



IGT UNC 26-04 Modification Workstream Meeting

Final Minutes

Thursday 9th April 2026 via Teleconference

Attendee	Initial	Organisation	Notes
Anne Jackson	AJ	Talan	Chair
Aleksis Butler	AB	BUUK	Proposer for RG008
Ben Mitchell	BM	Xoserve	
Ben Mulcahy	BMU	Joint Office	
Catherine Fearon	CF	ES Pipelines	Proposer for IGT181
Cher Harris	CH	Indigo Pipelines	
Ellie Osobina	EO	Ofgem	
Ellie Rutherford	ER	Energy Assets	
Harry Davis	HD	CSL (CNG Services Ltd)	
Kathryn Adeseye	KA	Xoserve	
Tim Davis	TD	CSL (CNG Services Ltd)	Proposer for CSL01
Talia Lattimore	TL	Talan	Code Administrator
Harry Firth	HF	Talan	Secretariat

1. Welcome and Apologies for Absence

The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting. Apologies had been received from Richard Welsby (Last Mile Gas)

The Chair acknowledged that there were no Shipper representatives present at the meeting. The Chair explained that there were no quoracy rules which would prevent the meeting from proceeding without a Shipper present. However, the Chair offered the opportunity for attendees to raise a challenge if they considered this to cause significant issue. Attendees unanimously agreed that the meeting could proceed in the absence of a Shipper representative, providing that the circumstances were noted in the meeting minutes and any impacted Workgroup Reports.

2. Confirmation of Agenda

The Chair confirmed the items for discussion outlined in the Final Agenda and asked for any additional items of business to be raised. EO added Item 11 – Authority Update

3. Approval of the Previous Minutes 26-03

HF noted that comments on the minutes of the previous meeting had been raised by Xoserve on the CSL01 item. The Workgroup reviewed the updates, had no comments with regards to the changes or the rest of the minutes, which were consequently approved as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

4. Outstanding Actions

The Chair noted that there was one outstanding action for consideration:

26/02 – 03: Ahead of the next Modification Workstream meeting on 12th March 2026, RG008 Members to consider Part CI in support of the Phase One identification and logging IGT-specific provisions. Part CII and CIII were reviewed by Workstream members in this meeting as part of ongoing work on RG008. Further detail on this is covered under Item 6.

The Workstream agreed to close the action.

MODIFICATIONS

5. [CSL01 – Exclusion of Standalone Networks from IGT UNC](#)

TL took the Workgroup through the amended Workgroup Report for CSL01. TL noted that CSL01 had been raised to make an amendment to the CNG Services Ltd. (CSL) Individual Network Code (INC) to exclude the provisions of the IGT UNC from applying to standalone networks r. TL advised that the IGT UNC Panel had reviewed the Workgroup Report and Draft Modification Report at their March meeting, and had sent the Modification back to Workgroup, asking for reconsideration on the legal text. Specifically, a Panel member had suggested that standalone network should be clearly defined as a defined term. TL summarised the Panel discussions for the Workgroup and showed a mock-up version of the CSL01 legal text with the requested changes made.

HD advised that CSL had looked into the Panel's request and believe it would be strange for the CSL INC to define standalone network. If changes were being made to the IGT UNC, it would make sense to clearly define standalone network. HD added that standalone network is defined within the current version of the legal text, but it is formatted in the INC differently to what would be required for the IGT UNC Code. TD added that the suggested definition of standalone network from the IGT UNC Panel would not be appropriate, as it is connected to the Total System in so much as you can use gas within the UK and have it counted for emission trading schemes. To avoid questions on when there is a standalone network connected and when there is not, CSL used the Connected System Exit Point (CSEP) in their definition instead.

CH suggested that the Panel had made these recommendations to avoid ambiguity or scope creep by clearly defining what a standalone network is. They added that the Panel and Workgroup are unfamiliar with this new concept, and a clear definition would aid understanding. TD responded that the current definition of standalone network in the legal text does that clearly, in particular with the use of CSEP as part of that definition. They explained that defining "connection to the network" is legally and practically complex, as physical, contractual, and notional connections can differ, giving an example that while networks can be treated as connected for purposes such as emissions trading and green gas certification, this does not equate to physical connection. To avoid these ambiguities, they

took the approach of defining the concept solely by the absence of a CSEP, as this is consistently present only where gas is taken from the network, and would never apply where gas is self-supplied.

TL showed the originally proposed version of the legal text for CSL01. TD explained that in the new proposed paragraph 3 of Schedule 1 of the CSL INC, the definition of standalone network is included. They added that the CSL INC has no defined terms within the INC, all capitalised terms are from other Codes. They felt that adding a defined capitalised term for standalone network would be inconsistent with the rest of the INC. CH responded that as this Modification is looking to disapply the IGT UNC Code in the case of standalone networks, the INC needs to define what a standalone network is. TD asked what a defined term is, and why the definition given in paragraph 3 does not count. CH asked if CSL would be happy making the Panel's suggested amendments, including capitalising standalone network. TD responded that they do not think changing the formatting of the INC will make the definition clearer and makes it inconsistent with the rest of the INC. TL advised that capitalising defined terms in the IGT UNC and UNC is a common approach, hence the suggestion, although they acknowledged that the CSL INC is different. TD responded noting that the rationale for why standalone network was not capitalised was also due to the fact that the other capitalised terms are from the IGT UNC or UNC, and standalone network is not defined in there. They added that if the Panel or Workgroup want these changes to be made, it can be done, but they are against the suggested approach as Proposer for CSL01. CH responded that Panel's recommendation can be ignored if the Proposer wishes.

The Chair asked the Workgroup if they had any comments on the Panel's recommendation and the Proposer's wish for the legal text to not be altered. The Workgroup had no comments to add.

The Chair sought reassurance that Shippers would have sufficient clarity on how to supply gas to these meter points. TD responded that, given the very small number of such supply points, the applicable rules would be bespoke and clearly understood at an individual level. It was confirmed that gas supply in these cases would not take place via Gemini and would not fall under the UNC. TD explained that if the IGT UNC does not apply, then the UNC does not apply either, as it is not reached in the regulatory "chain of command", notwithstanding cross-references between the codes intended to promote uniformity.

TL advised that they would include this discussion within new versions of the Workgroup Report and Draft Modification Report for CSL01, which will be reviewed by the Panel at their April meeting.

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

As the Proposer for the Review Group, AB reminded the Workstream of the intent of the Review, explaining 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 "consolidation-ready".

AB suggested that the Workgroup review the RG008 tracker first, to review what had been identified so far. The Chair advised the Workgroup that the Code Administrator will publish the RG008 tracker every month so Workgroup members can review ahead of the meeting.

BM advised that they had taken a question away from the March Workstream meeting during the review of Part CI around what the Gas Distribution Networks (GDNs) do in terms of determining an Annual Quantity (AQ) for new domestic sites, instead of the NExA tables. They advised that where the Shipper has not provided an AQ, the GDNs do have a table for this that sits outside of the UNC. This table is reviewed and updated annually, similar to the NExA tables for IGTs. They suggested this information should be captured in the tracker, potentially to review in the future if these processes are merged as part of Code Consolidation. AB and TL agreed it was useful to record this as a “nuance” in the tracker, even if decisions on alignment sit outside the immediate scope of the review group, as it provides valuable context for future consolidation work.

The Chair highlighted that the UNC itself simply requires the AQ to be notified by the Shipper to the CDSP, with no default defined in-code, and that the GDN default table is only used in the absence of a shipper-provided AQ. In contrast, the IGT process relies on the NExA tables as the standard input rather than a fallback. CH indicated that IGTs would be reluctant to move away from NExA due to its wider use across multiple processes and suggested that any harmonisation might more logically involve GDNs moving towards the IGT approach. There was general agreement that a standardised process across networks would be desirable. The Chair also noted that shipper views are likely to be important on this topic and should be sought at a later stage, as no shippers were present in the discussion.

TL took the Workgroup through the RG008 tracker. They highlighted that there are two tabs: one focused specifically on IGT-specific nuances and differences identified through meetings and feedback, and a broader “umbrella” tab that captures all comments, issues, and observations received from across the work, including items not yet fully reviewed. TL added that they are using the tracker to log housekeeping and formatting issues, providing examples where redlined text from previous releases had not been cleaned up. Where changes are purely formatting or clearly within their remit, TL has already addressed them (for example, correcting text colour in the February release), logged the action, and intends to tick them off once resolved. They committed to flagging such changes in advance and ensuring stakeholders are comfortable with them.

The Workstream completed a collaborative review of IGT UNC Parts CII and CIII, with Members having had an action to review this Part ahead of the meeting to identify IGT and IGT UNC-specific provisions.

The Workstream identified the following IGT UNC nuances within Parts CII and CIII:

- AB highlighted Part CII Paragraph 1 which disapplies certain requirements in the IGT UNC relating to seasonal large supply points, particularly in the context of Daily Metered (DM) and seasonal Local Distribution Zone (LDZ) capacity. The reference relates to paragraph 7.5C of

Annex B3 of the UNC, which appears to deal specifically with seasonal large supply points. Their understanding is that it is a Gas Distribution Network (GDN)-specific concept. CH suggested that it is important to note the specific disapplication, the Chair agreed.

- BM highlighted a clause in Paragraph 1 relating to paragraph 4.2 of Annex B3 of the UNC, which they believe is in incorrect quotation marks, as the paragraph looks to be a statement within the Code rather than replacement text. The Chair and TL responded that they would look into this further.
- BM and AB identified shared Supply Meter Points and applicable commodity rates being referenced in Paragraph 2, which do not apply in the IGT UNC.
- BM noted in Paragraph 3, that there is a disapplication of a section relating to Non Central Switching Service (non-CSS) Supply Meter Points. TL responded that this will be important to check against the legal drafting for [IGT176](#), as this Modification will introduce non-CSS supply meter points into the IGT UNC.
- BM highlighted a potential housekeeping amendment in Paragraph 4, noting that there is a reference to Paragraph 5(c) of Annex B3 of the UNC which does not exist, and suggested that it means to refer to Paragraph 5.1(c).
- BM highlighted a potential housekeeping amendment in Paragraph 5, noting an incorrect reference in 5.1(b).
- BM queried in 5.2, whether the correct defined term should be “New Supply Meter Point” rather than “New Supply Point”. TL clarified that, under the definitions, a new Supply Point is any proposed Supply Point, and that this explicitly includes a New Supply Meter Point.
- BM noted in 5.2(a), Prevailing Supply Meter Point is capitalised, but is not a defined term in the UNC. TL confirmed that it is not a defined term in the IGT UNC either. AB noted that Prevailing is defined in the UNC. AB and TL agreed that it is likely that two defined terms, “Prevailing” and “Supply Meter Point”, have been pushed together. TL noted that the IGT UNC points to the UNC definition of Prevailing.
- AB noted the defined term Provisional Maximum Supply Point Capacity, and that there is a difference to the definition in the UNC. While the UNC definition refers to the NEXA, the IGT UNC definition refers to the LDZ CSEP Ancillary Agreement (LCAA).
- BM notes a reference to Annex B3, Paragraph 6.4 of the UNC in 5.4(b). They added that the referenced clause includes the word “Transporter” and asked if the IGT UNC needs to stipulate that Transporter means Large Transporter in this scenario, which has been done in other sections of the IGT UNC. BM noted a similar amendment to be made in 6.1
- BM queried in 5.5 whether firm DM Supply Point was a defined term. TL responded that they would check that, noting that firm Supply Point is a defined term.
- BM noted that from 5.5 to 5.10, there are a lot of differences between the UNC and IGT UNC, in relation to Ratchet. TL added that they have been looking into this area of Code for Xoserve in relation to a new UNC Modification that has been raised. AB noted that the only IGT UNC nuance in this section is 5.10, as it has been done in IGT UNC invoicing style. TL

noted that this area of Code may need checking as 5.5 – 5.10 differ in its wording compared to the UNC.

- AB asked about Interruptible Supply Points, a defined term mentioned in Part CIII Paragraph 1. The Chair advised that that they were historically used as a mechanism to support network security at capacity pinch points. Under the scheme, organisations could offer to curtail their gas usage, typically through an auction-like process where they set a price at which they were willing to give up gas supply. GDNs could then choose to interrupt those supplies if needed, particularly during capacity constraints. They added that interruptible supply was once common at known capacity pinch points but is now rarely used, primarily because networks have reinforced capacity in those areas. In relation to IGTs, these networks typically have newer infrastructure with capacity well in excess of demand, meaning the same constraints are unlikely to arise. BMU noted that, regardless of current usage, interruptible supply definitions and related provisions still exist in the UNC and therefore it would be sensible to retain the existing carve-out. The Chair agreed. AB noted that this had been a point of debate internally and suggested that its long-term value would likely need to be considered during future code consolidation, rather than resolved immediately.
- BM raised a query under 2.1 regarding why a registered user on an IGT network would be expected to provide certain details to the Large Transporter. The Chair explained that, for large sites, there is often a more complex, behind-the-scenes relationship between parties. They noted that arrangements such as tripartite or local agreements can exist between the registered user, the IGT, and the Large Transporter. While the site may sit on an IGT network, its operation can have impacts on the connected GDN, meaning the Large Transporter may need visibility of certain information.
- BM noted the definitions of Transco Nominated Interruptible (TNI) and Network Sensitive Load (NSL) in 2.2 but added that these are no longer defined terms in the UNC, and they could only find reference to them in the transition document. The Chair suggested that it would be good to gain more knowledge of the interruptible supply point scheme ahead of the next Workgroup meeting. BM responded that they would be happy to take an informal action to reach out to a network for more information.
- AB noted 3.1(e), noting that it appears to exclude liability for a range of factors relating to interruptible supply points. They were unsure whether this provision remains appropriate or needs updating, particularly given the ongoing uncertainty and earlier discussion around the current relevance and use of interruptible supply points.

BMU offered to reach out to TL and AB around further coordination to ensure that any work undertaken as part of RG008 is not left outdated by updates to the UNC. AB and TL both agreed that this would be useful. TL responded that if BMU lets them know of anything of value to be discussed in UNC Workgroups, they would be happy to attend those. BMU agreed to keep AB and TL updated.

The Workstream agreed to review Parts CIV and CV of the IGT UNC in the April Workstream meeting as part of the next step in the work for RG008.

Action 26/04 – 01: Ahead of the next Modification Workstream meeting on 14th May 2026, RG008 Members to consider Parts CIV and CV in support of the Phase One identification and logging IGT-specific provisions.

7. IGT181 - Revision of Virtual Last Resort User and Contingent Procurement of Supplier Demand Event Triggers

TL reminded the Workgroup that IGT181 seeks to enable [UNC0854](#), which was approved in May 2024, and this Modification seeks to align the IGT UNC with the UNC. TL explained that UNC0854 introduced the concept of a User Premises Termination Notice (UPTN) to address situations where a Supplier is subject to UK Government sanctions, which provides a mechanism to suspend a Supplier's Licence and trigger associated processes. IGT181 seeks to introduce the same concept into the IGT UNC, addressing a current gap in the Code. The Workgroup was advised that the current IGT UNC user default provisions do not explicitly capture sanctions-based scenarios and therefore do not provide sufficient protections or mechanisms to manage such events. It was noted that legal advice and Government sanctions cannot be relied upon as a trigger under the existing IGT UNC framework. As a result, a specific Code change is required to enable appropriate suspension and contingency arrangements to be applied in a manner that is legally robust and operationally effective.

TL took the Workgroup through the proposed legal text for IGT181. They added that the legal text primarily affects Parts CI, G and some definitions in Part M. TL explained that the changes are broadly split across these areas and are designed to ensure alignment with relevant UNC provisions, particularly around termination, insolvency, and Supplier of Last Resort (SoLR) arrangements.

To address gaps in how termination provisions currently operate, TL described the introduction of a new catch-all clause, 7.5 in Part G. This clause applies where a User Premises Termination Notice has been issued and ring-fences the application of relevant UNC provisions by reference. Because IGT UNC cannot directly reference National Gas Transmission (NGT), specific UNC paragraphs have been referenced to ensure the appropriate UNC provisions are applied. TL advised that the legal text has been annotated to show which business rules are being satisfied by each reference, showing a clear link between the intent of the Modification and the legal text.

For SoLR, TL explained that, unlike other areas where wide cross-references can be used, the IGT UNC contains a standalone SoLR section. As a result, equivalent UNC wording has been replicated rather than cross-referenced, with minor adjustments to reflect IGT context. Changes made to align Transporter Payment Default (TPD) provisions with the UNC have been highlighted, again using section-level UNC references rather than NGT-specific references.

TL also noted explicit exclusions where certain UNC provisions do not apply, including those relating to shared supply points, which are not permitted under IGT arrangements, and provisions referring to NTS supply points, which currently do not exist within the IGT framework.

KA outlined updates made to the business rules and solution section of the Modification to improve clarity and traceability. These included adding specific UNC references under each business rule so

stakeholders can clearly see which UNC provisions are being imported into the IGT UNC and why. Additional avoidance of doubt statements were included, particularly to clarify that UNC TPD G 4.8.125 does not currently apply to the IGT UNC because it relates to NTS supply point capacity, which is not presently an IGT concept.

The Chair asked about future NTS direct-connect supply points, particularly in light of IGT176, which has been approved and will enable bi-directional connections between IGT networks and the NTS. It was noted that proposed amendments to Part CI already introduce the concept of NTS supply meter points as a subset of non-CSS Supply Meter Points, meaning UNC 4.8.125 could become relevant once IGT176 is implemented. While such Supply Points do not exist today, the Chair and KA highlighted the importance of future-proofing the drafting if these sites are likely to materialise. TL agreed to note this and confirmed that the implementation of IGT176 is still pending system changes to the related XRN, with the implementation date not yet confirmed. The Workgroup agreed that definitions and applicability should be checked offline and, if necessary, addressed either through aligned implementation dates or a subsequent housekeeping or consequential Modification that could be implemented at the same time as IGT176 to ensure there is no gap in the governance.

KA clarified the application of the SoLR process, explaining that it is triggered in situations where the shipper and supplier are the same legal entity and both are sanctioned simultaneously. In such circumstances, Ofgem would be required to designate a supplier. They confirmed this scenario has now been explicitly addressed in the proposed solution through an avoidance of doubt statement.

Governance

KA suggested that the Workgroup discuss the preferred governance route for IGT181, noting that the Workgroup Report may need to be amended prior to completion at the May Workgroup meeting. TL noted that the Panel had a split view when voting on the Governance route for IGT181. They advised that the Proposer had opted for Self-Governance initially, due to the Modification looking to align the IGT UNC with UNC following the implementation of UNC0854, which has also been approved by Ofgem. TL explained that two Panel members had agreed with this rationale and voted for Self-Governance. They added that the other two Panel members had voted for IGT181 to be subject to an Authority Decision, as they felt enabling intervention in the event of a sanctioned Shipper would have an effect on competition, as well as ensuring that IGT181 is assessed as an individual Modification. TL advised that Panel would make the final decision on the Governance route, but were keen for the Workgroup to discuss this matter in further detail.

The Chair reiterated that IGT UNC Modifications must be assessed on a standalone basis, regardless of whether equivalent UNC changes have already been approved. CH noted that this was why they supported an Authority decision at Panel, even though the UNC equivalent Modification had already been directed.

The original rationale for proposing self-governance was discussed. UNC0854 had already been approved, and its report assumed IGT sites were included, leading to an assumption that the IGT

UNC modification would logically follow. However, KA acknowledged that, assessed independently, Authority decision may be more appropriate. They also highlighted concerns about timing and risk, noting that current geopolitical conditions might increase the likelihood of these provisions being needed, and that delayed approval could disadvantage IGTs.

The Chair observed that IGT181 could have a material impact on consumers, particularly where SoLR arrangements may be triggered, potentially undermining the self-governance criteria. AB highlighted potential competition considerations, though acknowledged this was finely balanced.

EO advised they was awaiting internal input due to Easter leave, but would aim to provide indicative feedback for Panel on views and likely timescales if an Authority decision was pursued.

The Workgroup agreed to discuss the governance route further when finalising the Workgroup Report next month. TL added that all views expressed will be clearly captured in the Workgroup Report, including Panel's earlier split decision and the rationale on both sides. It was noted that further clarity from Ofgem on likely timescales would materially assist Panel's decision. Parties were encouraged to reflect further and bring final positions to the next meeting.

TL confirmed that agreed tweaks would be incorporated ahead of the next meeting, that today's discussions (including those on NTS impacts) would be captured in the Workgroup Report, and that further clarification on IGT176 would be fed back once reviewed. The plan is to finalise the Workgroup Report at the next meeting and submit it to Panel, with any additional points identified in the meantime to be shared in advance or raised at that meeting.

STANDING ITEMS

8. Cross Code Modification Implications Tracker

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

Watch List

- [**0929 - Consideration of an Independent Gas Quality Expert under the Uniform Network Code \(UNC\)**](#). Raised to explore the requirement of an Independent Gas Quality Expert (IGQE) under the UNC. To determine the needs case for the implementation of such an expert exists, and to determine whether the implementation of such an expert would be beneficial to monitoring and providing impartial advice on matters relating to gas quality within the UNC.
- [**0928 - Enabling Amendment of Hydrogen Sulphide Limits in Network Entry Agreements**](#). This Modification enables National Gas Transmission (NGT) to amend a subset of Network Entry Agreements (NEAs) in which the hydrogen sulphide (H₂S) limit is written as 3.3 ppm, allowing those agreements to be updated to 3.46 ppm for the ten Delivery Facility Operators (DFOs) who have requested the change. The revised 3.46 ppm limit represents the

correct ppm expression of the Gas Safety (Management) Regulations (GS(M)R) statutory limit of 5 mg/m³. **No impact on the IGT UNC is anticipated.**

- [0927 - Moving the Market Participant Identity Verification Approach Document out of the UK Link Manual and into the CDSP Service Document – Contract Management Arrangements.](#) The Market Participant Identity Verification Approach Document (MPID VAD) is currently incorporated into the UK Link Manual, this Modification proposes to move the MPID VAD into the CDSP Service Document – Contract Management Arrangements as originally intended. **No impact on IGT UNC Code anticipated.** The CDSP Service Document changes will apply to CDSP Customers (including IGTs) via other arrangements under the UNC.
- [0926 - Maintenance criteria for Emergency Contact data held in Central Systems.](#) UNC TPD Q 1.14.1 outlines that the CDSP has an Agency Function to maintain a record of User emergency contact details. This Modification has been raised to outline the parameters in which the emergency contact details are maintained under TPD Q 1.14.1 and under what circumstances emergency contact details provided for Larger Supply Points below the AQ threshold (see UNC TPD Q 2.3) should be recorded and retained.

TL advised that they have reviewed the Modification and feels that there is a potential impact on IGT UNC if the parameters are to apply to IGT Supply Points. However, the legal drafting will need to be reviewed to confirm this. The Chair raised concern that emergency procedures, which have been highlighted in the Strategic Direction Statement and incorporated into the UNC, have not been mirrored in the IGT UNC. They expressed confusion as to why IGTs would be excluded, noting that IGT sites would reasonably be expected to participate in emergency arrangements such as load shedding, in the same way as UNC sites. TL agreed and explained that further analysis is needed to understand the gap. In particular, what provisions already exist in the IGT UNC around user emergency contact information and whether there are equivalent requirements that simply lack cross-references. They confirmed this work would be completed prior to UNC Panel.

- [0923 - Disapplication of TPD Section D7 \(DSR Options\) for 2026 only.](#) This Proposal seeks to temporarily remove the obligation on National Gas Transmission (NGT) to operate a tender process for pre-contracted Demand Side Response (DSR) which is otherwise triggered by the launch of an annual DSR Option Invitation to tender, typically during July. This removal is sought for 2026 only, hence in absence of any further change, the obligation would apply again from 2027.

TL advised that they have reviewed the Modification and feels that direct impacts unlikely, but any changes within TPD Section D7 that disapply and then re-apply the provisions will also automatically fall under the IGT UNC as Part K 46.1 states that the provisions of clauses 5, 7 and 8 of TPD Section D of the UNC shall apply with regards to Demand Side Response

arrangements. The Chair noted that this references the earlier discussion under RG008 regarding interruptible supply points.

- [**0922 - CDSP Obligations required for the introduction of the Gas Shipper Obligation.**](#)
The first meeting for this joint Workgroup is currently scheduled to be held on 23rd April 2026. BM advised that they are awaiting the publication of the related papers by DESNZ before this joint Workgroup can proceed. TL advised that in the event of a cancellation, they will work with the Joint Office to discuss alternate dates.
- [**0909 - Refining the Class 2 Individual Valid Meter Reading Requirement Performance Measures.**](#) A self-governance modification approved by UNC Panel, implementation date TBC by Xoserve (XRN 6001). Will be applied automatically to the IGT UNC.
- [**0907 – Extension to Current Maintenance Period.**](#) Issued to Authority for decision. No direct IGT UNC Code impact, but potential impact on IGTs.
- [**0896 - Reducing the current Code Cut-Off Date \(Line in the Sand\) from 3 to 4 years to 2 to 3 years.**](#) Implemented on 1st April 2026.
- [**0890 - Update to AQ Correction Processes - Request for Adjustments \(RFA\) AQ Change.**](#) XRN 5940 still showing implementation date as TBC.
- [**0886 - Amend the Code Cut-Off Date to a Rolling 3-Year Period.**](#) Implemented on 2nd April 2026.

IGT UNC Equivalent Modifications

- TL advised that the Code Administrator are in talks with a prospective Proposer for required equivalent IGT UNC Modifications for [UNC 0914 - Refining the Class 3 EUC1 read submission rules introduced through Modification 0700](#) and [UNC 0921 - Broadening the definition of the Data Permissions Matrix to align with disclosure of UK Link Gemini data.](#)

Live Review Groups:

- [**0925 - Improving Smart / Automated Meter Reading Acceptance Levels for use in Settlement.**](#) Review raised to explore the reasons that Smart / Automated Meter Readings (AMR) are not being loaded into Systems for use in Settlement Calculations. To determine if any Code adjustments would be beneficial to increase the volume of readings being loaded, thereby improving settlement accuracy and to propose solutions for this. TL advised that they expect the outputs of this review to impact the IGT UNC and would suggest that IGT UNC impacts be considered during the progressions of this review to ensure IGT UNC and UNC remains aligned where necessary. The IGT UNC Code Administrator will keep an eye on this Review.
- [**0924 - Review of UK retained EU Network Codes \(to enable the streamlining of UK retained EU Network Codes\).**](#) No expected IGT UNC Code impact at this time.

9. IGT UNC Known Issues Register

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

10. IGT UNC Horizon Scanner

TL advised that all of the current Ofgem publications linked to the Code Reform programme have been added to the Horizon Scanner. These changes had also been reflected in the Milestone Timeline sheet.

AOB

11. Authority Update

The Chair noted that Ofgem has published further documents since last month, including [the draft Strategic Direction Statement \(SDS\), which is currently out for consultation](#). They highlighted that the SDS sets expectations for work to be undertaken under the IGT UNC over the next two years, including how this will influence prioritisation of modifications. EO confirmed that the SDS consultation closes on 28 May 2026, encouraging participants to review the document and submit responses if they wish to influence its direction.

TL flagged [a separate consultation issued at the end of March on the update to the IGT relative price control](#), with a closing date of 22 May 2026, noting its relevance to IGTs, Shippers, and other stakeholders.

EO advised that Ofgem will be holding a webinar on 23 April (10:00–11:15) to provide an update on the Energy Code Reform Programme, explaining what recent publications mean in practice and how industry can prepare. A potential timing clash was noted with a planned UNC Distribution Workgroup meeting, as well as the UNC 0922/IGT180 Joint Workgroup meeting (pending cancellation) and the Chair confirmed this would be discussed with the Joint Office to see whether timings could be adjusted.

The next Workgroup meeting is scheduled for Thursday 14th May 2026.

Annex 1 – Actions Table

Reference	Action	Owner	Status
26/03 - 01	<i>Ahead of the next Modification Workstream meeting on 9th April 2026, RG008 Members to consider Parts CII and CIII in support of the Phase One identification and logging IGT-specific provisions.</i>	All	Closed
26/04 - 01	Ahead of the next Modification Workstream meeting on 14th May 2026, RG008 Members to consider Parts CIV and CV in support of the Phase One identification and logging IGT-specific provisions.	All	Open