

IGT UNC Modification Panel Meeting

Draft Minutes

Friday 27th June 2025

Via teleconference

Attendee	Initials	Organisation	Representing	Notes
Anne Jackson	AJ	Gemserv	Code Administrator	Chair
Alison Beard	ABE	Gemserv	Code Administrator	
Aleksis Butler	AB	BUUK	Observer	Proposer for IGT177
Bradley Wood	BW	Centrica	Pipeline Users	
Cher Harris	CH	Indigo Pipelines	Pipeline Operators	
Eilidh McNally	EM	Last Mile Gas	Pipeline Operators	
Graeme Forbes	GF	Gemserv	Code Administrator	
James Macauley	JM	Ofgem	Authority	
Jenny Rawlinson	JR	BUUK	Pipeline Operators	
Paul McKie	PM	Joint Office	Observer	
Talia Lattimore	TL	Gemserv	Code Administrator	
Harry Firth	HF	Gemserv	Code Administrator	Secretariat

1. Welcomes and Apologies

The Chair welcomed the Panel to the reconvened meeting. The Chair noted that following the ongoing quoracy issues the Panel faces, the Code Administrator (CA) had opened a meeting prior to this and held that open for one hour as per Code rules (Part L6.10).

There were apologies from LG (Centrica). It was noted that BW was acting as alternate to LG.

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 Any Other Business (AOB). JR added Item 11 - Ofgem Cross Code Digitalisation Steering Group. The Chair added Item 12 – Gemserv Rebranding to Talan

3. Approval of the previous minutes (25-05 and 25-05 Reconvened)

The CA invited comments on the May 2025 meeting minutes noting that no comments had been received prior to the meeting. No comments were raised during the meeting and the minutes (both standard and reconvened meetings) were approved as a true and accurate account of the meetings.

4. Outstanding Actions

The Panel were informed that there were no outstanding actions:

Modification Business

5. [IGT177 - Aligning IGT “must read” obligations within the IGT UNC](#)

TL took the Panel through the Workgroup Report. TL advised that IGT177 is aiming to maintain the existing must read obligations on IGTs, by removing reference to UNC Transpiration Principle Document (TPD) Section M 5.10 from IGT UNC Part E and aligning the relevant legal text within the IGT UNC to ensure that these obligations “stand alone” in the IGT UNC.

Governance

TL advised that the Proposer believed IGT177 meets the requirements for a Self-Governance Modification Proposal as there is no change of process nor additional governance on any IGT UNC parties. As a result, the Proposer does not believe there is any material impact on the areas specified within the Self-Governance criteria. They added that the Proposer has ensured the Modification legal text reflects the current obligations currently under the UN and the IGT UNC is not subject to any unintended consequences resulting from [UNC 0908 - Removal of DNO meter reading obligations resulting from non-provision of a Valid Meter Reading](#). The Panel unanimously agreed the Modification still meets the Self-Governance criteria and should be subject to Self-Governance procedures.

Solution

TL advised that a reference to UNC TPD Section M 5.10 would be removed from IGT UNC Part E, and that paragraphs from UNC TPD Section M would be merged with Part E to ensure that the current Must Read obligations are directly captured in the IGT UNC. TL added that these changes will currently encompass the changes made to the IGT UNC as a result of [IGT159 - Amendments to the Must Read Process](#).

JR added that three of the Panel members had attended the IGT UNC Workgroup meeting in June when the IGT177 Workgroup Report was completed and suggested that there may not be a lot of further comments added as the Panel members already contributed at the Workgroup meeting. CH added that they did not attend Workgroup but read the meeting minutes had had nothing further to add with regards to the Solution.

The Panel agreed unanimously that no further work was required on the solution.

Impacts and Other Considerations

TL advised that no impacts on a Significant Code Review (SCR) or an industry project had been identified by the Proposer or Workgroup. The Panel unanimously agreed with the vies of the Proposer and the Workgroup.

TL advised that although there is no expected change to the Consumer experience as a result of this Modification, the Proposer had provided rationale that the must read process currently has a positive

impact on Consumers and that IGT177 will safeguard this process and thus will have positive Consumer benefits. They added that the Workgroup had discussed this rationale, and three members had argued that as IGT177 is only looking to maintain the current process, they did not feel there is a positive Consumer impact. TL added that the Workgroup had decided there was a neutral Consumer benefit, which is why the Proposer views and Workgroup views have been split out for certain impact areas. The Panel had no further comments on with regards to the consumer impacts and agreed that no further work was required in this area.

TL noted the Workgroup discussions on potential cross-Code impacts. They advised that the Workgroup had agreed with the Proposer's view that IGT177 will not have a direct impact on any other Code, but that UNC 0908 should record a cross-Code impact on the IGT UNC. This is due to the potential consequences of Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) pulling out of the Must Reads process, and if IGT177 is not implemented, removing legal text from Code that the IGT UNC currently references will require action.

TL noted the Workgroup discussions on potential Central Data Service Provider (CDSP) impacts. They advised that a Workgroup member had queried why no CDSP impact had been identified by the Proposer and had sought clarification on whether the proposed legal text was an exact lift of the current must read provisions in the UNC, which the Proposer had confirmed was the case. TL added that the Workgroup member had advised there could be a chain of consequences for the CDSP if UNC 0908 is implemented, potentially even funding splits being discussed under the Data Service Contract (DSC) Change Process, although the member did clarify that this would not be as a result of IGT177.

The Chair informed the Panel that a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) was requested at the latest UNC 0908 Workgroup meeting on 26th June, and this will be available at the next UNC 0908 Workgroup meeting in July. CH asked whether the ROM would include the cost to the CDSP of maintaining the must read service for IGTs only. The Chair responded that the CDSP had not provided any further information at the UNC 0908 meeting but suggested that the CDSP would likely consider the impacts of both Modifications as they are aware of them.

JR queried whether the Workgroup Report had correctly reflected the discussions around the CDSP impact, noting that a CDSP representative had challenged the impacts of IGT177 on UNC 0908, and later acknowledged that IGT177 stands alone and any discussion on UNC 0908 should be held on its own merits. JR noted an action from the UNC 0908 meeting which was to clarify why IGT177 has been raised and reiterated the intention to protect the current must read obligations by lifting them into the IGT UNC. They added that prior to UNC 0908 being raised, it had been made clear that the Modification would only apply to Large Transporter sites and there was no intention to include IGT sites. The Chair confirmed that they had taken that action as they had attended the meeting and added that there will be an item on the July IGT UNC Workgroup meeting to ask IGTs why they want the must read process to be retained.

The Chair suggested that the cost of the must read process is likely to rise proportionally because of UNC 0908 and this should be highlighted in the ROM and UNC Modification. CH agreed that the ROM should address the potential increased costs to IGTs. JR sought to clarify that these potential increased costs would be because of UNC 0908 only and were not relevant to the discussions on IGT177. CH advised that they questioned whether the potential increase in costs could be attributed to IGT177 as IGTs will have to bear the full cost of the must read service if the DNOs pull out of the obligation. JR asked if this was a discussion to be had in the UNC 0908 Workgroup. CH disagreed and added that whilst UNC 0908 is to take away the obligation from DNOs, IGT177 is specifically retaining the service for IGTs, so creates a risk of an additional cost. JR responded that if IGT177 is implemented in July before UNC 0908, IGTs will not see any additional costs in that month. They reiterated that IGT177 is aiming to maintain the status quo and protect the current must read obligations from any unforeseen changes resulting from UNC 0908, which IGTs have been on the outside of from the start. They added that a debate on potential costs to IGTs should take place in a UNC 0908 Workgroup. CH responded that implementing IGT177 before UNC 0908 is pushing the issue down the line and added that if both Modifications were implemented at the same time, there would likely be an immediate increase in costs on IGTs. JR responded that IGT177 is only preserving the existing governance and asked for discussions on UNC 0908 and IGT177 to be separated.

The Chair reiterated that the ROM will be available at the next UNC 0908 meeting and encouraged parties to attend. They noted that the CDSP member who attended the IGT UNC Workgroup meeting in June had not brought up the conversations on potential cost impacts at this UNC 0908 meeting. The Chair added that it had been decided that UNC 0908 will be implemented immediately following Panel approval.

CH suggested that it will not be until after the IGT177 consultation had closed for responses that it will be known whether IGTs want to keep the must read provisions or whether they would rather mirror UNC 0908. JR agreed.

The Chair asked the Panel if they were happy to proceed with the Modification as planned following these discussions and asked if this issue should be mitigated by sending IGT177 back to the Workgroup or including additional questions in the consultation. The Chair added that the Modification can be sent back to the Workgroup following the consultation. The Panel agreed that they were happy to proceed as planned.

TL advised that the Proposer and the Workgroup had not identified any environmental impacts, and the Panel agreed with this view.

TL advised that the Proposer had identified a positive impact to Relevant Objective (F) - Promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Code, as the lifting of current UNC legal text into the IGT UNC will safeguard the current must read process. They noted that one Workgroup member had agreed with this rationale, although they had noted that the Proposer had argued that IGTs will continue to operate as a backstop to improve settlement, by undertaking must reads which

have been missed, which would only be realised if UNC 0908 is implemented. TL added that the Workgroup had agreed that there is a positive impact on (F). The Panel unanimously agreed with this view.

Implementation

TL advised that the Workgroup had recommended for IGT177 to be implemented as part of an Extraordinary Release, which will take place as soon as possible following Panel approval and the closure of the standard 15 Working Day appeal window. TL noted that the CA had confirmed that an Extraordinary Release would be achievable. TL added that the Workgroup agreed that implementing IGT177 as soon as possible would protect the current must read provisions from any unintended consequences resulting from UNC 0908 being implemented.

CH asked why an Extraordinary Release had been recommended and why it had not been decided to wait to see what happens under UNC 0908. JR responded that IGT177 is a stand alone Modification and the next Standard Release in the IGT UNC is scheduled for November, which seems a while to wait. CH asked if UNC 0908 were not to be implemented, would IGT177 still be needed and suggested it could result in dual governance. JR responded that it would be the same governance in both the IGT UNC and UNC, noting that there are several instances where this is already the case between the two Code. The Chair added that there are minor differences in the must reads processes under the IGT UNC and UNC, but these are already captured in the IGT UNC and not being introduced as part of IGT177.

The Panel unanimously agreed with the proposed implementation approach.

Legal Text

The Chair asked the Panel if the legal text delivers the intent of the solution. The Panel unanimously agreed that it does.

Recommendations

The Panel unanimously agreed that:

- The Modification should be issued to consultation for a period of 15 working days, ending on 21st July 2025.
- The Final Modification Report for IGT177 will be considered at the IGT UNC Panel meeting in August.

Updates from Workgroup

6. Workgroup Report

The Panel had no comments on the Workgroup Summary.

Authority Updates

7. Authority Update

JM provided the Panel with the following updates:

- Ofgem have now [published their decision on Energy code reform: decision on code manager selection](#). This follows from the consultation published on 28 November 2024 on Ofgem's approach to code manager selection. They sought views on the processes that they would follow and the criteria that they would apply when selecting code managers on a competitive or non-competitive basis.

Ofgem have decided to select code managers using a three-stage selection process consisting of an initial eligibility assessment, a licensing assessment and an implementation and assurance process.

Alongside the decision, Ofgem have published their updated guidance on code manager selection after consideration of stakeholder feedback.

Ofgem intend to make regulations for the competitive selection of code managers, with the Department of Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) to lay these regulations in parliament later this year on their behalf. Ofgem also plan to consult on draft guidance and criteria on the competitive process in due course.

Ofgem are planning to begin the selection process for phase 2 codes as soon as possible and will share more information in due course.

- Ofgem and DESNZ have issued a joint consultation on [Code manager licence conditions and code modification appeals to the CMA](#) which is open to responses until 27 June 2025.
- If you have any questions related to our decision, or on energy code governance more generally, please contact Ofgem at industrycodes@ofgem.gov.uk

8. Ofgem's Expected Decision Dates

JM confirmed there were currently no IGT UNC Modifications awaiting an Authority decision on the EDD table.

AOB

9. June 2025 IGT UNC Release

TL confirmed that the June 2025 release in the IGT UNC went live on 27th June. They advised that the only Modification included in the release was [IGT175 - Alignment of the IGT UNC with the UNC following Modification UNC0899 and additional housekeeping changes](#).

10. Code Consolidation

GF informed the Panel that, as part of the work towards Code Consolidation with the UNC, and the formation on the new Gas Network Code (GNC), the Code Administrator will formally reach out to the Joint Office (JO) for an initial conversation on the work needed to be completed for Code Consolidation. GF added that following these initial conversations, they would report back to the IGT

UNC Panel, and PM would do the same for the UNC Panel. GF added that the possibility of a forum looking into Code Consolidation will be considered by the Code Administrator and JO. GF added that this work will happen irrespective of which organisation is appointed as Code Manager for the GNC. GF added that they would provide a further update to Panel in August.

JR responded that they were happy that the Code Administrator and JO were beginning discussions on Code Consolidation. They suggested one point for GF to raise with the JO is the possibility of combining the Codes prior to the GNC Code Manager being appointed. GF responded that they would be happy to discuss this with the JO. They noted that there will be a formal competition for the Code Manager role and that it will be part of the second phase of Ofgem's Code Manager selection. They added that due to the unknown timeframes, starting these discussions with the JO will put both Codes in a better position and ensure greater control over the Consolidation process.

PM reiterated the positives of commencing structured work and discussions on Code Consolidation between the Code Administrator and JO as soon as possible.

11. Cross Code Digitalisation Steering Group (CCDSG)

JR advised that the latest CCDSG meeting had taken place at the beginning of June. They added that despite previous conversations, CCDSG members will not be seeing the planned consultation on Data Best Practice prior to release. GF added that the consultation is slated for release on 30th June. They added that there are planned new arrangements for data best practice linking to license obligations which will be introduced between April and October 2026.

JR suggested that an item should be added to the July Panel meeting agenda to discuss any impacts on the IGT UNC resulting from the proposals in the consultation. GF agreed. The Chair responded that the Code Administrator will encourage IGT UNC parties to read the consultation at the July Workgroup meeting and added that all parties need to understand the implications of the consultation to the IGT UNC and whether any required changes will be easy to implement.

POST-MEETING NOTE: Ofgem issued [their consultation on Data Best Practice as a Code Obligation](#), which is open to responses until 11 August 2025.

12. Gemserv Rebranding to Talan

The Chair informed the Panel that as of 1st July 2025, Gemserv will be rebranding as Talan. They added that the mailbox for the Code Administrator will be changed in the future, but the current mailbox will remain open for now and the two mailboxes are likely to run in parallel for some time.

The Chair added that there are not expected to be other impacts on IGT UNC parties, but the Code Administrator will provide updates to Parties as part of future meetings and will notify parties via the usual communications channels of when to expect changes in the future.

The next IGT UNC Panel meeting is scheduled for Friday 25th July 2025.

DRAFT

Annex 1 – Actions Table

Reference	Action	Owner	Status
There are currently no open Panel actions.			

DRAFT