



IGT UNC 26-09 Modification Workstream Meeting

Draft Minutes

Thursday 10th September 2026 via Teleconference

Attendee	Initial	Organisation	Notes
Anne Jackson	AJ	Talan	Chair
Aleksis Butler	AB	BUUK	Proposer for RG008
Ben Mitchell	BM	Xoserve	
Cher Harris	CH	Indigo Pipelines	
Edma Hyskaj	EH	Talan	Observer, present for items 1-4 and 9
Gavin Sangiovanni	GS	Independent Networks Association (INA)	Present for items 1-4 and 9
Oorlagh Chapman	OC	Centrica	Proposer for IGT183
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 apologies received from Nadir Hafeez (Ofgem).

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. TL added Item 11 – Harry Firth.

3. Approval of the Previous Minutes 26-08

HF noted that no comments on the minutes of the 26-08 meeting had been raised ahead of this 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 were three outstanding actions for consideration:

26/08 – 01: RG008 Members to review and provide comments on the Part M document ahead of the next Modification Workstream meeting on 10th September. Discussion on the Part M review document took place as part of ongoing work on RG008. Further detail on this is covered under Item 5.

Action closed.

26/08 – 02: Ahead of the next Modification Workstream meeting on 10th September 2026, RG008 Members to consider Part K Clauses 1-23 in support of the Phase One identification and logging IGT-specific provisions. Part K, Clauses 1-23 were reviewed by Workstream members in this meeting as part of ongoing work on RG008. Further detail on this is covered under Item 5.

Action closed.

26/08 – 03: Kathryn Adeseye (Xoserve) to confirm whether approved NExA AQ table updates are automatically reflected within Xoserve systems following implementation. SM explained that Network Exit Agreement (NExA) values are not automatically populated by Xoserve. Instead, the relevant IGT applies the Annual Quantity (AQ) values when creating and registering an MPRN. The applicable NExA values are determined at the point the Meter Point Reference Number (MPRN) is entered into the registration process and are based on the NExA tables in force for the period in which the MPRN is expected to go live. They noted that while new NExA values are usually confirmed in July and become effective from February of the following year, an IGT may use the forthcoming values if an MPRN being created is expected to become live after the new values take effect. SM added that for large Connected System Exit Point (CSEP) developments. Where a site is built out over several years and MPRNs are registered at different times, individual MPRNs within the same CSEP may be assigned AQ values from different NExA periods. In such cases, the AQ applied is determined when each MPRN is registered rather than when the original CSEP was created.

Action closed.

MODIFICATIONS

5. [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 advised that BUUK had undertaken an initial review of IGT UNC Part M (Definitions), which had been published on the IGT UNC website ahead of this meeting, with an action (**26/08 – 01**) on Workstream attendees to review this document. They provided an overview of this Review, noting that the IGT UNC defers 25 definitions to the UNC, however these terms are not actually defined in the UNC, thus these 25 terms have no clear definition. They added that the IGT UNC has 167 definitions which are not within the UNC and not deferred to the UNC either. These could be seen as nuanced. The IGT UNC also has 172 definitions which are in the UNC but not deferred to the UNC – this could mean the IGT UNC definitions are worded differently to the UNC equivalents, which will require further consideration, but also a potential opportunity for standardisation.

TL confirmed that the Part M review is a long-term task and will continue to evolve over time. The immediate focus is on the 25 deferred definitions to establish their status within the UNC and determine whether they should instead be defined within the IGT UNC. They explained that each term

will require individual assessment, including reviewing historical UNC changes to understand whether definitions have been amended, replaced or removed over time. The group of 167 definitions will also be reviewed individually to determine whether these are genuinely IGT UNC-specific terms.

BM advised that Xoserve had not yet reviewed the Part M review document ahead of the Workstream meeting but would be happy to provide comments ahead of the October Workstream meeting. TL responded that any further comments on the Part M review document would be welcomed. The Chair noted that Action **26/08 – 01** had a specific reference to the September Workstream meeting, so suggested that this should be closed, and a new action should be opened for Review Group Members to submit comments on the Part M review document.

26/09 – 01: RG008 Members to review and provide comments on the Part M document ahead of the next Modification Workstream meeting on 8th October.

The Workstream identified the following IGT UNC nuances within Part K, Clauses 1-23:

- In 1.1(b), the definition of Framework Agreement differs in the UNC and IGT UNC
- In 1.2 (d), the paragraph references its own clause, TL agreed to check this clause, with the intention of clarifying its purpose.
- In 1.2(e), it was noted that the term Transportation Arrangement is not capitalised, it is referenced within the definition of Ancillary Agreement but is not itself defined in the IGT UNC. TL suggested that Members will determine at a future meeting whether this needs to be specifically defined in the IGT UNC, or if a reference to the Pipeline Operator Licence definition is sufficient.
- There are some additional/different requirements in the UNC Transportation Principle Document (TPD) V 2.1.2 to Part K 2.1, plus some additional clauses relating to Trader Users.
- For 2.2(b), there is an additional UNC requirement to notify the CDSP in UNC TPD V 2.2.2b
- There was discussion on references to the Shipper Licence, as it is referred to as Pipeline Users Shipper's Licence elsewhere in the IGT UNC.
- In 4, the IGT UNC states "to be agreed by the Pipeline Operator" (a single IGT), whereas the equivalent UNC clause states "to be agreed by the Transporters"
- For 5, there is an additional requirement in UNC TPD V 4.1, including notifying the CDSP.
- In 6, the Review Group discussed whether the voluntary discontinuance provisions apply to a Pipeline User ceasing participation across all IGT networks or only in respect of a single Pipeline Operator. SM raised the point that a Pipeline User may wish to discontinue its participation with one specific IGT while remaining active with others and questioned whether the drafting adequately reflects that scenario.

The Chair explained that admission arrangements are established individually with each Pipeline Operator rather than through a single application process covering all IGTs. TL agreed, noting that Shippers sign up and conduct business individually based on their portfolio requirements, suggesting that discontinuance would likewise occur on an individual basis.

The discussion broadened into the role of Individual Network Codes (INCs). AB confirmed that Shipper onboarding and accession arrangements continue to be managed individually by IGTs and that voluntary discontinuance is typically a network-specific process rather than an industry-wide action. However, they questioned whether such provisions should ultimately sit within INCs or be consolidated into a central code framework.

AB advised that Members will need to consider the future of INCs in light of Code Consolidation and Ofgem's preference to migrate INC provisions into new schedules. While some INCs contain limited content and largely defer to the IGT UNC, it was noted that others include important network-specific provisions, derogations and charging arrangements that may still justify their existence. AB encouraged IGTs to review their existing INCs to ensure they remain current and suitable for any future migration into consolidated schedules

- In 7.1(a), there are different payment terms and a minimum threshold in UNC TPD V 4.3.1(a).
- In 7.1(b), UNC TPD V 4.3.1(b) has several additional paragraphs on providing a programme for remedying the breach.
- In 7.2, there are additional details and monetary thresholds mentioned in UNC TPD V 4.3.2, plus an additional clause 4.3.5 relating to foreign insolvency practitioners.
- In 8.3, the terms “dispute” and “parties” in respect of any “dispute” are defined here, but these are not defined within Part M (Definitions).
- 9.5 sets out a different process to UNC General Terms Section A (GTA) 2.2.5 in the event an expert is not agreed in 10 business days, involving the President of the Law Society. The Chair and AB noted that this clause has never been invoked to their knowledge, and there is potential for it to be removed as part of Code Consolidation work.
- 11.5, the equivalent UNC GTA 2.4.5(b) includes the words “which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld” in brackets.
- 11.9, the equivalent UNC GTA 2.4.9 includes a page number limit.
- 12.2, the equivalent UNC GTA 2.4.2 references Framework Agreement, the IGT UNC does not.
- 17, the equivalent process in UNC GTA 1.5 stipulates that this notice cannot be provided via a UK Link communication, whereas the IGT UNC refers to a system communication. There are also minor differences in the wording of the equivalent clauses.
- 23, some equivalence with UNC TPD V 5.3, but the level of detail and definitions differ.
- TL noted a reference in 23.6 to Annex V-10, the Chair responded that they believe it refers to in UNC TPD V Annexes but asked if Xoserve would be able to provide some clarity on this clause, as the CDSP is referenced. BM responded that they would be happy to look at this clause further.

The Workstream agreed to continue reviewing Part K of the IGT UNC in the October Workstream meeting as part of the next step in the work for RG008. SM asked whether the Review Group should also look at appendices K1 and K2, in particular K2 which contains the list of IGT UNC Ancillary Documents. The Review Group agreed that the next task would be to verify that the list is complete,

up to date, and accurately reflects the titles of the current Ancillary Documents rather than undertaking a detailed review of each document.

The Review Group noted that, aside from the Derogations Guidance document, the Ancillary Documents had not yet been examined in detail. It was highlighted that some Ancillary Documents contain processes that are unique to the IGT UNC and differ from UNC arrangements, such as transportation invoicing and aspects of new connections. As a result, these documents may require more detailed consideration than a simple comparison against UNC provisions.

The Review Group agreed that where an Ancillary Document directly supports a section of the Code under review, it may be beneficial to review both together. Members considered that this approach had worked well during the review of the derogation provisions and associated guidance. However, some Ancillary Documents may be too extensive or detailed to review alongside Code text and could require separate sessions.

Action 26/09 – 02: Ahead of the next Modification Workstream meeting on 8th October 2026, RG008 Members to consider Part K Clauses 24-46, and appendices K1 and K2 in support of the Phase One identification and logging IGT-specific provisions.

STANDING ITEMS

6. Cross Code Modification Implications Tracker

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

Watch List

- **0940 - Updating the provision of Non-Daily Metered Sample Data.** This Modification seeks to amend a section of the UNC that the IGT UNC directly reference. This Modification may have unintended impacts should the referenced provisions under the UNC apply under IGT UNC Governance. The Code Administrator have advised that an IGT UNC impact should be highlighted for UNC 0940.
- **0934 - Clarification of Panel Member Attendance Requirements.** This Modification is out for consultation, with responses due by 15th October. Although there will not be any IGT UNC impacts from UNC 0934, the Modification will set a precedent which Parties may want to consider for the IGT UNC in future.
- **0933 - Amendment to the designation arrangements outlined within TPD B4.7.16 – 4.7.21 to include a designate as 'Daily Metered' category.** The Code Administrator have reviewed the legal text published on 24th August. There were no Code impacts identified. However, some of the changes apply to areas the IGT UNC cross reference so the changes will automatically apply. Workgroup Report is due at the September UNC Panel meeting.

- [0931 - Introduction of an Escalation process for Transportation invoice payment.](#) The Workgroup Report is still on track to be presented to UNC Panel in October. The Code Administrator will review legal text once published, as there are potential IGT UNC impacts.
- [0930 – Refining the Ratchet Charge Soft Landing Period.](#) The Workgroup Report is still on track to be presented to UNC Panel in October. The Code Administrator will review legal text once published, as there are potential IGT UNC impacts.
- [0907 – Extension to current maintenance period.](#) This Modification was rejected by the Authority.
- [0890 - Update to AQ Correction Processes - Request for Adjustments \(RFA\) AQ Change.](#) XRN5940 has been updated to reflect an implementation date of 6th November 2026.

IGT UNC Equivalent Modifications

- [0926 - Maintenance criteria for Emergency Contact data held in Central Systems.](#) The UNC Panel approved this Modification for implementation in August. The IGT UNC equivalent Modification, [IGT183](#), is currently out for consultation, with responses due by 22nd September. IGT183 will go to the October IGT UNC Panel meeting for decision.
- [0922 - CDSP Obligations required for the introduction of the Gas Shipper Obligation.](#) Both this Modification and [IGT180](#) are currently on hold whilst the Code Administrators wait for DESNZ to submit updated versions of both Modifications, which will look to implement the enduring solution, rather than focusing on a temporary solution.

TL advised that the REC Code Manager had contacted the Code Administrator regarding [10285 - Organisations with multiple role types EES and SDEP access.](#) 10285 concerns how organisations access the Secure Data Exchange Portal (SDEP). The issue proposes allowing multiple role types to be associated with a single user profile, rather than requiring separate email addresses and accounts for each role an individual performs within an organisation. The issue is particularly relevant given other REC changes under consideration that could require Gas Transporters (GTs) to access SDEP in future, such as [R0162 - Access to SDES for Gas Networks.](#) Without the proposed change, organisations may need to maintain multiple user accounts and email addresses for the same individual where they perform different functions, creating unnecessary administrative complexity and inefficiencies.

The REC Code Manager has advised that it has received limited feedback from GTs, particularly IGTs, and is therefore considering closing the Issue as resolved if no further interest is expressed. Stakeholders have been asked to review the Issue and provide feedback by 18 September. If organisations believe the functionality would be useful, either now or in the future, they are encouraged to inform the REC Code Manager so that the Issue can continue to progress. Equally,

organisations that do not see value in the proposal have been asked to provide that feedback to support the REC Code Manager's assessment.

The Chair emphasised that the issue may be especially important for smaller organisations, where a single individual often performs multiple operational roles. They noted that such organisations could be disproportionately affected by the requirement to maintain separate accounts for different functions and encouraged IGTs to consider the potential impacts carefully before the feedback deadline.

7. IGT UNC Known Issues Register

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

8. IGT UNC Horizon Scanner

TL advised the Workgroup that there was one new update to the Horizon Scanner:

- Ofgem have issued a consultation on [Energy Code Reform phase 1: Code Manager Licence Modifications](#). The deadline for responses is Thursday 1st October.

AOB

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

9. NExA AQ Review Tables

TL introduced the updated NExA AQ tables. They advised that following the August Workstream meeting, the Independent Networks Association (INA) formally submitted a corrected version of the proposed NExA AQ Review Values to the Code Administrator after an error was identified in an IGT's data submission. The original submitted version reviewed and recommended to Panel in the August Workgroup is now known to be incorrect. The revised version was reviewed by the Panel at their August meeting, and it was agreed that the updated NExA AQ tables would be reviewed by the Workstream to allow for any comments from IGT UNC parties, before returning to Panel in September.

TL took the Workgroup through the updated NExA AQ tables, noting that the weighted average AQ was slightly higher than in the incorrect version previously reviewed by the Workstream, although still lower than the 2026-27 value, aligning with the expected trend of recent years.

The Workstream had no comments on the proposed NExA AQ tables and were happy to recommend their approval to the IGT UNC Panel. AB asked about the timeline for approval. TL responded that the Panel would review the proposed NExA AQ tables at their next meeting on 25th September, and they would go live as part of the standard IGT UNC release in February 2027, subject to approval.

10. CACoP Survey 2026

TL advised that the Code Administration Code of Practice (CACoP) have issued their [2026 annual stakeholder survey](#), seeking feedback from Parties on how effectively Code Administrators are

delivering CACoP Principles and Standards. Responses can be submitted to box.CACoP@neso.energy until the deadline of Friday 2nd October.

11. Harry Firth

TL advised that HF will be leaving the IGT UNC Code Administration team and advised that there will be a short transition period for the Code Administrator as HF phases out their engagements, and a replacement is appointed. The Workstream thanked HF for their work and contributions as part of the Code Administration team.

The next Workgroup meeting is scheduled for Thursday 8th October 2026.

DRAFT

Annex 1 – Actions Table

Reference	Action	Owner	Status
26/08 – 01	<i>RG008 Members to review and provide comments on the Part M document ahead of the next Modification Workstream meeting on 10th September.</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>Closed</i>
26/08 – 02	<i>Ahead of the next Modification Workstream meeting on 10th September 2026, RG008 Members to consider Part K Clauses 1-23 in support of the Phase One identification and logging IGT-specific provisions.</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>Closed</i>
26/08 – 03	<i>Kathryn Adeseye (Xoserve) to confirm whether approved NExA AQ table updates are automatically reflected within Xoserve systems following implementation.</i>	<i>KA</i>	<i>Closed</i>
26/09 - 01	RG008 Members to review and provide comments on the Part M document ahead of the next Modification Workstream meeting on 8 th October.	All	Open
26/09 - 02	Ahead of the next Modification Workstream meeting on 8 th October 2026, RG008 Members to consider Part K Clauses 24-46 and appendices K1 and K2 in support of the Phase One identification and logging IGT-specific provisions.	All	Open