

# NTS Charging Methodology Forum (NTSCMF) Minutes

## Monday 08 May 2017

### at Elexon, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW

#### Attendees

Rebecca Hailes (Chair)	(RH)	Joint Office
Mike Berrisford (Secretary)	(MB)	Joint Office
Amrik Bal	(AB)	Shell
Andrew Pearce	(AP)	BP Gas
Benoit Enault	(BE)	Storengy UK Ltd
Bridget Roberts	(BR)	E.ON
Charles Ruffell	(CR)	RWE
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON
Colin Hamilton	(CH)	National Grid NTS
Colin Williams	(CW)	National Grid NTS
Danishtah Parker	(DP)	Cadent
David Cox*	(DC)	London Energy Consulting
David Reilly	(DR)	Ofgem
Debra Hawkin	(DH)	TPA Solutions
Gerry Hoggan	(GH)	ScottishPower
Graham Jack	(GJ)	Centrica
Henk Kreuze	(HK)	Vermilion Energy
Jeff Chandler*	(JCh)	SSE
John Costa	(JCo)	EDF Energy
Julie Cox*	(JCx)	Energy UK
Kieron Carroll	(KC)	PSE Kinsale Energy
Laura Johnson	(LJ)	National Grid NTS
Lucy Manning*	(LM)	Gazprom
Nahed Cherfa	(NC)	Statoil
Neil Rowley	(NR)	National Grid NTS
Paul Youngman	(PY)	DRAX
Pavanjit Dhesi	(PD)	Interconnector UK
Peter Bilottoft-Jensen*	(PBJ)	DONG Energy
Richard Fairholme*	(RF)	Uniper
Robert Wigginton*	(RW)	Wales & West Utilities
Sinead Obeng	(SO)	South Hook Gas
Vladislav Zuevskiy	(VZ)	Northern Gas Networks

\* via teleconference

Copies of all meeting papers are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/ntscmf/080517>

The NTSCMF Document Library has been set up on the Joint Office website and can be accessed at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/ntscmf/doclib>

#### 1. Introduction and Status Review

RH welcomed all to the meeting.

## 1.1 Approval of Minutes (24 April 2017)

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

## 1.2 Pre-Modification discussions

No business for consideration.

## 2. Workgroups

RH advised that there was no specific Workgroup business for consideration.

### 2.1 NTSCMF Future Energy Scenarios 2017 presentation

Opening, CW explained the rationale and background to today's presentation (in short it provides a further response to the previously closed action 0201) before handing over to NR (National Grid NTS Gas Modelling Manager) to run through the presentation in more detail.

The following discussion points focus (by exception) on the slides that generated the bulk of the debate, as follows:

Single View Forecast v's Scenarios – in recognising political stability and technical advances, establishes rationale and subsequent business rules and drivers;

2016 Future Energy Scenarios – presents a 2x2 matrix approach within which the 'Gone Green' and 'Slow Progress' elements look to respond to green legislation. For the record, the 'Gone Green' element hits 100% of its target.

When asked, NR explained that short term refers to forecasts 2 years out, medium term predictions forecast up to 10 years out, whilst longer-term predictions forecast 10 years and beyond. He went on to point out that accurately predicting medium term forecasts is an extremely difficult task;

FES: High Level Process – In recognising that the challenge is to 'balance' industry views/expectations, NR highlighted that National Grid also conducts bi-lateral (confidential) discussions with parties and that they (National Grid) also interact with bodies such as the Climate Change Committee. Furthermore, National Grid utilised multiple communication tool sets (during 2016) to engage with the industry such as workshops and webinars etc.;

A first look at engagement reach for 2016 – NR confirmed that the DESC members have also been engaged in discussions;

The scenarios are underpinned by the energy trilemma – In explaining that the process is heavily dependent upon various economic decisions and assumption drivers, NR suggested that a basic 'rule of thumb' is if it is legislation, then National Grid NTS would simply ensure compliance.

NR also pointed out that existing and new technological advances are reflected in the costs to the customer.

In considering the circa 25% of power station closure related impacts, (this roughly equates to a 34GWh energy generation capacity loss) this then raises questions around spare electricity generation capacity. When asked, NR confirmed that the assumption is that the bulk of the predicted emissions reductions will be from the energy sector. Other sectors such as agriculture are assumed to be able to contribute a minimal element of the 80% CO<sub>2</sub> reduction.

Example through the frame work – In essence this slide represents the 'FES World' presented in a little more detail.

NR pointed out that Political, Economic, Social and Technological (PEST) assumptions also take into account EU harmonisation considerations amongst many other factors, whilst 'Levers' include direct variances.

In terms of the 'Fixed Assumptions', these are based on circa 32 million homes in

2015 on the grounds that housing is perceived to be a bigger driver than simply using population in the analysis;

The Scenario Matrix – NR explained that ‘Gone Green’ includes both carbon capture and storage elements and that shale gas developments effectively come in to play in the absence of a green agenda and therefore appear in the ‘Consumer Power’ scenario. Regardless of where it resides, Shale gas would contribute to security of supply (based on 1:20 (UK) demand prediction). Whilst it is not expected that Brexit would impact on the (UK) infrastructure aspects, there could possibly be some other aspects that might need consideration over the next two years. When asked how National Grid NTS calculates the 1:20 demand prediction, NR agreed to undertake an action to provide an example of how National Grid NTS forecasts 1:20 demand, especially the short-term aspects (i.e. up to 5 years out). When asked, NR explained how National Grid NTS models the underlying levels of demand against the severity of the weather.

**New Action 0501: National Grid NTS (NR) to provide an example of how National Grid NTS forecasts 1:20 demand, especially the short-term aspects (i.e. up to 5 years out).**

It was noted that projecting the level of underlying demand and weather work together to provide weather corrected demand predictions (i.e. a composite weather variable defining the relationship between demand and weather).

When asked whether National Grid NTS factor in demand side response data into their supply and demand models, NR explained that whilst they do not typically include this information, they do keep a close eye on the demand side response (please note that in terms of Rough it is seen as energy neutral for FES purposes) – in essence, it depends on how demand side response is deployed.

When asked how this flows through to the Pricing Forecast Methodology (i.e. is FES used in the short-term?), CW explained that the matter specifically links into the National Grid 10 year statement that the Pricing Forecast Methodology feeds into – in short National Grid looks to objectively match the methodology.

When asked, NR confirmed that National Grid NTS undertakes significant analysis of both diversified and un-diversified values;

Example (slide 13) – NR explained that this is an electricity based example and there is no attempt to also build in any ‘trading’ considerations, as the feeling was that this is not the correct place in which to undertake this.

In considering the ‘Assumptions for renewable subsidies’ aspects, NR explained that the ‘Consumer Power’ medium assumption might include some air quality impacts (i.e. diesel emissions etc.), whilst the ‘Slow Progress’ medium assumption looks to balance off green aspects against costs.

When asked, NR explained that modelling with Brexit in mind is extremely difficult as FES is not necessarily the most optimal model, especially as there are so many unknowns relating to Brexit at this time;

Modelling Processes – focusing on the demand aspects, NR explained that the (econometric) ARUP model utilises Experion data. He confirmed that whilst National Grid NTS has been engaged in discussions with GNI for 2016’s plan, National Grid NTS may decide to simply utilise GNI’s data for this year’s Network Plan purposes. The power modelling utilises the new Bid3 model with the annual demand being established/calculated at around this point in the calendar year or so in order to feed into the supply considerations thereafter.

Moving on to consider the supply aspects, NR advised that this is mainly driven by bench marking and market intelligence leads. Focusing on the ‘Continent’ element of supply considerations, NR confirmed that this is based around annual (total) demand rather than a seasonal perspective for FES requirements.

When asked, NR confirmed that hydrogen aspects have also been considered and

believes that this has been built into the two degrees (Gone Green) scenario and the assumption seems to be that H<sub>2</sub> is predominately created for transport purposes (i.e. based on heavy goods emissions reduction and not network based aspects). However, NR recognises that there could also be some gas blending considerations. NR then pointed out that consideration of the hydrogen aspects would be included in this year's modelling, although as a separate element as part of some sensitivity analyses.

As far as storage is concerned, National Grid NTS see this as being a neutral value for modelling purposes. NR also confirmed that they also constantly monitor their forecasts against actuals and that the scenarios are utilised to look at fundamental, rather than short-term changes;

GB annual demand overview – NR explained that this is based on 2016 data and that the 'Gas / Coal Power Switch' has had a short-term impact, with renewables now expected to come into play over the mid-term;

Gas Supply Example (slide 16) – NR advised that this scenario (Consumer Power) represents the lowest import dependency.

Gas Supply Scenarios – NR pointed out that the two right hand graphs (Gone Green and Slow Progression) represent the high import dependency scenarios.

In short the graphs assume minimum levels for continental and EU flows and assume a 'generic' level for flows.

When asked how, in terms of the various scenarios, National Grid NTS utilise price fluctuations (i.e. rerun the model based on different prices), NR responded by explaining that whilst not all the models have a (direct) price impact factored into them, the Industrial & Commercial, slow progression models do. NR went on to explain that 'Gone Green' assumes that we can afford to make the changes and that home heating also assumes that constraining factors are involved.

When it was suggested that it would be beneficial to many parties/stakeholders if National Grid NTS could try to cost some of their models, NR acknowledged the point.

### **3. Gas Charging Review**

CW gave a brief overview of the programme for the meeting.

#### **3.1 EU Tariffs Code – Update**

CH explained that more information is available in the materials provided for the recent Transmission Workgroup meeting.<sup>1</sup>

When asked whether or not ENTSG have accepted who can make changes (i.e. ACER), CH indicated that in his opinion they have not although the matter is under review and it is expected to follow the (EU) legal change process which is 'heavier' than the equivalent GB UNC change process.

CH then provided a brief outline of the main aims of UNC Modification 0611 'Amendments to the firm capacity payable price at Interconnection Points'.

#### **3.2 Review of Subgroup Meeting Output**

CW reported that the Subgroup had focused on further development (additional functionality and other refinements) of the Charging spreadsheets.

#### **3.3 Charging Spreadsheets for modelling**

---

<sup>1</sup> A copy of the 04 May 2017 Transmission Workgroup meeting minutes are available to view and/or download from the Joint Office web site at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/tx/040517>

CW briefly outlined the progress made to date pointing out that in essence, the information on slide 9 is a summary of progress up to the last Workgroup presentation.

CW then focused attention on the emboldened item at the bottom of the table referring to the update to the model following updates discussed at the 11 April Sub-workgroup (see slide 10 for more details), made available 05 May 2017.

The revised spreadsheets (only the most up to date) are now available on the Joint Office website at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/ntscmf>. The files include:

- The Transmission Services CWD spreadsheet (version 1.2) plus a User Guide;
- A Transmission Services Postage Stamp Model (version 1.1) plus a User Guide;
- A Non-Transmission Services Charging Model (version 1.0).

### 3.4 Outstanding actions on key topics

#### Revenue Reconciliation

Focusing attention on the 'Key topics for discussion' table on slide 14, CW suggested that the question over whether or not sub accounts can be reconciled (i.e. can Entry and Exit be reconciled separately and not just at the full regulatory account level), links into Primary Legislation (and NRA approval) under 715/2009. As long as the methodology is approved by the relevant NRA, in this case Ofgem, National Grid NTS believes it is permissible under these proposals.

As a consequence, the National Grid NTS modification will recommend that Entry and Exit are reconciled separately. When asked whether this is expected to be reconciled on an individual Entry and Exit level, DR advised that Ofgem has already requested that National Grid NTS provides an indication on their proposals and noted that early sight of the proposals would be beneficial, especially as Ofgem's legal decision timeline is heavily dependent on what National Grid NTS ultimately proposes. At this point, CH reminded those present that there has been some de-scoping of the early TAR NC provisions in this area. CW indicated that the National Grid NTS response to both points is yes.

In advising that a definitive Ofgem decision is dependent on the modification, DR indicated that Ofgem may be able to provide an early (legal) 'minded to' position, depending on what is proposed, although it should be noted that it is not necessarily just a modification-related decision as it may also need to take into account any compliance considerations as well. In noting that the TAR NC makes reference to a reconciliation process, DR suggested that it is not clear what is actually meant by that.

When asked, those parties in attendance indicated that they believe that the proposed approach is sensible.

**New Action 0502: *Reference separate Entry and Exit reconciliation proposals - National Grid NTS (CW) and Ofgem (DR) to liaise and discuss the matter in order to provide a consolidated (early) view at the next NTSCMF meeting.***

#### Existing Contracts

Moving on, CW explained that as far as the existing contracts are concerned, the proposals are not seeking to define a concrete approach, but are simply looking to 'test' what might be realistically achievable.

In looking to address the question around what protection is afforded to capacity deemed to be an existing contract under Article 35 provisions, CW noted that the forum has previously discussed the long-term entry capacity contracts (i.e. those allocated prior to 06 April 2017).

In assessing what price is to be paid for existing contracts and whether or not the reserve price could be changed, CW suggested that a balance between capacity and

reconciliation is needed. In National Grid NTS's opinion, actual capacity price changes are unlikely and that revenue reconciliation would be possible, providing Ofgem approves the supporting methodology, which would be consulted upon in due course. Furthermore, National Grid NTS does not believe that a reserve price adjustment is appropriate, although it does recognise that there could potentially be a unit price adjustment mechanism employed via an additional capacity/commodity 'top up' charge – some parties suggested that care would be needed when considering this additional charge proposal.

Moving on to consider the question of what charges beyond the reserve price might be permissible to be levied on existing contracts, some parties voiced concern around the floating element aspects associated with existing bookings impacts. Responding, CW recognised that further discussion around existing contracts is needed, especially aspects such as calculating everyone else's prices etc. This will take place in workgroups after a draft Modification proposal is circulated by National Grid NTS.

Some parties also felt that overlaying TO Commodity is not necessarily the most appropriate mechanism, to which CW responded by pointing out that whilst there maybe alternative multiplier based options available, National Grid NTS recognises that views may differ on this matter. When GJ suggested that care is needed in considering whether or not any proposals put forward are legal, especially around the potential impact upon existing contracts, CW advised that in his opinion, both the National Grid and Ofgem lawyers would need to consider the matter carefully in due course.

When DR highlighted that Ofgem had already received Article 35/3 Entry into Force capacity booking information relating to existing contracts, CW observed that aggregated information has already been included within the National Grid NTS models (out to 4 years only). It was also noted that Exit is not included as this already includes floating provisions and that QSEC is not protected.

GJ remained of the opinion that in terms of looking forwards, the 'industry' should seek to avoid a repeat of this process impacting upon existing contracts. Responding, CW acknowledged that whilst the draft (??) modification will need to provide a level of flexibility around the existing contracts matter, it would not look to prescribe the actual solution and it will simply recognise that we have options.

Some parties strongly believe that as a point of principle, the Workgroup needs to recognise the sanctity of existing contracts that were entered into in good faith, otherwise the 'industry' risks undermining the regulatory process. In the belief that Ofgem is positioned somewhere down the process line, DR suggested that it is really down to National Grid NTS and their counter party contracts people to discuss the matter in order to make an informed (joint) proposal before even expecting Ofgem to take a view on the matter. He also believes that there are multiple potential solutions that potentially could/would work around the peripheral processes supporting the (existing) contracts. At this point, GJ suggested that perhaps stepping back from the question of capacity reconciliation might prove beneficial.

Recognising the concerns being voiced, CW accepts that there are aspects such as capacity booking elements that need further consideration, especially the fixed capacity aspects. In closing the discussions on this part of the presentation, it was noted that the Uniform Network Code is a dynamic document.

### 3.5 Plan and Change Process

CW reiterated the two approaches discussed at the previous NTSCMF meeting:

- **In Series** - run consultation processes consecutively, i.e. the UNC process to be followed by EU Consultation; or
- **In Parallel** - run the EU Consultation in parallel with the UNC process (consulting on all options in both - including any alternates).

When CW explained that National Grid NTS favours the 'In Series' option, DR suggested that it would be unwise to discount the 'In Parallel' option just in case the timeline of the 'In Series' option becomes an issue.

In providing an update on the UNC Modification timeline, CW confirmed that the aim is to provide the draft modification proposal in time for consideration at the 23 May meeting, although he is unable to give an actual release date at this time.

In considering the last bullet point on slide 20, CW suggested that looking beyond 2019 is considered to be another matter in its own right.

Moving on to consider slide 22 "Areas where changes are not being proposed", CW advised that in his opinion this is more of a capacity framework discussion rather than a charging discussion per se. Parties requested that National Grid NTS considers providing a one page summary that captures what is **not** being included in the review and when the items may, or may not be considered in a future work programme.

When asked about auctions and specifically Entry and Exit product aspects, CW advised that this is possibly a Tariff Code part II discussion to be undertaken at a later date.

Looking at the 'Gas Year / Formula Year', it was noted that this 'dovetails' into the RIIO-T2 discussions to be undertaken in due course. It was also suggested that perhaps a new issue item should be added to the register to cater for these matters.

Some parties questioned why 'Seasonal Factors' changes are not being proposed, especially as it has been at least 8 months since these were last discussed. Responding, CW suggested that little appetite to address these had been expressed and he does not believe that including them with a default value of 1 adds value, as it could possibly stifle the raising of alternative modifications.

**New Action 0503: Reference Gas Charging Review – Areas where changes are / are not being proposed - National Grid NTS (CW) to look to provide examples of future discussion topics in relation to the definitive workplan.**

#### Areas for proposed change

Four slides of "Areas for proposed change" were then considered. (slides 24-27)

The discussions on each topic are captured by exception only, as follows:

Capacity charge calculation – discussed at previous meetings – no adverse comments on the proposal from those in attendance;

Adjustment methodology to charges – consensus is this proposed approach is a viable one;

Non-Transmission Services Charging – CW confirmed that the intention is to have the proposal in place by the end of 2017 and to take the form of a split targeted topic based approach;

Revenue Reconciliation – briefly touched on in discussions earlier in the meeting with non Transmission based on an 'equitable split' approach (i.e. postalised, single reconciliation, or SO by another name);

Multipliers – When asked, CW explained the proposed approach of having the values sitting outside of Code, as this enables (yearly) changes to the pricing values to be undertaken without the need to raise a UNC modification. He also pointed out that the multipliers would be subjected to a yearly consultation mechanism.

When it was suggested that discussions around the underlying principles relating to governance of the multipliers would be needed, CH reminded everyone that the neighbouring NRAs would also have to discuss multipliers.

When CW suggested that in short, the aim is to adopt a pragmatic (governance) approach to how best to flex the values going forwards, parties voiced their concern that care would be needed around potentially confusing IP and domestic supply point

aspects relating to the annual multiplier proposals, in order to avoid the previous pitfalls associated with the Gas Day changes etc. However, some parties felt that this concern would be teased out during consideration of the underlying principles.

Recognising the concerns being voiced, CW accepted that National Grid NTS would need to examine the TAR NC position and consider how it potentially 'fits in' with their modification proposals. It was noted that whilst National Grid NTS are able to have a view, other parties who do not necessarily share the same views could always raise an alternative modification proposal.

When it was suggested that perhaps one starting point would/could be to look at the multipliers at IPs (as subject to TAR NC provisions) and thereafter examine the domestic supply point requirements, CW proposed looking at the rationale behind the current regime with a view to identifying what is a suitable starting point. However, concerns were still being voiced around how any change to the default value(s) would potentially be justified (i.e. whether the changes would stand the relevant objectives test), especially for any future modifications. CW reminded everyone that the initial starting point is to try to get to an equitable position for all parties concerned;

Interruptible – When asked, CW confirmed that this is on a per bullet point basis;

Forecasted Contracted Capacity (FCC) – CW noted a typographical error whereby 'RPM' should actually read as 'FCC'. When asked, CW also confirmed that further workgroup discussions would be expected to take place during the second half of 2017.

CW explained that the initial starting point for the draft modification is to include multiple options that could then be focused down into a single option that would then go forward to the modification consultation phase;

Timing – CW suggested that this is unlikely to involve substantial changes, although it is recognised that there could be some specific licence and UNC obligation aspects involved, and finally

Combined ASEP Splitting – CW noted that this might involve specific identification considerations similar to the previous Bacton split discussions.

When asked what frequency is envisaged for the modification workgroup meetings, CW indicated that he is open to suggestions. CW went on to explain the rationale behind having both NTSCMF and sub-group meetings, including the feedback mechanisms into the NTSCMF.

It was noted that the frequency and number of full and sub-group meetings would need to be discussed and agreed in due course. Some parties felt there could be a benefit in having a timeline plan (i.e. a work programme for NTSCMF and sub-group meetings).

**New Action 0504: National Grid NTS (CW) to update the previous timeline and include a justification and suggested topic coverage for the modification workgroup programme.**

A detailed discussion ensued on a possible meeting schedule with various suggestions being tabled. In the end, the conclusion was that the group requested that ALL meetings be at the higher NTSCMF level, rather than involve sub-group meetings and that the request is for these to be conducted on a fortnightly face-to-face basis. As and when required, an additional two supporting WebEx meetings per month could also be used, commencing July 2017 onwards.

Concluding discussions, RH confirmed that the four sub-group meetings planned for May and June would continue and once the UNC modification is formally raised, the above schedule may be activated.

**New Action 0505: Joint Office (RH) and National Grid NTS (CW) to discuss the proposed meeting schedule with a view to confirming whether or not, the Joint Office can provide sufficient resources to match the forthcoming modification**



---

**workgroup programme and meeting schedule (follows after action 0504).**

### 3.6 Next Steps

In briefly reviewing the 'Next Steps' slide, CW focused attention on the 23 May 2017 emboldened line when it is expected the Workgroup will be able to discuss the draft Modification.

## 4. Issues

### 4.1 Issues Register - Review

Not reviewed at this meeting.

## 5. Review of Outstanding Actions

**0301:** National Grid NTS (CW) to articulate and capture the Storage Review concerns within the NTSCMF Issue Register.

**Update:** CW advised that work remains ongoing. **Carried Forward**

**0402:** *NTS CMF Terms of Reference* - RH and CW to draft a 'strawman' for discussion at the May/June meetings.

**Update:** RH and CW advised that consideration remains ongoing. **Carried Forward**

**0403:** *NTSCMF and Subgroup documentation review* - All participants to review the available documentation published on the Joint Office website at:

<http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/ntscmf> and <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/ntscmf/subg>, and submit informed questions to CW as appropriate.

**Update:** CW confirmed that no questions/comments had been received. **Closed**

**0404:** *'Avoiding Inefficient Bypass of the NTS' (one-pager)* - CW and the Subgroup to revisit/re-word the final paragraph to add clarity, and republish.

**Update:** CW advised that work remains ongoing. **Carried Forward**

## 6. Any Other Business

### 6.1 Revenue (Long Term Revenue) Forecast

Referring to the E.ON allowed revenue modification, parties questioned when the revenue forecast could reasonably be expected to be published, to which CW advised that the forecast should be available at the end of May for an effective October date – a new item is to be added to the June agenda and thereafter more detail will be provided at the meeting.

## 7. Diary Planning

Further details of planned meetings are available at: <http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary>

<b>Time/Date</b>	<b>Venue</b>	<b>Workgroup Programme</b>
10:00, Tuesday 23 May 2017	Orange Room, ELEXON, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	UNC Modification - review of draft and development
10:00, Monday 05 June 2017	PINK Room, ELEXON, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	UNC Modification - final review prior to panel submission
10:00, Friday 07 July 2017	Orange Room, ELEXON, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:00, Wednesday 02 August 2017	Orange Room, ELEXON, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:00, Tuesday 05 September 2017	Orange Room, ELEXON, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:00, Wednesday 04 October 2017	Orange Room, ELEXON, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:00, Monday 06 November 2017	Orange Room, ELEXON, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	<i>To be confirmed</i>
10:00, Wednesday 06 December 2017	Orange Room, ELEXON, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	<i>To be confirmed</i>

**Action Table (as at 08 May 2017)**

<b>Action Ref</b>	<b>Meeting Date(s)</b>	<b>Minute Ref</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Status Update</b>
0301	06/03/17 (amended 05/04/17)	3.0	National Grid NTS (CW) to articulate and capture Storage Review concerns within the Storage discussion document.	National Grid NTS (CW)	<b>Carried Forward</b>
0402	24/04/17	3.2	<i>NTS CMF Terms of Reference</i> - RH and CW to draft a 'strawman' for discussion at the May/June meetings.	Joint Office (RH) and National Grid NTS (CW)	<b>Carried Forward</b>
0403	24/04/17	3.2	<i>NTSCMF and Subgroup documentation review</i> - All participants to review the available documentation published on the Joint Office website at: <a href="http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/ntscmf">http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/ntscmf</a> and <a href="http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/ntscmf/subg">http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/ntscmf/subg</a> , and submit informed questions to CW as appropriate.	ALL PARTIES	Update provided. <b>Closed</b>
0404	24/04/17	4.1	<i>'Avoiding Inefficient Bypass of the NTS' (one-pager)</i> - CW and the Subgroup to revisit/re-word the final paragraph to add clarity, and re-publish.	National Grid NTS (CW)	<b>Carried Forward</b>
0501	08/05/17	2.1	National Grid NTS (NR) to provide an example of how National Grid NTS forecasts 1:20 demand, especially the short-term aspects (i.e. up to 5 years out).		<b>Pending</b>
0502	08/05/17	3.4	<i>Reference separate Entry and Exit reconciliation proposals</i> - National Grid NTS (CW) and Ofgem (DR) to liaise and discuss the matter in order to provide a consolidated view at the next NTSCMF meeting.	National Grid NTS (CW) & Ofgem (DR)	<b>Pending</b>
0503	08/05/17	3.5	<i>Reference Gas Charging Review</i> – Areas where changes are / are not being proposed - National Grid NTS (CW) to look to provide examples of future discussion topics in relation to the definitive workplan.	National Grid NTS (CW)	<b>Pending</b>

---

0504	08/05/17	3.5	To update the previous timeline and include a justification and suggested topic coverage for the modification workgroup programme.	National Grid NTS (CW)	<b>Pending</b>
0505	08/05/17	3.5	To discuss the proposed meeting schedule with a view to confirming whether or not, the Joint Office can provide sufficient resources to match the forthcoming modification workgroup programme and meeting schedule (follows after action 0504).	Joint Office (RH) & National Grid NTS (CW)	<b>Pending</b>