

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

Thursday 26 November 2015

31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT

Attendees

Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(RF)	Joint Office
Helen Cuin (Secretary)	(HCu)	Joint Office
Alex Ross-Shaw	(ARS)	Northern Gas Networks
Andy Clasper	(AC)	National Grid Distribution
Andy Miller	(AM)	Xoserve
Angela Love*	(AL)	Scottish Power
Chris Warner	(CW)	National Grid Distribution
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
Colin Blair*	(CBI)	Scottish Power
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Gavin Anderson*	(GA)	EDF Energy
Hilary Chapman	(HCh)	Xoserve
Jon Dixon	(JD)	Ofgem
Kirandeep Samra	(KS)	RWE npower
Kirsten Elliott-Smith	(KES)	Cornwall Energy
Lorna Lewin*	(LL)	DONG Energy
Mark Jones*	(MJ)	SSE
Mark Lyndon	(ML)	National Grid NTS
Rachel Hinsley	(RH)	Xoserve
Richard Pomroy*	(RP)	Wales & West Utilities
Steve Mulinganie	(SM)	Gazprom
Sue Hilbourne*	(SH)	Scotia Gas Networks

* via teleconference

Copies of all papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/0468/261115>

The Workgroup Report is due to be presented at the UNC Modification Panel by 17 March 2016.

1.0 Review of Minutes and Actions

1.1 Approval of Minutes (22 October 2015)

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

2.0 Consideration of amended Modification

BF explained that at the UNC Panel meeting, concerns had been raised that this modification had failed to progress in its development for a significant period of time and that an extension had been granted on the proviso that a report suitable to be issued to consultation is delivered by 17 March 2016. The intention is to issue the modification for industry consideration no later than the March Panel.

CB explained the development of the modification had been frozen whilst consideration was being made by the Dual Fuel Data Quality Workgroup on the adoption of UPRN. The Data Quality Workgroup was unable to reach consensus on the compulsory adoption of UPRN, therefore requiring the development of this modification. She explained that the business rules have not yet been updated, however significant changes were not expected, and that it was hoped to provide a formal amended modification in due course.

SM questioned if the adoption of UPRN could be managed through the central registration service. He suggested the industry should wait and see what happens with the central registration service and whether it best sits within this process. He also questioned if this change cuts across the faster switching SCR.

CB explained this modification is about providing a better quality address data and to make sure the transition of a plot address to the final address happens as quickly and smoothly as possible.

BF understood that Ofgem intend to present a view on the iGT equivalent modification at the next iGT Panel meeting.

SM challenged what determines a change in an address and the cost benefit of incorporating a change into central systems when Shippers wouldn't see the UPRN or understand why the address had changed. He would like the Workgroup to assess and understand the clear benefit of adopting this change.

CB explained the process followed for maturing a address from plot to its postal address, and this modification would assist the removal of duplicates sites where an MPRN has been created under an incorrect address and should reduce the number of erroneous transfers. It would reduce the work required on manual address matching enquires of which there were around 185,000 each year.

SM suggested the UPRN itself wouldn't fix address problems; it's the underlying address data connected to the UPRN, which he believed could be improved without a change to central systems.

KS enquired about the potential licence requirements if the Transporters use the UPRN for data cleansing. DA explained that checking the address with Ordinance Survey outputs is acceptable without a need for the other party to hold a licence, however if there was a clear link i.e. the address is updated to include a UPRN then a licence would be required.

SM expressed concern about the changing of addresses by Transporters where Shipper or consumer site knowledge may be over-ridden resulting in the lose of accurate address details.

SM also enquired about the route for managing addresses. He understood that certain parties would want like for like gas and electric address/accounts linked to a UPRN. However, he was still concerned about addresses being overwritten by a validation process. ARS explained sometimes now addresses can be overwritten with wrong postcodes and if this has been validated against Post Office addresses, the only way to correct them is for customers to challenge the address recorded on PAF with the post office.

3.0 Workgroup Report

3.1. Consideration of Business Rules

The Workgroup reviewed the modification's Solution and Business Rules.

CW requested that within the Solution the proposer clarifies the definition of a UPRN, as this will required for the legal text.

DA was concerned about any misconceptions that the UPRN is part of an address product. DA asked about the use of the UPRN as a term in the UNC and that this may be

linked to the AddressBase product licenced by Ordnance Survey, which could cost and definition issues. DA explained that the UPRN is a recognised address product, and he was concerned that any reference in the UNC to use the UPRN may create requirements to purchase a licence to use the data provided by the product.

CB explained there are multiple products provided by Ordnance Survey that utilise the UPRN but she is not specifying that a certain product has to be used, to allow freedom of choice. However, she noted that UPRN is provided through the Land Registry system updated by Local Authorities and not specific to AddressBase.

SM wished to understand the potential licence requirements. He wanted assurance there would not be a claim against parties for using address information provided by Transporters using UPRN address based product. SM did not want to be liable for costs for unknowingly being in breach of licence.

KS suggested having contacted Ordnance Survey that being provided a UPRN would not require a licence, however if a party wanted the data associated with the UPRN there would be a need to hold a licence. CB confirmed that in her view there is no need to hold a licence as UPRN specific data is not being provided. The DNOs will use the UPRN to cleanse the UK Link address data. She confirmed that some DNOs already have a licence to use UPRN associated with mapping products they use.

SM understood that Xoserve would still need to associate the UPRN with a UPRN based product to use the references issued by the local authority. The Workgroup agreed the definition will need to be clear on the obligation to use the UPRN issued by local authorities through the local mapping agreement.

SM expressed some concern with business rule 7 in that Users may not have a relationship with the address service provider and would not have recourse of action if the wrong address were cleansed/assigned in UK Link. SM challenged that business rule 8 needs to be explicit in that the DNO will need to manage queries. i.e. if a Shipper disputes the validity of the address, Xoserve can in effect challenge the address with the product provider. The Workgroup discussed the ability to assign wrong UPRNs and where the UPRN compared to UK Link could signify a potential incorrect address, Xoserve will be able to challenge the data with the product provider.

DA explained how the current PAF product is utilised. Addresses can be validated against PAF, where PAF validates the address the PAF address will be used. Where the address cannot be validated then Xoserve will utilise the Shipper provided data. However, all of this sits outside of the UNC in low level operational processes. SM suggested that Shippers need to have the right to challenge an amended address.

The Workgroup agreed the business rules should allow for the right of challenge. Business rule 9 accepts, where there has been a valid challenge against updating the UK Link address, with the UPRN address, the meter point address is not linked to a UPRN and the information provided by the Shipper will be used instead and no automatic updates will be made for the UPRN product, with the flag active.

It was suggested that, where there is no UPRN address, then shipper challenged data needs to be considered within the business rules to ensure this is clearly defined. CB agreed to re-examine the rules and make any necessary amendments.

4.0 Actions

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

Update: Deferred to next meeting. **Carried forward**

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).

Update: Deferred to next meeting. **Carried forward**

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.

Update: Deferred to next meeting. **Carried forward**

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.

Update: Deferred to next meeting. **Carried forward**

1001: *Joint Industry Address Data Quality Workgroup Report* - DA to contact the originator of the report with a request to provide it for publication on the Joint Office website.

Update: Provided. **Closed**

5.0 Next Steps

An amended modification will be submitted for further consideration and development of the Workgroup Report in December 2015.

6.0 Diary Planning

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
Tuesday 22 December 2015	Energy Networks Association, Dean Bradley House, 52 Horseferry Road, London SW1P 2AF	Amended modification Development of Workgroup Report

Action Table (26 November 2015)

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0401	23/04/15	2.1	To look to obtaining a meaningful definition for a UPRN from the Land and Property Organisation.	E.ON (CB)	Carried forward
0402	23/04/15	2.1	<i>Reference reviewing Supply Meter Point address data</i> – Xoserve (HC) to double check whether or not Xoserve are able to accommodate the proposed UPRN update cycle (i.e. 6 week refresher).	Xoserve (HC)	Carried forward

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
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)	Carried forward
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) and Xoserve (HC)	Carried forward
1001	22/10/15	3.0	<i>Joint Industry Address Data Quality Workgroup Report</i> - DA to contact the originator of the report with a request to provide it for publication on the Joint Office website.	Xoserve (DA)	Closed