

ADWG Meeting 15_0617

17th June 2015 at 10:00

Gemserv, 8 Fenchurch Place, London, EC3M 4AJ

DRAFT Minutes

Attendees:

Representing	Name	Initial	Category
ELEXON	Justin Andrews	Chair	Meeting Chair
Gemserv	Nick Good	NG	Meeting Secretary
Northern Gas Networks	Alex Ross-Shaw	ARS	Gas Transporter
National Grid	Andy Clasper	AC	Gas Transporter
Scottish Gas Networks	David Mitchell	DM	Gas Transporter
ES Pipelines	Katy Binch	KB	Independent Gas Transporter
Gemserv	Glenn Sheern	GS	MRA Advisor
Electralink	Sarah Jones	SJ	SPAA Advisor
British Gas	Adam Iles	AI	Supplier
British Gas	Oorlagh Chapman	OC	Supplier
SSE	Victoria Burkett	VB	Supplier
Ofgem	Ciaran MacCann	CM	Authority
ELEXON	Jon Spence	JS	BSC Advisor
Citizens Advice Bureau	Conrad Steel	CS	Consumer Advisor
Electralink	Paul Gath	PG	DTN Service Provider
Xoserve	David Addison	DA	Technical Service Provider
Ordnance Survey	Peat Allan	PA	Technical Service Provider

Apologies:

Representing	Name	Initial	Category
E.ON	Colette Baldwin	CB	Supplier

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Chair welcomed all attendees and thanked parties for their participation in the Working Group.

2. Purpose of the Work, Terms of Reference

The Chair introduced the requirement for the Address Data Dual Fuel working group (ADWG) to produce a report to Ofgem by the end of November 2015. The Chair invited CM to provide an overview of Ofgem's motivation behind the formation of the group. CM highlighted that a recommendation of both industry Data Quality reports to Ofgem in December 2014 identified the need for a joint industry working group to consider aligning address format across gas and electricity registrations, to support Ofgem's faster switching programme and a Centralised Registration Service (CRS) initiative. CM noted the recommendation of both reports that the same joint industry working group consider adoption of the Unique Property Reference Number (UPRN) as an additional address reference, to support the customer experience on a Change of Supplier (CoS).

AI queried whether there was an opportunity for Ofgem to allow additional time for the group to produce the report, in order to maximise the number of responses provided for the consultation document from the industry. CM explained that the ADWG report will assist in underpinning the blueprint phase for the CRS and as such forms part of a planned timeline to implement the faster switching and CRS strategies. Following this, CM stated that unfortunately additional time to consult the industry may not be appropriate. The Chair acknowledged that time is short to produce the consultation and that it will be issued over the summer holiday period. This will limit respondents' ability to provide a detailed cost benefit analysis, so the group would need to ensure that it pitched the consultation at the right level of detail.

CM summarised that Ofgem is expecting the group to inform the existing address formats used by gas and electricity processes, the shared requirements between both, the options to harmonise these formats and whether the adoption of the UPRN would provide a benefit to the industry. CM invited the group to consider this in anticipation of the CRS, along with an indication of the governance arrangements which may be required to accommodate any changes that the group suggests in the report. Finally, CM thanked the group members for their participation.

The Chair invited the group to comment on the Working Group Terms of Reference (ToR). There were no comments and the group agreed the ToR.

3. Proposed Work Plan and Approach

The Chair invited JS to provide the group with a proposed work plan. JS outlined a timeline to complete and deliver the report to Ofgem, represented in Table 1 below.

Month	Group Activity	Work to be completed
June	Meeting	Establish Working Group and consider issues
July	Meeting	Agree consultation questions for circulation
August	Consultation	Collating consultation responses and
September	Meeting	Consider consultation responses; agree report content
October	Code Panel Review	Incorporate Code Panel feedback into report
November	Finalise Report	Finalise report and issue to Ofgem

Table 1 - Proposed Work Plan

JS outlined the relevant Code Panels to review the report:

- Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC) Panel;
- Master Registration Agreement (MRA) Executive Committee (MEC);
- Smart Energy Code(SEC) Panel;
- Supply Point Administration Agreement (SPAA) Executive Committee;
- Uniform Network Code (UNC) Panel; and
- Independent Gas Transporter (iGT) UNC Panel.

JS suggested that the consultation could include a high level impact assessment on the benefits of adopting UPRNs as an additional address validation measure. The Chair highlighted that the work would involve working group cooperation, which may require written contribution from all members for the report. CM suggested it may be beneficial to include the SEC in a distribution list, as the SEC will be the destination code for the development of faster switching and CRS requirements.

DA proposed that the consultation should be cognisant of the code modifications which seek to introduce the UPRN under the gas arrangements. E.ON has raised UNC Modification 0468 'Unique Property Reference Number (UPRN) Population by Gas Transporters' and iGT UNC Modification 056 'Unique Property Reference Number (UPRN) Population by Pipeline Operators. The Chair agreed and suggested that the group discuss these existing modification proposals at the next meeting, so that the raiser could attend.

PG queried who would be responsible for issuing the consultation document. JS asked for views from the group and noted that all the relevant Code Panels would have a distribution list, so it should not prove difficult to send to parties for response. He acknowledged the risk of duplicated effort from industry parties. The Group queried whether Ofgem could encourage responses or issue the consultation themselves. CM highlighted that since the working group and report is being led by the industry, it should be the industry to publish the consultation document. CM suggested that Ofgem may be able to publish a letter to encourage industry response, and volunteered to investigate whether this was feasible.

The Chair invited the group to propose any existing fora that could promote the responses to the consultation. KB suggested that the iGT Forum could promote the consultation and encourage responses from iGTs. GS advised that the Change of Supplier Expert Group (COSEG) had reconvened and would meet again in early July, and that the COSEG member distribution list would be an appropriate method to send the consultation to industry participants.

CS queried whether the group would undertake detailed analysis of how to implement any recommendations. CM highlighted that this would not be required as part of the scope of the working group as Ofgem only require the preparatory recommendations for the group on a common address format for gas and electricity and if UPRN should be adopted by the industry.

4. Gas and Electricity Address Data

The Chair introduced the agenda item and invited GS to provide an overview of the electricity requirements for address data (see separate slides). GS presented the structure of the MRA Standard Address Format (SAF), as outlined in MRA Agreed Procedure 09 (MAP09) 'Standard Address Format and Guidance Notes for Address Maintenance', which contains some minor variations on the Postal Address Format (PAF). GS also presented an overview of the reasons why the address may need to be changed. GS highlighted that the responsibility for the address data is placed on Distribution Businesses, as the information is held in the respective MPAS databases. GS noted that the Suppliers have more contact with customers and therefore they may be notified of a need to change the address. GS commented on this to state that a common responsibility is shared between both industry parties.

GS explained that the UPRN is mentioned in the MAP, as it is mandated as a requirement to be held in MPAS as part of the Meter Point Administration Data (MPAD) which will be sent to the DCC. GS noted that this has been agreed to be inserted into the MAP by the industry in anticipation that the UPRN will be utilised in Smart Metering. However, GS emphasised that there is no current mandate to populate the UPRN or to send it between industry participants via Data Flows.

PG stated that the Data Transfer Service (DTS) audit tool is currently being modified to allow market participants to search the list of all UPRNs that they have individually sent across the Data Transfer Network (DTN) and that the tool would be available through the 'DTN Webtools' application.

The Chair invited DA to provide a comparison of the electricity address requirements with the gas address requirements.

DA noted that the gas arrangements use the PAF with a minor variation which is different to the electricity structure. DA explained, stating that the difference is that the gas address structure contains a 'delivery point alias'. DA highlighted that the reasons that the address data would be updated are the same as those presented for electricity. The group agreed this point and noted that the address structures were similar at a high level. The group also agreed that the responsibility to update the address data is similar to the electricity arrangements outlined by GS previously. One difference is that gas Suppliers can change addresses (via the Shipper), whereas electricity Suppliers can propose changes, but distribution businesses retain a right of refusal.

5. Address Data Issues

The Chair invited parties to comment on the current issues experienced with gas and electricity address data, and whether any changes are underway which seek to improve these issues. The group discussed the following issues:

- Customers providing 'vanity addresses' to Suppliers during the registration process, which are used instead of the standard address. The group noted that this could cause rejections when validating Data Flows, which can then cause delays in the CoS process for the customer;
- Inconsistent address content, which can lead to the Supplier holding multiple variations of the same address, i.e. from MPAS, the Xoserve IX Network and the billing addresses for gas and electricity; and
- Data issues identified by both Data Quality Working Group Reports, such as crossed meters.

The group also discussed whether an address should identify either the customer or the metering point, as this may occasionally be different, for example rural properties which may hold different addresses for locations of meters and customer addresses.

The group agreed that in order to alleviate the above address data issues, a data cleansing exercise should reduce the number of inconsistencies in address records. The group also highlighted that in order to maintain data quality, appropriate maintenance processes must be in place to ensure that the cleansed data is not degraded over time. SJ suggested that the Theft Risk Assessment Service (TRAS) Service Provider may be able to provide industry participants with a source of cleansed data. SJ clarified that the assessment process provided will include an exercise to triangulate addresses, by using a variety of industry and non-industry sources of data. SJ agreed to provide further details on this service to the group to see if relevant to help cleanse address data.

The group considered the ability for an address to identify either the customer or the metering point, and noted that a single address format could reflect either aspect. The group noted that this needed to be considered by the industry to ensure that the customer is not negatively impacted, in light of Ofgem's faster switching programme, since it is designed to improve the CoS experience for the customer.

The Chair summarised the discussion around the issues experienced and highlighted that the problems seemed to be due to the inconsistent content of address data, as opposed to the format of gas and electricity addresses. The Chair suggested that these discussions would feed into the consultation questions. The group agreed.

The group noted that modifications under the Uniform Network Code (UNC) and Independent Gas Transports' UNC (IGT UNC) have been raised to implement the option to share the UPRN between industry participants. GS noted that the MRA Issue Resolution Expert Group (IREG) would be considering a review of the process to resolve crossed meters, as part of the issues mentioned in the Electricity Data Quality Working Group Report. GS advised that this would be brought to the next IREG meeting, and that this issue could be resolved through MRA Change Proposals being produced as a result of this review. The Chair noted this and advised that the existing Change Proposals would be circulated and discussed at the next meeting. The Chair invited all parties to investigate the individual address data quality issues for discussion at the next meeting, in order for the group to achieve an accurate perception of industry address data issues.

6. Unique Property Reference Numbers

The Chair introduced the agenda item and invited PA to provide an overview of the function of the UPRN. PA presented an introduction to the UPRN and an outline of its purpose, along with the benefits of adopting it to industry participants. These benefits included the UPRN's status as a 'persistent key', which pre-exists a PAF address (i.e. can be assigned to a plot) and endures following PAF address changes (for example, following a building being split into flats). PA also provided a summary of the Ordnance Survey address software 'AddressBase', which is an address lookup tool. The group noted that some industry participants have already procured an address lookup tool to assist with address data validation and to resolve issues. PA agreed to provide a written summary of the information presented to the group at the meeting.

The group continued a discussion around the ability of the UPRN to triangulate address data, reaching a consensus that the UPRN could be used as an additional address validation tool, but is not a complete solution to industry data issues. The group also noted that the adoption of the UPRN once the CRS has been implemented may present an additional set of complexities and issues, which would need to be mitigated. The Chair summarised that as the UPRN is a similar tool to the current industry meter address reference (MPAN and MPRN), the main benefit it could provide is in a data cleansing process. However, GS emphasised that the success of the data cleansing activity would depend on what the data would be cleansed in accordance with, as this would impact the content of the output data.

Based on these discussions, the Chair summarised a set of questions that could be included in the consultation:

- Can a recommendation be made that every industry party uses the AddressBase software (or other software tools) to cleanse address data in anticipation of the Smart Metering rollout, faster switching and CRS initiatives (given that AddressBase is a specific commercial product)?
- Is there a benefit to industry participants if parties were to cleanse the address data and assign a UPRN afterwards?
- Should the current set of references (i.e. MPAN and MPRN) be replaced by UPRNs when initiating the switching process or added as an additional reference?

The group considered the option of carrying out a data cleansing exercise and amending the existing references to be labelled as a unique switching ID, which could then be used in customer billing as a reference. This could then be used to initiate a CoS process for customers. The group identified that this could achieve a similar result to adopting the UPRN. CS commented on this proposal with the perspective of the Citizen's Advice Bureau, suggesting that this could add complexity to the CoS

process for customers. The group agreed that it would be beneficial to gain feedback from Distribution Businesses on this proposal as well as the wider discussions around UPRNs, as some industry participants are currently considering adopting the reference for asset management purposes.

7. Summary and Next Steps

The Chair summarised the discussions at the meeting and identified the following actions for group members to complete:

Action	Description	Who
1.1	Circulate presentation information from the meeting to all group members.	NG
1.2	Circulate existing industry changes which seek to change address data issues (UNC Modification 468 and iGT Modification 56).	NG
1.3	Identify key address data quality issues individually for discussion at the next meeting.	All
1.4	Confirm whether the different formats gas and electricity addresses (as opposed to different address contents) present a risk to the customer transfer process.	All
1.5	Provide a written summary of the information presented on the UPRN and AddressBase at the meeting.	PA
1.6	Consider (and seek views) on the feasibility and desirability of obtaining the MPAN/MPRN (or UPRN) from the customer to initiate the switching process.	All
1.7	Report back on any address data cleansing being undertaken as part of Project Nexus.	DA
1.8	Consider the feasibility of leveraging the single set of electricity and gas addresses to be utilised by the TRAS to improve address data quality.	SJ
1.9	Engage Suppliers and distribution businesses to encourage attendance at the next meeting.	JA

The Chair suggested the 22nd July as the next meeting date. The group agreed.

There were no further comments and the Chair closed the meeting.