

IGT UNC 26-06 Modification Workstream Meeting

Draft Minutes

Thursday 11th June 2026 via Teleconference

Attendee	Initial	Organisation	Notes
Anne Jackson	AJ	Talan	Chair
Aleksis Butler	AB	BUUK	Proposer for RG008
Alice Pigott	AP	Ofgem	
Ben Mitchell	BM	Xoserve	
Cher Harris	CH	Indigo Pipelines	
Ellie Osobina	EO	Ofgem	
Freya Dobson	FD	Ofgem	
Helen Gilbert	HG	NESO	
Kathryn Adeseye	KA	Xoserve	
Oorlagh Chapman	OC	Centrica	Proposer for IGT183
Olivia Down	OD	Ofgem	
Richard Welsby	RW	Last Mile Gas	
Stuart Monk	SM	Xoserve	
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 no apologies received prior to the meeting.

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. No further items were raised.

3. Approval of the Previous Minutes 26-05

HF noted that no comments on the minutes of the previous meeting had been raised ahead of the meeting. The Workgroup had no comments to add to 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:

26/05 – 01: Ahead of the next Modification Workstream meeting on 11th June 2026, RG008 Members to consider Part L of the IGT UNC in support of the Phase One identification and

logging IGT-specific provisions. Part L was 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. [IGT183 - Maintenance criteria for Emergency Contact data held in Central Systems](#)

KA introduced the Modification to the Workgroup. They advised that this is an equivalent Modification to [UNC 0926](#), aligning the IGT UNC with the UNC to establish clear rules on how Consumer emergency contact data should be maintained, retained, and handled. Currently, neither Code includes clarity on the above, only that this data must be provided for Large Firm Supply Points and Interruptible Supply Points.

KA added that key elements of the proposed solution include clarifying the Central Data Services Provider's (CDSP) role in maintaining Consumer emergency contact data, not just Pipeline User data. Part I Clause 8 will be updated to include detailed business rules for data maintenance, whilst provisions incorporating Interruptible Supply Points will be simplified and moved into Clause 8 from Part I Clause 9. The new rules will be consistent across Large Firm Supply Points and Interruptible Supply Points, and changes will be applied to National Gas Transmission (NGT) Supply Points, ahead of being introduced into the IGT UNC via [IGT176 - Changes to IGT UNC to enable UNC0887 'Facilitating Bi-Directional Connections Between IGT Pipelines and the NTS'](#).

KA advised the Workgroup of some of the specific scenarios which these new rules are proposed for, including when a site ceases to be a Large Firm Supply Point, meaning emergency Consumer contact data is no longer mandatory, with clarification needed on whether and how long this data should be retained in this instance. Other scenarios include when the data is submitted for a non-mandatory site, following Supply Point changes, or when the data becomes outdated, clarifying how this data should be handled, maintained or deleted. KA added that IGT183 will also introduce a maximum number of contacts of five per site, to be standardised across all site types. TL noted that a minor clarification may be required in the legal text to reflect a change in the IGT UNC as part of the upcoming June release to remove a reference to fax.

KA advised that the Proposer has put forward IGT183 as a Self-Governance Modification, noting it is unlikely to have a material impact on competition for Shipping, Transportation, Supply of Gas or any other connected commercial activities. They noted that UNC 0926 is also being progressed as a Self-Governance Modification.

KA advised that the Proposer has suggested that IGT183 be given a Standard Prioritisation Category. They added that IGT183 does not closely align with the Strategic Direction Statement (SDS) and is not a high risk or critical Modification which requires a faster timeline.

KA took the Workgroup through the proposed Business Rules in the Modification's solution. They noted that Business Rule 1 addresses change of Supply Point events. Where a site remains within

the mandatory criteria, but the incoming Shipper does not submit emergency contact data, the existing data is retained within UK Link for use by the network only (i.e. not visible to the new Shipper). This reflects current practice but is being made more explicit in Code, particularly for Central Switching Service (CSS) Supply Points, where confirmations cannot be blocked.

Business Rule 2 sets out data retention parameters. Data must be retained while the site meets mandatory criteria. Data may also be retained in two specific scenarios: for up to 12 months where a site is expected to become mandatory or if a site ceases to meet the mandatory criteria. If the site does not become mandatory during this period, the data must be deleted. KA added that there is a proposed re-verification process where data held for 36 months without update would trigger a request to shippers to confirm accuracy, likely via a Data Services Contract (DSC) service rather than being codified.

Business Rule 3 focuses on harmonising discrepancies between Part I Clauses 8 and 9:

- Removing irrelevant requirements (e.g. registered office details from emergency contacts) and relocating them where appropriate.
- Consolidating duplicated or overlapping clauses, with Clause 8 becoming the primary section for both Large Firm and Interruptible Supply Points.
- Introducing consistent definitions (e.g. “Relevant Supply Point”) and aligning operational rules (e.g. maximum number of contacts across all sites).
- Clarifying that Connected System Exit Points (CSEPs) can fall under either category and be subject to mandatory requirements.

Business Rule 4 is a housekeeping change, removing outdated Annual Quantity (AQ) references following the move to a rolling AQ regime post-Nexus.

Business Rule 5 clarifies the CDSP’s agency role, explicitly confirming responsibility for maintaining both Pipeline User and Consumer emergency contact data.

The Chair suggested it was essential for the UNC and IGT UNC Modifications to remain aligned, given they deal with the same subject matter. KA confirmed that alignment is critical, primarily because the changes relate to personal data, requiring consistent, transparent handling across both codes.

An update was provided on UNC 0926 progress, noting the Modification has been delayed and is expected to receive a one-month extension, with a further Workgroup scheduled for 25 June. KA reiterated that the intent is for both Modifications to remain effectively identical, with the same Business Rules applied. If issues are identified in either Workgroup, there is an expectation that both Modifications would be updated accordingly, although this becomes more complex if one Modification progresses further. The progression of UNC 0926 (and any final changes) will influence the IGT UNC timetable.

TL took the Workgroup through the proposed timetable for IGT183. They advised that the plan is for the Modification to come to two further Workgroup meetings, with the legal text to be reviewed in July and the Workgroup Report to be completed in August., before reporting back to Panel later that month. TL added that this will depend on the progression of UNC 0926.

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”.

TL took the Workgroup through the RG008 spreadsheet. AB suggested introducing a new tab to track consequential actions, such as Modifications arising from RG008 work. This prompted a wider discussion on how the Workgroup should act on such findings. There was agreement that Workgroup members should identify and document issues and gaps but also consider when to raise formal Modifications. AB added that Modifications should not be raised excessively or in isolation; instead, related issues should be grouped together where possible to improve efficiency. They added that housekeeping changes should be consolidated into a single, larger Modification at a later stage to minimise administrative burden.

OC suggested that a structured and staged approach is needed to avoid repeatedly opening and closing code sections, ensuring each area is reviewed comprehensively before progressing. AB agreed

TL proposed reviewing identified actions offline with AB to compile potential Modifications, with the Workgroup to decide at a future meeting when and how to progress them. The Chair emphasised the need to balance consolidation with transparency, ensuring external parties can still follow and understand the changes.

AB noted that a potentially missing paragraph had been highlighted during the review of Part CIV. BM advised that Xoserve had taken an informal action on CSS Synchronisation Messages, per UNC Section G 7.5.2. BM confirmed that the CDSP do send these messages for IGT sites, suggesting that this paragraph has been omitted from the IGT UNC. The Chair asked whether this was as a result of a numbering change in the UNC clause, causing an incorrect reference in the IGT UNC. BM responded that G7.5.2 had been noted as a difference between the equivalent Part/Sections in the IGT UNC and UNC, and the informal action had been taken to determine why this clause has been omitted from the IGT UNC.

The Workstream identified the following IGT UNC nuances within Part L:

- TL advised that in Clause 1, the IGT UNC references Standard Condition 9(5) of the Licence whereas the equivalent section of the UNC does not.
- TL advised that Clause 2 contains a list of definitions, with several differences identified from the UNC. The IGT UNC includes a definition for Affected Person, whilst the UNC defines Affected Party. Several items such as Alternate and Alternative Proposal are not defined in

the UNC, although some of these are referenced in the UNC Modification Rules. The UNC also defines some terms in its equivalent section which are omitted from the IGT UNC, such as the Independent System Operator and Planner (ISOP).

- TL referenced several IGT UNC-specific documents in Clause 2, the Best Practice Guidelines and Chairperson's Guidelines. They advised that they were unsure of any UNC equivalent guidance documents existing. SM clarified that Chairperson's Guidelines is referenced once in the UNC, 12.9.3(C), but is not a defined term. EO noted that the UNC has a UNC Panel Chair Appointment Document. BM noted that the closest equivalent to the Best Practice Guidelines is a Modification Proposal Guidelines document.
- The Chair noted that a definition of Consumers' Representative includes the National Consumer Council, which is now defunct, so this definition will need to be reviewed.
- The Chair raised a concern regarding the definition of Code of Practice, noting that it appears to be tied specifically to the Code Administrator's Code of Practice (CaCoP) and could unintentionally restrict the term's use elsewhere in the IGT UNC. They questioned whether this was appropriate drafting, as it may not reflect wider usage across the Code. TL clarified that the definition is explicitly limited to Part L only, meaning it does not apply more broadly across the IGT UNC.
- TL advised that Fast Track Self-Governance Modification Report is not a defined term in the UNC. SM responded that there is reference in the UNC to a fast-track Special Licence Condition, in A11 Paragraph 24A. The Chair asked if this would also be applicable to IGTs. SM responded that they were unsure and suggested it might apply to DNOs only. The IGT UNC have a clearly defined fast-track section which is not replicated in the UNC.
- AB and BM queried the definition of IGT Shipper Standing Work Group, suggesting that this should have been updated previously to IGT UNC Workstream. TL noted a separate defined term of Work Group, which includes the IGT Shipper Standing Work Group. They highlighted the need to move towards a single defined term, with a clearer definition better reflecting current IGT UNC practices.
- TL noted for the definition of Panel Chairperson, the UNC includes explicit provisions for appointing the Panel Chair but was unable to locate an equivalent provision in the IGT UNC and flagged this for further review. EO clarified that under the UNC the appointment of the Chair requires approval from Ofgem, whereas this is not the case in the IGT UNC. The Chair noted the historical shift in UNC arrangements, where the Chair role moved from being held by the Code Administrator to an independent appointment, although the rationale for this change was not confirmed. The Chair and TL noted the difference in voting arrangements. In the UNC, the Chair is generally a non-voting member but can exercise a casting vote in the event of no majority, whereas in the IGT UNC, the Chair is explicitly a non-voting member with no casting vote provision.
- TL and BM noted that the Review Proposal definition references 18.1.1, which is not an existing UNC clause. They suggested that the correct reference should be to 22.1.1. TL

suggested that significant renumbering errors have been picked up as part of RG008, and these could be dealt with through a fast-track Modification.

- TL and AB noted that the remainder of Paragraph 2 which is not defined terms, is very IGT UNC-specific, specifically on the Code Administrator and its role in the Modification Rules.
- TL noted for Paragraph 3, there is some equivalence to the UNC, but the UNC does not define Critical Friend. AB noted in 3.1 (e) and (f), the UNC does not refer to assisting on Derogation Applications within their own Modification Rules.
- TL highlighted in Clauses 4 and 5, that while overall IGT UNC and UNC Panel structures are broadly similar, there are notable differences in representation, seat numbers, and appointment processes which require further detailed review. At this stage, these differences have been identified but not fully analysed, with a deeper comparison needed in due course. The Chair noted that the UNC Panel Memberships operate on a fixed annual cycle, starting on 1st October post coordinated elections, whereas the IGT UNC use a more flexible rolling approach. The IGT UNC explicitly prevents multiple representatives from the same organisation or group sitting on the Panel, an equivalent provision in UNC was not identified. Differences in alternates and termination of Memberships were also noted.
- TL noted several similarities in Clause 6 and the equivalent section of the UNC on meeting management, particularly in notice periods for meetings and paper circulation. However, there are key differences. The IGT UNC is flexible when reconvening non-quorate Panel meetings, allowing for meetings to be “rescheduled” for the same day, provided sufficient notice is provided ahead of the meeting. The IGT UNC also agree meeting dates annually at the January Panel meeting, which is not reflected in the UNC.
- TL advised that there were minor differences in Clause 7 from the equivalent UNC section, relating to voting resolutions, and observers and invitees for Panel meetings.
- TL noted several nuances in Clause 8 regarding minutes and recordings. Both the IGT UNC and UNC have similar expectations in practice, but while UNC meeting minutes are published within five working days, the IGT UNC Code states ten working days, although the Code Administrator publish within five in practice. There is currently no explicit provision in either Code on recording meetings, despite this now being standard practice. TL asked about a potential policy on AI being required, noting there are no such policies in the IGT UNC. BM noted that the UNC has an AI policy regarding recording and transcription tools. The Chair added that many Codes and organisations have banned AI bots from attending meetings. The Chair and TL suggested that an item on a potential AI policy may need to be raised with the IGT UNC Panel, to align with the UNC.
- BM noted a likely incorrect reference in Clause 9, pointing to Clause 28.7, however it should reference Clause 28.6.
- TL advised that for the Relevant Persons area of Clause 10, there are numerous differences, including structure inconsistencies and definitions of relevant persons. The equivalent UNC section includes provisions not present in IGT UNC, particularly relating to CDSP and DSC-related activities, where CDSP can raise Modifications—something not applicable under IGT

arrangements. Another key difference is under the IGT UNC, the Cross-Code Steering Group (CCSG) has the ability to raise Modifications directly, for example where cross-code impacts arise, avoiding the need to find an individual IGT UNC Party to act as Proposer. There was uncertainty as to whether an equivalent provision exists in UNC, or whether this reflects a divergence introduced through SCR reforms.

- AB mentioned another nuance in Clause 10, European Modification Proposals. This term is also in Paragraph 18.
- For Content of Modification Proposals, the equivalent UNC sections have more detailed and extensive provisions, particularly in regard to Self-Governance Modifications. The wording and structure differ sufficiently that a targeted comparison exercise is needed to understand practical impacts.
- Both Codes include similar high-level provisions on Significant Code Reviews (SCRs), but UNC makes more frequent cross-references to these within other sections.
- There are expected differences in referencing standard vs special Licence Conditions, reflecting Code-specific contexts.
- TL noted that circulation requirements for Modification proposals are largely consistent (e.g. timelines such as 10 business days and general process steps), although UNC includes additional provisions (e.g. ISOP-related content) and is structured differently.
- On Panel handling of Modification proposals, UNC contains more explicit wording on discussion and determinations, whereas IGT UNC appears to capture similar intent but across different sections.
- A key difference is in Alternative Modification Proposals. Under IGT UNC, alternatives can be raised and considered directly by the Workgroup, potentially without needing explicit Panel involvement, subject to notice periods. UNC also supports alternatives, but the terminology is less formally defined, and provisions are structured differently.
- Further differences were identified in withdrawal and variation of Modifications. IGT UNC includes a formal definition of “variation request”, whereas UNC references it without defining it. IGT UNC also allows for withdrawn Modifications to be adopted by another party and continue, although this is not commonly observed in practice and there is no clear UNC equivalent.
- On Urgent Modifications, both Codes are broadly aligned in timelines, but UNC includes additional detail and references (e.g. ISOP, CDSP). The Chair noted that, in practice, the formal urgent process can be supplemented by informal/preparatory discussions with Ofgem to ensure efficiency. The Chair also clarified that IGT UNC does not include ISOP provisions by design, following earlier guidance that this was not required, as ISOP relates more to network-level (UNC) rather than retail-level (IGT UNC) decisions.
- TL advised that for Panel discussions, UNC Panel will need to consider other aspects that are not relevant to the IGT UNC, such as NTS Charging Methodology.. The wording is thus very different and will require further review.

- There are minor difference on Workgroup assessment/development, mainly on the number and makeup of members in attendance. TL noted the use of both Workstream and Workgroup meetings as terms within Code, which adds confusion, and reiterated the need to move to one clear name and definition for all Workgroup meetings.
- AB noted some terms in Clause 19 that are not replicated in the UNC, such as insufficient business and subgroup.
- In terms of legal text drafting, there are differences between the Codes. The IGT UNC places responsibility for legal text drafting on IGTs, but this is typically discharged in practice via contractual arrangements with the Code Administrator. UNC has additional supporting material, such as a legal text guidance document, which IGT UNC does not have.
- The Review process is largely similar for both Codes, although in the UNC, these are called Requests instead.
- TL advised that the core consultation framework is broadly aligned. However, several key differences were identified. The UNC includes additional detailed provisions involving CDSP and ISOP, particularly around responsibilities for preparing and submitting consultation materials, which are not present in IGT UNC. UNC also contains more extensive procedural detail overall, including how consultation inputs are managed. The IGT UNC includes references to self-governance classification, which were not evident in the equivalent UNC section (though may exist elsewhere).
- The processes for Draft and Final Modification Reports (D/FMRs) are largely aligned, excluding common differences in stakeholders between the Codes. The main differences occur in the later stages of the FMR, where UNC includes additional implementation and decision-making detail and more extensive content requirements (e.g. references to licence conditions, charging methodologies, and backstop timelines). IGT UNC is comparatively simpler and less prescriptive in these areas.
- There is a clear section on Authority send-back provisions in the IGT UNC, with no equivalent section in the UNC, instead referencing the concept more loosely via licence conditions.
- On Modification implementation, IGT UNC includes more detailed and prescriptive provisions, particularly around implementation dates and sequencing. UNC appears less prescriptive and more flexible, with fewer explicit rules and there was no clear like-for-like UNC equivalent identified for the IGT UNC implementation section.
- On pre-release and publication, IGT UNC includes a provision allowing up to 30 days post-implementation to publish updated Code, likely as a backstop in case of delays. In practice, publication typically occurs on the implementation date, and no equivalent UNC provision was identified. TL added that this requirement may reflect a legacy safeguard and is not current practice.
- IGT UNC contains a dedicated section for SCR Modifications, whereas UNC does not have a single equivalent section, instead referencing SCRs in multiple areas.
- UNC does contain a cross-code change section, but it is structured very differently to IGT UNC. UNC uses different terminology and defined terms (e.g. “principal energy code”, “lead

code”, “relevant EC body”), whereas IGT UNC uses its own terminology. IGT UNC appears to include more explicit provisions around CCSG involvement, including roles in raising or progressing Modifications, which UNC does not clearly replicate. The Chair highlighted that IGT UNC CCSG provisions were introduced via SCR, meaning any differences are likely intentional and driven by policy decisions, rather than drafting anomalies.

EO commended the work undertaken, noting that identifying and documenting differences between the two Codes—particularly in areas such as Modification and governance rules—is highly valuable from Ofgem’s perspective. They highlighted that, while it may not be worthwhile making immediate changes where differences will ultimately be encapsulated through Code consolidation, understanding and evidencing why those differences exist is critical and strongly beneficial.

The Chair asked about future work to be potentially undertaken by the Review Group on Part L. EO advised that they would confirm with Ofgem’s Code Consolidation team before committing and would provide an update shortly. AB asked about the Code Consolidation Workgroups being run by Ofgem. EO responded that invites for the Workgroups had not yet been issued but were expected soon.

AB proposed progressing the review by moving on to Part O (Derogations), confirming he would finalise initial work and share it with TL for further annotation. They noted this aligns with upcoming Ofgem work on derogation processes and suggested focusing on areas relevant to that programme. They also acknowledged limited participation due to availability and his own upcoming absence, and suggested the group retain flexibility to revisit other sections if progress slows.

In closing, the Chair confirmed next steps: TL will update the tracking spreadsheet with identified differences; the “why” behind differences will be explored at a later stage; and Part O will form the next area of review. TL also proposed producing an interim report compiling all agreed outputs to date for circulation on paper day, both to maintain a clear record of progress and to invite feedback from the Panel on structure and content, with a view to providing a formal interim update in July.

The Workstream agreed to review Part O (Derogations) of the IGT UNC in the July Workstream meeting as part of the next step in the work for RG008. The Chair suggested that, alongside reviewing Part O, the Workgroup should also review the associated derogation guidance document to ensure alignment. AB agreed this should be added as follow-up work, noting that guidance and code provisions may differ.

TL advised that they would produce an interim report for RG008 ahead of the July Workstream meeting, to summarise the work undertaken so far and everything agreed by the Review Group. This would also provide the IGT UNC Panel with regular updates on RG008.

Action 26/06 – 01: Ahead of the next Modification Workstream meeting on 9th July 2026, RG008 Members to consider Part O Derogations and the Derogations Guidance Document in support of the Phase One identification and logging IGT-specific provisions.

7. Update on IGT180 – CDSP Obligations required for the introduction of the Gas Shipper Obligation

BM explained the current position on IGT180 and UNC equivalent Modification UNC 0922, which relate to implementing the Gas Shipper Obligation (GSO) scheme.

BM outlined that the original intent of these Modifications was to introduce transitional arrangements enabling the Central Data Service Provider (CDSP) to develop a service that provides Shipper data to the Low Carbon Contracts Company (LCCC). This data would support calculation of payments that fund hydrogen projects under the GSO scheme. Although the scheme's regulations are due in 2027, development needed to start earlier, hence the proposal for interim obligations followed by a later Modification to make them enduring.

However, progress has been delayed due to Department of Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) postponing its response to the GSO consultation, although these delays are unrelated to the scheme itself. As a result, planned joint workgroups between the UNC and IGT UNC could not proceed, and there is now insufficient time to complete the Modification process and development work via the original route.

BM advised that to address this, the approach has changed. The development work will now be funded outside of the DSC, via discussions between DESNZ and Xoserve. Once the scheme goes live in 2027, the service will transition into a business-as-usual DSC service. The two existing Modifications in the UNC and IGT UNC will be withdrawn and replaced with two new Modifications focused only on the enduring post-implementation service

STANDING ITEMS

The Chair suggested that due to time constraints, that updates to the standing items should be postponed until the July Workstream meeting. The Workstream agreed.

TL provided a brief update on two new UNC reviews:

- [0937R - Aligning LDZ Charges with Actual Gas Usage for All Customers](#) – This will have a low but direct impact on IGTs.
- [0938R - Introduction of Qualification Requirements for new Shippers](#) – An equivalent review is expected to be raised in the IGT UNC. AB advised that BUUK are the co-Proposer for UNC 0938 and will be the Proposer for the IGT UNC equivalent Review. They added that there is an intention to make a joint workgroup for both Reviews. TL added that it has not been determined when the Review will be raised but suggested that it could be assessed at the next Panel meeting, as it has been moved to 1st July.

AOB

The Chair asked the Workgroup to raise any other items for consideration.

8. IGT UNC June 2026 Release Confirmation

TL 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).

9. IGT UNC Panel Membership

TL advised that the Shipper election process has now closed, with one nomination received. The nominated individual will be automatically appointed as a IGT UNC Panel member. TL added that two vacant Shipper seats remain, meaning the Panel is still not quorate. They advised that nominations can be accepted at any time, given the absence of a fixed election cycle.

10. [IGT182 - Alignment of the IGT UNC with the UNC definition of the Data Permissions Matrix.](#)

The Chair advised that the consultation for the fast-track Modification has now closed and will now proceed to Panel for a decision at the meeting on 1st July. TL added that the Modification is correcting the definition of the Data Permissions Matrix (DPM), adding in a reference to UK Link, which aligns the IGT UNC with the UNC.

11. IGT UNC Next Panel Meeting Date

TL advised that the next meeting for the IGT UNC Panel has been rescheduled from 26th June to 1st July. They advised that for any Workgroup members wishing to raise an item for the meeting, the paper day has now moved back to 24th June.

No further items were raised, and the Chair closed the meeting.

The next Workgroup meeting is scheduled for Thursday 9th July 2026.

Annex 1 – Actions Table

Reference	Action	Owner	Status
26/05 - 01	<i>Ahead of the next Modification Workstream meeting on 11th June 2026, RG008 Members to consider Part L in support of the Phase One identification and logging IGT-specific provisions.</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>Closed</i>
26/06 - 01	Ahead of the next Modification Workstream meeting on 9th July 2026, RG008 Members to consider Part O and the Derogations Guidance Document in support of the Phase One identification and logging IGT-specific provisions.	All	Open