

Never Stand Still

Off-Site Renewable Energy

Stakeholder Workshop #1 24th Nov 2016

Engineering \$ Direct purchasing from Large energy users off-site renewable generators Ś

Terminology

"Off-site RE"

Corporate PPAs (i.e. power purchase agreements)

Direct procurement of RE



Why is this important?

• What is the difference from 'Business As Usual'?





Project team

- Graham Mills
- Iain MacGill
- Anna Bruce
- Sharon Young





Project Overview

Title	Facilitating large energy user deployment of off-site renewable generation				
Funding	CRC for Low Carbon Living				
Duration	12 months				
Motivation	Recent market explosion in the US Initial movements in Australia but perceived lack of transparency/information				
Methodology	Case studies Market survey Stakeholder workshops Panel discussion!				







Corporate Renewable Deals



Publicly announced contracted capacity of corporate Power Purchase Agreements, Green Power Purchases, Green Tariffs, and Outright Project Ownership in the US and Mexico, 2012 – 2016. Excludes on-site generation (e.g., rooftop solar PV) and deals with operating plants. Last updated: February 21, 2017. Copyright 2016 by Rocky Mountain Institute

For more information, please visit http://www.businessrenewables.org/ or contact BRC@RMI.org



And the Australian context?

- Project initiated based on a couple of pioneering projects
 - Could this be a game changer??
- The answer was unclear 12 months ago but...
 - Yes
 - (Lucky for us $\textcircled{\odot}$)



Project Rationale - Objectives

Rationale

To bring information into the public domain which supports end user decision making and reduces transaction costs associated with implementing direct procurement deals

Objectives

- 1. to explore the <u>options</u> available to end users in directly procuring offsite renewable energy; and
- 2. to describe the market for such services in the Australian electricity industry context;
- 3. to describe the current status of offsite contracting in Australia and identify drivers and barriers to market development.





Transaction costs and market maturity – where we want to go





Spectrum of options for RE







Conceptualising the off-site RE market







٠

CUMULATIVE CORPORATE RENEWABLE ENERGY PURCHASING IN THE UNITED STATES, EUROPE, AND MEXICO-NOVEMBER 2016



https://blog.google/topics/environment/100-percent-renewable-energy/



Marketing opportunities





Conceptualising the off-site RE market





Tri-partite market

Market Structure - process through which parties (supply and demand side) match given their individual preferences and objectives





How to make everyone happy

Market evolution will be an iterative process of identifying the set of options that work for all parties





Overview of participants in our study

	End users	
End Users		
Commercial	8	
Local govt	5	
Manufacturing	4	
Property	6	
Universities	4	
Utilities	3	
TOTAL	30	

Others		
Retailers	6	Electricity retailers
Project developers	7	RE project developers
Intermediaries	4	Intermediar ies Financiers
Case studies	6	End users
TOTAL	23	



Market survey interviews





RE project developers

For project developers

- Business drivers
- Deal preferences
 - Financing

•

•

Risk allocation





- Drivers
- End users drive the market, but why would they want to do this?

For RE generally:

- o End user control
- Environmental or CSR targets;
- Political or community values
- Government policy vacuum

Specific to Off-site RE:

- o Cost
- Cost hedging
- o Marketing value
- o Traceability/Tangibility
- Flexibility for multi-site operations



Drivers (barriers)



• The other drivers are actually *barriers* to alternative options

Barriers to "behind the meter" RE:

- <u>Facility barriers</u>: Space; roofing condition; electrical installation; facility flexibility;
- <u>Tenant Landlord</u>: Split incentives; negotiation cost; short term lease/long term asset lifetime.

End user attitudes towards GreenPower:

- <u>Additional cost</u>: Green power is an expensive option;
- <u>Tangibility</u>: lacks tangibility; untraceable;
- <u>Integrity/marketing</u>: lacks integrity;



The decision/option model

- The top two levels of the RE procurement process funnel are the primary focus for this study.
- The framework describes the decisions which need to be made by end users in structuring an offsite RE procurement deal.
- Decision model describes 192 different structures.

Structure:	Buy (PPA)	Own		
Project type:	New		Existing		
Approach:	Single end ι	iser	Aggregated		
PPA counterparty:	Retailer		End user		
Purchase of:	LGC only	Electricity		Bundle	
LGC treatment:	Sell Surrender			urrender	



Structure:	Buy (PPA)	Own		
	Melbourne RE Project Sydney Metro NW	Sunshine Coast CC Ikea		

- Decision depends on:
 - Cost of capital
 - In-house expertise





- Decision depends on:
 - Appetite for long term
 - additionality



Approach:	Single end user	Aggregated
	Newcastle City Council	Melbourne RE Project
	Victorian State Govt	WWF buyers group

- Decision depends on:
 - Size of end user
 - Ability to compromise





- Decision depends on:
 - Desire for flexibility vs desire for simiplicity



PPA Counterparty – Direct or intermediated

- Electricity retailer's role is to manage risk
 - Direct agreement (end-user as counterparty to PPA)
 - Intermediated agreement (retailer as counterparty to PPA)
- There was a preference for a direct agreement;
- Direct agreement better for flexibility, tractability, marketing
- A direct agreement has electricity retail licensing issues.







- Decision depends on:
 - Simplicity
 - Cost
 - Marketing



RE generation value ('Black') vs RECs ('Green')

- A key preference expressed by a broad range of end users was for RE generation value to be procured with/or without RECs;
- It should be noted that this is not a physical proposition, it instead reflects a financial arrangement;
- Issues in this regard:
 - RECs as offsets are an additional cost options and abstract mechanism which was hard to describe;
 - Acquiring generation value will reduce electricity costs;
 - Marketability and tangibility all enhanced;
- It was not entirely clear the extent to which all end users appreciated the physical vs financial nature of generation value procurement.





- Decision depends on:
 - Cost
 - Additionality



Case Studies

Project name	Who?	BOO/ Buy	Single/ Aggreg.	Black/ LGC only	Retailer involved?	Status	Case study?
Desalination Plant	Sydney Water	Buy	Single	Black+LGC	Retailer = developer	Complete	
Singleton Solar Deal	UTS	Buy	Single	Black only	Supply unserved load	(Pre-existing)	*
RE Reverse Auctions	ACT state govt	Buy	Single	LGC only	No	Complete	
RE Purchasing	Victorian state govt	Buy	Single	LGC only	No	Construction	*
Sunshine Coast Solar Farm	Sunshine Coast City Council	BOO	Single	n/a	Pass through spot exposure	Construction	*
Solar Yarra Trams	Victorian state govt	Buy	Single	LGC only	No	Construction	
Zinc refinery solar farm	Sun Metals	BOO	Single	n/a	No, on-site. (behind meter?)	Construction	
Melbourne RE Project (MREP)	Melbourne City Council	Buy	Aggreg	Black+LGC	PPA counterparty	Tender	*
Sydney Metro North West	Transport for NSW	Buy	Single	Black+LGC (probably)	PPA counterp (probably)	Tender	*
RE Buyers Forum	WWF/JLL	Buy	Aggreg	Black+LGC	PPA counterparty	EOI	
Summerhill Solar Farm	Newcastle City Council	BOO ? (TBC)	Single	n/a	ТВС	EOI	*







End-user market context



- Internal decisions:
 - Energy procurement teams vs sustainability teams
 - Risk adverse management
- Doing deals:
 - Information asymmetry (compared to retailers/developers)
 - Typical energy procurement process in 3-year cycles
 - Desire to retain flexibility



Electricity Retailer market context



- Drivers:
 - Retain existing or attract new customers, i.e. market differentiation
 - Large retailers less interested
 - Smaller retailers lack the necessary credit rating
- Profit margins are thin in commercial/industrial contracts
 - Bespoke agreements impose higher costs
 - Risk management costs for intermittent generation





Project Developer market context



- Drivers
 - Increase diversity of effective customer base
- Constraints
 - Requirements of financiers
 - Finance cost is a function of project size, term, credit rating
 - Counterparty risk (some end users have better rating than retailers!)
- Preferences
 - Off-take contracts for bundled RECs and generation value
 - Contract with a single representative counterparty if end users are aggregated in a buyers group



Looking forward



- Market facilitation
 - A trusted, independent body is needed for information, education and matching services
 - E.g. RMI Business Renewables Centre in the US, 193 members
- Deal standardisation
 - The most obvious way to reduce transaction costs and speed up market 'throughput'
 - Is it feasible??
 - Discussion at our workshop last week suggested not.
 - However, opportunities exist to simplify offerings via government programs or aggregated deals

