ADWG Meeting 15_0722

22nd July 2015 at 10:00

ELEXON, 350 Euston Road, London, NW1 3AW

DRAFT Minutes

Attendees:

Representing	Name	Initial	Category
ELEXON	Justin Andrews	Chair	Meeting Chair
Gemserv	Nick Good	NG	Meeting Secretary
Scottish Gas Networks	David Mitchell	DM	Gas Transporter
ES Pipelines	Katy Binch	KB	Independent Gas Transporter
Gemserv	Andy Knowles	AK	MRA Advisor
Electralink	Ben Howarth	BH	SPAA Advisor
UK Power Networks	Jonathan Purdy	JP	Distribution Network Operator
Western Power Distribution	Jane Jones	JJ	Distribution Network Operator
British Gas	Adam Iles	AI	Supplier
British Gas	Oorlagh Chapman	OC	Supplier
E.ON	Colette Baldwin	CB	Supplier
SSE	Anne Jackson	AJ	Supplier
Npower	Maitrayee Bhomwick-Jewkes	MBJ	Supplier
First Utility	Jeremy Guard	JG	Supplier
Ofgem	Ciaran MacCann	CM	Authority
ELEXON	Jon Spence	JS	BSC Advisor
Citizens Advice Bureau	Conrad Steel	CS	Consumer Advisor
Xoserve	David Addison	DA	Technical Service Provider
Xoserve	Emma Lyndon	EL	Technical Service Provider
Data Communications Company	Simon Quayle	SQ	Technical Service Provider
Ordnance Survey	Peat Allan	PA	Technical Service Provider

Apologies:

Representing	Name	Initial	Category
ScottishPower	Lorna Mallon	LM	Supplier

1. Welcome and Introductions

The Chair welcomed all attendees to the second Address Data Dual Fuel Working Group (ADWG) meeting and thanked parties for their participation in the Working Group.

The Chair invited parties to comment on the minutes of the last meeting. DA suggested that there may have been some content missing in the table on page 2, under the month of August. NG clarified that the word 'and' should be deleted and that there was no additional content to add to the table. There were no further comments and the Group agreed the minutes as an accurate representation of the meeting.

2. Actions

The Chair summarised the discussions at the last meeting and provided and update on the actions agreed, as outlined in the table below.

Action	Description	Who	Meeting Update
1.1	Circulate presentation information from the meeting to all Group members.	NG	Information circulated to Group
1.2	Circulate existing industry changes which seek to change address data issues (UNC Modification 468 and iGT Modification 56).	NG	Information circulated to Group
1.3	Identify key address data quality issues individually for discussion at the next meeting.	All	The Chair noted that this action would be covered by the discussions under agenda item 3
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	The Chair noted that this action would be covered by the discussions under agenda items 3 and 4
1.5	Provide a written summary of the information presented on the UPRN and AddressBase at the meeting.	PA	Information circulated to Group
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	The Chair noted that this action would be covered by the discussions under agenda items 3 and 4
1.7	Report back on any address data cleansing being undertaken as part of Project Nexus.	DA	DA advised that no specific data cleansing process was required under Project Nexus
1.8	Consider the feasibility of leveraging the single set of electricity and gas addresses to be	SJ	The Group discussed that the focus is currently on implementing the TRAS solution, therefore it would not be possible to utilise the TRAS address data in the short term. The Group considered the use of TRAS data to cleanse address

	utilised by the TRAS to improve address data quality.		data as an alternative to the AddressBase software package provided by Ordnance Survey, but noted that the associated costs would have to be considered if this is a route that the industry explores further. The Group also noted that a challenge to this proposal is the timeline for the TRAS Technical Provider to develop systems and processes from which the data could be extracted
1.9	Engage Suppliers and Distribution Businesses to encourage attendance at the next meeting.	Chair	The Chair advised that this had been completed

3. Issues For Discussion

The Chair introduced the agenda item and invited CB to provide an overview of the existing Modification proposals under the IGT UNC and UNC codes, which seek to implement the UPRN.

CB noted that UNC Modification 468 and iGT Modification 56 were currently in Working Group phase. They seek to implement the UPRN into Gas Transporters' internal datasets, to assist with validation of address data and keeping address data up-to-date. Although the Modifications require Gas Transporters to hold the UPRN, there will be no requirements to pass the UPRN to other market participants (so avoiding any potential licensing issues for other participants). CB advised that the implementation dates of these Modifications are after the implementation of the NEXUS programme in October 2016.

The Chair invited the Group to identify the current industry adoption of the UPRN. The group suggested that some Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) had begun to use the UPRN for internal purposes, along with the Ordnance Survey AddressBase geographical software package. The Group also noted that other DNOs are currently investigating the feasibility of the UPRN for the same purpose. PA advised that the software could be utilised to enable triangulation of a metering point address, between the address and MPAN/MPRN held, the UPRN and the geographical coordinates provided by the AddressBase software. CB advised that GTs and iGTs may be opposed to the UPRN if there is a reliance on the AddressBase software for it to benefit address data quality, as this could impact the level of competition in the market. The UNC and iGT UNC Mods deliberately avoid specifying use of the AddressBase product for this reason. Rather, they place obligations on GTs/iGTs to improve address data quality. The Chair clarified that there may be other alternative software packages which carry out the same function as AddressBase which parties could use in conjunction with the Ordnance Survey UPRN. CB highlighted that there was a lack of knowledge on these specific alternatives and that this may be an area of work which needs to be completed in order to make a clear recommendation on the use of the UPRN and a geographical software package.

The Group discussed the issues associated with communicating the UPRN through Data Flows across gas and electricity, noting that the current gas arrangements only allowed the UPRN to be sent between parties in smart Metering registration processes. The Group also noted that the current electricity arrangements allowed parties to communicate the UPRN on both legacy and smart Metering registration scenarios. BH noted that Electralink have developed the DTN Web Tools software, which enables the user to search by UPRN (on the condition that the user has obtained the appropriate licence). However, the Group noted a further issue with communicating the UPRN between parties is that some parties may not use the UPRN, therefore not all parties would be using the same address references. The Group also discussed the benefit of introducing the UPRN at the introduction of a Supply Point under a new connection, as it would provide an unambiguous reference

to associate the Metering Point to. The Group discussed that this may remove some existing risk that the address could change as it is moved from the plot number to the postal address, and therefore ensuring that the location of the metering point is accurate. However, the Group was uncertain about the inclination of property developers to obtain the UPRN, since there is currently as there is currently a geographical difference for property developers to navigate. This is because there may be a difference between DNOs, who use the UPRN and some who may not across different geographical areas in which the DNOs operate. The Group identified that even without the UPRN, only a very small number of new connections are erroneously registered and therefore considered whether the benefit would be significant enough.

The Group identified that a challenge for the Supplier is to use the customer address provided when switching and match it to the central industry metering point address to ensure that the correct property is registered. AJ highlighted that this challenge can be complicated by energy switching websites, as a postal address is provided for the Change of Supplier (CoS) which may not be aligned to the address held for the electricity account. The Group also discussed practical CoS issues produced by the switching websites, as customers can unintentionally initiate CoS processes for different properties, or provide incorrect address information without extensive validation. AJ suggested that switching sites could implement an additional field for the customer to provide their UPRN if it is known, to aid the Supplier in identifying the correct metering point address. The Group also considered if the switching sites could adopt an approach using a software package such as AddressBase for the customer to identify their address, which would then associated the geographical location of the property with the MPAN, MPRN or UPRN. The Group emphasised that this enhancement would only be possible if the UPRN is adopted across the industry. CS noted that these initiatives may improve the customer experience.

The Chair invited the Group to comment on a fundamental issue which had been identified through the discussions, which was that inadequate quality of addresses for gas and electricity metering points were the root cause of Erroneous Transfers. DA identified two considerations of this fundamental issue, which were new and existing metering points. DA explained that for new connections, Erroneous Transfers are caused by poor quality address data, which is produced in the process to allocate properties from plot numbers to postal addresses. DA suggested that for existing connections, the issue is more complex as switching websites involve the customer making a choice on the address intended to be switched. AJ stated that a choice is also made by the Supplier, as the customer-given address is matched with the metering point address, which can also add complexity to the switching process and produce Erroneous Transfers if this choice is incorrect.

4. Identification and Agreement of Solutions

The Group discussed the benefits that introducing the UPRN would achieve, noting that if the UPRN could be used to clarify address data along with a geographical software package such as AddressBase, it would be logical to expect an improvement. AddressBase is wider than the PAF database as it includes sites without a postal address. It also revisits addresses, keeping track of houses being divided into flats, the merging of small premises or street renaming or renumbering and keeps a history of changes. However, the Group highlighted that there is a lack of quantitative analysis on the specific issues which would be reduced, and therefore a clear identification of the level of improvement to address data quality experienced by adopting the UPRN could not be achieved. Although this was recognised, the Group acknowledged a principle benefit of aligning addresses from the gas and electricity markets. The Group also suggested that a consideration could be made to a data cleansing process as an alternative to industry adoption of the UPRN. However, this would also require quantitative analysis of its advantages.

The Group discussed the challenges faced by an allocation of UPRN to existing gas and electricity address data, noting that there would still be a small number of addresses which could be misaligned. The Group noted that this small number of addresses would still be candidates for Erroneous Transfers to occur, which may not produce a clear benefit for the customer experience.

The Group recognised that the potential licencing conditions for the UPRN could pose a significant challenge for adoption, which could impact equal competition between participants. The Group discussed licencing costs, which are set by Ordnance Survey, as well as ongoing feedback on this between DECC and Ofgem. PA advised that Ordnance Survey could provide some written guidance on licencing costs for the industry to consider as part of the Working Group consultation document. The Chair agreed.

Finally, the Group emphasised that a single address format may not be the preferred option for the Central Registration Service (CRS), as multiple address formats could be recognised. The Group also agreed that it was unable to confirm that a single address format for gas and electricity metering points would improve the quality of address data in the CRS.

The Chair summarised the discussions held, highlighting that the use of UPRNs may provide some ability for the industry to improve address data, however there may be some address issues which may not be alleviated. The Chair suggested that more information could be obtained from the consultation document, in order to quantify the potential benefits and costs of the adoption of the UPRN.

5. Draft Consultation Structure

The Chair introduced the agenda item and invited JS to present the Group with a draft report structure.

CM requested that the report could include an explanation on the industry best practice for each step in the customer journey on a CoS process. JS noted this comment and advised that this would be included in the consultation document for Suppliers to complete and then included in the 'Current Processes' section of the report.

When smart electricity and gas meters are installed and associated with a shared communications hub, the DCC will be able to compare the electricity and gas addresses associated with the MPAN and MPRN respectively. The Chair noted that it would be beneficial to identify whether different address attributes could be validated for MPAN/MPRNs with a shared smart metering communications hub. SQ agreed to provide this information for inclusion in the report after the meeting.

The Group agreed that the first and second sections of the report were logical in structure and provided some feedback on the issue categories. The Chair noted that these issue categories would be updated and included in the consultation document for reference, so that parties could quantify these issues for analysis. The Group noted the timescales for seeking responses to the consultation and that Suppliers could do preparatory work on costs and benefits. Additionally the group agreed that Suppliers could start investigating the types of issues/quantity on the problems associated with switching supplier related to poor address data.

6. Agreement of Consultation Questions

The Chair introduced the agenda item and summarised the information required to inform the Working Group report, based on the feedback provided by the Working Group throughout the meeting:

- Quantification of the issues experienced by poor address data quality;
- An identification of the issues which would be alleviated through industry adoption of the UPRN; and
- Three options for the extent to which the UPRN could be adopted including:
    a. Mandating the use of the UPRN for Gas Transporters and electricity DNOs, so that address triangulation can be carried out internally without the need for the UPRN to be communicated across the industry;

b. Mandating the sharing of the UPRN across the industry, including inclusion in switching sites, registration systems, Supplier and DNO or Gas Transporter records;
c. A different reference to link the electricity and gas address data instead of the UPRN.

The Chair noted that the Group's considerations across the previous two meetings would be included in the consultation document to inform the rationale for inviting the comments. The Group agreed the consultation content and there were no further comments.

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
2.1	Investigate whether the DCC can (or could) cross-validate the address details associated (via the MAPN/MPRN) with smart electricity and gas meters sharing a common communications hub	SQ
2.2	Provide worked examples and a description of the process along with a summary of the licencing terms for industry use of the UPRN and AddressBase software package.	PA
2.3	Suppliers to do preparatory work on costs and benefits as part of their response to the consultation. Suppliers to start thinking about the types of issues/quantity on the problems associated with switching supplier related to poor address data.	Suppliers
2.4	Provide a work plan for circulation to the Group, showing the consultation window, report drafting timescale and next meeting dates.	Chair

The Chair suggested that the next meeting could occur following closure of the consultation window, in order to discuss the industry feedback. The Group agreed.

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