






UNC Workgroup Report	At what stage is this document in the process?
<h1>UNC 0746:</h1> <h2>Application of Clarificatory change to the AQ amendment process within TPD G2.3 from 1st April 2020</h2>	<div style="display: flex; flex-direction: column; gap: 5px;"> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 2px; display: flex; align-items: center; gap: 5px;"> 01 Modification </div> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 2px; display: flex; align-items: center; gap: 5px;"> 02 Workgroup Report </div> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 2px; display: flex; align-items: center; gap: 5px;"> 03 Draft Modification Report </div> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 2px; display: flex; align-items: center; gap: 5px;"> 04 Final Modification Report </div> </div>
<p>Purpose of Modification:</p> <p>Following the implementation of UNC 0736S Clarificatory change to the AQ amendment process within TPD G2.3 this modification applies the change to all relevant transactions which occurred from 01 April 2020</p>	
	<p>The Workgroup recommends that this modification should not be subject to self-governance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Panel will consider this Workgroup Report on 17 June 2021. The Panel will consider the recommendations and determine the appropriate next steps.
	<p>High Impact: Shippers</p>
	<p>Medium Impact: Transporters</p>
	<p>Low Impact: Customers</p>

Contents	
1. Summary	3
2. Governance	4
3. Why Change?	5
4. Code Specific Matters	5
5. Solution	5
6. Impacts & Other Considerations	7
7. Relevant Objectives	98
8. Implementation	10
9. Legal Text	1140
10. Recommendations	13
Timetable	
Modification Timetable:	
Modification consideration by Panel	17 September 2020
Initial consideration by Workgroup	24 September 2020
Workgroup Report presented to Panel	17 June 2021
Draft Modification Report issued for Consultation	17 June 2021
Consultation Close-out for Representations	08 July 2021
Final Modification Report available for Panel	13 July 2021
Modification Panel Recommendation	15 July 2021
	(at short notice or 19 August 2021)
 Any questions? Contact: Joint Office of Gas Transporters  enquiries@gasgovernance.co.uk  0121 288 2107 Proposer: Steve Mulinganie  steve.mulinganie@gazprom-energy.com  07517 998178 Transporter: Guv Dosanjh  Gurvinder.Dosanjh@cadentgas.com  07773151572 Systems Provider: Xoserve  UKLink@xoserve.com	

1. Summary

What

The Uniform Network Code (UNC) currently allows for the amendment of a Supply Point Annual Quantity (AQ) when the AQ does not reflect the expected consumption of gas over the following 12-month period. Three 'eligible causes' (G2.3.21) exist which a User can utilise in order to justify the requirement for an AQ amendment. This is intended to cover exceptional circumstances were a "new" Shipper takes over a site and needs to take corrective action.

2.3.20 The Registered User may request a change in the Annual Quantity of a Supply Meter Point on the grounds that the most recently calculated Annual Quantity does not reflect the expected (seasonally adjusted where relevant) consumption of gas over the 12 months following the date of the request due to an eligible cause which occurred after the Read Date of the AQ Opening Reading used in the most recent calculation of the Annual Quantity.

2.3.21 For the purpose of paragraph 2.3.20 "eligible cause" means:

- (a) the confirmed theft of gas (which resulted in the metered consumption in the AQ Metered Period at the Supply Meter Point being less than the actual consumption);
- (b) the installation, replacement or removal of Consumer's Plant which results in a material change in the basis on which gas is consumed; or
- (c) the commencement of a new business activity or discontinuance of an existing business activity at the consumer's premises.

The AQ amendment process, defined by UNC Modification 0432 - Project Nexus – Gas Demand Estimation, Allocation, Settlement and Reconciliation reform and refined by UNC Modification 0610 - Project Nexus - Miscellaneous Requirements, was always meant to be an exceptions process only and not designed to facilitate mass AQ amendment process changes.

This expectation was outlined within the relevant Project Nexus Business Requirements Definition document (BRD) where it stated:

"8.6.1¹ This is an exception process to amend the AQ in certain circumstances. **This process is not to be used for 'normal' AQ increases or decreases whereby the submission of reads will update the AQ over time.**"

¹ [Annual Quantity Business Requirements Definition for Project Nexus V6.0](#)

However, we have seen a large-scale utilisation of this process as identified in the DNCFM (see below)

Report measures the count of Shipper Portfolio of MPRNs where AQ Correction process Used

Changes in total number of AQ corrections used

Reason Code 01-
Confirmed Theft

↑ 1 Monthly Change

↓ 1 Annual Change

Reason Code 02- Change in
Consumer Plant

↑ 13674 Monthly Change

↑ 15608 Annual Change

Reason Code 03- Commencement
of New Business

↑ 1756 Monthly Change

↑ 1760 Annual Change

Reason Code 04-
Tolerance Change

↑ 152 Monthly Change

↑ 225 Annual Change

We would note that these changes were undertaken at the same time as the industry was seeking to collectively address the adverse impacts of COVID-19. The industry changes relating to the ability to amend customers AQ's and SOQ's (Mod 0721 (Urgent) - Shipper submitted AQ Corrections during COVID-19 & Mod 0725 (Urgent) Ability to Reflect the Correct Customer Network Use and System Offtake Quantity (SOQ) During COVID-19) were rejected by Ofgem.

This Modification seeks to apply the changes arising from the implementation of UNC 0736S Clarificatory change to the AQ amendment process within TPD G2.3 retrospectively from the 01 April 2020 thus remedying the detrimental transfer of costs (estimated for Cadent at £3.9m for revenues in 2020/21 but also financially impacting other Networks) to other Users arising from the use of these arrangements by a User.

Why

This Modification seeks to apply the changes arising from the implementation of UNC 0736S Clarificatory change to the AQ amendment process within TPD G2.3 retrospectively from the 01 April 2020 thus remedying the detrimental transfer of costs (estimated for Cadent at £3.9m for revenues in 2020/21 but also financially impacting other Networks) to other Users arising from the use of these arrangements by a User.

How

This change will also apply retrospectively from the 01 April 2020 thus addressing thus remedying the detrimental transfer of costs (estimated for Cadent at £3.9m for revenues in 2020/21 but also financially impacting other Networks) to other Users arising from the use of these arrangements by a User.

2. Governance

Requested Next Steps

This Modification should be:

- Considered a material change and subject Authority Direction.
- Assessed by a Workgroup.

3. Why Change?

This Modification seeks to apply the changes arising from the implementation of UNC 0736S Clarificatory change to the AQ amendment process within TPD G2.3 retrospectively from the 01 April 2020 thus remedying the detrimental transfer of costs (estimated for Cadent at £3.9m for revenues in 2020/21 but also financially impacting other Networks) to other Users arising from the use of these arrangements by a User.

4. Code Specific Matters

Reference Documents

[Annual Quantity Business Requirements Definition for Project Nexus V6.0](#)

[All versions of Nexus AQ BRDs](#)

Knowledge/Skills

None required.

5. Solution

Business Rules

Business Rule 1: The changes arising from the implementation of UNC [Modification](#) 736S Clarificatory change to the AQ amendment process within TPD G2.3 will be applied retrospectively in relation to AQ amendments using Reason Code 3 which became effective between 01 April 2020 and 14 January 2021.

Guidance: All relevant AQ amendments using Reason Code 3 between 01 April 2020 and 14 January 2021 will be considered in accordance with [Modification](#) 0736S i.e. that the relevant Shipper warrants it did not pick up the MPRN from the same affiliate group when it undertook an AQ amendment using Reason Code 3.

Guidance: For reference, the relevant sections of TPD [G2.3.24](#) are set out below:

2.3.24 A User may only give notice requesting a change in the Annual Quantity of a Supply Meter Point under paragraph 2.3.20 for an eligible cause under paragraph 2.3.21(c) where the following conditions are satisfied:

- (a) the notice is given submitted no later than three (3) months after the Supply Point Registration Date;
- (b) the User has submitted a notification under paragraph 2.3.30;
- (c) the User was not, prior to the Supply Point Registration Date, and the Existing Registered User for of the Supply Point in which the Supply Meter Point is comprised is neither
 - (i) the User submitting the request for a change in the Annual Quantity; or
 - (ii) a 25% Affiliate of such User.

Business Rule 2: The CDSP will in relation to all changes in scope of BR1 require the relevant User to warrant to the CDSP within 20 Supply Point Business Days of a request from the CDSP, which shall be submitted as soon as reasonably practicable following implementation, that all AQ amendments using Reason Code 3 undertaken in accordance with BR1 were compliant with the requirements of TPD G2.3.24(c).

Guidance: The CDSP will request require the relevant Shipper to confirm within 20 Supply Point Business Days of notification that any AQ amendments using Reason Code 3 made between the 01 April 2020 and the 14 January 2021 comply with the requirements of [Modification 736S](#).

Business Rule 3: If the User fails to submit a response in accordance with BR2 or does not warrant that that all AQ amendments using Reason Code 3 undertaken in accordance with BR1 are compliant with the requirements of TPD G2.3.24(c) then for those AQ amendments where either the User fails to submit a response or confirmation of compliance with BR1 is not received then TPD G2.3.31 will apply and the relevant AQ amendment using Reason Code 3 shall be deemed to not have applied and any avoided costs will be recovered by the CDSP. The period of adjustment will be defined from the date the AQ amendment became effective until such time that that AQ ([which determines the Transportation Charges e.g. for Class 3 and 4 sites the FYAQ and for Class 1 and 2 sites the AQ \(Rolling\)](#)) is revised. ([note a revision to the FYAQ for Class 3 and 4 sites should be considered the end of the period of adjustment other than where a revision of this value is a result of the Applicable Demand Model determining Seasonal Normal Demand](#)), or there is a Change of Shipper or in the event neither of these activities have occurred, the date of implementation of this modification.

Guidance: If the Shipper confirms the relevant AQ amendment was not done in accordance with 0736S or fails to submit a response within the 20 Supply Point Business Days window then the CDSP will recover any avoided costs. The period of recovery will be from the date the AQ amendment became effective until one of the following:

[The earliest date of any subsequent AQ revision to the AQ which determines the Transportation Charges e.g. for Class 3 and 4 sites the FYAQ and for Class 1 and 2 sites the AQ \(Rolling\). Note, a revision to the FYAQ for Class 3 and 4 sites should be considered the end of the period of adjustment other than where a revision of this value is a result of the Applicable Demand Model determining Seasonal Normal Demand.](#)

The earliest date at which a Change of Supplier event occurred, or

~~Or in~~ the absence of the above, the date of implementation of this modification.

Business Rule 4: Where a relevant Supply Point AQ [which determines the Transportation Charges e.g. for Class 3 and 4 sites the FYAQ and for Class 1 and 2 sites the AQ \(Rolling\)](#), has not been revised subsequent to the AQ Correction determined as invalid by BR2, either by AQ calculation (in accordance with TPD G2.3) or amendment (in accordance with TPD G2.3.20), ([note, a revision to the FYAQ for Class 3 and 4 sites should be considered the end of the period of adjustment other than where a revision of this value is a result of the Applicable Demand Model determining Seasonal Normal Demand](#)), and it remains in the portfolio of the Shipper which carried out such erroneous AQ amendment, (in contravention of TPD G2.3.24(c)(ii)), then Xoserve will have the vires to amend the AQ back to the value prior to the erroneous AQ amendment.

Guidance: This allows the CDSP the vires to amend an erroneous AQ.

Commented [SM1]: Added to clarify that the change in AQ should be based on the AQ that determined the Transportation Charges for the site. This would be the FYAQ for Class 3 and 4 sites and the AQ (Rolling) for Class 1 and 2.

6. Impacts & Other Considerations

Does this modification impact a Significant Code Review (SCR) or other significant industry change projects, if so, how?

No impact identified.

Consumer Impacts

This Modification seeks to apply these arrangements established by Modification 736, retrospectively from the 01 April 2020 thus remedying the detrimental transfer of costs, (estimated for Cadent at £3.9m for revenues in 2020/21 but also financially impacting other Networks) to other Users arising from the use of these arrangements by a User which will ultimately be borne by consumers of other Users.

Consequential Effect of implementing.

Should the Modification be implemented, qualifying AQ amendments would be corrected to a point in time, resulting in additional transportation revenue, above the levels predicted by the DNOs. Since revenues are capped, the excess money would need to be returned to shippers through a subsequent general reduction in transportation charges.

Since the reduction in transportation charges would be applied generally, transportation charges for all customer groups would see some degree of reduction, and hence it is not possible to identify specific customer groups as beneficiaries.

In terms of when the transportation charge reductions would materialise, this depend on the magnitude of the additional recovery: if the additional revenue was significant, it would be recovered within Formula Year Y, or if the recovery did not trigger a within year resetting of charges, the reduction would materialise in Formula Year (Y+1).

In terms of the shippers facing the additional transportation charges, it would be speculation as to how these would be dealt with.

Questions to be answered

Commented [AR2]: Which Consumer groups are affected? What costs or benefits will pass through to them? When will these costs/benefits impact upon consumers?

Consumer Impact Assessment

(Workgroup assessment of proposer initial view or subsequent information)

Criteria

Extent of Impact

	<p><i>Please consider each group and delete if not applicable.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestic Consumers • Small non-domestic Consumers • Large non-domestic Consumers • Very Large Consumers
	<p><i>Please explain what costs will ultimately flow through to each Consumer group. If no costs pass through to Consumers, please explain why. Use the General Market Assumptions approved by Panel to express as 'cost per consumer'.</i></p> <p>Insert text here</p>

	<p><i>Unless this is immediately on implementation, please explain any deferred impact.</i></p> <p>Insert text here</p>
Are there any other Consumer Impacts?	<p><i>Prompts:</i></p> <p><i>Are there any impacts on switching?</i></p> <p><i>Is the provision of information affected?</i></p> <p><i>Are Product Classes affected?</i></p> <p>Insert text here</p>
General Market Assumptions as at December 2016 (to underpin the Costs analysis)	
Number of Domestic consumers	21 million
Number of non-domestic consumers <73,200 kWh/annum	500,000
Number of consumers between 73,200 and 732,000 kWh/annum	250,000
Number of very large consumers >732,000 kWh/annum	26,000

Commented [AR3]: Transportation revenue regime rules apply – see notes

Cross Code Impacts

Workgroup concurs with the view of the proposer that in terms of changes to the IGT UNC, there are no cross-code impacts, although it has been subsequently pointed out that implementation would trigger AQ amendments at qualifying Supply Points located on CSEPs.

EU Code Impacts

No impact

Impacts and other considerations continued

Workgroup Impact Assessment

As part of the discussions at Workgroup the matter of retrospectivity was discussed. In terms of why retrospection should apply was set out by some Workgroup participants on the basis that the Reason Code 3, (RC3), AQ amendments in question would not be permitted following the implementation of Modification 736, (and assuming the rationale for implementation of Modification 736 was sound), any qualifying historical AQ amendments actioned on the basis of RC3 during the specified period should be reversed.

Essentially, the view of the participants advocating retrospectivity was that the narrative contained in the Modification presents sufficient justification to support the case for the retrospective application of Modification 736.

Section S1.8: Invoice adjustment – are any of the rules contained this section relevant to this debate – would the retrospective application of the 736 rules fall under this section?

Commented [AR4]: Workgroup views required: does 27.6 cover this point of?

Central Systems Impacts

A change will be required to identify the AQ corrections in question and a process implemented to manage these depending on their circumstance. A DSC Change Proposal has been raised to deliver the solution for Modification 0746 (XRN5286).

Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Assessment

Commented [AR5]: Any further information?

Information provided by the CDSP at the April Workgroup suggested that a system solution could be provided at a cost of between £50,000 to £65,000.

The solution would use a modified charge adjustment tool, and because of the relatively low level of development required, the CDSP is of the view is that this could be deployed outside of a major system release, most likely included as an element of a minor release. (although the exact deployment date would be a matter for the DSC Change Management Committee.)

Cost estimate from CDSP where the Modification relates to a change to a CDSP Service Document

Insert text here

OR

Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Assessment <i>(Workgroup assessment of costs)</i>	
Cost estimate from CDSP	Insert text here
Insert Subheading here	Insert text here

7. Relevant Objectives

Impact of the modification on the Relevant Objectives:	
Relevant Objective	Identified impact
a) Efficient and economic operation of the pipe-line system.	None
b) Coordinated, efficient and economic operation of (i) the combined pipe-line system, and/ or (ii) the pipe-line system of one or more other relevant gas transporters.	None
c) Efficient discharge of the licensee's obligations.	None
d) Securing of effective competition: (i) between relevant shippers; (ii) between relevant suppliers; and/or (iii) between DN operators (who have entered into transportation arrangements with other relevant gas transporters) and relevant shippers.	None
e) Provision of reasonable economic incentives for relevant suppliers to secure that the domestic customer supply security standards... are satisfied as respects the availability of gas to their domestic customers.	None
f) Promotion of efficiency in the implementation and administration of the Code.	None
g) Compliance with the Regulation and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators.	None

Commented [AR6]: Need a normal Relevant Objectives to go with the Charging one

Relevant Objective

Need a few words on a standard RO (d): securing effective competition, etc. by better aligning appropriate costs.

Commented [AR7]: Resolve at MAY WG - SM to provide some words

Impact of the modification on the Relevant Charging Methodology Objectives:	
Relevant Objective	Identified impact
a) Save in so far as paragraphs (aa) or (d) apply, that compliance with the charging methodology results in charges which reflect the costs incurred by the licensee in its transportation business;	None
aa) That, in so far as prices in respect of transportation arrangements are established by auction, either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) no reserve price is applied, or (ii) that reserve price is set at a level - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (I) best calculated to promote efficiency and avoid undue preference in the supply of transportation services; and (II) best calculated to promote competition between gas suppliers and between gas shippers; 	None
b) That, so far as is consistent with sub-paragraph (a), the charging methodology properly takes account of developments in the transportation business;	None
c) That, so far as is consistent with sub-paragraphs (a) and (b), compliance with the charging methodology facilitates effective competition between gas shippers and between gas suppliers; and	Positive
d) That the charging methodology reflects any alternative arrangements put in place in accordance with a determination made by the Secretary of State under paragraph 2A(a) of Standard Special Condition A27 (Disposal of Assets).	None
e) Compliance with the Regulation and any relevant legally binding decisions of the European Commission and/or the Agency for the Co-operation of Energy Regulators.	None

Relevant Charging Methodology Objective

We believe the proposal is positive in respect of Relevant Charging Methodology Objective (C) as by applying these arrangements retrospectively from the 1 April 2020 and remedying the detrimental transfer of costs (estimated for Cadent at £3.9m for revenues in 2020/21 but also financially impacting other Networks) to other Users arising from the use of these arrangements by a User which will ultimately be borne by consumers.

It further improves cost reflectivity of capacity charges by better aligning them with a customer's actual system usage, thereby furthering competition between Shipper and Suppliers.

8. Implementation

We are not proposing a specific implementation date, but it would be beneficial to implement the change as soon as authority direction has been received.

During Workgroup discussions it was noted that the effective application of this process would need to align with the CDSP's system solution.

9. Legal Text

Legal Text Commentary

Draft: 15 April 2021

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
<u>Transition Document</u>	-
<u>Part II C – Transitional Rules</u>	-
<u>New paragraph 27 (Heading)</u>	<u>Capacity Charge adjustment following application of TPD Section G2.3.20 between 1 April 2020 and 13 January 2021</u>
<u>New paragraph 27.1</u>	<p><u>New definitions to support the later drafting, and all designed around, (and relating to), the AQ reduction made following acceptance of an AQ reduction request under TPD G2.3.20 on the grounds of new business activity or discontinuing business activity.</u></p> <p><u>So a 'relevant AQ amendment' is defined (as is the User submitting the request, the 'relevant User', with the relevant Supply Meter Point being the 'relevant SMP'). Also defined is the date on which the reduction is effective ('relevant date') and the period in respect of which any adjustment applies ('relevant adjustment period') – this provided the 'relevant date' falls within the 1 April 2020 – 13 January 2021 period ('relevant period').</u></p> <p><u>The 'relevant period' is back-stopped by the earlier of a change of shipper or AQ revision in the normal course ('relevant event') or in the absence of either by the date the Modification is effective ('implementation date').</u></p> <p><u>Finally, the 'relevant SPRD' needs to be defined as it is the relationship between the incoming/outgoing User either side of the Supply Point Registration Date (which triggered the right to request an AQ reduction) against which the 25% Affiliate test is applied.</u></p>
<u>New paragraph 27.2</u>	<u>The CDSP will ask the relevant User to confirm (following a reduction to the AQ consequent on a reduction request by the incoming User for 'reason code 3') that it was not a 25% Affiliate of the outgoing User.</u>
<u>New paragraph 27.3</u>	<u>If the User is unable to confirm, or does not respond to the CDSP's request for confirmation, then the additional Capacity Charges will be payable by the relevant User. The relevant User has 20 Supply Point System Business Days to respond.</u>

Commented [AR8]: There may be a later version

New paragraph 27.4	The additional Capacity Charges payable by the relevant User are calculated as being the difference between (A) the charges that would have been payable by the relevant User during the relevant adjustment period based on the AQ applying prior to the reduction (i.e. before the relevant AQ amendment was effective) and (B) the charges that were actually payable by the relevant User on the basis of the reduced AQ following the relevant AQ amendment.
New paragraph 27.5	Where there is no change of shipper or AQ revision at a relevant SMP in the period between the AQ reduction and the implementation date then the CDSP may revise the AQ with effect from a date it may determine such that it is equivalent to the AQ applying before the relevant AQ amendment.
New paragraph 27.6	The additional Capacity Charges will be invoiced and will be payable in accordance with the normal UNC processes.

Legal Text

[Draft 1.0: 15 April 2021](#)

[TRANSITION DOCUMENT](#)

[PART II – TRANSITIONAL RULES](#)

[Add new paragraph 27 to read as follows:](#)

[27 CAPACITY CHARGE ADJUSTMENT FOLLOWING APPLICATION OF TPD SECTION G2.3.20 BETWEEN 1 APRIL 2020 AND 13 JANUARY 2021](#)

[27.1 For the purposes of this paragraph 27:](#)

- [\(a\) the "implementation date" is the date on which the Code Modification giving effect to this paragraph 27 is implemented and effective from:](#)
- [\(b\) a "relevant AQ amendment" is a change to the Annual Quantity of a Supply Meter Point which:
 - \[\\(i\\) resulted from the relevant User submitting a request in accordance with TPD Section G2.3.20 which identified the eligible cause for the request as being that specified in TPD Section G2.3.21\\(c\\); and\]\(#\)
 - \[\\(ii\\) was effective in accordance with TPD Section G2.3.27 on a day falling in the relevant period;\]\(#\)](#)
- [\(c\) the "relevant date" means the date on which a relevant AQ amendment was effective;](#)
- [\(d\) a "relevant event" is, in relation to a relevant SMP, either a change \(which occurred after the relevant date\):
 - \[\\(i\\) in the Registered User of the Supply Point in which the relevant SMP is comprised;\]\(#\)
 - \[\\(ii\\) to the Annual Quantity of the relevant SMP in accordance with TPD Section G2.3;\]\(#\)](#)
- [\(e\) in respect of a relevant SMP the "relevant adjustment period" is the period from \(and including\) the relevant date of a relevant AQ adjustment and ending on \(and excluding\) the earlier of:
 - \[\\(i\\) the date on which a relevant event occurred;\]\(#\)](#)

(ii) the implementation date;

(f) the "relevant period" is the period commencing on (and including) 1 April 2020 and ending on (and including) 13 January 2021;

(g) the "relevant SMP" is the Supply Meter Point in respect of which a relevant AQ amendment is effective;

(h) the "relevant SPRD" is the Supply Point Registration Date by reference to which the condition in TPD Section G2.3.24(a) is satisfied in relation to a relevant AQ amendment; and

(i) the "relevant User" is the User submitting the request pursuant to TPD Section G2.3.20 which resulted in a relevant AQ amendment.

27.2 In respect of each relevant AQ amendment the CDSP shall request the relevant User to confirm to the CDSP that prior to the relevant SPRD it was not a 25% Affiliate of the Existing User of the Supply Point in which the relevant SMP is comprised.

27.3 Where the relevant User fails to provide the confirmation requested by the CDSP pursuant to paragraph 27.2 within twenty (20) Supply Point Systems Business Days of the CDSP's request paragraph 27.4 shall apply.

27.4 Where this paragraph applies in relation to a relevant SMP the relevant User shall pay to the Transporter an amount equal to:

$$A - B$$

where in relation to the relevant SMP and respect of the relevant adjustment period:

A is the amount of Capacity Charges that would have been payable by the relevant User by reference to the Annual Quantity applying immediately prior to the relevant AQ amendment;

B is the amount of Capacity Charges payable by the relevant User by reference to the Annual Quantity applying following the relevant AQ amendment.

27.5 Where in relation to a relevant SMP no relevant event has occurred prior to the implementation date the CDSP may revise the Annual Quantity of the relevant SMP such that with effect from such date as the CDSP may determine the Annual Quantity shall be the same as the Annual Quantity applying immediately prior to the relevant AQ amendment.

27.6 Capacity Charges payable by a relevant User in accordance with paragraph 27.4 shall be invoiced and payable in accordance with TPD Section S.

10. Recommendations

Proposer's Recommendation to Workgroup

The Workgroup recommends to the panel that:

- This modification should proceed to consultation.
- It should consider reviewing the Final Modification Report, (FMR), at the July Panel, (at short notice), or alternatively, review the FMR at the August Panel.