RETAIL ENERGY CODE

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

NON-CONFIDENTIAL CONSOLIDATED CONSULTATION RESPONSES

C3-0172 - ADDRESS PRIORITISATION MATRIX NEW OUTCOMES STATUS

On 29 September 2026, the Code Manager issued a consultation to industry to seek feedback on REC Category 3 Change Proposal C3-0172 – Address Prioritisation Matrix new outcomes status.

The purpose of this document is to consolidate the responses and for the Code Manager to answer any questions raised within those responses.

DOCUMENT VERSION	V1.0
RESPONSE TYPE	Non-Confidential
DATE ISSUED	20 October 2026

DATE CONSULTATION ISSUED	29/09/2026
RESPONSE DEADLINE	16/10/2026

Question 1:	Do you agree with the updated outcome status table? If not please provide justification for your response.	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
National Grid Electricity Distribution (Distribution Network Operator)	Yes, we agree with the updated outcome status table. The revised outcome statuses provide a clearer and more detailed view of investigation outcomes, helping to differentiate between the various underlying causes of address and postcode issues. We consider the changes to be beneficial for reporting.	Thank you for your response.
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	**Position: We support the updated outcome status table.** The revised outcome statuses provide clearer and more consistent categorisation of DNO investigation outcomes. In particular, the updated table distinguishes between: • cases where the postcode or address requires correction; • timing differences between the Postcode Address File and Ordnance Survey AddressBase Premium; and • valid non-postal addresses that are not expected to appear on the Postcode Address File. This additional clarity should support more accurate reporting and help distinguish data-quality issues requiring corrective action from cases caused by differences between the underlying address datasets. We therefore support the proposed changes.	Thank you for your response.

Northern Powergrid (Distribution Network Operator)	Yes, we agree with the updated status table.	Thank you for your response.
UK Power Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	We agree with the updated outcome status table. The changes are not significant and mainly serve to provide additional clarity around postcode validation outcomes. The revised statuses better distinguish timing-related database update issues from genuine exceptions and clearly identify scenarios where supplier action is not required. Overall, the proposed updates improve transparency without materially changing the existing process.	Thank you for your response.
SP Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	We are generally supportive of the outcome status; however, we believe that there is an overlap and multiple categories could be chosen for one update it may make more sense to isolate the categories relating to the actual update.	Thank you for your response.

Question 2:	Do you have any additional comments on the outcome status table?	
RESPONDENT DETAILS	**RESPONSE**	**CODE MANAGER COMMENTS**
National Grid Electricity Distribution (Distribution Network Operator)	No.	Thank you for your response.
British Gas (Energy Supplier)	We have no additional comments.	Thank you for your response.
Northern Powergrid (Distribution Network Operator)	N/A	N/A
UK Power Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	No further comments	Thank you for your response.

SP Energy Networks (Distribution Network Operator)	We would suggest that the following are the major response categories, as these adequately reflect the update status: • Postcode only updated • Postcode and address updated • Address only updated • Require Energy Supplier support (appreciate that this will be provided in this round) • Disconnected • Complex investigation required The following we believe to be a description of the update, and it should perhaps be made clearer what the response is trying to cover. We may well update a postcode even if it falls into one of the categories below. We would not expect to report these twice. This is more about the quality of the update applied, not necessarily the outcome of the update. • Postcode valid – on Postcode Address File (PAF) • Valid Postcode not on PAF • Valid Postcode not on ABP • Postcode valid - non PAF • DNO UPRN available We also believe that in relation to the DNO UPRN available text, there is a requirement for clarification on the means by which the DNO would be expected to provide this. Our preference would be a separate ask for this, the results of which to be uploaded on the portal as a secure means of transfer (this would be subject to an assessment by each DNO in relation to the provision of this data)	Thank you for your response. The proposed outcomes list was drawn up following feedback from a number of DNOs as many challenged why the postcode was flagged as invalid when it was PAF. Having the additional options available allows the DNOs to flag which steps they have followed as part of their analysis. If required, the outcome statuses may be reviewed following the completion of round 1.

RETAIL ENERGY CODE