Core ID CC Monthly Report

2025-12-01 – 2025-12-31



Contents

Reading Guide 3
Glossary 3
Introduction 4
Individual DACF CGM was used instead of combined DACF 5
Introduction 5
Additional information 5
Successfully provided capacities for bidding zones 6
Introduction 6
Additional information 6
DA Domain AAC fallback was applied 7
Introduction 7
Additional information 7
Zero Capacity fallback was applied 8
Introduction 8
Additional information 8

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
BZ	Bidding Zone
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	≤ 24 MTUs
Successfully provided capacities for bidding zones	≤ 24 MTUs
DA domain AAC fallback was applied	≤ 24 MTUs
Zero capacity fallback was applied	≤ 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 AAC fallback* and *failure in calculation of capacity values for BZ(s)* 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*.

Month/Year	Number of BDs/MTUs
Total BDs of Month: December, 2025	31
Number of BDs with combined DACF	31
Number of BDs with initial Coreso DACF	0
Number of BDs with initial TSCNET DACF	0
Number of BDs with failed process/fallbacks	0
Is ambition level reached?	Yes

Additional information

No BDs/MTUs for which an incident occurred.

SUCCESSFULLY PROVIDED CAPACITIES FOR BIDDING ZONES

Introduction

This section contains the overview of results of the quality indicator **Successfully provided capacities for bidding zones** 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*.

Month/Year	Number of BDs/MTUs
Total BDs of Month: December, 2025	31
Number of BDs where capacities provided successfully	31
Number of BDs where capacities couldn't provide successfully	0
Is ambition level reached?	Yes

Additional information

No BDs/MTUs for which an incident occurred.

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*.

Month/Year	Number of BDs/MTUs
Total BDs of Month: December, 2025	31
Number of BDs with DA Domain AAC Fallback	0
Number of MTUs with DA Domain AAC Fallback	0
Is ambition level reached?	Yes

Additional information

No BDs/MTUs for which an incident occurred.

ZERO CAPACITY FALLBACK WAS APPLIED

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*.

Month/Year	Number of BDs/MTUs
Total BDs of Month: December, 2025	31
Number of BDs with Zero Capacity Fallback	0
Number of MTUs with Zero Capacity Fallback	0
Is ambition level reached?	Yes

Additional information

No BDs/MTUs for which an incident occurred.