

20181005 Meeting Notes (Address Matching)

Placeholder for notes of meeting held at 11:00-12:00 on Friday 20181005 with:

Jason.Ward@communities.gsi.gov.uk (MHCLG): "JW"

[Phil Beschizza](#) (MHCLG) "PB"

[Jason Ward](#) (Valtech) "JJW"

[Sarah Belghiti](#) (Valtech) "SB"

First Pass Notes

1. Licensing issues around using Royal Mail PAF
2. Landmark can use PAF for creation of registered address
3. Landmark also license with Experian to cleanse and clarify
4. Assessors creating problems?
5. PB: Cannot delay a process, e.g. home buying process
6. PB: Got to be flexible enough to do quickly (Timeliness) and provide sub-addresses. Cannot wait for an address to arrive on an address database.
7. JW: and the addresses change over time
8. PB: Some certificates refer to floors
9. JW: attention to assessor input process
10. PB: Address matching obviously related to the Register UPRN.
11. PB: Got to have commissioned EPC within 7 days of marketing property and have further 21 days.
12. PB: New build. Assessed off plan. Produce EPC from the plan. Issue of generating address.
13. PB: [The National Land and Property Gazetteer \(NLPG\)](#)
14. JW: example [Eland House](#)
15. PB: quickness, flexibility & quality improvement.
16. PAF files - multiple lines (13-14 lines per address) but the EPC has room for 6 lines in the address. <—!!!! (JJW)
17. PB: Consider licensing and cost. MHCLG reliant on lodgement fee to pay for services. Royal Mail - issues around people exploiting address data.
18. JW: Stick with Experian. Other options for address matching service. CLG allowed to use PAF file.
19. JW: the way PAF is searched.
20. There's a clear item around what lines of the address are used, EPC Register address format.
21. PB: UPRN link to address. How easy under a new address matching service? Search to see if UPRN is on register.
22. Aside: JJW notes PB phrase "all of our transactions", maybe "transactions" is a useful lens to view the process?
23. PB: It is estimated that approximately 95% of domestic sales have an EPC at completion.
(JJW this prompts the question, what are the real approximate accuracy rates?).
(JJW - indeed a broader thought - what are the measurable metrics throughout the whole register problem)
24. Options on how to improve address matching. Consider role of tools that are not CLG Intellectual Property Rights e.g. Experian, PAF.
25. PB: 19 million EPCs lodged on the registers.
26. JW: Compatibility issues.
27. PB: Evidence of address exploitation and commercialisation. Mindful also that address licensing and copyright restrictions are respected.
28. JW: Data team - practical solutions? Maintenance, who maintains?
29. JW: Address matching is a key thing that affects everyone - a future register could address this.