RETAIL ENERGY CODE

This document is classified as **WHITE**. Information is for the public, unrestricted dissemination and publication.

I0200 WORKING GROUP 2
MEETING NOTES

MEETING	**I0200 WORKING GROUP 2**
DATE	**17 July 2026 (10:00 – 12:00)**
LOCATION	**Via Teams**

Presenter	Representing	Initials	Role
Lorna Mallon	REC Code Manager	LM	Chair; Regulatory Specialist
Victoria Crossan	Data Communications Company (DCC)	VC	DCC Address Management Service Manager
Bela Ashworth	REC Code Manager	BA	Lead Analyst

Full attendee list available upon request.

1 INTRODUCTION

The chair welcomed attendees to the second session of the I0200 working group.

2 CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

The chair presented the agenda for the meeting and invited any additional items of business for consideration, but no items were raised.

LM also reviewed the minutes and actions from the previous session, confirming actions had been closed since the previous meeting. LM confirmed that the draft Address Guidance Document had been issued for members' review and feedback, but no feedback had been received. LM proposed that the review of the guidance be an agenda item for the next meeting. Members were encouraged to provide feedback ahead of that meeting.

LM confirmed that actions for the DCC would be closed as part of this meeting's discussion.

LM also reiterated the purpose of the working group, explaining that the Meter Point Location (MPL) is a key industry data item, owned by Network Operators, but used across industry for a myriad of reasons (e.g., by Consumers to Switch, safety and theft investigations, meter installation and exchanges). The aim of I0200 is to improve future address data quality and industry behaviours, rather than undertake a bulk, industry-wide data cleanse. Where it is needed, data cleansing will be part of the Address Prioritisation Matrix (APM) process.

3 DCC – REL ADDRESS DATA QUALITY AND INCIDENT MANAGEMENT

3.1 SYSTEMIC MATCHING

VC presented an overview of the DCC's systemic matching process. VC explained that matching is triggered by the initial registration of an MPL. When the DCC receives that initial registration

request, the MPL is attempted to be matched against the Ordnance Survey Address Base Premium (OS ABP), which is refreshed every six weeks and contains over 140 million UPRN addresses to be matched against. There are 18 attempts to match the address, using a combination of different elements of the address – this is known as 'Search Blazes'. The 'gold standard match' in systemic matching consists of only the candidate address and stands clear of other address with a confidence score close to the threshold of 90. There are two outcomes from the matching process. If there is a match, the REL address is created and the UPRN from OS ABP is allocated to the REL. If it is an unmatched address, it is allocated a local UPRN that starts with 999 and is six digits long.

3.2 MATCHABLE VS UNMATCHABLE

VC presented an analysis of matchable and unmatchable pots of addresses:

1. Matchable – unmatched addresses that cannot be matched based on the MPL address held within CSS but could be matched if the MPL address was improved. For example, invalid postcodes.
2. Matchable – unmatched addresses that could potentially be matched if the MPL address was improved, but the address is not one that a Consumer would use to Switch via a Price Comparison Website or TPI service. These are challenging and complex addresses but potentially could be identified using a stop word. VC explained that it is to be determined whether it is appropriate to invest resources into matching those addresses or attempt to match until a point is reached whereby no further attempts are made.
3. Unmatchable – unmatched addresses that will never be matched because it is correct that the MPL should not be matched to OS ABP. For example, flats or landlord supplies where there is no appropriate UPRN to match to, or where we risk an Erroneous Switch as a result of matching. These records cannot be easily identified through a stop word but would require manual investigation to identify that these records should not be matched. Subject to a period of review, no further activity would be undertaken.
4. Unmatchable – unmatched addresses that will never be matched because the property type does not exist in OS ABP. For example, grass verges and temporary building supplies. These are identified by reviewing the unmatched pot and using a regex expression. These records have already undergone the systemic matching process and had several attempts at matching.

3.3 STOP WORDS

VC explained that the REL Guidance Document refers to the scope of matching. Locations that are deemed 'out of scope' are addresses that have neither a postal address nor carry a distinct identifiable location which will ever be expected to appear in OS ABP. These locations will not be included in the match rate calculations. New matches are reviewed where potential false positives could be created. Currently, records that are identified with the descriptor of Non PAF (Postcode Address File) or Non-Postal are not excluded. Members were encouraged to provide feedback on whether Non PAF or Non-Postal should be used as a stop word.

Similarly, Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP) are not excluded. VC proposed that unless it is associated with a residential address and a specific number, there should not be an attempt to match those records.

VC also noted that temporary building supply is another stop word under review. 'Temporary' is included in the list of stop words used, but 'temporary building supply' is abbreviated to TBS, which is not currently excluded. Records retained from go-live of the Address Management Service has included TBS in the address descriptor. VC proposed potentially excluding TBS records that are relatively new, but any record older than a certain number of years would be included in calculations and match attempts.

Substations are also found within the unmatched data, displaying a kV as part of the address. VC invited views on whether substations should be included in the match process and what value can be gained from doing so.

LM clarified that stop words are included in the APM and the reports that the DCC provides. However, the aim is to eventually not include stop words. If a record is not matched and has a stop word, no further attempts to match would made. This will reduce the number of MPXNs that Parties will be asked to review and confirm addresses on.

A working group member questioned whether the working group would do a step-by-step review of each category to agree on whether it should be included in the list of stop words. LM confirmed this would be planned for a future meeting and a list of stop words have been included in the guidance document for members to review. A Category 3 document or another Code product may then be published, that can be continuously updated through consultation and review by industry.

VC confirmed that, in the DCC's Address Quality Issues report provided to Parties, if a record is identified as having a stop word and excluded, it is noted within the report but not in the tabs where the DCC suggests records to be investigated. The report includes a separate tab that includes all records with stop words. VC analyses monthly the trends of stop words and their occurrences. This helps in prioritising records and determining whether they are matchable.

A working group member noted, in regard to plot details that are identified where the address is no longer a plot address, Independent Gas Transporters (IGTs) may continue to use and have a business need to retain the plot details. Over the life cycle of the meter point, the MPL will hold a legitimate address, but also retain the original plot details which can be traced back to the original plans.

Additionally, regarding use of Non PAF or Non-Postal as a stop word, the member noted that Xoserve's dataset includes an indicator that allows customers to reflect an address that may be, for a period of time, Non PAF valid. When a Shipper or Network Operator wants to update the address, they can create an address amendment and indicate when they do so that it is Non PAF valid. This triggers operational checks against the requested address to ensure that the amendment is correct on behalf of the party requesting the MPL change. LM questioned whether this was a data item that is shared with CSS, the member committed to confirming that at a later meeting.

LM clarified that when the APM was set up, invalid postcodes was selected as a priority pot to review this year. Review of electricity invalid postcodes has started to progress, pending a final decision at PAB at the end of July. Review of gas invalid postcodes will follow, with input from

the GRDA. The second target was gas plot addresses, because they are causing problems for matching. Electricity does not have the same issue as those addresses were part of a data cleanse activity that pre-dated REC go-live, and it is a standing data cleanse item. Understanding that IGTs may have a business need to retain that data item, but it is not needed on the electricity side, this creates the issue that dual-fuel addresses do not match.

VC noted there is a manually entered address process that would enable the Supplier to request that the address is updated, so the MPL address would remain as it is, but the manually entered address would take precedent. VC noted this is something to be reviewed and whether this process benefits the Consumer in that both REL addresses are matched, how to validate the data correctly and it is appropriate for a manually entered address to be entered, and how to do so without the need for a Supplier to raise the request for a manually entered address. Currently, under the REC, it is the responsibility of the Supplier to raise the request.

LM presented the table on slide 10 of the slide pack, which has also included in the guidance document. Members were invited to provide feedback on the list of stop words.

A working group member queried whether ‘do not use’, ‘duplicate’, ‘exchange’ should be used as stop words as they may been included in the address to denote something that should not be a live site, or whether these denote live sites that should be excluded from address data cleansing.

LM and VC committed to review ‘duplicate’, ‘do not use’, and ‘do not remove’, however ‘exchange’ is a valid stop word referring to telephone exchanges.

A working group member noted they have ‘do not use’ in their portfolio and a majority of these addresses seem to be historic, used in testing plans and identified as ‘do not use’ but have since been used by Suppliers and are registered. Those addresses will need to be reviewed and excluded.

A working group member highlighted the need for a future working group session to review the stop words in further detail, noting a few of the stop words will vary across the networks. LM committed to provide working group members with the stop words to review with internal teams, ahead of the next meeting.

3.4 HIDDEN CHARACTERS

VC walked through the issue of hidden characters, which affects the use of the address downstream in the Smart Metering systems and only recently came to light. The address appears to be valid and perfectly formed in the Enquiry Service and in CSS, however, upon further investigation, it was identified that the MPL address as provided to CSS included a Non-Breaking Space Command (NBSP) that translated as a ‘?’. This creates an issue when the Supplier’s or their agent’s system tries to communicate with the meter but finds the hidden character and is unable to install and commission the meter, leading to significant impacts on the Consumer, Guaranteed Standards of Performance (GSoP) payments and issue resolution across various parties. This issue can be resolved by updating the Registrable Meter Point (RMP), updating the MPL to cleanse the address and update CSS. VC has created a knowledge article and the DCC is proactively identifying all records of this across the database.

While it is a small proportion of addresses impacted, it is a niche issue that cannot be easily fixed by raising a case with a customer service desk.

Members were invited to provide feedback on how they would prefer to be notified of this issue occurrence. One working group member noted they would need further engagement with internal teams but may require further information around how this issue would be raised, with an attached spreadsheet as one incident or raised as one incident per MPAN. Additionally, the member considered SLAs to respond to the raised issue, updating the addresses and returning the query to the DCC. Working group members agreed they would need to review impacted records and hidden character incidents before being able to decide on best approach to resolve the issue. A working group member confirmed that their electricity system had validation that made it impossible to input a NBSP when creating or updating a MPAN.

LM queried whether the same process can be applied for gas, whether incidents should be raised through the CDSP or whether GTs and IGTs would prefer individual consultation. LM committed to engaging further with Xoserve.

3.5 INCIDENT MANAGEMENT

VC explained that REC Schedule 29 – Address Management states that a Switching Incident/Switching Service Request should be raised when investigating issues with REL addresses. However, previous Address Quality Plans (AQP) followed from industry engagement that INC would not be used to track and resolve issues, due to the volume of issues and impact of the short 10 Working Day SLA. VC explained that the DCC are currently working with the RECCo to propose a REC Change to create a P5-type incident that could be used to share incidents with the respective ERDA and GRDA, including a much longer SLA. This would be a targeted incident and would not be for general data cleanse queries.

VC invited members to provide feedback on preferred points of contact for incident management, whether it be the contract manager directly or an operational contact.

One working group member noted they have an internal incident management team with their own processes. Introducing the INC process risks incidents being raised with a different operational team, introducing new (potentially conflicting) SLAs, and would require lead time to train teams on the INC process.

Working group members confirmed that VC can reach out to contract managers to start discussions on the INC process.

Working group members asked for further for clarification around the manually entered address process. VC clarified that only the Supplier can do the manually entered address. VC committed to sharing a knowledge article on this process with the working group, as well as include it in the guidance document.

LM further clarified that if a Supplier does an offline manual update, a REL address will not be generated again. Every address amendment tries to rematch to the REL or double check against the REL, however, if the address has been manually updated, the rematch is not triggered. If there is a fundamental change to the address, it can mean the REL address is incorrect and the UPRN specifically is wrong. VC confirms the amount of manually entered addresses is tracked on a monthly basis and the DCC receives less than 10 requests per

month. However, there is a trend where a manually entered address update request is received it is then followed by, after a period of time, an MPL update. CSS is designed in a way that the manually entered address takes precedence because it flags that the REL address is different to the MPL. DCC is looking at how the manually entered address can be separated out, then recoupled with the MPL address. Currently, the volumes are low, but over time, this could increase.

VC committed to review the manually entered address process ahead of an in-depth discussion at a later meeting.

4 NEXT STEPS AND MEETING 3 AGENDA ITEMS

LM presented the agenda for the next meeting, focusing on standardisation. VC and LM committed to drafting a list of common address types, but members were encouraged to provide input prior to the next meeting. LM also committed to drafting drawing up the process of how Suppliers engage in address management process.

5 NEW ACTIONS RAISED

Item	Responsible	Status
All working group participants to review the Address Guidance Document and provide feedback to changemanagement@recmanager.co.uk before or during the next meeting.	All Working Group Members	To be completed at the next meeting.
All working group participants to review and feedback on the list of DCC stop words shared by LM on Monday 20 July 2026, ahead of the next meeting, including providing suggested additions.	All Working Group Members	To be completed before next meeting.
All working group participants to provide any examples of good practice, bad practice, working instructions etc to help inform future discussions	All Working Group Members	As soon as possible
Confirm how the indicator of a “Non PAF” address is communicated with industry, including CSS	GRDA	To be completed before next meeting.
Update the Address Guidance Document with links to the DCC’s Knowledge Articles on hidden characters and the manually entered address process.	Lorna Mallon.	To be reviewed at next meeting (September).

Item	Responsible	Status
Review list of stop words for validity and whether they refer to a live site, for example, use of ‘do not use’, ‘duplicate’ and ‘do not remove’.	Lorna Mallon and Vic Crossan.	To be reviewed at a future meeting.
DCC to clarify the manually entered address process and Supplier obligations, including when the process can be used and who can raise a request for a manually entered address.	Vic Crossan.	To be reviewed at a future meeting.

6 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled 03 September 2026 (14:00-16:00).