



IGT UNC 22-03 Modification Workstream Meeting

Final Minutes

Thursday 10th March 2022 via Teleconference

Attendee	Initial	Organisation	Notes
Anne Jackson	AJ	Gemserv	Chair
Kundai Matiringe	KM	BUUK	
Heather Ward	HW	Energy Assets	
Michelle King	MK	Energy Assets	
Clare Manning	CM	E.ON	Present for items 1-5, 7 and 8 only
Cher Harris	CH	Indigo Pipelines	
Graeme Cunningham	GC	British Gas	Present for items 1 -5 only
Oorlagh Chapman	OC	Proposer (IGT159)	Present for items 1- 5 only
Claire Roberts	CR	Scottish Power	Present for items 1-8 only
Ellie Rogers	ER	Xoserve	Present for items 1- 5 only
Michael Payley	MP	Correla	Present for items 7 and 8 only To present under IGT158 and RG005
Dave Addison	DA	Xoserve	Present for items 7 and 8 only To present under IGT158 and RG005
Jaimee LeResche	JL	Xoserve	
Sandra Fawzy	SF	Gemserv	Code Administrator

1. Welcome and Apologies for Absence

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and accepted apologies received from Gethyn Howard (Last Mile), Lee Greenwood (British Gas) and Talia Lattimore (Gemserv). All attendees confirmed permission for the meeting to be recorded.

2. Confirmation of Agenda

The Chair advised the Workgroup that the meeting would be lengthy as there were a lot of items on the agenda that involved a significant amount of time and work. Item 5 (IGT159 – Amendments to the Must Read Process) was listed first on the agenda under New Modifications as it was on the February Workgroup agenda but due to other items overrunning it did not get heard. It was agreed that item 7 (IGT158 - Transition to the Central Switching Service and the Retail Energy Code v3.0) would be brought before item 6 (IGT160 – Introducing the concept of a derogation into the IGT UNC for innovation projects) as it is subject to tighter time constraints.

3. Approval of the Previous Minutes 22-02

The CA informed the Workgroup that no comments were received for the draft 22-02 Modification Workstream meeting minutes prior to the meeting. The Workgroup had no comments to add to the Minutes at the meeting and they were approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

4. Outstanding Actions

The CA informed the Workgroup that there were two outstanding actions:

21-12/04 CA to propose a legal definition to the Workgroup for LDZ “Ancillary Agreement” and for it to be provided to the Workgroup at its next meeting. To be discussed under item 10.

22-02/01 DA to check the impact on the RPC Entry AQ of the new registration process. To be discussed under item 8.

New Modifications

5. [IGT159 – Amendments to the Must Read Process](#)

OC (The Proposer) explained to the Workgroup that they have been in discussion with Xoserve and they have amended the Modification Proposal. The Proposer took the Workgroup through the five areas under the Modification Solution.

Rules for IGTs to provide Reads within an agreed window which allows the Shipper sufficient time to enter the read into Settlement

The Proposer explained that the Modification aims to ensure that any Reads obtained are useful, as there has been an issue of Reads being submitted too late and therefore unable to be used for Settlement. The Proposer highlighted to the Workgroup that both the UNC and IGT UNC have a set time frame for Reads to be supplied to Shippers. IGT UNC Part E Section 11 points to Section M 5.10 of the UNC Code for the purpose of Must Reads. UNC Section M 5.10.6 reads:

“If

- (a) *before the Transporter has initiated a Meter Read pursuant to paragraph 5.10.1, the User notifies the Transporter (by Conventional Notice) that the User is taking steps to obtain a Meter Reading in respect of the relevant Supply Meter, specifying the expected date of the Meter Read;*
- (b) *not later than the 10th Supply Point Systems Business Day of the following month the User provides to the Transporter a copy of the warrant (granted under the Rights of Entry (Gas and Electricity Boards) Act 1954, as amended) authorising entry to the relevant premises, or a copy of the application for such a warrant, or demonstrates to the Transporter’s reasonable satisfaction that a Meter Reading can be obtained without such a warrant; and*

(c) a Valid Meter Reading is submitted to the Transporter in respect of the relevant Supply Meter not later than the 20th Supply Point System Business Day after the start of the following month

CR, HW and CH informed the Workgroup that they were not aware of this process and that they have not received any requests using it. There was debate as to whether it should be clarified or if process guidelines could be issued to draw attention to it. CR questioned if it would be captured as part of the Contact Management Service (CMS) rebuild. ER explained the CMS rebuild will be taking the current process and replicating in an enhanced way but will not be making changes to the process unless those changes have previously been made by industry.

The Workgroup discussed the meaning of UNC Section M 5.10.6 and decided that further research would be needed to decide if it indicated that:

- a) the Shipper would have the right to reject a late Reading as it was not submitted within a certain timeframe and therefore the Shipper would not be charged; or
- b) the Shipper could notify the Transporter within 10 days of the readings, that they (the Shipper) could obtain a reading within 20 days and therefore the Transporter would be alleviated from providing a Must Read.

CH highlighted that extending the pre-notification period could be considered in order to resolve the Must Read time constraints issues.

It was agreed that the Workgroup representatives for IGTs and Shippers would investigate if UNC Section M 5.10.6 is utilised by their organisation, the frequency of it being used and the details of that process. A second action would be for the Workgroup representatives for IGTs and Shippers to consider the definition of Section M 5.10.6 and any ideas that could be added for clarity of the Must Read process to make it more efficient.

The Workgroup discussed the number of days suitable for a timeframe bearing in mind that the live read cycle is 25 days in total. The larger IGTs thought that a 20 day window for the Read to be provided would be sufficient. The Chair assessed the debate and stated that there were two time brackets to consider:

- a) the first was how long the agent has to get the Read back after it had been obtained; and
- b) the second was how long the IGTs have to upload the Read onto the Xoserve system.

It was agreed that further clarification from Xoserve would be needed to confirm if the timeframes for validation of the Meter Readings applies to all parties in the same way with regards to submission deadlines.

The Workgroup discussed the fact that IGTs can and have been submitting Reads directly into CMS and they have been going straight into Settlement. The Workgroup considered if this leads to duplication of Reads and if it would be unnecessary for the Shippers to resubmit the same Read.

The Proposer explained that there has been many Must Read CMS rebuild workshops and that Lee Greenwood was the representative who attended on behalf of British Gas but unfortunately was unable to attend this Workgroup meeting to give an update. The Proposer thought that the Must Read processes are defined and available and needed to be brought to the Workgroups attention.

ER drew the Workgroup's attention to [Xoserve's Must Read training webpage](#) and encouraged attendees to familiarise themselves with the process as the Workgroup agreed that there was confusion over the process. The Workgroup agreed to take an action to familiarise themselves with the Xoserve Must Reads training material and for the Proposer to investigate why a Read is not valid after 25 days. In addition to this an Xoserve process expert will attend the next Workgroup meeting in April.

Reporting requirements to ensure that data is regularly refreshed and the most accurate and up to date information is available and used by all industry Parties

The Proposer explained that the Modification seeks to implement a mechanism so that the most up to date information is provided to all the parties. It was agreed that this was an issue for both Shippers and IGTs.

ER explained that this issue has been brought to Xoserve's attention in the past and that a mechanism to ensure accurate data would be welcomed by Xoserve.

A process for any faults or visible concerns with a meter, or issues obtaining a read, to be recorded and reported

The Proposer explained the Meter Reading process offers a window of opportunity for faults or other read issues, the meter reader may notice, to be reported. CH and KM notified the Workgroup that there is a comments field in the form used by the meter readers and issues such as 'a new meter has been fitted' or 'a meter has a broken screen display' can be reported.

The Workgroup agreed that the information being noted by a meter reader and then later not being acted upon could have a negative impact on the consumer. The consumer will not differentiate between an IGT meter reader or Shipper meter reader and would expect that a note taken of their meter (e.g. broken display) should be acted upon by the Supplier or that the Supplier should at least have a record of it. There was also the concern that the consumer would be less accommodating to meter readers generally if they have a SMART meter, as they would assume that a key purpose of a SMART meter would be that the old fashioned *knock-on-your-door* meter readings would no longer be necessary.

A specific process for Smart and Automatic Meter Reading (AMR) meters with an active DCC flag

The Proposer explained to the Workgroup that the Modification aims to have a specific process for SMART and AMR meters to address an active Data Communications Company (DCC) flag that is not communicated, leading to issues taking a few months to resolve. It was agreed that additional and unnecessary site visits are inefficient and can also create a poor experience for consumers. ER

explained that Xoserve is aware of this and is willing to work with industry in order to implement a process that is effective.

Xoserve do currently act upon meters that are not in use for Distribution Networks (DNs) but do not have a process to address meters with a fault.

A specific process for sites gained via the Supplier of Last Resort (SoLR) process to allow Shippers the new Shipper the opportunity to obtain a read

The Proposer explained that Modification aims to have a specific process for sites gained via the SoLR process to allow the new Shipper the opportunity to obtain a Read. The Proposer explained that new Shippers can currently obtain a Read but the process is not clarified and could lead to duplicate reading. It was highlighted that the information held for a SoLR would need to be kept up to date and this may need further thought.

Legal Text

In response to the Chair's question the Proposer confirmed that the legal text will be drafted in order to place the governance of the Must Read process for IGTs and Shippers into the IGT UNC, rather than to update the UNC and for the IGT UNC to point into the UNC, as it currently stands. There is currently no intention to raise a UNC equivalent Modification.

The Proposer will draft business rules in time for the April 2022 Workgroup meeting and it was agreed that an Xoserve process expert will attend the April 2022 Workgroup meeting.

ACTION: 22-03/ 01 Workgroup representatives for IGTs and Shippers are to investigate if UNC Section M 5.10.6 is utilised by their organisation and to report on the frequency and details of that process. If the process is not used to provide reasons for that.

ACTION: 22-03/02 Workgroup representatives for IGTs and Shippers are to consider the definition of UNC Section M 5.10.6 and to consider any potential aspects that could be added for clarity or could make the Must Read process more efficient.

ACTION: 22-03/3 ER and JL to confirm if the timeframe for the validation of Meter Reading applies to all parties in the same way with regards to submission deadlines.

ACTION: 22-03/4 Workgroup representatives for IGTs and Shippers to familiarise themselves with [Xoserve's Must Read training webpage](#).

ACTION: 22-03/5 OC to investigate why a Read is not valid after 25 days.

6. [IGT160 – Introducing the concept of a derogation into the IGT UNC for innovation projects](#)

HW (The Proposer) took the Workgroup through the track changes of the amended [IGT160 Modification Proposal](#). IGT160 is a replacement Modification for [IGT154 – Introducing the concept of a derogation into the IGT UNC for Net Zero innovation project](#) which was rejected by Ofgem on 21st

January 2022. IGT160 aims to introduce the same solution as IGT154 but will address the points raised by Ofgem in their [decision letter for IGT154](#). The Chair explained that the Modification has been colour coded to show which parts of the Modification have been changed and which parts have been added compared with IGT154.

The Modification is linked to [UNC0800 - Introducing the concept of a derogation framework into Uniform Network Code \(UNC\) \(Authority Direction\)](#) and is intended to ensure that any derogations to the UNC are applied appropriately within the IGT UNC where the derogation affects one or more IGT networks. It is also intended to provide scope for similar derogations to be raised to the IGT UNC specifically should that be appropriate in the future. The Proposer noted that in the Ofgem rejection letter they advised that they '*welcome the proposal to include a new section of the IGT UNC that would allow derogation requests*' specifically mentioning this in relation to '*Net Zero innovation projects to be made*'.

The Chair notified the Workgroup that IGT160 is a new Modification and that comments and discussions from IGT154 could not be lifted and placed into IGT160 without the Workgroup reassessing each of those comments.

The Proposer took the Workgroup through the business rules and the changes from the business rules in IGT154. The business rules that were highlighted were as follows:

- The Derogation may only apply to the applicant party (or where the Derogation is in relation to specific MPRNs) any IGT UNC parties associated with the MPRN;
- The applicant must provide evidence that all necessary interactions with Health and Safety Executive (HSE) have taken place and been satisfactorily concluded. This must (at a minimum) include the applicant's safety assessment which must demonstrate that the Derogation does not adversely impact on safe management of gas flow;
- It is up to the proposer to confirm that it has complied with all relevant safety requirements and the Panel shall not be required to independently verify any statement or representation made by the applicant party regarding health and safety matters;
- Any other derogations that are (in the applicant's opinion) required, have been applied for and not rejected and it cannot be assumed that Ofgem will make a decision about associated Derogations at the same time;
- Derogation requests will be subject to Authority determination. The Panel shall vote to recommend implementation of a Derogation;
- The Authority may choose to approve or reject the Derogation request or return it to the applicant for more information ('send back')
- In the event the Derogation is 'sent back', it shall be reviewed by the Panel before returning it to the Authority to ensure the revised Derogation request meets Ofgem's criteria, similar to the Modification process;
- The Derogation will take effect from the date directed by the Authority, the applicant and Panel will recommend a date but that can be overruled by the Authority;

- A Derogation must contain a fixed end date, the purpose of this to prevent a Derogation being open for several years and not being utilised;
- Once a Derogation request has been rejected or approved the Derogation details will be published on the IGT UNC website;
- An approved Derogation may be varied by submission of a new Derogation request via the IGT UNC CA clearly showing it is intended to supersede the original Derogation, along with clear change marking differences to the approved Derogation, for the avoidance of doubt;
- Should the new Derogation request be rejected, the original, approved Derogation will remain effective;
- Once a Derogation is in operation, the party who requested the Derogation shall report progress to the Panel every 6 months, this rule is not in the UNC;
- The Derogation will be tracked by the proposer and will be based on their 6 monthly reports;
- Business rule 17 is a duplication and is to be removed.

The Proposer confirmed that all safety matters would need to be consulted upon before Panel could be asked to make a decision on the Derogation. The Proposer stated that the safety checks would be the responsibility of the proposer.

Legal Text

The Chair notified the Workgroup that the [draft legal text changes for IGT160](#) have been based on the final baselined legal text for IGT154 and the CA along with the Proposer have colour coded the changes for clarification purposes; black is existing IGT UNC provisions, red is baseline IGT154 legal drafting and blue signifies changes proposed by IGT160.

The Proposer took the Workgroup through the legal text for IGT160 and the following areas were highlighted:

- Appendix K-2 has a new addition: IGT UNC Innovation Derogations Guidance;
- **1.2.1 (a)** the “Derogation Determination Date” has been removed as it would be an Ofgem function rather than a Panel function;
- **1.2.1 (c)** as has been updated to include Shippers that have been impacted by a Derogation;
- **1.2.1 (v)** the terms of an IGT UNC Ancillary Document - is to be reconsidered;
- **1.2.1 (h)** and **(i)** define “Relevant Day” and “Relevant Person” – there were concerns raised that the phrase is commonly used in legal drafting and is not/should not be exclusively used for IGT160 legal drafting;
- **2.1.2** Derogation Eligibility was covered in the IGT UNC, and is not pointed into the UNC;
- **2.1.2 (g)** the basis on which applicant party demonstrates compliance with the health and safety requirements described in the Derogation Guidance Document – the Derogation Guidance Document, sets out what the evidence is and it should be included in the application form;

- **2.1.3 (a)** Relevant Person is a term being used instead of “Panel Member”;
- **2.1.5 (b)** indicates that the Panel does not have to independently verify the applicant party regarding health and safety matters - it offers legal protection for Panel members;
- **2.1.6 (b)** has been removed as Use Case is covered in **2.1.2**;
- **2.1.7** the applicant party is still required to be present and that is still included in the business rules;
- **2.1.8 (a)** replaces “Eligibility Criteria” with “Use Case”;
- **2.1.9** standardised the approach that could otherwise be changed by the Panel;
- **2.1.9 (c) (i)** replaces “unanimous” with “majority”;
- **2.1.9 (c) (ii)** replaces “Where the Derogation Application does not proceed to implementation” with “by a majority vote to recommend to the Authority that the IGT UNC Derogation Application be rejected” – “not implemented” could be a better term and Ofgem could send it back it to be reconsidered
- **2.1.9 (c) (iii)** replaces “determination” with “recommendation”;
- **2.1.9** of the previous legal drafting has been removed as it speaks of the Panel approving implementation;
- **2.1.11** removes the Panel’s ability to defer determinations and places that ability with the Authority;
- **2.1.14 (b)** a second application should be considered separately by the Panel to the first application;
- **2.1.15** an applicant party shall ensure a representative attends each meeting of the IGT UNC Modification Panel;
- **2.2** appeals to Panel have been removed as this will be an Authority decision and Ofgem have their own appeals system for all of their decisions;
- **2.2** stipulates the Derogation period – the start is determined by Ofgem and the length of the Derogation is stipulated by the proposer in the application, Ofgem can change the end date;
- **2.2.4 (c) (i)** is a name change from “gas transporter licence” to “Pipeline Operator’s Gas Transporters’ Licence”;
- **2.4.3** the Panel may request the Authority to rescind a Derogation - previously the Panel had the power to do that, further drafting is needed in the legal text to address the method that Panel would use to make the application to rescind;
- The term “Clauses” and “Paragraphs” may need to be reversed throughout the legal drafting.

The Workgroup agreed that the Legal text drafting and Ancillary Document facilitated the solution.

The Workgroup discussed and considered previous comments on consumer impacts under IGT154 and determined that the majority of the comments are relevant and applicable to IGT160. ([See the Workgroup Report on the IGT160 webpage](#)).

The Workgroup identified that there was an added mitigation to the IGT UNC representatives, who are also UNC representatives to ensure their views are taken into consideration throughout the UNC development processes. All Derogations requests will be subject to Authority direction and therefore IGT UNC parties would have some protection as the Authority would not be expected to approve something with significant detrimental implications or discriminatory outcomes.

The Workgroup agreed with the Proposer that IGT160 should proceed under Authority rules and that the Solution facilitates the intention of the Modification

The Workgroup unanimously agreed that IGT160 be taken to the March 2022 Panel and recommended that the Modification should be sent out for a 3 week consultation period in order to align it with the schedule of the equivalent UNC Modification.

Existing Modifications

7. IGT158 – Transition to the Central Switching Service and the Retail Energy Code v3.0

The Chair reminded the Workgroup that they had completed the Workgroup Report for IGT158 at the February 2022 Workgroup meeting and that it should be taken to the February 2022 Panel meeting.

The February 2022 Panel reviewed the Workgroup Report and unanimously agreed that IGT158 should be returned to this Workgroup to further consider impacts on IGT processes. The reasons for sending the Modification back to Workgroup was because it was focussed essentially on the transitional arrangements for Shippers and was silent to the transitional arrangements for the IGTs. It was therefore decided that the impact on the IGT processes had not been adequately considered.

The Panel were aware of the timing issues and agreed that, following further Workgroup consideration, IGT158 should follow an expedited timetable.

The provisional timetable agreed by the Panel is as follows:

- **10th March 2022** - Workgroup reconsider IGT158, including additional information with regards to impacts on IGT processes and reviewing required amendments to the Modification and legal drafting (if required);
- **W/C 14th March 2022**- Extraordinary Panel meeting to consider updated Workgroup Report;
- **March - April 2022** - IGT158 issued for consultation for a period of two weeks; and
- **W/C 4th April 2022** - Extraordinary Panel meeting to consider Final Modification Report.

DA pointed to a table that the Workgroup agreed would be added in the IGT158 Workgroup Report as [Appendix 1](#), in particular DA pointed to the penultimate column *Action Subsequent to Last Processing Date* where it stated:

- “Suppliers will need to hold and submit Registration Deactivation Requests post CSS ID”;
- “Suppliers will need to submit Registration Deactivation Requests in REC post CSS ID”;

- “Any RGMA transactions submitted after this date will still effect the Isolation, but the Effective Supply Point Withdrawal will not be enacted under the UNC, and this will need to be enacted by a Supplier using the Registration Deactivation Requests in REC post CSS ID”.

The Workgroup discussed potential impacts to IGTs of the transitional arrangements and were assured by Xoserve that these would be limited to a delay in Transporter initiated registrations and that all other processes will continue as normal, including responses to any messages received by Xoserve by the IGTs.

MP confirmed the limited delays will only effect confirmations, other areas such as Nominations, Meter Point Creations, Meter Installations etc. will continue as normal throughout the transitional period. The CSS process should not constrain Xoserve’s processes with IGTs in any other way.

The Workgroup agreed that the solutions in IGT158 did not need amending, as the Workgroup comments address the IGT processes question and Appendix 1 of the Workgroup Report also provides clarity and guidance. The Chair notified the Workgroup that although Appendix 1 of the IGT158 Workgroup Report states UNC references, those references are referred to in the IGT UNC and they are addressing the same processes.

The Workgroup agreed that IGT158 should be implemented immediately after the Modification’s appeal window closes and acknowledged that it may require an extraordinary release of the IGT UNC. The Workgroup completed the Workgroup Report and unanimously agreed that it should be taken to the Extraordinary March Panel meeting and recommended a shorter two week consultation period.

Post Meeting Note: This Modification has now been issued for a 2 week consultation following the decision at the Extraordinary Panel meeting on the 14th March 2022.

Review Groups

8. [RG005 – IGT UNC Review of Impacts resulting from the Faster Switching Programme arrangements](#)

The Chair notified the Workgroup that UNC Modification [UNC0804 - Consequential UNC changes for Switching SCR \(REC 3.0\)](#) has been raised, that it went to the UNC February 2022 Panel meeting and at that meeting Xoserve informed the Panel that the legal drafting had further amendments to be made and that resulted in the Modification Consultation being delayed. UNC 0804 has been issued for consultation and is due to close on 1st April 2022.

The IGT UNC legal drafting has a significant number of UNC cross references and therefore the IGT UNC legal drafting will need to be updated based on changes made to UNC 0804. The changes being made under UNC 0804 are regarding Non-CSS supply points. This does not necessarily affect the IGT UNC text, but it will affect the numbering within the IGT UNC drafting.

DA notified the Workgroup that the original drafting of the UNC text had been on the assumption that the only Non-CSS sites are NTS directly connected sites only, this later transpired not to be the case. Non-CSS sites are registered using the existing nominations and confirmation files (for Shared Supply Points the Shared Supply Point notification file is used). Those procedures amongst other changes needed to be referenced and as a result there have been changes in sections G, M and B of the UNC.

DA gave the Workgroup a brief summary of the issues that were identified with regards to the SCR drafting in March 2022 and pointed the Workgroup to look at the [UNC updated legal drafting for the faster switching SCR explanatory note March 2022](#) document. DA summarised the changes as follows:

- CSS and Non-CSS supply points and Switching (see above)
- Reinstate Sections in G6 for LDZ Supply Points
- Review instances that CSS and Non-CSS Transactions apply
- Amendments to the terminology
- Following implementation of Modification [UNC0728B](#) – LDZ Site ‘Shorthaul’ charge is correctly referenced
- Following the acceptance of CR-D118 and greater understanding of the SoLR process under REC – exiting elements of Section G 4.2 of the UNC has been reinstated.

DA confirmed that the input on Section G regarding Termination and SoLR has been reinstated from Section G 4.2 of the UNC.

DA and the Chair encouraged Workgroup members to take the opportunity to read the legal text of the UNC Modification and to anticipate that future housekeeping Modifications may need to be raised to deal with minor errors in the legal text as the IGT UNC points to the UNC.

DA informed the Workgroup that he did not know what the impact of the new registration process on the Relative Price Control (RPC) Entry AQ, but DA presumed that when Xoserve receive a notice to create a Meter Point there is an assessment of that AQ and the AQ would be loaded onto the UK Link. DA also stated that:

- CSS does not hold the AQ value and therefore cannot make changes to the AQ value;
- The AQ could get updated via the settlement transaction **Detail Registration Nomination (DRN)** and the **Base Registration Nomination (BRN)**, although it is unlikely at that stage; and
- There is a reference in the current UNC that states that the AQ value that is provided at Meter Point Creation will prevail for a certain period of time (possibly 9 months).

The Chair informed the Workgroup that Ofgem have published the timetable for the IGT UNC SCR Modification Proposal and that it is anticipated that the Modification will be put to the March 2022 Panel. If timing is limited it will be put before the Extraordinary Panel meeting scheduled for 1st April 2022.

The Chair notified the Workgroup that they will not get the opportunity to see the amended legal drafting prior to the Modification being raised, however a marked version of the drafting between the last published version and that raised in the SCR Modification will be published on the IGT UNC website, providing parties an opportunity to see it before the consultation period begins. The Chair encouraged Workgroup members to read the drafting as there have been significant reference changes.

The Chair notified the Workgroup that post the IGT UNC SCR Modification being implemented, the Review Group Report for RG005 will be brought to the Workgroup for it to be completed. It is not anticipated that it will be brought before the June 2022 Workgroup.

Standing Items

9. Cross-Code Modification Implications Tracker

The Chair notified the Workgroup that the review group [0778R - Gas Vacant Sites Process review](#) may result in a Modification in the upcoming weeks. MK confirmed that they attended the UNC March 2022 Workgroup meeting and that a Modification will be raised in the UNC and Centrica will be the Proposers.

The Chair notified the Workgroup that UNC Modification [0803 - Exceptional Circumstances Modification process](#) has been raised in the UNC by Gazprom and it is likely that a IGT UNC equivalent will need to be raised in the future.

The Chair notified the Workgroup that UNC Modification [0800 - Introducing the concept of a derogation framework into Uniform Network Code \(UNC\) \(Authority Direction\)](#) is the equivalent Modification for IGT160 (see item 6 above).

The Chair notified the Workgroup that UNC Modification [0734S - Reporting Valid Confirmed Theft of Gas into Central Systems and Reporting Suspected Theft to Suppliers](#) has been implemented 2022. Gazprom is the Proposer of this Modification and it is expected that an IGT UNC equivalent Modification will need to be raised. The Chair informed the Workgroup that they have been in contact with Gazprom about this matter and Gazprom are willing to sponsor the Modification but will not be drafting the proposal.

The Chair notified the Workgroup that UNC Modification [0799 - UNC arrangements for the H100 Fife project \(100% hydrogen\)](#) is a Hydrogen related Modification which does not have an impact on IGTs, but it has been brought to the Workgroup's attention as it is likely to set precedencies in the Hydrogen field and may be of interest to the parties.

10. IGT UNC Known Issues Register

Both terms Meter Asset Manager (MAM) and Meter Equipment Manager (MEM) are used within the IGT UNC, they make reference to the same role but are used interchangeably within the IGT UNC. The UNC uses the term MAM and REC uses MEM. KM raised this matter with the CA they noticed the inconsistency.

The Workgroup had a brief discussion regarding the interchanging terms and it was agreed that they should use one term as it would be confusing to use two terms for the same role. The Workgroup agreed that a housekeeping Modification would need to be raised to align the terms. The Chair notified the Workgroup that the UNC have not followed the term used by REC and have shown no preference to do so in the future. The Workgroup agreed to consider which term they should use either MEM or MAM and should give their feedback at the April 2022 Workgroup meeting.

The Chair updated the Workgroup that the LDZ Ancillary Agreement is the same document as the CSEP Ancillary Agreement identified in the UNC. The Chair recognised that they are rarely used and they are designed to give the DN's some control over the arrangements for large consumers (most likely Daily Metered(DM)). The governance of the agreement is directed under the UNC Section J.

The Chair proposed that the definition of the "LDZ Ancillary Agreement" in the IGT UNC should follow the definition of "CSEP Ancillary Agreement" in the UNC. This would need to be raised as a housekeeping Modification. The Workgroup agreed with this proposal.

ACTION: WS 22-03/6 Workgroup representatives for IGTs and Shippers are to consider which terms they should use either MEM or MAM and to give feedback at the April 2022 Workgroup meeting.

AOB

11. Definition for MAM or MEM

See item 10 above.

12. IGT RGMA Guidance Document V2.0

CH informed the Workgroup that they have updated the IGT RGMA guidance document, the updates were relatively minor and they were as follows:

- Version number and date incremented
- SPAA replaced with REC
- MAM replaced with MEM
- New IGTs added to sections 1.1 & 2.1
- Asset Provider data set added to file specs and example files
- Amendment to text in Section 3 references 4 & 5
- Correction of some minor typos, e.g. rogue spaces, commas etc.

There was further feedback from the Workgroup, with regards to the number of characters used in the mapping process. The Chair informed the Workgroup that there was no Shipper representative present in the meeting for this agenda item and the Workgroup agreed to reassess the IGT RGMA Guidance V2.0 and to give feedback at the April 2022 Workgroup meeting.

ACTION: WS 22-03/7 Workgroup representatives for IGTs and Shippers to reassess the IGT RGMA Guidance V2.0 and to give feedback at the April 2022 Workgroup meeting.



The next Workgroup meeting is scheduled for Thursday 14th April 2022.

Annex A – Action Log

Action reference	Action Description	Owner	Status
WS 21-12/04	CA to propose a legal definition to the Workgroup for LDZ “Ancillary Agreement” and for it to be provided to the Workgroup at its next meeting.	CA	Closed
WS 22-02/01	DA to check the impact on the RPC Entry AQ of the new registration process.	DA	Closed
WS 22-03/ 01	Workgroup representatives for IGTs and Shippers are to investigate if UNC Section M 5.10.6 is utilised by their organisation and to report on the frequency and details of that process. If the process is not used to provide reasons for that.	IGTs and Shippers	New
WS 22-03/02	Workgroup representatives for IGTs and Shippers are to consider the definition of UNC Section M 5.10.6 and to consider any potential aspects that could be added for clarity or could make the Must Read process more efficient.	IGTs and Shippers	New
WS 22-03/3	ER and JL to confirm if the timeframe for the validation of Meter Reading applies to all parties in the same way with regards to submission deadlines.	ER and JL	New
WS 22-03/4	Workgroup representatives for IGTs and Shippers to familiarise themselves with Xoserve’s Must Read training webpage.	IGTs and Shippers	New
WS 22-03/5	OC to investigate why a Read is not valid after 25 days.	OC	New
WS 22-03/6	Workgroup representatives for IGTs and Shippers are to consider which terms they should use either MEM or MAM and to give feedback at the April 2022 Workgroup meeting.	IGTs and Shippers	New
WS 22-03/7	Workgroup representatives for IGTs and Shippers to reassess the IGT RGMA Guidance V2.0 and to give feedback at the April 2022 Workgroup meeting.	IGTs and Shippers	New