

IGT UNC 26-01 Modification Workstream Meeting

Final Minutes

Thursday 8th January 2026 via Teleconference

Attendee	Initial	Organisation	Notes
Anne Jackson	AJ	Talan	Chair
Aleksis Butler	AB	BUUK	Proposer for RG008
Ashley Foster	AF	Indigo Pipelines	
Ben Mitchell	BM	Xoserve	
Helen Gilbert	HG	National Energy System Operator (NESO)	
Jenny Rawlinson	JR	BUUK	
Lee Greenwood	LG	Centrica	
Nadir Hafeez	NH	Ofgem	
Richard Welsby	RW	Last Mile Gas	
Tim Davis	TD	CNG Services	
Talia Lattimore	TL	Talan	Code Administrator
Harry Firth	HF	Talan	Secretariat

1. Welcome and Apologies for Absence

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting. There were apologies received from Cher Harris (CH), Indigo Pipelines and Ellie Osobina (EO), Ofgem.

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. Tim Davis (TD) added Item 9 – Potential Modification on Removal of Standalone Networks from IGT UNC. The Chair added Item 10 – Ofgem Consultations.

3. Approval of the Previous Minutes 25-09

HF informed the Workgroup that several comments were received for the draft 25-09 Modification Workstream meeting minutes prior to the meeting. They advised that these comments were provided by Aleksis Butler (AB) to provide further clarity on [IGT179 - NExA Tables Clarification Update and Related Documents](#). The Workgroup had no further 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

Talia Lattimore (TL) informed the Workgroup that there was one outstanding action:

25/09 – 01: Code Administrator to review the time required to implement changes to the IGT UNC website suggested by BUUK. TL advised that BUUK had made suggestions to change the

CSEP NExA tables section on the website to provide more clarity on the process to parties. They confirmed that these changes would be considered and the best approach to changes would be in place by the time IGT179 has been implemented in February 2026. TL noted that BUUK had made other general suggestions to improve the website, such as a page containing all of the templates and guidance information on the website. TL added that they thought the page would be a useful addition to the website and had been included in a list of Code Administration tasks to be completed at a later date. JR asked when TL would expect to have completed the guidance page. TL responded that they would aim for completion by the end of March. **Action closed.**

MODIFICATIONS

5. RG008 – IGT UNC Code Review in preparation for Code Manager and Code Consolidation

AB and JR introduced the Review to the Workgroup. AB explained that RG008 proposes a proactive, collaborative tidy-up of the IGT UNC so documentation handed to a future Code Manager of the Gas Network Code (GNC) is as clean, consistent and “consolidation-ready” as possible.

AB added that BUUK met with Ofgem in December to discuss this review. They added that this was positive engagement, with Ofgem not foreseeing any conflicts with their own Energy Code Reform (ECR) timeline. Ofgem asked BUUK to keep the UNC Panel updated on the review. Consolidation currently anticipated post-Code Manager appointment (from 2027/28), with Ofgem-led engagement on ECR in Q1 2026

AB took the Workgroup through what will be covered under the review. Housekeeping is a key part, correcting typos/formatting, aligning terminology with the UNC and standardising cross-reference phrasing so references to UNC sections are uniform and machine-detectable. Every current cross-reference must be validated, to ensure the target content and wording still matches after consolidation. The review will also look to catalogue sections that must remain IGT-specific post-consolidation. This list will become a key hand-over artefact for the new Code Manager. Templates used by parties will also be covered. AB noted that changing existing or future governance models themselves (ECR, Code Manager selection/operations etc.) would be out of scope. The Review may reference governance to check alignment but will not propose governance reform via RG008.

BM asked about the cross-referencing focus of the review. They suggested that these cross-references would disappear following consolidation. JR responded that this would help towards tidying up the IGT UNC for future Code Consolidation work. The Chair added that it is important to identify cross-reference errors now to increase uniformity.

HG noted work being undertaken by the UNC under the Governance Workgroup and added that it would be worth keeping an eye on this to ensure that RG008 work aligns with the ongoing UNC governance work.

JR suggested a spreadsheet would be useful for capturing all of the changes passed through to the IGT UNC Review falling out of the UNC Governance Workgroup, as any change could have an impact on one of the cross-references which RG008 hopes to cover, continuing good practices from

previous IGT UNC reviews. TL agreed that this would be a good approach. The Chair added that a risk register is also required, which TL added could be included within the same document.

LG noted a letter sent out by Energy UK the previous week on the Unified GNC collaboration piece with Ofgem and asked whether this review is linked to that wider piece of work. The Chair responded that this review is a separate piece of work being undertaken in both Codes under the current governance. The new Code Manager will be appointed prior to consolidation, so RG008 will look to ensure that all documents forwarded to the new Code Manager are as clean as possible.

JR suggested that the Workgroup should focus first on the review approach, then the makeup of the group, the outcomes of this to be then included within the Terms of Reference (ToR) which will be reviewed first.

JR outlined their view for the initial approach of the review, beginning with a page turner to pull out all of the required housekeeping changes, followed by a secondary phase focused on cross-references to the UNC, and a final phase focused on IGT specific processes and provisions. The Chair asked whether in-person meetings were envisaged for the page turner. JR responded that although page turners are more efficient in person, this may limit engagement, noting difficulties with in-person meetings these days. They suggested doing the page turner virtually, pulling up the UNC and IGT Codes side by side. They noted the importance of engagement with IGTs and Shippers as part of the review process.

LG asked how long JR foresees each of these three phases taking. JR responded that the first two phases could be quite laborious. They noted that AB had been going through both Codes to help identify housekeeping and UNC referencing errors but added that it would be useful for a second person to undertake the same task to ensure the Codes have been thoroughly covered. They added that it was likely that page turners would be required for the first two phases, although potentially they could be covered in one. TL suggested that areas of Code could be issued to industry for review if the Review Group felt that certain areas of Code required further work or insight. JR responded that this may be useful, although raised a concern over how much engagement this would get from parties not already attending the Review Group. LG also raised concerns on the time required by parties to commit to the Review Group.

LG asked about approach taken by the UNC in the Governance Workgroup. AB responded that GDNs have been running through the legal text with Dentons, which has highlighted errors within the Code, such as proposed changes from Modifications have never been included as they have been superseded by different Modifications.

JR suggested that the first phase should focus on IGT UNC specific processes and provisions, noting that it will be the shortest section, and allow the Review Group to get into a flow ahead of the more laborious sections requiring page turners. The Workgroup agreed.

There was discussion on the cadence of Review Group meetings. JR suggested that a four-hour session monthly would be sufficient to get through the required work. They asked whether these

meetings should be separated from the existing Workgroup meetings, noting that it may be better to use the Workgroup meetings when the agenda is lighter. TL suggested a flexible approach to be included within the ToR, allowing the Code Administrator to either schedule a separate meeting or include within the Workgroup agenda, depending on other Modifications currently in progress. It was agreed to start the review meetings as part of the Workgroup, to be reviewed periodically.

LG asked whether the Review Group could meet and proceed without the presence of a certain party, such as a Shipper. JR responded that the Review Group would have to proceed regardless and added that this should be recorded as a risk. As there is no decision making, the review sessions will not have quoracy. TL added that the Panel will be kept updated on the review process and could step in if they have concerns.

HG added that although NESO would not have the same knowledge of IGT processes as other parties, they were keen to be involved and help out with the Review Group meetings. They suggested it would be sensible to announce which sections would be covered ahead of each meeting, allowing for attendees to do some pre reading. TL agreed that this information could be included within agendas.

The group discussed how to manage housekeeping issues arising from the review. There was agreement that creating a separate log or spreadsheet specifically for review-related housekeeping changes would be the cleanest approach. This would prevent duplication or inconsistencies between the main housekeeping log held in the Known Issues Register. AB asked whether to circulate or hold the list of housekeeping issues they had discovered as part of their work on the review. The group agreed for AB to place them straight into the review-specific log. TL agreed to draft this log and bring it to the February Workgroup meeting.

The Workgroup went through the proposed Review Group ToR and made amendments based on the discussions and agreements made previously in this meeting. TL asked about the proposed attendees for the Review Group. JR suggested that the group should comprise of usual Workgroup attendees, plus any others who wish to attend. There was discussion on the objectives and topics of discussion for the Review Group, and which sections would need to be agreed again as part of the first meeting at the February Workgroup.

The Workgroup covered the scope of the review as set out in the ToR, which includes the main IGT UNC Code, Ancillary, Guidance and Process documents. Consideration will also be given to potential changes required at the request of Ofgem for Code Reform. TL and JR clarified in the ToR that changes to existing and future governance is out of scope, unless deemed relevant as the review proceeds.

AB asked about the inclusion of a priority matrix within the IGT UNC Modification templates, as per [the ongoing Ofgem consultation](#), and whether this would need to be called out specifically as part of this review. TL responded that if it needs to be picked up, it will be, but the required changes to the Modification templates could be taken to Panel for approval separately from the review. They added

that the templates will always have to hit the minimum standard for Codes, in which the priority matrix is likely to be included in due course. JR and the Chair discussed the potential standardisation of all templates between the UNC and IGT UNC but agreed that this would be kept separate from both the prioritisation work being undertaken by Ofgem, and any minimum standards work to be done by the Code Administrators Code of Practice (CaCoP) Forum.

The Workgroup discussed the outputs of the review. TL added that one of the final outputs is always a review report to Panel containing assessment and recommendations from the group including draft Modification(s) if required/appropriate. They suggested monthly updates be provided to IGT UNC Panel, with the ability to raise draft Modifications where needed. TL also suggested that RG008 could be kept open after the final review report to deal with any lingering issues that crop up afterwards. The Workgroup agreed to these outputs.

TL advised that they would finalise the draft ToR ahead of them being published for paper day of the January IGT UNC Panel meeting should the Panel wish to review, with the aim to commence the Review Group at the February Workgroup meeting.

STANDING ITEMS

6. Cross Code Modification Implications Tracker

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

Watch List

- [**0921 - Broadening the definition of the Data Permissions Matrix to align with disclosure of UK Link Gemini data.**](#) This has been raised following the approval of the Disclosure Request Report permitting the CDSP to provide Renewable Energy Assurance Limited (REA) with data from UK Link Gemini; specifically, allocated volumes of biomethane gas injected. The UNC definition of the Data Permissions Matrix will be broadened to accommodate this.
- [**0919 - Housekeeping amendments to TPD Sections B, G and M.**](#) Identified cross-referencing errors in Transportation Principal Document (TPD) sections which were erroneously introduced by the implementation of several Modifications. The Code Administrator has reviewed the legal drafting and has not identified any impacts to IGT UNC as a result of the legal text changes under this Modification.
- [**0914 - Refining the Class 3 EUC1 read submission rules introduced through Modification 0700.**](#) This Modification proposes the removal of the batch read validation rules introduced under Modification 0700 for Class 3 EUC1 reads. This would allow daily reads for Class 3 EUC1 to be submitted and validated without the current restrictions. IGT UNC Code impact to be determined based on legal text drafting. It is expected that this functionality will apply to all Supply Points, including those on IGT Networks.

- **0909 - Refining the Class 2 Individual Valid Meter Reading Requirement Performance Measures**. The Code Administrator has reviewed the legal drafting and any changes to 5.17 of Section M will automatically apply under the IGT UNC. However, there are no changes to the IGT UNC required. Consultation open for responses until 6th February.
- **0908 - Removal of DNO meter reading obligations resulting from non-provision of a Valid Meter Reading**. IGT177 was implemented on 26th September 2025. This means UNC 0908 will not pose a direct impact to IGT UNC Code as the must read provisions will sit within the IGT UNC. UNC 0908 is due to report to UNC Panel in February, although this may be pushed back as this Modification had not been to Distribution Workgroup for a while.
- **0907 - Extension to current maintenance period**. No direct Code impact but IGT UNC Part H, 2.2 says, “The Pipeline Operator will use reasonable endeavours to co-ordinate its Maintenance Programme with the maintenance of the Large Transporter System in accordance with Section L4 of the UNC.”. L4 is System Maintenance. Consultation open for responses until 11th February.
- **0896 - Reducing the current Code Cut-Off Date (Line in the Sand) from 3 to 4 years to 2 to 3 years**. The Modification has been approved by the Authority and is awaiting implementation, with a planned date for 1st April 2026.
- **0890 - Update to AQ Correction Processes - Request for Adjustments (RFA) AQ Change**. The Modification has been approved by the Authority and is awaiting implementation, with no date confirmed yet.
- **0886 – Amend the Code Cut-off Date to a Rolling Three-Year Period**. The Modification has been approved by the Authority and is awaiting implementation, with a planned date for 1st April 2026.
- **0876 - Updates to the Annual Quantity (AQ) amendment process**. The Modification has been approved by the Authority and is awaiting implementation, with no date confirmed yet.

IGT UNC Equivalent Modifications

- **0887 – Facilitating Bi-Directional Connections Between IGT Pipelines and the NTS**: The Modification has been approved by the Authority and is awaiting implementation, with no date confirmed yet. IGT176 was approved by the Authority in December. The implementation date will depend on required system changes being introduced by Xoserve. TL added that they check the related XRN on a regular basis to check for the implementation date and will provide an update once there is a date for these Modifications.
- **0884 – Extending the PC4 Read Submission Window**. UNC0884 has been approved by the Authority and IGT178 was approved by the Panel under Self-Governance, having initially been raised as an Authority Decision Modification. The implementation date will depend on required system changes being introduced by Xoserve. TL added that the date for the related XRN is slated for February and added that they will check this with Xoserve before confirming.

- **0854 - Revision of Virtual Last Resort User and Contingent Procurement of Supplier Demand Event Triggers**: BM advised that Xoserve intend to take an update on the IGT UNC equivalent Modification to the January Panel meeting, and the Modification will be brought to the February Workgroup meeting
- **0843 - Establishing the Independent Shrinkage Charge and the Independent Shrinkage Expert**. This Modification is currently with the Authority for a decision, along with IGT165. An expected decision date of 30th January has been published.

Live Review Groups:

- **0879 – Review of current Supply Meter Point Classes (Classes 1-4)**: This review has now been closed, with the Draft Workgroup Report presented to Workgroup in September. There are a number of potential Modifications that have been proposed by this Workgroup. The Code Administrator recommends parties review the report. The Code Administrator will review and engage on the Modifications raised.
- **0849 - Commercial Framework Review to Enable Hydrogen Blending**. This review has now been closed, with the Draft Workgroup Report presented to Workgroup in September. There are a number of potential Modifications that have been proposed by this Workgroup. The Code Administrator recommends parties review the report. The Code Administrator will review and engage on the Modifications raised.

7. IGT UNC Known Issues Register

TL advised the Workgroup that there were no new updates to the Known Issues Register.

8. IGT UNC Horizon Scanner

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

Updates on the Gas Shipper Obligation (GSO) have been included on the Horizon Scanner. It had been previously flagged as likely for introduction in 2027, with potential Code impacts on data sharing and funding arrangements.

Two new Modifications connected to GSO have emerged. [UNC 0922](#) has been raised, whilst a IGT UNC related Modification is currently under Critical Friend review. Both are aimed for their respective January Panel meetings.

The intention is to progress both Modifications together via a joint IGT UNC and UNC working group. TL has meetings scheduled with the Joint Office to coordinate timelines and confirm meeting dates, which should be available ahead of the Panel meetings. They warned that the initial working group dates may not fall within the usual meeting slots.

The Chair added that IGT UNC and UNC will increasingly work jointly on areas of shared scope. This is not entirely new but intended to be more systematic and efficient. Parties are encouraged to provide feedback on whether joint processes are helpful.

AOB

9. Potential Modification on Removal of Standalone Networks from IGT UNC.

TD advised that CNG Services are currently developing standalone networks where gas will be produced by biomethane sites. They added that these networks work differently to the grid, as gas will only be transported on these networks when the biomethane site is producing. TD added that these networks would require large scale changes to the UNC and IGT UNC Codes to recognise them and instead had raised a proposal to change CNG Services own network Code and to state that standalone networks are removed from the IGT UNC. TD added that this proposal has also been presented at a UNC Workgroup meeting.

LG asked for the Modification number. The Chair responded that the proposal is currently with the Code Administrator for critical friend review and has not been officially raised yet.

The Chair asked whether developments outside of the IGT UNC would be made public. TD responded that there is no requirement for public disclosure, although there is no intent to be secretive.

10. Ofgem Consultations.

The Chair advised that the [Ofgem consultation on Establishing a harmonised prioritisation process in the Industry Codes is open to responses](#) until 13th January. They added that [the consultation on Energy code reform: competitive code manager selection](#) is open until 23rd January.

The next Workgroup meeting is scheduled for Thursday 12th February 2026.

Annex 1 – Actions Table

Reference	Action	Owner	Status
25/09 - 01	<i>Code Administrator to review the time required to implement changes to the IGT UNC website suggested by BUUK</i>	<i>Code Administrator</i>	<i>Closed</i>