

IGT UNC 25-02 Modification Workstream Meeting

Final Minutes

Thursday 13th February 2025 via Teleconference

Attendee	Initial	Organisation	Notes
Anne Jackson	AJ	Gemserv	Chair
Charlotte Gilbert	CG	BUUK	
Cher Harris	CH	Indigo Pipelines	
David Morley	DM	Ovo	
Eilidh McNally	EIM	Last Mile Gas	
Ellie Osobina	EO	Ofgem	
Erin McFeeley	ERM	Last Mile Gas	
Gareth Powell	GP	E.ON UK	For Item 5 below only
Josie Lewis	JL	Xoserve	
Kathryn Adeseye	KA	Xoserve	
Kirsty Dudley	KD	E.ON UK	
Nick King	NK	CNG Services	
Oorlagh Chapman	OC	Centrica	
Philip Lucas	PL	National Gas Transmission	For item 13 below only
Talia Lattimore	TL	Gemserv	Code Administrator
Harry Firth	HF	Gemserv	Secretariat

1. Welcome and Apologies for Absence

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and accepted apologies received from Lee Greenwood (Centrica).

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. The Chair added Item 13 – UNC 0887 - Facilitating Bi-Directional Connections Between IGT Pipelines and the NTS and EO added Item 14 – Authority Update.

3. Approval of the Previous Minutes 24-12 and 25-01

HF informed the Workgroup that one comment was received for the draft 24-12 Modification Workstream meeting minutes prior to the meeting, which was to include a comment made by Xoserve regarding UNC 0854 - Revision of Virtual Last Resort User and Contingent Procurement of Supplier Demand Event Triggers. HF added that no comments were received for the draft 25-01 Modification Workstream meeting minutes. The Workgroup had no further comments to add to the two sets of minutes at the meeting and they were approved as true and accurate records of the meetings.

4. Outstanding Actions

TL informed the Workgroup that there was 1 outstanding action as follows:

- **24/12 – 01: Centrica and Xoserve to review the impacts of UNC 0884 on the IGT UNC PC4 Read Submission Window Processes and the Must Read Process.** KA informed the Workgroup that the action would be covered off under Item 7. Action closed.

MODIFICATIONS

5. IGT173 – Gateway Delivery for RPC Data

KD presented a post-implementation update of IGT173 to the Workgroup. KD noted a few key observations from EON UKs experience since IGT173 was implemented in November 2024. KD advised that the majority of IGTs are transferring Relative Price Control (RPC) data files via the IX, although they have identified a few IGTs who are still sending the files via email. KD added that two IGTs had issued the RPC files via email in December and January, and it is down to one IGT in February. KD listed some of the clauses within the IGT173 legal drafting which these IGTs have been in breach of, meaning there were some non-compliance issues under both the IGT UNC and the UK Link Manual.

CH advised, from an IGT's perspective, that a number of Shippers have not implemented the IX solution and have been putting pressure on IGTs to revert back to email. CH added that there were issues with a few smaller Shippers just after implementation and there is one large Shipper who has still not implemented the IX solution and has no immediate plans to do so. CH added that, as a result, this Shipper has not paid any invoices for the last few months. KD thanked CH for the additional information, noting that they only have sight of what they can see as a Shipper. They added that they believed Shippers were not able to request an alternative mechanism of delivery for the RPC files as per the IGT173 legal text.

KD added that while they had no immediate plans to make any changes to the IGT173 legal text, it may be worth monitoring the non-compliant IGTs and Shippers in the coming months to see whether amendments need to be made to the contingency clauses. CG agreed, adding that if these non-compliant parties have found workarounds, then there may need to be explicit inclusions to the legal text. They added that these issues may be just part of the ironing out process for the new Modification which could resolve themselves over time. KD agreed and suggested that the IGT UNC Panel could reach out to those non-compliant parties to work with them and establish a clear onboarding process. CH added that they believed the Modification is clear in what is expected of all parties and should not require any changes.

KD noted that some RPC files are failing loading validation on the IX. They added that although most of the files received were loading successfully, two issues have been identified with the February 2025 data loads:

- Duplicate data issued for the same billing period; and

- Length of MSN longer than the permitted value.

KD made the following recommendations to the Workgroup:

- E.ON UK to continue to monitor delivery and to provide the agreed 6-month post-implementation update of IGT173 at the May 2025 Workgroup meeting;
- The IGT UNC Panel to write to the IGT(s) and Shipper(s) and understand when they will deliver an IGT173 compliant solution; and
- For Shippers to continue to monitor the data issues within the files and to raise with the IGTs directly.

The Workgroup agreed with all of the recommendations.

KD added that they would be happy to present an updated version of the post-implementation paper at the February Panel meeting, including the addition of reports of non-compliant Shippers. The Workgroup agreed with this approach. CH thanked KD. KD also requested for this issue to be added to the Known Issues Register.

The Chair added that the paper presents E.ON's view of the Modification post-implementation and suggested that the Panel might want a more rounded perspective of the compliance issues regarding IGT173. They suggested that the Code Administrator (CA) write out to their distribution list indicating that there have been suggestions that IGT173 has not been fully implemented and encourage Parties to indicate any difficulties they are having with implementing the Modification solution, for this information to be presented at the February Panel meeting. The Workgroup agreed with this approach.

25/02 – 01: Code Administrator to write to Parties for information on any difficulties faced when implementing IGT173

POST-MEETING NOTE: *The Code Administrator issued an email on 14th February asking Parties to provide information on any difficulties with implementing IGT173, with a view to presenting this information to Panel at the February meeting.*

TL advised that not all Shippers are on the IGT UNC distribution list and advised that if any IGTs were concerned that non-compliant Shippers may not be receiving our emails, they could inform the CA confidentially of the Shipper organisation. The CA could then determine if they are on the distribution list or not which may indicate a communications gap. The CA could then look to obtain a contact email address and forward on any communications. The Chair suggested that if some Shippers have not received the communications for IGT173, this may be the reason for non-compliance. CH responded that the non-compliant large Shipper is aware of the issue as Indigo Pipelines have escalated the issue through the IGT Constituency Group and have asked Xoserve to speak to their Shipper representative.

6. [IGT165 – Independent Shrinkage Expert and Independent Shrinkage Charge](#)

TL provided an overview of the Modification to the Workgroup. TL reminded the Workgroup that IGT165 is seeking to introduce the concept of Shrinkage Model Error into the IGT UNC, and to include provisions to support [UNC Modification 0843 - Establishing the Independent Shrinkage Charge \(ISC\) and the Independent Shrinkage Expert \(ISE\)](#).

TL advised that there are two business rules under the IGT165 solution, the first being to ensure the ISE has jurisdiction within the IGT UNC and the second around the provision of IGT Supply Point level data. TL took the Workgroup through the approach to the legal drafting, advising that there were two main elements around Shrinkage Model Error.

The first element was a catch-all clause that ensures that no provisions in the IGT UNC could get in the way of any IGT UNC party complying with the provisions in the UNC with regards to Shrinkage Model Error (this includes the ISE and the ISC related provisions). The CA felt that this was all that was needed to ensure that the ISE had the required jurisdiction. This is because IGTs are parties to the UNC and regardless of this Modification will be required to comply with the provisions on them as parties to that Code. The IGT UNC cannot stipulate what happens in the UNC but it can make sure its provisions do not keep an IGT UNC party from complying with their UNC obligations.

The second element was a specific carve out to ensure that that IGT Supply Point level data was provided as per the UNC provisions. The CA believe this is appropriate as IGT Supply Point level data is under the remit of the IGT UNC and not the UNC. They added that the text used for this section was largely the same as the provision of data text in the UNC Modification, with some terms and references updated to ensure it fits within the IGT UNC.

TL added that as part of the legal drafting, a new section FI had been created to pull existing Shrinkage provisions into the same section as Shrinkage Model Error provisions. The CA felt that this would ensure all Shrinkage related provisions were in one place in the Code. They added that nothing had changes apart from some cross references within the existing sections as the numbering will have changed. They added that there were no other references in Code to these paragraphs so there were no knock-on impacts. TL also advised that some new terms had been defined to align with the terms in the drafting.

CG asked if paragraph 4.1(c) of the IGT UNC drafting includes obligations that are either not relevant to the ISE, or to IGTs and Shippers on IGT networks, as it refers to TPD Section N 5 in the whole. TL showed TPD Section N Paragraph 5 to the Workgroup and confirmed that the entire paragraph is referenced and therefore it includes all relevant provisions. They added that there are some obligations within the paragraph that are not relevant to IGTs (e.g. the DN Charges and DN definitions). However, like other areas of the IGT UNC, the CA felt it was more efficient to reference the entire section as matters relating to just DNs will not be applicable to IGTs regardless of them being referenced or not. Furthermore, it allows for some future proofing should amendments be

required to this section as amendments to the IGT UNC would not be required every time you amend the paragraph.

DM thanked TL for their work on the IGT165 legal drafting. They noted the 3 new definitions within Paragraph 4.1 but suggested that “Shrinkage Model Error” and “Independent Shrinkage Document” should also be defined as they are directly referenced in Paragraph 5.1 and 5.2. TL responded that they would add those definitions into the legal drafting. DM added that “Shrinkage Model Error” is also not defined in the UNC 0843 legal text. They suggested that the clause including “Shrinkage Model Error” could be removed as the purpose is already captured by the rest of Paragraph 4.1.

CG asked if the three new definitions under Paragraph 4.1 could explicitly refer back to TPD Section N of the UNC. TL agreed to include this. CG asked if a definition of “Independent Shrinkage Charge” needs to be included within the IGT165 legal drafting. TL responded that the charging falls under UNC governance and the paragraph on compliance with TPD Section N Paragraph 5 should encompass this.

KA informed the Workgroup that a refreshed version of the Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) for UNC0843 will be available shortly. TL asked if the ROM will be available before the next UNC 0843 Workgroup meeting on 26th February. KA confirmed this. The Chair asked for an update on the progression of UNC0843. TL responded that there are two further Workgroups planned, and DM added that the second meeting is scheduled for 26th March, with the aim of finishing the Workgroup Report at that Workgroup before it proceeds back to Panel and out for consultation. The Chair noted that Ofgem would probably like to have UNC 0843 and IGT165 aligned closely in terms of development completion dates ahead of the Authority decision on both Modifications.

TL suggested that the next steps for IGT165 should be to complete the Workgroup Report in the March Workgroup meeting, which should provide all parties the opportunity to look through the legal drafting for both UNC 0843 and IGT165. TL added that they will pre-draft the Workgroup Report with the conversations from previous Workgroup meetings included, with the aim of publishing one or two weeks prior to the March Workgroup. TL suggested that IGT165 may be able to be issued for consultation alongside UNC0843, though there won’t be a full overlap due to the different Panel meeting dates. However, this was dependent on the outcome of the March meeting. The Workgroup agreed with this approach.

MATTERS ARISING

7. [UNC 0884 – Extending the PC4 Read Submission Window](#)

KA provided an overview of the UNC Modification to the Workgroup. KA informed the Workgroup that as the IGT UNC references the UNC regarding the Read Submission Windows for Class 4 sites, if UNC 0884 is implemented, the IGT Must Read Submission Window will be updated in line with the new Domestic and Industrial and Commercial (I&C) Class 4 Read Submission Windows.

KA added that following the implementation of [IGT159 – Amendments to the Must Read Process](#), there are specific clauses in the IGT UNC relating to charging for Must Read submissions. They

added that it specifically states Shippers are only obligated to pay IGT charges for Must Reads submitted within 25 Supply Point system business days. KA added that in the last UNC 0884 Workgroup, the Proposer indicated that there is no intention to raise a Modification in the IGT UNC to align the charging methodology with the new Read Submission Window. KA advised that this would lead to a difference between the time that IGTs have to submit their Must Reads and have them accepted as valid readings by the CDSP, and the actual number of Must Reads they can charge for. KA asked attendees for their perspectives on this analysis and whether an IGT UNC Modification may be required to mitigate for this consequence.

KA advised that the proposed new Read Submission Windows are 80 Supply Point System business days for Domestic Class 4 sites and 45 Supply Point System business days for I&C Class 4 sites. They added that in the event that UNC 0884 is implemented, if IGTs submitted a Must Read with a date over 25 Supply Point business days, the CDSP would accept it as a valid reading, but the Shipper would not have to pay a charge. TL showed the IGT159 legal text to the Workgroup and explained that the current 25 Supply Point System business day cutoff for Must Read charging on Class 4 sites would need to be extended to align with the proposed Read Submission Windows if the IGTs wanted a Modification to address the issue.

KA advised that they had spoken to CG offline about the Contact Management Service (CMS), the system the IGTs currently use to submit Must Reads. They added that because of the proposed difference between Submission Windows, a Must Read could be validated by the CDSP and shown as valid on a CMS report, but the Shippers could dispute the charge if the Must Read date is over 25 Supply Point System business days. They added that if any IGTs currently use the CMS reports to determine chargeable Must Reads, these reports could potentially no longer be correct. KA asked IGT representatives if they use the CMS reports for charging purposes? CH responded that Indigo Pipelines do not use them. No other IGTs responded.

The Chair asked if a lead time would be required for UNC 0884 if it is approved for implementation. KA responded that the implementation would require system changes and therefore it would go through the Data Services Contract (DSC) Change process, with the DSC Change Management committee determining the timeline and release date of the Modification. KA added that the actual expected length of lead time required is unavailable at the moment.

The Chair asked about the current status of UNC 0884. KA responded that there is a Distribution Workgroup scheduled for 27th February. They added that the group is due to report back to UNC Panel in April, and it is likely that there will be an extension request. JL added that UNC 0884 was discussed at a Workgroup for the first time in a few months at the January Distribution meeting.

The Chair asked IGTs how they wanted to progress with UNC 0884 consequential impact, suggesting that it may be worthwhile for them to allow time to properly assess the Modification first. CG responded that BUUK are still discussing the Modification internally and have not decided how they want to proceed. KA suggested that the Code Administrator could send out communications to all IGTs about the concerns raised at the February Workgroup meeting regarding the potential impacts of

UNC 0884. The Chair suggested that the Independent Networks Association (INA) is also sent these comms. CG agreed. KA suggested that UNC 0884 consequential impact to the IGT UNC is put on the agenda for the March Workgroup meeting so that IGTs can provide an update on their views. CH added that the next INA meeting is on 24th February so there will be an opportunity for all IGTs to discuss the Modification before next month.

25/02 – 02: Code Administrator to write to IGTs and the INA regarding the impacts of UNC 0884 on the IGT UNC Must Read process

STANDING ITEMS

8. Cross Code Modification Implications Tracker

HF provided the Workgroup with the following updates on in flight UNC modifications:

Watch List

- [0907 – Extension to Current Maintenance Period](#). This Modification proposes to amend the current Maintenance Period from 1st April – 31st October to 1st March to 30th November. There is potential automatic application under the IGT UNC as it references Section L4 of the UNC. CH asked what the maintenance period refers to. TL added that it is related to the National Transmission System (NTS). CH and TL agreed that it is unlikely to have an impact on IGTs, however, if there is any amendments that could affect numbering etc. it may have an indirect impact
- [0899 - To ensure the suite of Network Exit Agreements \(NExA\) Modifications has been implemented, taking into account the changes introduced by 0804](#). CG informed the Workgroup that they are currently working on an IGT UNC equivalent Modification to UNC 0899, which is a housekeeping Modification amending the UNC legal text back to the changes made by [UNC 0804 - Consequential UNC changes for Switching](#), which was a Significant Code Review Modification implemented by Ofgem. CG added that the IGT UNC Modification is also including other housekeeping changes that have been identified in the Known Issues Register.
- [0890 - Update to AQ Correction Processes - Request for Adjustments \(RFA\) AQ Change](#). JL informed the Workgroup that the Modification had been put on hold whilst Xoserve looked into whether a new AQ reason code was required, or if there was functionality to do an AQ automatic recalculation. They added that the Proposer and Workgroup had now decided to go for the AQ automatic recalculation as the preferred solution. JL added that they have finished drafting the revised Modification and will be taking it to the February Workgroup on 27th February.
- [0896 - Reducing the current Code Cut-Off Date \(Line in the Sand\) from 3 to 4 years to 2 to 3 years](#). JL informed the Workgroup that the legal drafting is not yet available in this

Modification, but there is expected to be an update on the legal text status at either the February or March Workgroups.

- [0886 – Amend the Code Cut-off Date to a Rolling Three-Year Period](#). KA noted that the Tracker states that the impacts to the IGT UNC are not yet known and asked when it is expected for any impacts to be determined. TL responded that legal drafting is required to fully determine if there is any impact on the IGT UNC.
- [0876 – Updates to the AQ Amendment Process](#). At the January Distribution Workgroup, cross-code impacts were discussed, and it was determined that an IGT UNC equivalent Modification would not be required. Changes to the UNC should automatically apply under the IGT UNC as currently IGT UNC Part C16 cross references G2.3 of the UNC. The Chair of the Distribution Workgroup reached out to the Code Administrator and informed them that the Workgroup had highlighted there would be impacts on individual IGTs, even if there is no change to the IGT UNC Code. The Code Administrator recommends that IGTs review this Modification.

IGT UNC Equivalent Modifications

- [0881 - Review and consolidation of UNC Transition Document TDIIC - Transitional Rules](#). This Modification was implemented on 15th January. A change is required to the IGT UNC to remove a reference to TDIIC 1.3.8 as this clause has now been removed. TL asked CG if this has been included within their upcoming housekeeping Modification. CG responded that it had not been included yet, but they would add it in. TL added that this required change would also be added to the Known Issues Register.
- [0854 - Revision of Virtual Last Resort User and Contingent Procurement of Supplier Demand Event Triggers](#): It had been anticipated that there would be pre-Modification discussion on the IGT UNC equivalent Modification at this Workgroup meeting. However, due to extenuating circumstances, this Modification will now be discussed at the March Workgroup meeting. KA asked if a copy of the Modification Proposal will be available to view prior to the meeting. TL responded that it will be made available for paper day on Thursday 6th March at the latest, and potentially earlier if possible.

Review Groups

- [0904 - Review of the profiling arrangements with respect to LDZ Shrinkage Quantity](#). No IGT UNC impacts are expected as this Review only applies to LDZ Shrinkage arrangements. TL suggested this Review does not need to be tracked. The Workgroup agreed.
- [0879 – Review of the current Supply Meter Point Classes \(Classes 1-4\)](#): JL informed the Workgroup that the January Workgroup focused on Class 1 and there were discussions over the potential reduction of the Class 1 mandatory threshold. The next Workgroup is scheduled for 24th February and will mainly focus on Class 2.
- [0849 – Commercial Framework Review to Enable Hydrogen Blending](#). After the last few Workgroups were cancelled, the December Workgroup went ahead as scheduled. The Code

Administrator recommend IGTs remain informed as the outputs of this Review will likely impact the IGT UNC.

9. IGT UNC Known Issues Register

HF advised the Workgroup that there were no new updates to the Known Issues Register prior to the meeting. They added that a new issue on IGT173 non-compliance would be added as per the discussions in Item 5 and a new housekeeping change to remove a reference to TDIC 1.3.8 as per the discussions on UNC 0881 in Item 10.

10. IGT UNC Horizon Scanner

TL presented some changes to the Horizon Scanner and provided the Workgroup with the following updates:

SDS & Code Governance:

Following the release of the [Ofgem consultation on the preliminary Strategic Direction Statement and Code Governance Arrangements](#) on 31st January, Ofgem are also hosting an event on 17th February for industry participants. The consultation is open for responses until 8th March. TL also advised that it is aware of the proposed changes to the IGT UNC and other Codes to allow for better harmonisation of the prioritisation of industry change. The CA will review these and liaise with Ofgem where required.

AOB

11. 2026 Meeting Dates

The Code Administrator presented the proposed 2026 dates for IGT UNC Panel and Workstream meetings to the Workgroup. The Chair advised that as dictated in the IGT UNC, Panel are required to sign off the meeting dates of the following year at the first meeting of the year. The Chair added that the January Panel meeting had been cancelled, and the 2026 dates will be going to the February Panel meeting. The Workgroup had no comments on the 2026 proposed meeting dates.

12. Ofgem Consultation on the preliminary Strategic Direction Statement and Code Governance Arrangements

The Chair noted the release of the Ofgem consultation on Friday 31st January. The Workgroup had no comments on the consultation.

13. UNC 0887 - Facilitating Bi-Directional Connections Between IGT Pipelines and the NTS

The Chair informed the Workgroup that the Code Administrator had invited Phil Lucas, the proposer of UNC 0887, to talk about the Modification and the potential impacts on the IGT UNC, given the extensive changes proposed to the UNC Independent Gas Transporters Arrangement Document (IGTAD) and TPD.

PL provided the Workgroup with an overview of the Modification. PL informed the Workgroup that National Gas Transmission (NGT) had been approached by a party who wished to connect to National Transmission System (NTS). They added that the intent was to create a bidirectional flow (i.e. a flow from an entry point on their IGT network onto NTS) and potentially also exit points on the IGT network. PL added that the UNC did not explicitly account for a bidirectional flow, so this Modification was raised to introduce this. PL added that the points of connection between the IGT and NTS networks would be unmetered, similar to the unmetered connections between IGTs and Gas Distribution Networks (GDNs) introduced under [UNC 0842 - Gas Entry onto the Total system via an Independent Gas Transporter](#). PL added that there are proposed changes to the IGTAD as it currently does not cover unmetered IGT to NTS connections. NK added that it would also lead to the introduction of an unmetered IGT Supply Points to the IGT UNC.

PL added that the IGT UNC currently assumes all Supply Points on IGT networks are Central Switching Service (CSS) Supply Points, and changes to the UNC and the IGT UNC are needed to ensure IGT Supply Points connected to the NTS can be considered as Non-CSS Supply Points. PL also noted that Supply Point Administration Arrangements (SPAA) for the relevant IGT Pipelines and Entry Points are relevant.

The Chair asked about how capacity charging would work for Meter Point Reference Numbers (MPRNs) on IGT networks that are connected to the NTS. PL responded that the gas going in at the connection point will be deemed to commercially flow into and out of the Total System and the Modification will make Entry and Exit Capacity available to cover these commercial flows at the connection points between the IGT and NTS networks.

The Chair asked attendees if someone would be happy to sponsor a Modification and NK added that they would be happy to support. KA asked PL if any timeline is required for this Modification. PL responded that from their understanding there are a number of projects in the planning stage which would require evidence that there is movement to get the commercial arrangements in place to incentivise investment in these projects. JL added that at the last UNC 0887 Workgroup, Ofgem had been asked if they would want to make a decision simultaneously for the Modification and a potential IGT UNC equivalent, so potentially an IGT UNC Modification could hold up the implementation of UNC 0887. EO responded that Ofgem are still looking into this and do not have an update yet.

The Chair suggested that given NGT were approached originally about this Modification due to a potential project hoping to connect to NTS through an IGT network, there is likely an IGT aware of these plans and are keen to see this Modification implemented, so could act as a Sponsor to the IGT UNC Modification. PL responded that there is a particular IGT who approached NGT over this matter as well as a Shipper who also initiated discussions. They added that these two parties have an interest in ensuring that these commercial arrangements are fully in place to facilitate these new bidirectional points. PL suggested that it may be worth approaching these parties offline to see if they are interested in sponsoring the Modification.

PL added that the Workgroup Report for UNC 0887 is going to UNC Panel on 20th February, and it is expected for the Modification to go out for a three-week consultation afterwards. The Chair added that given how advanced UNC 0887 is and that the IGT UNC will need a Modification raised, there is not a huge amount of time to potentially find a Sponsor. TL added that an IGT UNC equivalent Modification will likely take less time overall to develop compared to UNC 0887, but there will be a lag. NK agreed. The Chair advised that Non-CSS supply points would have to be written into the IGT UNC. They asked if there will be any requirements for a Non-CSS Supply Point on an IGT network. PL responded that it would have to be a Class 1 site and site specific to measure the Calorific Value (CV) as the lowest average CV won't be able to be utilised, as it is specific to a DN area. The Chair asked if there would be any added difficulties for parties, particularly Suppliers. PL responded that they do not see any impediments to competition at these points aside from the additional requirements that normally would not been required on these points.

The Chair suggested that the Code Administrator put out a notice to all parties regarding the need to raise a Modification in the IGT UNC to support the implementation of UNC 0887. They added that the Code Administrator will also get in contact with the potential interested parties with the aim of finding a Sponsor.

25/02 – 03: Code Administrator to write to all parties and reach out to the impacted IGT and Shipper in relation to raising an IGT UNC Modification to facilitate UNC 0887.

***POST-MEETING NOTE:** An IGT UNC Party has reached out to the CA to advise that they would like to raise the required IGT UNC Modification. The CA and the Party have begun working on this Modification and are aiming for it to be raised ahead of the March IGT UNC Panel meeting. As a result, the CA did not issue the note to industry Parties as a sponsor has come forward.*

14. Authority Update

EO provided the Workgroup with the following updates:

- Ofgem have recently published their consultation on a preliminary SDS and accompanying governance changes. This is a milestone for the code governance reform project and Ofgem look forward to hearing stakeholder views on this draft. The consultation is open for 8-weeks and there will be a webinar and workshops with stakeholders during the consultation period. More details about this engagement will be shared in due course. Ofgem would like to thank you for your ongoing engagement with the SDS, and in particular your contribution to previous stakeholder engagement sessions that have informed this SDS draft.
- The ECR project has hit another milestone, on 29 January 2025, the Secretary of State designated the majority of codes and certain central systems as 'qualifying' for the purposes of Schedule 12 of the Energy Act 2023. Schedule 12 of the Energy Act provides Ofgem with transitional powers for the purpose of establishing the new governance framework, which allows Ofgem to modify licence conditions, energy codes and contracts. These transitional powers may only be used in relation to 'qualifying documents' (i.e. codes) and 'qualifying

central systems', which must be designated as such by the Secretary of State following a recommendation from Ofgem. The Secretary of State's designation of the codes and systems listed in our recommendation means that Ofgem can now use their Schedule 12 transitional powers in relation to those codes and systems. This is a vital step in code governance reform, allowing Ofgem to carry out the changes necessary to implement their reforms.

- If you have any questions on their consultations, or on energy code governance more generally, please contact Ofgem at industrycodes@ofgem.gov.uk

The next Workgroup meeting is scheduled for Thursday 13th March 2025.

Annex 1 – Actions Table

Reference	Action	Owner	Status
24/12 - 01	<i>Centrica and Xoserve to review the impacts of UNC 0884 on the IGT UNC PC4 Read Submission Window Processes and the Must Read Process.</i>	LG,DA,KA	Closed
25/02 - 01	Code Administrator to write to Parties for information on any difficulties faced when implementing IGT173	Code Administrator	Open
25/02 - 02	Code Administrator to write to IGTs and the INA regarding the impacts of UNC 0884 on the IGT UNC Must Read process.	Code Administrator	Open
25/02 - 03	Code Administrator to write to all parties and reach out to the impacted IGT and Shipper in relation to raising an IGT UNC Modification to facilitate UNC 0887. <i>POST-MEETING NOTE: An IGT UNC Party has reached out to the CA to advise that they would like to raise the required IGT UNC Modification. The CA and the Party have begun working on this Modification and are aiming for it to be raised ahead of the March IGT UNC Panel meeting. As a result, the CA did not issue the note to industry Parties as a sponsor has come forward.</i>	Code Administrator	Open