August 21, 2017 WEBEX MEETING NOTES

Summary

- Attendance: approximately 30 attendees via Webex
- Presentations and notes available online: http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/vgi/
- Facilitator Justin Regnier summarized key takeaways from the August 7 in-person meeting
- Presentation 1: Amy Mesrobian, CPUC
  - Reviewed GO-Biz' visual representation of the workplan, and accomplishments thus far.
- Presentation 2: Dean Taylor, SCE
  - Straw proposal to be circulated by the end of the month, dependent on consensus process. Definitions are a less a critical path task than the use cases.
    - Glossary version 4 will include general and technical terms, organizations, agencies, and standards. Example controversial terms that need precision. Will reduce the number of frameworks in the glossary from 8 to maybe 2.
      - Will present draft during a sub-working group meeting to be scheduled.
      - Will present glossary to Working Group during September 5th call.
- Presentation 3: Stephanie Palmer, ARB
  - Extracted use case requirements will be sent to Justin's sub-working group, which will map protocols to requirements.
  - 8 fundamental actor terms: 3 entities and 5 equipment items.
    - Removed duplicates to 32 requirements—other than functional requirements (Non-Fn, Customer, Other, Alternatives).
    - Working on removing duplicates from Functional Requirements
- Presentation 4: Justin Regnier, CEC
  - Mapping sub-working group will engage SMEs on protocols. SMEs will take first effort to match capabilities of a protocol to requirements.
  - As requirements are finalized, a survey to SMEs was sent to examine methods for standards development. Survey results are due Friday morning, where Justin will facilitate a discussion of how the protocols will demonstrate how the functional requirements are met.
- Presentation 5: Noel Crisostomo, CEC
  - Revised proposal for subject matter expert teams to categorize costs and benefits of the specific implementations of standards, based on the output of Deliverable 1.3. Provided key considerations and identified needed areas of clarification. Described how standard implementations would be juxtaposed to assist analysis of net benefits.

Action Items & Next Steps

- After Dean sends out link to latest version of Glossary, provide input during to-be-scheduled call to attempt consensus on certain terms.
- Protocols SMEs will respond to Justin's survey by 8/25.
- Parties should provide feedback on Costs and Benefits mapping to Noel (noel.crisostomo@energy.ca.gov) by 8/25.
- The next full Working Group meeting is a Webex on Tuesday, September 5.

Resources

- Email the state agencies (CPUC, CEC, ARB, CAISO, GO-Biz) with any questions or comments: vgiworkinggroup@cpuc.ca.gov
- Access the Use Case Sub-Working Group documents, including requirements template, on Google drive: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/0B4_ZRQzLAsLNeXRYcjRKa2FwUjg?usp=sharing
- Access the Definitions Sub-Working Group documents on Google drive: https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B4_ZRQzLAsLNdV9Fc0doVHZPZEU

Detailed Comments

- Questions on Costs and Benefits process
    - Mike: Does this require completing Deliverable 1 or can it be run in parallel?
        - Noel: Mapping costs and benefits would benefit from the subject matter expertise of systems designers responsible for implementing standards. While it would benefit from the outputs, this process is relatively more accessible for discussions of non-technical stakeholders.
    - George: Is the focus on examining the implementation of use cases or the standard's ability to meet requirements?
        - Noel: There is some overlap, since it is possible that in certain implementations of a standard within a charging system might need equipment or supporting systems that are otherwise unnecessary in other implementations, like V2G needing an extra bidirectional inverter and metering. Regarding the use of the terminology, it is possible that some standards will meet Stephanie's "requirements" but not incur certain costs or benefits unless they pursue a certain use case. This exercise is intended to help identify points of incremental equipment or supporting systems.
    - Mike: It is possible to simplify the process if you start with service required. Will send an email detailing the idea.
    - Dean and Josh: What if the focus is on end to end solutions?
        - Noel: The key task is to identify where standards are needed for EVSE and EV communications. While this does not connect directly to the utility, Deliverable 1.3 allows us to assemble distinct implementations of standards or combinations thereof.
    - George: It is hard to understand costs of interoperability.
        - We'll have more information after completing this exercise, and by examining each of the components individually we will have the ability to compare and contrast. While it is difficult, but we could find where gaps exist.

Attendees

- George Bellino, Lance Atkins, Mahdi Ghamkari, John Mengwasser, Mike Bourton, Jordan Smith, Robert Uyeki, Steven Yip, Abigail Tinker, Dean Taylor, Jamie Hall, Chad Bass, Hannah Goldsmith, Rich Scholer, Quang Pham, Christopher Michelbacher, Josh McDonald, Alec Brooks, Niki, Lee Slezak, Bill Boyce, Lisa McGhee, Adam Langton, Lydia
- Agencies: Stephanie Palmer, Elise Keddie, Noel Crisostomo, Justin Regnier, Amy Mesrobian, Peter Klauer