RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

I0200 WORKING GROUP 3 MEETING NOTES

MEETING	**I0200 WORKING GROUP 3**
DATE	**03 September 2026 (14:00-16:00)**
LOCATION	**Via Teams**

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

Full attendee list available upon request.

1 INTRODUCTION

The chair welcomed attendees to the third 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.

BA also reviewed the actions from the previous sessions, confirming actions had been closed since the previous meeting. BA confirmed that the draft Address Guidance Document and the DCC Stop Words list had been issued for members' review and feedback, but no feedback had been received. BA noted that the DCC Stop Words list would be reviewed during the session. Members were encouraged to provide feedback on both the list and the draft Address Guidance Document, particularly providing examples of good practice, bad practice or working instructions to inform the Guidance Document.

3 STOP WORDS REVIEW

LM presented the DCC Stop Words list and clarified that stop words are used by the DCC at the end of the matching process, after multiple match attempts have already been made. Stop words help the DCC understand what addresses are left in the unmatched pot and why they cannot be matched. Members were encouraged to provide feedback on each stop word identified and confirm the use of the words. If members identify a word to be removed from the list, LM clarified that those words should not be corrected in records if already used, but in the future, these words should no longer be used. A key aim of I0200 is to facilitate wider discussions around stop words before agreeing to remove the existing stop words. Members were encouraged to provide feedback on the stop words list.

LM has also begun a process of grouping stop words to reduce the number of words the DCC need to track for. If a stop word category is identified, the address is excluded from reporting, and

Parties will not be asked to investigate addresses containing stop words. This will reduce the number of MPXNs that Parties will be asked to review and confirm addresses for. The working group reviewed the left-side table of the DCC Stop List WG comments. Members were encouraged to review the right-side table and provide feedback ahead of the next working group session.

During the last session, LM and VC took the action to analyse the use of 'DO NOT USE' as a stop word. LM has since sent out the MPANs that use this phrase to the relevant DNOs. LM recommended that the phrase should no longer be used as a stop word because it could lead to misunderstandings and MPANs trading that should not be so the phrase should be removed from those MPANs entirely. A working group member agreed, noting that if that phrase is used, we should be looking further into the MPANs and why they've been flagged as 'DO NOT USE'. LM and VC confirmed that any MPANs flagged as "DISCONNECTED" are disconnected so no additional analysis is required.

A working group member asked how stop words are treated if multiple stop words are identified in an address. VC clarified that if an address contains multiple stop words, the first stop word within the address is used to exclude and categorise the reason for exclusion.

LM noted that the stop words list heavily focuses on electricity. Members were encouraged to provide examples for gas.

During the review, VC and LM took actions to conduct further analysis or gather examples on some stop words ahead of the next session's review – please see the DCC Stop Words WG comments document.

4 MANUALLY ENTERED ADDRESS PROCESS

VC explained the manually entered address process and presented slide 17. The process is only available for the Current, Registered Supplier and is set out in REC Schedule 29 – Address Management. This process is not to be used by the Supplier to update the MPL Address – that should be done via the D0381 process for electricity, or the processes laid out in the UNC. The manually entered address process can be used by the Registered Supplier to provide a better description of the location of where the energy is consumed, the REL Address. Suppliers who identify an opportunity to improve the REL Address should do it via raising a query to the Switching Service Desk, which can then be picked up by Landmark who may update the REL Address based on the suggested changes, which may result in a match to OS ABP or the Address may remain or become unmatched.

VC clarified that there are many instances where the REL Address and the MPL Address should be aligned, for example where the meter is in the same place where the energy is consumed. An example for where we would expect a manually entered address request is where there is a block of flats and the MPL Address is a meter room and the actual energy consumed is in an individual flat. The DCC has identified very low volumes of this instance, with less than 0.01% of the total estate to have a manually entered address against it. Volumes are reviewed on a monthly basis.

VC confirmed that this process should not be used as a means of updating the MPL Address and it cannot be used for that purpose as DNOs and Network Operators are the data masters of

the MPL Address. If a Supplier requests a manually entered address update, the only address changed is the REL Address. The only place that the REL Address is currently displayed is in the Enquiry Services. This will not lead to a material difference to the MPL Address.

A working group member noted that the process is underutilised and REL Address will not cater for all circumstances. LM clarified that while the process is underutilised, it should not be misused. When a manually entered address process occurs, if the MPL Address is updated in the future, it will not re-trigger the matching process.

VC further clarified that the design logic of the CSS is that if a request is made, once a manually entered address update is accepted this takes precedence over the MPL. Therefore, if an MPL update is received it does not automatically update the REL address, it creates a ticket indicating that the address needs to be reviewed. VC confirmed that, as part of I0200, the DCC and industry need to agree a process on how to signpost or flag a situation where the Network Operator has confirmed the MPL Address is fit for their purposes and can confirm to the DCC that the REL Address can be updated.

LM confirmed this process will be added to the draft Address Guidance Document for Members to review.

5 STANDARDISATION

LM presented on proposed standardisation of stop words and common phrases. There are various documents already available to industry that set out standardisation or what to include in each address line. For electricity, this was set out in MAP09, which became part of the MRA Transitional Schedule and also included examples of addresses. For gas, LM has looked at the UNC and the address amendments process through CMS. LM clarified that the aim of the standardisation exercise as part of I0200 is to update either the Address Population Rules or create new guidance with agreed standards of address population rules moving forward.

LM presented on the suggested standard words/phrases in slides 20-22 of the attached slide pack.

A working group member asked how Xoserve would validate addresses. They noted that the address amendment process is automated so you can get rejections when you first submit an address amendment, but that can be disputed. This rejection process can be burdensome if there are multiple addresses to be amended. The working group member asked how the suggested stop words would be verified and discussed with Xoserve to confirm their system's automation would not lead to further rejections. LM confirmed that the Code Manager will engage with Xoserve to assess the impact of agreed stop words on their validation process.

Another working group member noted that, while they agree certain stop words like LANDLORD should not be abbreviated, DNO systems may have a character limit of 40 characters for all address items. LANDLORD may be followed by abbreviations. LM confirmed that character limits would be taken into consideration during solution analysis, however, many of the suggested standard words/phrases are recommended to be set out in address line 1 as one of the address lines that the DCC does not validate against.

VC noted that TBS has been included in the list of suggested standard words/phrases, however, the timescale for 'temporary' should be reviewed and whether there is a point at which

the building site is no longer 'temporary'. LM confirmed this review could be done as part of the APM work. LM confirmed further analysis would be carried out with DCC and the output provided to a future I0200 working group.

A working group member asked if, after matching against Ordnance Survey, the DCC reviews what is left in the OS' unmatched pot. VC confirmed that systemic matching occurs when an Initial Registration Request is received and the OS ABP database is used in that matching. Anything that does not match against the OS ABP goes into the unmatched pot and is reviewed every six weeks. After further matching attempts, a manual matching process is triggered and the DCC uses specific queries to try and match and improve the REL Address. The goal is to achieve a 'Gold Standard Match'. LM took the action to add to the I0200 topics log signposting of what the DCC does with the Ordnance Survey data in the matching process.

No further feedback was provided on the stop words list.

6 SIGNPOSTING – SUPPLIER'S ROLE IN THE ADDRESS MANAGEMENT PROCESS

LM outlined the Supplier's role in the address matching process when they become aware that the MPL Address may be incorrect. This process is set out in REC Schedule 29 – Address Management. Suppliers should send the D0381 Metering Point Address Update to the DNO, setting out the current and proposed address in the correct format as outlined in the Address Population Rules. They can provide additional information, including photographs, via SDEP PT0030 – Address Management. The DNO has the right to reject the D0381 and the Suppliers have the obligation to monitor those rejections.

Members were encouraged to provide feedback on how the process is currently working and if a review of the D0381 process is needed.

For gas, the process is not outlined in the REC, and are set out under the UNC, through CMS. The CDSP can reject the address amendment request so Suppliers should be monitoring these rejections too.

A working group member mentioned that they received a demonstration from Xoserve on how the Royal Mail populates their addresses because CMS does a look-up against the PAF file. They showed how many commercial addresses do not actually have a building name or number. Instead, Royal Mail records a business name and that would populate the delivery point alias field on an address. The user then has to manually amend that to include a business name into a building name field and add qualifying information in the free text box. This creates difficulty when the business moves from the property.

The GRDA took the action to review this process, engage directly with the working group member and feedback to BA and LM where relevant.

Another working group member noted that it can be similarly difficult to accurately match addresses for farm supplies. The GRDA noted that this is an example of an edge-case scenario that may be resolved by the manually entered address process. For farms, Network Operators are keen to record the gas supply as part of the MPL rather than an addressable location (e.g., the farmhouse). There may be instances where the farmhouse is listed under the REL, but the MPL is in the barn. LM confirmed that Non-PAF examples like these will be on the agenda for

the next meeting. LM took the action to extend the discussion on Non-PAF addresses and what to do when you receive them.

7 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

A working group member asked whether the use of 'what3words' would be on the agenda for a future session. LM clarified that this is on the agenda for meeting 4 as part of the discussion on standardisation.

Another working group member asked about the process of updating addresses with the Royal Mail. LM clarified that this process is not set out in the REC, however, there is a DNO who has been successful with raising queries with the Royal Mail and Ordnance Survey to update addresses. LM noted that this could be added to the agenda of a future meeting.

LM noted that the Address Prioritisation Matrix webinar took place last Thursday, 27 August 2026. The recording, slides and the FAQs have been published on the REC Portal. Suppliers are expected to receive their APM data w/c 28 September. For any queries on the APM, please contact LM directly (lorna.mallon@recmanager.co.uk).

8 NEXT STEPS AND MEETING 4 AGENDA ITEMS

BA presented the agenda for the next meeting, focusing on standardisation and new connections process. Members then voted on the preferred date for the next meeting.

BA confirmed the next meeting would be held on Monday 05 October 2026, 14:00-16:00. Calendar invitations and the agenda for the next session will be sent out by 28 September 2026.

9 ACTIONS RAISED

Item	Responsible	Status
All working group participants to review the updated Address Guidance Document and provide feedback to changemanagement@recmanager.co.uk before or during the next meeting.	All Working Group Members	To be completed before next meeting
All working group participants to review and feedback on the list of DCC Stop Words_WG comments reviewed at the last session and the proposed stop words, 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	Ongoing

Item	Responsible	Status
Confirm how the indicator of a “Non PAF” address is communicated with industry, including CSS	GRDA	To be completed before next meeting.
Provide examples of stop words used for gas MPXNs.	GRDA	To be completed before next meeting.
Review list of stop words for validity and whether they refer to a live site as noted on the DCC Stop Words WG comments.	Lorna Mallon and Vic Crossan.	To be reviewed at a future meeting.

10 DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, 05 October 2026 (14:00-16:00).