



## DR POLICY WORKING GROUP MEETING 4/7/22

### Agenda

1. Discuss priorities for upcoming IOU DR applications
2. Discuss today's kickoff of CEC's DR QC working group
3. Other issues

### Meeting Notes

#### Discuss priorities for upcoming IOU DR applications

On Monday 4/11, Greg will be meeting with Jomo Thorne and John Hernandez from PG&E, at their request. Here are a few ideas that Greg will communicate during the discussion:

- Why didn't PG&E donate data for the CAISO/Recurve control group study?
- IOU application deadline is 5/1.
- We want to stress the importance of offering more 3P opportunities, beyond just DRAM.
- We'd like to see potential changes to CBP in the form of higher incentives and more event call opportunities.
  - Look for making permanent changes that were authorized as part of the Phase 2 Emergency Reliability proceeding (e.g., \$650 bid cap).
  - We have concerns about IOUs requiring customers to make commitments far in advance of DR season (per supply plans) but 15 days need to be retained....this pushes all the risk on customers even though IOUs are getting a RAIM exemption.
- Future of DRAM will be addressed in this proceeding. We want to see DRAM enhancements in spite of underperformance during Q1/Q2 2021...perhaps drawing on things that were authorized during the Emergency Reliability proceeding.
  - This is a structure for bilateral contracts (i.e., revive AMP)
- We like the BYOD approach with the Smart AC program, and perhaps expand that to other devices.

- Issue of ineffectiveness of cost-effectiveness methods. Now that EE is using TSB, shouldn't DR use something similar or how do we overcome the fact that it is broken?

### **Discuss today's kickoff of CEC's DR QC working group**

The CEC indicated how they want to proceed with proposals. They want each one to be a stand-alone document and must contain sufficient detail.

They want to apply the final working group principles to their proposals.

The timeline they outlined needs to take into account that DR providers must know by November which counting method must be used. So final decision by November 17th. This doesn't give a lot of time to finalize a proposal.

Might we want to put forth the Council's incentive-based methodology. We could put forth some examples as suggested by Josh Bode. This approach might be welcomed by the CEC and CPUC and may eliminate redundant proposals across stakeholders.

Might we want to push for a streamlined LIP approach, which is to take all of the protocols and narrow down various requirements that are not relevant for 3Ps.

Are there any methods that we haven't talked about yet?

Note from Andrew Cole (Leap): Luke, my one thought on a streamlined LIP process is that the development of this 'universal model' needs to be well thought out and still tunable to specific DR portfolios. With Leap's heterogeneous portfolio it's not appropriate to stick resi tstats and municipal water pumps together. We wouldn't want to move to a new evaluation methodology that simple and easy, but doesn't adequately capture some of the complexity and variety of DR portfolios.

### **Other issues**

Greg joined a webinar earlier today hosted by AESP about alternative DR baselines. The presentation was given by Jill Powers of CAISO and Adam Scheer from Recurve.

Key slides from the webinar are provided [here](#).

### **Next Working Group Meeting**

**Note that due to schedule conflicts, we need to reschedule our May 5th DR Policy call.** The new date and time for the call are May 12th 10-11. We will send out a separate note soon about when that call will be rescheduled. The call-in coordinates for this call are below.

[Zoom link](#)

Call-in: +13017158592,,84698809296#

Passcode: cedmc2022