

## IGT UNC Modification Panel Meeting

### Final Minutes

Friday 25<sup>th</sup> June 2021

Via teleconference

Attendee	Initials	Organisation	Representing	Notes
Anne Jackson	AJ	Gemserv	Code Administrator	Chair
Jenny Rawlinson	JR	BUUK	Pipeline Operators	
Cher Harris	CH	Indigo Pipelines	Pipeline Operators	
Claire Roberts	CR	ScottishPower	Pipeline User	
Rachel Clarke	RC	Gemserv	Code Administrator	
Eugene Asante	EA	Gemserv	Code Administrator	
Amie Lauper-Bull	ALB	Gemserv	Code Administrator	Secretariat

### 1. Welcomes and Apologies

The Chair welcomed the Panel to the reconvened meeting. The Chair noted that following the ongoing quoracy issues the Panel faces, the Code Administrator had opened a meeting prior to this and held that open for one hour as per Code rules (Part L6.10).

The Chair noted that apologies were received prior to the meeting from Heather Ward (Energy Assets Pipelines) and Scott McPhillimy (Ofgem). It was noted that Cher Harris (Indigo Pipelines) would be Heather's alternate, casting two votes and no Ofgem representative would be present during the meeting.

### 2. Confirmation of Agenda

The Chair confirmed the items for discussion as outlined in the final Agenda. The Panel were invited to add any items for AOB. The Chair noted that they had two items of AOB to raise regarding IGT137 (Alignment of the IGT UNC to the UNC in advance of Faster Switching) and the implementation of UNC0692S.

There were no further items of AOB added by the Panel.

### 3. Approval of the previous minutes (21-05 and 21-05 Reconvened)

ALB informed Panel that an amendment had been made to the minutes of the reconvened meeting. Under the Authority Updates section, the date of the return of IGT140 (Changes to the IGT Panel Rules). The original date written in the minutes was 16<sup>th</sup> July 2021 but this had been amended to reflect the correct date of 16<sup>th</sup> June 2021. The Chair noted however that there had not yet been a decision from the Authority on IGT140, resulting in a further delay.

The Panel had no further comments to add and the minutes were approved as a true reflection of both May meetings.

#### 4. Outstanding Actions

ALB informed the Panel that one action had been taken in the last meeting and all previous actions had been formally closed.

- **21/05 – 01:** CH stated that there had not been a meeting of the Independent Networks Association (INA) since the last IGT UNC Panel meeting so there was no update to provide. The Panel agreed to keep this action open until next month, when an update would be provided.

#### New Modifications

##### 5. IGT157 - Adding Local Authorities as a new User Type to the Data Permissions Matrix

CH presented the Modification to the Panel and suggested that it be sent to one Workgroup to align with the timescales being followed by the UNC. JR had attended the UNC Distribution Workgroup and reported that there had been discussions held on what happens when a modification goes to the Data Services Committee (DSC) and it decides on permissions. Concerns had been raised with regards to Local Authorities potentially using data to penalise businesses that did not meet their net zero targets. The Chair asked if the UNC modification was due to be discussed at another UNC Distribution Workgroup meeting or if it would be sent to the UNC Panel. JR confirmed that there would be further discussion in the Distribution Workgroup.

The Chair suggested that, to align with the UNC timescales, IGT157 may need more discussion time than that of just one Workgroup. The Chair asked if the proposer wished to send the modification to the Workgroup and then keep it running in parallel with the UNC or if they would prefer to put the modification on hold until the UNC discussions had concluded. JR suggested that it should be sent to the Workgroup whilst keeping an eye on the progress under the UNC. CR agreed with this approach, stating that when data is added to the Data Permissions Matrix, it sits with Xoserve for validation then goes to contract management. The Chair confirmed that they would track the IGT UNC modification with the Workgroup as well as the UNC modification and once the UNC modification had been sent back to the UNC Panel, then IGT157 would be returned to the IGT UNC Panel for a decision on how to proceed.

The Panel agreed with this approach, stating that they were happy that the modification should be subject to self-governance procedures.

There were no further comments and the Chair closed this section of the meeting.

#### Final Modification Reports

##### 6. IGT138 - Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls

CR advised that the UNC equivalent modification, UNC0674, would be returning to the UNC Workgroup for a further six months following issues that had been identified in the last UNC Panel meeting. The Chair highlighted that the Joint Office had stated that the modification would be brought back sooner if possible, and they had undertaken to write a plan with the proposer so that parties would know what would be discussed in each of the future meetings. CR stated that they were not aware whether this plan had been drafted, adding that they would provide an update once they had confirmation.

The Chair highlighted that there had been an appeal for people to attend the UNC Panel meeting to discuss UNC0674, following the most recent Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) meeting. It had been discussed that unless parties attend the meetings, the new issues would not receive sufficient discussion and conclusions would not be reached.

The Chair stated that IGT138 could not be implemented without UNC0674 being implemented and asked the Panel how they would like to proceed. JR agreed that the modification could not be closed until a conclusion had been reached for UNC0674, stating that it would be a good idea to track the progress of UNC0674. CR asked what the protocol would be for holding a decision on the modification. The Chair advised that would mean deferring a decision on IGT138 as there was nothing written in code stating that Panel were required to decide during this meeting. It was noted that Ofgem were interested in the outcome, so feedback would be provided to them. The Chair stated that the IGT UNC Panel could track the progress of UNC0674 and if anything were to alter in the governance then IGT138 would need to be returned to the Workgroup and implications would need to be discussed again. The Chair advised that the Code Administrator would track the progress of UNC0674 and if any new issues were raised that would impact IGTs then they would bring IGT138 back to the Panel to discuss whether a Workgroup should be formed to discuss the issues.

The Chair suggested deferring the decision on IGT138 to bring it back in three months, or sooner, to inform the Panel on the progress of UNC0674. JR stated that they were happy for the Code Administrator to monitor the modification and return it to the Panel as appropriate, to align with the timescales for UNC0674.

The Panel unanimously agreed that decision on the Modification should be deferred.

## **7. IGT156 – Retail Code Consolidation SCR**

ALB reminded the Panel that IGT156 had been sent for consultation for a period of 10 working days, which closed on 15<sup>th</sup> June 2021. The Panel heard that five consultation responses were received in total, four in support of the Modification and one offering qualified support. All responders agreed that the Modification should not be self-governance and final decision should be made by the Authority. All responders agreed that the Modification satisfied Relevant Objective F (Promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Code). ALB flagged that the party that had offered qualified support had stated that they had concerns regarding clause Part D 3.1 as the changes were not referenced in the Modification report so it was unclear exactly which REC requirement it was referring to. The party had assumed it was clarifying the need to comply with the Smart Metering Installation Code of Practice (SMICOP) obligations on a new connection and had asked for clarification on the matter. It had been suggested that these changes had not been discussed fully at Regulatory Design User Group (RDUG) and the party had concerns about the changes being implemented impacting commercial agreements or system processes.

CR stated that, as they were from the party who had raised the concerns, they had spoken to the person who had provided the response internally and it had been agreed that they did not wish to hold-up the modification. The Chair stated that they had spoken to the party offline as the changes had in fact been discussed at the RDUG meeting in November 2020 and asked if the party still had concerns, or if these had been clarified. RC added that they had presented the changes at RDUG, alongside most of the changes that were taking place under the UNC.

RC advised that the implications on the IGT UNC had been stated in the information provided to RDUG, including stating that the changes in the Metering Schedules were unique to the IGT UNC and required as metering clauses had not been fully unbundled from the IGT UNC. They were there to acknowledge the role of the IGT as a Meter Installer and/or Meter Equipment Manager (MEM) and that such parties would be required to sign up to and adhere to RECv2. When such parties might look to transact with a Supplier, the IGT UNC indicates that that role will be fulfilled by the Shipper. The Chair added that the nuance regarding metering was that the IGT UNC contains metering in the code, but the UNC does not. The Chair noted that metering agents would now be governed in the Retail Energy Code (REC) and that any IGTs that performed this role would be subject to the REC as well as any IGT UNC clauses. The Chair advised that the clauses that had been added stated that meter installers and Meter Equipment Managers (MEMs) would need to comply with the REC and there would be no connection with SMICOP.

The Chair asked the Panel if they thought the concerns raised would be a new issue to be discussed by the Workgroup. CR confirmed they were satisfied this was no longer an issue and any concerns had now been addressed, adding they did not wish to hold up the modification. The Panel agreed with this statement.

The Panel agreed that IGT156 should be sent to the Authority for decision and that no new impacts had been identified. The Panel agreed that the modification met the relevant objective cited by the proposer and that the legal text delivered the intent of the modification. The Chair noted that, if implemented, this modification would require a special Code release and the Panel would be informed of the time and date of the release in due course.

The vote was carried out with One Pipeline User and three Pipeline Operators (please note that this meeting was held as a Reconvened meeting, as per Part L6.10 of the IGT UNC where current quoracy rules do not apply).

The Panel unanimously recommended that IGT156 should be implemented.

### **Update on Workgroups**

#### **8. Workgroup Summary**

There were no additional comments or questions from the Panel.

*Please find the link to the Workgroup Summary [here](#).*

### **Authority Updates**

RC advised that the Ofgem publishing moratorium would end on 25<sup>th</sup> June 2021 and publishing would recommence on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2021, following the update to their website. It was noted that Ofgem were welcoming feedback on the new website.

RC informed the Panel that John Phillips would no longer be the Authority representative for the IGT UNC and Scott McPhillimy would be taking over the position on an interim basis whilst Ofgem were seeking a new representative. The Chair highlighted the advantages of having the same representative as the UNC for efficiency and consistency. JR agreed with this approach due to the similarities between the two codes and cross-code working.

## 9. AOB

JR advised that they had attended the UNC Distribution Workgroup meeting the day prior to the Panel meeting and there had been interesting discussions, including a pre-modification discussion about micro-business identifiers. JR advised that it was likely that an IGT UNC equivalent modification would be needed once a UNC modification had been raised and this would come to the Panel in due course.

Secondly, JR noted that there had been mention of a Distribution Network Operator (DNO) designated Class One document that had been endorsed and would move to the UNC. The Chair advised that they had been informed of this and there had been one reference to IGTs but this did not have implications for the IGT UNC. The Chair advised however that it had been a few months since they had seen the document and had not seen the final version, so they would report back once they had.

### **Review of IGT137 (Alignment of the IGT UNC to the UNC in advance of Faster Switching)**

The Chair advised that IGT137 had been brought in to realign the UNC and IGT UNC to make it easier for the Faster Switching Significant Code Review (SCR). The UNC went through a restructure, which subsequently interfered with the references in the IGT UNC, so this had to be addressed. It was noted that, at the time, parties had reviewed the amendments but as there had only been a 15 working day consultation period, the review might not have been carried out thoroughly enough.

RC advised that when IGT137 was implemented, there had been a comment that the consultation window had not been long enough to get external views on whether the changes would have impacts, so it was implemented at risk. The Code Administrator had stated that they would bring the item back to Panel after six months to mitigate the risk and ask if anyone had found any issues. RC noted that no issues had been raised to the Code Administrator in that time and their recommendation was that anything raised going forward should be incorporated as a housekeeping amendment.

The Chair asked the Panel if they were happy to remove this as a risk, or if they would prefer to keep it as a risk and review after another period of time. JR stated that they thought it could be removed as a risk and if something were to surface as an issue then it could be dealt with at that time. The Chair highlighted that the Known Issues Register could also be utilised and the importance of the issue would determine how quickly it would be dealt with. The Chair agreed that the issue could be brought back to Panel when needed. The Panel agreed with this approach.

### **Implementation of UNC0692S (Automatic updates to Meter Read Frequency) related to IGT131**

The Chair informed the Panel that a date for implementation for UNC0692S had been set for November 2021. Consequently, the Code Administrator would be asking the proposer of the IGT UNC equivalent, IGT131, to withdraw the modification. The Chair added that the Code Administrator would then email parties informing them of why IGT131 is being withdrawn and provide information on what is happening with regards to implementation of UNC0692S.

### **Cross-Code Working Report**

The Chair advised the Panel that they had taken the Cross-Code Working Report to the last UNC Panel meeting to discuss the IGT UNC's issues with cross-code working and indicated that if work would not be done to improve cross-code working then there was a view that digitisation might assist with this going forward. A party assumed

that the Chair was referring to the Energy Market Architecture Repository (EMAR) in regards to cross-code improvement via digitisation. The Chair noted that, regardless of the digitisation structure, as there was an indication that it would not help, there was a requirement that cross-code working improves. The Chair also noted that this discussion that had been held had been missed out of the minutes from the UNC Panel meeting and the introduction had not stated that the IGT UNC Chair was attending the meeting to represent the IGT UNC, not Gemserv. The Chair advised that they had requested that the minutes be amended to accurately reflect the discussions held and that the EMAR is not held by Gemserv and is not a Gemserv product. It was noted that a correction would be published in the minutes.

JR asked if the new rules that would be put in place following implementation of IGT156 would address the issues. The Chair advised that they had gone to the UNC as well, however the process felt onerous as there was an indication that as a group the UNC Panel would discuss each modification. This would not take place until after REC v2 had been implemented and there would be a period of time to see what value it would be adding. The Chair added that, as Code Administrators, they would need to consider efficiencies and as a representative of the UNC Panel that is something that they would be seeking.

#### **UNC0762S - Adding the Retail Energy Code Company (RECCo) as a User Type to the Data Permissions Matrix**

The Chair advised that the proposer of UNC0762S was suggesting that the modification be implemented on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2021, however they had not been informed of what the need for urgency was. The Chair highlighted that the IGT UNC equivalent, IGT155, had just had its consultation period and would be returning to the Panel in July 2021 for a decision. The Chair noted that the UNC would be working at risk by implementing the change early and they had stated that it would be easier for them to remove the IGT sites until implementation of IGT155. CH stated that, until an explanation was given as to the need for urgency, the timeline for IGT155 should remain unchanged.

#### **Other**

RC noted that they would be stepping away from the operational side of the IGT UNC. The Chair noted that this was due to reorganisation within the team and EA would be helping with the operational side for the next three months. The Panel thanked RC for their input in Panel matters.

There were no further items of AOB raised or comments from the Panel and the meeting was closed.

**The next IGT UNC Panel is scheduled for 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2021.**

## Annex 1 – Actions Table

Reference	Date	Action	Owner	Status
21/05 - 01	28/05/2021	IGTs to provide feedback following discussions on the RGMA Guidance document from INA Regulatory Subgroup in the July Panel meeting.	CH	NEW