DC Performance Monitoring
Webinar Q&A (24/03/2022)

DC Performance Monitoring Webinar Q&A

Question	Answer
Will the recording of the webinar be available?	The slides and the recording will both be available after the session. A notification will be issued to all once the materials have been uploaded on the ESO website
Where can I find the proposed changes on the 14th March? Don't appear to be on website.	The changes are discussed at the webinar on 24/03. After the webinar, we will upload all relevant materials on the ESO website, and you will receive a notification when this happens.
Plant availability is the availability of the plant which does not depend on the service contracted. So, for example, availability should be 3 if a plant can deliver DCL and DCH, even if it is only contracted to deliver DCL in that SP. That appears to be exactly as NGESO describes on pages 5-6 of Performance Monitoring Technical Guidance. Please confirm.	The availability flag is the indicator to show what services the plant is providing. Hence, if only contracted for DCL, the availability flag should be 1 if the DCL is available, and 0 if DCL is unavailable.
In the documentation sent around beforehand it said you were planning to change the $F_{[ij]}$ unavailabiltiy factor to only take effect if the availability ratio went below 0.999. Are you still planning on bringing in this change?	Yes, to be more specific, F_{ij} is set to 1 if it is greater than 0.999. This means a very small period of unavailability is acceptable.
It doesn't look like you're proposing any changes to the grace periods today. Are you just going over this for clarity or is there a change we've missed?	The grace period still follows the service terms and the information provided at the webinar is for clarity on how the grace period is implemented. We are still looking into the impact of giving a longer grace period when there is a switch between delivered services at EFA change, e.g., FFR to DC from EFA 2 to 3 and will communicate with providers in due course. If a change in the grace period is proposed, then this will be included in the consultation as it will involve change in service terms.
I presume we will get the information on individual SP affected with the backing data on the preliminary reports.	Yes
What about rolling errors continuing from the previous SP? From my understanding they will be reset at the start of a new SP.	The rolling errors are calculated per EFA blocks. At the start of an EFA block, it will be reset. If the errors belong to a different EFA block contract, the errors will be reset.

When will the DC CSV filenames need to be changed to meet the new DR+DM specification – the change from UID_Timestamp_perfmonv1.csv. to UID_Timestamp_FREQ_perfmonv1.csv; or ABCDE_20200915170000_perfmonv1.csv to ABCDE_20200915170000_20Hz_perfmonv1.csv. Will there be a grace period when both filename specifications will be accepted?	The Data Concentrator will continue to accept both naming conventions after go-live of the new services. If the older naming convention is used, then 20Hz capture rate is assumed. This will allow a smooth transition for existing DC providers.
Will all of the maths covered in this presentation be made available in some official documentation that we can follow?	All of the maths are covered in the Performance Monitoring Technical Guidance document that will be uploaded on the ESO website by the end of March.
You mentioned that ABSVD wasn't applied to BMUs for a period of time in 2021. Please could you specify this time period?	Most days in 2021 have been impacted and for that reason we have re-submitted all ABSVD files from April 2021 to date to resolve the issue and ensure there are no gaps in the data.
Will ABSVD be applicable for DC?	ABSVD is currently applicable only for BM DC units. It will be applied to NBM DC units in the near future. When we are closer to applying ABSVD for NBM units in DC, we will issue industry comms to that effect.
In the perfmon Excel spreadsheet (and in the previous Python script) there was a rule applied that while an asset was declaring unavailability it would not also be marked as having a performance error at the same timepoint. We think this is a good rule as it stops assets being double-penalised while they're declaring themselves unavailable. However, it isn't documented anywhere in the service terms or the new guidance. Can you clarify what the intent is here and if it will be added to the terms?	As explained in the service terms, the final payment considers the performance score 'k' as well as the availability 'Fij'. If a unit is declared unavailable, we will not assess performance for the period of unavailability.
What is the new master file name for the csv endpoint? Currently related to DC only.	All files on the data portal will now start 'DC, DR & DM' followed by the relevant file name (i.e. DC, DR & DM Block Orders.csv)
In case rolling errors are reset during the start of the SP, can you share the rolling error calculation logic for the first 4 timestamps?	For the first three timestamps, there are no rolling errors calculated. Therefore, the length of rolling errors is less than the raw error.
Regarding charges, is there a deadline for disputing charges from the ones NG have shared already?	Performance monitoring penalties between April 2021 and March 2022 inclusive will not be recovered. Penalties can be disputed up to 12 months after the delivery month.
How long is the grace period expected to be and will there be an opportunity to feedback or review any issues?	We will be performance monitoring DC from the 01/04/2022 so providers will need to submit their performance data on time and according to service terms requirements. We have made a number of proposed changes to the performance monitoring methodology for DC to make it clearer for providers. However, those changes require an update to the

	service terms and for that reason, we intend to follow a consultation process in the coming months. For the time being, performance monitoring and application of associated penalties will be done according to the existing performance monitoring methodology. Performance monitoring data and associated penalties will be shared with providers on a monthly basis at prelim and final invoicing stage, starting from April prelim (issued early May). A grace period for penalty recovery will not apply from 01/04/2022. Providers can dispute our data and calculations up to 12 months after the delivery month.
Are you planning on providing a non-Excel based implementation of the performance calculations (e.g., Python)?	This is something we are looking into, but we cannot provide a definitive answer at this point in time. We will be able to provide an update on this in the coming weeks.
Do you plan to unify these changes you're making across DC/DM/DR?	Yes, subject to the consultation process, our intention is to separate the Low and High side for DC, DM and DR if the provider has bundled contracts.
Could you comment on the thinking behind the 0.55s and 1s grace periods? How did you decide these were the appropriate levels?	The debate goes back to the service design stage. Since the ramp limit is applied to 0.55s and 1s grace period, that provides more room. The basis of the 0.55s and 1s is related to the allowed lag time in the service parameters.
Are the performance calculations that were sent round the performance calculations for all periods, both historic and future, or are they only going to be for future periods, and if so from which date?	Performance monitoring and calculation of penalties are applied to services delivered so, by definition, they cannot be applied for the future. The performance monitoring methodology explains how we monitor performance and apply penalties.
You said you'd be submitting ABSVD from Apr 2021 onwards. What's happening with data from Feb/Mar 21?	Based on our analysis, we have not identified any gaps in the data for February and March 2021.
When will you know what grace periods will be between DC and FFR and when would such a change be implemented? There is a FFR tender coming shortly.	The grace period still follows the service terms and the information provided at the webinar is for clarity on how the grace period is implemented. We are still looking into the impact of giving a longer grace period when there is a switch between delivered services at EFA change, e.g., FFR to DC from EFA 2 to 3 and will communicate with providers in due course. There is no clear timescale for this at the moment. If a change in the grace period is proposed, then this will be included in the consultation as it will involve change in service terms.
We are not yet a provider but would like to see everything that has been shared. How can I get it?	All relevant materials about performance monitoring, including the slides for the webinar and the recording will be uploaded on the ESO website by

	the end of March. You will receive a notification once this has happened.
Could you please give us some more information on the consultation process you mentioned at the beginning for implementing these changes?	The consultation process is the article 18. Once the consultation document is launched, it is out for industry consultation for a minimum of 31 days. It is then submitted to Ofgem and they have up to 3 months to review it and provide approval (if applicable).
Will nothing change until the consultation has been completed?	We will not be changing anything in the performance monitoring methodology and application of penalties for DC until the consultation process has been completed.
When dealing with BOAs, how much flexibility is given to providers to adjust their baseline? Is it for instance allowed to apply a 'standard' ramping profile to represent to asset's 'natural state'?	It is best to extract the actual behaviour of the unit applying the mentioned BOA, rather than presenting a best guess or representative ramp so that the unit is not penalised due to the ramping behaviour.