

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking to
Continue the Development of Rates
and Infrastructure for Vehicle
Electrification.

Rulemaking 18-12-006
(Filed December 13, 2018)

**REPLY COMMENTS OF THE VEHICLE GRID INTEGRATION
COUNCIL ON THE PROPOSED DECISION ADOPTING PLUG-IN
ELECTRIC VEHICLE SUBMETERING PROTOCOL AND ELECTRIC
VEHICLE SUPPLY EQUIPMENT COMMUNICATION PROTOCOLS**

Edward Burgess
Senior Policy Director

Zach Woogen
Policy Manager

VEHICLE GRID INTEGRATION COUNCIL
10265 Rockingham Dr.
Suite #100-4061
Sacramento, CA 95827
Telephone: (510) 665-7811
Email: vgicregulatory@vgicouncil.org

July 25, 2022

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking to
Continue the Development of Rates
and Infrastructure for Vehicle
Electrification.

Rulemaking 18-12-006
(Filed December 13, 2018)

**REPLY COMMENTS OF THE VEHICLE GRID INTEGRATION
COUNCIL ON THE PROPOSED DECISION ADOPTING PLUG-IN
ELECTRIC VEHICLE SUBMETERING PROTOCOL AND ELECTRIC
VEHICLE SUPPLY EQUIPMENT COMMUNICATION PROTOCOLS**

In accordance with the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the California Public Utilities Commission (“Commission”), the Vehicle Grid Integration Council (“VGIC”) hereby submits these reply comments on the *Proposed Decision Adopting Plug-In Electric Vehicle Submetering Protocol and Electric Vehicle Supply Equipment Communication Protocols* (“PD”), issued on June 30, 2022.

I. UTILITIES SHOULD FILE A TIER 2 ADVICE LETTER CONTAINING IMPLEMENTATION PLANS THAT MEANINGFULLY SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDIZED DATA FORMATS.

In opening comments, each of the three major investor-owned utilities (“IOU”) requested the Commission direct them to file a Tier 2 Advice Letter detailing submetering implementation plans.¹ While VGIC does not oppose this recommendation, we emphasize that the Commission should require specific elements be in the IOU implantation plans to ensure the Advice Letters result in meaningful action to implement submetering and do not lead to unnecessary delays.

In opening comments, ChargePoint and Enel X, Environmental Defense Fund, each of the three major IOUs, and VGIC highlighted that a standardized data format will need to be developed.²

¹ Opening Comments of PG&E at 2; SCE at 2; SDG&E at 2; and CASMU at 8.

² Opening Comments of VGIC at 9; ChargePoint and Enel X at 6; Environmental Defense Fund at 3; PG&E at 2; SCE at 2; SDG&E at 2; and CASMU at 8.

Additionally, ChargePoint and Enel X shared VGIC’s recommendation to update each applicable rate tariff sheet to enable submetering.³ With this in mind, the IOUs’ Tier 2 Advice Letter containing implementation plans should, at a minimum, request approval for the following: (1) electric rule updates per Section 3 and OP 2; (2) electric rate tariff sheet updates per opening comments from ChargePoint, Enel X, and VGIC⁴; (3) processes for onboarding EV service providers (“EVSP”), not including the standardized data format; and (4) a stakeholder working group led by the IOUs to develop a standard data format, as highlighted by several parties in opening comments.⁵ The working group should develop a standard data format within 120 days, at which point the IOUs should file an Advice Letter seeking approval for the standardized data format. The IOUs should begin accepting submetering 30 days after the effective date of the Advice Letter containing the working group-developed standard data format. As detailed in the PD, billing system upgrades should not preclude customers from using submetering. VGIC believes the development of a standardized data format is needed to facilitate manual reconciliation in the interim until billing system upgrades are completed.

II. VGIC DISAGREES THAT ADDITIONAL ACCURACY TESTING AND FAILURE OF COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES ARE NEEDED.

In opening comments, SCE and SDG&E recommend conducting a one-year accuracy test.⁶ Meanwhile, the EV Submetering Protocol (“EVSMP”) detailed in Attachment A to the PD includes provisions related to field testing that is based on the comprehensive record developed over the past decade.⁷ VGIC, therefore, disagrees with SCE and SDG&E’s recommendation for a

³ Opening Comments of VGIC at 7; ChargePoint and Enel X at 11.

⁴ Opening Comments of VGIC at 7; ChargePoint and Enel X at 11.

⁵ Opening Comments of VGIC at 9; ChargePoint and Enel X at 6; Environmental Defense Fund at 3; PG&E at 2; SCE at 2; SDG&E at 2; and CASMU at 8.

⁶ Opening Comments of SCE at 4; SDG&E at 4.

⁷ PD Attachment A at 16.

one-year field test in addition to the requirements laid out in the EVSMP. Additionally, SDG&E requests authority to, “disqualify MDMAs with poor data quality that result in customers being regularly billed on the primary meter.”⁸ VGIC notes that “Failure of Compliance” is sufficiently addressed in the EVSMP and recommends against imposing additional terms not in the EVSMP.⁹

III. THE SUBMETERING PROTOCOL SHOULD APPLY TO DCFC AND EXTERNAL SUBMETERS.

In opening comments, Enel X and ChargePoint recommend the submetering protocol apply to DCFC sites.¹⁰ VGIC agrees with these parties and adds that this can facilitate customer adoption of Automated Load Management (“ALM”) solutions that use integrated or co-located stationary energy storage to defer or avoid infrastructure costs for DCFC site hosts.¹¹ Notably, ALM was prioritized as a Commission-adopted VGI strategy pursuant to SB 676 in D.20-12-029.¹² Additionally, EVgo’s opening comments recommend that the submetering protocol apply equally to non-utility-owned external submeters and non-utility-owned submeters embedded in the EVSE.¹³ VGIC supports this recommendation and is not aware of any technical or implementation barrier to allowing submetering for both types of devices.

IV. VGIC AGREES WITH THE ALLIANCE FOR AUTOMOTIVE INNOVATION THAT NEXT STEPS TO ENABLE TELEMATICS ARE NEEDED.

In opening comments, Alliance for Automotive Innovation notes that EV-based submetering was considered as early as 2011 as a form of submetering but has since been “put on the back burner.”¹⁴ VGIC agrees that the pending CARB Advanced Clean Cars II regulation, utility interest in telematics, and current technology collectively indicate that stakeholder work is now needed to

⁸ Opening Comments of SDG&E at 4.

⁹ PD Attachment A at 17.

¹⁰ Opening Comments of ChargePoint and Enel X at 4.

¹¹ See, for example, solutions offered by FreeWire Technologies and Veloce Energy.

¹² D.20-12-029 OP 5 at 79.

¹³ Opening Comments of EVgo at 4.

¹⁴ Opening Comments of Alliance for Automotive Innovation at 3.

advance telematics for the benefit of all EV drivers, fleet owners, and ratepayers at large. VGIC agrees with Alliance for Automotive Innovation's recommendation for a workplan to unlock telematics in California's EV rates and programs.

V. VGIC AGREES WITH PARTIES SEEKING CLARITY THAT THE EVSE COMMUNICATION REQUIREMENTS APPLY ONLY TO TRANSPORTATION ELECTRIFICATION INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS.

In opening comments, all three IOUs request the Commission clarify that the proposed EVSE requirements apply only to TE infrastructure programs, rather than *all* ratepayer-funded and utility-administered programs including the IOUs' EV Infrastructure Rules.¹⁵ This echoes VGIC's opening comments, which state that the EVSE requirements shall not apply to VGI pilots or programs, DR pilots or programs, and EV-specific rates, including SDG&E's PYD VGI Rate, PG&E's Approved V2X Pilots, SCE's pending Large-Scale V1G Pilot, PG&E's LCFS Resilient Charging Pilot, SDG&E's pending EV DR Pilot, PG&E's pending DAHRTP Non-NEM Export Compensation Pilot, SCE's EPIC V2G Pilot, SDG&E's MHDV V2G Pilot, PG&E's pending RTP pilot, and ELRP Customer Group A.5.

VI. CERTAIN EXEMPTIONS TO EVSE COMMUNICATION PROTOCOLS REQUIREMENTS ARE NECESSARY TO AVOID NULLIFYING COMMISSION EFFORTS TO ADVANCE BIDIRECTIONAL CHARGING.

In opening comments, VGIC and Fermata highlight that the proposed EVSE communication protocols would carry the unintended consequence of obstructing ongoing and upcoming Commission-ordered bidirectional charging pilots that rely on standards other than those required under the PD.¹⁶ As noted above in Section V, VGIC believes it is inappropriate to subject *all* ratepayer-funded and utility-administered EVSE to the new EVSE communication protocol

¹⁵ Opening Comments of PG&E at 6; SCE at 6; SDG&E at 8.

¹⁶ Opening Comments of Fermata at 4; VGIC at 10.

requirements. Specifically, bidirectional chargers should be exempt from all EVSE requirements detailed in Ordering Paragraph 6 until the bidirectional charging market is more developed.

Additionally, bidirectional chargers are placed at a disadvantage in IOUs' TE programs. Since existing "make-ready" incentives are available only for separately-metered EVSE, many promising bidirectional use cases that rely on co-mingled EVSE and site load, such as V2B backup power and V2B customer bill management, are effectively shut out of TE programs and cannot take advantage of make-ready incentives. In its opening comments, Fermata Energy captures how this places bidirectional chargers at a disadvantage relative to unidirectional chargers.¹⁷ Meanwhile, bidirectional chargers, a type of behind-the-meter energy storage, are not eligible for Self-Generation Incentive Program ("SGIP") funding meant to support behind-the-meter energy storage. Representing both a type of EVSE and energy storage, bidirectional chargers are effectively shut out of utility programs that are meant to support EVSE and energy storage. Considering the many benefits of bidirectional charging highlighted in opening comments, VGIC supports Fermata's recommendation that the Commission undertake a focused effort either in this rulemaking or another proceeding to address barriers specific to bidirectional charging.¹⁸

VII. CONCLUSION.

VGIC appreciates the opportunity to submit these reply comments on the Proposed Decision. We look forward to further collaboration with the Commission and stakeholders on this initiative.

/s/ Edward Burgess

Edward Burgess

Senior Policy Director

VEHICLE GRID INTEGRATION COUNCIL

July 25, 2022

¹⁷ Opening Comments of Fermata at 9.

¹⁸ Opening Comments of Fermata at 9.