Performance monitoring & Pre-qualification

Before manufacturers will produce product for pre-qualification we need incentives and long term returns on investment.

Utilising HH meter data simplifies access, as per ODFM. More detailed metering is cost prohibitive on smaller assets.

Speed of sampling is 10% of ramp time plus 500 measurements over the delivery period.

Approach to baselining is key to market accessibility. Requiring PNs to be submitted an hour ahead of real-time excludes a lot of DSR and, potentially renewables. ESO should consider use of historic baselines (preferred) or, if nominated baselines must be used, either using filtered meter signal or letting them be submitted close to real-time. Historic baselines are most common approach in international markets and the optimal approach, though.

Performance monitoring & penalties preferred rather than pre-qual. Quicker access, and also allows ESO to 'trust' industry to hit standards early - rather than dictating tests that might be hard to do / not relevant.

If you have availability decs in ASDP why not baseline as you do in STOR.

Think carefully about accuracy requirements. It is common to have asymmetric tolerances – i.e. severe penalties for not delivering enough, but not for delivering a bit too much. (There's already economic incentives not to over-deliver, in addition to imbalance costs.) It's the width of the total band that matters, in terms of the range of assets and customers that can participate.

No, the PN is not a useful baseline for many resources.

Support ESO testing of MCPD plant compliance to facilitate carbon monitoring of services.

Definitely support the scalability and automation.

Technology neutrality is not an end in itself. Need appropriate, comparable treatment of all applicable resources, even if that means different details to accommodate different technologies.

Transparency for all or none - can't have some parties positions are known to all and others not.

Standardised rules, baselining, and incorporating past asset performance would be best - if this discriminates against some asset types/providers then that's a good thing for efficiency, surely?

Condiser using the operational API and performance APIs that are being used for some of the newer response services.

The prequalification needs to fully comply with the minimum technical requirements in SOGL Articles 154/155, 158/159 and 161/162.

Only open to thermal generation subject to submission of EA Permit information evidencing compliance with the MCPD specified Generator Controls, including EA Customer Number, Permit ID, data of test, NGx and CO levels at date of test and permit end date.

Consider performance monitoring requirements for the new suite of products as a whole. Sending multiple performance files, at different resolutions becomes challenging, only having to send one would be better.

Type testing approval will be important for unlocking access to smaller scale (e.g. aggregated residential scale assets).

Auction can be opened to the market for a more appropriate mix of long-term and short-term contracts. Striking the right balance between short and long-term participation by industry and data will be key to success. Therefore what is the actual benefit of market design and any elements used in the current legislative framework.

Do you want new providers or the Grid doing it? If you go thru the work designing a product, or the Grid doing it allows the Grid to avoid barriers.

Many wind farm have the optimal approach, though.

As distributed assets begin to participate in ancillary services market. Striking the right balance between short and long-term participation by industry and data will be key to success. Therefore what is the actual benefit of market design and any elements used in the current legislative framework.

Standardised rules, baselining, and incorporating past asset performance would be best - if this discriminates against some asset types/providers then that's a good thing for efficiency, surely?