

NTS Charging Methodology Forum (NTSCMF) Minutes
Thursday 11 January 2024
Via Microsoft Teams

| Attendees | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Eric Fowler (Chair) | (EF) | Joint Office |
| Tanaka Tizirai (Secretary) | (TT) | Joint Office |
| Adam Bates | (AB) | SEFE Energy |
| Adaeze Okafor | (AO) | Equinor |
| Alex Nield | (AN) | Storengy |
| Amy Howarth | (AH) | Storengy |
| Anna Shrigley | (AS) | Eni |
| Antony Miller | (AM) | South Hook Gas |
| Ash Adams | (AA) | National Gas Transmission |
| Brian McGlinchey | (BM) | Pavilion Energy |
| Carlos Aguirre | (CA) | Pavilion Energy |
| Christiane Sykes | (CS) | Shell |
| Chris Wright | (CW _r) | Exxon Mobil |
| Colin Williams | (CW _i) | National Gas Transmission |
| David Bayliss | (DB) | National Gas Transmission |
| Davide Rubini | (DR) | Vitol |
| Emma Robinson | (ER) | E.ON |
| Jeff Chandler | (JC) | SSE |
| Joseph Glews | (JG) | Ofgem |
| Julie Cox | (JC _x) | Energy UK |
| Karen Cashio | (KC) | Ofgem |
| Kieran McGoldrick | (KM _c) | National Gas Transmission |
| Lauren Jauss | (LJ) | RWE |
| Matthew Atkinson | (MA) | SEFE Energy |
| Mariachiara Zennaro | (MZ) | Centrica |
| Marion Joste | (MJ) | Eni |
| Nick Wye | (NW) | Waters Wye Associates |
| Nigel Sisman | (NS) | Sisman Consult |
| Oreoluwa Ogundipe | (OO) | Interconnector |
| Richard Hewitt | (RH) | BBLC |
| Paige Leigh-Wilkes | (PL _w) | Cadent Gas |
| William Duff | (WD) | Ofgem |

Please note that NTSCMF meetings will be quorate where at least six participants are attending, of which at least two shall be Shipper Users and one Transporter is in attendance.

Please note these minutes do not replicate/include detailed content provided within the presentation slides, therefore it is recommended that the published presentation material is reviewed in conjunction with these minutes. Copies of all papers are available at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/ntscmf/110124>

1. Introduction

Eric Fowler (EF) welcomed delegates to the meeting.

1.1. Approval of Minutes (05 December 2023)

The minutes from the previous December 2023 meeting were approved.

1.2. Approval of Late Papers

EF noted that there were four late papers received on the 8th, 9th and 10th January 2024, which were approved by the Workgroup, for agenda items 3.0, 4.0, and 6.

1.3. Review of Outstanding Actions

Action 0301: National Gas Transmission to consider the effect of the removal of non-obligated entry capacity revenue from capacity neutrality.

Update: Colin Williams (CWi) presented to the Workgroup a joint update for Action 0301 and Action 0801. CWi referred the Revenue Mapping document and commented that it is meant to be a live-document, therefore, it may include further clarifications or updates on the matter in the future; and NGT welcomes any comments or feedback on the document. The Revenue Mapping document can be found here: [NTS Charging Methodology Forum | Joint Office of Gas Transporters \(gasgovernance.co.uk\)](https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/nts-charging-methodology-forum-joint-office-of-gas-transporters).

CWi provided a high-level of overview of the concerns that led to the actions and commented that he was not attributing a weight to the concerns but reflecting what had been captured from previous discussions; therefore, if anything has been missed, the Workgroup should raise those concerns.

CWi noted that generally the treatment of recovered revenues has remained unchanged in terms of where they are directed under the licence; with the exception of a change effecting the removal of specific entry capacity revenues from capacity neutrality but also where there was a change to the licence that corrected their mapping to be recovered as Transmission Owner (TO) recovered revenue rather than System Operator (SO).

Anna Shrigley (AS) asked CWi to confirm whether the change with UNC0748 removed the interruptible capacity product i.e. whether that has been removed from the neutrality?

CWi confirmed that it removed a number of things, including obligated revenue streams as well. He mentioned that 3 categories of revenue streams were removed of which interruptible capacity was one of them.

AS enquired as to whether interruptible was the non-obligated capacity?

CWi clarified that the non-obligated has not changed.

AS further enquired whether it is correct that when we talk about non-obligated capacity product, we classify interruptible capacity as non-obligated capacity. AS queried whether under UNC0748, the specific entry capacity product i.e. the revenue that relates to non-obligated products, has been changed so that it does not go to neutrality anymore; is that the interruptible capacity or is there something else when it comes down to non-obligated.

CWi acknowledged AS' query and commented that her points will be addressed later in the presentation pack. He pointed out that the licence change clarified how certain revenues would be treated. CWi pointed to the link on the powerpoint for the Revenue Allocation Modification Decision: [Modification of National Grid Gas Plc Gas Transporter Licence to change Part B of Special Condition 2.1 and Part B of Special Condition 2.3 | Ofgem](#).

He highlighted two updates (one relating to TO and another relating to SO). He explained that the Interruptible Entry Capacity and the Off-peak Exit Capacity are considered TO activity; whereas, Interruptible Entry Capacity, Off-peak Exit Capacity and all on the Day sales of Non-Incremental Obligated Exit Capacity and Funded Incremental Obligated Exit Capacity are removed from SO activity. Therefore, Non-Obligated Entry Capacity and Non-Obligated Exit Capacity are the only items which remain for SO activity.

AS sought confirmation that, in plain language, when we say non-obligated entry and exit capacity, they can be described as capacity which is sold above the baseline (i.e. discretionary capacity).

CWi confirmed that is correct.

Julie Cox (JCx) questioned why there is different treatment between non-obligated entry and exit. JCx cautioned against the justification of *"its always been that way"* as the current position may have been right at some point in time; however, she noted a lack of fundamental principles being explained as to why that is still the right thing to do.

CWi stated that these points are covered off in the presentation. He explained that entry was set up with a particular purpose, and in anticipation of certain scenarios and it was not as necessary to have the same function for exit. He further explained that the nature of exit has more potential for very localised effects affecting only a few parties. The design for entry allowed for effects that could be more sizable.

JCx acknowledged that explains how we got here but raised a concern that it does not explain whether that is still the right approach. She queried whether capacity neutrality as a principle is still appropriate as the mechanism places money back with capacity holders and asked if the different treatment between entry and exit still justified. JCx highlighted a concern that a forecast of non-obligated capacity goes into the financial model and that feeds into charges, but somehow through neutrality it all comes out again, and it is not clear how the cash flows and whether the money ends up in the right places.

CWi mentioned that the presentation covers off the materiality aspects of those concerns.

JCx clarified that she is not querying materiality but the principles. The charges regime is so complicated to understand so consideration should be given to making it more simple. JCx concluded that *"small materiality"* or *"it's always been that way"* are not sufficient justification to say the current approach is fine.

CWi accepted JCx's points and acknowledged it is worth considering whether an approach is justifiable. However, any alternatives would also need consideration whether they are appropriate or better.

JCx highlighted the importance of making the information in question more user-friendly and highlighted the main concern of being unable to track and identify the areas which may become an issue in the future or even work out whether the rules are being applied correctly adding that Ofgem should also be concerned about this.

CWi commented that NGT is always seeking improvement in respect of what they are sharing and where they can make it more visible. He rejected the implication that NGT might doing something untoward commenting that there are measures in place e.g. NGT reports to Ofgem and it provides communications and participates in these Workgroup forums. If there are specific concerns, NGT is open to hearing them and would respond.

JCx stated that it is very difficult to ask specific questions as the arrangements are so complex across Code and Licence. JCx also stated that it is not sufficient for concerns to be predominantly addressed in these forums as industry does not have the time nor resources to understand the materials fully. She questioned as to whether Ofgem has an understanding and full appreciation of where the revenues are going.

Joseph Glews (JG) of Ofgem acknowledged JCx raised valid concerns and that it is complex topic. He clarified that Ofgem has teams who are responsible for the process of monitoring and managing the system so there is very little scope for misdirection by NGT.

JG stated that they have taken steps in terms of transparency with NGT. He commented that Ofgem are striving for great transparency when it comes to their decision-making processes and the processes which relate to NGT. He encouraged feedback for any specific improvements that industry thinks Ofgem can make. JG stated that this could be via one-on-one discussions or smaller discussions. Joseph Glews is contactable via: joseph.glews@ofgem.gov.uk

JCx asked if it would be helpful to undertake realignment of the terminology between license and Code; e.g. for transmission services and non-transmission services. Even in the presentation today, there are references to some things being SO, and some of it being TO. JG recognised that some of the complexity comes from the usage of different terms. He noted that Ofgem are very happy to consider those issues perhaps as a longer-term project.

AS provided positive feedback on the presentation produced by CWi, as she feels that we now have everything that we need to decode the complex legislation behind this process now.

Nick Wye (NW) commented that the main point he has taken from the above discussion is the inconsistency between the Code and the licence, and this has always caused problems going back many years. He then noted that the sale of non-obligated reflects the sort of reduction in gas demand over time and the expectation is that this will continue, and also an expectation that there may be some replacement of methane with hydrogen. This may potentially create additional issues in terms of accommodating hydrogen, not only physically, but also commercially in respect to getting access to the NTS. NW further mentioned that Joseph Glews offer to run a project looking at the inconsistency between the way the Code, other documentation methodologies, alongside making them more consistent with the licence would be an exceptionally useful way to spend some time and resource. NW noted that the alignment and treatment of the revenues between entry and exit as secondary matter.

Nigel Sisman (NS) noted that it was good that other participants had indicated that there might be issues arising from the treatment of Non-Obligated Entry capacity. NS indicated that he had formulated the action item 301 to explore one of many cashflows where treatments, and therefore outcomes, might be less than desirable. He remained concerned that the interaction between Licence, UNC, regulatory accounting and NG's tariff calculations may distort prices paid by shippers, which are likely passed through to consumers and therefore cause consumer detriment. His concern is that there may be distortions to the (Licence) determination of Allowed Revenues and Revenues Recovered. NS indicated that Non-Obligated Entry Capacity is just one of several cashflows that should be considered. Non-Obligated Entry capacity had been chosen because it is perhaps the easiest to understand of the potential cashflows that might be problematic.

NS indicated that revenues associated with products of all durations for all other capacities, including all obligated firm, all interruptible, and all non-obligated exit capacities contribute to NG's Licence Recovered Revenues. However, the presentation (slide 9) indicates "From National Gas' perspective, Non-Obligated capacity for Entry and Exit are attributable to SO Activity and should therefore remain as SO recovered revenues". He noted readers might struggle with this because other parts of the presentation confirm this is not the case: Non-Obligated **Entry** Capacity makes a zero contribution to SO Recovered Revenues regardless of how much of that capacity is sold.

NS indicated that the presentation reflects a lot of wider pricing issues including those associated with UNC Transmission and Non-Transmission elements, Entry/Exit elements, licence TO/SO components, variances between forecasts and outturns that cause year on year changes in prices, and the complex interactions between all of those factors but these are not the primary concern.

The critical questions are rather “are the total payments paid for relevant services appropriate or not? Do we have distortions that generate inappropriate Recovered Revenues or Allowed Revenue determinations arising from what are likely unintended consequences currently buried within the broader pricing regime and which are poorly understood? And do these cause a detriment to consumers?”

CWi firstly responded that with respect to alignment, people need to be clear what they mean; since the licence and Code are separate things with their own individual set ups. He noted that it feels that people think both licence and Code should precisely match each other. However, CWi’s questioned under what conditions? Is it clarification or change expected?

CWi secondly mentioned that some of the points raised are alarmist in nature and imply that NGT is not doing its job. Any implication that certain things are misdirected or not in keeping with expectations need to be followed up with examples. He highlighted the inappropriateness of making broad brush statements which give the implication that NGT or Ofgem is doing something wrong without examples. He stressed that NGT and Ofgem are happy to look into any concerns or questions that they people may wish to raise.

In respect of page 11 of the presentation NS asked whether he is correct in thinking that the two things offset: the revenue (*referred at second bullet point, slide 11*) which is treated as recovered revenue and concurrently redistributed through entry capacity neutrality. Therefore, no revenue contributes to the recovered revenue?

CWi clarified that the result is a neutral position. NS’ responded that the end result is that the money, some would argue is missing because it does not contribute to recovered revenue?

CWi clarified that it contributes and then it is returned; it is just returned very quickly, so for net position is shown as not contributing. However, he emphasised that to not state that it does not contribute would twisting the language of the licence, as it stipulates that it is part of the recovered revenue, but it is then returned, which is the net position.

NS’ then stated that the revenue does not contribute to the SO recovered revenue. He provided an example that if you sold £1.00 worth of non-obligated capacity on entry, £1.00 would not appear in the recovered revenue position for the SO, and asked whether this is correct? CWi responded that that is correct for the net position. He explained that in regard to the pricing process, you assume a value of ‘0’ because of an assumption of money-in and money-out, at the same value.

NS’ acknowledged that is what NGT uses for the charging purposes. However, noted that in terms of the overall pot of the money, there is no credit coming through for that revenue received. He then noted that to achieve the allowed revenue, another charge is higher to compensate, and asked whether that is the effect.

CWi confirmed that is the effect but explained that equally where have money flowing-in and out; you can think of it from different layers of customers, because the assumption that one price is technically higher as a consequence of the treatment, but it must not be ignored that there are monies being returned out into the industry which lowers certain costs as well.

NS responded that this seems inconsistent with assumptions that NG’s consultants have used in relation to previous assessments of consumer impacts of the charging regime where it has been assumed that the headline i.e. published prices for services feed through to consumers. NS noted that NG’s stated position might explain why it took so long to remove distortions created by overly generous shorthaul provisions and why, as it seems likely now, that the distortion created by Existing Contracts is unlikely to be removed.

JCx, referring back to CWi’s question around alignment argued that alignment means there is a level of consistency when it comes to things such as the SO and TO; whether in Code or licence. She further questioned whether neutrality is still the right thing to have.

AS suggested that is relevant to Option 3 (system operation could generate its own capacity charge) and explained that it could be a commodity charge, and the revenue can be collected in a similar way. She asked CWi whether there is a reason for why Option 3 was not considered as being associated a commodity charge.

CWi explained that non-obligated is a capacity product, therefore, an assumption was made that a capacity product would be paid for by a capacity charge. He further noted that if you are doing something different with it, you are potentially changing the arrangement about how the capacity is procured.

JCx questioned the role of Shippers in terms of passing through transportation charges, as Shippers will pass through transportation charges into their tariffs based on the tariffs which are set in advance. However, she is concerned with the idea of the transportation charging arrangements, being reliant on something uncertain and arising at a later stage.

CWi clarified that from NGT's perspective for everything which sits behind this there is a degree of forecasting, and equally in terms of what Shippers do with the information in terms of translating it into their prices is opaque to NGT.

JCx noted the oddness of the matter, and highlighted that neutrality is more inherently unpredictable than some other elements which CWi has touched upon. AS offered the opinion that neutrality works because it returns in the same gas year but that the amounts are insignificant.

NS asked CWi why non-obligated entry capacity was addressed via capacity neutrality?

CWi explained that the mechanism for capacity neutrality, in respect to the entry side, was to lower the cost implications of constraints, if they were to occur. ~~He confirmed that there is no direct linkage between the two.~~ However, he noted that it does not lower the cost of constraints, but the net effect of netting off the identified revenues is that it would lower some of the impacts to customers.

NS asked to refer back to the question posed in the action and asked whether NGT would consider this to be a helpful change with a 'yes' or 'no' answer.

CWi answered that NGT does not see the benefit of making a change at this point in time. He then asked NS to explain what the 'material' benefit is?

NS argued that it is not an issue of materiality but a matter of principle. He mentioned that it is a similar principle to that which NGT used to justify UNC0748. NS indicated that the principles associated with the removal of Non-Obligated Entry Capacity from capacity neutrality are those that were the justification for the removal of several other cashflows from capacity neutrality under UNC0748. NS stated that the removal of Non-Obligated Entry Capacity from capacity neutrality would reduce transportation charges and reduce cashflows behind the scenes in the very opaque capacity neutrality process.

CWi explained that the two items need to be separated, since 0748 was around specific revenue streams that they did not consider system operator activity. CWi indicated that this is the only revenue stream that contributes to capacity neutrality. NS countered that this is not the case as there are other cashflows, other than Non-Obligated Entry capacity, that contribute to capacity neutrality revenues. CWi added this is about capacity revenues and what has been addressed is reviewing and commenting on capacity revenues, extending from UNC0748 which focused on capacity revenues.

NS pointed out that the promised review of capacity not taken place and indicated that the decision about whether, once Non-Obligated Entry Capacity was removed, it was regarded as TO or SO Recovered Revenue is a separate point and is separable from the decision about its potential removal from capacity removal. If Entry Non-Obligated Capacity is removed from capacity neutrality, and no other changes are made, then Entry Non-Obligated Capacity Revenue it will contribute to SO Recovered Revenue which, from NS view, is what NG appear to suggest would be appropriate.

The Chair observed a degree of frustration between the diverging points being made and that the debate had continued for some time in this meeting. He asked the Workgroup to consider whether the discussion has discharged the questions associated with the actions.

NW stated that he is satisfied that the discussions and the presentation has sufficiently discharged the actions.

EF further proposed Workgroup members to re-read and consider the materials and the discussion points; and take into account whether they want more information or further depth, and then resume the matter at the upcoming meeting in February for next steps regarding the discharged actions.

Workgroup agreed to the proposal to resume the matter at the February 2024 meeting.

For full details, please refer to the 'NTSCMF January 2024 Action Updates' presentation pack published: [NTSCMF 11 January 2024 | Joint Office of Gas Transporters \(gasgovernance.co.uk\)](#). **Carried Forward**

Commented [CW(G1)]: As with 0801 believe these were considered closed.

Action 0801: National Gas Transmission (CWt) to Provide an overview, and an understanding of the reasons underpinning the current treatment, of recovered revenue for Entry Non-Obligated capacity and its inclusion in capacity neutrality. This will also cover thoughts on the potential impacts, for discussion, of changing the treatment of Non-Obligated Entry Capacity revenue.

Update: Please see Action 0301 for the update for this action. **Carried Forward**

1.4. Industry Update from Ofgem

Joseph Glews (JG) referred to the Ofgem Expected publication dates timetable at [Code modification/modification proposals with Ofgem for decision - Expected publication dates timetable](#); noting the estimated decision dates for:

| Modification | Estimated Decision Date |
|--|-------------------------|
| 0823- Amendment to the Allocation of Entry Capacity and Flow Quantities to Qualifying CNCCD Routes | 26 January 2024 |
| 0847- Introduction of a Minimum General on Transmission Services Charge | 31 May 2024 |

1.5. Pre-Modification discussions

None to consider.

2. Workgroups

No Workgroups currently on-going.

3. Non-Transmission Charging Reforms

Ash Adams (AA) presented an overview of the non-transmission reforms for October 2024 implementation. He noted that this is in view of a decision on 0857 having not yet been made, but NGT believes those changes will have a positive impact to reduce volatility. He noted that NGT does think more can be done to address the issues which remain.

AA then provided a high-level overview of the further potential change that could be made:

- Reviewing ability to update the non-transmission revenues and tariffs within the year;
- Removing volatile elements from the GNTs charge and charge these separately;
- Introducing a provision for tariff updates under certain circumstances; and
- Alternative method of managing the volatility and reconciliations without more frequent tariff updates.

Christiana Sykes (CS) highlighted a concern with option 1 that whilst a change to tariffs within the year makes sense, as you may have less impact at the end of the gas year; it also creates more uncertainty which could be a problem.

Julie Cox (JCx) supported CS' comments and added that Mod0748 was about not making change to charges unless it is absolutely necessary. AA acknowledged the concerns raised by CS and JCx, and confirmed that they will consider those issues. However, he highlighted that there will be pros and cons associated with all of the options that the Workgroup can identify in their analysis.

CS raised a concern regarding the third option ("*...provision for tariff updates...*") and indicated that monthly changes or changes based on some sort of thresholds is not something they would support, since these could add to volatility. Anna Shrigley (AS) supported CS' viewpoint and noted that such an approach would complicate the matter and may not be something which would be favoured by other industry participants.

CS raised concerns regarding the fundamental changes to the charging regime, and the recent updates where people obtained information at different times which created more uncertainty.

AA acknowledged those points and invited bilaterally conversation with people to understand the impacts in more detail.

For full details, please refer to the presentation pack published: [NTSCMF 11 January 2024 | Joint Office of Gas Transporters \(gasgovernance.co.uk\)](#)

4. St Fergus Compressor Emissions Charging Considerations

Colin Williams (CWi) presented an overview of the emissions related investment linked to the St Fergus compressors. He provided a draft timeline for discussions of the St Fergus charges, running from January 2024 into June 2024 onwards.

For full details, please refer to the St Fergus presentation pack published: [NTSCMF 11 January 2024 | Joint Office of Gas Transporters \(gasgovernance.co.uk\)](#)

5. Transmission Services Review

CWi provided an update to the Workgroup and noted that they expect to bring something more substantial together with a final publication of the Gas Charging Discussion Document 13 (GCD-13) conclusions document in February 2024. He provided an overview of the background, history and reasoning behind UNC0790 and GCD-13 and an outline of the timeline for the proposed discussion dates which will inform the plan going forward.

CWi commented that NGT believed the proposals in Mod0790 were the best way to address the issue and they had not identified a better alternative.

CWi commented that NGT has not ruled out a review of the entry/exit split and see merit in a review to look at the potential benefits or impacts that a change might bring. However, NGT does not want to progress another proposal that fails on compliance at the final assessment so consideration of compliance should occur earlier in the process.

RHe commented that the timeline appears long and that NGT is proposing a much quicker timescale for its own modifications. CWi responded that the timescale is conservative and it could be shorter. RHe asked whether Ofgem has views the timeline. JGI responded that Ofgem supports the discussion taking place but does not have a position on when it should be implemented. Ofgem would probably need to carry out an impact assessment.

For full details, please refer to the Transmission Services Review presentation pack published: [NTSCMF 11 January 2024 | Joint Office of Gas Transporters \(gasgovernance.co.uk\)](https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/NTSCMF-11-January-2024)

6. NTS Gas Charging Consultation – Periodic Consultation under Art 26 of TAR

AA ran through the presentation pack on the periodic consultation required under Article 26 of the Tariff Network Code. He provided a brief overview of the obligations under TAR, the requirements of the consultation, how the consultation will be utilised and the proposed timelines.

JCx asked if the consultation is specific to the obligations in the UK retained law which amended TAR NC. AA responded that NGT have looked at the requirements that are set out under TAR as retained in UK law and confirmed that the content within the presentation is correct.

Joseph Glews (JG) clarified that the retained UK law was amended at least once since it was made. He further confirmed that everything in the presentation pack is required under retained UK law and it is not specifically just about looking at TAR NC. JG confirmed that he is happy to provide a link to the law for the purposes of clarity.

The Workgroup confirmed that the action on NGT and Ofgem (Action 1201) has been discharged.

7. Capacity and Revenue Monitoring

Kieran McGoldrick (KMc) provided the Capacity and Revenue Monitoring Report summarising the Entry and Exit capacity and revenue actuals against the forecast.

KMc highlighted the differences in behaviours concerning capacity bookings for Entry and Exit. Please refer to the published slides for full details.

Exit Capacity & Revenue FY24 – November 2023

- November 2023 saw an increase on demand in comparison to the previous year due to the colder weather, however, it has remained on target.

Entry Capacity & Revenue FY24 – November 2024

- The figures for entry are more in-line with the actuals. He noted that the effect on revenues was exacerbated by a much greater use of existing contracts than NGT initially forecast.

General Non -Transmission & St Fergus Compression Revenue FY24

- As a result of the price increase from October 2023, there was a jump in revenues, but overall flows remained down on forecast, resulting in about a £9million under collection for November 2023 for this flow-based charge.

8. Any Other Business

8.1 - FCC Methodology for 24/25

Ash Adams (AA) presented an overview of the FCC Methodology for 2024 and 2025. He explained that NGT have to keep under review the FCC methodology and consult on any material changes that are proposed.

Richard Hewitt (RH) raised a concern on the lack of consultation and stated that it would have been prudent for NGT to consult with power generation users about the reductions proposed. JCx echoed this point and asked what discretion rests with NGT to declare whether a change was material.

AA commented that NGT is not proposing a change to the FCC methodology so hadn't triggered a formal consultation. He acknowledged the points raised and offered to engage with some of the power generation operators and also Ofgem, and potentially bring back a couple of lines on this matter for next time.

Karen Cashio (KC) of Ofgem confirmed that she will also inform her team regarding JCx points on the FCC charging reforms, and will get back to JCx via email.

For further information on the FCC Methodology, please refer to the presentation pack published: [NTSCMF 11 January 2024 | Joint Office of Gas Transporters \(gasgovernance.co.uk\)](https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/NTSCMF_11_January_2024_Joint_Office_of_Gas_Transporters)

New Action 0101: NGT to engage with power station users regarding the assumptions and return to the Workgroup with any findings following those engagements.

9. Diary Planning

NTSCMF meetings are listed at: <https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/NTSCMF>

All other Joint Office events are available via: www.gasgovernance.co.uk/events-calendar/month

| Time/Date | Meeting Paper Deadline | Venue | Workgroup Programme |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 10:00 Tuesday 6 February 2024 | 5 pm on Tuesday 29 January 2024 | Via Microsoft Teams | Standard Agenda |
| 10:00 Tuesday 5 March 2024 | 5 pm Tuesday 27 February 2024 | Via Microsoft Teams | Standard Agenda |
| 10:00 Tuesday 2 April 2024 | 5 pm Tuesday 26 March 2024 | Via Microsoft Teams | Standard Agenda |

| NTCSMF Action Table | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------|---------|---|-----------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| Action Ref | Meeting Date | Min Ref | Action | Reporting Month | Owner | Status Update |
| 0301 | 07/03/23 | 1.3 | National Gas Transmission to consider the effect of the removal of non-obligated entry capacity revenue from capacity neutrality. <i>Would NGT consider this to be a helpful change? Does NGT consider that there are other necessary, or desirable changes (in UNC and/or Licence) to appropriately manage non-obligated entry cashflows?</i> | December 2023 | National Gas Transmission (CWi) | Carried Forward |
| 0801 | 01/08/23 | 1.3 | National Gas Transmission (CWi) to provide an overview, and an understanding of the reasons underpinning the current treatment, of recovered revenue for Entry Non-Obligated capacity and its inclusion in capacity neutrality. | December 2023 | National Gas Transmission (CWi) | Carried Forward |
| 0101 | 11/01/24 | 8.1 | National Gas Transmission (AA) to engage with power station users regarding the assumptions and return to the Workgroup with any findings following those engagements. | February 2024 | National Gas Transmission (AA) | Pending |