



IGT UNC 23-02 Modification Workstream Meeting

Draft Minutes

Thursday, 9th February 2023 via Teleconference

Attendee	Initial	Organisation	Notes
Anne Jackson	AJ	Gemserv	Chair
Cher Harris	CH	Indigo Pipelines	Pipeline
Claire Louise Roberts	CR	Scottish Power	Pipeline User
Ellie Rogers	ER	Xoserve	CDSP
Isaac Moore	IM	Gemserv	Code Administrator
Jenny Rawlinson	JRRJ	BUUK	Pipeline
Michelle Brown	MB	Energy Assets	Attended for items 8 - 11
Talia Lattimore	TL	Gemserv	Code Administrator

1. Welcome and Apologies for Absence

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and accepted apologies received from Clare Manning (E.ON).

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. Jenny Rawlinson (JR) added item 12 – BUUK Workgroup Representation Change.

3. Approval of the Previous Minutes 22-08

Talia Lattimore (TL) informed the Workgroup that no comments were received for the draft 23-01 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

TL informed the Workgroup that there were no outstanding actions.

Review Group

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

The Chair provided the Workgroup with an update on the RG005 Workgroup Report. They advised that the Code Administrator is currently working on the report so that the Workgroup can review it and the Review Group can be closed by the Panel. The Chair reminded the Workgroup that the Panel

agreed to keep the Review Group open until the completion of the the Central Switching Service (CSS) go-live bedding in period had passed and the Faster Switching Programme had been formally closed. Now that both have been completed the Code Administrator is finalising the Workgroup Report, revisiting the progress and development under the Review from 2019.

The Chair noted that the final Workgroup Report had been drafted and a quality review of the document would be completed in the coming days and the document published shortly after that.

The Chair advised that the Review Group has a specific Terms of Reference (ToR) which requires a minimum of two IGT and two Shipper representatives in order for Review Group meetings to be quorate. Therefore, the RG005 Report cannot be discussed if the meeting is not quorate by the standards of this ToR. The Chair proposed that the Code Administrator publish the finalised report once the review has been completed which will provide nearly a month for the Workgroup to review the document ahead of its March 2023 meeting. The Chair reminded the Workgroup that while work was done on legal drafting as part of the Review Group, there is a lot of work documented under the SCR Modifications, and therefore relevant documentation has been referenced within the report.

TL suggested that the Code Administrator highlight the quoracy rules in any industry communications related to the March meeting to ensure adequate representation.

Claire Louise Roberts (CR) asked whether the recently raised UNC CSS Modification ([UNC0836 - Resolution of Missing Messages following Central Switching Service implementation and integration with REC Change R0067](#)) would have any bearing on this Review Group. The Chair advised that the issues identified under UNC0836 related to an error with CSS Gate Closure messages. They added that it became apparent to Xoserve following the CSS go live that Gate Closure Notifications were not arriving and therefore some Parties were not being informed of a switch taking place. Xoserve raised this issue with the DCC, with the issue being graded as low (3). Then in December 2022 the DCC indicated that a fix was being implemented during that month which should remedy the issue. The fix has been released however it transpires that now there are Notifications going missing in a more random way and not necessarily at Gate Closure and the point of switching. This means that the DCC are currently unsure as to the pattern of the missing notifications and are unable to determine what might go missing in future. The Modification under the UNC is solely regarding the Late Gate Closure notifications and seeks to give Xoserve the authority to put the situation right and update the data base to where it needs to be.

Ellie Rogers (ER) confirmed that UNC0836 formalises the temporary Central Data Services Provider (CDSP) authority to act on a notification that is different to what it is expected. This means that where there are instances of issues with a message the CDSP can act on this. They added that the UNCC allowed the CDSP to act on unofficial notices given by the DCC with regards to Late Gate Closure notifications and this Modification allows for enduring permissions.

The Chair asked if the CDSP needs permissions to remedy missing notifications for IGT sites. ER advised that they have not heard whether an IGT equivalent is needed or not. There will be

consideration of Cross Code impacts at the UNC Panel and whether the IGT UNC points to this area of the UNC. They expect changes to be made to Section G of the UNC. The Chair confirmed that there are a number of references to Section G within the IGT UNC.

CR asked if the Workgroup feel this Modification would have an impact on the closure of the Review Group. JR asked if this work would fall within the scope of the Review Group as it currently stands. The Chair advised that the Review Group had different work strands added to the to do list over time but work on all the strands has been completed now and in effect the Review Group has completed its work. They added that the Panel kept the Review Group open in case anything came up that fell within the remit of the SCR. The Chair asked the Workgroup if they feel the Review Group can serve any purpose with regards to this issue. TL added that the Workgroup may also want to consider if the Review Group adds any greater value beyond the monthly Workgroup meetings.

JR suggested that the ToR be circulated which will help guide the Workgroup on the closure of the Review. They added that they are leaning more towards closing the Group unless the ToR requires it to remain open. They noted further that the Workgroup could continue to shoehorn a lot of things into this Review if it tried, so suggested that the group look at the usual route to investigate the issue and IGT impact.

Action 23/02- 01: CA to circulate the Terms of Reference for the RG005 Review Group alongside the RG005 Report.

There were no further comments received on RG005.

6. Cross Code Modification Implications Tracker

TL provided the Workgroup with the following updates:

Watch List

- **UNC0837 – Updating all UNC references of “National Grid” to “National Gas Transmission” to reflect the sale of National Grid Gas plc:** TL advised the Workgroup that this Modification had been added to the Cross Code Tracker as similar changes will need to be made to the IGT UNC to recognise the sale of National Grid Gas plc.
- **UNC0816 – Update to AQ Correction Processes:** TL advised the Workgroup that the Workgroup Report is due to be considered by UNC Panel in February 2023.
- **UNC0813 – Revision of Virtual Last Resort User and Contingent Procurement of Supplier Demand Event Triggers:** TL advised the Workgroup that the Workgroup Report is due to be considered by UNC Panel in February 2023.
- **UNC0811S – Shipper Agreed Read (SAR) exceptions process:** TL advised the Workgroup that the FMR was presented to Panel on 19th January 2023 and the Panel determined that this Modification should be implemented on a date to be confirmed.

- **UNC0808 – Reverse Compression:** TL advised that an extension for this Modification was agreed from January 2023 to April 2023. The Workgroup Report will be presented to UNC Panel in April 2023.

IGT UNC Equivalent Modifications

No updates provided regarding equivalent Modifications.

Review Groups

- **UNC0835R – Review of Gas Demand Side Response Arrangements:** TL informed the Workgroup that this Review Group would be added to the Cross Code Tracker from next month. JR advised that there are short timescales expected for this Review Group and advised that Phil Hobbins (PH) agreed to come to ~~regular Demand Side Response (DSR) related Workgroup appropriate Workgroup / Panel~~ meetings to keep parties in the loop so if they are raising any further Modifications to the UNC they can be included in the IGT UNC.
- **UNC0828R – Introduction of an Independent Shrinkage Expert:** ER advised that the Workgroup are moving quite quickly for this Review and the Proposer has created a lot of documentation to support the Modification that they want to raise. They added that there are questions being raised regarding the impacts of the Modification on IGTs. ER advised that the Workgroup might benefit from an IGT representative and that it might be useful for one to reach out to the Proposer.

The Chair confirmed that shrinkage is currently set to zero within the IGT UNC. While the Code acknowledges that its set to zero there is no process for shrinkage in the IGT UNC. Therefore, if the number is changed from zero in the future there is nothing in Code that sets out what this means for Shippers and IGTs. ER advised that the Workgroup have discussed potential alignment with Unidentified Gas (UIG), specifically how it is allocated by the Allocation of Unidentified Gas Expert (AUGE). There was also discussion on the fact that the AUGE does not determine what UIG is, UIG is UIG but they can say how UIG is allocated. It is currently unclear how they will foresee it working in a Modification. If the figure is altered for IGTs there will need to be thought to the implications of that.

ER advised that some questions have been posed to Ofgem to determine their desire for this Modification. The DNs have highlighted licence implications and asked Ofgem for a view on these. The response provided by Ofgem was quite vague in that they asked for all the information to be provided to Ofgem at the same time so it can make a decision from there.

Action 23/02-02: CA to approach the proposer to determine considerations up to this point for IGTs and the IGT UNC with regards to UNC0828R – Introduction of an Independent Shrinkage Expert.

7. IGT UNC Known Issues Register

TL provided the Workgroup with an overview of an update to one existing issue as follows:

- **11 - Difficulty finding IGT UNC Parties to raise required IGT UNC Modifications:** TL advised the Workgroup that while the issue remains on the log, BUUK have come forward to be the proposer for the required DSR Modification. That said, TL suggested that there is work that could be done to mitigate further issues with finding proposers.

Cher Harris (CH) highlighted that IGT parties are not included in discussions with the UNC and unfortunately IGT parties don't know enough about certain Modifications / issues to be comfortable raising / sponsoring them. The Shrinkage Modification being an example, IGT parties were not considered / engaged up front and were therefore a bit behind. JR agreed with this view and noted that their preference is for the person raising a Modification under the UNC should be the one raising a Modification in the IGT UNC.

The Code Administrator noted that National Grid raised the UNC DSR Modifications and that whilst they are not a party in the IGT UNC and are therefore unable to raise a Modification, they were reluctant to support with the drafting of a Modification. The Chair and JR echoed this view and added that they did recognise in the end that there was a lack of understanding with regards to the impact on IGT sites and that more could have been done at the time to bring the IGT UNC in.

JR suggested that we invite UNC Modification Proposer to the IGT UNC Panel so that a discussion can be had with them and the Panel can come to a conclusion from there on whether a Modification is or is not required. Though they felt that the IGT UNC needs to be proactive in doing this, so that UNC Parties raising changes become used to this being part of the process.

The Chair asked TL what happens at the UNC Panel meetings when assessing impacts on IGTs. TL advised that the Panel consider IGT impacts at multiple points (*considering a new Modification, Considering the Workgroup Report and considering the Final Modification Report*). When a new Modification is raised, we are often asked for an initial view of impacts and we advised yes, no or maybe. This is then recorded, and the UNC Workgroup are then required to confirm if there are impacts. When the Workgroup Report is presented to Panel we are asked to confirm if we agree there are / are not impacts on IGTs and if there are what kind of impacts (e.g. simply cross reference changes, changes to IGT UNC governance) and that's as far as it goes.

JR felt that putting it on the IGT UNC Code Administration was a lot, as the Code Administrator may have incomplete information, but was being asked to identify if an IGT UNC Modification is required. They would like to see a process put in place so there is more accountability from IGT UNC Parties to input into the review. JR suggested that UNC Modification Proposers be invited to IGT UNC meetings to set out what may or may not be required under the IGT UNC and believes that this should be something that they are doing anyway. JR asked whether this would be too onerous to do or would not be supported. The Chair advised that it ultimately comes down to whether UNC Modification Proposers will attend a Workgroup meeting to explain the Modification and any implications and whether Workgroup members will contribute to the discussion. JR suggested that we give UNC

Modification Proposers a choice to attend or not, which also gives them a chance to talk directly to IGT UNC parties and give credibility to any UNC decisions on impacts. This also provides a chance for the IGT UNC Workgroup to hear from the Proposer directly about the Modification and which allows potential impacts to be worked through. JR suggested IGT UNC should be pushing a bit more and raising the focus.

ER agreed with TL's description of the assessment process under the UNC with regards to IGT UNC impacts on Modifications and echoed that the Workgroup look into the impacts on IGTs. CH noted that because the Panel process is more of a tick box exercise, its contributing to why the cross-code impact assessments are falling down.

The Chair asked ER, with regards to system changes, if a UNC Modification was raised and needed an IGT Modification, would Xoserve need to exclude IGT sites and if it did need to exclude them would this result in additional cost? ER advised that, from a solution development side, Xoserve currently develop solutions for all sites unless IGTs sites (or other sites) are excluded. ER used the UNC theft Modification ([UNC0734 – Reporting Valid Confirmed Theft of Gas into Central Systems and Reporting Suspected Theft to Suppliers](#)) as an example, noting that there is a UNC Modification that requires system changes and IGT sites are not excluded. However, there is not yet an IGT UNC Modification.

JR responded noting that UNC0734 is a really good example and noted that the Central Data Services Provider (CDSP) should not be taking on activities on behalf of IGT sites and wondered if the CDSP should be more active to highlight under UNC Modifications that there is no IGT UNC Modification and therefore no governance in the Code to include IGT sites. ER advised that they can highlight this but as the Service Provider they look to deliver a solution as it is required and that in terms of forcing the issue on the governance side, they feel this is more of a Code Administrator Code of Practice (CACoP) issue. Xoserve are not party to either the UNC or IGT UNC and simply have to deliver the required solution. Though they do what they can to flag where IGT sites might be impacted.

JR advised that the CDSP may not be able to include IGTs where the governance is not in place in Code. They added that the industry needs to get to a point where IGTs, and changes to the IGT UNC, are considered. They noted that if the CDSP assess a change and advise that there is an impact on Shippers for not including IGT sites (as these sites cannot be included without governance), Shippers will have to give some thought to this impact. JR advised that this is one additional thing that can be done to help address the current issue.

ER confirmed that they can try to flag the IGT side of it and agree it cannot be just one approach. They noted that the CACoP needs to ensure that there is a uniform approach. From a system's side, if Xoserve advised parties that they cannot deliver in a certain way, it could cost industry more money

to change the scope, noting further that there needs to be a balance and space to raise changes and engage. JR responded that that they agree that there needs to be balance but if IGTs cannot be in scope without governance in place, it does not have to be CDSPs decision to include them, and the CDSP can reflect the costs with or without IGTs included and let industry pick it up from there. They added that that we have been tinkering around the edges of making cross code working successful and perhaps a workshop to look at how it should work would be useful. In the new world there will be Code Managers and these impacts will be picked up at a higher level but at the moment it does not seem to work smoothly. ER agreed the alignment is not fully there and not consistent.

JR asked how best to take this forward, noting that we could re-visit this issue every month or we could look at a specific session to improve things, recognising that the Code Administrator has tried hard to recognise and highlight IGT impacts. The Chair noted that where there are Modifications being developed and Impacts are highlighted, and there can be a lack of desire to raise equivalent Modifications. Where a change goes to the CDSP as a result of a UNC Modification, the UNC should only be seeing the solution as a change for Gas Distribution Network (GDN) sites. Recognising and considering if the same change is required for IGT sites can then be considered.

JR noted that the issue of IGT impacts and lack of proposers for Modifications has only really been an issue since the reduction in Shipper representation. They added that the CDSP should not be making changes for IGT supply points where there is no governance. ER advised that it does not feel right that the 'system side' is driving the governance side noting that the CDSP could say that their assumption is that IGTs are not included. They added that it does not go entirely against governance by including IGT sites, its more about trying to ensure cost and delivery remains reasonable. JR responded that the cost issue should not be the CDSPs concern. If a customer is asking for a change, as a Service Provider, they should not be producing the same change for a different customer.

The Chair referenced [IGT159 – Amendments to the Must Read Process](#), noting that this is an IGT only solution and asked if this has been rolled out for all sites or not. ER confirmed that as the intention was for it to be an IGT site only modification they were explicit in it only being a change for IGTs sites, noting that the Must Read process is already different.

AOB

8. Gemserv Acquisition

The Chair advised the Workgroup that Gemserv Limited has been acquired and are now wholly owned by Talan Group, a French organisation. They advised that previously Gemserv has been owned by Energy industry participants. Whilst the ownership of the company has changed the company will continue to exist and will continue to deliver its current contracts and responsibilities. They advised that the only organisational change is that the current Non-Executive Directors will be replaced by members of Talan Group.

Talan group owns a number of companies and it is interested in innovation and the introduction of digital solutions as a way of providing efficiencies.

The Workgroup had no comments with regards to this item.

9. February 2023 Release Date

TL confirmed that the February 2023 Release includes [IGT145 – Transfer of Sites with Low Valid Meter Reading Submission Performance from Classes 2 and 3 into Class 4](#) and updates to the CESP NeXA Tables.

They added that the Panel considered a change to the Release Date for this Scheduled Release because the Release Date for Xoserve, which was confirmed by Xoserve at the end of 2022, changed from Friday 24th February to Saturday 25th February. TL added that at the time these dates were provided it was made clear by Xoserve that these were provisional. However, the change to the date only became apparent when the UNC confirmed the release date of [UNC664 – Transfer of Sites with Low Valid Meter Reading Submission Performance from Classes 2 and 3 into Class 4](#) to the IGT UNC Code Administrator.

TL noted that the Panel agreed that the current IGT UNC Release Date should remain the 24th February 2023 as that was the date the industry expected the updated CESP NeXA tables to go live. They considered that a 24 hour misalignment between the IGT UNC and the UNC had a small risk associated with it.

CR noted that UNC0664 will go live on 25th February but there is a 3 month grace period. The Chair asked whether the switch to a Saturday Release Date was a new policy decision. ER advised that prior to the REC it was always the preference to have a major release done over a weekend. With the REC and industry decision to align releases they looked to align on a Friday with the caveat that if there are no REC changes, or if the DSC committee agree otherwise, they will revert back to a weekend. This happened for February 2023 and is expected to happen for June 2023.

CR confirmed that the date of the June 2023 release has been set. TL advised that the Code Administrator will ask the Panel to consider a date change for this release at the March Panel meeting. Noting that IGT UNC Governance requires a Panel decision to change release dates.

10. 2024 IGT UNC Meeting Dates

TL advised the Workgroup that the Panel have approved the 2024 IGT UNC Meeting dates, reminding members that the Code requires that next year's dates be agreed in January each year.

They noted that all the dates follow the typical pattern apart from the March and December Panel meeting dates. The March date is a bank holiday, so the Panel agreed to bring the meeting forward a week. The December date falls in the period between Christmas and New Year and therefore agreed for it to be brought forward. TL advised that bringing these meetings forward will reduce the time

between Workgroup and Panel meetings for March and December 2024. However, this will be kept in mind and any impacts monitored.

11. Potential Changes to Cross Code Tracker

JR advised that they were recently looking into the history of a UNC Modification and as part of this work they were looking to find historic discussions from Workgroup via the Cross Code Tracker. They noted that the Tracker simply recorded information shared with the Workgroup as part of a single meeting and that there was no historic record that was updated and published for the next meeting. JR asked the Workgroup to consider updates to the Cross Code tracker to ensure there is a live record of UNC Modifications that have been discussed.

The Workgroup supported such a change and the Code Administrator agreed to look into how best to amend the Cross Code Tracker and that an example would be brought to the March 2023 Workgroup meeting.

Action 23/02-03: CA to review the current Cross Code Tracker and develop an example as to how to capture historic information regarding assessing UNC Modifications.

12. BUUK Representation Change

JR advised that Kundai Matiringe, who previously covered IGT UNC Workgroups has now moved on within BUUK. JR confirmed that Charlotte Gilbert will be joining them for the next few Workgroup meetings and then taking over the BUUK representation.

The next Workgroup meeting is scheduled for Thursday 9th March 2023.

Annex 1 – Actions Table

Reference	Action	Owner	Status
23/02 – 01	CA to circulate the Terms of Reference for the RG005 Review Group alongside the RG005 Report.	Code Administrator	Open
23/02 – 02	CA to approach the proposer to determine considerations up to this point for IGTs and the IGT UNC with regards to UNC0828R – Introduction of an Independent Shrinkage Expert.	Code Administrator	Open
23/02 – 03	CA to review the current Cross Code Tracker and develop an example as to how to capture historic information regarding assessing UNC Modifications.	Code Administrator	Open

DRAFT