

## Transitional Demand Response Program

### Capture of Points on Flipcharts – April 22, 2004

During the second workshop on April 22, 2004 IMO staff captured the following stakeholder comments on flipcharts. The IMO is assessing the feedback received and will factor it into the further development of the Transitional Demand Response Program.

#### Issues:

- The IMO should view the TDRP as a building block for future DR programs
- The 2 – 3 year time period will limit participation
- The IMO should take into consideration the ‘build time’ for projects, allow a sliding window for participation (i.e. the 2 –3 year time period will start after the ‘build time’ needed to get DR into the program)
- The IMO needs to assess and consider the impact on LDCs – i.e. increased costs due to requests from ‘aggregators’ for meter data for settlements
- Need clear guidelines on what projects would fall within each sector, i.e. are multi-residential units residential or commercial, warehouses
  
- Free driver activity has a negative impact on baseline (if participant responds to 3 hour-ahead price signal below \$120 it will reduce the baseline when the program is activated)
- Environmental impact should be included in ranking, i.e. under ‘innovative approach’
- How will the IMO market/promote the program?
- IMO should lower the threshold price to increase certainty of payback
- Allow for sliding threshold – i.e. start the program at a lower than \$120 threshold and then move it up – the IMO can adjust it such that the program is activated 5% of all hours
  
- Will IMO waive the \$1000.00 fee to become a market participant?
- Use seasonal and diversity factors in ranking projects – include in ‘Overall Fit’ category.
- IMO needs to ensure that information is gathered to complete ranking
- Provide a minimum number of hours for the TDRP, i.e. test hours
  
- Is the 100 MW limit to be applied to total DR available or total DR actually provided (i.e. 20% response rate)
- Application should indicate participants ability to respond (i.e. length of DR provided, estimate of MWs, seasonal and diversity factors)

- Back-up generation – will they be able to participate? How will they be settled? There is a question of equity – paying some generators twice
- In assessing ‘incremental’ DR, what does the IMO consider ‘current’?
- How will the benefits of avoided costs in transmission and generation be assessed?
- Need a clear indication of the level of ‘evidence’ required in the application form that would indicate the participant meets the criteria
- The criteria for inclusion in the program is too detailed and intrusive – the IMO should only be concerned with the amount of DR and whether it is measurable
- IMO should develop milestones for participants to meet (i.e. during build phase) and have the ability to remove participants from the program when they do not meet the milestones
- IMO should have the ability to remove participants who consistently fail to achieve their stated DR amounts

#### Feedback

- IMO needs to provide clarification of how and when the program will be expanded beyond the 100 MW cap
- IMO needs to ensure the program is consistent with government policy
- Program should facilitate the development of DR
- Encourage participation of embedded generation
- Include guidelines on ranking in the application form
- Analyse the program on an ongoing basis (i.e. quarterly) to determine what the threshold price should be