AEMO
AUSTRALIAN ENERGY MARKET OPERATOR

Semi-Scheduled Generation Dispatch Self-Forecast - Assessment Procedure Consultation

December 2018

Final Determination

Important notice

PURPOSE

On 13 November 2018, AEMO invited written submissions on the second draft of the "Semi-Scheduled Generation Self-Forecast – Assessment Procedure". The procedure describes how AEMO intends to assess the suitability of self-forecasts for use in dispatch.

This report summarises the feedback received, AEMO's response and our final determination.

The final "Semi-Scheduled Generation Self-Forecast – Assessment Procedure" takes effect from Friday 21 December 2018.

DISCLAIMER

This document or the information in it may be subsequently updated or amended. This document does not constitute legal or business advice and should not be relied on as a substitute for obtaining detailed advice about the National Electricity Law, the National Electricity Rules, or any other applicable laws, procedures or policies. AEMO has made every effort to ensure the quality of the information in this document but cannot guarantee its accuracy or completeness.

Accordingly, to the maximum extent permitted by law, AEMO and its officers, employees and consultants involved in the preparation of this document:

- make no representation or warranty, express or implied, as to the currency, accuracy, reliability or completeness of the information in this document; and
- are not liable (whether by reason of negligence or otherwise) for any statements or representations in this document, or any omissions from it, or for any use or reliance on the information in it.

Contents

Definitions, acronyms, and abbreviations

Terms defined in the National Electricity Rules have the same meanings when used in this document. Acronyms used in this document are explained in the table below.

Term	Definition
AGC	AEMO's Automatic Generation Control system
ASEFS	Australian Solar Energy Forecasting System
AWEFS	Australian Wind Energy Forecasting System
DI	Dispatch Interval
ECM	Energy Conversion Model for AWEFS and ASEFS
NER	National Electricity Rules
SCADA	Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition
SF	Participant's 5-minute ahead Dispatch Self-Forecast of unconstrained intermittent generation from a semi-scheduled generating unit
UIGF	Unconstrained Intermittent Generation Forecast

1. Introduction

AEMO currently uses the Australian Wind Energy Forecasting System (AWEFS) and Australian Solar Energy Forecasting System (ASEFS) to provide 5-minute ahead unconstrained intermittent generation forecasts (UIGF) for wind and solar generating units, respectively, for use in 5-minute dispatch.

From January 2019, AEMO may use the 5-minute ahead UIGF provided by the participant (self-forecast) as an alternative to the AWEFS/ASEFS UIGF, subject to satisfactory performance assessed by AEMO on an initial and ongoing basis.

The "Semi-Scheduled Generation Dispatch Self-Forecast – Assessment Procedure" describes how AEMO intends to assess the suitability of self-forecasts for use in dispatch.

AEMO has prepared this procedure in consultation with industry stakeholders.

2. Consultation summary

On 11 July 2018, AEMO released an initial draft of the Semi-Scheduled Generation Dispatch Self-Forecast - Assessment Procedure. In preparing the draft procedure, AEMO considered feedback received following the self-forecasting technologies workshop on 15 February 2018. AEMO invited written submissions from NEM Semi-Scheduled Generators and Interested Parties on the initial draft, with five respondents:

- Infigen Energy (Infigen)
- Meridian Energy (Meridian)
- Neoen Australia (NEOEN)
- Proa Analytics (PROA)
- Tilt Renewables (Tilt)

On 13 November 2018, AEMO released a second draft of the procedure and associated determination report. AEMO invited written submissions from NEM Semi-Scheduled and Scheduled Generators and Interested Parties on the second draft, with five respondents:

- Fulcrum3D
- Infigen Energy (Infigen)
- Neoen Australia (NEOEN)[1]
- Pacific Hydro
- Tilt Renewables (Tilt)

AEMO considered all feedback received and determined that changes of an administrative nature only were required to the second draft procedure, which now becomes the final procedure. This report summarises the feedback received on the second draft procedure, AEMO's response and our final determination.

AEMO wishes to thank all respondents for providing their valued feedback.

[1] NEOEN supported the second draft of the procedure without further comment

3. Determination

AEMO has considered all feedback received and determined that only the administrative changes below (marked in underline) were required to the second draft procedure, which now becomes the final procedure.

The requirement for these changes was identified after the second draft procedure was released. The changes clarify a scenario where a dispatch interval may still be used for the ongoing assessment if the self-forecast has been used in dispatch, despite being submitted later than 70 seconds prior to dispatch.

AEMO has published the final procedure here: https://www.aemo.com.au/Stakeholder-Consultation/Industry-forums-and-working-groups/Other-meetings/Market-Participant-5-Minute-Self-Forecast

The final "Semi-Scheduled Generation Self-Forecast – Assessment Procedure" takes effect on Friday 21 December 2018, after which self-forecasts may be submitted to AEMO for assessment, and potential use by AEMO from 2019 onwards.

AEMO intends to further engage with stakeholders within 12 months to review the effectiveness of the Self-Forecast Assessment Procedure (including metrics, benchmarks, thresholds and exclusions) after gaining sufficient experience with the use of self-forecasts in dispatch.

Changes to the second draft procedure

1. Section 4.2 Minimum DIs for SF Performance Assessment

   – AEMO will only conduct a SF performance assessment if at least 80% of *dispatch intervals* satisfy the following criteria over the current assessment window:

      i. the SF was used in dispatch[4] for the *dispatch interval*, or AEMO received an unsuppressed SF at least 70 seconds prior to the gate closure time for the *dispatch interval*; and

   4. Not relevant during the initial assessment stage

2. Section 4.3 Initial performance assessment

   Where:

   $\boldsymbol{SF_i}$ = 5-minute ahead MW forecast from the participant for time i, which is the forecast that is not suppressed by the participant with the highest forecast priority number used in dispatch[6] or received on or before the dispatch gate closure time at i-70 seconds.

   6. Not relevant during the initial assessment stage

4. Stakeholder feedback

4.1 Assessment process

4.1.1 Current proposal

The second draft procedure proposed a two-stage weekly process to assess SFs for use in dispatch:

1. Initial weekly assessment process:
   - For SFs not yet initially accepted for use in dispatch, AEMO conducts assessments over an assessment window, which is initially 8 weeks with a fixed start date but (if required) adds one week to the end date each week, up to a maximum of 16 weeks
   - AEMO conducts preliminary tests of the reliability of the SF over the assessment window and whether there are enough assessable intervals over that window to perform a performance assessment
   - If both preliminary tests pass, AEMO conducts a performance assessment of the accuracy of the SF relative to the AWEFS/ASEFS forecast, for all assessable intervals over the assessment window
   - If a preliminary test fails or the SF performance assessment fails, AEMO repeats the above assessments the next week, extending the assessment window by one week.
   - Once the SF performance assessment passes, AEMO accepts the SF for use in dispatch and subjects the SF to ongoing assessments
2. Ongoing weekly assessment process:
   - For SFs initially accepted for use in dispatch, AEMO conducts ongoing assessments (as soon as practicable) each week over three fixed assessment windows; 1, 4 and 8 weeks
   - For each assessment window, AEMO conducts a preliminary test of whether there are enough assessable intervals over that window to perform a meaningful performance assessment
   - If the preliminary test passes for an assessment window, AEMO conducts a performance assessment of the accuracy of the SF relative to the AWEFS/ASEFS forecast, for all assessable intervals over that window
   - If the preliminary test or SF performance assessment fails for an assessment window, and this occurs for ALL three assessment windows, AEMO does not change the current status of the SF (unsuppressed or unsuppressed in dispatch) and repeats the above assessments the next week, rolling the start date of each assessment window forward by one week
   - If the SF performance assessment passes for ANY assessment window, AEMO unsuppresses the SF for use in dispatch
   - AEMO control room continually monitors the currently used forecast in dispatch (SF or AWEFS/ASEFS) and suppresses that forecast if in gross error or causing a system security issue. If SF is suppressed, AEMO does not re-assess its use in dispatch until the next weekly assessment

4.1.2 Feedback

General

Infigen supported AEMO's proposal to "review the effectiveness of the SF process…after gaining sufficient experience with the use of self-forecasts in dispatch".

Infigen also supported the changes in section 6 of the second draft procedure whereby the AEMO control room can suppress a forecast (SF or AWEFS/ASEFS) if it is in gross error or causing a system security issue.

Fulcrum3D sought clarity on AEMO's reference to "overall self-forecast performance" in the footnote under section 4.1 of the second draft procedure:

- "If a participant submits multiple model forecasts, AEMO may, at the participant's request, assess the individual performance of each model separately and provide feedback to the participant. However, AEMO will only use overall self-forecast performance as the basis for acceptance for use in dispatch regardless of individual model performance."

Treatment of Self-Suppressed SF

In their previous submission, Infigen were concerned that AEMO would treat a grossly inaccurate SF differently if it was proactively suppressed by the participant rather than by the AEMO control room, adding that AEMO should be encouraging self-awareness of an inaccurate SF.

Infigen sought clarity on how self-suppressed SFs will be treated in the initial and ongoing assessments, specifically:

- *Will it be possible to flag an already suppressed forecast as self-suppressed? If AEMO has suppressed the SF, it is not possible for the participant or AEMO to retrospectively flag that SF as self-suppressed.*
- *Is the data from a self-suppressed forecast used in assessments or is it ignored? Participant suppressed SFs are ignored in assessments, because this indicates to AEMO that it is not to be assessed for use in dispatch.*
- *Is it counted against the 80% of DIs required for preliminary assessment? Because participant suppressed SFs are ignored in assessments, they do not count toward meeting the minimum 80% of DIs requirement.*

Automated assessment process

In their previous submission, Infigen suggested an alternative to the ongoing weekly assessment – an automated rolling 60-minute evaluation with automatic switching between the SF and AWEFS/ASEFS forecasts depending on which was more accurate and a switching hysteresis, to prevent forecasts switching too frequently.

Infigen again raised this approach in their submission to the second draft procedure, arguing this was the most attractive implementation of SF as it would provide the greatest accuracy.

The use of a hysteresis would mean that one forecast must be a certain percentage more accurate than the alternate forecast over a defined rolling window (minutes to hours) before the dispatch forecast is switched to the more accurate forecast. Increasing this hysteresis threshold would decrease the rate at which this switching occurs.

Infigen envisaged the switching hysteresis thresholds would be either of a set duration or based on accumulated MW or % error, with the thresholds refined with experience gained over the coming months using self-forecasting.

4.1.3 AEMO response

General

Fulcrum3D sought clarity on the meaning of "overall self-forecast performance".

AEMO's reference to "overall self-forecast performance" means that it will assess the performance of self-forecasts submitted for use in dispatch for a semi-scheduled generating unit, regardless of the underlying forecasting model that was used to produce that self-forecast. AEMO will not differentiate between underlying forecasting models when assessing performance.

Treatment of Self-Suppressed SF

AEMO considers the proposed procedure is designed to encourage the participant to proactively suppress a grossly inaccurate SF before the AEMO control room suppresses it. If the AEMO control room suppresses a grossly inaccurate SF it remains suppressed until AEMO's next weekly assessment, whereas if the participant proactively suppresses that SF (rather than AEMO control room) then the participant can choose when to unsuppress that SF once they have addressed the underlying issue with the SF.

In response to Infigen's specific questions:

- *Will it be possible to flag an already suppressed forecast as self-suppressed?*
  - If AEMO has suppressed a SF that is not already suppressed by the participant over a certain period, it is not possible for the participant or AEMO to retrospectively flag that SF as self-suppressed.
- *Is the data from a self-suppressed forecast used in assessments or is it ignored?*
  - Participant suppressed SFs are ignored in all assessments, because this indicates to AEMO that the SF is not to be assessed by AEMO for use in dispatch.
- *Is it counted against the 80% of DIs required for preliminary assessment?*
  - Because participant suppressed SFs are ignored in all assessments, they do not count toward meeting the minimum 80% of DIs requirement (the "Minimum DIs for SF Performance Assessment" test). However, the minimum 95% of DIs requirement for the "Minimum DIs for Reliable SF" test applies to any SF received at least 70 seconds before the gate closure time, regardless of whether suppressed or unsuppressed.

Automated assessment process

As previously noted in our draft determination, AEMO will consider Infigen's suggestion of an automated rolling assessment and forecast switching using hysteresis as part of a future review of the self-forecasting process. As part of this review, AEMO will also consider the value of implementing a very short-term online assessment to assist the AEMO control room in detecting grossly inaccurate forecasts.

AEMO considers that some experience with the weekly self-forecast assessment process would be required before it could confidently automate the process and determine thresholds for forecast switching.

AEMO likens Infigen's automated switching approach to ensemble forecasting, with switching between forecasting models based on their relative performance under the current conditions.

AEMO encourages participants to develop ensemble forecasting themselves and to switch or blend those model forecasts based on performance, either through:

- offering multiple model forecasts to AEMO directly and dynamically suppressing those not to be used in dispatch, or
- offering a single forecast to AEMO with switching/blending of models performed by the forecast provider prior to submission to AEMO

Determination: AEMO has not revised the second draft procedure

4.2 Preliminary assessments

4.2.1 Current proposal

The second draft procedure proposed preliminary tests that must be satisfied before AEMO can undertake a SF performance assessment:

- Minimum DIs for Reliable SF test (initial assessments only):
  - For at least 95% of dispatch intervals over the current assessment window, AEMO received a SF at least 70 seconds before the gate closure time for the dispatch interval
- Minimum DIs for SF Performance Assessment test (initial and ongoing assessments):
  - For at least 80% of dispatch intervals over the assessment window the following criteria are satisfied:
    - AEMO received an unsuppressed SF at least 70 seconds before the gate closure time, or the SF was used in dispatch for that dispatch interval[2]
    - Unit's energy target was greater than or equal to its UIGF (that is, the unit is not constrained off), unless the participant submitted a good quality SCADA Possible Power for the dispatch interval

4.2.2 Feedback

Minimum DIs for SF reliability

Infigen considered the procedure assumes all forecasts will improve over time and is designed such that an issue encountered late in the assessment period would significantly delay SF implementation. A bad '8th' week would result in a 16-week assessment, while a bad initial week would only result in a 9-week assessment. This seems to disproportionately penalise faults in later weeks, despite issues such as network outages being just as likely at either time.

Infigen suggested that AEMO disregard up to one failed week within the assessment period and substitute an additional week of assessment at the end, rather than forcing the assessment to be started again from scratch.

Minimum DIs for SF performance assessment

Infigen are concerned that an ongoing assessment may not be completed for multiple weeks (or continuously) due to insufficient data. Infigen understands the need for sufficient data to conduct an assessment but believes it would be better to require a certain number of dispatch intervals for each of the three duration-based tests. In the case that not enough assessable intervals were received in a given week, there should be an option for those intervals to be accumulated and the test run in the following week when sufficient intervals were available (even if both individual weeks had insufficient assessable intervals).

Infigen considered that if AEMO requires a certain amount of data to determine accuracy, it would be more appropriate to use a dynamic test duration, based on when the determined number of non-constrained DIs required has been reached. This could potentially be coupled with a sense check during all semi-dispatch capped intervals which compares the SF with AWEFS/ASEFS to ensure their average predictions are within an acceptable margin. Infigen would prefer this method for both initial and ongoing testing.

They noted that it is likely the 80% "Minimum DIs for SF Performance Assessment" requirement will not be met for numerous weeks throughout the year for several participants. In Q3 2018 for example, South Australian non-synchronous units were constrained for 26% of the time due to system strength constraints.

[2] The latter only applies during the ongoing assessment stage

4.2.3 AEMO response

Minimum DIs for SF reliability

AEMO considers the minimum SF reliability requirement of 95% of all dispatch intervals (a 5% failure rate) is adequate and consistent with previous feedback from Infigen[3] that the "Minimum DIs for Reliable SF" test would only need to cater for the equivalent of 2 full days of SF outage, which is a failure rate of 3.5% over the initial 8-week assessment window.

AEMO disagrees that the "Minimum DIs for Reliable SF" test would disproportionately penalise faults in later weeks of the assessment window for the first 16 weeks of an initial assessment. This is because the start of the assessment window is fixed for the first 16 weeks of an initial assessment. Beyond 16 weeks, however, the 16-week assessment window is rolling, so "good" weeks prior to that rolling window do not offset more recent "bad" weeks.

AEMO also notes that reliability is based on a minimum 95% of all DIs meeting the criteria anywhere within the assessment window, rather than a fixed number of DIs regardless of the length of the assessment window.

For example, for the initial assessment window of 8 weeks (16,128 DIs), if a SF for a wind farm is not received at least 70 seconds before the gate closure time for more than 5% or 806 DIs of those DIs the SF reliability test would fail. For each week thereafter, one week (2,016 DIs) is added to the assessment window, which allows a further 5% or around 100 DIs to fail the SF reliability test.

Minimum DIs for SF performance assessment

AEMO notes the second draft procedure clearly defines the "certain number of Dispatch Intervals for each of the three duration-based tests". The "Minimum DIs for SF Performance Assessment" requirement is 80% of all DIs over the relevant assessment window, which equates to X dispatch intervals accumulated over that window.

For example, assume the ongoing assessment of a SF for a wind farm not providing Possible Power. The 1 week, 4-week and 8-week SF performance assessments would only occur if there were no more than 403, 1,612 and 3,225 constrained DIs respectively. However, if Possible Power were provided then all constrained DIs are included in meeting the minimum requirement, which allows the SF performance assessments to occur.

If AEMO were to relax the 80% minimum requirement, this might result in insufficient samples for a statistically significant result over the performance assessment window.

In assessing against the minimum requirement, AEMO will not include (otherwise assessable) DIs that occur before the relevant assessment window (as Infigen's "dynamic test duration" suggests), because there is a risk of over-weighting historical forecast performance over more recent, relevant forecast performance. AEMO notes that Infigen proposed an automated process that assesses only recent forecast performance.

AEMO is unclear of the purpose of Infigen's proposal for the "sense check during all semi-dispatch capped intervals which compares the SF with AWEFS/ASEFS to ensure their average predictions are within an acceptable margin". If "within an acceptable margin" refers to a comparison between the SF and AWEFS/ASEFS, this does not indicate which is the more accurate forecast compared to Possible Power. If the "acceptable margin" refers to a comparison of the forecasts against Possible Power, then Infigen's proposal does not indicate whether to use the result of that comparison to switch between forecasts.

Determination: AEMO has not revised the second draft procedure

[3] Infigen's first-round submission to the initial draft procedure

4.3 Performance benchmark and assessable intervals

4.3.1 Current proposal

The second draft procedure proposed to assess the accuracy of the SF and AWEFS/ASEFS forecasts for assessable intervals against the following performance benchmarks:

- Maximum of (0, Good SCADA Possible Power) for DIs where the unit energy target is less than its UIGF
- Maximum of (0, SCADA Initial MW[4]) for all other DIs

For solar units, DIs ending 2105 to 0400 AEST inclusive are excluded from the total DI count (used in the preliminary tests to determine the minimum DI requirement) and excluded from all performance assessments.

Of the remaining DIs, the following are also excluded from those tests:

- DIs where unit energy target is less than its UIGF and SCADA Possible Power is unavailable or not good
- DIs where SF is not used in dispatch and there is no participant-unsuppressed SF received at least 70 seconds before the gate closure

AEMO has defined the optional SCADA Possible Power in the Energy Conversion Model (ECM) Guidelines as the real-time now-cast estimate of unconstrained intermittent generation[5].

AEMO notes that some wind farms that provide FCAS Regulation already use Possible Power in their calculation of the Automatic Generation Control (AGC) Upper Limit sent to AEMO via SCADA. The SCADA AGC Upper Limit is used in NEMDE as an upper bound on FCAS Regulation enablement maximum, and in AEMO's AGC as an upper bound on AGC raise set-points when enabled for FCAS Regulation Raise.

4.3.2 Feedback

Use of SCADA Initial MW

AEMO proposes to use SCADA Initial MW as the forecast performance benchmark for intervals where either the semi-dispatch cap is not set, or where the semi-dispatch cap is set and the unit energy target equals its forecast.

Infigen considered that using SCADA Initial MW to determine accuracy during these intervals will heavily favour the active forecast (or the forecast that predicts a slightly lower value than SCADA Initial MW), as during these times the park controller will be ensuring production is capped at this output and will be prevented from moving any higher. This means that suppressed forecasts[6] that predict a higher (but potentially more accurate) value will be assessed (potentially unfairly) as being less accurate whenever the active forecast under predicts production.

Instead, Infigen suggested that AEMO return to its original proposal – to use SCADA Initial MW as the benchmark only for intervals where the semi-dispatch cap is not set, and to use SCADA Possible Power as the benchmark at other times.

Use of SCADA Possible Power

Infigen and Tilt made submissions to both the first and second draft procedure in relation to the use of SCADA Possible Power as a performance benchmark.

Infigen noted that SCADA Possible Power is a value calculated and provided by the participant, and while default inputs and methodology generally depend on the turbine manufacturer, there is scope for these figures to be manipulated by the participant. For this reason, Infigen considered that Possible Power is not

[4] The procedure refers to this as NEMDE Initial MW, being the unit SCADA active power captured at the time of the dispatch run, or (if not good quality), the energy target from the previous dispatch run

[5] The Wind and Solar ECM Guidelines are found on AEMO's webpages at Australian Wind Energy Forecasting System (AWEFS) and Australian Solar Energy Forecasting System (ASEFS)

[6] AEMO clarifies that only SF that are not suppressed by the participant forecast are used in performance assessments.

suitable for correctly determining which forecast is more accurate. Infigen once again requests that all times where any semi-dispatch cap is recorded be ignored.

Infigen strongly believed that if AEMO uses the SCADA Possible Power signal for forecast assessments, it must be used for all times that a semi-dispatch cap is set, regardless of whether the unit's energy target is less than the UIGF, or equal to the UIGF.

Tilt supported the development of Possible Power now-cast from the self-forecasting system itself. They considered this could provide a more accurate performance benchmark than the manufacturer's Possible Power estimate, which might not account for all factors such as high wind cut-out and de-rating effects, wind sector management, wind direction effects). The manufacturer's Possible Power estimate is typically used for indicative calculations of lost generation, not for precise now-casting.

Tilt also noted that AEMO has added Possible Power signal to the SCADA list in the proposed ECM changes. They consider that requiring the Possible Power estimate to come via SCADA imposes a technical limitation and cost, as injecting external data into the site SCADA system for provision to AEMO is complex.

Tilt instead suggested a slight modification to the Self-Forecasting Web API, to allow participants to provide their Possible Power estimate to AEMO at or very shortly after the dispatch interval ends, based on observed conditions at the time.

4.3.3 AEMO response

Use of SCADA Initial MW

AEMO accepts that using SCADA Initial MW to determine accuracy during intervals where the semi-dispatch cap is set and the unit energy target equals its forecast might at times favour the active forecast given the park controller will be capping output at the energy target (particularly where the active forecast is under-forecasting).

However, AEMO notes there are other times when the unit energy target equals its forecast and the active forecast is over-forecasting (so that the output is not constrained but generating to the available energy) and the SCADA Initial MW is a valid performance benchmark at those times.

AEMO did consider an option to define a constrained DI to include intervals where the actual output was within X MW of the unit's energy target during a semi-dispatch interval. However, AEMO considers the X MW threshold might be difficult to define and to do so would require experience with the operation of the SF assessment process.

On balance, AEMO considers that including dispatch intervals where the semi-dispatch cap is set and the unit energy target equals its UIGF allows an increased sample size in SF performance assessments, and this would outweigh the slight impact of the bias in using SCADA Initial MW.

Use of SCADA Possible Power

AEMO sees value in using Possible Power as the performance benchmark during constrained DIs and disagrees with Infigen that those intervals should be excluded from the assessment.

AEMO accepts Infigen's view that a participant might be able to manipulate their SCADA Possible Power in their favour for the SF assessments. For example, the participant might artificially set their SCADA Possible Power to always be at or near their SF, so that the SF always appears to perform better than the AWEFS/ASEFS forecast during constrained operation, when AEMO uses the Possible Power as the benchmark.

This is clearly undesirable, and AEMO would likely monitor the performance of the Possible Power benchmark itself, to ensure it is valid and complies with the definition in the ECM Guidelines. The definition requires that Possible Power only reflect "technical factors", and therefore excludes the use of forecasts to determine Possible Power.

AEMO clarifies that, if a participant intends to provide SFs for a unit and does not want AEMO to use the SCADA Possible Power in SF assessments, they must notify AEMO prior to the nominated start of the initial

assessment window. The participant can provide a subsequent notice that they want AEMO to use the SCADA Possible Power in SF assessments from a nominated future date.

AEMO further clarifies that, if the unit's SCADA Possible Power signal is flagged as bad quality over certain intervals because its estimate is poor, then AEMO will exclude those intervals from all SF assessments.

AEMO accepts Tilt's view there might be technical limitations and costs involved in setting up an interface between the self-forecasting system and site SCADA, although AEMO has no insight into these limitations and costs.

AEMO will consider a future enhancement to provide Possible Power via a Web API, as an alternative to providing it via SCADA.

Determination: AEMO has not revised the second draft procedure

4.4 Other feedback

4.4.1 Assessment principles

Tilt supported the addition of the new "Participant Dispatch Self-Forecast" section, which defines the SF and clarifies the roles and responsibilities of AEMO and the participant in relation to managing SFs.

4.4.2 Purpose of self-forecast assessment

Pacific Hydro questioned whether AEMO should be assessing self-forecasts submitted by Semi-Scheduled Generators for use in dispatch, while the equivalent maximum availability submitted in the dispatch offer by a Scheduled Generator is automatically used in dispatch without assessment.

They sought clarity on whether the need for SF assessment was due to a requirement under the NER, or to check that the SF was received in time.

AEMO response

Under rule 3.7B of the NER, AEMO is responsible for producing UIGFs across all timeframes using the information defined under that rule, but not precluding other sources of information including participant self-forecasts.

The objective of forecast assessment is to use the best forecast available in dispatch.

Given that self-forecasting development is at the embryonic stage, AEMO considers it would be initially prudent to assess performance of self-forecasts against the existing forecasting system before their use in dispatch.