

# ChargePoint

Please see attachment



June 5, 2024

Washington Department of Ecology  
300 Desmond Dr SE  
Lacey, WA 98503

## **RE: ChargePoint Informal Comments Following May Workshops for Proposed Clean Fuels Standard Amendments**

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the proposed amendments to the Clean Fuel Standard (CFS). ChargePoint has reviewed the proposed amendments and appreciates the work of the Department of Ecology (Ecology) Staff to implement changes to the CFS that will advance investment in low carbon fuels and infrastructure in Washington.

### **About ChargePoint**

Since 2007, ChargePoint has been committed to making it easy for businesses and drivers to go electric with one of the largest electric vehicle (EV) charging networks and a comprehensive portfolio of charging solutions. ChargePoint's cloud subscription platform and software defined charging hardware is designed internally and includes options for every charging scenario from home and multifamily to workplace, parking, hospitality, retail, corridor, and fleets of all kinds.

### **Summary of comments**

- Third-party verification: Ensure that verification requirements for on-road EV charging providers are feasible and effective for large, distributed networks.
- Fast Charging Infrastructure (FCI) crediting: Transition FCI credits to medium- and heavy-duty sites, as California is proposing. Restrict FCI credits to disadvantaged communities for light-duty.
- Book-and-claim: Allow book-and-claim accounting with RECs from generators with a rolling COD eligibility window. Do not require Green-e.
- Statewide mix pathway: Allow non-utility reporting entities to use the statewide mix pathway when reporting electricity.



### **Third-party verification of on-road EV charging**

We support Ecology's proposals to implement full verification in 2027 and to exempt entities generating fewer than 6,000 credits per year from verification. Both proposals reflect a practical approach to ensuring feasible and effective verification.

We recommend that Ecology implement procedures for verification of on-road EV charging that acknowledge the large, geographically distributed networks of charging providers. Any verification procedures that rely on sampling individual chargers for meter accuracy are likely to be cost prohibitive or infeasible. Instead, we propose that verification relies on 1) existing metering standards, 2) desktop reviews of software and data architecture, and 3) desktop reviews of data collection and reporting.

- 1) Existing metering standards: The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) publishes a guide, called "Handbook 44", that sets standards for accuracy across a wide range of technologies, including EV chargers. The NIST standards have been translated into accuracy certifications for commercial charging equipment under the National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP). (Note that California has their own similar program, called CTEP.) Charging equipment can receive NTEP certification at the product level, meaning that a certain make and model of charger is certified to meet NIST accuracy thresholds based on its design and embedded meters. Handbook 44 establishes factory accuracy thresholds of +/- 1% for Level 2 chargers and DC fast chargers. We propose that Ecology integrate NIST standards for accuracy into verification by allowing all devices that are NTEP certified to be deemed accurate for reporting. This removes the need to test accuracy of individual stations and instead provides confidence in the metering accuracy of specific charger makes/models. A verifier would therefore only need to confirm that charger types used to generate credits have current NTEP certification.
- 2) Desktop review of software and data architecture: After charging data is collected across a network, it typically enters a company's data storage systems, where data can be housed until needed for reporting, etc. All EV charging companies are likely to have their own unique data architecture, but all can be validated at a systems level. In other words, a verifier can test the systems that store, process, and call data to ensure that the risks of data manipulation or mishandling are low. We recommend this systems-level approach to ensuring data integrity. Since almost all charging networks form a basis for financial transactions, many network architectures are already subject to stringent standards such as Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCI DSS), which ensures that the network can facilitate secure transactions. Verification of software and data architecture could lean on existing standards and certifications.
- 3) Desktop review of data collection and reporting: Finally, verification must ensure that data collected by an EV charging provider's systems are accurately transformed into a format that can be reported under the CFS. This part of verification could involve the straightforward review of outputs from charging data systems to confirm that the data



have been handled appropriately following output from software systems. This can all be accomplished with a desktop review of data outputs that are used in reporting to generate credits.

### **Fast Charging Infrastructure (FCI) credits**

ChargePoint recommends Ecology follow California's lead and transition at least a portion of the FCI pathway to medium and heavy duty (MHD) vehicles. Ecology could bring forward the December 2029 cutoff date for light duty (LD) FCI applications (to say, December 2026) after which FCI would transition to MHD. The MHD EV sector is less mature than the LD space and would benefit more from infrastructure credits at this stage of development. The MHD FCI mechanism is particularly useful to charging providers serving MHD fleet and drayage vehicles, which will be needed to electrify and decarbonize the Seattle-Tacoma port. ChargePoint is engaged with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) on the California MHD FCI provisions and generally supports the proposed design of the pathway; however, Ecology should solicit industry feedback on the details of a MHD FCI provision closer to the date of implementation to account for potential differences between California and Washington's needs. We also recommend that both private and public MHD charging depots be eligible for credits to reflect the value of private "depot-style" charging sites.

### **Book-and-claim accounting**

We support Ecology's move to allow book-and-claim accounting, but recommend some revisions:

- 1) We suggest that Ecology implement a rolling eligibility window for commercial operation date (COD), and that the eligibility begins with a year further in the past than 2023. We suggest that the eligibility begins with a COD of 2020 and then moves forward by one year each year. Setting the COD date of 2023 may artificially restrict the supply of eligible RECs, leading to higher program costs for renewable energy.
- 2) We suggest that Ecology does not require RECs to be Green-e certified. While Oregon has chosen to go this route, California has not. Requiring Green-e certification places another restriction on the supply of eligible RECs, which again puts upward pressure on the cost of using renewable energy in the program.
- 3) We recommend that any requirements placed on book-and-claim electricity are also implemented, in principle, for all types of fuel that may use book-and-claim methods, particularly biomethane. Ecology should ensure fair competition between fuel types under the program by applying restrictions evenly.

### **Use of the statewide mix electricity pathway**

We propose that Ecology allows non-utility entities that are reporting electricity to use the statewide mix pathway rather than utility-specific pathways. We find that the rule has some ambiguity around when statewide mix may be used, as was discussed with Brian Goldgeier via email in April 2024. Ecology can take this opportunity to clarify that ambiguity and make the rule more workable for electricity reporters.



While we understand that the use of utility-specific CIs is intended to provide an incentive for utilities to lower their CI scores and receive more credits, we do not feel that this incentive applies to entities that are not utilities. These entities, such as ChargePoint and other EV network operators, do not have direct means to reduce utility CIs. Requiring the use of utility-specific CIs therefore places an additional burden on these entities without any way for them to participate in the processes that could lead to CI reduction. Furthermore, the burden of requiring utility-specific CIs can pose a significant barrier to reporting for both small and large EV charging providers. Often the entity reporting the electricity under the CFS (whether that be the EV charging provider, a site host/operator, or any other entity) does not have utility information for the chargers being reported. Determining which utility is supplying any given charger is an inherently manual process that will slow adoption of the program for electricity reporters.

## **Conclusion**

ChargePoint appreciates the opportunity to submit comments to Ecology on the proposed amendments. We stand ready to work with Ecology staff to implement the CFS in a way that best incentivizes the electrification of Washington's vehicle fleet. Please feel free to reach out with any questions or if you would like to schedule a time to meet and discuss.