# Core ID CC Monthly Report
# 2024-05-29 – 2024-06-30

## Contents

## READING GUIDE

This report contains the results of the 4 quality indicators related to *Art. 23(4) of ID CCM (Quality of the data published)*. The structure of the report follows each of the quality indicators defined for monthly reporting. In the first chapter, an overview of the quality indicators and the levels achieved on average on a monthly basis are presented. In each of the following chapters, a detailed overview by BD is provided for each of the 4 quality indicators. In case at least one incident occurred for any of the quality indicators, an additional subsection is provided with the exact BDs and MTUs.

## GLOSSARY

| | |
|---|---|
| AAC | Already Allocated Capacity |
| BD | Business Day |
| CCC | Capacity Calculation Coordinator |
| CCM | Capacity Calculation Methodology |
| CCCt | Core Capacity Calculation Tool |
| CGM | Common Grid Model |
| CNE | Critical Network Element |
| CNEC | Critical Network Element and Contingency |
| DA | Day-ahead |
| ID | Intra-day |
| IGM | Individual Grid Model |
| JAO | Joint Allocation Office |
| MTU | Market Time Unit |
| TSO | Transmission System Operator |

# INTRODUCTION

According to Article 23(4) of the Intraday Capacity Calculation Methodology (ID CCM), Core TSOs have the obligation to define quality indicators for which to commit to a minimum value (in this report, called *ambition level*). TSOs should achieve the ambition levels on average on a monthly basis. In case the ambition level is not met for at least one of the agreed data quality indicators, TSOs shall provide to the CCC detailed reasons for the failure and an action plan to correct past failures and prevent future failures, which shall be provided within 1 month after the failure. The action plan shall be fully implemented within 3 months after the failure. This information shall be published on the JAO website and included as an Annex to the annual report.

The four agreed data quality indicators are presented in the table below:

| Quality Indicators for monthly reporting | Ambition level |
|---|---|
| Individual DACF CGM was used instead of combined DACF | $\leq$ 24 MTUs |
| ID domain AAC fallback was applied | $\leq$ 24 MTUs |
| DA domain AAC fallback was applied | $\leq$ 24 MTUs |
| Zero Capacity Fallback was applied | $\leq$ 0 MTUs |

The corresponding ambition levels for the four data quality indicators have been defined according to their impact on the quality of the results. Thus, the biggest impact is with the application of *Zero Capacity Fallback*, with the ambition level set as 0 MTUs per month. *CGM quality issues*, *application of DA domain Refprog fallback* and *DA domain AAC fallback* are considered to have comparable impact on the quality of the results, with the ambition levels set as 24 MTUs per month.

## INDIVIDUAL DACF CGM WAS USED INSTEAD OF COMBINED DACF

### Introduction

This section contains the overview of results of the quality indicator **Individual DACF CGM was used instead of combined DACF** for each BD of the month. In case the ambition level was not reached, detailed information for particular MTUs is provided in the section *Additional information*.

| BD | Number of BDs with combined DACF | Number of BDs with initial Coreso DACF | Number of BDs with initial TSCNET DACF |
|---|---|---|---|
| 29.05.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 30.05.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 31.05.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 01.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 02.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 03.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 04.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 05.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 06.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 07.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 08.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 09.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 10.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 11.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 12.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 13.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 14.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 15.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 16.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 17.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 18.06.2024 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 19.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 20.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 21.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 22.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 23.06.2024 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 24.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 25.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 26.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 27.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 28.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 29.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 30.06.2024 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

**Commented [CV1]:** In this case, seen there are 48 MTUs without the combined DACF, and the ambition level is <= 24 MTUs, TSOs have to follow the rule mentioned above?
"provide to the CCC detailed reasons for the failure and an action plan to correct past failures and prevent future failures, which shall be provided within 1 month after the failure. The action plan shall be fully implemented within 3 months after the failure. "

## Additional information

Indication of BDs/MTUs for which an incident occurred/Type (Combined DACF or Initial Coreso DACF or Initial TSCNET DACF).

| BD | Number of BDs with combined DACF | Additional Information |
|---|---|---|
| 18.06.2024 | 0 | Combined DACF failed. Coreso only DACF was successfully provided. No fallback applied. |
| 23.06.2024 | 0 | Combining tool failed and no DACF provided. DA Domain AAC fallback used. |

**Commented [AM2]:** The table on the previous page states that TSCNET DACF was used.

**Commented [AM3]:** The table on the previous page states that Coreso DACF was used.

**Commented [PV4R3]:** updated

## ID DOMAIN AAC FALLBACK WAS APPLIED

### Introduction

This section contains the overview of results of the quality indicator **ID domain AAC fallback was applied** for each BD of the month. In case the ambition level was not reached, detailed information for particular MTUs is provided in the section *Additional information*.

| BD | Number of MTUs with ID Domain AAC fallback |
|---|---|
| 29.05.2024 | 0 |
| 30.05.2024 | 0 |
| 31.05.2024 | 0 |
| 01.06.2024 | 0 |
| 02.06.2024 | 0 |
| 03.06.2024 | 0 |
| 04.06.2024 | 0 |
| 05.06.2024 | 0 |
| 06.06.2024 | 0 |
| 07.06.2024 | 0 |
| 08.06.2024 | 0 |
| 09.06.2024 | 0 |
| 10.06.2024 | 0 |
| 11.06.2024 | 0 |
| 12.06.2024 | 0 |
| 13.06.2024 | 0 |
| 14.06.2024 | 0 |
| 15.06.2024 | 0 |
| 16.06.2024 | 0 |
| 17.06.2024 | 0 |
| 18.06.2024 | 0 |
| 19.06.2024 | 0 |
| 20.06.2024 | 0 |
| 21.06.2024 | 0 |
| 22.06.2024 | 0 |
| 23.06.2024 | 0 |
| 24.06.2024 | 0 |
| 25.06.2024 | 0 |
| 26.06.2024 | 0 |
| 27.06.2024 | 0 |
| 28.06.2024 | 0 |
| 29.06.2024 | 0 |
| 30.06.2024 | 0 |

**Commented [CV5]:** There was ID domain AAC fallback applied for the initial FB computation/ATC extraction. Shouldn't this be considered here?

## DA DOMAIN AAC FALLBACK WAS APPLIED

### Introduction

This section contains the overview of results of the quality indicator **DA domain AAC fallback was applied** for each BD of the month. In case the ambition level was not reached, detailed information for particular MTUs is provided in the section *Additional information*.

| BD | Number of MTUs with DA domain AAC fallback |
|---|---|
| 29.05.2024 | 0 |
| 30.05.2024 | 0 |
| 31.05.2024 | 0 |
| 01.06.2024 | 0 |
| 02.06.2024 | 0 |
| 03.06.2024 | 1 |
| 04.06.2024 | 0 |
| 05.06.2024 | 0 |
| 06.06.2024 | 0 |
| 07.06.2024 | 0 |
| 08.06.2024 | 0 |
| 09.06.2024 | 0 |
| 10.06.2024 | 0 |
| 11.06.2024 | 0 |
| 12.06.2024 | 0 |
| 13.06.2024 | 0 |
| 14.06.2024 | 0 |
| 15.06.2024 | 0 |
| 16.06.2024 | 0 |
| 17.06.2024 | 0 |
| 18.06.2024 | 0 |
| 19.06.2024 | 0 |
| 20.06.2024 | 0 |
| 21.06.2024 | 0 |
| 22.06.2024 | 0 |
| 23.06.2024 | 24 |
| 24.06.2024 | 0 |
| 25.06.2024 | 0 |
| 26.06.2024 | 0 |
| 27.06.2024 | 0 |
| 28.06.2024 | 0 |
| 29.06.2024 | 0 |
| 30.06.2024 | 0 |

## Additional information

Indication of BDs/MTUs for which an incident occurred.

| BD | MTU |
|---|---|
| 03.06.2024 | 22 |
| 23.06.2024 | 1 |
| | 2 |
| | 3 |
| | 4 |
| | 5 |
| | 6 |
| | 7 |
| | 8 |
| | 9 |
| | 10 |
| | 11 |
| | 12 |
| | 13 |
| | 14 |
| | 15 |
| | 16 |
| | 17 |
| | 18 |
| | 19 |
| | 20 |
| | 21 |
| | 22 |
| | 23 |
| | 24 |

## Introduction

This section contains the overview of results of the quality indicator **Zero capacity fallback was applied** for each BD of the month. In case the ambition level was not reached, detailed information for particular MTUs is provided in the section *Additional information*.

| BD | Number of MTUs with Zero Capacity fallback |
|---|---|
| 29.05.2024 | 0 |
| 30.05.2024 | 0 |
| 31.05.2024 | 0 |
| 01.06.2024 | 0 |
| 02.06.2024 | 0 |
| 03.06.2024 | 0 |
| 04.06.2024 | 0 |
| 05.06.2024 | 0 |
| 06.06.2024 | 0 |
| 07.06.2024 | 0 |
| 08.06.2024 | 0 |
| 09.06.2024 | 0 |
| 10.06.2024 | 0 |
| 11.06.2024 | 0 |
| 12.06.2024 | 0 |
| 13.06.2024 | 0 |
| 14.06.2024 | 0 |
| 15.06.2024 | 0 |
| 16.06.2024 | 0 |
| 17.06.2024 | 0 |
| 18.06.2024 | 0 |
| 19.06.2024 | 0 |
| 20.06.2024 | 0 |
| 21.06.2024 | 0 |
| 22.06.2024 | 0 |
| 23.06.2024 | 0 |
| 24.06.2024 | 0 |
| 25.06.2024 | 0 |
| 26.06.2024 | 0 |
| 27.06.2024 | 0 |
| 28.06.2024 | 0 |
| 29.06.2024 | 0 |
| 30.06.2024 | 0 |

**Commented [CV6]:** Wasn't there a zero capacity fallback on the 17th June?

**Commented [MA7R6]:** The same applies for 09/06 when IDCC(b) process failed.