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Action: DE0202
Holiday Factors

## Holiday Factors

- "xoserve to consider what can be done to review/change the holiday factors for the remainder of the year and establish a flexible mechanism for future application"
- Presentation aims to clarify how holiday factors are derived and where they are applied in the calculation of Annual Load Profile (ALP) and the Daily Adjustment Factor (DAF)
- Presents analysis of scaling factor results over christmas holiday period 2009
- Provides suggestion on how holiday factors could be reviewed as part of limited Autumn 'adhoc' analysis


## Holiday Factors - EUC model parameters

- EUC Model parameters derived from non holiday Mon-Thurs sample demand -01B includes holiday



## Holiday Factors - Calculation

- Holiday Code Days - e.g. Christmas/New Year for period from 21st December to second New Year bank holiday in Scotland
- Code 1: $25^{\text {th }}, 26^{\text {th }}$ December, $1^{\text {st }}$ January
- Code 2: $24^{\text {th }}, 27^{\text {th }}$ to $31^{\text {st }}$ December, $2^{\text {nd }}$ January
- Code 3: $21^{\text {st }}$ to $23^{\text {rd }}$ December and remaining days of period above
- For each of the individual 3 years of sample data calculate the 'fitted demand' for each day (C1+C2*CWV). Sum these demands for each holiday code.
- For the same gas days sum the total actual demand from the sample for each holiday code
- Total sample demand / Total fitted demand = Holiday Factor (for holiday code) for year
- Average of 3 individual years = Overall Holiday Factor (for holiday code)


## Holiday Factors - Application

- Using results from sample regression and holiday / weekend factors:
- For each EUC derive demand for each day in target gas year (SNDt)
- (C1+C2*SNCWV)*Factor (Pt)
- Factor is either a holiday factor or weekend factor
- For each EUC derive weather sensitivity for each day (WSENSt)
- C2*Factor (Pt)
- ALP: For each day in target year:
- SNDt / Average SNDt
- DAF: Numerator in DAF calculation derived from sample:
- WSENSt / SNDt = EUC DAF Ratio


## Holiday Factors - Aggregate NDM demand model

- Aggregate NDM demand model required for denominator of DAF formula only - required to compare to EUC weather sensitivity (numerator)
- Denominator calculation:
- WSENSt / SNDt for agg. NDM in LDZ
- Both WSENSt and SNDt are calculated from historical aggregate NDM model using same principles as EUC calculation
- Consistent approach - regression to derive constants, same holiday code days used to derive holiday factors, historical model derived from 3 years' models
- Only significant difference is gas years are used rather than April to March years
- Consistent approach in calculating and applying holiday factors for both sample and agg. NDM data


## DAF Calculation

- DAF calculation:
- WSENSt / SNDt (For EUC) WSENSt / SNDt (For agg.NDM in LDZ)
- EUC Ratio LDZ Ratio
- DAF expresses each EUCs proportional weather sensitivity - this is key element of NDM algorithm i.e. WCF * DAF
- Changes to values of WSENSt / SNDt for LDZ will result in a different DAF value but proportionally the effect to allocation is very small
- To conclude, the values of WSENSt and SNDt derived from the aggregate NDM demand model are merely calculated in order to provide an 'LDZ ratio' (denominator)
- Amending values within this model will not significantly change allocation as every EUC ratio (numerator) is divided by the same 'LDZ ratio'


## 2009/10 Proposals - Raised Re. 28 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ December

- A comparison has been undertaken of SF values during December 2008 and December 2009.
- SF values on each 28 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ December (in 2008 and 2009) have been compared with the average SF values for:
- All December dates in that particular year between Christmas and New Years Day with the same holiday code as $28^{\text {th }}$ December.
- Results are presented as percentage changes
- Objective to highlight any significant \& material difference between the two $28^{\text {th }}$ Decembers for the two years.


## Comparison of relative SF Values

| LDZ | 28th ${ }^{\text {th }}$ December Relative to Other December Dates with Same Holiday Code |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ |
| SC | $-0.04 \%$ | $0.03 \%$ |
| NO | $0.00 \%$ | $-0.03 \%$ |
| NW | $0.01 \%$ | $-0.01 \%$ |
| NE | $-0.01 \%$ | $0.12 \%$ |
| EM | $0.00 \%$ | $-0.03 \%$ |
| WM | $-0.02 \%$ | $-0.04 \%$ |
| WN | $-0.01 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |
| WS | $-0.01 \%$ | $-0.04 \%$ |
| EA | $-0.01 \%$ | $-0.16 \%$ |
| NT | $0.00 \%$ | $-0.10 \%$ |
| SE | $-0.03 \%$ | $0.08 \%$ |
| SO | $-0.02 \%$ | $0.13 \%$ |
| SW | $0.00 \%$ | $-0.08 \%$ |

## 2009/10 Proposals - Raised Re. 28 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ December

- Comparison also done based on RMS Deviation of Scaling Factor from 1
- RMS Deviation calculated for $28^{\text {th }}$ December 2009 for each LDZ and compared to:
- Holiday Code 1 Average
- Holiday Code 2 Average (incl.28 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Dec)
- Holiday Code 3 Average
- December non-holiday days Average
- 29th December


## Comparison of RMS Deviation results for $\mathbf{2 8}^{\text {th }}$ December 09

| LDZ | December 28th | Holiday Code 1 <br> Average | Holiday Code 2 <br> Average | Holiday Code 3 <br> Average | December Non- <br> Hol Average | December 29th |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SC | 0.0008 | 0.0011 | 0.0010 | 0.0009 | 0.0046 | 0.0009 |
| NO | 0.0026 | 0.0025 | 0.0026 | 0.0031 | 0.0021 | 0.0027 |
| NW | 0.0024 | 0.0026 | 0.0030 | 0.0049 | 0.0051 | 0.0028 |
| NE | 0.0002 | 0.0009 | 0.0005 | 0.0015 | 0.0036 | 0.0000 |
| WM | 0.0016 | 0.0011 | 0.0015 | 0.0022 | 0.0028 | 0.0017 |
| EM | 0.0002 | 0.0016 | 0.0007 | 0.0016 | 0.0047 | 0.0002 |
| WN | 0.0052 | 0.0043 | 0.0053 | 0.0066 | 0.0058 | 0.0056 |
| WS | 0.0008 | 0.0012 | 0.0009 | 0.0005 | 0.0014 | 0.0008 |
| EA | 0.0024 | 0.0019 | 0.0025 | 0.0042 | 0.0033 | 0.0027 |
| NT | 0.0003 | 0.0007 | 0.0004 | 0.0003 | 0.0019 | 0.0004 |
| SE | 0.0007 | 0.0022 | 0.0011 | 0.0016 | 0.0040 | 0.0005 |
| SO | 0.0002 | 0.0009 | 0.0003 | 0.0011 | 0.0026 | 0.0002 |
| SW | 0.0032 | 0.0031 | 0.0033 | 0.0043 | 0.0027 | 0.0033 |
| AVG | 0.0016 | 0.0019 | 0.0018 | 0.0025 | 0.0034 | 0.0017 |

- Green: RMS Deviation for $28^{\text {th }}$ better (closer to 1 ) than average for category
- Red: RMS Deviation for $28^{\text {th }}$ worse (further away from 1) than average for category


## Commentary on Scaling Factor analysis results

- For 2008 and 2009 the same dates in December were assigned the same specific holiday codes
- Comparison of SF values on $28^{\text {th }}$ December in each LDZ relative to the SF values over Christmas with the same holiday code suggests $28^{\text {th }}$ December was not materially different from other days with the same holiday code for both 2008 and 2009.
- Comparison of RMS deviation of Scaling Factor from 1 for $28^{\text {th }}$ December 2009 with other combinations showed on average that results for $28^{\text {th }}$ December on their own were better (closer to 1 )
- Both sets of results indicate that treatment of $28^{\text {th }}$ December 2009 (i.e. holiday code assigned) was not inappropriate


## Holiday Factors

- Evidence of Scaling Factor analysis indicates that December 28 ${ }^{\text {th }} 2009$ was not treated inappropriately
- Therefore no evidence exists that changes to holiday codes need to be considered for 2010/11
- To make changes to the holiday codes and factors in 2010/11 you would need the appropriate analysis and calculations to base those changes on
- The best time to review and (if justified) amend the holiday codes is in the Autumn prior to the demand modelling and analysis carried out in the Spring
- If DESC agrees analysis of holiday codes can be carried out in Autumn 2010. Next slide highlights potential scope for analysis


## Proposed Analysis for Autumn 2010

- Proposed limited review of days to which holiday codes apply for spring 2011 NDM analysis
- Retain existing number of holiday codes but redefine them if appropriate
- Retain existing summer reduction period
- Analysis based on residuals (demand - fitted) from current EUC models for the most recent four NDM analysis years
- Separate review of whether holidays should continue to be included in regressions for band 1 (0-73.2 MWh pa)

