

Guidelines Operator visibility charge stations

Date: May 2022
Version: 1.5 – **Final**
Workgroup: POI - eViolin
Author: Michel Bayings

Introduction

The market is more and more organised in a situation where CPOs make use of tools/systems from other CPOs, who can either act as software supplier or service supplier or can even manage the operations (partially or totally) on behalf of the other CPO.

For the user of a charge station (EV driver) and other parties in the EV charging ecosystem, it is important to know who is responsible for the operations of a charge station and who to call in case of problems.

Protocols try to support this with fields where information about CPO and contact details can be filled in. Most protocols have the option to add a sub-operator, operator and owner of a charge station. In OCPI these fields are optional. And OCHP and e-clearing.net have different usage for this. Same can be said for other protocols and roaming hubs. However this proposal is a guideline how it should be used according to eViolin, and systems and protocols should follow the business and not limit it. This proposal makes it mandatory in the way it is proposed to use it. Finally this is in the benefit for market parties and EV drivers to get correct information about operators, owners and who to get in touch with in case of issues.

Problem

The overall problem is that the real responsible operator and right contact details are often not clear, either at the station or via tools of MSPs and NSPs.

This problem can be split up in several more specific problems:

1. There is not a common understanding of the names and roles and what is an Owner, Operator and Suboperator
2. The field for sub-operator is often used for other info than what it should be
3. The operator field is not used in a common way.

To solve the issues the following solutions are proposed

Solutions

Definitions

- Operator
This should always be the name/brand of the party presenting itself as the operator of the station (and which is typically also displayed on the station itself). The reasoning is that this field will be used by Data aggregators, EMSPs and maps to show what the brand is that the end user can expect when they navigate to or arrive at the location. There should be no confusion with the name of the

manufacturer of the station. If the protocol supports it, like OCPI, the link to the logo of the Operator should always be used and filled in; a logo is a much stronger hint to a user than a textual brand-name.

- Sub-operator
Since we defined that the brand that is shown on the station is the name of the Operator, there is not much use for the field sub-operator. We recommend NOT to use this. We cannot come up with an example where there is a second lower entity brand on the station that is vital to the end user. Also the implementation of using only the Operator name for the brand is much more simple. If you have no other reasons to use this field e.g. via bilateral agreements, we strongly advise to put the same name in this field as in the Operator field. This is because there are systems who do use and expect a value in a sub-operator and leaving it empty could cause issues. So if not used for a specific reason: use it with the same data as the Operator.

- Owner
The brand of the station can be different from the real owner of the station. For the end user there is no real reason to use the Owner field. There can be national regulations who demand to know the legal owner of the location or station. Although it is up to the MSP/NSP to show it or not, as there is no benefit for the end user and because of that it can be confusing, it is recommended not to show this by the MSP/NSP.

- Support phone number
Although there is not (yet) a possibility to add a support phone number from the operator in the (OCPI) protocol, it should be clear that on the charge station contact information must be mentioned which should contain at least the phone number for support.

Platform operator

If you want to know the platform operator you should look in the credentials module of protocols e.g. OCPI to find this information.

Examples and use cases

Enclosed a few examples to explain the proposed definitions:

1. Station operated by Joulz
 - a. Operator: Joulz (this should be the visible name on maps etc.)
 - b. Sub-operator: Joulz (there is no real sub-operator and it is also not relevant for the EV driver)
 - c. Owner: Rijksvastgoedbedrijf
 - d. Platform operator: GreenFlux (this is via the credentials the technical connection operator)

2. Station located at a Volvo car dealer, operated by PowerStop
 - a. Operator: PowerStop (Volvo)
 - b. Sub-operator: Dufenco (this sub-operator is not relevant for EV driver)

- c. Owner: Volvo Dealer
 - d. Platform operator: GreenFlux
-
- 3. Station operated by TankE
 - a. Operator: TankE
 - b. Sub-operator: RheinEnergie (this is not relevant for the EV driver)
 - c. Owner: RheinEnergie
 - d. Platform operator: Chargecloud
-
- 4. Station located at a Aral Petrol Station, operated by Aral pulse
 - a. Operator: Aral pulse (this should be the visible name on maps etc)
 - b. Sub-operator: Aral pulse (there is no real sub-operator and it is also not relevant for EV driver)
 - c. Owner: Aral AG (not relevant for EV driver)
 - d. Platform operator: ChargePoint Austria GmbH