

From: [Larisa Dobriansky](#)
To: [Gravelly, Mike@Energy](#); [Harland, Eli@Energy](#)
Subject: Subject: CEC Commercializing Microgrids Workshop I
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 5:18:39 PM

I strongly support this proceeding and think it got off to a very good start.

The following are some comments that I'd like to offer relating to yesterday's presentations and discussions:

1. The importance of defining Microgrids to commercialize these technologies. It is vital to have a consistent definition that recognizes the attributes and benefits/costs to be able to attract private capital in market development. Microgrids need to be distinguished from the distributed energy resources that comprise these systems, as well as taking these components into account; Microgrids are distribution systems, not just sources of generation. Microgrids also need to be distinguished from Virtual Power Plants and DER aggregation;
2. The importance of evolving a legal, regulatory and institutional framework for Microgrids. Legal and regulatory uncertainties are one of the biggest impediments to commercialization.
3. Focus in the Roadmap on the high value created by the "systems" approach taken by microgrids, as distinctive from value generated by individual DER technologies within a "compiled" portfolio. Performance-based metrics should recognize the higher values that can be generated by microgrid systems applications ("integrated systems") in contrast to aggregating the values of individual DER technologies. To me, this is important to evaluate and compare the net benefits of advanced Microgrids to traditional investments in assessing the cost-effectiveness of "mitigation" solutions and ways in which to improve the performance of the power value chain;
4. CA (See Erickson and others) is the only state I know that is recognizing the changing functionalities of Microgrids that are using "smart" technologies: information, communications and control technologies that enable "dynamic" Microgrids. The Roadmap should differentiate "traditional," conventional Microgrids from "advanced" Microgrids and the implications for commercialization;
4. The Roadmap should address, as David Erickson pointed out, how "smart"/advanced Microgrids can help communities achieve integrated energy solutions, using intelligent energy management, in developing their infrastructure and built-environment.
5. The Roadmap should address how smart/advanced Microgrids could enable communities, through community choice aggregation and other means, to plan, pilot and implement, in coordination with utilities, a resource-efficient "systems" approach for managing and optimizing local energy across end use sectors (water, wastewater treatment, waste management, transportation, buildings, etc.) -- combining onsite renewable technologies with end user efficiency, demand reduction, smart grid and energy storage capabilities.
6. I think the Roadmap should discuss how microgrid strategies should inform both community land-use development and utility integrated resource planning/distribution resources planning in a mutually beneficial way.

7. Lay groundwork in the Roadmap for the development of financing models;
8. The Roadmap might address how advanced Microgrids could facilitate "transactive energy," enabling peer to peer energy sharing within local energy networks of microgrid cells.

Also, please include me in your Commercializing Microgrids Roadmap list so I can attend the full array of activities that you have planned.

Below is my contact information:

Larisa Dobriansky
Chief Business and Regulatory Innovations Officer
General Microgrids

larisa.dobriansky@gmail.com

703 920 1377

Thanks and great start!