



## **IGT UNC Modification Workstream Meeting**

### **Draft Minutes**

**11<sup>th</sup> March 2021 via Teleconference**

<b>Attendee</b>	<b>Initial</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Role</b>
Rachel Clarke	RC	Gemserv	Chair
Cher Harris	CH	Indigo Pipelines	
Brandon Rodrigues	BR	ESPUG	Agenda item 4 onwards.
Heather Ward	HW	Energy Assets	Agenda items 6 and 9-11
Rebecca Cailles	RC	BUUK	
Chris Barker	CB	BUUK	Items 1-5
Claire Roberts	CR	Scottish Power	
Kirsty Dudley	KD	E.ON	
Ellie Rogers	ER	Xoserve	
Amie Lauper-Bull	ALB	Gemserv	Code Administrator

#### **1. Welcome and Apologies for Absence**

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and advised that apologies had been received from Anne Jackson (Gemserv) and Rachel Clarke would be chairing this meeting in her place. The Chair noted that apologies were also received prior to the meeting from Carine Russell (Last Mile Gas).

#### **2. Confirmation of Agenda**

The Chair confirmed the items for discussion as outlined in the Final Agenda and asked attendees for 'Any Other Business' (AOB) items. KD stated that they had an item of AOB to raise regarding UNC760 (Introducing the concept of derogation for Net Zero innovation into Uniform Network Code (UNC))..

#### **3. Approval of the Previous Minutes**

##### **21-02**

The Workgroup had no comments on the previous minutes, they were approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting, and the Chair closed the agenda item.

#### **4. Outstanding Actions**

The Chair outlined the outstanding actions and updated the Workgroup on the following actions:

**WS 21-02-01:** The Chair noted that the Code Administrator was working with BR offline with regards to his request for information on the data file capabilities of IGT Transportation Invoices. It was noted that BR was discussing this with IGTs before sending communications out to Shippers. CR noted that Scottish Power had approached BR following last month's meeting and noted that Scottish Power

would not have an issue with alphanumeric invoice numbers. KD also supported this view. BR stated that the action could be marked as closed as their Operations team was investigating whether alphanumeric invoicing would be possible.

## **Modification Workgroups**

### **5. IGT132 – Introduction of IGT Code Credit Rules**

The Chair informed the Workgroup that IGT132 had been sent for an extended consultation period, which closed at the end of January 2021. During consultation, new issues with the legal text were raised that had not been previously discussed at the Workstream meetings and following discussion, the Panel felt that these issues would need to be discussed further by the Workgroup. The Chair reopened the Workgroup Report and the Workgroup discussed two new issues raised within the legal text. These were:

- 'It is not clearly identified in the legal text how far in advance the exact figures for the credit will need to be known (both initially set and renewal) we believe this is essential to be outlined and that the legal text could be improved to give process clarity, especially if not all IGTs will be applying this requirement and where they do the timings can be agreed bilaterally'; and
- 'It is not clear if the approach would allow for Shippers with multiple entities / short codes to complete a multiple Shipper agreement. For those Shippers with complex portfolios, we are concerned that it will cause unnecessary complexity in administration (setting up and renewing) when the process is compared to the UNC. Some IGTs have multiple entities and again it is not clear if it could be rolled up into an organisation cover to improve efficiency or if it is expected to be at an entity level for the IGTs also, which creates further administration issues in our view.'

KD stated that there was another point that had been missed regarding mandating all parties and that timelines were not clear. KD added that, on renewal, it was a little clearer in the legal text what the timescales are, however the process was not clear and may be interpreted differently. The proposer stated that they thought it was clear as the text specified 'reasonable endeavours' and what they were trying to mandate was a set methodology rather than set timescales. KD noted that this could be interpreted differently between IGTs making it an onerous activity and during consultation the reference to 'reasonable endeavours' was deemed to be unsuitable as it could cause inconsistencies. BR agreed, suggesting that a backstop be added into the legal text so that parties could have extra time if needed. The proposer stated that a timeframe had not been added into the legal text previously to allow flexibility, however it could be added into the existing text. RC suggested as an alternative adding in a reference to state that there is not a set timeframe, to provide clarity. KD agreed with the idea of a backstop and minimum timeframe. BR noted that the ability to request a change in cover levels has a timeframe set out of one calendar month and therefore it would seem sensible to set one for initial requests.

The Proposer noted that conversations between parties could take a varied amount of time and therefore they would not be comfortable suggesting a specific timeframe without others input. The current drafting would allow for the flexibility in the early discussions between parties. The Proposer noted that the timelines set out in this Modification are those implemented in the DCUSA currently and that this change does not seek to vary from those established timescales.

One Workgroup member noted that there is a compromise on gaining the necessary security vs administration on the length of cover based on the DCUSA arrangements.

One Workgroup member suggested that Bilateral agreements could be implemented to prevent parties having different interpretations of 'reasonable endeavours'.

The Chair concluded that the discussion should be taken offline as a solution would not be reached during the meeting. The Chair stated that the Proposer and Code Administrator would look at what was written into the UNC to determine whether there were set timescales in Code and there were two options: leaving the reference to 'reasonable endeavours' in the legal text or baselining a minimum period of requirement which would alleviate some concerns of parties' different interpretations of the definition.

The Chair asked the Workgroup if they thought the legal text would need further discussion at another Workstream meeting, or if it should be sent to the Modification Panel for their further consideration. CH suggested that it would not need to be discussed at another Workstream meeting as it had been discussed enough already and the Code Administrator would be checking the UNC. KD suggested that if something was found to be conflicting in the UNC then it may need to be discussed further at a Workstream meeting to ensure all Workgroup Parties comments were fully explored. The Proposer agreed to work with the Code Administrator to investigate other potential solutions and send an email to parties prior to the Panel meeting to determine whether IGT132 would need further discussion at a Workstream meeting.

**WS21-03-01: Gemserv and Brookfield to investigate potential solutions with regards to the Advance notice of Creditand email parties offline before the April 2021 Panel meeting to determine if IGT132 needs further discussion at a Workstream meeting.**

The Chair noted the second point that had been made during consultation regarding shippers with multiple entities and short codes and whether cover would be required at an entity level or a licence level. CB stated that they believed that the credit arrangement would have to be implemented for each licence or short code, noting that some of the calculations in the methodology allowed for the parent company score to be used but the arrangements themselves would be done on a licence basis.

KD stated that because it was not an identical copy of what was written into the UNC or DCUSA, it would be unique to IGTs. KD added that an assumption had been made that it was per single entity and asked if a multi shipper agreement could be added to the legal text to make it clearer and avoid inconsistencies. The proposer agreed to this suggestion but added that they would not want to detract

from the existing arrangements in the industry. BR agreed with this approach, stating that they supported multiple agreements because a transporter with multiple entities would have to do the calculations multiple times. The proposer agreed to work with the Code Administrator to amend the legal text to add in clarity on the ability to agree bilateral Multi Shipper Agreements as well as at a licence level as per the established rules in other Codes.

**WS21-03-02: Gemserv and Brookfield to amend the legal text for IGT132 to add in clarity on the ability to agree bilateral Multi Shipper Agreements as well as at a licence level as per the established rules in other Codes.**

## 6. IGT138 - Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls

The Chair informed the Workgroup that an amended Modification had been published, which included a change in the timeline and the proposer. The Chair noted that the UNC674S (Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls) legal text had been published on Friday 5<sup>th</sup> March 2021 for the final version of the Modification prior to being presented at the April UNC Panel meeting. The Chair noted that the legal text would be reviewed against the solution and IGT UNC legal text to ensure that they matched the last version (v15) of UNC674. The Chair proposed that the group review the Workgroup Report from November 2020 to ensure that the Workgroups position on areas of discussion had not changed. The Chair noted that it is the ambition to complete the Workgroup Report for IGT138 in the April 2021 Workgroup meeting.

KD queried the timescales for the outputs of the final UNC674 meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> March 2021 and whether there would be enough time to publish papers for IGT138 in April 2021. The Chair noted that the Code Administrator would be attending the final UNC674 workgroup to ensure that any outputs from the group are captured and amended well in time for the April IGT UNC Workstream paper day.

The Chair lead the Workgroup through the Workgroup report and noted that the timeline for the Modification had changed since the Workgroup held discussions in November 2020. There had been comments suggesting that the timelines may need to be delayed as the Modification was heavily dependent on UNC674S and it may be beneficial for industry to consider them alongside each other when sending their consultation responses. KD stated that the Workgroup should be explicit that the consultation timelines would be identical for the two Modifications so that they are considered as a suite of changes. The Workgroup agreed that this Modification should close at the same time as UNC674S and ideally run for the same amount of time for efficiencies in returning consultation responses.

The Chair advised that the proposer of the change believe that it should be governed by the Authority in line with UNC674S. KD highlighted that there was no change in the comments made in the November meeting as it was a material change.

The Chair noted that the solution had changed prior to the meeting in November as previously, the solution was the same as the solution for UNC674S, however the Workgroup had decided that it would be better to move that section into the appendix and add in high-level business rules to the solution section. There were no opposing views to this and the Workgroup had no further comments on the proposed Solution from that of November 2020.

The Chair highlighted that there would be a cross-code impact with UNC674S and there had been some new developments to this section of the Modification proposal. In the November meeting, the Workgroup discussed that the Performance Assurance Framework Document (PAFD) had the ability to be changed by the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) without the need to be put through the current change process. The Workgroup highlighted that there was an area of risk that changes made to the document would not have industry-wide visibility and therefore there would be occasions where there were IGT UNC consequences that were not identified. The Chair recalled that the Workgroup had discussed how this could be mitigated and suggested to the proposer that a checklist or mechanism should be put into the PAFD to ensure that all implications for change are considered before being implemented.

The Chair stated that they believed that this requirement had been written into the PAFD. CR agreed to check this offline.

KD asked whether the new customer impacts section, which is now included in all new Modification Proposals should be applied to this Modification. The Chair advised that the Workgroup could discuss it, but as the new Modification template was only implemented last month, this Modification did not follow the template as it was older. KD suggested cross-referencing the Modification with UNC674S to determine whether there would be any positive or negative consumer impacts. The Chair agreed with this approach and agreed to speak to the Chair of the UNC meeting and add the discussion to the agenda for the April Workgroup meeting.

**WS21-03-03: CA to hold discussion with the independent UNC Chair to determine whether there will be any consumer impacts from IGT138 or UNC674S.**

There were no further comments made on the Relevant Objectives that had been agreed in the November 2020 meeting. The Chair advised that no timescales had been provided regarding implementation, however it would be dependent on UNC674S and aligning the date with the UNC would be of paramount importance. CR advised that they had raised this issue with the proposer, however there was no update on timescales. The Workgroup discussed comments raised in the November 2020 meeting regarding a transition period needed for both Modifications and agreed that the same transition periods would not be needed as the arrangements being introduced into the IGT UNC were new.

The Chair advised that the Legal Text and Consumer Impacts sections would be left until the April 2021 meeting and the final comments on recommendations for panel with regards to consultation would be discussed.

**7. IGT145 – Transfer of Sites with Low Valid Meter Reading Submission Performance from Classes 2 and 3 into Class 4**

The Chair informed the Workgroup that no work could be done on this Modification during the last month as the proposer of this change was in the process of raising a second variant of UNC664V (Transfer of Sites with Low Valid Meter Reading Submission Performance from Classes 2 and 3 into Class 4). The Chair noted that the proposer indicated the Modification would be discussed further at the April 2021 Workstream meeting.

**8. IGT148 - IGT UNC Modification Proposal-Class 1 Meter Reads**

The Chair advised that the draft legal text for IGT148 had been published with the final agenda and papers prior to the meeting. It was noted that there were a few points to discuss and the progress of the Workgroup report would be dependent on whether these points required further discussion.

The Chair informed the Workgroup that in the legal text the CDSP had been newly defined as the Daily Metered Service Provider (DMSP) for the purposed of providing the Class 1 read service. The Chair noted that this was not an existing defined term, so this had been added in because there were clauses throughout the IGT UNC where the person responsible for obtaining those readings would send them to the CDSP and it did not read well. The Chair noted that the Code Administrator had contextualised this by creating the DMSP as the CDSP in the capacity for providing Class One Daily Read Service, and asked parties whether within the definition they should add reference to it being subject to arrangements contained in the Data Services Contract (DSC) in order to futureproof the text. KD agreed with this approach as it may add clarity for new entrants. BR stated that the added detail was useful and that they were happy with the additional few words to show it was in the DSC.

ER raised concerns about the definition created for DMSP and enquired if that was what was written in the UNC. The Chair advised that it was not named in the UNC and KD added that this was due to the differentiation between Datalogged sites and telemetered sites in the UNC, as there was not that type of site in the IGT UNC so they were of the belief that belief that you could direct all sites in class one to the read by the CDSP. ER highlighted that they were concerned about the wording behind the definition of DMSP, as technically it would not be the CDSP physically obtaining the reading and parties may confuse this. KD agreed stating that it would have to be worded carefully to ensure that it did not imply that Xoserve would be reading the meter as part of the CDSP as it would be the contracted parties who would be responsible. The Chair noted that by adding in further detail about it being included in the DSC contract, the obligations would be outlined and clarified. ER agreed that this would clarify the matter but stated that the wording would need to reflect that the concept of the DMSP is not in the UNC and the CDSP are procuring that service on behalf of Transporters. ER asked if further discussions had been held with Dave Addison (Xoserve) regarding this matter. The Chair advised that a conversation had been had but it centred more on the issue of telemetered sites.



RC asked if there would ever be telemetered sites under the IGT UNC and the Chair advised that it was the opinion of Xoserve that there would not be.

The Chair noted that the legal text could not be replicated as simply as had been initially anticipated as the arrangements sat outside of code. KD added that the Daily Metered Service Provider (DMSP) would be an activity that would be completed on IGT sites, facilitated by the DSC. ER suggested that it should be made clear that the Central Data Services Provider (CDSP) would not be doing this. The Chair advised that if the vehicle for procuring the service provider changed then that clause would need to be amended. The Chair resolved to consider this further before the next Workgroup meeting.

The Chair noted that reference to 'Transporter' had been removed and left the text as 'Daily Read Equipment'. It was noted that the UNC had split their definition of Daily Read Equipment into two parts, but this had not been done for this Modification due to there not being Telemetered sites on IGT networks.

The Workgroup heard that the UNC's approach was to remove ownership of the daily read equipment definition and split it, but due to how the IGT Modification would work, it would not be possible to reference it there. The Chair asked the Workgroup if they deemed ownership of the equipment to be important. KD stated that they would have to discuss the matter with colleagues before providing an answer. BR stated that transporters had to be allowed to the site and if that had not changed then it would not matter. ER suggested that ownership was not a Code-related matter. The Chair agreed to revise the definition and raise the question again at the next Workgroup meeting.

The Chair drew the Workgroup's attention to Part E, stating that there was a specific reference to Paragraph 8 of Section N of the UNC, which had been deleted entirely from UNC710, therefore it would no longer be possible to direct there. The Chair suggested directing to Section D of the IGTAD, which would set out everything that the IGT UNC would need to have in it. KD queried how this would work as they believed that everything would be stripped out of the IGTAD and, as a Shipper, it is not clear how it related to Shippers. The Chair advised that UNC710 had stripped out obligations in Section C, but Section D provided a baseline of what would need to be in the IGT UNC, so that would be where parties would be directed to now.

BR stated that the section that was removed mandated that the large transporters provide that service, whilst Section D simply outlined some of the IGT code rules. BR noted that this would not hold the same purpose as mandating the large transporters but it did outline that that information should be held.

The Chair raised the issue that the IGT UNC references an LDZ CESP Ancillary Agreement between large sites and the network. The clause details a process of obtaining meter readings and references pursuant to the LDZ CSEP Ancillary Agreement. The Chair asked if the CDSP as the DMSP would be party to that agreement as the document sits outside of the IGT UNC governance and therefore the Code Administrator does not have sight of it. KD advised that if it was a Network Exit Agreement (NExA), the DMSP would not have sight of it. KD advised that further understanding was needed and

the aim of the paragraph needed to be clear, as the DMSP would not have sight of the agreement so they could not be made responsible for something in that clause. The Chair agreed that an understanding was needed of what was in the agreement, how meter readings were obtained pursuant to the agreement and who would be responsible, noting that it was not an ancillary document to the IGT UNC. BR agreed to work with the Code Administrator to discuss further prior to the April 2021 Workgroup meeting.

The Chair highlighted that under Section M, a reference to DMSP had been added and under Section N, a subclause had been added into the first clause and that the wording was identical to the wording in the UNC for consistency in adding the Class 1 read service as a core service under the DSC.

The Chair noted that it would not be possible to complete the workgroup report during the meeting, but the Code Administrator would work with the proposer offline and return to the next Workgroup with definitive legal text. KD asked if the term 'Class One' was defined as it is in the UNC and suggested directing people to the UNC for the definition. The Chair noted that 'Class One Meter Read Equipment' was a defined term and agreed to ensure the definition was aligned with the definition given in the UNC.

**WS21-03-04: CA to ensure the definition of 'Class One Meter Read Equipment' in IGT148 is aligned with the definition given in the UNC.**

KD queried whether IGT148 would be implemented in time for XRN5218 to be implemented which is targeted for 1<sup>st</sup> June 2021. The Chair advised that timescales were tight but there were a few options for Panel to consider. The first option would be to shorten the consultation, as the Modification would be self-governance it would need a 15 working day appeal window. The Workgroup heard that the Panel could either send the Modification out with a shortened consultation or add the Modification into an extraordinary release. KD stated that they were not content with a shortened consultation window and suggested that the Code Administrator ask parties during the completion of the Workgroup Report which option they would prefer. CR agreed with this approach, adding that a shortened timescale may result in a lack of response.

KD raised a question of how many sites are classified as Class One for IGTs, as they believed it was a low number so justification would be needed for shortening timescales when the impacts would not be that big or if there wouldn't be a break in service. The Chair highlighted that they had been informed that any disruption to the implementation of IGT148 could result in the IGT element of XRN5218 being removed in order to maintain their target date of 1<sup>st</sup> June 2021.

BR asked whether it would be beneficial to get the Panel's views on the best approach. The Chair agreed to raise this as AOB in the next Panel meeting and flag the concerns that the Workgroup have.

**WS21-03-05: CA to raise an item of AOB at the April 2021 Panel meeting to discuss options regarding timescales with IGT148.**



The Workgroup was asked for further views in regard to concerns on timings. BR stated that, as the proposer, they agreed that they need to ensure that there would be no break in service adding that if it was something that they could work around then they would consider different approaches if the XRN could accommodate that. CH agreed with this approach, and stated that, in terms of governance, whilst it did not seem appropriate to shorten timescales with a low number of sites, if it would affect the XRN then parties should be mindful of that. ER noted that the XRN would be driven by the Modification, therefore it would need a 'lift and shift' of the existing process, but this might not necessarily be the right thing to do. ER added that it would be preferable for implementations to happen at the same time and have the approvals in place. The Chair stated that the suggested UNC release of 1<sup>st</sup> June 2021 was outside of the IGT UNC release schedule. KD recommended that the timelines be kept as close as possible, but due diligence checks would need to be carried out. The Chair agreed to flag the risks to Panel and bring back the legal text to the next Workgroup meeting in order to write the Workgroup Report during that meeting. BR agreed to work with the Code Administrator to amend the definition of 'Daily Metered Service Provider' and return the text to the next Workgroup meeting.

**WS21-03-06: CA to work with BR to amend the definition of 'Daily Metered Service Provider' in IGT148.**

## **Standing Items**

### **9. [Cross-Code Modification Implications Tracker](#)**

**UNC746 - Clarificatory change to the AQ amendment process within TPD G2.3** – The Chair informed the Workgroup that this Modification was still being developed and further business rules had been added to version 2.1.

**UNC734S – Reporting Valid Confirmed Theft of Gas into Central Systems** – The Chair advised that they were still holding discussions with Electralink, however the legal text for this Modification had not yet been published and noted that this will be reviewed against the IGT UNC to ascertain the impact on the code.

**UNC730V - COVID-19 Capacity Retention Process** – The Workgroup heard that this Modification was still with the Authority, pending decision.

**UNC758 - Temporary extension of AUG Statement creation process** – The Chair highlighted that this Modification may have implications on Shippers.

**UNC760 - Introducing the concept of derogation for Net Zero innovation into the UNC** – KD highlighted that the proposer of this Modification was NGN and discussions had been held to discuss how it would impact XRN and CDSP deliverables. It was noted that the Modification would bring about a governance document which would allow more details on how to follow Net-Zero derogations. The Chair asked the workgroup if they thought that this should be something that is included in the IGT

UNC or if there would need to be a derogation that extended over the supply points in the IGT UNC and UNC. It was noted that there had been discussions held with IGTs and it had been agreed that a UNC Modification would be drafted first.

BR stated that they disagreed with this approach and it should be a Cross-Code Modification and some IGTs would be interested. KD noted that, as a Shipper, their preference would be to have a IGT UNC Modification raised as soon as practicable in order to keep the processes consistent. HW advised that they thought that IGTs should have an equivalent Modification as it would not be possible to guarantee the effect on the IGT UNC. The Chair added that it could be a potential blocker for innovation if the IGT UNC did not have it in place.

The Chair advised that the UNC Workgroup meeting would be held on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2021 and the Workgroup Report would be taken to Panel in July 2021. It was noted that the Modification would need approval from Authority.

The Chair highlighted that a lot of work had happened behind the scenes in NGN and an IGT UNC Modification would be needed quickly in order to feed into discussions. HW stated that they did not think that this would be the correct Modification to incorporate a joint Workgroup as there may be some differences in approach to derogations on IGT networks. KD advised that a Modification would need to be worked on together using Code Administrator's Code of Practice (CACoP) principles. The Chair agreed to add it to the Cross-Code Modification Implications Tracker.

**IGT151 – Revisions to User Termination Provisions** – The Chair stated that this Modifications mirrored UNC743 (Revisions to User Termination Provisions) which aimed to introduce up to date legislation on insolvency. The Workgroup heard that it would be going to Panel in March 2021 and one Workgroup after that. CH stated that they had lifted the wording from UNC743, adding in a clause to point to Corporate Insolvency and Governance Act 2020 (CIGA) regulations.

**IGT153 - Aligning the IGT UNC with licence changes following the UK leaving the EU** – The Chair informed the Workgroup that this Modification had been raised by BUUK in place of IGT120F (Aligning the IGT UNC with licence changes following the UK leaving the EU with a 'No deal'). The Workgroup heard that it would be sent to the Panel in March 2021, with the recommendation of a discussion at one Workgroup, and the Panel felt that the legal text of IGT120F was still applicable but the intention of the solution was not as the terms of the EU Exit had changed. The Chair advised that IGT120F had been withdrawn and the equivalent UNC Modification was UNC735 (UNC Changes as a consequence of the United Kingdom's exit from the European Union).

**UNC757R – Investigate Advanced Analytic Options to Improve NDM Demand Modelling -**

The Chair advised that this new review group had been created to look at the UIG volatility by machine learning. It was noted that any Code changes were likely to impact Section H, which the IGT referenced at specific clausal levels. The Workgroup heard that the review group was projected to last nine months, therefore, the Code Administrator would track its progress and provide the Workgroup with any updates.



KD highlighted that UNC693R had closed. The Chair agreed to remove this review group from the Cross-Code Modification Implications Tracker.

The Workgroup acknowledged the update and had no further comments.

#### **10. [IGT UNC Known Issues Register](#)**

The Chair noted that the Code Administrator was still waiting on a decision on IGT140 (Change to the IGT Panel Rules) from the Authority, and there had not been a timescale given.

CR asked whether they would be able to appoint an alternate since they were the only Shipper representative in Workgroup meetings. The Chair advised that this would be possible.

The Chair informed the Workgroup that IGT152F (Housekeeping changes for IGT UNC) had been sent out for fast-track consultation, which would be closing on 26<sup>th</sup> March 2021.

The Chair advised that the Known Issues Register had been updated to reflect the current position of issues. It was noted that Party engagement was still an issue and the register would be updated to reflect that.

#### **AOB**

No further AOB was raised by the Workgroup as UNC760 had been discussed during agenda item nine. The Chair thanked attendees for their input and closed the meeting.

**The next Workgroup meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 8<sup>th</sup> April 2021.**

## Appendix A – Action Log

Action reference	Action Description	Owner	Status
WS21-03-01	Gemserv and Brookfield to investigate potential solutions with regards to the Advance notice of Credit and email parties offline before the April 2021 Panel meeting to determine if IGT132 needs further discussion at a Workstream meeting.	CA	NEW
WS21-03-02	Gemserv and Brookfield to amend the legal text for IGT132 to add in clarity on the ability to agree bilateral Multi Shipper Agreements as well as at a licence level as per the established rules in other Codes.	CA	NEW
WS21-03-03	CA to hold discussion with the independent UNC Chair to determine whether there will be any consumer impacts from IGT138 or UNC674S.	CA	NEW
WS21-03-04	CA to ensure the definition of 'Class One Meter Read Equipment' in IGT148 is aligned with the definition given in the UNC.	CA	NEW
WS-21-03-05	CA to raise an item of AOB at the April 2021 Panel meeting to discuss options regarding timescales with IGT148.	CA	NEW
WS21-03-06	CA to work with BR to amend the definition of 'Daily Metered Service Provider' in IGT148.	CA	NEW
WS21-02-01	CA to send email to all Shippers requesting that they investigate internally whether their systems are capable of receiving alphanumeric invoicing for IGT Transportation charging invoices.	CA	Closed