

Demand Response Working Group – *Feedback Form*

Meeting Date: November 15, 2018

Date Submitted: <i>2018/12/07</i>	<u>Feedback provided by (optional):</u> Company Name: Centrica Business Solutions Contact Name: Peter J. Cavan
--	---

Following the November 15 meeting of the Demand Response Working Group (DRWG), the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback from participants on questions posed during the presentation.

The presentation can be accessed from the DRWG engagement [webpage](#).

Please provide feedback by December 7, 2018 to engagement@ieso.ca. To promote transparency, this feedback will be posted on the DRWG engagement webpage unless otherwise requested by the sender. Any feedback on specific ICA design considerations should be made directly through the ICA engagement, rather than through this feedback mechanism.

Section	Question/Topic	Stakeholder Feedback
Operations: DR Activation Times	Recommendation: update to DR activation timeline - Approach #1 (Activation notice will be issued approximately 2 hours and 30 minutes but at least 2 hours before the start of the first dispatch hour)	Support the added clarity of “at least 2 hours before”

<p>Metering: DR Registration Updates</p>	<p>Proposed Changes to Contributor Management Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Record of Installation - LDC statement submissions - Single Line Diagrams - Identification of Records - Record Retention Period Requirement 	
<p>Metering: Additional Means of Collecting Data</p>	<p>Reasons why data collection via KYZ pulses should be allowed.</p>	<p>Data collection via a data logger using KYZ pulses has proven reliable and useful for some customer sites in other jurisdictions, such as PJM. We would be happy to review our current and future data collection process in more detail if that would be valuable.</p>
<p>2019 DR Workplan</p>	<p>What is required, and what would be most efficient, to transition from the DR Auction to the Incremental Capacity Auction?</p> <p>What does the DR Community need?</p>	
<p>2019 DR Workplan: Website changes</p>	<p>What changes to the DR webpage(s) would help demonstrate the value of DR and support communication about this resource to the broader sector?</p>	
<p>DR in the ICA</p>	<p>Of the items presented regarding ICA design features that may be most impactful for DR resources, which ones do you believe should be a top priority for discussion when establishing the 2019 DRWG work plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Resource Eligibility •Qualified Capacity 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Forward Period Obligation •Performance Assessment •Capacity Payments 	
<p>Accounting for Loads Participating in the ICI and as DR Resources in the ICA</p>	<p>Comments on potential approaches and suggestion for other approaches to address the reliability risk.</p>	<p>Ensuring that the IESO can meet the reliability obligations placed upon it is obviously critical. It is also important that customers be allowed to deliver the demand-side capability they are capable of, without leaving “megawatts on the table” through overly broad or restrictive rule design. Finally, the introduction of the ICA will change a number of market fundamentals at the same time, making an ex ante prediction of how customers will respond to an ‘extra’ change to the ICI program difficult.</p> <p>Therefore, the fourth option – to apply a ‘lever’ once the ICA is in market and its simultaneous effect with the ICI can be observed, appears prudent. To the principle above of enabling customer flexibility within reasonable bounds, we could not support the ‘blanket ban’ inferred by option five.</p>
<p>Future Meetings</p>	<p>Proposed first 2019 meeting date (Feb 12) and meeting frequency (8-10 week cycles).</p>	<p>An eight week frequency is reasonable. Scheduling meetings as far as possible in advance is appreciated, especially for those with longer travel commitments.</p>

General Comments/Feedback:

A general comment on meeting recording: when a decision is taken or deferred in a DRWG meeting, it would be helpful to provide a clear record of such. For example, the minutes of the Septmeber 11 meeting include an “Action Item Summary” box – perhaps a “Decision Taken” box could be added.

To provide a tangible example: utilization payments have been discussed multiple times in 2018, with implementation tabled for now. For stakeholders who cannot necessarily attend each DRWG meeting, finding out what was decided (or tabled) via the printed materials is quite difficult.