



Meeting Name	Date of Meeting
Microgrid Services Tariff Working Group Meeting	January 21, 2021

Agenda

Introduction, Jan. 20 Meeting Summary, Proposed Schedule (Slides 1-5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working Group Lead (K. Aramaki) provided a summary of the January 20 meeting (slide 4). No additions/revisions proposed by the Commission Staff. • Working Group Leads discussed the schedule extension to be requested by the CA’s office on January 21. The extension allows for the Working Group to flag areas of disagreement, and additional time for Parties to respond to the Working Group filing, as well as respond to the Parties’ comments.
Hybrid MGO Interconnection Agreement Walk-Through (Slide 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Working Group continued and completed a walk-through of the Hybrid MGO Interconnection Agreement. Updates based on discussion on 1/21/21 reflected in word document sent to Working Group. • Significant discussion items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Company proposed to change the title to “Microgrid Services Tariff – Hybrid Microgrid Agreement” to clarify the Agreement is not intended to be a generation interconnection agreement. WG agreed with change. ○ The Working Group discussed MRC’s proposed changes to Sec. 1. The Working Group flagged the section for an area of disagreement for purposes of the WG filing. ○ The Company provided its redlines to include remedy provisions (Sec. 2.e-g) and a Dispute Resolution clause (Sec. 25.n). Working Group to review further. ○ The Company provided its redlines to Sec. 11 (Personnel and System Safety) for Working Group to review. ○ Working Group briefly discussed MRC’s proposed changes to Sec. 13.b.i. The Working Group agreed to flag this section for an area of disagreement. ○ The Company mentioned that Sec. 20 (Insurance) liability coverage amounts would need to be reviewed based on the change in methodology that the microgrid’s size is based on Total Peak Demand.
Microgrid Services Tariff (Slide 7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Working Group commenced and completed a walk-through of the Microgrid Services Tariff. Updates based on discussion on 1/21/21 reflected in word document sent to Working Group. • Significant discussion items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Working Group agreed to table alternative hybrid compensation models (as proposed by MRC and Ulupono) for future discussions or phase.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sec. 1 – “Island Mode” definition. Company proposed adding a clarification that Hybrid Microgrids may enter Island Mode under Emergency Events only. Working Group was agreeable to clarification under existing model. ○ MRC proposed a Sec. 4.b due to concerns with existing DER Tariff language that may create barriers for Microgrid development. MRC provided an example where a Commercial establishment leases property to a MGO to place DER to export energy. Based on MRC’s application of the DER Tariffs, there would be an issue with this model. ○ MRC proposed additions to Sec. C.3-4 (Limitation of Liability). Working Group agreed to flag as an area of disagreement. ○ Working Group agreed any reference to a disclosure checklist should remain in the Tariff and Hybrid Microgrid Agreement, subject to revisions of the checklist.
<p>Hybrid Microgrids, Hybrid MG Compensation, Applicability of Other Tariffs (Slides 8-24)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Applicability of Other Tariffs briefly discussed with Microgrid Services Tariff walk-through. ● The Company confirmed and the Working Group agreed that customers who qualify for DER Tariffs may also qualify for the Microgrid Services Tariff, but customers who qualify for the Microgrid Services Tariff may not automatically qualify for DER Tariffs.
<p>Working Group Parking Lot (Added for reference)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Change of ownership of Microgrid ● Standby Charges or Exit Fees ● Customer protection-related considerations ● Microgrid/IGP procurement considerations ● Considerations of gaming between utility-owned and 3rd-party MGs ● Army/Military MG issues such as WG will consider nested microgrids, if appropriate ● Interactions with other dockets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ DER Tariff/Programs ○ IGP Resiliency ● Consideration of societal, environmental value ● Development of PPA model for hybrid MGs ● Other types of microgrids that don’t fit Act 200 definition ● Gap in tariff for customers greater than 100kW participation & compensation in non-normal, non-island scenarios. Eg, SIA ● Harmonize compensation with other grid service mechanisms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Expanded functionality from MG service and whether should be included in MST.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractual obligations for other grid services – Customers with existing DER/DR obligations still need to meet performance if included in a MG. • Customer approvals – Does a Hybrid MG need a full customer subscription? • Resiliency Tariff • Retail wheeling (see January 16, 2020 Commission Guidance Letter) • Compensation While Grid Connected (see January 16, 2020 Commission Guidance Letter)
--	---

Working Group Chairs:

Marcey Chang, DCCA	Chair, Market Facilitation and Interconnection WG	mchang@dcca.hawaii.gov
Marc Asano, HE	Chair, Interconnection WG	marc.asano@hawaiianelectric.com
Ken Aramaki, HE	Chair, Market Facilitation WG	ken.aramaki@hawaiianelectric.com

Attendees:

Anand Samtani, Hawaii PUC	Brittany Blair, Newport Consulting	Gerald Sumida, Carlsmith Ball
Andrew Nojiri, HE	Craig Nakanishi, Cades Schutte	Gina Yi, Hawaii PUC
Andrew Okabe, Hawaii PUC	Darene Matsuoka, Cades Schutte	Paul De Martini, Newport Consulting
Ashley Agcaoili, Hawaii PUC	Earlynne Maile, HE	Tracie Black, HE
Baird Brown, eco(n)law LLC	Eric Kunisaki, HE	