**June 26, 2017 WEBEX MEETING NOTES**

**Summary**

* Attendance: approximately 25 attendees via Webex
* Presentations and notes available online: <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/vgi/>
* Facilitator Justin Regnier summarized key takeaways from the June 12 in-person meeting
* Presentation 1: Mike Bourton, Update on Use Case Subgroup
  + 30 use cases have completed review
  + 21 use cases scheduled for review on June 27 and 29
  + There are 16 place holder cases for 15118 because Fahaad is seeking permission from ANSI and ISO to use a licensed version
  + Subgroup Minutes and Attendance records at:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B4_ZRQzLAsLNLUVBbGlGVG1MV00>

* Presentation 2: Jeremy Whaling, IOU OEM joint presentation on VGI Themes
  + Jeremy presented on behalf of SCE, PG&E, SDG&E, EPRI, Ford, Nissan, Toyota, Honda, Tesla, Fiat Chrysler, and General Motors
  + The IOU/OEM group sees two discussion themes occurring within the working group
    - Theme 1 – How do we advance VGI in California?
    - Theme 2 – How do we ‘future proof’ charging station investments by the utilities?
  + Would like further clarification on which theme the working group is addressing and the specific questions the working group aims to answer.
  + They see conflicting goals from the working group and want to make sure that the Working Group results in an actionable outcome
  + Would like to make sure that future proofing is about minimizing risk. Asserts that future proofing has different purpose from market development.
  + Would like greater focus on defining VGI value within an order of magnitude by exploring what has been done in storage and smart inverters.

**Action Items & Next Steps**

* All use case submitters should complete the Use Case Requirements Template, found on Google drive, and submit to Stephanie Palmer of ARB at [Stephanie.palmer@arb.ca.gov](mailto:Stephanie.palmer@arb.ca.gov) within a week of the Use Case Sub-Working Group reviewing your use case.
* Stephanie Palmer of ARB will work with the 4 volunteers (Jeremy Whaling, George Bellino, Mike Bourton and Vincent Chen) to review the Use Case Requirements Templates that are submitted.
* After the use cases and requirements have been finalized, the state agencies would like to create another sub-working group to map the use case requirements to communication protocols. By Thursday, July 6, email [vgiworkinggroup@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:vgiworkinggroup@cpuc.ca.gov) if you are interested in leading or participating in this new sub-working group.
* The next full Working Group meeting is a Webex on Monday, July 10.

**Resources**

* Email the state agencies (CPUC, CEC, ARB, CAISO, GO-Biz) with any questions or comments: [vgiworkinggroup@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto: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**

* Jen Kalafut, CPUC
  + The two themes presented by Jeremy Whaling do track with the Working Group’s workplan, but we should frame ‘value’ better, identify existing value streams and the order of magnitude of available value streams connected to each use case
  + The focus is on utility investments in infrastructure, so a narrower look at Theme 2 is the scope of this working group
  + Requested proposed edits to the work plan to clarify the narrower focus on Theme 2/IOU infrastructure investments
* Adam Langton, BMW
  + The two themes require two different approaches and doing both will be very difficult in the working group given its timeframe
  + Wants the CPUC to answer the question of how can utility investments support VGI, do standards future proof? IOUs and OEMs seem to feel that a specific standard does not help future proof and help investments. Concerned about risk of enacting standards immediately would lock in pathways and limit innovation.
* Amy Mesrobian, CPUC – There are some things related to Theme 1 that may need to be addressed to accomplish Theme 2. The working group’s effort to address Theme 2 may help move forward on answering Theme 1, but there will be more work necessary beyond this working group’s output.
* Dean Taylor, SCE – suggests addressing VGI Roadmap activities in an update, as discussed by CEC during the June 13 IEPR Workshop. Certain utilities and autos will be submitting comments.
* Peter Klauer, ISO: Communications is just one component of a solution that would facilitate VGI, whether it helps utilities or ISO. Does not intend to paint a broad picture, “one way and one way only.” Highlights the fact that standards could reduce situation to reduce cost and integrate into systems, not precluding options. Focus is the emergence of communications that are perceived as leading edge. Not precluding anything, up to the EVSE and EV OEMs, and if there is a business case.
* Stephanie Palmer, ARB: Will support ZEV implementation. Trying to not preclude. Not intended to change.
* Noel Crisostomo, CEC- CEC has an interest in not just outcomes, but how VGI is done. The Alternative and Renewable Fuels and Vehicles Technology program requires open standards in funding charging infrastructure to avoid vendor lock-in and enable interoperability.
* Jeremy Whaling, Honda: Requests consideration of the design of the SCE Make Ready program, which infrastructure is provided up to the stub and, EVSE is selected by the customer. Difficult to have a mandate, difficult. Study whether or not consensus of how VGI is approached. Is choosing from a list that the utility has qualified.
* Steve Davis, Oxygen Initiative: Suggests a focus on an end goal that preserves California’s options and develops a homogenous charging experience. Notes that global automakers need a means to enable advanced functionalities within the EVSEs in preparation for vehicles and clearly. Recalls the LA Air Force Base’s challenge in market resource certification and notes the need of streamlined method. Notes de minimis costs in EVSE and that per utility discussions about sending users dynamic prices, a standard would reduce the customer’s direct interaction with the rate.
* Forest Williams, PowerFlex, –the data is what’s necessary for the IOUs to be able to use, it doesn’t matter if it comes directly from the vehicle or the EVSE. The transmittal path is not crucial, just need to make sure that what is being sent to the utilities/grid can be used to align grid resources