Framework for VRET Models Table, July 3, 2014

3.b.	(2.) Regulated Utility 3.a. (3.) Utility Affiliate 3.b.		1.d.	1.a. 1.b. 1.b. 1.c. (IPP, ESS) 1.c. 1.d.			
						Utility Role	
						Relationships	Basic Structure
Agree this resembles 1.b. and would require safeguards to ensure fair competition and no incumbent utility advantage.	Agree that this is effectively the same as 1.a. but allowing utility affiliate involvement would require much greater regulatory scrutiny to ensure separation of costs and no provision of advantages through things like T&D service to the utility affiliate.	It may not be possible to separate the regular customers of the utility from the customers opting for this product. Establishing a utility affiliate to procure resources and provide service would make more sense	See comments for 1.c.	play as a broker — leave it to the buyers/sellers or agents for one or both. There are businesses that perform this function so the utility does not need to be saddled with the task. This model may be appealing if it enables partial-load service (e.g., 25 MW of a 100 MW load) and customers with multiple meters in different locations (e.g., grocery stores in six different towns, all served by the same utility). Whether utility should aggregate demand first then takes bids, or take bids and then offer service to customers (see 1.d.), or something in between (such as indicative bids or conditional customer commitments) is not clear. Not likely to be FERC implications as the process appears to be a variation on utility procurement to serve end-use customers. Not a product for ESS to serve since the arrangement is with the utility. It might be a useful model, however, to serve customers which loads are of insufficient size for service from an ESS. If utility affiliate is eligible to bid then stringent safeguards would be required to ensure a fair process and decision.	This model looks a lot like direct access. There is no role for the utility to	Notes/Comments	

(6.) 3rd Party (transmission VRET)	(REC Product) 5.b.	(4.) Customer Owned		
Appears to be the same as 1.a.	This model is no different from utility ownership model 1.b. or 2, depending on whether the bundled product that the utility sells to the customer is from a power-purchase agreement (1.b.) or a utility-owned asset (2). Same comments apply here to those rows, respectively.	There is no barrier to this model today. Customer is free to purchase unbundled RECs in the markets that sell them. This does not affect regulated service under standard commercial/industrial tariffs.	If gustomer-owned resource is not on site the provision of service should be like direct access with respect to transmission and ancillary services.	