

IGT UNC Extraordinary Modification Panel Meeting

Final Minutes

Tuesday 30th April 2024

Via teleconference

Attendee	Initials	Organisation	Representing	Notes
Anne Jackson	AJ	Gemserv	Code Administrator	Chair
Cher Harris	CH	Indigo Pipelines	Pipeline Operators	
Eilidh McNally	EM	Last Mile Gas	Pipeline Operators	
Gareth Powell	GP	E.ON UK	Observer	Proposer for IGT173
Grace Royall	GR	Ofgem	Observer	
Helen Bevan	HB	Gemserv	Code Administrator	
Jenny Rawlinson	JR	BUUK	Pipeline Operators	
Kirsty Dudley	KD	E.ON UK	Pipeline Users	Proposer for IGT173
Lee Greenwood	LG	Centrica	Pipeline Users	
Matthew Brown	MB	Ofgem	Authority	
Nick King	NK	Barrow Shipping	Observer	Proposer for IGT172
Harry Firth	HF	Gemserv	Code Administrator	Secretariat

1. Welcomes and Apologies

The Chair welcomed the Panel to the extraordinary meeting. There were apologies from Andrew Eisenberg (E.ON UK). It was noted that Kirsty Dudley would be acting as Andrew Eisenberg's alternate.

2. Confirmation of Agenda

The Chair confirmed the items for discussion as outlined in the final agenda. The Panel were invited to add any items for AOB, but there were no further items added.

Modification Business

3. IGT172 – Provision for gas entry within the IGT UNC

The Code Administrator took the Panel through the Consultation responses of the Final Modification Report.

CH noted that a number of parties who responded to the Consultation were neither licensed IGTs or Shippers, and asked if Panel are still allowed to consider these responses if they are not party to the agreement. The Chair responded that any interested party is allowed to respond to the Consultation, and there may be a number of different stakeholders with direct and indirect impacts from this modification. NK added that several of the responding parties were anaerobic digestion developers who wish to connect to the network.

Governance

JR and KD agreed to support an Authority decision as it would match up with the governance for IGT172's matching modification [UNC 0842 - Gas Entry onto the Total system via an Independent Gas Transporter](#). CH added that the proposed new additions to the IGT UNC Code warranted Ofgem scrutiny.

Implementation

JR suggested that the implementation of IGT172 should be aligned with UNC 0842. CH and KD agreed. CH suggested that a big lead time would not be necessary as there would not be any immediate actions needed to be taken by IGTs, only if they choose to enter an agreement with an anaerobic digestion plant.

Solution

JR noted the amount of time and scrutiny provided to the Modification Legal Text, including the arrangement of an additional extraordinary meeting on 5th March.

Recommendations

The Panel unanimously agreed that:

- The Modification should proceed under Authority decision.
- The Impacts were identified and considered.
- The Modification does not impact a Significant Code Review (SCR).
- The Relevant Objectives (A) and (B) identified by the IGT UNC Workstream were positively impacted.
- The Legal Text delivers the intent of the Solution.
- The Modification should be implemented at the same time as the marrying modification UNC 0842.
- The Modification should be recommended for implementation.

The Proposer thanked the Panel and Code Administrator for their help and support in developing this Modification.

4. [IGT173 – Gateway Delivery for RPC data](#)

The Code Administrator took the Panel through the Consultation responses of the Final Modification Report.

Governance

JR noted the discussions on Governance at the April Panel Meeting and supported a self-governance decision for the modification. This was unanimously agreed by Panel.

Implementation

JR noted that some Consultation responses had supported a six-month lead time for this modification which would take the implementation of the modification through to January 2025. KD responded that only one responder had supported a six-month lead time and if Panel decided to support this, as the Modification Proposer they would support a February 2025 release in keeping with the standard IGT UNC calendar. They added that they still supported a November 2024 release but were aware of the importance of every party being ready for implementation. CH asked when the XRN is scheduled for release. KD responded that Xoserve have said in discussions that they would be preparing for either a November or February release, and they have not received any feedback to suggest a November release is not possible.

At this point, EM left the session.

KD asked LG for any comments on implementation, noting that they had supported a six-month lead time in their Consultation response. LG responded that they have begun internal conversations regarding implementation and testing and suggested that a November release may be possible. LG queried about whether the modification going to the Data Services Committee (DSC) would affect a potential November release, assuming Panel chose to approve the modification. KD responded that if Panel approved a November release, the DSC would have to prioritise the modification.

JR suggested that the modification could be implemented in the first standard Code release after the XRN is ready. The Chair suggested that should the agreed testing period highlight any issues with the IX, this implementation strategy could also allow for any implementation delays to address said issues. This was unanimously agreed by the remaining Panel members.

Recommendations

The Panel (apart from EM) unanimously agreed that:

- The Modification should be subject to Self-Governance.
- The Impacts were identified.

- The Modification does not impact a Significant Code Review (SCR).
- The Relevant Objective (F) identified by the IGT UNC Workstream was appropriate.
- The Legal Text delivers the intent of the Solution.
- The Modification should be implemented in the first standard Code release following the readiness of the XRN and successful testing period.
- The Modification should be recommended for implementation.

The Proposer thanked the Panel and Code Administrator for their help and support in developing this Modification.

JR stated that it is important to recognise that decisions on costs and allocations will be made by the DSC and the funding is not decided at the time of implementation.

KD suggested that the modification process may need to be reviewed in the future, in particular with how the ROM and XRN processes link in with development of modifications. They added that if it is possible to have more transparency with costings and the split of these costings in the future, it should be provided to Panel when assessing modifications going forwards. JR agreed and suggested it could be an issue discussed further regarding DSC contracts. They added that the DSC's decisions on funding and allocation coming after the Panel's implementation decision does not seem right in some circumstances. This was unanimously agreed by the remaining Panel members.

AOB

No items of AOB were raised in the meeting and the Chair closed the meeting.

The next IGT UNC Panel meeting is scheduled for Friday 24th May 2024