address Query process during which HC clarified that when the Transporter raises a query (ADDN), an update is provided to the Shipper – thereafter the consensus was that this BR is 'fit for purpose' as drafted;

BR4 – CB suggested that this BR reflects a concern from D Addison of Xoserve relating to the potential use of a 16 digit UPRN identifier. CB also felt that the overall statement could now be reduced by removing the second sentence – this was agreed by those present;

BR5 – CW questioned why the Transporters would not be required to publish or provide property identifiers to the Users. Responding, CB reminded those present that the modification simply seeks to ensure that the industry has access to the best possible address related information and to know that transporters have matched

the address against a UPRN would provide confidence the address is accurate – some parties still believed that this represented a missed opportunity as the UPRN should be provided with the address data.

CB pointed out that having UPRN information does not necessarily assist dual fuel billing and reminded everyone that 0468 is not seeking to resolve wider energy industry issues. Additionally, CB pointed out that from the very beginning of 0468, she had never proposed that UPRNs would be provided to Shippers, as this modification is all about the quality of the address information held on central systems. HC suggested that, if the modification is all about resolving a central system address related issue, would it not be better to look to an alternative solution based on improving the existing process – it was felt that the various options would be ‘teased out’ during subsequent consideration and development of the Relevant Objectives. BF suggested that should Shippers wish to receive UPRN information, they would need to raise an alternative modification;

BR6 – CB confirmed that regardless of whether or not Transporters state that the address management system is PAF based, UPRNs would need to be embraced at some stage if most other utilities adopt the process;

BR7 – CW suggested that as written, this BR seems to infer that Users are able to interact (on UPRNs) with Transporters, which was recognised as a potential weakness as there are no formal obligations placed on the Users. It was noted that should transporters seek to obligate Users, this would then constitute a formal communication mechanism.

BF suggested that this is simply ‘normal’ business anyway and questioned having the specific rule in the first place. Responding, HC suggested that this relates to concerns around address changes (inc. errors) and the potential stranding of UPRNs on the system – in recognising that there could be issues associated with the UPRNs for blocks of flats etc, CB reminded everyone that UPRNs are geographically anchored to a property regardless of subsequent parent/child relationships (i.e. where a property is developed into multiple flats and then reverted back to a single property at some point)

It was suggested that it might be beneficial to amend the statement to add clarity;

BR8 – during a discussion on whether or not people are happy with the assumption that the address information is valid, CB felt that the industry would still need an ability to challenge various parties views on whether address information is accurate, even in instances where this information is perceived as being immature in nature, as this is still preferable to basing decisions on plot/site related information – it was noted that this is also linked to the 6 weekly review cycle timeline, and

BR9 – CW felt that it is important that the Workgroup follows predicated Code practises whilst BF suggested that whatever rules the industry utilises now for validating address related information should continue to apply going forward – in short, why seek to over engineer a solution when the UPRN should enhance the process.

BF also pointed out that process related aspects which relate to the way Xoserve operate do not need to be included within the BRs as they could form part of a ‘Guidance Document’ in due course. CB agreed to look to removing BRs 8 and 9 and instead providing a supporting process statement elsewhere within the modification.

3.0 Workgroup Report

3.1. Consideration of business rules

In light of discussions under item 2.1 above, further consideration was deferred at this time.

3.2. Consideration of User Pays

In light of discussions under item 2.1 above, further consideration was deferred at this time.

4.0 Next Steps

It was suggested that in order to progress the modification further, National Grid Distribution (as provider of the legal text) would need to consider any amendments to the business rules before commencing work on preparation of the legal text.

It was also noted that a cost estimate from Xoserve would be required in due course. HC pointed out that this could only realistically be provided once the BRs are bottomed out and indicated that she remains concerned about the proposed timelines associated with progression of the modification (i.e. the Workgroup Report date etc.).

It was also suggested that an apparent exclusion of Scottish Local Authority's from the Land & Property Organisation provisions might impact the full GB coverage. CB pointed out that Scotland is covered by its own similar organisation as it is subject to Scottish Law.

It was agreed that the Workgroup would look to consider an amended modification, associated (draft) legal text and cost estimate at the May meeting with a view to submitting the Workgroup Report at the August 2015 Panel meeting.

New Action 0403: E.ON (CB) to investigate the statutory requirements of Local Authorities in England & Wales and whether or not similar obligations are replicated in Scotland.

New Action 0404: E.ON (CB) & Xoserve (HC) to consider the PAF to UPRN based solution transitional requirements for inclusion in a subsequent amended version of the modification.

5.0 Any Other Business

None.

6.0 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 Thursday 28 May 2015	31 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3LT	Standard Workgroup considerations plus: Consideration of amended modification (inc. business rules)
10:30 Thursday 25 June 2015	ENA, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	Standard Workgroup considerations plus: Consideration of amended modification (inc. business rules) Consideration of draft legal text Development/completion of Workgroup Report

10:30 Thursday 23 July 2015	31 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3LT	Standard Workgroup considerations plus: Consideration of draft legal text Consideration of cost estimate Completion of Workgroup Report
-----------------------------	----------------------------------	--

Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0202	22/02/14 revised 09/05/14	2.0	All parties to consider and provide a view on the benefits and organisational requirements of enhancing address services.	All	Update provided. Closed
0203	22/02/14	2.0	Ordnance Survey to consider the options for Licence requirements (following completion of Action 0202)	Ordnance Survey (JJ)	Update provided. Closed
0501	09/05/14	1.2	<i>Address Management</i> – Invite DECC to give its perspective on this area.	Xoserve (DA)	Update provided. Closed
0601	06/06/14	3.0	To consider how best to develop an address related data structure provision built around the UPRN concept (including consideration of a move away from the current PAF related approach and possible matching to similar existing address information product lines).	Transporters (AR) & Xoserve (DA)	Update provided. Closed
0401	23/04/15	2.1	To look to obtaining a meaningful definition for a UPRN from the Land & Property Organisation.	E.ON (CB)	Pending

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0402	23/04/15	2.1	<i>Reference reviewing Supply Meter Point address data – Xoserve (HC) to double check whether or not Xoserve are able to accommodate the proposed UPRN update cycle (i.e. 6 week refresher).</i>	Xoserve (HC)	Pending
0403	23/04/15	4.0	To investigate the statutory requirements of Local Authorities in England & Wales and whether or not similar obligations are replicated in Scotland.	E.ON (CB)	Pending
0404	23/04/15	4.0	To consider the PAF to UPRN based solution transitional requirements for inclusion in a subsequent amended version of the modification.	E.ON (CB) & Xoserve (HC)	Pending