
NTS Charging Methodology Forum (NTSCMF) Minutes

Wednesday 02 August 2017

at Elexon, Charles House, 5-11 Regent Street, London SW1Y 4LR

Attendees

Les Jenkins (Chair)	(LJe)	Joint Office
Helen Bennett (Secretary)	(HB)	Joint Office
Adam Bates	(AB)	National Grid NTS
Andrew Pearce	(AP)	BP
Anna Shrigley	(AS)	ENI
Benoit Enault*	(BE)	Storengy
Charles Ruffell	(CR)	RWE Trading
Colette Baldwin	(CB)	E.ON
Colin Williams	(CW)	National Grid NTS
Craig Neilson*	(CN)	Cadent
Danishtah Parker*	(DP)	Cadent
David Cox*	(DC)	London Energy Consulting
David Mitchell	(DM)	SGN
David Reilly	(DR)	Ofgem
Debra Hawkin*	(DH)	TPA Solutions
Dymph Cooke	(DC)	Shell
Gerry Hogan	(GH)	Scottish Power
Graham Jack	(GJ)	Centrica
Jeff Chandler	(JCh)	SSE
Joanne Parker	(JP)	Scotia Gas Networks
Kieron Carroll	(KC)	PSE Kinsale Energy
Laura Johnson	(LJo)	National Grid NTS
Lee Bowerbank*	(LB)	Exxon Mobil International Ltd
Lucy Manning	(LM)	Gazprom
Nicky White*	(NWWh)	npower
Nick Wye*	(NWy)	WatersWye
Pavanjit Dhesi*	(PD)	Interconnector
Peter Bilttoft-Jenson*	(PBJ)	Dong Energy
Richard Fairholme	(RF)	Uniper
Sinead Obeng	(SO)	South Hook Gas
Vladislav Zuevskiy	(VZ)	Northern Gas Networks

* *via teleconference*

Copies of all meeting papers are available at:
<https://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/ntscmf/020817>

1. Introduction and Status Review

LJ welcomed all to the meeting

1.1 Approval of Minutes (07 July 2017 and 17 July 2017)

The minutes for 07 July 2017 were approved.

DR suggested an amendment to the 17 July 2017 minutes as follows:

Page 5

~~DR suggested it could be made mandatory, adding that if something is free do you need to stop others from hoarding~~

DR reminded participants that UNC611 proposed the introduction of a "Mandatory Minimum Premium" to deal with user commitment issues for incremental capacity at interconnection points.

CW suggested an amendment to the minutes suggesting there is further clarification required around system contracts, the amendment is as follows:

Page 6

~~CW confirmed that FCC will be based at an aggregate level, and JCx agreed that this meets the objective that it is published and transparent.~~

CW confirmed that FCC is required by Entry and Exit point for the capacity charge calculations. For the purposes of revenue reconciliation any postalised charge, if used, would be over an aggregate value (not necessarily FCC) and disaggregated to be point specific.

The Workgroup approved the amendments and, as such, the minutes for 17 July will be re-published.

1.2 Pre-Modification discussion

No modifications were provided for consideration at this meeting.

2. Workgroups

2.1 0621 – Amendments to Gas Transmission Charging Regime

As there is nothing that is ready for impact assessment LJ advised that the meeting will move on to the Gas Charging Review and the material provided by National Grid NTS.

3. Gas Charging Review

During an onscreen review of the material provided for the Workgroup, CW advised which discussion points would be covered during this workgroup meeting:

- Sub-workgroups
 - Output / Summary of recent sub-workgroups (Multipliers)
- Avoiding Inefficient bypass of the NTS
 - Reminder of the outcomes from recent discussions
 - Discussion on progress and development of options
- Action 0602
 - Removal of sites from the CWD Model (Theddlethorpe)
- Action 0603
 - Current revenues from commodity and capacity charges from different types of point for 2015/16 as an example
- Action 0707
 - Understanding how Existing Contracts are included in the CWD calculations
- Plan and change process
 - Overall timeline
 - Overview of the future sub groups and NTSCMF meetings and their focus
- Next Steps

3.1 Multipliers

Output from sub workgroup

CW talked through an onscreen presentation starting with the output from the recent sub-workgroup held on 25 July covering Multipliers.

CW encouraged the workgroup to provide any inputs in advance of the meetings via email to the National Grid Charging team on:

box.transmissioncapacityandcharging@nationalgrid.com.

The timetable of discussion topics for the sub workgroups has been shared which should allow time for preparation and the submission of any material.

Any contributions are welcomed and most helpful, adding that, the more contributions received, the better.

Talking through the Objectives – Key questions to address slide, CW advised the workgroup that there are a number of questions that the sub-workgroup, held on 25 July 2017, had considered for both Entry and Exit, he went on to cover some of the views expressed for each of the questions:

1. Short term (ST) relative to Long term (LT) multipliers – should they incentivise a certain behaviour?
2. Should multipliers facilitate access? – How to consider when combined with the revenue recovery options – do certain combinations work more effectively in this regard?
3. Measurement against Relevant Objectives, GTCR and Stakeholder Objectives and EU (Multipliers at IPs need to be consulted on each year)

The discussion on Entry covered many of the same themes as Exit (see below).

The following discussions took place for Exit:

Referring to the terminology of cross subsidy used in the question ‘Should multipliers facilitate access’ for both Entry and Exit, RF stated that he had concerns about using the term ‘cross subsidy’, expressing that you could say that Long Term Capacity is cross subsidy and that there are different products with different uses. CW suggested that the rest of the statement still holds true, and agreed that cross subsidy can mean a number of different things. JC asked if cross subsidy is a defined term in the licence, to which DR and CW advised they were unsure if it is a defined term but that it may be in the regulation itself.

Throughout the workgroup there were differing views on whether cross subsidy is the right term to use. CW added that another way to look at it might be that, there are a range of users, a range of products, and range of prices as a result of any methodology and it will be a choice (where possible) to select which is appropriate for them. As a result, there may be a revenue distribution impact.

KC suggested that maybe examples would help to define the volume of the cross-subsidy. DR agreed that an example would be helpful.

When asked by LM if there would be an increase in under recovery if there is an increase in the multipliers, DR suggested it would be helpful to provide how much revenue is recovered under long term contracts.

There followed a general discussion throughout the workgroup around the point that LM made. CW generally asked the workgroup, how does one come up with what an appropriate multiplier for Entry/Exit?

GJ advised that the workgroup need to look at interruption as well, this needs to be considered in this multiplier topic too so that the whole short term view can be considered.

CW clarified the difference in topics Firm vs Interruptible and agreed they are very closely linked.

When asked by VZ about the probability of interruption, CW clarified that this is only a

requirement under TAR NC at interconnection-points, however it can be applied at all points. LJo confirmed there is a sub-workgroup on Tuesday 08 August 2017 for Interruptible and then the outcome will be discussed at this workgroup at the end of August.

Moving on, GJ mentioned that there may be other objectives that might need to be considered within this modification. LJe suggested that cost reflectivity needs to be thought about. Agreeing, DR advised that Network Code states that reasonable cost reflectivity should be measured against cost drivers, those mentioned under TAR NC being capacity and distance as the cost drivers.

There was agreement from the workgroup that caution needs to be applied around the potential to prohibit trade; cost reflective prices should promote trade. When asked, CW reiterated encouragement of the workgroup comments and views to be submitted to the NTS Charging team and clarified that they are still gathering information.

In response to clarity being sought on how DNs use the system as opposed to direct connects from a security aspect, CW advised that DNs are a particular category and that they have different requirements, recognising that there are different users and different reasons why they book different products.

GJ mentioned that, from a 1 in 20 peak demand point of view, that there is no obligation on shippers but there are obligations on DNs given they have Licence requirements in what is required to book capacity. DR added that DNs pay the capacity and it all gets passed through to the consumers at the end of the day.

VZ asked if the Charging team can provide a rough breakdown of bookings by products by time period showing how much off peak and how much long term capacity? Also, commenting that using a Multiplier of 1 for daily capacity, each individual party will know how their own behaviour will change.

VZ added that the understanding is that all multipliers for all products are under discussion.

New Action 0801: NTS Charging team to provide analysis of Exit capacity booking and revenue recovered long term and day ahead as an aggregate plus, if possible, how much Flex is booked.

Moving on to General themes there was a discussion around discrimination. DR clarified that Ofgem would consider all proposed changes, as long as there is justification for that change. Ofgem must look after the interests of gas consumers.

JC reminded DR that the impact assessment clearly states Ofgem will consider impacts to gas and electricity consumers.

When considering a significant change, Ofgem should do an impact assessment at the start of the process, however, DR clarified that Ofgem cannot do an impact assessment until they have a proposal, to think about that now would be premature.

GJ suggested that User Commitment also needs to be considered.

Finally, DR stated that National Grid NTS need to provide a proposal that complies with the UNC.

3.2 Avoiding Inefficient Bypass of the NTS

AB took the workgroup through the general themes from discussions to date which are:

- A product to use NTS and discourage inefficient bypass considered beneficial to keep
- Generally agreed that in some way it should reflect the cost of pipelines and be a form of discount against these investment costs
- Preference for the product to be self-limiting in design (e.g. through formula) rather than arbitrary parameters
- Discount to both TO and SO commodity charges
 - Optional Commodity Charge (OCC) was originally designed as a discount to Commodity charges as no incentive to have a bypass product which was a

-
- discount to Capacity charges at applicable points (i.e. as the Capacity charge was low a discount would not provide much incentive)
 - Originally a discount to SO Commodity charge (NTS operational costs)
 - Resulted in a discount to TO Entry and Exit commodity charges once they were implemented
 - Is now a discount from both TO and SO Commodity charges
 - Therefore, currently a discount from both NTS asset costs (investment) and NTS operational charges
 - Impacts the commodity charging base
 - OCC rate is a replacement to both entry and exit commodity (TO and SO) charges
 - Therefore, for every unit put onto OCC means two units are lost from the commodity charging base – disproportionately increasing cross subsidisation
 - The cost inputs have remained constant
 - Therefore, it is a fixed OCC rate against a variable commodity rate. Other aspects of the charging framework pick up inflationary adjustments.
 - The resulting calculation therefore results in a variable discount and only self-limiting factor is if NTS OCC is less than the combined Commodity Rate

Moving on to Optioneering, RF suggested that this is a technicality and depending on the final package it is not necessary to define now. The size of capacity / commodity is not yet known. CW advised that showing these options is useful at this stage, recognising that some of the options will be done later and some, such as costs, can be done earlier. GJ suggested it might be useful to have a suite of formulae to use for differing circumstances, e.g. IP vs Non-IP.

Referring to the point being made on costs and how they are reviewed and updated, CW stated there are challenges around all of this, including cost inputs and appropriate cost inputs; pipeline costs; workgroup expectations and how we overcome them. There followed a general discussion around the cost base used, KC wondered if comparing with costs of 1998 was a suitable starting point.

DR suggested that there could be an argument around such a product being a Transmission Service under TAR NC.

CW explained the way it works is that a variable discount is an alternative to commodity charges.

DH suggested that the word 'discount' might not be the right terminology, isn't this really the cost of building a new pipe, CW advised the price paid is a stronger link to the avoided cost and that is essentially what we are trying to do.

LJe then passed over to KC to go through his material submitted for the workgroup for which there is a supporting paper: "Inefficient Bypass of the NTS". He showed how he had prepared a simple model comparing the likely OCC revenues of 36 direct connect sites versus estimated costs of constructing pipelines to those sites. A clear discrepancy could be observed in the comparison.

General discussion moved on with GJ advising that on any 'leg' to an exit point you can only have one service per shipper, therefore, there is not going to be short hauling at every exit point. He added that the example shown is not realistic, clarifying that there are limitations on how you can use the product at the moment.

LJe mentioned there was a discussion document from a year or 2 ago, GCD-11 – Updating the Cost Inputs to the NTS Optional Commodity Charge Function, which can be found here: <http://www2.nationalgrid.com/UK/Industry-information/System-charges/Gas-transmission/Charging-methodology/Gas-Charging-Discussion-papers/>. CW clarified that the reason why this did not progress at the time is because the industry would have spent a lot of time discussing short haul when there was a gas charging review ongoing at the time.

Thanking KC for his presentation, LJe suggested that participants should consider the material further outside of the meeting and raise any supplementary matters at a future

meeting. LJe took the opportunity to remind the workgroup that material should be submitted 5 days before the meeting to allow attendees to be able to review and provide comment at the meeting.

Finally, on this topic, AB encouraged the workgroup to provide their input via NTSCMF, sub-workgroups or directly to the NTS Charging team as it is essential to help shape the development of the topic.

AS mentioned that most of the comments around the short haul tariffs are negative, but positives are not yet on the table. This applies to long distance which broadens the charging base; the workgroup needs to be thinking how to fine tune the whole regime, also, if a discount is applied, that discount begins to apply to every participant.

Moving on to address 3 of the outstanding actions specific to National Grid NTS:

Action 0602: NTS to review the models and determine ways of removing points in the models to allow the impacts of removing points to be assessed.

LJo took the workgroup through an onscreen review that showed the impact on prices and the process followed if an Entry point (in this example Theddlethorpe) is removed from the the CWD model. Advising the workgroup that if a point is in the licence, this is not something that they would be looking to do.

When asked, LJo confirmed that the Theddlethorpe Entry point was being used in the example, as JCx requested Theddlethorpe to be used as this point will be closing in a few years' time.

DH mentioned that she is puzzled by exit prices reducing when entry obligated capacity is being reduced as shown on slide 22, to which LJo advised that a slide is provided which shows how the CWD model works which may help with this.

Discussion continued around available technical capacity vs obligated capacity available at a point.

When asked what is the Ofgem view on removing points from licence, DR advised that this is outstanding and awaiting review from National Grid. LJe clarified that an Issue (ISS0066) was open under the Transmission Workgroup, and his understanding was that this was seen to be a Price Control matter.

SO asked if there is any scope to consider how allowed revenue is determined? LJe confirmed that this was not within the scope of this workgroup.

GJ suggested having some rules around methodology for sites that might be changing to a zero capacity, LJo agreed that there could be a methodology for the calculation of Forecasted Contracted Capacity (FCC) which is used within the CWD model and then that could be reviewed during a routine Price Control.

Action closed.

Action 0603: To prepare some analysis on current revenues from commodity and capacity charges from different types of point e.g. storage, generator, IP, LNG, domestic production, DN offtakes etc.

Update: LJo took the workgroup through an example, advising that revenues in the example are based on the actual billed data for 2015/16 and are split by Capacity, TO Commodity and SO Commodity.

DR asked if this can be split in to long term short term contracts? Refer to New Action 0801 documented above.

Discussion took place based around the % of revenue that is collected on what % of capacity, DR suggested that it works out to 89% of revenue collected on 50% of capacity which reflects the load factor, therefore, DNO pays 89% of the costs.

KC thought that TO Commodity would be higher than SO commodity.

Action closed (superseded by 0801).

Action 0707: CW/LJ to check the calculations of CWD to better understand when to

include the existing contracts, clarifying the influence on entry vs exit impact in the CWD model of existing contracts. This will be illustrated at future workgroup.

Update: CW updated the workgroup and gave a simplified view of how the calculation worked, showing how capacity is used in the calculation and where existing contracts feature.

CN asked for clarification around the front end of the calculation, CW advised that the methodology, specifically on the FCC value and whether it should be closer to the anticipated bookings.

CW said on FCC that the discussions to date have landed on using obligated or a proportion of obligated and whilst moving towards a value closer to anticipated bookings may be considered a better approach. The ability to calculate one considering the behavioural changes as a result of price changes would be very difficult. Using something that is more transparent and understandable as an anchor (such as obligated) feels appropriate until more data on bookings is seen, post 2019.

DR asked for clarity where the illustration on the diagram showing 'CWD Calculation – simplified' where it shows that costs could be passed back through the capacity calculations, CW clarified that there are a range of options of how this could be done or it could be done as a separate adjustment.

When advising how the Entry Calculations under CWD model work, there was a general discussion, DR asked for confirmation that Existing Contracts would be coming out at the first stage, CW advised that it is not specific as to how this will be done as yet and TAR NC does not stipulate how it should be done, but Existing Contracts must be considered as part of the calculation.

CW asked that on the existing contracts topic, please put comments forward to the Charging Team.

AS sought clarity and stressed it is important to understand the justification for why existing contracts are being excluded from the new CWD model?

CW wondered what would be the alternative? Are they going to pay the reserve price that comes out of this model or the price that they originally struck? For existing contracts, they will pay what the original contract stipulated.

CW went on to explain the calculations to be used for further clarity, including anticipated bookings.

In summary, CWD Calculation:

- Entry does influence Exit and vice versa at the Weighted Average Distance (WAD) stage, linked to the FCC levels.
- Existing contracts, if netted off FCC will impact Entry Capacity calculations and may impact Exit.
 - The Level of impact not driving by overall level of FCC but the profile of capacity across the points, so the relative differences between points.
- Overall the FCC number for each has the most influence on its own charges when spreading the target revenue by point over the FCC per point.

Referring to the 'Weighted Cost' calculation on slide 26, NW wondered whether the FCC, which appeared as both numerator and denominator, actually cancelled each other out, making this step unnecessary. LJo believed this to not be the case, but needed time to demonstrate the point.

Action 0707 extension: CW/LJo to give a view on materiality and analysis is required to see if the calculations cancel each other out.

Plan and change process

LJo clarified the discussion topic timeline, (updated below) was put together to ensure all topics had time against them, and that all topics are being discussed at least twice.

An updated meeting timetable with all NTSCMF and subgroup meetings was shown at the workgroup meeting:

Date	Meeting	Key topic to discuss [#]
30 May 13:00 – 15:00 (complete)	Sub Group	• Forecasted Contracted Capacity
5 June (complete)	NTSCMF	• Forecasted Contracted Capacity*
14 June 10:00 – 12:00 (complete)	Sub Group	• Revenue Reconciliation / Recovery (may also include some views on Multipliers)
29 June 10:00 – 12:00 (complete)	Sub Group	• Avoiding inefficient bypass of the NTS
7 July (complete)	NTSCMF	• CWD Updated Model • Revenue Reconciliation / Recovery* • Avoiding inefficient bypass of the NTS*
11 July 13:00 – 15:00 (complete)	Sub Group	• Specific Capacity Discounts
17 July (complete)	NTSCMF	• Specific Capacity Discounts* • Non-Transmission Services Model*
25 July 13:00 – 15:00 (complete)	Sub group	• Multipliers

Date	Meeting	Key topic to discuss [#]
2 August	NTSCMF	• Multipliers* • Avoiding inefficient bypass of the NTS
8 August 13:00 – 15:00	Sub Group	• Interruptible
23 August	NTSCMF	• Interruptible* • Specific Capacity Discounts • Non-Tx Services
24 August 10:00 – 12:00	Sub Group	• Existing Contracts
31 August 10:00 – 12:00	Sub Group	• Revenue Reconciliation/Recovery Mechanisms
5 September	NTSCMF	• Existing Contracts*
8 September 10:00 – 12:00	Sub Group	• Forecasted Contracted Capacity
12 September 10:00 – 12:00	Sub Group	• Avoiding inefficient bypass of the NTS
19 September 13:00 – 15:00	Sub Group	• Multipliers / Interruptible
26 September	NTSCMF	• Forecasted Contracted Capacity • Avoiding inefficient bypass of the NTS • Multipliers / Interruptible
28 September 10:00 – 12:00	Sub Group	• To be confirmed

37

(Further details about the sub groups including joining instructions can be obtained by messaging box.transmissioncapacityandcharging@nationalgrid.com)

n.b please note amendment to the NTSCMF 23 August 2017 addition of Specific Capacity Discounts and Non-Tx Services topics, plus the addition of new sub-workgroup Revenue Reconciliation/Recovery Mechanisms on 31 August 2017.

When asked, it was confirmed that the topic of 'Closure of sites' would fit in to sub workgroup on 08 September 2017 which will how they can be dealt with in the Forecasted Contracted Capacity and 'Anticipated bookings' will fit in to Revenue Reconciliation/Recovery Mechanisms sub workgroup on 31 August 2017.

CW advised the workgroup that from the beginning of September, they will be looking to advance the topics, therefore, if there are options needing to be considered, please get the options in to the NTS Charging team to benefit those conversations.

LJe added that working backwards from the January 2018 UNC Panel meeting, there is lots of work to be done especially if there are any alternates to be considered.

It was confirmed that NTSCMF workgroups should continue to be twice monthly from October onwards.

New Action 0802: Joint Office to book extra meetings from October 2017 onwards and update the events diary.

When reviewing the Timeline (slide 39) DR questioned that there is an Ofgem decision shown prior to EU consultation and then another decision, adding that Ofgem would not be deciding anything before concluding the EU consultation (required under the TAR NC that will receive comments from ACER as part of the process).

CW advised that the timeline works on the assumption that there is little or no impact from any EU decisions.

LJe suggested that the timeline should be amended to show that there is no decision at the end of the modification process, and to maybe change the Ofgem consideration to be a longer block of time extending it out over a 7-month period.

The workgroup agreed with this approach.

Moving on to some Modification 0621 relevant updates provided the NTS Charging team made the following points:

- UNC 0621 Modification was sent to Panel on 2 June.
- Voted to go to workgroup for development and back to Panel for January 2018.
 - Twice monthly NTSCMFs, twice monthly Sub Groups.
- As progress is made through the workgroups and sub groups UNC 0621 will be updated accordingly at the appropriate time.
- IUK approved as a “materially affected party” for Mod 0621 so can raise an alternate if wishes to.

For clarification, LJe confirmed that only a Shipper or a Transporter (i.e. a Code Party) can normally raise an alternate. Other parties could approach Ofgem if they also felt they were a ‘Materially Affected Party’.

4. Review of Outstanding Actions (remaining)

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

Update: This will be provided at the end of August. **Carried Forward**

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

Update: Approved at June UNC Panel meeting. **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: This will be provided at the end of August. **Carried Forward**

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).

Update: This should be ready for the next NTSCMF meeting to be held on 23 August 2017. **Carried Forward**

0702: National Grid (CW) to confirm with input from a legal point of view what the charging period for Revenue Reconciliation / Recovery is likely to be.

Update: Unable to identify what this action relates to, the workgroup agreed to close for now. **Closed**

0703: All to feed in to National Grid NTS – ideas for cost information for avoiding inefficient bypass.

Update: **Closed**

5. Any Other Business

- 5.1** AB advised that the latest Commodity Charges have now been published on both National Grid and Joint Office websites.
- 5.2** LJe wished CB the very best of luck in her new role and notes that this would be her last UNC meeting.
- 5.3** LJe advised the workgroup that this would be his last workgroup as Chair before he retires in September. He thanked the workgroup for their involvement and wished them luck going forward.

6. Diary Planning

Next meeting 23 August 2017 at ELEXON, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW, where the following topics will be reviewed:

- Interruptible
- Specific Capacity Discounts
- Non-Tx Services

Further details of planned meetings are available at:

<http://www.gasgovernance.co.uk/Diary>

Time/Date	Venue	Workgroup Programme
10:00, Wednesday 23 August 2017	Pink Room, ELEXON, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	Interruptible Specific Capacity Discounts Non-Tx Services
10:00, Tuesday 05 September 2017	Orange Room, ELEXON, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	Existing Contracts
10:00, Tuesday 26 September 2017	Pink Room, ELEXON, 350 Euston Road, London NW1 3AW	Forecasted Contracted Capacity Avoiding inefficient bypass of the NTS Multipliers / Interruptible
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 02 August 2017)

Action Ref	Meeting Date(s)	Minute Ref	Action	Owner	Status Update
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)	Carried Forward
0402	24/04/17	3.2	<i>NTS CMF Terms of Reference</i> - LJ and CW to draft a 'strawman' for discussion at the May/June meetings.	Joint Office (LJ) and National Grid NTS (CW)	Closed
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)	Carried Forward
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).	National Grid NTS (NR)	Carried Forward
0602	05/06/17		NTS to review the models and determine ways of removing points in the models to allow the impacts of removing points to be assessed.	National Grid NTS (CW/LJ)	Closed
0603	05/06/17		To prepare some analysis on current revenues from commodity and capacity charges from different types of point. EG storage, generator, IP, LNG, domestic production, DN offtakes etc. Linked to Action 0801	National Grid NTS (CW/LJ)	Closed Superseded by Action 0801
0702	07/07/17	3.2	National Grid (CW) to confirm with input from a legal point of view what the charging period for Revenue Reconciliation / Recovery is likely to be.	National Grid NTS (CW)	Closed
0703	07/07/17		All to feed in to National Grid NTS – ideas for cost information for avoiding inefficient bypass.	All	Closed
0707	17/07/17	3.1	CW/LJ to check the calculations of CWD to better understand when to include the existing contracts, clarifying the influence on entry vs exit impact in the CWD model of existing contracts. This will be illustrated at future workgroup. Action extension: CW/LJo to give a view on materiality and analysis is required to see if the calculations cancel each other out.	National Grid (CW/LJ)	Carried Forward

0801	02/08/17	3.0	NTS Charging team to provide analysis of Exit capacity booking and revenue recovered long term and day ahead as an aggregate plus, if possible, how much Flex is booked. Linked to Action 0603	National Grid (CW/LJ)	Pending
0802	02/08/17	3.0	Joint Office to book extra meetings from October 2017 onwards and update the events diary.	Joint Office	Pending