IGT UNC Modification Panel Meeting

Draft Minutes

Friday 29th May 2026

Via teleconference

Attendee	Initials	Organisation	Representing	Notes
Anne Jackson	AJ	Talan	Code Administrator	Chair
Catherine Fearon	CF	ES Pipelines	Observer	Proposer for IGT181 Present for Item 6 only
Cher Harris	CH	Indigo Pipelines	Panel Member: Pipeline Operators	
Ellie Osobina	EO	Ofgem	Authority	
Harry Davis	HD	CSL	Observer	Present for Item 5 only
Jenny Rawlinson	JR	BUUK	Panel Member: Pipeline Operators	
Lydia Bentley	LB	Talan	Code Administrator	
Oorlagh Chapman	OC	Centrica	Panel Member: Pipeline Users	Alternate for Lee Greenwood Proposer for IGT183 Present for Items 1-6 only
Tim Davis	TD	CSL	Observer	Proposer for CSL01 Present for Item 5 only
Harry Firth	HF	Talan	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 received prior to the start of the meeting from Graeme Forbes (GF) (Code Administrator), Lee Greenwood (LG) (Centrica), Paul McKie (PM) (Joint Office), Richard Welsby (RW) (Last Mile Gas) and Talia Lattimore (TL) (Code Administrator). It was noted that Oorlagh Chapman (OC) would be acting as LG's alternate.

2. Confirmation of Agenda

The Chair confirmed the items for discussion as outlined in the final agenda. The Panel were invited to add any items for Any Other Business (AOB). No items were raised.

3. Approval of the previous minutes (26-04 and 26-04 Reconvened)

The CA invited comments on the April 2026 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 was one outstanding action:

26/04 – 01: EO to raise awareness of RG008 to Ofgem Code Reform Programme and provide any received feedback to the Panel. EO read the following statement to the Panel:

"We're [Ofgem] aware of RG008 and recognise the work that the IGT UNC Workgroup has been doing so far. The Code Review Tracker and latest Review Proposal Request provide a helpful overview of the scope and progress.

We don't have any objections to the work continuing and expect that it will lead to some useful improvements to current arrangements. As we move forward with code reform and code consolidation, we'll be looking to bring greater alignment across codes, including harmonising some processes. We'll be targeting a number of areas in the UNC and IGT UNC for rationalisation and simplification during the initial Ofgem-led phase of consolidation.

This does mean there's a chance that some areas of the Review group work may overlap with, or be superseded by, changes introduced through code reform. While we'll take into account differences between the existing codes during code consolidation, certain processes and provisions will change as part of the move to the new governance framework.

It may therefore be helpful for the workgroup to review the decisions set out in the first and second implementation consultations, which outline the direction of travel for consolidation and the areas where change is expected.

We'll be continuing to develop detailed policy proposals through engagement with code administrators and wider industry, which will then be subject to consultation. This should create an opportunity for the Review group's work to help inform our policy development."

JR welcomed the statement, and the recognition from Ofgem of the useful work currently being undertaken in preparation for Code consolidation via RG008. They noted that one of the main purposes of RG008 is to identify all current nuances in Code for IGTs that are different from Gas Distribution Networks (GDNs) and advised it will be important for Ofgem to note these nuances and understand that there will not be able to be complete operational and regulatory alignment through the Unified Gas Network Code (UGNC). EO agreed that this is an important point and Ofgem will work with all relevant stakeholders to ensure no processes or nuances are lost through the Code consolidation process.

Action closed.

Modification Business

5. [CSL01 - Exclusion of Standalone Networks from IGT UNC]

LB took the Panel through the Final Modification Report (FMR) and consultation responses. LB 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 (as defined within the Modification).

Consultation

LB advised that three consultation responses had been received. Two responses received from IGTs expressed positive views on the Modification, whilst the third, received from the National Energy System Operator (NESO) had been neutral. The supporting responses agreed that disapplying the IGT UNC for standalone networks is appropriate and pragmatic, as those networks do not interact with the wider system, the approach allows for bespoke arrangements that better reflect operational and commercial realities and CSL01 delivers positive impacts against Objectives (D) and (F), including minimising impacts on other code parties, improving cost targeting, and supporting efficient and proportionate regulation. The neutral response acknowledged that the Modification could remove unnecessary regulatory barriers but remained neutral because standalone arrangements sit outside the broader network code framework and NESO felt they could not fully assess impacts on consumer protection, charging, safety, or settlement, and therefore could not take a definitive position. All responses agreed that the Modification should be subject to an Authority decision, that the legal text delivers the intent of the solution, and that they had not identified any additional impacts or costs. The two IGT responses were supportive of the implementation approach, and that the Modification should be implemented, whilst NESO remained neutral.

The Panel had no comments on the consultation responses provided, although CH reiterated their previous concerns that the creation of the precedent of disapplying standalone networks from the IGT UNC might be used as a loophole by other parties in the future.

Governance

LB advised that the Proposer, Workgroup and consultation responses had all supported that CSL01 be subject to an Authority Decision. The Panel agreed with the recommended governance route for CSL01.

Prioritisation

TD as Proposer suggested that CSL01 should have a standard prioritisation category, as it does not achieve any of the criteria required for it to be a high prioritisation Modification. The Chair added that this means no alignment to the Strategic Direction Statement (SDS), and the Modification has a low level of complexity and importance. The Panel agreed with the standard prioritisation category for CSL01.

<u>Impacts</u>

LB advised that the Proposer, Workgroup and consultation responses had indicated no impacts to a Significant Code Review (SCR) or other industry change projects. The Panel agreed that there are no impacts.

LB advised that the Proposer, Workgroup and consultation responses had identified positive consumer impacts, including reduced environmental damage and broader benefits for society and had identified both positive and neutral impacts on lower bills for consumers, as existing consumers would not be impacted, only new consumers on a standalone network would be positively impacted. The Panel had no comments on the identified consumer impacts.

LB advised that the Proposer, Workgroup and consultation responses had not identified any cross-Code impacts. The Panel agreed.

LB advised that the Proposer, Workgroup and consultation responses had identified positive environmental impacts as a standalone network would support increased biomethane production, supporting net zero by displacing fossil fuel usage. The Panel agreed with the identified environmental impacts.

LB noted that for the Relevant Objectives, the Proposer, Workgroup and two of three consultation responses had identified positive impacts on Objectives (D) – Securing of effective competition and (F) – Promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Code. They added that the third consultation response from NESO had indicated a neutral impact on these Objectives. The Panel unanimously agreed that CSL01 has a positive impact on the Relevant Objectives (D) and (F).

<u>Implementation</u>

LB advised that with no systems or process changes required, the implementation can be immediate once the proposal is accepted and could be implemented as part of an Extraordinary Release or a scheduled Release. LB added that although there will be no change to the IGT UNC Code itself, any changes to an INC will have to be published by the CA and notice of the formal implementation date given in the same way it would be for an IGT UNC Modification.

LB noted that the Workgroup had agreed on an implementation approach of one working day after the 15-day working day appeal has ended following Ofgem's published decision.

The Panel had no comments and agreed with the proposed implementation approach for CSL01.

<u>Legal Text</u>

LB noted that the Panel had previously sent back the CSL01 Workgroup Report to the IGT UNC Workgroup to determine whether the term standalone network should be formally defined within the CSL INC. They noted that the Workgroup Report had been sent back to Panel at the next meeting, with no change to the Modification legal text. JR responded that they had initially supported adding a definition, but, following discussion, accepted that the solution being ring-fenced within the CSL INC was appropriate. They noted a potential future risk that similar concepts could be extended into the main Code but was satisfied that this could be managed through due diligence. CH agreed, noting that the Modification is clear and fit for purpose, while highlighting the need to ensure that future Modifications do not inadvertently create loopholes or unintended precedents. OC added that their position had changed since the last Panel meeting and was comfortable with the Modification and legal text.

Determinations

The Panel considered the CSL01 FMR and unanimously agreed:

- that CSL01 does not have an impact on any SCRs or other industry projects;
- that CSL01 is an Authority Direction Modification Proposal;
- that CSL01 should be treated as Standard Priority;
- that CSL01 will have a positive impact on Objectives (D) and (F);
- with the proposed implementation approach; and
- that the legal text delivers the intention of the solution.

The Panel unanimously agreed to recommend:

- that CSL01 should be implemented.

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

LB took the Panel through the Workgroup Report and Draft Modification Report (DMR). LB noted that IGT181 mirrors UNC 0854, which was approved in May 2024, and this Modification seeks to align the IGT UNC with the UNC. LB 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.

LB took the Panel through the proposed solution. They advised that IGT181 will be implemented in two different phases due to a dependency on IGT176 - Changes to IGT UNC to enable UNC0887 'Facilitating Bi-Directional Connections Between IGT Pipelines and the NTS'. Parts of the IGT181 solution refer only to NTS Supply Points, which will be introduced into the IGT UNC when IGT176 is implemented. However, the Proposer and Xoserve are keen to see the rest of the solution implemented as soon as possible into the IGT UNC, to provide protection for IGTs. This part of the solution will be implemented as soon as possible as the first phase, whilst the second phase will go live in the IGT UNC along with IGT176. If IGT176 is implemented prior to IGT181, both phases will be implemented at the same time. The Panel had no comments on the proposed solution.

LB went over the Workgroup discussions on IGT181. Key points that were raised in Workgroup meetings included the situation when a User's sanction is lifted, and it was determined that this was outside of the scope for IGT181 and UNC 0854, but an urgent Modification could be raised to address this should this unlikely scenario arise. There was also discussion on the scenario where the Shipper and Supplier were both the same sanctioned entity.

LB noted that extensive discussion had taken place on the governance route for IGT181, noting that the Panel had been split during the initial assessment of the Modification. While some Workgroup members supported Authority Determination due to the need to assess the Modification independently of the UNC, others favoured Self-Governance but raised concerns around timing, geopolitical risks, and potential urgency. The Chair noted that the Modification could have material consumer impacts, particularly where supplier of last resort arrangements are triggered, which may challenge the self-governance criteria. Competition considerations were also highlighted.

LB noted that in a previous Workgroup meeting, Ofgem had advised that they were waiting on internal feedback and would provide Panel with their views on the Modification governance route ahead of their final determination. EO provided an updated view from Ofgem. They advised that the final decision on governance would be up to Panel, but Ofgem's feeling is that IGT181 could remain a Self-Governance modification at present. Ofgem will be reviewing the consultation responses to see whether the respondents highlight any issues or concerns, which may change their perspective on the governance question. The Chair and Panel thanked EO for providing Ofgem's view on the governance route, as this will be useful during future deliberations.

The Panel acknowledged that the Workgroup had thoroughly discussed IGT181 and had no further comments to add on the discussions, phased implementation approach or solution.

<u>Governance</u>

LB went through the Workgroup discussions on the governance route and advised that a range of views had been heard, but no consensus had been reached. JR voiced their support for the Modification to progress as Self-Governance for now, with the potential to revisit this after the consultation had closed, aligning with Ofgem's statement. OC and CH agreed.

The Chair asked if it would be sensible to include a specific question in the consultation on governance, allowing Ofgem and the Panel to directly view the views of the responses on the optimal governance route for IGT181. The Panel agreed that an extra question should be included within the consultation.

Prioritisation

The Chair advised that the Proposer had determined that IGT181 does not align with the SDS and is deemed to be of low complexity and importance. Therefore, IGT181 should be categorised as a standard priority Modification. The Panel unanimously agreed with the Proposer's view.

POST-MEETING NOTE: *OC left the meeting at this point having provided their vote on the remaining IGT 181 Panel determination matters. As no new elements or issues were raised over and above that documented in the DMR, the Chair included their vote in the determination for the Modification. Views expressed by the Panel from this point in the meeting were made by CH and JR only.*

Impacts

LB advised that the Proposer and Workgroup had indicated no impacts to a SCR or other industry change projects. The Panel agreed that there are no impacts.

LB advised that the Proposer and Workgroup had identified positive consumer impacts, including lower bills for consumers, as this Modification would enable National Gas Transmission (NGT) to secure additional gas supplies at lower than usual costs, and benefits for society as a whole. The Panel had no comments on the identified consumer impacts.

LB advised that the Proposer and Workgroup had not identified any cross-Code impacts. The Panel agreed.

LB advised that the Proposer and Workgroup had not identified any environmental impacts. The Panel agreed.

LB noted that for the Relevant Objectives, the Proposer and Workgroup had identified a positive impact on Objective (F), as this Modification will further align the IGT UNC with the UNC the Panel unanimously agreed with the views on the Relevant Objectives for IGT181.

Implementation

The Panel unanimously agreed with the proposed phased implementation approach, with the first phase being implemented following the 15-day Appeal Window, and the second phase being implemented alongside IGT176.

Legal Text

LB took the Panel through the proposed legal text, noting that the drafting primarily impacts IGT UNC Parts C, G, and I, as well as definitions in Part M. The amendments were structured to align with relevant UNC provisions, particularly in relation to termination, insolvency, and Supplier of Last Resort

(SoLR) arrangements, while ensuring compatibility with the IGT UNC where direct cross-referencing is not possible.

To address gaps in existing arrangements, a new "catch-all" clause (7.5 in IGT UNC Part G) was introduced to apply where a UPTN has been issued, ensuring appropriate UNC provisions are applied via referenced paragraphs. The legal text was designed to clearly map to the business rules, with annotations and explicit UNC references included to improve traceability and stakeholder understanding. In areas such as SoLR, where the IGT UNC operates standalone provisions, UNC drafting was replicated with appropriate adjustments rather than directly cross-referenced. Explicit exclusions were also included where certain UNC provisions (e.g. relating to shared supply points) do not apply within the IGT UNC.

LB also noted Workgroup discussions on future-proofing considerations, particularly in relation to IGT176 and anticipated changes to supply point arrangements. It was agreed that any remaining definitional or applicability issues could be addressed via aligned implementation or, if required, a subsequent housekeeping Modification. A specific scenario involving a Shipper and Supplier being the same sanctioned entity was confirmed as now explicitly covered in the solution.

The Panel had no comments on the legal text or Workgroup discussions and agreed that the legal text achieved the intent of the solution.

Determinations:

The Panel unanimously agreed to:

- Send IGT181 out for industry consultation for a period of 15 working days.

7. IGT183 - Maintenance criteria for Emergency Contact data held in Central Systems

CH and JR suggested that although the Modification Proposer (or their representative) was not present and they were the only Panel members present, they were happy to proceed with an initial review of IGT183, focusing on whether the Modification is sufficiently clear and suitable for Workgroup assessment, rather than making any substantive decisions. The Chair expressed preference for broader attendance, particularly as there were no Shipper representatives present, but noted that this Panel meeting had already been rescheduled due to a lack of quoracy, and were happy for the Panel to proceed, primarily not to delay sending IGT183 to the Workgroup for further assessment. It was noted that UNC 0926 was still in development, with a final decision expected in August. LB added that the proposed timeline for IGT183 would see the Workgroup Report sent to Panel in August, so the Panel members should be aware of the final decision on UNC 0926 before IGT183 is sent out for consultation.

LB provided the Panel with an introduction of the Modification. They noted that IGT183 intends to improve the accuracy and maintenance of emergency contact details for large supply points. There is a current industry problem that existing contact information is often unreliable, which creates risks where sites need to be contacted urgently—whether for safety-related gas incidents or demand-side response actions—potentially limiting the ability to reduce gas load when required. IGT183 will look to replicate in the IGT UNC similar changes in the UNC proposed by UNC 0926.

CH raised a concern regarding terminology. They noted that a UNC definition has been used in the Modification Proposal Form, “User Emergency Contacts”, and advised that this should be amended to align with IGT UNC terminology, as IGTs would assume “User” refers to a Shipper, whereas in the UNC, “User” refers to the Consumer. The Chair responded that this would be fed back to the Proposer.

JR raised a potential issue regarding references to interruptible supply points, noting that there are currently no interruptible sites under the IGT UNC and questioning the relevance of including such provisions in the Modification. They suggested this may simply have been carried over from the equivalent UNC Modification. The Chair clarified that, while no interruptible sites currently exist, the governance framework for interruptible arrangements remains within the Code. Both agreed that, although the impact may be minimal, it would be worthwhile to confirm whether the provisions are still relevant and accurate and agreed that this point should be raised as a question for the Workgroup to review and clarify.

Governance

LB advised that the Proposer had supported IGT183 being subject to Self-Governance. The Panel unanimously agreed.

Prioritisation

The Chair advised that the Proposer had determined that IGT183 does not align with the Strategic Direction Statement and is deemed to be of low complexity and importance. Therefore, IGT183 should be categorised as a standard priority Modification. The Panel unanimously agreed with the Proposer’s view.

Determinations

The Panel unanimously agreed to:

- Send IGT183 to the IGT UNC Workgroup for further assessment.

8. Harmonised Prioritisation Process in the Industry Codes

The Chair provided an overview of Ofgem’s requirement for all Codes to introduce a formal Modification prioritisation process. They advised that as part of this harmonised process, all current and future Modifications will have to be given a prioritisation category of high or standard. To be considered for high priority, the Modification must meet all of the three criteria: alignment with the Strategic Direction Statement, high complexity and high importance.

The Chair advised that the Panel must categorise all live IGT UNC Modifications to high or standard prioritisation. They added that CSL01, IGT181 and IGT183 had already been categorised as part of earlier Panel business, so there was only [IGT180 - CDSP Obligations required for the introduction of the Gas Shipper Obligation] left to consider.

The Chair noted that DESNZ have put IGT180 on hold until further notice. The Chair and JR discussed that although the Gas Shipper Obligation is included within the proposed Strategic Direction Statement, IGT180 itself is a preparatory Modification for the benefit of the CDSP, rather than introducing the obligation into the IGT UNC itself. JR added that they do not believe IGT180 is of high complexity or importance. CH agreed. The Panel unanimously agreed to categorise IGT180 as a standard prioritisation Modification.

Updates from Workgroup

9. Workgroup Summary Report

The Panel reviewed the Workgroup Summary Report and had no questions or comments to add.

Authority Updates

10. Authority Update

EO provided the following updates from the Authority:

- "On 28 April, we published Energy Code Reform – decision on statutory consultation on Modifications to industry codes to implement the harmonised code Modification prioritisation process. This publication sets out our decision in response to stakeholder feedback on our policy proposals, proposed guidance document, and proposed code text changes. It also details our decision for the policy to become effective in the relevant codes from 29 May 2026. We have also published the guidance here, which has come into effect from 29 May 2026: [Establishing a harmonised prioritisation process in the Industry Codes: statutory consultation | Ofgem]. Any future updates to the guidance will be made on this page.

- On 2 April we published two consultations as part of energy code reform programme:
    - Consultation on the draft second preliminary Strategic Direction Statement (SDS) for industry codes.
    - Phase 1: transitional measures and code changes consultation.

IGT | UNC

Consultation on the draft second preliminary SDS for industry Codes:

This second preliminary SDS builds on the first version published in 2025. It retains the overall structure and approach, reflecting stakeholder feedback, providing an updated assessment on the policies and sector developments which may require code changes.

Through this consultation, we are seeking views on:

- the proposed content of the SDS, including our categorisation of policy areas against three different time horizons ('act now', 'think and plan' and 'listen and wait'),
- whether any key areas that will or may require code changes are missing from our assessment, and
- our proposed approach to convert this SDS from a preliminary document to a hybrid document once certain codes are designated later in 2026.

This consultation closed on 28 May 2026. We expect to publish the second preliminary Strategic Direction Statement in September 2026.

[Consultation on the draft second preliminary Strategic Direction Statement for industry codes | Ofgem]

The Energy code reform phase 1: transitional measures and code changes consultation document

This document is the "Modification proposal consultation" as previously signposted in our second implementation consultation. It sets out the steps we need to take to be ready to transition to the new governance framework for the phase 1 codes, the Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC) and the Retail Energy Code (REC).

This work is needed alongside the work on the template code text for the new code Modification process and set up of the stakeholder advisory forum (SAF), as well as the standard licence conditions in our recent publications, so that we can be ready to make the decision on designation of the phase 1 codes and granting the first code manager licences before the end of 2026.

This consultation:

- sets out on our proposed approach to key changes needed to the BSC and REC code texts
- includes proposed licence revocation terms as well as amended licence conditions for the phase 1 code manager candidates.

The phase 1 consultation closed on 15 May 2026. Following this, we plan to publish further statutory consultations to amend the REC/BSC code texts or the code manager licence conditions so that we can transition to the new governance framework this year as smoothly as possible.

[Energy code reform phase 1: transitional measures and code changes | Ofgem]

- On 23 March, the government and Ofgem published a joint response, to our May 2025 consultation (Energy code reform: Code manager licence conditions and code Modification appeals to the CMA). The consultation response sets out a series of decisions to proceed with the majority of proposals on the code manger standard licence conditions and on updates to the code Modification appeals process to the CMA as set out in the consultation.

DRAFT

[Energy code reform: Code manager licence conditions and code modification appeals to the CMA - GOV.UK]

- We started the code manager selection process for the phase 2 codes, via the publication of an open call for expressions of interest on 26 January 2026 (closing on 20 March 2026). After the conclusion of this process, we expect to be able to publish a decision in Q2 2026 on both candidate eligibility and our determination between competitive versus non-competitive selection for these two codes. The successful candidate(s) would then be invited to participate in a licensing assessment process, with a proposal to grant a licence expected to follow towards the end of 2026."

11. Ofgem's Expected Decision Dates (EDD)

EO advised that there are no IGT UNC Modifications currently awaiting an Authority decision on the EDD table.

AOB

12. Code Consolidation Update

JR advised that the Xoserve-Encodar-Talan partnership recently gave an update on their proposal to become the licensed Code Manager of the UGNC at the latest Independent Networks Association (INA) meeting. The partnership advised that they will be undertaking further stakeholder engagement and intend to establish a dedicated stakeholder group to support the work, with a focus on structured cross-industry engagement. This group is expected to include representatives from Xoserve and Encodar, as well as Shippers, IGTs, GDNs and potentially transmission stakeholders.

13. Extraordinary May 2026 IGT UNC Release

HF advised that an extraordinary IGT UNC release had gone live as of 5am on 29th May. This release was linked to the Authority-directed implementation of the harmonised prioritisation criteria across all Industry Codes, by Ofgem under the powers of the Energy Act 2023. As part of the release, updates have been made to the IGT UNC website and some external-facing documents. This includes the Modification Register, which is now available as a downloadable Excel document on the website.

14. June 2026 IGT UNC Release

HF advised that the pre-release code for the upcoming IGT UNC release on 26th June has been published on the IGT UNC website. There is one Modification set to be implemented in this release, IGT174 – Update of IGT UNC Code Communication Methods. There are minor changes to the IGT UNC Code and other ancillary documents to replace any references to fax with an alternate communication method (email).

15. IGT UNC Panel Membership

The Chair informed the Panel that Lee Greenwood had resigned their membership from Panel, and this will be effective from 1st July. They advised that it is not ideal to currently not have a Shipper representative on the IGT UNC Panel in the long term. They added that the CA have received one Shipper nomination but added that it is too early in the process to identify the nominated individual. The Chair added that the CA have intermittently advertised the vacant Shipper Panel roles to their distribution list and will continue to do so.

JR asked if the nominated Shipper would step in from the beginning of July to ensure there is no gap from Lee Greenwood's resignation. The Chair responded that they would not be able to say until the closing date for nominations on 9th June. They added that in the event of more than three Shipper nominations, an election would need to be held, which would delay any appointment, although this was deemed unlikely.

The Chair discussed with Panel members the ongoing struggle to get Shippers to engage with IGT UNC meetings. They noted that in some recent Workgroup meetings, they have had to state there is no Shipper present when Modifications are being assessed, particularly for Modifications that will be subject to an Authority decision. CH responded that they believe it is more of an industry-wide issue, that Shippers engage less with other stakeholders than previously, potentially down to smaller regulatory teams. The Chair added that if any party finds a Shipper willing to step up to a role on the IGT UNC Panel, the CA would be very keen to meet with them.

JR asked if it would be useful for the Panel Membership term dates to be published on the IGT UNC website. The Chair responded that this is a good idea.

26/05 – 01: Code Administrator to publish IGT UNC Panel Membership term dates on the IGT UNC website

16. IGT UNC June 2026 Panel Meeting Date

The Chair advised that CH and JR have both informed the CA that they are unable to attend the next scheduled IGT UNC Panel meeting on Friday 26th June. The Chair added that a potential replacement date of Tuesday 30th June would not work for them due to a meeting clash with the REC Performance Assurance Board. They suggested a time on Wednesday 1st July. CH and JR responded that they would be able to attend a meeting in the afternoon of 1st July. HF confirmed that there would be no clashes with other industry meetings on that date. The Chair advised that they would write to the other Panel members to see whether this proposed meeting date would work. They noted that Lee Greenwood's Panel membership would have finished by then, so they would contact the nominated Shipper for their availability.

The next IGT UNC Panel meeting is scheduled for Wednesday 1st July 2026.

DRAFT

Annex 1 – Actions Table

Reference	Action	Owner	Status
26/04 – 01	*EO to raise awareness of RG008 to Ofgem Code Reform Programme and provide any received feedback to the Panel*	*EO*	*Closed*
26/05 - 01	Code Administrator to publish IGT UNC Panel Membership term dates on the IGT UNC website	Code Administrator	Open

DRAFT