

WG Number	Topic	Discussion point	Outcome/resolution
1	<p>Introduction of the proposed scope Reconfirm the purpose of the review</p> <p>What is the desired output. We understand this is to not only consider if current arrangements are fit for purpose BUT also look at encouraging / incentivising more daily read sites, looking, plus considering how the future arrangements can be considered e.g. with decarb.</p>	<p>Introduction of Mod Ask WG parties what they feel needs to be the focus of the review What is it that WG feels does not meet the needs of the industry What do we see for the future?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm Purpose of the review and next steps. • Each WG will be used to focus on a specific area • Once that area has been discussed we will then move onto the next • Through discussions we can confirm and decide if the outcome of that area would be best suited to look at just specific class requirements, does it work for some and not all what would work better?
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share and go through the proposed schedule with WG for the order of discussions going forward. Check if anything else needs to be added. • Share data for last month's action • Start going through Slide pack describing Classes and Background Information • Share MI Requested from Previous WG • Aim to stick to WG schedule to enable parties to bring their own SMEs if they wish. • Sweep up session(s) can be raised in later sessions so that we can revisit points raised once parties have a fuller picture. • 	<p>Share analysis requested from last WG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share the MI Pack • Confirm the WG plan going forward • Topics to be discussed each WG and ask if parties have any input on the plan? • Long- and short-term scenarios 	<p>Confirmation of the proposed schedule and anything additional to be included.</p>
3	<p>Complete Slide Pack describing the Classes / Background Information</p> <p>Ambition for Frequency of Meter Readings – propose / verify ‘timeline’</p> <p>Characteristics of the Classes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Criteria for being in Classes ... are these right? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any current requirements that discourage the wide scale utilisation of DM • Consideration of future net-zero settlement arrangements / requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do we want from this conversation/discussion • Reads are a fundamental part of the Gas industry; how can we consider the future scope and what direction would we want to give here • How do Read submissions and AQ impact each other? does it work for all classes as is?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AQ thresholds? ○ Other characteristics that should determine class? <p>- Requirements in each Class regarding METER READING Submission – are these right (NB: there are other criteria (e.g. DM Noms etc – which we propose to look at in subsequent WGs)</p> <p>Read Submission suggested areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Read frequency - Submission deadlines - Submission processes - Read obligation - Validation <p>- What if anything is preventing more frequent Meter Readings</p> <p>-</p>		
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuation of read discussion WG with the follow up actions. 		
5	<p>Allocation and Class Charges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gemini impacts • DM sites - their requirements against NDM sites 	<p>Consideration of future net-zero settlement arrangements / requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the logic behind <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nomination - Scheduling charges <p>Ratchet charges (including soft-landing) do these serve the needs of the industry now?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do we want from this conversation / discussion
6	<p>Continuation of Allocation and Gemini impacts discussion WG with the follow up actions.</p>		<p>NB - this will be a Christmas WG so will be scheduled at a different date and could fall close to previous WG so might be limited on what is produced.</p>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuation of Allocation and Gemini impacts discussion WG with the follow up 		
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Playback of discussions to date – CDSP ... proposal for areas to take forward 		

9	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• CDSP Summary / WG Conclusions of previous discussions• Agree next steps• Discuss any proposed Modification outputs		
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Visibility / run through of any proposed Modification outputs• Start Request WG Report		
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continue Request WG Report• Continue discussion on any proposed Modification outputs• Update on [UK Link Roadmap and Project Trident Plan]		
12	Finalise WG Report		