



IGT UNC Modification Workstream Meeting

Final Minutes

8th April 2021 via Teleconference

Attendee	Initial	Organisation	Role
Anne Jackson	AJ	Gemserv	Chair
Brandon Rodrigues	BR	ESPUG	
Heather Ward	HW	Energy Assets	Agenda item 5 onwards
Rebecca Cailles	RC	BUUK	Agenda Item 1-9
Claire Roberts	CR	Scottish Power	
Kirsty Dudley	KD	E.ON	
Ellie Rogers	ER	Xoserve	Agenda Item 1-7
David Addison	DA	Xoserve	Agenda Item 1- 7
Rachel Clarke	RCI	Gemserv	Code Administrator
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 Cher Harris at Indigo Pipelines.

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. There were no items of AOB raised.

3. Approval of the Previous Minutes

21-03

The Workgroup heard that comments had been received on the minutes prior to the meeting and these had been addressed. This included an amendment to the number of Agenda Items that BR had joined the meeting for, and a change in wording to action WS 21-03-03. The Workgroup had no further 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 21-03-01 and WS 21-03-01: RCI noted that those who had attended the last Workstream meeting had been contacted to review some potential legal text changes in the context of the issues identified. It was noted that this action could be formally closed, as the legal text changes were not challenged,

had been presented to Panel, accepted, and the modification sent out for consultation. The Workgroup heard that the consultation period would close on 23rd April 2021.

WS 21-03-03: The Workgroup heard that this action could be closed as RCI had spoken with the Chair of the UNC0674 (Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls) meeting and was informed that the consumer impacts analysis had been carried out.

WS 21-03-04: RCI advised that this action would be discussed under Agenda Item 7 and could therefore be closed.

WS 21-03-05: RCI advised that this action could be closed as the subject of timescales for IGT148 (IGT UNC Modification Proposal-Class 1 Meter Reads) had been raised at the last IGT UNC Panel meeting and would be discussed further at under Agenda item 7.

WS 21-03-06: RCI advised that this action would be discussed under Agenda Item 7 and could therefore be closed. KD asked if there had been an action taken in the previous meeting to investigate the definition of Network Exit Agreement (NExA). RCI advised that a specific action had not been taken but it would be discussed further under Agenda Item 7.

Modification Workgroups

5. IGT138 - Performance Assurance Techniques and Controls

The Chair noted that the UNC0674 meeting had taken place in March and no amendments had been made to the Modification or the legal text drafting. The Workgroup heard that UNC0674 would be sent to the UNC Panel at the end of April 2021. It was noted that amendments had been made to the legal text drafting for IGT138, which would be discussed in the meeting, with a view of sending it to the IGT UNC Panel meeting in April 2021.

The Chair advised that the first change that had been made was to add clarification to the term 'Performance Assurance Parties' so that it was clear that both Pipelines Operators and Pipeline Users were included. It was noted that all parties to the IGT UNC were also parties to the UNC and therefore subject to the UNC regime. The Workgroup heard that an additional definition had also been added into the section about the Performance Assurance Framework Document (PAFD) stating that the content would be defined in the UNC but maintained by the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC). References to numbering had been amended as the numbering was not correct where additional clauses had been added in.

The Chair advised that Part L - Modification Rules had also been amended and outlined the changes to the Workgroup. KD asked if anything could be done to ensure that, when a UNC Modification is raised, an IGT UNC equivalent Modification would also be raised. The Chair advised that it would not be possible to put obligations on the PAC, but an amendment could be made to the PAFD following implementation of the Modification. BR enquired as to whether there would be a reasonable expectation that a PAFD Modification would be required and could bring

benefits. The Chair stated that it would be clear and if the benefit were marginal the PAC would not raise the Modification. The Chair also noted that such a Modification would receive scrutiny during the consultation period and would have to meet all measures necessary before being applied to Code. RCI added that as part of the role of Critical Friend, if the Modification was deemed to have no benefit, the Code Administrator would give feedback to the Proposer to advise that further work was needed on the Modification before it could enter the Modification process.

The Chair advised that the definition for PAF had been added into Part M – Definitions. KD suggested that a risk would need to be raised and added to the Known Issues Register as there would be a gap in governance. The Chair stated that Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA) could address the issue through the PAC.

The Chair advised that the proposed appeals process pointed to the UNC and asked if parties thought that the IGT UNC had a sufficient voice in the UNC. The Chair advised that IGTs have a seat on the PAC and the UNCC and shippers are also represented in these for a. KD stated that, as all parties to the IGT UNC had also acceded to the UNC, they were comfortable with the approach and due to the make-up of the UNC Panel, pragmatically going to the Uniform Network Code Committee (UNCC) as the first contact was correct. HW agreed.

The Workgroup agreed that the amendments made to the legal text drafting adequately supported the intention of the Modification.

RCI stated that at the last Workstream meeting it was agreed that the Consumer Benefit Analysis was a good section to include and the Proposer had indicated that there were no direct impacts identified. RCI advised that there were two questions which needed addressing in the Consumer Impacts section, the first regarding the current consumer experience. KD suggested that as the UNC was the lead code, the Workgroup should use the same text as what had been written in UNC0674 so that there would be no contradictions. RCI advised that the text in UNC0674 centred more around what that Modification would bring in so it would not be as relevant. The Chair stated that there was a focus on Settlement accuracy which, for consumers, would mean the cost was being fairly distributed between Shippers and Suppliers and would be a fair representation of their usage. The Chair noted that the accuracy of Settlement would be impacted by meter readings rather than estimates and currently there was a disjoint between obtaining the readings and sending readings into Settlement. It was highlighted that more readings available for consumer billing would mean greater accuracy for consumer billing and less use of estimated reads.

The Workgroup were asked what they thought the new consumer experience would be. After speculation, no parties in the meeting were able to comment definitively on whether this Modification would be a benefit to the consumer experience. KD stated that the costs and benefits

could be speculated on as there would be varying levels of Shipper experiences, which would mean some may use in-house read services or third-party services. It was noted that there would be the potential for seeing less Shipper parties exit the market due to a more accurate Settlement process. KD advised that a stable market with accurate Settlement would decrease volatility and make the market more efficient. RCI advised that the Workgroup Report would be amended offline to reflect the Workgroup's discussion.

RCI stated that the next section of the Consumer Impacts section that needed the Workgroup's attention was regarding improved safety and reliability. CR stated that the UNC Modification had indicated that there was no clear connection. HW advised that they did not believe there would be an impact on safety. KD advised that accurate billing would be a positive outcome, but the estimated reads would still be a neutral outcome. RCI asked if overall the Workgroup thought that there would be a positive impact leading to improved safety and reliability. The Workgroup agreed.

The Workgroup also determined that there would be no environmental damage but would be a positive impact on quality of service as there would be the potential for less use of estimated readings leading to greater accuracy. The Workgroup also agreed that there would not be a direct connection between the Modification and benefits to society, however any parties with differing views could raise these during consultation.

RCI asked the Workgroup if they were happy to recommend to the Panel that the Modification proceeds to consultation. CR stated that the timeline would need to align with UNC0674. The Chair asked if parties felt IGT138 would need the same amount of time for consultation period as UNC0674. KD stated that the principles of IGT138 were slightly different so would not need a longer consultation period, however parties would be likely to consider both Modifications as a package so consultation timings should align, but if this was not possible then as a minimum both Modifications' consultation period should close at the same time. The Chair noted that the IGT UNC Panel meeting would be held one week after the UNC Panel meeting, so it would not be possible to have a consultation period of the same amount of time. KD stated that if the consultation period was to last less time than 20 Working Days, then the Modification would not receive the correct responses. CR agreed, stating that the consultation period for IGT138 should align with UNC0674. The Chair asked if the Workgroup would like to discuss IGT138 further if UNC0674 needed further discussion following consultation, or if it should be paused. The Workgroup agreed that in that instance, the modification should be paused.

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

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

RCI advised that UNC0664V (Transfer of Sites with Low Valid Meter Reading Submission Performance from Classes 2 and 3 into Class 4) had been raised as a variant to UNC0664. The Workgroup heard that the Modification had been changed from Authority decision to Self-Governance and the lockout period had been removed. RCI stated that, as the Proposer of IGT145 was not present at the meeting, a discussion would be held offline to determine if the changes to UNC0664 would have an impact on IGT145. There were no further comments, so the Chair closed this section of the meeting.

7. IGT148 - IGT UNC Modification Proposal-Class 1 Meter Reads

RCI advised that some definitions in the Modification had been deemed inappropriate, so these had been taken away to consider and some amendments would be presented. RCI advised that one of the main changes was to the definition of Daily Metered Service Provider (DMSP) as it was a known industry acronym, so it had been changed to 'Class 1 Read Provider'. ER stated that it made sense to change the definition to 'Class 1 Read Provider' referring to the Central Data Service Provider (CDSP) to align with the UNC. BR agreed with this comment, stating that it added clarity.

RCI advised that they had spoken to various people within the industry and they could not find out what the Local Distribution Zone Connected System Exit Point (LDZ CSEP) Agreement was. It was noted that it was not an ancillary document to the IGT UNC. The reference to it had not been removed so it was likely that it had been left in historically for a reason. The Workgroup heard that in order to 'dillute' the reference, the Code Administrator had added in a line to the legal drafting to state that it would be pursuant to the DSC Service Line. DA asked if there was something else that could be put in place instead of the LDZ CSEP Agreement as a precedent. The Chair advised that in the Code Administrator's investigations on LDZ CSEP Agreement, the IGT UNC was largely rewritten for Nexus in 2017 so this reference was current at that time. The Chair also advised that before Nexus the phrase was widely used in the IGT UNC and also used in individual IGT network codes, so there was a nervousness regarding removing it.

RCI stated that the next amendment was to Section 14.9 and the references to Independent Gas Transporters Arrangements Document (IGTAD), as following conversations with Xoserve there was confusion around referencing the IGTAD as UNC0710S (CDSP provision of Class 1 read service) would be removing clauses for providing that service from the IGTAD. RCI noted that Section D of the IGTAD set out everything that the IGT UNC needed to include and for settlement purposes, so this would be the new hook for why the IGT UNC would need to provide this service. ER stated that they had difficulty understanding what Section D of the IGTAD was. The Chair advised that Section D set out everything that IGTs must ensure is done under the IGT UNC, however it was the Section E references that had been removed. This had previously mentioned that large transporters were

required to obtain meter readings for Class 1 sites. ER stated that this made it sound like IGTs were responsible for getting Class 1 to provide the meter readings, adding that the intention of UNC0710S was to make the CDSP responsible for the service on behalf of Shippers. The Chair advised that this would require a change to the IGTAD to take on that responsibility, adding that Section D of the IGTAD required that IGTs ensure that the readings are obtained in the IGT UNC. BR clarified this statement, stating that it required the IGT UNC to have provisions to provide the readings and it allows the IGT to adopt or implement processes through the UNC principal document. BR added that it did not state that it was an obligation on IGTs but it needed to be written into Code, suggesting that it could be a reference to the UNC or an independent section in the IGT UNC.

The Chair advised that under the IGT UNC, it would not be possible to ask parties to do something for no good reason and the IGTAD set a requirement for those readings to be maintained.

The Chair advised that the IGTAD had been created with the current IGT UNC, after Nexus. As the IGTAD had been written into the UNC Code and impacts only the IGTs and Distribution Networks, the Chair suggested taking the discussion offline to go through the IGTAD and explain the relationship further. DA agreed to this. KD asked if the Code Administrator would be amending the Modification offline during that discussion. The Chair stated that the discussion would be held solely to explain the matter further and no amendments would be made.

BR advised that another option would be to make a change to the IGTAD but this could take longer and would need a UNC equivalent Modification. The Chair stated that the IGT UNC was written to make it the Shipper's responsibility to obtain the readings from the large Transporter. The Chair noted that the Shipper was still required to obtain them under this modification from the CDSP.

RCI noted that in Part N, text had been lifted from the definition in the UNC to provide an additional hook in the IGT UNC to detail the obligation on the CDSP as the 'Class 1 read provider' to obtain the meter readings on Class 1 sites. RCI stated that a conversation needed to be had regarding the use of the word 'providing' and asked the Workgroup if they thought it should be changed to 'procuring'. ER mentioned that in the DSC Service Line it would be added in that the CDSP would have no obligation to provide valid reads, so it should say procure rather than provide. BR advised that two other Service Lines use the term 'provide'. DA suggested that the difference between 'provide' and 'procure' had caused confusion with service providers and service lines should be clear when they get into the DSC. BR asked if there would be any benefit to changing the wording from 'provide' to 'procure', stating that the original wording was based on UNC0710S. BR added that, from the perspective of a new market entrant, if 'procure' was used confusion may be had over what they should do with the data so their preference would be to leave it as 'provide'. DA suggested that this matter had been discussed in the UNC0710S Workgroup and was highlighted during development, adding that the change to the word might also mean changing 'Class 1 Service Provider' to 'Class 1 Service Procurer'.

The Chair suggested taking the discussion offline with BR, ER and DA to make sure all were happy with the content and asked the Workgroup how to proceed if amendments were needed. DA stated

that it would not be necessary to return it to the Workgroup as it was relying on the principles of what was written in the IGTAD. DA added that if amendments were more fundamental however then it should be discussed further by the Workgroup. BR agreed with this approach, stating that due to the change in the hook it may lead to a longer discussion, which would mean the timeline to implement would be missed. The Chair asked if implementation on 1st June 2021 could still be targeted. DA stated that they were still aiming for 1st June 2021, but the timeline would be tight. The Chair asked what the implications of missing the deadline would be. BR stated that they would need to investigate this.

KD stated that they agreed with the approach from a Shipper perspective as the text had been lifted and shifted from UNC0710S and they did not want anything to jeopardise the timeline. DA stated that, during discussions about the access agreement, there was a stable Class One population and in the interim, there would be limited risk so the service should continue to be provided, identifying problems along the way. KD was grateful for the pragmatic approach to ensuring the service continues.

The Chair asked the Workgroup if they were happy to discuss the Workgroup Report during the meeting. The Workgroup agreed.

RCI advised that the Modification would be Self-Governance as there are a low number of relevant sites and it would mean a lift and shift of the service. The Workgroup agreed, stating they had no concerns. RCI asked if parties had anything to add to the solution and whether they thought the discussion on 'provide' or 'procure' should be added there or in the legal text section. BR stated they thought it should be added to the legal text section of the report. DA suggested adding in wording to the solution section. RCI agreed to amend the Workgroup report to reflect the discussion.

There were no further comments on the solution.

RCI stated that in the impacts section, the Proposer had noted no impacts on the SCR or change projects. It was noted that the Proposer had cited Relevant Objectives C and F.

RCI stated that the implementation date should be targeted for the UNC0710S and XRN5218 (CDSP provision of Class 1 read service) release date of 1st June 2021, however this would not align with the IGT UNC release date so the next IGT UNC release date would be 25th June 2021. The Workgroup heard that the Code Administrator would be targeting an implementation decision in the May 2021 Panel meeting and there would be a 15 Working Days appeal window to follow. Due to a bank holiday, the earliest that the Modification could be implemented would be 21st June 2021. ER advised that, based on earlier discussions, it would be appropriate to mention this in the Workgroup comments to avoid similar comments during consultation. KD suggested adding in wording to state that if there were to be a delay on the decision, the service would still be changed as per UNC0710 and services to IGT sites should not be impacted.

RCI stated that they would add in the amendments to the legal text offline. RCI suggested that the Workgroup's recommendation to Panel would be to send the Modification to Panel to proceed with

consultation. KD agreed, stating that if anything further was discussed offline then this should be brought to the Workgroup's attention. BR agreed with this approach.

8. [IGT153 – Aligning the IGT UNC with licence changes following the UK leaving the EU](#)

RC informed the Workgroup that IGT153 was an adapted Modification from IGT120F, with the tense changed to the present rather than the future tense as in IGT120F. RC advised that the Modification would be Self-Governance. The Workgroup heard that there had been no major changes, but a couple of things had been checked due to licence changes coming through from Ofgem. It was noted that no changes were needed as a result of the licence changes. RCI noted that the Code Administrator had also investigated the Clean Energy Package with Brookfield, which looks at initiatives from Europe and they were satisfied that no changes were needed to the legal text.

RCI advised that some reference documents had been added for clarity. RCI advised that there would be no impact to the Significant Code Review (SCR) and there were no expected consumer or Cross-Code impacts.

It was highlighted that the UNC had a similar Modification, UNC743S (Revisions to User Termination Provisions), which had already been implemented.

RCI informed the Workgroup that the Modification would be implemented as soon as possible and there had been a couple of definitions added to Part M of the suggested legal text. The Workgroup agreed that the Modification should be implemented in the next Code release.

The Workgroup agreed that the Modification met the Relevant Objectives and that the solution adequately facilitated the intention of the Modification. The Workgroup also agreed that the legal text was correct and recommended that the Modification proceed to the IGT UNC Panel as Self-Governance.

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

9. [IGT154 – Introducing the concept of a derogation into the IGT UNC for Net Zero innovation project](#)

The Chair advised that this Modification had been discussed at the March 2021 IGT UNC Panel meeting and it was felt that it should be sent to four Workstream meetings for discussion. It was noted that there was an ancillary document to accompany the Modification, which had been published prior to the meeting. HW advised that IGT154 was the equivalent Modification to UNC0760 (Introducing the concept of derogation for Net Zero innovation into Uniform Network Code (UNC)). The Workgroup heard that the Proposer had the view of achieving two main things with the Modification, the first being that if there is a derogation to the UNC that impacts an IGT then a derogation would be automatically created for the IGT UNC. It was noted that a derogation facility would also be created solely for the IGT UNC.

HW proposed that IGT154 be sent to Ofgem for approval alongside UNC0760 as the development timescales may depend on that Modification. KD asked if IGT154 could be implemented on its own, to which HW stated that they could be implemented separately. KD asked whether the scope of the Modification would be too narrow because it would be solely going on an individual topic or should the Workgroup consider derogation principles as a whole. KD also noted that there were some areas that the UNC Workgroup were challenging the Proposer of UNC0670 on, as there were some overlapping areas and concerns that this could be problematic. HW advised that the last IGT UNC Panel meeting was at the same time as the UNC0670 Workgroup so they had not heard the whole debate. HW suggested that if the derogations were narrower, they may be more likely to be approved but if the consensus was that they should be wider in the IGT UNC then they were not opposed to changing the Modification.

The Chair noted that the Proposer of IGT154 had not tried to redefine what a derogation was, but they were attempting to state what the reasons were for giving a derogation. The Chair advised that UNC0670 provided a definition which included reference to Net Zero. Due to the approach taken by the Proposer of IGT154, points could be added or taken away as required, which would be clear and helpful for parties.

KD asked what kind of remit would be expected under the IGT UNC. HW suggested that the UNC and IGT UNC Panels may be uncomfortable making decisions without engagement from the rest of the market and they would try to make that clear when updating the Modification.

KD enquired as to whether there would be any time constraints for derogation requests. HW stated that no time constraints had been written into the Modification, however the ancillary document that had been provided prior to the meeting was a guidance document that would set out the information needed for the derogation and whether to approve or reject it. KD asked if timescales would be mandatory and if more time was needed would the party need to request an extension. HW stated that timescales would be mandatory and if parties required more time, then they would have to apply for an extension. CR asked how long the time period should be set for. KD suggested that the timescale could be bespoke for each party and if a party were to run out of time, they should be asked to submit a new request. HW agreed with this approach and stated they would develop the idea offline.

The Workgroup heard that the derogation guidance document provided more detail on why a derogation would be needed, how to apply and what the Panel may consider in the process. HW advised that the document may get updated from time to time and asked for the Workgroup's thoughts on what sort of evidence should be provided. KD suggested that there was a possibility of crossing commercial boundaries with innovation and ideas, dependent on what evidence was required. KD asked if there would be a way that a non-disclosure agreement could be created, stating that parties would need to be mindful that any announcements could give someone a commercial advantage on something that was being worked on. HW agreed that it needed more thought as innovations may not be funded by Ofgem.

There were no further comments, so the Chair closed this section of the meeting. HW advised that any further comments should be sent to them offline via email.

Standing Items

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

UNC0762 - Adding the Retail Energy Code Performance Assurance Code Manager as a new User type to the Data Permissions Matrix – RCI advised that this Modification had been raised in March and it had been mentioned to the IGT UNC Panel that an IGT UNC equivalent Modification would be required. It was noted that this would be the first Modification to be raised following UNC736 (Clarificatory change to the AQ amendment process within TPD G2.3) being implemented and any code or regulations changes around the data permissions matrix would be for visibility only.

UNC764 - UNC TPD Section Y (Part A-I) amendments to K to align to RII02 Licence – It was highlighted that the legal text had not yet been developed for this modification and the Code Administrator was waiting to see if there would be an impact on the IGT UNC.

UNC734S - Reporting Valid Confirmed Theft of Gas into Central Systems – It was noted that the legal text had not yet been drafted for this Modification, but discussions would be held with the Supply Point Administration Agreement (SPAA) committee once the legal text has been developed to make sure IGT UNC would be covered.

UNC743S – Revisions to User Termination Provisions – RCI advised that IGT151 had been raised as a Self-Governance equivalent Modification and the Proposer wanted it to be discussed at one Workstream meeting. It was highlighted that, as UNC0743S had already been implemented, the Panel decided that IGT151 could be sent straight out for consultation and would be returned to the IGT UNC Panel in May 2021.

KD asked how the Code Administration Code of Practice (CACoP) were driving efficiency with regards to Cross-Code working, noting that there were Modifications that were aligned but were being discussed separately. They believed that they did not always need to be discussed at separate workgroups. KD also noted that they had noticed marginal improvements with both the UNC and IGT UNC, however the matter would only get more complex and they did not feel that the CACoP principles were having a benefit.

RCI advised that other Codes were not as aligned with each other as the UNC and IGT UNC are so other Code Administrators may not experience the same complexities. RCI suggested that it would be a matter that needed consideration. The Chair advised that they would be providing the UNC Chair with a report on the discussions held by the Workgroup.

The Chair advised that there would be a new Cross-Code Steering Group (CCSG) that would be set up and generated by the Retail Energy Code (REC), however they were still working on the Terms of Reference. KD stated that they did not see the efforts of the UNC and IGT UNC replicated in other codes. The Chair advised that the CCSG would not hold regular meetings but would schedule a

meeting if a specific issue were raised and that most of the discussion and debate would be facilitated by email. The Chair noted that further information on the CSSG could be found on the IGT UNC [website](#) and advised that the presentation would be given to the UNC Panel at their next meeting on Thursday, 15th April if anyone wished to attend as an observer.

The Workgroup acknowledged the update and had no further comments.

11. [IGT UNC Known Issues Register](#)

RCI advised that there had been no new additions to the Known Issues Register prior to the meeting, but that the issue regarding Performance Assurance changes not being replicated in the IGT UNC from the UNC, which had been discussed under IGT138, had been added. It was noted that Party engagement was still an issue and there had been no further comment from Ofgem regarding IGT151 (Revisions to User Termination Provisions).

KD advised that there may not be a permanent E.On representative in meetings going forward to represent on Modifications raised by E.On. RCI stated that this would not be an issue as E.On did not have an obligation to progress the Modifications that they had raised.

BR stated that an issue should be added to the register regarding the LDZ CSEP Agreement. RCI agreed, stating that it was an unknown agreement which sat outside of the IGT UNC, but the Code made several references to it. KD suggested opening a discussion with one of Gemserv's REC Manager colleagues as they may have further information on the Agreement.

AOB

No further AOB was raised by the Workgroup. The Chair thanked attendees for their input and closed the meeting.

The next Workgroup meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 13th May 2021.

Annex 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	Closed
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	Closed
WS21-03-03	CA to hold discussion with the UNC Modification 0674 Chair to determine whether there will be any consumer impacts from IGT138 or UNC674S.	CA	Closed
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	Closed
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	Closed
WS21-03-06	CA to work with BR to amend the definition of 'Daily Metered Service Provider' in IGT148.	CA	Closed
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