

June 2016

DRAC Issue Paper Comment

From: Irina Phillips

Representing: Herself

1. Is the scope of the proposed demand response advisory committee sufficient?
 - a. Do you agree with the focus of the advisory committee in both the near- and long -term?

In general, I agree with the scope for DRAC.

I have one comment though. The Council still concentrates its attention on traditional regulatory approach which is supplier/utility-focused. It would be nice to explore true market transformation and how ready our region is for new market participants- independent DR (DSM) Operators. When utilities are charged with integrating DR resources then policies consider only portfolio optimization application of DR. DR operators bring flexibility to the market, but we don't know what is the value of this. I think that DR operators might allow bring positive externalities into market integration process.

2. Is it appropriate to convene a separate forum to discuss smart grid, storage, and other enabling technologies?
 - a. Do you agree that a forum is the appropriate venue for these topics (versus an advisory committee)?

If the purpose of the forum is to exchange ideas and views then forum is the right venue. In my view the role of the advisory committee is to provide recommendation on the best (optimum) technology. The area of smart grid and storage is still under applied research and technological development, so it is too early to form an advisory committee. It makes sense to convene at a forum during 2016-2017 and then decide if the issue is ripe for advisory committee.