



**Stakeholder Comments Template**  
**Hybrid Resources Initiative: Metering & Telemetry Technical Workgroup**

This template has been created for submission of stakeholder comments on the **Hybrid Resources Initiative, Metering & Telemetry Technical Working Group** that was held on August 27, 2019. The meeting material and other information related to this initiative may be found on the initiative webpage at:

<http://www.caiso.com/informed/Pages/StakeholderProcesses/HybridResources.aspx>

Upon completion of this template, please submit it to [initiativecomments@caiso.com](mailto:initiativecomments@caiso.com). Submissions are requested by close of business on **September 10, 2019**.

Submitted by	Organization	Date Submitted
Regis Reverchon Senior Transmission Manager T: (510) 457-2142 M: (925) 353-8815	EDF-Renewables (EDF-R)	September 10 <sup>th</sup> , 2019
Julie Love Interconnection Project Engineer (415) 496-4914	SPower	

EDF-R and SPower (the Suppliers) appreciate the CAISO holding the Metering & Telemetry Working Group (MTWG) meeting (Meeting) to discuss details related to Hybrid Resources (HRs). EDF-R agrees with the CAISO's characterization of stakeholder feedback that metering and telemetry solutions may reduce HR forecasting risk, resolve most significant HR operational issues, and address other CAISO concerns about HRs.

For example, the Suppliers' written comments on the [Issue Paper](#) supported CAISO ability to require reasonable information from HRs – regardless of Resource ID configuration – sufficient to ensure that those HRs can fulfill market awards they receive. That includes: (1) Sufficient information for CAISO to construct a forecast for any VER components; and (2) SOC information for any storage components. As such, CAISO metering and telemetry requirements for technologies included in HRs should reflect such requirements for projects using those same technologies on a stand-alone basis.

**Please provide your organization's comments on the following issues and questions.**

**1. Metering Layout for Grid and Distribution Connection**

There are a number of metering configurations that are available to the generating facilities that were presented during the 8/27/19 meeting. Please provide your organization's feedback on any issues related to the metering configurations discussed. Please explain your rationale and include examples if applicable.

The Suppliers have several comments related to the metering layouts presented at the Meeting.

- **CAISO vs. CEC requirements:** The text and graphics in the CAISO presentation seemed to confuse CAISO metering requirements with additional requirements CAISO believes are need to meet CEC RPS reporting requirements for HRs with storage components, but are not required by the CAISO. For example, at least some of the diagrams seem to include separate meters for the storage components, not because CAISO rules require it, but because the CAISO believes that CEC RPS reporting rules require it.

At a minimum, the CAISO clarify the following in the upcoming Straw Proposal,

- **The meters needed only for CAISO tariff compliance.** This is especially important, since the CEC rules may change in the near future, and/or the CAISO's interpretation of those rules may not be correct (see below).
- **Which hybrid configurations would require additional meters under its interpretation of the CEC guidance**, for that purpose only. For example:
  - Storage charged only from on-site renewable generation under a single Resource ID: Additional meters are not needed, since the metered export to the grid would already reflect any round-trip storage losses.
  - Storage charged only from the grid, under two or more Resource IDs: Additional meters are not needed, since the renewable and storage components are already separately metered, and technically any energy generated by a renewable component would be "exported" (injected into the grid) before being "imported" (imported from the grid) to charge the storage.  
*(As noted below, applicability of CAISO's interpretation of CEC guidance to multiple-Resource ID configurations is highly questionable since, for settlements and otherwise, this configuration is the same as separate renewable and storage projects except for the shared Interconnection Facilities.)*
  - Storage charged from both the grid and on-site renewable generation: This is the only configuration where additional metering between generation and storage components would be needed for RPS reporting purposes under the CAISO interpretation, so "round-trip" losses could be estimated and subtracted from generation. However, this need would be for CEC/RPS purposes, and not required under the CAISO tariff.
- **Application of CEC requirements:** Given the CAISO's interpretation, the CAISO should describe in the Straw Proposal how it would determine and subtract round-trip losses through storage from production of on-site renewable generation, i.e.: (1) the data sources and calculations that would be used; and (2) which Resource ID (renewable generation or storage) would absorb the losses under multi-Resource ID configurations.

- **Characterization of losses:** It appears that losses for HRs are treated under the CAISO tariff the same as losses for other projects, i.e., projects that:
  - Meter before the Point of Interconnection (POI) must compensate for line losses to the POI;
  - Connect at distribution level must compensate for distribution losses; and
  - Meter on the low side of transformers must compensate for transformation losses.

The above requirements apply to both HR and non-HR projects, i.e., the scope of this initiative need only address them to the degree that they are different from those applicable to non-HR projects. The CAISO should clarify in the upcoming [Straw Proposal](#) whether there are any HR losses requirements that are unique to HRs, other than the “round-trip” storage losses discussed further below.

## 2. Metering Layout for AC and DC connection

There were a number of metering configurations available for AC and DC connection of hybrid resource components that were presented during the 8/27/19 meeting. Please provide your organization’s feedback on any issue related to the AC and DC metering issues that were discussed. Please explain your rationale and include examples if applicable.

The Suppliers thank the CAISO for recognizing this issue. Adding DC-coupled storage to a generation project, instead of AC-coupled storage, can be more economic, and also avoid issues related to short-circuit duty impacts, and the CAISO should more toward accommodating and encouraging such additions.

As the Meeting presentation noted, resources using DC metering elements can participate in CAISO markets as SC-Metered Entities, using SQMD Plans. However, in our experience, Scheduling Coordinators consider this to be a burden, and considerable additional costs can be involved in establishing and sustaining that arrangement.

Thus, it would be better if the CAISO could certify one or more DC meters promptly, so resources using them can be CAISO-Metered Entities. EDF-R appreciates the CAISO planned outreach to meter manufacturers that CAISO has made or is planning to make and offers its assistance on this matter.

## 3. Other metering and telemetry needs

Please provide your organization’s feedback on other metering and telemetry needs for hybrid resources.

The Suppliers wish to comment on the extensive discussion at the Meeting about CEC RPS reporting requirements. Specifically, EDF-R agrees with SPower’s comments on the [Issue Paper](#) concerning subtraction of storage “round-trip losses” for RPS reporting purposes under the CEC’s [RPS Eligibility Guidebook](#) when there are separate Resource IDs for renewables and storage, in HRs containing both components.

The [Guidebook](#) (Section 3F) states as follows:

The reportable RPS energy from this hybrid resource configuration would be equal to the renewable energy produced net of any losses from storage.

However, the [Guidebook](#) discussion describes requirements for a hybrid “facility,” without defining that term. The issue of separate vs. combined Resource IDs, or the applicability of this guidance to configurations with separate renewables and storage Resource IDs, is not addressed in the CEC document.

As SPower’s comments point out, there is little difference for RPS purposes between:

- **A stand-alone solar project located near a stand-alone storage project**, where physically some of the energy generated and then exported to the grid is effectively injected into and withdrawn from the separate storage project, before re-export and transmittal to consumers; and
- **The solar component of an HR project co-located with a storage component**, where some of the energy generated is injected into and withdrawn from the on-site storage component, before export and transmittal to consumers.

Thus, renewable generation and storage equipment under [separate](#) Resource IDs would logically be considered as separate “facilities” under CEC rules, and there is little justification for treating them together as one “facility.”

The CAISO itself treats the two Resource IDs as separate facilities for settlements, dispatch, Resource Adequacy, and other purposes. (In fact, under current Master File protocols, they are considered entirely separate and unrelated resources.)

Moreover, it would be inconsistent for the CAISO to charge market settlements for the full injection amount into storage from on-site renewables when there are two Resource IDs (as it appears may be the case, based on information in the [Issue Paper](#)), but then subtract round-trip losses from reportable RPS amounts. Effectively, the supplier would pay the CAISO as though all the energy came from the grid, but then be unable to get full RPS benefits because the CEC assumes that the round-trip losses energy never reached the grid. This situation would clearly be unfair and unreasonable.

With respect to metering requirements, under an interpretation considering the renewable and solar HR components as separate “facilities” if they are under separate Resource IDs, there would be no need for the CAISO to meter the energy from the renewable component into an on-site storage component for either CAISO or CEC purposes. Instead, such metering would be at the option of the supplier, e.g., to demonstrate for ITC purposes that injections into on-site storage are from renewable sources.

Finally, the Suppliers understand that the CEC, and not the CAISO, determines RPS reporting rules. The CEC is in the process of updating its [Guidebook](#), and some suppliers have already engaged with the CEC on this topic.

It would be helpful for the CAISO to also engage with the CEC, to help explain issues related to separate Resource IDs, CAISO metering requirements, and the issue of comparability between co-located vs. separately located solar and storage projects. In addition, the CAISO should also design its systems to be flexible, such that they can accommodate different interpretations of current RPS accounting rules, and also respond to possible future change in those rules as the market evolves.

**Additional comments**

Please offer any other feedback your organization would like to provide on the Hybrid Resources Initiative.