

**iGT056 - UPRN Population by Pipeline Operators**

**Development Group Meeting #06**

**Friday 9<sup>th</sup> May 2014**

**31 Homer Road, Solihull, B91 3LT**

<b>Attendee</b>	<b>Initials</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Bob Fletcher (Chair)	(BF)	Joint Office
Lorna Dupont (Secretary)	(LD)	Joint Office
Adam Pearce*	(AP)	ESP
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON UK
Darcy Harmer-Manning	(DHM)	Ordnance Survey
David Addison	(DA)	Xoserve
David Mitchell	(DM)	Scotia Gas Networks
Kiran Samra	(KS)	RWE npower
Maria Hesketh	(MHe)	Scottish Power
Richard Duffield	(RD)	GeoPlace
Roger Hunt	(RH)	Ordnance Survey
Tahera Choudhury	(TC)	Xoserve
Trevor Peacock*	(TP)	Fulcrum

\* *via teleconference*

Apologies were received from Jenny Rawlinson

*The following is extracted from UNC Workgroup 0468 Minutes, prepared by the Joint Office.*

## **1.0 Introduction and Status Review**

BF welcomed all to the meeting. The meeting was not quorate as only one Transporter was in attendance.

### **1.1 Minutes**

An error in the previous minutes had been noted. All references to iGT059 will be corrected to iGT056, and the minutes will be republished.

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted.

### **1.2 Actions**

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

**Update:** A draft had been produced for review. **Closed.**

**0201:** Ordnance Survey, Xoserve and iGTs to undertake a sample matching exercise to establish the benefits of using Address Base and matching UPRNs.

**Update:** Exercise completed and the results provided for review. **Closed.**

**0202:** All parties to consider and provide a view on the benefits and organisational requirements of using the Address Base and UPRN data.

**Update:** DA requested an amendment to the wording of the action to avoid being too prescriptive in terms of product. It was agreed to amend the action to:

All parties to consider and provide a view on the benefits and organisational Requirements of enhancing address services using the Address Base and UPRN data.

**Carried Forward.**

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

**Update:** Dependent on Action 0202, above; item deferred. **Carried Forward.**

**0301:** C&C Group (NM) to provide an overview of address management within the electricity industry.

**Update:** NM was not present at this meeting and BF will undertake to contact him regarding this action.

There was a brief discussion on the relevance of this information to this Workgroup, and whether any benefit would be gained from reviewing/utilising the electricity industry's experiences.

**Post Meeting Note:** Neil McKeown has confirmed a verbal update had been provided on 15 April 2014. He has enquired internally however there is no real insight; if an issue is identified with an address informal emails are exchanged. There is an enquiry system and data flows to allow the opportunity to challenge addresses however the ownership of addresses is outside remit. **Complete**

DA confirmed that Xoserve was contacting DECC regarding its statistics on the ease/degree of match and was also in dialogue with those Transporters (Wales & West Utilities, Northern Gas Networks and National Grid Distribution) who also use a specific UPRN based product in their separate systems that may interact with Xoserve systems. DM confirmed that Scotia Gas Networks was discussing the acquisition of a similar product. It was suggested that a DECC representative might be invited to give an overview of its perspective on address management. DA agreed to contact DECC with an invitation.

**NEW ACTION 0501: Address Management – Invite DECC to give its perspective on this area.**

Observing that the Transporters already have some sort of service BF questioned, how did that feed into the Transporter Agent's activities? It was suggested that this might be within their asset management systems, which may not directly link to central systems. CB reiterated that Shippers want clean up-to-date managed addresses for Supply Points, and if the Transporters already had some sort of access how could this inform/support this requirement? DA added that he was aware that some Shippers also had this access and used it for various activities; he did not know how far across the industry it might be in use. DM asked does it increase the effective provision of clean addresses, ie if all parties become 'UPRN fluent' does it lead to improvement?

BF observed that if every party had access to this system it would solve the licensing difficulties. RH thought that would be a position unlikely to be reached in the near future.

CB pointed out the modification was asking the Transporters to provide accurate addresses for Supply Points to fulfil existing obligations. DA believed it would be better for all parties to be 'UPRN fluent' but this was not a requirement of the modification as written.

## **2.0 Presentation and Demonstrations: *Ordnance Survey - New Service Products from May 2014***

DHM gave a presentation centred on new developments that have been made to products to meet customer requirements for obtaining accurate address information and maintaining clean databases. RH confirmed this was an ancillary product/supplementary services to provide data cleaning tools. The data would be received on DVD; release timescales and frequency of updates were discussed. DHM explained the design features of each of the three service products (APIs) that could be purchased, and summarised the activities covered and the expected results that could be obtained from their use. It was confirmed that Ordnance Survey (OS) had developed and tested the algorithms and achieved a high match rate of 98%. DHM gave some examples.

DHM then explained the Matching and Cleansing, Capture and Verification, and GeoSearch functions in more detail.

### *Live Demonstration*

The individual functionality of the service was demonstrated, using real data. DA and CB compared this to what might be experienced through PAF. It was suggested the OS service might have more powerful algorithms and be able to perform better and more quickly because it is considering various data items other than the postcode from a system perspective.

DHM described various scenarios/data items that it might handle and match; a reasonable number of base data items (eg 4 or 6) were required for it to offer the best result. A response would provide more than one match and would also provide a 'match confidence' level. If customers required a certain attribution then OS could look to provide this. RD explained possible hierarchy models. DA confirmed that the address item was the most important at present, and observed that the application to more sophisticated data sets might be useful in the future, eg verification of Market Sector Code.

A second demonstration was then performed, providing examples of results that would not be obtainable under PAF, and extra information that could be returned from a Search. This would be useful for sites that did not have a postal address, eg churches, power stations, etc), or multi-occupancy sites.

## **3.0 Business Rules**

The review of the draft Business Rules was commenced. DA explained that it had been attempted to focus these into covering relevant activities rather than mandating the use of a specific product. The draft rules were discussed.

*BR 2* – The point at which obligations should be placed was queried. The roles/process involved in installing a meter were outlined, and it was observed that different organisations might have in place different service providers/arrangements. A number of scenarios were described. It was confirmed that GeoPlace was responsible for allocating

UPRNs to Local Authorities who then assign them to sites at the planning or build stage.

It was questioned at what point should the Transporters be reviewing and Xoserve managing the address data. DA explained how he envisaged the process working. AP believed there was a need for address information to be as accurate as possible before the meter was installed, and for the Transporter to confirm the address provided by the developer or contractor.

It was suggested that the business rule be revised with additional words as follows:

“Once an address is confirmed<sup>1</sup> as being valid, and a Supply Meter Point has been created that – following the relevant meter connection activity – is capable of flowing gas or the Supply Meter Point becomes confirmed by a Shipper, whichever is the earlier - the Transporters shall within a period of [three months] review the Supply Meter Point address.”

*BR 4* - DA reiterated he was concerned not to mandate the use of a particular product by explicitly stating ‘UPRN’, rather than a generic reference to a unique property identifier. It should not preclude other service providers. A discussion of the wording ensued and disparate views were expressed.

CB reiterated that the ‘address data experience’ is currently quite poor, and the intent of the modification was to accurately track an address from planning through to occupancy.

AP observed that the UNC should state what is wanted to achieve and the Transporters must then decide how they will deliver it, eg by procuring services to achieve an agreed SLA. DECC has stated an ambition to increase the use of UPRN in the future, but was there a need for that to go into the GT systems today.

It was noted that not every potential service provider used UPRN. CB explained her view that using the 12 digit UPRN gave a valid and trusted source for address data. Changes of service providers for similar information opened up opportunities for mismatches and potential losses of address histories.

BF suggested clearly defining in the modification what was meant by ‘UPRN’ and whether a definition should be created within the UNC, and also clarifying exactly what was required to be held and included in the systems and if this information is to be shared.

Reference was made to the National Land and Property Gazetteer. RD and RH reiterated that a single national address database was advocated by DECC and the government; any charges for licences for use were currently capped based on existing products with less functionality.

Until the materiality of any potentially mandatory requirement to limit operations to use of a single national address database through a single service provider was clarified, it was felt that no further progress could be made with a review of the Business Rules.

#### **4.0 Matching Exercise (Action 0201)**

RD provided a hand out: “Review of Xoserve sample data (version 1.0)” and a brief review of the matching exercise and the results obtained took place.

RD explained the findings. Various questions specific to the data under review were asked, and this led to the source data itself being questioned. DA observed that it might have been sourced and provided from a certain project. On closer examination RH believed it be Xoserve data sent for a trial purpose and did not include the iGT data provided by JR. DA commented that it was clear that the business context should be applied to the data provided and this might give a different perspective to the findings, rather than continue to make what could be an incorrect inference.

**Action 0502: Matching Exercise Data - Xoserve to clarify the source of the data and its business context and report back to Workgroup.**

The representatives from Ordnance Survey and GeoPlace left the meeting at this point.

**5.0 Discussion**

A discussion took place centred on the aspiration for provision of accurate address information. The actual requirements as presented in the current version of the modification were disputed, with disparate understandings and viewpoints expressed. It was suggested that a key point was to ascertain if DECC was advocating mandatory use of a data source based on 'UPRN' across the industry.

*Next Steps*

CB to revise the modification and Business Rules to redefine and clarify the requirements.

Xoserve to obtain a view from DECC on the use of source data and invite a DECC representative to attend the next meeting (see Action 0501, above).

It was confirmed that National Grid Distribution would be the Transporter providing the legal text for this modification.

**6.0 Any Other Business**

None.

**7.0 Diary Planning for Review Group**

Workgroup meetings will take place as follows:

<b>Time/Date</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>Workgroup Programme</b>
10:30 Friday 06 June 2014	31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT	Revised modification and Business Rules Legal text
10:30 TBC	31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT	31 Homer Road, Solihull B91 3LT To be confirmed

### Action Table

Action Ref	Meeting Date	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
0103	20/01/14	2.0	E.ON to consider required business rules.	E.ON (CB)	Closed
0201	22/02/14	2.0	Ordnance Survey, Xoserve and iGTs to undertake a sample matching exercise to establish the benefits of using Address Base and matching UPRNs.	Ordnance Survey / Xoserve/i GTs	Closed
0202	22/02/14 09/05/14 action revised	2.0	All parties to consider and provide a view on the benefits and organisational requirements of enhancing address services.	All	Carried Forward
0203	22/02/14	2.0	Ordnance Survey to consider the options for Licence requirements (following completion of Action 0202)	Ordnance Survey (JJ)	Carried Forward
0301	24/03/14	2.0	C&C Group to provide an overview of address management within the electricity industry.	C&C Group (NM)	Post Meeting Note. Complete
0501	09/05/14	1.2	Address Management – Invite DECC to give its perspective on this area.	Xoserve (DA)	Pending
0502	09/05/14	4.0	Matching Exercise Data - Xoserve to clarify the source of the data and its business context and report back to Workgroup.	Xoserve (DA)	Pending