CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FOOD & AGRICULTURE

California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)
Division of Measurement Standards (DMS)

EVSE Info Hour Questions and Answers
May 19, 2026

1. Before we apply as a Registered Service Agency (RSA), can we send our EVSE testing equipment for approval to ensure it meets CDFA's requirements?

   The Division of Measurement Standards does not approve equipment used for testing EVSE used for commercial purposes. The DMS metrology laboratory has the ability to review the documentation provided by a prospective RSA to verify whether the certification of the testing equipment is metrologically traceable.

   The equipment also must be capable of performing the testing parameters identified in the “Notes” section of the applicable code, in this case the 3.40. Electric Vehicle Fueling Systems Code and, if the EVSE has an integral timing element, the 5.55. Timing Devices Code.

2. Modern DC electric vehicle charging systems may be designed to deliver a temporary, time-limited maximum output current (“boost” current) that exceeds their continuous rated output current. It is fully understood and accepted that, for NTEP / HB 44 purposes, meter accuracy must be evaluated at this maximum possible current, including any boost or temporary high-current mode.

   The issue addressed here is how charger output current markings and NTEP certificate ratings should be structured and interpreted so that compliant, accurate equipment is not subjected to avoidable field enforcement violations.

   Under current practice, county officials conducting field accuracy audits are required to verify that the maximum deliverable output current marked on the device and the current rating stated on the NTEP Certificate match AND that the maximum current observed during operation or testing does not exceed the certificate or marked values.

   If they do not match, the station may be deemed in violation, red-tagged, and removed from service—even when the observed behavior is intentional, time-limited, and fully compliant with design intent.

The problem to be resolved is therefore one of marking and certification alignment.

How should current markings and NTEP certificate current ratings be aligned for DC EV chargers with time-limited boost functionality?

Our understanding is that currently, companies will list both their rated current and their boost current limitations. We are not aware of any distinction between the two in Weights & Measures laws/regulations.

Our understanding is also that the Underwriters Laboratories (UL) will require the rated current to appear on the labeling of the device. Currently the National Type Evaluation Program (NTEP) and California Type Evaluation Program (CTEP) will accept for type evaluation only those EVSEs that comply with all requirements of this code and have received safety certification by a nationally recognized testing laboratory (NRTL).

Currently, the maximum current deliverable (the maximum current that the EVSE can deliver as installed under optimum conditions) is required to be marked on the device as stated in 4 CCR Section 4002.11 3.40. S.5.2.

3. We are working to meet CDFA RSA requirements, which we understand require EVSE devices to have current calibration certificates from an ISO/IEC 17025-accredited lab with appropriate scope (per CDFA DMS guidance).

   We currently use a Charging Discovery System calibrated by Keysight Technologies with a valid calibration certificate, which we believe can serve as an internal (owned) standard; however, Kern Electronics (RSA) is not ISO/IEC 17025 accredited.

   Can this device be used for EVSE calibration under RSA requirements, or must calibration be performed by an ISO/IEC 17025-accredited lab?

   An RSA is not required to be ISO/IEC 17025-accredited. For example, if Kern Electronics is an RSA, then their **testing equipment** is required to have a calibration certificate traceable to NIST or an International Organization for Standardization 17025 (ISO 17025) accredited laboratory with electrical energy measurement (AC and DC) on its scope. The service agent must ensure that the field standard is appropriate for use with the EVFS/EVSE under test.

The equipment may only be used for calibration of EVSE if the equipment meets the traceability standards described above and is capable of performing the test parameters identified in the “Notes” section of the applicable code.

Given the difficulty finding labs with scope covering DC energy measurement at EVSE levels (~≤1000V / 350A), can CDFA recommend qualified labs or clarify acceptable alternatives if none are available?

CDFA-DMS does not recommend laboratories. Accredited laboratories can be searched through the International Laboratory Accreditation Cooperation (ILAC) website [https://ilac.org/ilac-mra-and-signatories/].

4. For a CMS software platform seeking a CTEP Certificate of Approval, what documentation and evaluation process does DMS require, and is there a published checklist or guidance document following the Epic Charging and PowerFlex CSMS certifications?

   Please reach out to our CTEP specialists so that they can assist you.

   Filling out an application for your project; Application for Evaluation of a Weighing and Measuring Device. Once you have an open project a type evaluator will consult with you on the process of approving any app/software.

   CTEP hardware is evaluated in conjunction with software and must be evaluated as a system. An EVSP (for example) who offers mobile app or web-based URL activation methods must have the device evaluated in conjunction with CTEP approved hardware before receiving a CTEP Certificate of Approval.

5. NTEP has updated DCFC energy accuracy requirements to 3 decimals (0.001 kWh) while CTEP is still asking for 4 (0.0001 kWh). Does CTEP plan to align with NTEP in 2026 or 2027 time frame?

   CTEP bases their evaluation criteria on California Code of Regulations; NTEP bases their criteria on National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Handbook 44. A work group has been created by the National Council on Weights & Measures to assess proposed updates to the 3.40 EVFS/EVSE Code. We cannot comment on such a change occurring in the 2026-2027 timeframe.

6. Clarification on Category of devices and sealing - If we have a screen to display the energy meters but we don't have a way to manipulate the data, is it qualified as category 1 or 3?

   This will need to be discussed with a Type Evaluation specialist during the evaluation process.

7. I was informed by a county inspector that there may be legislation transferring EV charger regulation to the California Energy Commission starting next year. Is that correct, and are there any recent updates regarding this legislation?

   SB 1327 is a senate bill which is currently in the legislative process. CDFA-DMS cannot make comments on this bill while it is in the process. [A link to the bill was provided.]

8. If there is a cosmetic issue with a Charger e.g. cracked post/damage, but is still operable, is that considered a Handbook 44 violation? Would it be possible to receive a tag on that device if it is still able to be used?

   This is something that will need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the device meets applicable requirements, including specifications and user requirements for instance.