



IGT UNC 26-08 Modification Workstream Meeting

Final Minutes

Thursday 13th August 2026 via Teleconference

Attendee	Initial	Organisation	Notes
Anne Jackson	AJ	Talan	Chair
Aleksis Butler	AB	BUUK	Proposer for RG008
Cher Harris	CH	Indigo Pipelines	
Daniel Marchant	DM	BUUK	
Helen Gilbert	HG	NESO	
Kathryn Adeseye	KA	Xoserve	
Kundai Matiringe	KM	BUUK	
Oorlagh Chapman	OC	Centrica	Proposer for IGT183
Richard Welsby	RW	Last Mile Gas	
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 Ellie Rutherford (Energy Assets), Ben Mitchell and Stuart Monk (both Xoserve).

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 26-06 and 26-07

HF noted that one comment had been received on the 26-06 meeting minutes clarifying that BUUK is not the co-Proposer for [UNC 0938 - Introduction of Qualification Requirements for new Shippers](#), and no comments on the minutes of the 26-07 meeting had been raised ahead of this meeting. The Workgroup had no further comments to add to either of the minutes, which were consequently approved as true and accurate records of the meetings.

4. Outstanding Actions

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

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. Part O 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 0926S - Maintenance criteria for Emergency Contact data held in Central Systems](#), 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 one change had been made since the June Workgroup meeting. It had been identified that an amendment made within the legal drafting had not been fully reflected within the business rules. To address this, a new Business Rule 4A had been added to the Modification proposal.

KA explained that the additional business rule amended provisions relating to Clause 8.3B of IGT UNC Part I to ensure consistency with the corresponding UNC 0926 solution. The amendment clarifies that the obligations set out under Clause 8.1 apply equally to Interruptible Supply Points, bringing the treatment of Interruptible sites into alignment with the position being established under the UNC. KA noted that no equivalent drafting changes were required for Large Firm Supply Points as these obligations were already covered by the existing IGT UNC provisions.

TL presented the draft legal text. A detailed explanation was provided regarding how the legal text had been structured. TL advised that a number of existing provisions had been repositioned within the Code to ensure they sat within the most appropriate sections while maintaining their ongoing applicability. One example involved moving provisions relating to Interruptible Supply Points from Part I into Part CIII to better reflect the purpose of the requirements. TL stressed that this did not represent a change in obligation, but simply a restructuring exercise to improve clarity and align the drafting with the equivalent UNC arrangements. KA added that some provisions relating to emergency contacts had previously been located within sections dealing with emergency processes when, in practice, they related to interruption contracts rather than emergency management arrangements. As a result, these provisions had been moved to ensure they sat in the most logical place within the Code structure.

TL advised that emergency contact provisions for Large Firm and Interruptible Supply Points had been amalgamated into a single set of requirements. Existing text had been retained wherever possible, with amendments made only where necessary to align with the UNC solution. Obsolete text in the Interruptible-only provisions had been removed, with some clauses marked as "not used" to avoid unnecessary renumbering throughout the Code. TL noted that this approach reduced complexity and improved consistency while preserving the integrity of existing references elsewhere in the Code.

In addition to the substantive drafting changes, a number of minor formatting amendments had been made. These included standardising drafting conventions, numbering formats and terminology so that the new text aligned more closely with the drafting style adopted elsewhere within the Code and within the UNC itself. TL explained that these changes formed part of a wider effort to improve consistency across industry Codes ahead of future Code Reform activities. No questions or concerns were raised regarding either the legal text or the business rules.

TL took the Workgroup through the Workgroup Report for IGT183. KA explained the key objectives behind the Modification. The first objective was to establish consistent treatment of emergency contact information for both Large Firm and Interruptible Supply Points across the UNC and IGT UNC. They noted that historical differences between the two Codes had resulted in slightly different processes and obligations being applied to similar categories of sites. The Modification would remove these inconsistencies and create a single, aligned approach.

The second objective was to improve transparency regarding the maintenance, retention and removal of emergency contact information held within Central Systems. KA highlighted that the Modification introduced explicit retention and maintenance requirements, making it clear what data would be held, under what circumstances it would remain on systems, and when it would be removed. Business Rules 1 and 2 were identified as particularly important in this respect. KA explained that the legal text now clearly defines how long non-mandatory emergency contact data may be retained and what actions would be taken once retention periods expired. This represented a significant improvement in transparency and would ensure that all parties understood the lifecycle of emergency contact records within CDSP systems.

The Chair stated that the Modification appeared to provide clear efficiency benefits. They noted that maintaining separate arrangements across the UNC and IGT UNC created unnecessary complexity and that harmonisation would support both current operational efficiency and future Code Reform objectives. The Chair also commented that it was difficult to identify any reason why emergency contact information should be treated differently across the two Codes.

The Workgroup formally expressed support for the objectives of the Modification and agreed that the proposed solution appropriately addressed the identified issues. The Workgroup also confirmed they were satisfied with the business rules and legal drafting and did not believe any further development work was necessary prior to consultation.

Impacts

TL advised that the Proposer had indicated no impacts to a Significant Code Review or other industry change projects. The Workgroup unanimously agreed with this view.

TL advised that the Proposer had identified positive consumer impacts on improved safety and reliability and improved quality of service. KA confirmed that the revised retention arrangements should benefit Consumers by helping to ensure that emergency contact information remains accurate and up to date. Under the proposed arrangements, non-mandatory contact information would only be

retained for 12 months before being removed if it did not become mandatory during that period. Where data subsequently became mandatory, updated information would need to be resubmitted rather than relying on potentially outdated records. For mandatory emergency contact data, the CDSP would introduce additional monitoring and prompting arrangements. Where records remained unchanged for three years, the CDSP would contact the relevant Shipper to request confirmation that the information remained accurate or to submit updated details where appropriate. KA emphasised that responsibility for data accuracy would remain with Shippers, but the additional prompts were intended to improve data quality and encourage regular review. The Workgroup agreed with the Proposer's view on consumer benefits for IGT183.

TL noted that the Proposer had not identified any direct cross-Code impacts. The Workgroup unanimously agreed with the Proposer's view.

TL noted that the Proposer had not identified any environmental impacts. The Workgroup agreed with the Proposer's view on environmental impacts for IGT183.

TL noted that for the Relevant Objectives, the Proposer had identified a positive impact on Objective (F) – Promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Code, as IGT183 will align the IGT UNC with the UNC following the progression of UNC 0926, and see a more consistent approach adopted for handling emergency contact data across multiple Supply Point types. The Workgroup unanimously agreed with the Proposer's view on the Relevant Objectives.

Implementation

TL advised that the planned implementation approach is for IGT183 to be implemented any time after one working day after the closure of the 15-day appeal window, subject to no appeal being submitted, when the DSC Change Management Committee determine due to the Central System impacts. The Workgroup were happy with this approach.

KA advised that the associated Central Systems Change Proposal, [XRN6079](#), had been developed on the basis that the solution would apply across both GTs and IGTs. They explained that the changes had already been costed on that basis and that rejection of IGT183 could increase implementation costs because additional development work would be required to separate IGT arrangements from the wider solution. The Workgroup requested that this dependency and potential cost implication be reflected within the Workgroup Report.

Post-Meeting Note: *At the UNC Panel meeting on 20th August, the Code Administrator asked whether the CDSP were happy with the proposed implementation approach for UNC 0926 of 16 working days following approval, and whether the related Central System changes under XRN6079 would be ready for implementation on this date. The CDSP responded noting that the 16 working days following approval had been included as the Modification is Self-Governance and that is a possible implementation approach. However, they believed this would not be achievable as the related system changes still have to move through the DSC Change Process. The Code Administrator*

has now updated the proposed implementation approach in the IGT183 Workgroup Report to note that IGT183 will now be implemented alongside XRN6079 and UNC 0926.

Governance

TL noted that the Proposer had submitted IGT183 as a Self-Governance Modification. The Workgroup agreed with the governance route for IGT183.

Prioritisation

TL noted that the Proposer had assessed IGT183 to have a prioritisation category of standard. The Workgroup had no comments on the prioritisation category.

The Chair asked the Workgroup if they were happy to submit the Workgroup Report to Panel for review. The Workgroup agreed that the Workgroup Report had been completed and recommended that it be sent for consultation.

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 interim RG008 report. They explained that the report had been produced to provide a formal record of progress made since the start of the Review and to keep key stakeholders such as the IGT UNC Panel, Ofgem and the Joint Office informed of developments. The report covers Review work completed up to Part L and is intended to provide a clear record of discussions, rationale and decisions, rather than relying solely on meeting minutes or clause comparison spreadsheets.

The Chair noted that no concerns had been raised by the Panel when the report was presented for information. They also advised that Ofgem had recently confirmed it was actively monitoring the RG008 review and had expressed a particular interest in the group's work, making the interim reporting approach useful for regulatory engagement. TL confirmed that they intended to continue publishing periodic interim reports as the review progresses, providing transparency and maintaining an accessible record of work completed. AB supported the report's format, commenting that the report structure provides a clearer and more user-friendly summary of discussions and decisions than reviewing historic minutes.

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

- In 1.2, the definitions Derogation Eligibility Criteria and Derogation Guidance Documents are IGT UNC specific definitions
- In 2.1.3 (a), there is a reference to Non-voting member while the equivalent UNC text does not.
- In 2.1.3 (b), the Code Administrator provides Critical Friend guidance which the UNC does not

- In 2.1.3 (c), a IGT UNC Panel meeting must be held to consider a Derogation Application no less than eight Business Days after a copy of the application has been sent. It is 10 Business Days in the UNC
- In the UNC equivalent of 2.1.6, there is an additional rejection reason listed to those in the IGT UNC
- In 2.1.6 (b), Excluded Provision is not a defined UNC term
- In 2.1.8 (c), if the IGT UNC Panel invites a Derogation Application to be re-submitted, it must be placed on a IGT UNC Panel agenda no less than eight Business Days after a copy was submitted. This clause is not time bound within the UNC.
- In 2.1.8 (d), the IGT UNC Panel can determine additional consultation questions to be added, this is not replicated in the equivalent UNC text
- In 2.1.9 (b), where the IGT UNC Panel considers and assesses the requested non-compliance against the Code, this is not replicated in the UNC. Also, in 2.1.9 (c) (iv), the request for additional information is also a nuance.
- In 2.1.10, where the Code Administrator promptly publishes Derogation Applications on the IGT UNC website, this is not replicated within the UNC Code but is within the UNC Derogation Guidance document.
- In 2.1.15, where matters relating to the Derogation Application will be deferred to the next IGT UNC Panel meeting if no Party representative is present, this is not replicated in the UNC
- 2.3 – Impact of UNC Derogation is not replicated in the UNC. The Chair also noted that there is no 'Impact of the Derogation' section in the UNC.
- 2.4 – IGT UNC Derogation Reporting and Cessation is not replicated in the UNC
- 2.5 – IGT UNC Derogation Use Cases. AB advised that any Derogation Use Cases would be in the Derogation Guidance Document, and the Workgroup agreed that this list would need to be reviewed to confirm any similarities to 2.5

The Workgroup moved onto the IGT UNC Derogations Guidance Document. AB advised that one of the most notable observations from their review of the document was that the structure of the IGT UNC guidance and application form differs significantly from the UNC documentation. They questioned whether this reflected a deliberate design choice or whether the documents had simply never been fully updated following previous process changes.

The Workgroup identified a number of formatting, drafting and document maintenance issues. TL noted that many of these issues appeared to result from historic amendments not being fully reflected throughout the document. For example, references to appeals remained within the contents structure despite the related provisions no longer existing, creating errors in numbering and document navigation. The Workgroup agreed that these issues represented housekeeping matters rather than substantive concerns.

The Workgroup considered differences between the IGT UNC and UNC derogation processes. TL highlighted that the UNC guidance document includes a pre-derogation engagement stage, allowing

discussions to take place before a formal derogation application is submitted. An equivalent stage does not exist within the IGT UNC process, although the Workgroup noted that this is consistent with wider governance differences between the two Codes. The Chair observed that, in several areas, requirements included directly within IGT UNC Code provisions are reflected only within UNC guidance documents. Whilst the practical expectations are often similar, the legal status of the requirements therefore differs between the Codes.

The review also identified differences in how supporting evidence is requested from applicants. Whilst both processes require relevant information to accompany applications, it was noted that the UNC guidance contains more explicit examples of supporting evidence, such as process maps and additional documentation. TL observed that much of this information is nevertheless captured within the IGT UNC application requirements, albeit presented differently within the guidance and appendices.

The Chair noted that the IGT UNC process requires applicants to provide greater information regarding how they intend to return to compliance at the conclusion of a derogation period. They suggested that the IGT UNC therefore places a greater obligation on applicants to demonstrate a clear route back to compliance than appears to be the case under the UNC arrangements.

The Workgroup also discussed several provisions that appear unique to the IGT UNC process, including arrangements allowing another party to assume responsibility for an innovation project, trial or demonstration that is subject to a derogation. AB noted that such provisions reflect the specific nature of the IGT market and are not replicated within the UNC guidance.

During the review, it was noted that no derogations have ever been raised under the IGT UNC, meaning the process has never been tested in practice. TL commented that, despite this, the overall framework appears broadly aligned with the UNC process and remains fit for purpose.

TL advised that AB had submitted a housekeeping Modification Proposal intended to implement non-material amendments identified through the review of Parts CI-CV, L and O. TL confirmed that the proposal was currently undergoing critical friend review, with legal text being prepared prior to formal submission as a Fast Track Modification. Subject to completion of the required objection period, the Modification is expected to be considered at the September Panel meeting.

AB emphasised that the Modification had intentionally been limited to issues already reviewed and discussed by the Review Group. The proposal does not attempt to undertake a comprehensive review of the entire Code but instead focuses on non-material improvements identified through RG008. TL advised that any additional housekeeping issues identified within the Derogations Guidance Document, including updating outdated contact details and correcting drafting errors, could also be incorporated into the Modification where appropriate.

AB advised that they had completed a detailed comparison of all definitions contained within Part M against the equivalent UNC definitions. A tracking spreadsheet had been produced identifying definitions that align, definitions that defer to UNC wording, definitions that differ between the Codes

and instances where the IGT UNC references definitions that no longer exist within the UNC. The Workgroup welcomed the work and agreed that the definitions analysis should be circulated to all participants for review. TL confirmed that the document would be published on the RG008 webpage and that an action would be raised for the Review Group to consider the document and provide comments before the next meeting. AB acknowledged that some differences are likely to remain necessary due to specific IGT UNC requirements but encouraged the Review Group to challenge any areas where alignment may now be appropriate.

Action 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.

Looking ahead, AB proposed that Part K be reviewed next.

The Workstream agreed to review Part K of the IGT UNC in the September Workstream meeting as part of the next step in the work for RG008. Given the volume of material involved, AB suggested splitting the review into two manageable sections covering Clauses 1-23 and Clauses 24-46 respectively. The Workgroup agreed with these next steps.

Action 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.

7. [Update on Joint UNC / IGT UNC Review Group \(RG009 & UNC 0938\)](#)

TL provided an update on the joint Review group examining the introduction of qualification requirements for new Shippers entering the IGT UNC and UNC. Although [RG009](#) and [UNC 0938](#) have been raised separately under each Code, they are being progressed collaboratively through a single joint Review group, with the Joint Office leading on meeting administration, papers and minutes. To date, only one review group meeting has taken place, with the second meeting scheduled for this week being postponed.

The first meeting included a detailed presentation from the Performance Assurance Framework Administrator (PAFA), who are supporting the review on behalf of the Proposer of the UNC modification. TL noted that the Performance Assurance Committee (PAC) has also been involved in the Review. The presentation set out the rationale for introducing qualification requirements, explained the current arrangements for joining the UNC and IGT UNC, outlined the potential future approach, and provided examples illustrating why the Review has been initiated. Members were encouraged to review the presentation materials, which have been made available via [the Review webpage](#).

The Chair clarified that the Review is focused specifically on potential qualification requirements for new entrants and does not cover accession arrangements. The intention is to assess whether organisations are sufficiently prepared to actively participate in and comply with Code obligations once they have joined.

TL emphasised that, given the ongoing Code Reform programme and the future consolidation of the two gas codes, there is a strong expectation that any qualification requirements developed through the review will be consistent across both the UNC and IGT UNC. The Review is expected to run for approximately a year and may ultimately conclude after Code consolidation has progressed, potentially resulting in any associated Modifications being implemented under a successor Code rather than the existing arrangements.

The Chair highlighted the importance of ensuring that proposals are assessed from both an UNC and IGT UNC perspective throughout the Review process, with the relative advantages and disadvantages for each Code being fully considered before recommendations are developed.

TL advised that, as the Review progresses, separate reports will be produced for the IGT UNC and UNC, although these are expected to be closely aligned and will likely reference common meeting outputs and minutes. They also confirmed that Ofgem has been engaged by PAFA during the preparatory stages and is aware of the Review, supporting its progression.

All IGT UNC parties, particularly Shippers, were encouraged to participate in future meetings. The next Review group meeting is scheduled for 15 September, and interested parties can obtain meeting invitations through either Code Administrator.

STANDING ITEMS

8. Cross Code Modification Implications Tracker

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

Watch List

- [0936 - 3 Year Modified Extension to UNC 0780S](#). This Modification will not have an impact on the IGT UNC and will not be tracked further.
- [0926 - Maintenance criteria for Emergency Contact data held in Central Systems](#). There was a one-month extension approved by the UNC Panel. This Modification will have its final vote at the UNC Panel meeting in August, taking place next week.
- [0923 - Disapplication of TPD Section D7 \(DSR Options\) for 2026 only](#). This Modification was rejected by the Authority.

IGT UNC Equivalent Modifications

- [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.

- [0921 - Broadening the definition of the Data Permissions Matrix to align with disclosure of UK Link Gemini data](#). An equivalent IGT UNC Modification, [IGT182](#), was implemented into the IGT UNC on 23rd July.
- [0887 - Facilitating Bi-Directional Connections Between IGT Pipelines and the NTS](#). An equivalent IGT UNC Modification, [IGT176](#), will be implemented into the IGT UNC on 14th August.
- [0854 - Revision of Virtual Last Resort User and Contingent Procurement of Supplier Demand Event Triggers](#). An equivalent IGT UNC Modification, [IGT181](#), has been approved for implementation. A phased implementation approach has been approved, the first phase was implemented on 23rd July, and the second phase will be implemented on 14th August.

Live Review Groups

- [0939 - Amendment to Gas Quality NTS Entry Specification at the Teesside or Easington System Entry Point](#). This Review has no IGT UNC impact and will not be monitored further.
- [0937 - Aligning LDZ Charges with Actual Gas Usage for All Customers](#). Potential IGT UNC impact, the Code Administrator will review further.
- [0929 - Consideration of an Independent Gas Quality Expert under the UNC](#). There is expected to be an IGT UNC impact from the outputs of this Review. Code Administrator will look to attend meetings where possible.

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 the Workgroup that there were no new updates to the Horizon Scanner.

AOB

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

11. NExA AQ Review Tables

The Chair introduced the annual review of the NEXA AQ tables, noting that a higher-than-usual number of questions had been raised by IGT UNC Parties due to the larger changes seen in some values compared to previous years. Whilst AQ values have generally followed a gradual downward trend in recent years, Parties had highlighted that some of the proposed reductions appeared more significant than expected.

TL explained that feedback had been focused on Parties wanting to understand why some values had changed more substantially than in previous years and why Parties were unable to replicate the published figures using the information available in the tables. They advised that the values are derived from data submitted by individual IGTs and that differences in underlying datasets and

rounding methodologies could account for discrepancies when attempting to reconstruct the calculations. The Code Administrator facilitates the governance process but does not undertake the calculations itself, this is done by the Independent Networks Association (INA).

CH identified an error within the published historical ancillary document, where the tables for 2025/26 and 2026/27 appeared to contain the same values. TL and AB confirmed that this was a copy-and-paste error affecting the historical record only. The current AQ values and the figures submitted as part of the current review process were confirmed to be correct and the error had no impact on the calculations used to derive the proposed values. TL advised that they would publish an updated version of the ancillary document to reduce further confusion.

The Workstream reviewed the current and proposed AQ values and discussed possible reasons for the larger reductions. It was suggested that changes in consumer behaviour, higher energy prices, increased energy efficiency, greater electrification and the wider move towards net zero could all be contributing factors, and AB, CH and KM confirmed that the values appeared reasonable when compared with underlying network data and no material concerns were identified.

Having considered the feedback and explanations provided, the Workstream agreed that the proposed values were appropriate and agreed to recommend approval of the proposed NExA AQ tables to the Panel, noting that the larger reductions likely reflect broader changes in energy consumption patterns and market conditions.

The Chair asked KA whether the NExA AQ tables are automatically updated within Xoserve systems following implementation. KA responded that they would check this.

Post meeting note: *Following the August Workstream meeting, the INA formally submitted corrected NExA AQ Review Values to the Code Administrator after an error was identified in an IGT's data submission. The corrected values (v2.0) will be discussed with the IGT UNC Panel on 28th August 2026 to agree next steps.*

Please note the original submitted version reviewed and recommended to Panel in the August Workgroup (v1.0), is now known to be incorrect. The document with these values remains online for transparency purposes only. However, the revised version to be discussed with Panel (v2.0) can be found [here](#) and will be an August Panel paper. The Code Administrator will inform parties of next steps for the NExA AQ Review Values once they have been agreed by Panel.

Action 26/08 – 03: Kathryn Adeseye (Xoserve) to confirm whether approved NExA AQ table updates are automatically reflected within Xoserve systems following implementation.

12. July & August Extraordinary IGT UNC Release Confirmations

TL noted the extraordinary IGT UNC release on 23rd July, which incorporated the implementation of [IGT182 - Alignment of the IGT UNC with the UNC definition of the Data Permissions Matrix](#) and the first implementation phase of [IGT181 - Revision of Virtual Last Resort User and Contingent Procurement of Supplier Demand Event Triggers](#).

TL advised that another extraordinary IGT UNC release would be going live the next day, 14th August. Modifications included within the release are [IGT176 - Changes to IGT UNC to enable UNC 0887 'Facilitating Bi-Directional Connections Between IGT Pipelines and the NTS'](#) and the second implementation phase of IGT181, comprising those elements dependent on the introduction of National Transmission System (NTS) Supply Points into the IGT UNC. TL noted that the review work undertaken under RG008 during this meeting had used the version of the IGT UNC Code scheduled to go live as part of the 14th August extraordinary release.

13. IGT Emergency Contact Data Sharing

KA provided an update on ongoing engagement regarding the sharing of emergency contact information between IGTs and Distribution Network Operators (DNOs) during emergency situations. Following questions raised by the Chair at the June Workstream meeting, Xoserve had engaged with DNOs and IGTs to better understand existing arrangements.

KA reported that DNOs had advised that, where emergency situations arise requiring the isolation of supplies on IGT networks, they would typically contact the relevant IGT directly. Discussions held with IGT representatives indicated that this broadly reflected the existing operational approach. However, because the IGT UNC includes obligations on IGTs to share contact data with DNOs, Xoserve has initiated a wider review to determine whether current arrangements remain appropriate or whether there may be benefits in introducing a more centralised process.

Questionnaires have been issued to all IGTs seeking feedback on how emergency contact data is currently shared in practice and whether any changes would be beneficial. KA stressed that this work was separate from IGT183 but had emerged from the broader review of emergency contact data governance. The feedback received would be analysed through ongoing industry engagement and may inform future work in this area. The Chair noted that the subject continued to attract regulatory interest due to wider security of supply considerations. KA encouraged all IGTs to respond to the questionnaires.

The next Workgroup meeting is scheduled for Thursday 10th September 2026.

Annex 1 – Actions Table

Reference	Action	Owner	Status
26/06 - 01	<i>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.</i>	All	Closed
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.	All	Open
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.	All	Open
26/08 – 03	Kathryn Adeseye (Xoserve) to confirm whether approved NExA AQ table updates are automatically reflected within Xoserve systems following implementation.	KA	Open