

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298**FILED**05-21-10  
02:50 PM

May 21, 2010

**Agenda ID #9498**  
**Quasi-Legislative**

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING 08-12-009

This is the proposed decision of Commissioner Nancy E. Ryan. It will not appear on the Commission's agenda for at least 30 days after the date it is mailed. The Commission may act then, or it may postpone action until later.

When the Commission acts on the proposed decision, it may adopt all or part of it as written, amend or modify it, or set it aside and prepare its own decision. Only when the Commission acts does the decision become binding on the parties.

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Article 14 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules), accessible on the Commission's website at [www.cpuc.ca.gov](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov). Pursuant to Rule 14.3, opening comments shall not exceed 15 pages.

Comments must be filed either electronically pursuant to Resolution ALJ-188 or with the Commission's Docket Office. Comments should be served on parties to this proceeding in accordance with Rules 1.9 and 1.10. Electronic and hard copies of comments should be sent to ALJ Sullivan at [tjs@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:tjs@cpuc.ca.gov) and Commissioner Ryan's advisor, Andrew Campbell, at [agc@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:agc@cpuc.ca.gov). The current service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission's website at [www.cpuc.ca.gov](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov).

/s/ KAREN V. CLOPTON  
Karen V. Clopton, Chief  
Administrative Law Judge

KVC:avs

Attachment

Decision PROPOSED DECISION OF COMMISSIONER RYAN  
(Mailed 5/21/2010)

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Consider Smart Grid Technologies Pursuant to Federal Legislation and on the Commission's own Motion to Actively Guide Policy in California's Development of a Smart Grid System.

Rulemaking 08-12-009  
(Filed December 18, 2008)

**DECISION ADOPTING REQUIREMENTS FOR SMART GRID DEPLOYMENT  
PLANS PURSUANT TO SENATE BILL 17 (PADILLA), CHAPTER 327,  
STATUTES OF 2009**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
DECISION ADOPTING REQUIREMENTS FOR SMART GRID DEPLOYMENT PLANS PURSUANT TO SENATE BILL 17 (PADILLA), CHAPTER 327, STATUTES OF 2009 .....	2
1. Summary .....	2
2. Background .....	5
2.1. Recent Procedural History .....	5
2.2. This Decision Adopts Policies Pertaining to Deployment Plans and Annual Reports .....	7
2.3. Access to Information and Privacy Protections .....	8
2.4. Policies Pertaining to Functionality and Interoperability Standards Await Action by Standard Setting Bodies.....	9
2.4.1. Positions of Parties .....	10
2.4.2. Discussion: Interoperability Standards Should be Informed by National Actions .....	14
3. Issues before the Commission Pertaining to Use and Content of Deployment Plans.....	15
3.1. How Should the Commission use Smart Grid Deployment Plans?.....	15
3.1.1. Position of Parties.....	16
3.1.2. Discussion: Deployment Plans Can Determine Smart Grid Baseline and Guide Investments.....	20
3.2. What Elements Must a Smart Grid Deployment Plan Have?.....	21
3.2.1. Position of Parties.....	22
3.2.2. Discussion: The Deployment Plan Should Have Eight Elements.....	27
3.3. What Should the Smart Grid Vision Statement Include? How Should the Vision Statement be Structured? .....	29
3.3.1. Position of Parties.....	31
3.3.2. Discussion: Vision Statement Should Present a Vision of Smart Energy Markets, Smart Consumers and a Smart Utility .....	32
3.4. What Should the Deployment Baseline Include? .....	35
3.4.1. Position of Parties.....	35
3.4.2. Discussion: Elements for Deployment Baseline .....	38
3.5. What Should the Smart Grid Strategy Include?.....	41

<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
3.5.1. Position of Parties.....	41
3.5.2. Discussion: Smart Grid Strategy Should Provide Direction and Demonstrate Consistency with SB 17 and GO 156 Goals.....	45
3.6. What Should be in the Grid Security and Cyber Security Section of the Deployment Plan? .....	47
3.6.1. Position of Parties.....	47
3.6.2. Discussion: Deployment Plans Should Provide Assurance of Security of Smart Grid.....	56
3.7. What Should be in the Smart Grid Roadmap?.....	60
3.7.1. Position of Parties.....	60
3.7.2. Discussion: A Roadmap Can Help Identify How Technology Deployment Aligns with Policy and Statutory Deadlines.....	61
3.8. What Should the Section on Cost Estimates Include?.....	62
3.8.1. Position of Parties.....	62
3.8.2. Discussion: Smart Grid Deployment Plans Should Include Cost Estimates.....	65
3.9. What Should the Section on Benefits Include?.....	66
3.9.1. Positions of Parties .....	67
3.9.2. Discussion: Smart Grid Deployment Plans Should Assess All Benefits .....	71
3.10. What Metrics Should Be Included in the Deployment Plans?.....	72
3.10.1. Positions of Parties .....	73
3.10.2. Discussion: Quantitative Metrics Should be Part of Deployment Plan, but Workshops Are Needed to Develop Metrics .....	81
4. Other Issues Pertaining to Deployment Plan and SB 17 Requirements that Require Resolution at this Time .....	82
4.1. How Should the Commission Consider/Approve Deployment Plans?.....	82
4.1.1. Positions of Parties .....	82
4.1.2. Discussion: Combined Proceeding with All Companies .....	84
4.2. How Should the Commission Review Proposed Revisions to Deployment Plans? .....	86

4.2.1. Positions of Parties .....	86
<b>Title</b>	<b>Page</b>
4.2.2. Discussion: Commission Will Set Update Procedure Following Review of Initial Deployment Plans.....	90
4.3. How Should the Commission Review/Consider Specific Smart Grid Investments? .....	90
4.3.1. Positions of Parties .....	91
4.3.2. Discussion: Application or GRC Offer Appropriate Procedures for Reviewing Smart Grid Investments .....	91
4.4. What Reports Should the Commission Require Pertaining to Smart Grid Investments? When Should They be Filed? .....	92
4.4.1. Positions of Parties .....	92
4.4.2. Discussion: Annual Reports Are Needed to Provide Annual Data to Legislature .....	95
4.5. Should the Commission Set a Demarcation Point for Utility Investments.....	98
4.5.1. Positions of Parties .....	98
4.5.2. Discussion: Commission Declines to Adopt a Demarcation Point at this Time .....	104
5. Comments on Proposed Decision .....	106
6. Assignment of Proceeding.....	106
Findings of Fact .....	106
Conclusions of Law .....	114
ORDER .....	119

**DECISION ADOPTING REQUIREMENTS FOR SMART GRID DEPLOYMENT  
PLANS PURSUANT TO SENATE BILL 17 (PADILLA), CHAPTER 327,  
STATUTES OF 2009**

**1. Summary**

This decision provides Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Edison Company with the guidance needed to file Smart Grid deployment plans with this Commission by July 1, 2011.

As the Commission stated in Decision (D) 09-09-029, modernizing the electric grid with additional two-way communications, sensors and control technologies, key components of a Smart Grid, can lead to substantial benefits for consumers. A Smart Grid can enable the integration of higher levels of renewable energy, energy storage, and, eventually, electric vehicles, at a lower cost to consumers. A Smart Grid can also facilitate consumer participation in demand response programs and help consumers to use energy more efficiently. Greater monitoring and automated controls can also reduce the frequency and duration of outages. Many of the advantages of a Smart Grid will contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

The California legislature and Governor have enshrined the importance of modernizing the state's electric grid through the enactment of Senate Bill (SB) 17 (Padilla), signed into law on October 11, 2009. SB 17 states that "[i]t is the policy of the state to modernize the state's electrical transmission and distribution system to maintain safe, reliable, efficient, and secure electrical service, with infrastructure that can meet future growth in demand" and achieve purposes specified in the law. SB 17 further requires the Commission "by July 1, 2010, and in consultation with the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (Energy Commission), the Independent System Operator (ISO), and

other key stakeholders, to determine the requirements for a smart grid deployment plan consistent with the policies set forth in the bill and federal law.”<sup>1</sup>

Pursuant to SB 17, this proceeding, in consultation with the Energy Commission and the ISO and other key stakeholders, sets the requirements for Smart Grid deployment plans. This decision requires that utilities follow a common outline in preparing their Smart Grid deployment plans. The outline consists of eight topics as follows:

1. Smart Grid Vision Statement.
2. Deployment Baseline.
3. Smart Grid Strategy.
4. Grid Security and Cyber Security Strategy.
5. Smart Grid Roadmap.
6. Cost Estimates.
7. Benefits Estimates; and
8. Metrics.

In addition, this decision sets requirements for each of these sections concerning the topics that the Smart Grid deployment plans must address, the information that the deployment plans must provide, and how the deployment plans must link each section and topic back to the policies set forth in SB 17 and in relevant federal law.

The decision requires that the Smart Grid deployment plans present a vision of the Smart Grid consistent with legislative initiatives, provide a deployment baseline so that we understand the character of the California grid today, and articulate a strategy for achieving the adopted goals.

The decision requires each utility to address Grid Security and Cyber Security issues in their Smart Grid deployment plans to ensure that these issues

---

<sup>1</sup> Chapter 327, Statutes of 2009.

are considered explicitly at the planning stage. The decision, consistent with the intent of SB 17, links California concerns for security with the security guidelines identified as under development by the National Institute of Standards and Technology. The decision also adopts security strategy requirements and principles to guide the development of Smart Grid deployment plans to ensure alignment with national efforts.

The decision provides a discussion of the cost and benefit procedures that the Smart Grid deployment plans should use. The decision requires the plans to follow cost-effectiveness analysis to meet legislatively mandated goals in a cost effective way and requires the presentation of the “business case” analysis for other components of the Smart Grid.

The decision also finds that the Smart Grid deployment plans should include metrics that permit the assessment of progress, but the adoption of specific metrics requires additional work by parties. A subsequent decision will endorse specific metrics for inclusion in Smart Grid deployment plans and other reports.

This decision also proposes to review the initial deployment plans in a single proceeding. Subsequent utility requests to make specific Smart Grid-related investments, however, would occur in utility-specific proceedings where the reasonableness of particular Smart Grid investments can be determined.

Finally, this decision requires that the utilities file annual reports on their Smart Grid activities, with the first annual reports due on October 1, 2012.



## 2. Background

Since this proceeding commenced in 2008, new legislation at both the Federal and state level have affected policies concerning the Smart Grid and the management of this proceeding.

### 2.1. Recent Procedural History

This decision is largely the result of Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signing into law Senate Bill (SB) 17 (Padilla),<sup>2</sup> which became effective January 1, 2010. SB 17 directs the Commission “to determine the requirements for a Smart Grid deployment plan consistent with the policies set forth in the bill and federal law” by July 1, 2010.

The older procedural history leading to this phase of this proceeding can be found in Decision (D) 09-12-046 and the Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge’s Joint Ruling of September 28, 2009.<sup>3</sup>

The more recent procedural history of direct relevance to this proceeding begins in 2010. On February 6, 2010, a ruling amended the scoping memo to ensure that this proceeding solicits the information needed to implement the regulatory provisions adopted in SB 17.<sup>4</sup> In particular, this ruling sought the information the Commission needs to provide policy guidance to

---

<sup>2</sup> Chapter 327, Statutes of 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge’s Joint Ruling Inviting Comments on Proposed Policies and Findings Pertaining to the Smart Grid Policies Established by the Energy Information and Security Act of 2007, September 28, 2009. (“Joint Ruling of September 28, 2009”).

<sup>4</sup> Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge’s Joint Ruling Amending Scoping Memo and Inviting Comments on Proposed Policies and Findings Pertaining to the Smart Grid (“Ruling Amending Scope”) (February 8, 2010). [<http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/efile/RULINGS/113482.pdf>]

allow electric utilities to develop Smart Grid deployment plans by July 1, 2011, as required by SB 17.

The Commission's adoption of D.09-12-046 on December 17, 2009, in addition to fulfilling the state obligations adopted by the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA),<sup>5</sup> set forth policies to promote access to electricity usage and price information by consumers and authorized third parties. These policies, however, require implementation and the Ruling Amending Scope solicited comments to develop the rules needed to effectuate these policies, consistent with EISA, the public interest, and state privacy rules. Finally, the Ruling Amending Scope also solicited comments in order to develop policies that advance the goals set forth in the Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) that initiated this proceeding that were not previously addressed.

Opening Comments on the Ruling Amending Scope were due on March 9, 2010. The Alliance for Retail Energy Markets (AREM), the Black Economic Council (BEC), the California Cable and Telecommunications Association (CCTA), the California Energy Storage Alliance (CESA), the California Independent System Operator Corporation (ISO), California Large Energy Consumers Association (CLECA), the Center for Democracy and Technology (CDT) and the Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF) (filing jointly), Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies (CEERT), Cisco Systems, Inc. (Cisco), Consumer Federation of California (CFC), the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA), Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC), EnergyHub, Inc. (EnergyHub), Environmental Defense Fund (EDF), Google, Inc. (Google), the Greenlining Institute (Greenlining), the Green Power Institute (GPI), Interstate Renewable Energy Council (IREC), Latino Business Chamber of

---

<sup>5</sup> 16 U.S.C. § 2621(d).

Greater Los Angeles (Latino Chamber), MegaWatt Storage Farms, Inc. (MegaWatt), Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Pacific Telephone Company, d/b/a AT&T California (AT&T), Privacy and Cybersecurity Law and Policy Researchers (Researchers), QUALCOMM Incorporated (Qualcomm), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE), Tendril Networks, Inc. (Tendril), The Utility Reform Network (TURN), the Utility Consumers' Action Network (UCAN), Verizon California, Inc., MCI Communications Services, Inc. d/b/a Verizon Business Services, and Verizon Wireless (collectively "Verizon"), and Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. and Sam's West, Inc. (Wal-Mart) submitted comments.

On March 17-19, 2010, public workshops on Smart Grid technologies took place in San Francisco at the Commission offices. On March 17 and March 18, the workshop sessions considered what requirements deployment plans submitted pursuant to SB 17 must meet. On March 19, the workshop considered how to provide customers with timely access to their usage and price data, as required by D.09-12-046.

Reply comments were due on April 7, 2010. AT&T, CDT and EFF (filing jointly), CESA, CEERT, CFC, DRA, EDF, EPIC, GPI, Greenlining, Grounded Power, Inc. (Grounded Power), HomeGrid Forum (HomeGrid), Lantiq Inc. (Lantiq), PG&E, SCE, SDG&E, Sigma Designs, Inc. (Sigma), the Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA), To-the-Point, and TURN filed reply comments.

## **2.2. This Decision Adopts Policies Pertaining to Deployment Plans and Annual Reports**

SB 17 requires that "By July 1, 2010, the commission, in consultation with the Energy Commission, the ISO, and other key stakeholders shall

determine the requirements for a smart grid consistent with Section 8360 and federal law, including the provisions of Title XIII (commencing with Section 1301) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140).”<sup>6</sup> Complying with this statutory deadline is a major priority of this proceeding.

To date, this proceeding has benefited from the participation of the ISO, both as an active party to the proceeding and as presenters and panelists at the workshops held pursuant to SB 17. In addition, the California Energy Commission (CEC) has interacted with the Commission, both through staff-to-staff discussions and by the participation of CEC Commissioners and high-level CEC staff as workshop leaders. The participation of the ISO and the CEC has not only enabled the Commission to comply with the requirements of SB 17, but it has also added greatly to this Commission’s understanding of the complex nuances and challenges confronting California energy policy today.

Pursuant to SB 17, this decision will adopt policies to guide the development of Smart Grid deployment plans and sets procedures for the review of the initial plans by the Commission. This decision will also require annual reports from utilities on Smart Grid activities to facilitate the preparation of annual reports to the legislature required by SB 17.

### **2.3. Access to Information and Privacy Protections**

Based on a review of the comments, replies and the information provided at the workshop, it is clear that issues concerning access to information and privacy protections contain subtleties and complexities that prevent their resolution without further deliberation and comments. Although there is a

---

<sup>6</sup> § 8362(a). Unless stated otherwise, citations are to the Pub. Util. Code.

widespread consensus that consumer privacy is important and requires protection and there are numerous principles on which there is major agreement, developing a full host of regulatory requirements and protections cannot be done in this decision. There are, however, some elements of security and privacy that should be addressed in deployment plans, and this decision will provide guidance on these matters.

After the adoption of this decision, this proceeding will focus on information access and privacy protections needed to implement access to price and consumption data. Our goal remains the development of a decision that resolves these matters in time to meet the deadlines and goals for providing consumers with access to data adopted in D.09-12-046, namely a policy objective for the provision of retail and wholesale price information by the “end of 2010,”<sup>7</sup> access to usage data through an agreement with a third party by the “end of 2010,”<sup>8</sup> and access to usage information on a near real-time basis for customers with an Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) meter by the “end of 2011.”<sup>9</sup>

#### **2.4. Policies Pertaining to Functionality and Interoperability Standards Await Action by Standard Setting Bodies**

SB 17 requires that:

The commission shall institute a rulemaking or expand the scope of an existing rulemaking to adopt standards and protocols to ensure functionality and interoperability developed by public and private entities, including, but not limited to, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gridwise Architecture Council, the International Electrical and Electronics Engineers, and the

---

<sup>7</sup> D.09-12-046 at 54.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 65.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*

National Electric Reliability Organization recognized by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. An adopted smart grid deployment plan may provide for deployment of cost-effective smart grid products, technologies, and services by entities other than electrical corporations. The smart grid technologies and services shall improve overall efficiency, reliability, and cost-effectiveness of electrical system operations, planning, and maintenance.<sup>10</sup>

The Ruling Amending Scope sought comments from parties over whether the Commission should proceed by:

1) deferring Commission consideration in this proceeding until a number of the listed agencies have adopted standards or protocols; 2) deferring Commission consideration of protocols to another proceeding that will commence after a number of the listed agencies have adopted standards or protocols; or 3) adopting a “performance standard” in this proceeding requiring that those implementing a Smart Grid technology take steps to ensure that it has the capability to function and operate with devices developed pursuant to standards adopted by major standard setting agencies, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gridwise Architecture Council, the International Electrical and Electronics Engineers, and the National Electric Reliability Organization recognized by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.<sup>11</sup>

We review and discuss the responses of parties to these questions.

#### **2.4.1. Positions of Parties**

Concerning the approach the Commission should adopt to comply with the SB 17 requirements to adopt standards and/or protocols to ensure

---

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> Ruling Amending Scope at 19.

functionality and interoperability of the different parts of the Smart Grid, few parties provided comments.

SCE recommended that:

... the Commission act in parallel with FERC to adopt Smart Grid standards as NIST [National Institute of Standards and Technology] achieves consensus. SCE further recommends that Smart Grid standards adoption be taken up as a part of this Rulemaking, rather than opening another proceeding to deal specifically with this issue.

The Commission should also consider, as part of this proceeding, mechanisms adopting those specific standards for which NIST has achieved consensus. We respectfully recommend that the Commission incorporate these standards by reference in its final decision in an appropriate proceeding.<sup>12</sup>

SCE, however, provides little information on how this process would work, or how this Commission could “act in parallel” with FERC.

SDG&E argues for a similar approach, stating:

SDG&E believes development of interoperability standards and protocols is a complicated process which exceeds the scope and opportunity of these proceedings, whereby the Commission should wait for the adoption of uniform standards by recognized standards bodies.<sup>13</sup>

PG&E also supports national standards and recommends that this Commission await national developments:

PG&E recommends that the Commission continue to defer to the national and international standard-setting bodies, such as NIST, and not attempt to set California

---

<sup>12</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 10.

<sup>13</sup> SDG&E Opening Comments at 26.

only standards for interoperability or functionality at this early stage. National standards will help drive costs down and broaden the availability of new products in the marketplace, while also ensuring the necessary degree of backward systems compatibility. It will be these national standards that determine the capabilities and performance of the Smart Grid.<sup>14</sup>

The ISO states that:

... development of national standards and open communication protocols will encourage the maximum participation by technology vendors and should encourage greater acceptance by energy service providers and consumers.<sup>15</sup>

Thus, an implication of the comments of the ISO is that California policy would benefit from the adoption of national standards.

Communications companies and equipment providers also support national standards. AT&T recommends that the Commission defer the adoption of standards until NIST acts:

In light of the substantial activity and progress of the NIST proceedings and the significant comments and participation of both public and private stakeholders, AT&T respectfully suggests that the best way to ensure that the resulting standards contemplated by §8362(a) promote the public interest is to defer Commission consideration of adopting state specific protocols and rules until these agencies have completed their review and adopted national standards and protocols.<sup>16</sup>

CCTA similarly states a preference that California standards track national standards, arguing:

---

<sup>14</sup> PG&E Opening Comments at 11.

<sup>15</sup> ISO Opening Comments at 5-6.

<sup>16</sup> AT&T Opening Comments at 10-11.



Promoting open interoperability standards now will help ensure that competitors are not materially disadvantaged *vis a vis* the IOUs in offering competitive energy management and other Smart Grid services to consumers.<sup>17</sup>

Cisco states:

Cisco believes that the CPUC should defer its consideration of standards and protocols to another proceeding that will commence after a number of the listed agencies have adopted standards or protocols.<sup>18</sup>

Consumer groups and retailers also endorse waiting for standards bodies to act. DRA calls for the Commission to await national action, arguing:

The Commission should defer consideration of standards and protocols until the listed agencies – which are in a better position to analyze the technical aspects of interoperability – have adopted appropriate standards or protocols.<sup>19</sup>

The retailer Wal-Mart supports interoperability, stating that “smart grid technology installed by utilities should interoperate seamlessly with equipment developed and installed proactively by any entity using their own resources.”<sup>20</sup> Wal-Mart, however, does not opine on how best to achieve interoperability.

Only Tendril supports action now. Tendril states that:

[W]e favor a phased approach that is consistent with approach #3 (“adopting a “performance standard” in

---

<sup>17</sup> CCTA Opening Comments at 6.

<sup>18</sup> Cisco Opening Comments at 9.

<sup>19</sup> DRA Opening Comments at 11.

<sup>20</sup> Wal-Mart Opening Comments at 2.

this proceeding...”) articulated in the Joint Ruling [Ruling Amending Scope].<sup>21</sup>

We note that even though this approach permits the Commission to act now to adopt a performance standard requiring a device to function with devices built to national standards, this course of action will still likely require participants in the Smart Grid to await the adoption of standards by national bodies to ensure that their devices meet the “performance standard.”

#### **2.4.2. Discussion: Interoperability Standards Should be Informed by National Actions**

It is clearly good policy that California’s Smart Grid deployment should follow national standards and guidelines for interoperability and incorporate national communication protocols. As the review of the positions of parties makes clear, there is a general consensus that California should follow national standards and guidelines for interoperability and should use communication protocols that Smart Grid operations share throughout the nation.

There is, however, less agreement or detail on the specific next steps for California.

Concerning SCE’s suggestion that this proceeding coordinate with standard setting actions by NIST and other standard setting bodies, this seems to be a reasonable idea, but one lacking in details.

SB 17, in adding § 8360 to the Public Utilities Code, directs that California, among other things, “Develop standards for communication and interoperability of appliances and equipment connected to the electric grid, including the infrastructure serving the grid”<sup>22</sup>; and, also achieve an

---

<sup>21</sup> Tendril Opening Comments at 6.

<sup>22</sup> § 8360.

“[i]dentification and lowering of unreasonable or unnecessary barriers to adoption of smart grid technologies, practices, and services.”<sup>23</sup>

Since the absence of Commission-endorsed standards or guidelines for the Smart Grid can serve as a barrier to adoption and deployment of Smart Grid technologies, timely actions to endorse standards for communications and interoperability are consistent with the goals adopted by law. Therefore, we will order utilities planning Smart Grid investments to recommend the adoption of a particular communications protocol as part of their Smart Grid deployment plans and to seek Commission approval of appropriate Smart Grid interoperability standards or guidelines identified by NIST.

### **3. Issues before the Commission Pertaining to Use and Content of Deployment Plans**

SB 17 charged the Commission with adopting criteria to guide the use, the development and the review of Smart Grid deployment plans. This section will address the comments that parties provided on each of these topics, including the detailed discussion of the elements of a Smart Grid deployment plan that we adopt to ensure that the deployment plans conform to best practices in engineering planning and provide the information that this Commission needs to determine whether the project comports with the provisions of SB 17.

#### **3.1. How Should the Commission use Smart Grid Deployment Plans?**

In the Ruling Amending Scope, the Commission identified three different roles that a deployment plan could play as part of the Smart Grid regulatory program: 1) creating a “baseline” against which the Commission could measure progress; 2) providing utilities with approved deployment plans

---

<sup>23</sup> *Id.*

that guide investment and provide the utility with a rationale that could support a proposed investment during review of the project and help in the determination of whether a specific project is reasonable and consistent with the Commission's overall Smart Grid vision; or 3) provide the utility investing in an approved project with an elimination of after-the-fact reasonableness reviews.<sup>24</sup>

The Ruling Amending Scope speculated that using the deployment plans to find a Smart Grid investment to be reasonable would not be appropriate because “[c]onferring a finding of reasonableness on investments made pursuant to a deployment plan would place much more importance on the approval of the plan than the uncertainty of current technology and Smart Grid plans warrants at this time.”<sup>25</sup>

The Ruling Amending Scope invited parties to comment on which approach they believed would best permit the Commission to develop and review Smart Grid deployment plans within the timeframe set out by SB 17.

### **3.1.1. Position of Parties**

Many parties commented on the role that deployment plans should play in Commission regulation of Smart Grid investments. SCE advocates for the use of Smart Grid deployment plans as a useful guide, but not as a document that controls utility investments. SCE argues:

Commission review and acceptance of the Deployment Plans should provide strategic guidance for future utility specific Smart Grid investment proposals.<sup>26</sup>

More specifically, SCE contends:

---

<sup>24</sup> Ruling Amending Scope at 5-6.

<sup>25</sup> *Id.* at 7.

<sup>26</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 4.

...that Deployment Plans should be used to establish a strategic baseline plan for evaluating and deploying technology, and to serve as a reference for future Smart Grid technology evaluation and investment proposals by the IOUs. We further agree that the Commission should not evaluate the Deployment Plans to the extent that approval would convey a presumption of reasonableness for all future investments included in the plans. Finally, we agree that a “utility or other party” could cite to an approved deployment plan as part of the rationale for why specific utility investments are or are not reasonable.<sup>27</sup>

PG&E argues that “the deployment plans should be a source of policy guidance, information and evidentiary support for Smart Grid projects and investments, but not mandatory or binding in individual proceedings.”<sup>28</sup> On the other hand, PG&E observes that:

It is important that the Commission clarify that the “baseline for measuring deployment” established in deployment plans is not prescriptive, but a source of information and policy direction that can inform individual Smart Grid proposals without restricting the Commission’s ability to consider those proposals on their own individual merits, on an incremental and flexible basis, as standards and structure for the Smart Grid evolve.<sup>29</sup>

Many of the consumer representatives commenting express similar views to those of the utilities.

UCAN argues that a deployment plan may be a useful guide, but not a document that controls utility investments. UCAN posits:

---

<sup>27</sup> *Id.* at 7.

<sup>28</sup> PG&E Opening Comments at 6.

<sup>29</sup> *Id.*

... that a Smart Grid deployment plan should serve as a blueprint for a utilities' Smart Grid deployment. It need not be a procurement plan, as per Section 454.5, but they can be if the utility so desires. First, and foremost, it should clearly state the objectives that the utility seeks to achieve. Secondly, it must keep an eye squarely focused upon cost-effectiveness of the measures taken to achieve those objectives. Finally, it should be a living, breathing blueprint that is routinely, if not annually, revised based upon emerging technologies, utilities' experiences, changes in cost and customer responses.<sup>30</sup>

Greenlining reaches a similar conclusion, endorsing the analysis and tentative conclusions of the Ruling Amending Scope:

As the Joint Ruling [Ruling Amending Scope] tentatively proposed regarding deployment plans: (1) the approval or a deployment plan could establish a baseline for the Commission to monitor a utility's deployment of Smart Grid technologies and capabilities, subject to annual status reports to measure progress; and (2) a utility or other party could cite to an approved deployment plan as a rationale for specific investments (although the inclusion of a specific investment in a deployment will not convey a presumption of reasonableness). ... Greenlining agrees that Smart Grid deployment plans should not be treated similar to procurement plans, ...<sup>31</sup>

Like Greenlining, DRA also supports the proposed uses of the Smart Grid deployment plans outlined in the Ruling Amending Scope. DRA states that:

DRA agrees that Plans should be used to assess and monitor a utility's deployment of Smart Grid capabilities and technologies. The development of Smart Grid Plan offers an opportunity to thoughtfully create guidelines to

---

<sup>30</sup> UCAN Opening Comments at 3-4.

<sup>31</sup> Greenlining Opening Comments at 11.

steer development of a Smart Grid. As part of the development of the Plan, DRA recommends the Commission order each utility to provide an inventory of all Smart Grid activities made to date. The inventory would provide a snapshot of California's Smart Grid progress, and provide guidance in how each utility will move forward.<sup>32</sup>

GPI, in a similar vein, argues that:

The smart-grid deployment plans should certainly be used to establish a baseline that will be used in monitoring the development and deployment of these technologies over at least the next couple of decades. ... It is reasonable for the Commission to consider favorably the fact that a proposed project is consistent with a filed and approved smart-grid deployment plan, as long as the favorable consideration is taken in the proper context. We agree with the Joint Ruling [Ruling Amending Scope] that it would **not** be reasonable to use the deployment plans to confer automatic approval on proposed projects, given the nature of the plans and their inherent uncertainties.<sup>33</sup>

EDF also supports the analysis of the Ruling Amending Scope, but in addition, it observes that "the consideration of smart grid technologies be part of all utilities' normal infrastructure planning processes."<sup>34</sup>

CFC takes an opposing viewpoint, arguing, "the better use of the plan is to allow the utility to use the plan to justify specific investments."<sup>35</sup> On the other hand, CFC would require that the "costs and benefits associated with a

---

<sup>32</sup> DRA Opening Comments at 3.

<sup>33</sup> GPI Opening Comments at 2, emphasis in original.

<sup>34</sup> EDF Opening Comments at 8.

<sup>35</sup> CFC Opening Comments at 4.

particular investment should be reviewed carefully to assure that the most cost-effective technology was chosen.”<sup>36</sup>

CEERT, like other commenters, agrees with the approach suggested in the Ruling Amending Scope. CEERT, however, suggests like CFC that “the Commission may wish to consider preserving the option of utilizing an approach analogous to an approved procurement plan – pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 454.5 – if it were to prove practical in later years.”<sup>37</sup>

### **3.1.2. Discussion: Deployment Plans Can Determine Smart Grid Baseline and Guide Investments**

The arguments of commenters confirm our tentative conclusion that the best uses of the deployment plans is to determine a baseline indicating the current deployment of Smart Grid technologies and as a document for guiding future Smart Grid investments. We also conclude that deployment plans are not a substitute for a Commission review of specific infrastructure investments that will take place just prior to the time of deployment.

PG&E’s observation that any baseline for measuring deployment should not be “prescriptive,” is a point well taken. A goal of the deployment plans is to initiate project planning that encourages a deployment of Smart Grid technologies needed to meet current policy objectives or to improve the operations of the grid. In this situation, we seek a descriptive, not prescriptive, characterization of the status quo in a deployment plan that enables the Commission to understand where California is today and better understand where California should go.

---

<sup>36</sup> *Id.*

<sup>37</sup> CEERT Opening Comments at 4.



CFC, the single commenter stating that a deployment plan can serve in lieu of a subsequent reasonableness review, argues for a detailed review of the costs and benefits at the time of the filing of the deployment plan. This argument, however, is unpersuasive because information on Smart Grid technologies is developing rapidly, and undertaking a detailed review of costs and benefits far in advance of an investment could not yield reliable results. Therefore, it would be wiser to view the Smart Grid deployment plans as a policy guide for utility investment, not as a determination that certain investments are reasonable.

### **3.2. What Elements Must a Smart Grid Deployment Plan Have?**

SB 17, in requiring the development and filing of deployment plans, specifies that it is the “policy of the state to modernize the state’s electrical transmission and distribution system to maintain safe, reliable, efficient, and secure electrical service, with infrastructure that can meet future growth in demand...”<sup>38</sup> SB 17 then identifies 10 goals that the Smart Grid should achieve.<sup>39</sup> In addition, SB 17 requires the Commission to “evaluate the impact of deployment on major initiatives and policies” and specified seven initiatives against which the Commission, “in consultation with the Energy Commission, the ISO, and electrical corporations”<sup>40</sup> should use when evaluating proposed deployments of Smart Grid technologies.

---

<sup>38</sup> § 8360.

<sup>39</sup> § 8360 (a) - § 8360(j).

<sup>40</sup> § 8366

Subsequently, the Ruling Amending Scope then proposed seven policy outcomes that constituted a vision of the Smart Grid and are linked to the SB 17 initiatives.<sup>41</sup> The Ruling Amending Scope concluded that:

...the deployment plan should have the following:

- A demonstrable vision consistent with the goals of SB 17;
- Timeline (where are you now, and how long will it take to upgrade system); and
- Projected cost, to the extent possible at this time.<sup>42</sup>

The ruling then invited parties to comment on a proposed structure for deployment plans that would offer a practical way to proceed.

In addition, the workshops held on March 17 and 18, 2010, addressed the topic of deployment plans.

### **3.2.1. Position of Parties**

Following the workshops, the utilities, filing separate replies, proposed a 7-element format for the filing of deployment plans. These seven elements include (quoting directly):

1. Smart Grid Vision Statement.
2. Deployment Baseline.
3. Smart Grid Strategy.
4. Smart Grid Roadmap.
5. Cost Estimates.
6. Benefits Estimates; and
7. Metrics.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Ruling Amending Scope at 12-13.

<sup>42</sup> *Id.* at 13-14.

<sup>43</sup> See SCE Reply Comments at 3-4; SDG&E Reply Comments at 5 include the first six elements, but SCE's Reply Comments include metrics as part of its "Deployment Baseline;" and PG&E Reply Comments at 3 support the same six elements as SDG&E.

DRA also proposes a strategy to create deployment plans that is consistent with the approach recommended by the three utilities. DRA argues (quoting directly) that:

- The Commission should formally adopt a set of Smart Grid objectives; and
- Plans should contain a vision and strategy, technology evaluation and deployment roadmap, and conceptual cost estimates and timelines.<sup>44</sup>

The ISO expresses support for the direction set forth in the Ruling.<sup>45</sup> The ISO identifies three goals of special concern, namely, 1) increasing the reliability and use of the grid;<sup>46</sup> 2) increasing demand-side participation in ISO markets;<sup>47</sup> and 3) integrating greater amounts of intermittent renewable resources.<sup>48</sup>

Greenlining asks that a discussion of General Order (“GO”) 156 be a required part of each deployment plan, arguing that “the Commission and the utilities should act prospectively to address the negative impact on supplier diversity that is sure to result from the development of the Smart Grid.”<sup>49</sup>

HomeGrid recommends that deployment plan “guidelines call out capabilities, not technologies.”<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> DRA Reply Comments at 2.

<sup>45</sup> ISO Opening Comments at 2.

<sup>46</sup> *Id.* at 3.

<sup>47</sup> *Id.*

<sup>48</sup> *Id.* at 4

<sup>49</sup> Greenlining Reply Comments at 3.

<sup>50</sup> HomeGrid Reply Comments at 3.

EDF asks that the utility deployment plans, in addition to the items outlined in the Ruling Amending Scope, also address the following three points (quoting directly):

1. Enable maximum access by third parties to the grid, creating a platform for innovation in technology and services.
2. Have the infrastructure and policies necessary to enable and support the sale of demand response, energy efficiency, distributed generation, and storage into wholesale energy markets as a resource, on equal footing with traditional generation resources; and
3. Significantly reduce the total environmental footprint of the current electric generation and delivery system in California.<sup>51</sup>

CEERT states that it “agreed with the Commission’s recommendation that deployment plans should be used to establish a baseline from which it can monitor a utility’s progress in deploying a smart grid.”<sup>52</sup> CEERT asks for a tight link between the deployment plans and the legislative requirements, the inclusion of a timeline, and projected costs.<sup>53</sup> Finally, CEERT asks that deployment plans tie back to California’s Energy Action Plan’s priorities for meeting the loading order.<sup>54</sup>

IREC, although expressing broad agreement with the direction proposed in the Ruling Amending Scope, states that “successful implementation

---

<sup>51</sup> EDF Reply Comments at 12-13.

<sup>52</sup> CEERT Reply Comments at 3.

<sup>53</sup> CEERT Opening Comments at 6.

<sup>54</sup> *Id.*

of SB 17 requires an ongoing forum through which stakeholders can identify necessary Smart Grid functionality.”<sup>55</sup>

CESA argues that “Smart Grid deployment plans should include integration of advanced storage and peak shaving technologies.”<sup>56</sup> In addition, CESA recommends that the deployment plans show how they “address each element of the policies embedded in §8360 and §8366.”<sup>57</sup>

Wal-Mart also supports a consideration of storage as part of the Smart Grid.<sup>58</sup>

Cisco argues for flexibility in the consideration of deployment plans, and believes that the planning process produces benefits:

... as a vision statement and a planning tool, deployment plans containing information about how a utility will address these topics is a useful means to ensure that there is policy agreement between a regulated utility and the CPUC on what is important in the deployment of the Smart Grid. The regulator needs to specify what is important to it in the deployment of the Smart Grid by stating broad policy outcomes the state wants to achieve, and the utility needs the flexibility to produce those outcomes in a way that makes sense for its operations and customers.<sup>59</sup>

Tendril, on the other hand, calls for more specificity in the approach set out in the Ruling Amending Scope. Tendril argues that the criteria are not linked closely enough to those set out in SB 17, stating:

---

<sup>55</sup> IREC Opening Comments at 4.

<sup>56</sup> CESA Opening Comments at 5.

<sup>57</sup> *Id.* at 6.

<sup>58</sup> Wal-Mart Opening Comments at 2.

<sup>59</sup> Cisco Opening Comments at 7.

While we agree that these are all valuable criteria, we respectfully submit that they are incomplete with regard to the policies established in § 8360 of SB 17 and the evaluation criteria established in § 8366 of SB 17. Specifically, both the policies and the criteria of these sections include provisions that focus on (1) deployment of renewable energy technologies, (2) reduced carbon emissions and (3) technology innovation that “provide the ratepayers with new options in meeting their individual energy needs.”<sup>60</sup>

CLECA asks that the Commission, in reviewing deployment plans, make sure that it remains focused on the effectiveness and the costs and benefits of proposed Smart Grid investments.<sup>61</sup>

Verizon voices general support for the Commission’s efforts to ensure the open review of Smart Grid deployment plans to ensure compliance with the goals of SB 17, stating:

Verizon concurs with the Commission’s view that defined plans for the design, implementation and management of smart grid projects are needed and will benefit all parties, as it will provide a logical, practical and visible method for the parties to follow.<sup>62</sup>

Qualcomm argues that:

... a plan should address how the IOU plans to meet the need for communications, especially broadband communications, which is essential for so many Smart Grid applications. ... Smart Grid plans should address the extent to which an IOU plans to rely on such technology. Including these provisions will ensure that the Smart Grid plans are comprehensive and fully describe how the IOUs

---

<sup>60</sup> Tendril Opening Comments at 2.

<sup>61</sup> CLECA Opening Comments at 3-4.

<sup>62</sup> Verizon Opening Comments at 5-6.

intend to meet the policy objectives established by state and federal law.<sup>63</sup>

GPI endorses the use of deployment plans for establishing a baseline against which to measure infrastructure development. GPI states:

The smart-grid deployment plans should certainly be used to establish a baseline that will be used in monitoring the development and deployment of these technologies over at least the next couple of decades.<sup>64</sup>

### **3.2.2. Discussion: The Deployment Plan Should Have Eight Elements**

The comments of parties on the Smart Grid deployment plan make clear both the use and limitations of these planning documents. Indeed, there is substantial agreement concerning the appropriate format of the deployment plans.

Concerning the format of the deployment plans, we find that the elements of a Smart Grid plan recommended by SCE, SDG&E, PG&E, and DRA have so much in common that they are essentially the same. As proposed by SCE, the Smart Grid deployment plan elements provide a framework whereby the parties can both discuss the general elements of a Smart Grid deployment plan, such as a vision statement, a deployment baseline, a Smart Grid strategy, a Smart Grid roadmap, cost and benefit estimates, and metrics and also address the specific requirements for complying with the provisions of SB 17.

In addition, the framework proposed by these parties has sufficient flexibility to enable the Smart Grid deployment plans to address in advance critical interests of concern to the Commission. For example, the section on Smart Grid Strategy should enable the utilities to discuss how the utility can

---

<sup>63</sup> Qualcomm Opening Comments at 3-4.

<sup>64</sup> GPI Opening Comments at 2.

advance the goals of GO 156, as recommended by Greenlining and other parties, even as it makes Smart Grid investments to develop California's infrastructure.

We do, however, adopt one minor change. Although the issues of grid security and cyber-security could be addressed as part of the strategic planning section, this decision requires that deployment plans include a separate section on the topic of security. The section on security will require the utility to discuss the security needed to ensure the operation of the grid and the security needed to prevent unauthorized access to consumer data.

We therefore adopt an eight element proposal, based on the seven element proposal of SCE, as the organizing structure for the sections of the Smart Grid deployment plans that all utilities must file. The eight elements are:

1. Smart Grid Vision Statement.
2. Deployment Baseline.
3. Smart Grid Strategy.
4. Grid Security and Cyber Security Strategy.
5. Smart Grid Roadmap.
6. Cost Estimates.
7. Benefits Estimates; and
8. Metrics.

These eight topic areas will permit the development of Smart Grid deployment plans that demonstrate compliance with the policy initiatives of SB 17.

As many parties note, the systematic presentation of a Smart Grid deployment plan can enable the Commission to understand and assess the baseline condition of today's grid even as we plan for the grid of the future. A common structure for the Smart Grid deployment plans will also facilitate participation by interested parties in Commission proceedings. Moreover, the flexibility of the adopted structure allows for the ready incorporation of a discussion of infrastructure issues, such as using energy storage technologies as



part of a Smart Grid and considering the use of public communications networks to serve the communications needs of the Smart Grid.

In the sections that follow, we will discuss in more detail the topics that each of the eight sections should address.

In summary, the eight part outline for the presentation of Smart Grid deployment plans offers a practical way for the utilities to organize their Smart Grid deployment plan and to demonstrate compliance with the policies adopted in SB 17. The use of a common structure in all deployment plans, when combined with the guidance offered below, should produce deployment plans that permit simple comparisons to the approaches each utility proposes. In addition, the common structure of all utility deployment plans should facilitate participation by interested parties addressing the topics either omitted or included in the deployment plans.

### **3.3. What Should the Smart Grid Vision Statement Include? How Should the Vision Statement be Structured?**

The Ruling Amending Scope stated that a Smart Grid must:

- Be self-healing and resilient – Using real-time information from embedded sensors and automated controls to anticipate, detect, and respond to system problems, a smart grid can automatically avoid or mitigate power outages, power quality problems, and service disruptions. (§ 8360 a, b, and d; § 8366 a, e, f, and g.)
- Motivate consumers to actively participate in operations of the grid – A smart grid should enable consumers to change their behavior around dynamic prices or to pay vastly increased rates for the privilege of reliable electrical service during high-demand conditions. (§ 8360 c, d, e, f, g, and h; § 8366 a, b, c, and d.)

- Resist attack – A smart grid system should better identify and respond to man-made or natural disruptions. A smart grid system using real-time information should enable grid operators to isolate affected areas and redirect power flows around damaged facilities. (§ 8360 a, b, and d; § 8366 a, e, f, and g.)
- Provide higher quality power that will save money wasted from outages – A smart grid system should create and provide more stable and reliable power to reduce down time. (§ 8360 a and b; § 8366 a, e, f, and g.)
- Accommodate all generation and storage options – A smart grid system should continue to support traditional power loads, and also seamlessly interconnect with renewable energy, micro-turbines, and other distributed generation technologies at local and regional levels. (§ 8360 b, c, d, e, f, and g; § 8366 a, e, f, and g.)
- Enable electricity markets to flourish – A smart grid system should create an open marketplace where alternative energy sources from geographically distant locations can easily be sold to customers wherever they are located. Intelligence in distribution grids should enable small producers to generate and sell electricity at the local level using alternative sources such as rooftop-mounted photo voltaic panels, small-scale wind turbines, and micro hydro generators. (§ 8360 b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, and j; § 8366 a, b, c, and d.)
- Run more efficiently – A smart grid system should optimize capital assets while minimizing operations and maintenance costs (optimized power flows reduce waste and maximize use of lowest-cost generation resources). (§ 8360 a; § 8366 g.)
- Enable penetration of intermittent power generation sources – As climate change and environmental concerns increase, the demand for renewable energy resources will also increase; since these are for the most

part intermittent in nature, a smart grid system should enable power systems to operate with larger amounts of such energy resources. (§ 8360 c, g, and j; § 8366 a, b, c, and d.)

These characteristics are also policy goals enumerated by SB 17 as noted in the citations that were included in the Ruling Amending Scope and repeated above. The next step in providing guidance on the development of a Smart Grid vision plan is to specify what the statement should include and how it should be structured.

### **3.3.1. Position of Parties**

In general, parties who commented on the Smart Grid vision statement argue that a vision is needed, but did not elaborate on the details or the structure of one.

DRA, for example, argues that the entire deployment plan should serve as a guiding vision statement. DRA also warns:

While an approved Plan may serve as one factor in reasonableness reviews of specific investment requests – depending upon the specificity of the plan – they cannot be both visionary guidelines and carry weight in a determination of reasonableness at the expense of a thorough cost-benefit analysis and technological feasibility.<sup>65</sup>SCE argues that the vision statement in each deployment plan “should be consistent with the Commission’s Smart Grid objectives as contained in the eight bullet-pointed ‘must haves’ listed on pages 12 and 13 of the [Ruling Amending Scope].”<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> DRA Reply Comments at 3.

<sup>66</sup> SCE Reply Comments at 2.

SDG&E<sup>67</sup> argues that a vision statement is needed to advance the Smart Grid deployment. SDG&E and PG&E both express support for SCE's argument that the vision statement must be consistent with the eight "must haves" that were included in the Ruling Amending Scope.<sup>68</sup>

**3.3.2. Discussion: Vision Statement  
Should Present a Vision of Smart  
Energy Markets, Smart Consumers  
and a Smart Utility**

We agree with the views of commenters that a vision statement is needed.

Based on the nine workshops that we have held as part of this proceeding and the comments we have received, we conclude that a Smart Grid vision statement will help orient a utility's efforts to upgrade its electrical system to meet today's requirements and tomorrow's needs using the latest technologies.

In filing their deployment plans, IOUs should address how their vision of the Smart Grid will perform in each of the areas stated in section 3.3 above with particular reference to the relevant sections of § 8360 and § 8366.

The workshops and the record of this proceeding show that a Smart Grid is a system of networked utility and consumer devices that use communications technology to exchange information that enables intelligent consumers, devices, and utility generation, transmission and distribution equipment in order to optimize the secure, reliable and efficient production, delivery and consumption of electricity.

---


<sup>67</sup> SDG&E Reply Comments at 2.

<sup>68</sup> SDG&E Reply Comments at 5; PG&E Reply Comments at 3.

Therefore, the IOUs' vision statements must not only discuss the broad policy objectives that are referenced in SB 17 and in the earlier sections of this decision, but also provide sufficient detail concerning the qualitative benefits and opportunities for each participant in the Smart Grid.

To guide the utility vision statements, below we provide a schematic presentation of the types of benefits that the Smart Grid can provide.

We propose that the IOUs' vision statements divide their discussion of the Smart Grid vision into three sections - 1) Smart Market, 2) Smart Customer, and 3) Smart Utility as depicted below.



The Smart Market that emerges from the Smart Grid should be sufficiently transparent and provide price, tariff and usage information sufficient to facilitate, among other things, wholesale demand response and distributed generation. In addition, the Smart Grid should have sufficient communications

capabilities to enable and measure the participation by, including, but not limited to, wholesale demand response participants and distributed generators.

In addition, because prices play such a critical role in the functioning of the Smart Market, the vision statement should also describe the types of pricing structures needed to ensure cost-effective demand response, distributed generation, and conservation responses needed to benefit customers.

Concerning the section called Smart Customer, the Smart Grid vision statement should address how a utility will enable customers to become more informed about the Smart Grid and allow customers to use electricity more efficiently and save money. The vision statement should consider the expectations of consumers concerning the Smart Grid and how to meet customer expectations and educate customers so that they can align their expectations with the realities of the technology. In general, the Smart Grid deployment plans should learn lessons from consumer reactions to the deployment of Advanced Meters and seek to avoid adverse consumer reactions, particularly those brought on by failures to communicate effectively with consumers. The evolution of a utility customer from a recipient of energy and into a participant in the grid must also involve a detailed education and marketing of why Smart Grid is beneficial to the individual consumer.

Concerning the section on Smart Utility, the vision statements should reflect how the Smart Grid will enable a utility to operate its transmission and distribution system in ways that anticipate events, enable responsiveness, and permit automatic or “self-healing” responses by the grid.

In summary, each IOU’s vision statement should consider how the utility plans to promote a Smart Market, a Smart Customer, and a Smart Utility.

### **3.4. What Should the Deployment Baseline Include?**

In presenting a Smart Grid deployment plan, the reasonability of the proposed steps depends on the current state of a utility's deployment of Smart Grid infrastructure. Due to the interconnectedness of Smart Grid technology with the utility's existing distribution, transmission and control infrastructure and the overall interconnectedness of the electric grid, this decision will provide guidance on what the utility should include and exclude in the description of the baseline situation.

#### **3.4.1. Position of Parties**

DRA recommends that the IOUs provide an inventory of current smart grid investments that would "provide a snapshot of Smart Grid progress." Further, DRA recommends that this inventory, which can be used as a baseline, be filed by October 1, 2010.<sup>69</sup>

UCAN suggests that a deployment plan baseline should include the "Scorecard and Decision-maker's Checklist"<sup>70</sup> in the absence of interoperability standards. UCAN argues that "until official standards are adopted [the Scorecard and Decision-makers Checklist] are the best measurement for ensuring the utilities are adopting technology that is interoperable."<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> DRA Opening Comments at 3; DRA Reply Comments at 9.

<sup>70</sup> The "Decision-Maker's Interoperability Checklist" is a document created by the Gridwise Architecture Council and "is a tool to help regulatory and utility decision-makers evaluate options ... to determine whether they have the characteristics and attributes that contribute to interoperability." The "Smart Grid Scorecard" is a document developed by EnerNex for the Gridwise Architecture Council and Smart Grid News that is to assist decision-makers in evaluating products developed for the Smart Grid. See UCAN Opening Comments at Attachments C and D.

<sup>71</sup> UCAN Opening Comments at 19.

GPI supports a baseline in the deployment plans that can “be used in monitoring the development and deployment of [Smart Grid] technologies over at least the next couple of decades.”<sup>72</sup>

Tendril and MegaWatt support the use of a deployment plan as a means to establish a baseline to monitor Smart Grid deployments.<sup>73</sup>

PG&E supports using the deployment plan to gather information and data “that can inform individual Smart Grid proposals,” but not be used in a prescriptive manner. Rather, the baselines should provide the Commission with the flexibility to consider proposals individually as the Smart Grid evolves.<sup>74</sup> Both PG&E and SDG&E agree that this baseline should list projects and activities, “including status and metrics as appropriate over time.”<sup>75</sup>

CESA states that a baseline should be established to allow the Commission to monitor Smart Grid deployments and “be included as an important factor in the evaluation of the reasonableness” of Smart Grid investments.<sup>76</sup>

CDT-EFF suggests that a privacy impact assessment should be included as part of the IOUs’ deployment baseline. This assessment should be based on privacy standards suggested by CDT-EFF or as adopted by the Commission.<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> GPI Opening Comments at 2.

<sup>73</sup> Tendril Opening Comments at 1; MegaWatt Opening Comments at 9.

<sup>74</sup> PG&E Opening Comments at 6.

<sup>75</sup> PG&E Reply Comments at 3; SDG&E Reply Comments at 5.

<sup>76</sup> CESA Opening Comments at 6.

<sup>77</sup> CDT-EFF Opening Comments at 24.



CDT-EFF further suggests that these baseline privacy standards should also apply to third parties.<sup>78</sup>

EPIC supports the need for minimal, or “baseline,” privacy standards.<sup>79</sup> Researchers also offer several privacy standards suggestions that should be part of any initial deployment baseline.<sup>80</sup>

SCE “agrees that Deployment Plans should be used to establish a strategic baseline plan” that will be useful for evaluating and deploying technology, and be a reference point for future Smart Grid investments.<sup>81</sup> Additionally, SCE argues that a baseline “should describe the current state of each IOU’s Smart Grid systems, identify the smart grid technologies that have been deployed by the IOU in the past 10 years, and describe the basic scope of the deployment of those technologies. According to SCE, this baseline will serve as an initial point in evaluating the IOUs’ deployment plans.<sup>82</sup>

EDF, CEERT, TURN, Greenlining and TIA support the Ruling Amending Scope’s tentative decision to use the deployment plans to establish a baseline.<sup>83</sup>

CFC comments that certain parties have requested that a baseline be established “so that the Commission can determine the extent to which the electric grid needs to be upgraded to accommodate state policy goals.” CFC cautions that a Smart Grid may already exist in California, and the establishment

---

<sup>78</sup> CDT-EFF Reply Comments at 6.

<sup>79</sup> EPIC Reply Comments at 4.

<sup>80</sup> Researchers Opening Comments at 7-9.

<sup>81</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 7.

<sup>82</sup> SCE Reply Comments at 2.

<sup>83</sup> EDF Opening Comments at 8; CEERT Opening Comments at 4; TURN Opening Comments at 2; Greenlining Opening Comments at 11; TIA Reply Comments at 2.

of a baseline will help avoid the risk of paying twice for duplicative installations.<sup>84</sup> Further, CFC argues that a state-wide baseline should be developed as one of the goals of SB 17 is “to modernize *the state’s* electrical transmission and distribution system.”<sup>85</sup>

#### **3.4.2. Discussion: Elements for Deployment Baseline**

Parties are in near total agreement that a baseline, or inventory, of current Smart Grid infrastructure investments is necessary to enable the Commission to understand where the utilities are today and can be used to gauge how much “smarter” the grid is in the future. The Commission agrees that a baseline should be undertaken by the utilities and included in their deployment plan filings, due by July 1, 2011. We decline to adopt the recommendation of DRA to have the inventory of technologies due on October 1, 2010 since such an early date is inconsistent with the statutory intent.

The baseline methodology we adopt follows the proposal made by SCE in its Reply Comments, that is, the baseline should include information on the current state of the grid for each utility, describe smart technologies that have been deployed and the scope of those deployments and investments. We are cognizant of CFC’s concerns that ratepayers not pay for the same investment twice, and will provide notice to the utilities that the Commission will strictly scrutinize and use this baseline report as a comparison against future requests for funding for Smart Grid and other infrastructure investments.

Additionally, we agree with CDT-EFF and Researchers that an assessment of privacy and grid security issues should be included as part of this

---

<sup>84</sup> CFC Reply Comments at 2-3.

<sup>85</sup> *Id.* at 5 (emphasis in original).

baseline report. CDT-EFF suggests that this privacy assessment should be responsive to the principles outlined in the Fair Information Practices, which include:

- Smart Grid service providers should limit collection of consumers' personal data; any such data collected should be obtained by lawful means and with the consent of the consumer, where appropriate.
- Data collected by Smart Grid service providers should be relevant to a specific purpose, and be accurate, complete and up-to-date.
- The purpose for collecting Smart Grid data should be settled at the outset.
- The use of Smart Grid personal data ought to be limited to specified purposes, and data acquired for one purpose ought not be used for others.
- Smart Grid data must be collected and stored in a way reasonably calculated to prevent its loss, theft, or modification.
- There should be a general position of transparency with respect to the practices of handling Smart Grid data.
- Smart Grid consumers should have the right to access, confirm, and demand correction of their personal data.
- Those in charge of handling Smart Grid data should be responsible for complying with the principles of the privacy guidelines.

While the Commission would prefer to rely on national standards, the Commission is aware that delays in adoption of these standards may not work within the timeline required by SB 17. Nevertheless, we agree with CDT-EFF and Researchers that at a minimum this privacy impact assessment should address the following questions that pertain to current privacy practices:

- What data is the utility now collecting?

- For what purpose is the data being collected?
- With whom will the utility currently share the data?
- How long will the utility currently keep the data?
- What confidence does the utility have that the data will be accurate and reliable enough for the purposes for which the data will be used?
- How does the utility protect the data against loss or misuse?
- How do individuals have access to the data about themselves? And
- What audit, oversight and enforcement mechanisms does the utility have in place to ensure that the utility is following their own rules?<sup>86</sup>

As discussed elsewhere, the Commission will address customer access and specific privacy and cyber security rules in a separate phase; but the IOUs can provide these privacy and cyber-security assessments in time for the filing of their deployment plans. Moreover, independent of the specific rules adopted concerning privacy and access to-date in the short-term, long-term security requires an incorporation of these concerns at the project planning stage.

Finally, CDT-EFF request that the Commission require similar reports from demand response providers and other third parties that plan to access customers' usage data via the customer's meter. At this time, the Commission declines to adopt such a request. The Commission is aware of the concerns of certain parties regarding the need to enforce privacy standards upon these third

---

<sup>86</sup> Note that we ask a variant of these questions in the cyber security section below. In that setting, the emphasis is on utility plans, whereas in this section of the plan we solicit information on current practices.

parties, but at this time the Commission requires more time to assess whether any rule, law or mandate authorizes the Commission to apply this section to third parties.<sup>87</sup>

### **3.5. What Should the Smart Grid Strategy Include?**

Since each Smart Grid deployment plan will include a statement of the utility's strategy towards this key infrastructure investment, it is logical to ask what a strategy statement should include. This section reviews the recommendations made by parties, provides parties with guidance, and describes what the Commission will look for in a strategy statement.

#### **3.5.1. Position of Parties**

Concerning the Smart Grid strategy, SCE provides the most comprehensive view of what the strategy should include. SCE recommends that:

Each IOU should describe their strategy for evaluating Smart Grid technologies and deploying those technologies that it deems will create sufficient customer value and are technologically mature and commercially available. This strategy section should demonstrate how an IOU prioritizes its technology evaluation and deployment efforts against the Smart Grid objectives described ... above. The IOU's strategy section should describe a formal decision-making framework.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> The Commission is aware that privacy protections and the reach of Commission jurisdiction are under review by legislation pending before the State Legislature. Legislative action may provide greater legal clarity in this matter. If there is no action on this matter by the Legislature, then the Commission will consider inviting legal briefs to clarify the extent of the Commission's jurisdiction and to recommend the best procedure for protecting consumer interests.

<sup>88</sup> SCE Reply Comments at 3.

SCE agrees with the Ruling Amending Scope that “Deployment Plans should be used to establish a strategic baseline plan for evaluating and deploying technology, and to serve as a reference for future Smart Grid technology evaluation and investment proposals by the IOUs.”<sup>89</sup>

SDG&E provides a more general description of what a Smart Grid strategy should include. SDG&E argues that

... the question for the Commission in considering any utility’s Smart Grid application should be limited to whether the utility’s proposal for achieving those objectives through Smart Grid investments is the most cost effective alternative available, in light of existing technologies and the specific system requirements and customer needs confronted by that particular utility.<sup>90</sup>

PG&E states that the Smart Grid deployment plans should include a strategy that includes “[t]echnology deployment decision making criteria and strategy that the utility proposes to use to move forward with incremental projects, programs and investments.”<sup>91</sup> PG&E cautions that “the evolution of the Smart Grid will not follow a neat and prescribed set of goals and criteria.”<sup>92</sup>

DRA supports the proposal of SCE for the inclusion of a strategy as part of a deployment plan.<sup>93</sup> DRA also supports the comments of SDG&E and PG&E that the deployment plans should provide guidance and direction.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 7.

<sup>90</sup> SDG&E Reply Comments at 6-7.

<sup>91</sup> PG&E Reply Comments at 3.

<sup>92</sup> PG&E Opening Comments at 7.

<sup>93</sup> DRA Reply Comments at 2.

<sup>94</sup> *Id.*

Qualcomm argues that “each Smart Grid plan should be required to state the extent to which the IOU plans to use cellular technology for broadband communications and justify construction of a new broadband network by any IOU planning to do so.”<sup>95</sup> AT&T similarly “recommends the Commission support rules that allow for and encourage the use of existing commercial carrier networks and services.”<sup>96</sup> Verizon asks “the Commission to consider the extensive and tested information technology capabilities that Verizon and other communications carriers can bring to any smart grid project.”<sup>97</sup> CCTA similarly argues that “in evaluating IOUs’ Smart Grid deployment plans, the Commission should encourage the use of existing network providers in smart grid deployments.”<sup>98</sup>

Concerning the issue of what communications protocols the Smart Grid should include, we note that the Commission cannot reach a decision on this matter until national standards become clearer. Nevertheless, two standards are currently emerging and parties have provided comments that warrant consideration now.

Concerning a standard known as “SEP 2.0 [Smart Energy Profile 2.0],” SCE states that it “strongly supports SEP 2.0 as the appropriate standard for the exchange of customer data” and comments that this standard “has the full support of five of the six major smart meter providers.”<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> Qualcomm Comments at 3.

<sup>96</sup> AT&T Opening Comments at 5.

<sup>97</sup> Verizon Opening Comments at 1.

<sup>98</sup> CCTA Opening Comments at 2.

<sup>99</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 27.

Concerning a different standard known as OpenADR, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL), in response to questions at a workshop, provided information that indicates that OpenADR offers many attractive features and is already in use in many commercial settings. In addition, LBNL comments that OpenADR and SEP can coexist and both can be integrated into the Smart Grid. LBNL states that “OpenADR could be included as a standard infrastructure deployment plan requirement for Smart Grid implementation.”<sup>100</sup>

A number of parties provided comments on how to incorporate or whether to incorporate the Commission’s GO 156 requirements into the Smart Grid deployment plans. Greenlining recommends that the requirements of GO 156 be included in the utilities’ Smart Grid deployment plans, with the reporting and diversity requirements of GO 156 specifically applied to the discrete portion of the utilities’ plans that consists of the development of the Smart Grid.<sup>101</sup>

The Black Economic Council in its comments urged the Commission to extend its regulatory authority over a number of new participants in the energy industry.

The Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles urged this commission to increase, not decrease, its effectiveness and jurisdiction by including all corporations that could and should benefit from the Smart Grid system, including those likely to supply most of the new technology for the Smart Grid system. Specifically, it urged that every Silicon Valley company with

---

<sup>100</sup> ALJ Ruling, March 20, 2010, Attachment A at 7.

<sup>101</sup> Greenlining Opening Comments at 4.



\$500 million or more in revenue that could benefit or participate in the Smart Grid system be a part of this proceeding.<sup>102</sup>

**3.5.2. Discussion: Smart Grid Strategy Should Provide Direction and Demonstrate Consistency with SB 17 and GO 156 Goals**

The comments of parties demonstrate a general consensus that deployment plans should include a discussion of an IOU's Smart Grid strategy, and that the strategy should offer a sense of direction and guidance, rather than setting rigid requirements. This is clearly a reasonable approach since there are significant uncertainties surrounding future technologies that may be part of a Smart Grid.

As SCE points out, it will be helpful for Smart Grid strategies to demonstrate that an IOU's deployment plans will promote the goals identified for California by SB 17. Moreover, to facilitate Commission review of the Smart Grid deployment plans, the section on strategy should explicitly reference the Smart Grid goals and standards included in § 8360 and § 8366.

It is also reasonable to require that a utility's Smart Grid strategy demonstrates that the utility has considered whether third party communications networks can provide cost-effective communications that meet the security and performance requirements of the Smart Grid. We expect that before the Commission approves a specific Smart Grid infrastructure investment, the Commission will wish to ascertain whether investments in Smart Grid communications are cost-effective and whether a utility has adequately considered a range of alternatives, especially those concerning the use of existing and future communications infrastructure operated by third parties.

---

<sup>102</sup> Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles Opening Comments at 4.

Similarly, concerning interoperability standards, prudence requires that the strategy section of a utility's deployment plan should consider how standards will be used and how the utility will minimize the risk of stranded costs in cases where consensus standards do not yet exist. In that context, the strategic plans should discuss whether it would be feasible and cost-effective to offer OpenADR via dedicated servers that can communicate with devices in the home even as the advanced meters communicate with customers and customer devices via SEP 2.0.

GO 156 was created over two decades ago to ensure that women, minority, and disabled veteran business enterprises are encouraged to become potential suppliers of products and services to the utilities. The purposes of this General Order are to:

- Encourage greater economic opportunity for women, minority, and disabled veteran business enterprises;
- Promote competition among regulated public utility suppliers to enhance economic efficiency in the procurement of electrical, gas, and telephone corporations' contracts; and
- Clarify and expand the program for the utilities' procurement of products and services from diverse enterprises.

Smart Grid investments could create new economic opportunities as utilities move away from traditional infrastructure investments toward advanced technologies. The Commission encourages the utilities to be mindful that diverse suppliers may not be as familiar with these new opportunities. Consequently, the Commission encourages the utilities to engage with the small business community to educate and inform this community about the emerging business potential that may result from Smart Grid investments.

Currently, the Commission has an open proceeding reviewing the issues surrounding GO 156, Rulemaking (R.) 09-07-027. The existing language in GO 156 includes all goods and services that a utility purchases, which, by definition, includes Smart Grid-related expenditures. Therefore, the issue of whether Smart Grid-related costs will be included is moot since they are already included.

The issue of whether and how GO 156 should be extended to non-utility entities is best addressed in R.09-07-027, and is beyond the scope of this proceeding.

### **3.6. What Should be in the Grid Security and Cyber Security Section of the Deployment Plan?**

SB 17 states that it is the “policy of the state to modernize the state’s electrical transmission and distribution system to maintain ... secure electrical service.”<sup>103</sup> SB 17 also seeks to achieve “cost-effective full cyber security.”<sup>104</sup> Due to the strong legislative and consumer interest in this aspect of the Smart Grid and because of the highly technical and new direction in which this takes state electric policy, we will require that Smart Grid deployment plans contain a separate discussion of electric grid security, including cyber security. In this section of the decision, we identify the grid security and cybersecurity topics the Smart Grid deployment plans should address.

#### **3.6.1. Position of Parties**

All parties who discussed security agree with the Commission that security of California’s electric grid, including cyber security, is critical. Many parties provided extensive comments which we summarize in this section.

---

<sup>103</sup> § 8360.

<sup>104</sup> § 8360.

SCE states cyber security is “critical to the proper functioning of the Smart Grid”<sup>105</sup> and is “a critical policy area for the Commission.”<sup>106</sup> Nevertheless, after citing actions by NIST and other national agencies, SCE opines that “[t]he Commission does not need to take specific action with respect to cyber security, apart from adopting consensus Smart Grid standards identified by NIST.”<sup>107</sup>

In addition to its own work on cyber security, SCE states that a “need exists for independent product certifications and a national vulnerability and incident response clearinghouse.”<sup>108</sup> Furthermore, SCE identifies four specific roles for state and federal regulators in the area of cyber security (quoting directly):

1. Define performance criteria in the context of meeting public policy objectives. California’s “six criteria” for advanced metering is one example.
2. Provide oversight on utility expenditures and enforce interoperability and cybersecurity standards adoption.
3. Ensure utility participation in a centralized incident response effort.
4. Refine performance criteria based on continuous improvement.<sup>109</sup>

Concerning cyber security, PG&E states:

PG&E agrees with the Ruling that maintaining robust and fully compliant cyber security protection for utility systems and customer information is of utmost importance as we

---

<sup>105</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 24.

<sup>106</sup> SCE Reply Comments at 23.

<sup>107</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 33.

<sup>108</sup> SCE Reply Comments at 23.

<sup>109</sup> *Id.*

move forward with new Smart Grid technologies. To that end, we believe that rules relating to third-party access to customer and utility information need to be evaluated in light of national cyber-security protections and standards. PG&E is and has been continuously monitoring and participating in the national standard-setting forums on cyber-security, and updating and assimilating new “best practices” and security measures to enhance our existing protocols and protections. We do not believe that California-specific cyber security standards are necessary and in fact could be counter productive, inefficient and costly. However, we do believe that the Commission, utilities and interested parties should directly monitor and keep updated on national cyber-security forums and developments.<sup>110</sup>

SDG&E also acknowledges the importance of security, stating:

To minimize [security attacks and cyber-threat] risks, a continuing investment in a cyber security program is necessary to prevent current threats from materializing and to anticipate future cyber security threats. Cyber security risks are not a new problem to SDG&E, and existing approaches can address those issues when combined with a continuous and consistent effort to manage risk. To this end, SDG&E advocates a proactive and preventative security approach which programmatically addresses architectural, design, engineering, comprehensive testing, and operational monitoring and maintenance stage of cyber security lifecycle.<sup>111</sup>

SDG&E argues that “[t]he Commission should consider ensuring that Smart Grid proposals, regardless of their technical differences, adhere to fundamental security principles and concepts.”<sup>112</sup> Regarding security, SDG&E argues that the

---

<sup>110</sup> PG&E Opening Comments at 18-19.

<sup>111</sup> SDG&E Opening Comments at 16-17.

<sup>112</sup> *Id.* at 31.

Commission should evaluate Smart Grid projects to ensure adherence to basic security principles including: 1) availability, integrity, and confidentiality; 2) defense in depth; and, 3) role based access controls and least privilege.<sup>113</sup>

The ISO comments on the importance of security and the steps it has taken to increase the security of its own operations. The ISO states:

... the ISO maintains a secure network in accordance with applicable regulations of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation. The ISO's standards are available to all whom wish to participate in the ISO market.<sup>114</sup>

DRA argues that “[c]yber security is critical to insulating the grid from external, unlawful influences, and protecting the flow of consumer information.”<sup>115</sup>

TURN agrees that cyber security issues are critical and states that such issues arise “both due to the potential to invade the grid through the encrypted ‘backhaul’ communications platform, as well as through the portal associated with the customer’s own computer (or other device) when it becomes linked with the meter through the Home Area Network.” TURN identifies work conducted for the CEC as “excellent” and asks the Commission to take official notice of a particular report.<sup>116</sup>

UCAN also comments on the importance of cyber security and argues that “[t]he risk of interrupted energy service has the potential of being much

---

<sup>113</sup> *Id.*

<sup>114</sup> ISO Opening Comments at 8.

<sup>115</sup> DRA Reply Comments at 19.

<sup>116</sup> We hereby take official notice of the report, listed as P.A. Subrahmanyam, et al., “Network Security Architecture for Demand Response/Sensor Networks,” October 2005 (revised June 2006), CyberKnowledge and University of California at Berkeley, Draft Consultant Report for CEC, PIER Contract No. 500-01-043, which is available at [http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/demand\\_response\\_CEC.pdf](http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/demand_response_CEC.pdf)

more devastating to a consumer than the dropped calls that occur in the cellular communications network.”<sup>117</sup>

CDT-EFF argues that the Commission should “broadly adopt cyber security and privacy principles to ensure that smart grid proposals will provide sufficient privacy protections.”<sup>118</sup> As part of their security planning, CDT-EFF argues that the utilities should follow the Fair Information Practice principles. In particular, they argue that as part of a basic security practice, the utility should be required to “articulate the purpose or purposes for which customer information will be used” and collect only “data directly relevant and necessary to accomplish a specific purpose” and retain that data only “for as long as necessary to fulfill the specified purpose.”<sup>119</sup> CDT-EFF also argue for a variety of “good practices” that should be included at the planning stage, including, for example the “encryption ... for all communications that are sent over open wireless protocols...”<sup>120</sup> CDT-EFF also recommend that “[i]f a security or other breach results in the loss or exposure of customer information, the regulable entity should be required to notify affected customers and take all reasonable steps to minimize harm to customers.”<sup>121</sup>

Verizon, in its comments on cyber security, also stresses the importance of integrating “security measures into the *initial* design, development and provisioning of a smart grid network in California.”<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>117</sup> UCAN Opening Comments at 36.

<sup>118</sup> CDT-EFF Opening Comments at 10.

<sup>119</sup> *Id.* at 17.

<sup>120</sup> *Id.* at 21.

<sup>121</sup> *Id.* at 21.

<sup>122</sup> Verizon Opening Comments at 8.

Researchers argues that:

The Commission's decisions about Smart Grid privacy and cybersecurity will have far reaching implications. For the state of California, the Smart Grid infrastructure will function over a long period of time; therefore it is crucial that privacy and cybersecurity are incorporated into the Smart Grid from the beginning. Retrofitting privacy and cybersecurity could incur prohibitive costs while exposing California's citizens to serious privacy and security risks.<sup>123</sup>

Researchers argues that the Commission should articulate a common set of questions that Smart Grid deployment plans should address and propose a series of questions in their Opening Comments.<sup>124</sup> Among other things, Researchers argues that the Smart Grid deployment plans should ask:

- What measures are employed by the utility to protect the security of customer information?
- Has the utility audited its security and privacy practices, both internally and by independent outside entities? If so, how often are the audits and what are the audit results.<sup>125</sup>

Researchers also recounts a series of security issues that have arisen in the last year on voting systems and relying in inadequate standards for securing critical new technologies. Based on their analysis of these security issues, Researchers recommend (quoting directly):

- Participate in NIST's conformance assessment development effort, to ensure that assessments will subject Smart Grid devices and systems to a full range of cybersecurity tests, and that the details of those

---

<sup>123</sup> Researchers Opening Comments at 2-3.

<sup>124</sup> *Id.* at 7-9.

<sup>125</sup> *Id.* at 8-9.



assessments – including methodologies and results – will be made public to the fullest possible extent.

- Since the Smart Grid is developing, and attackers are adaptive, recognize that cybersecurity assessments will have to be adaptive, too. For example, we recommend that the Commission develop a process for identifying the steps that are necessary to update hardware, software, and firmware in deployed devices in order to eliminate known vulnerabilities.
- Review utility-vendor contracts for clauses that govern (1) the identification of applicable cybersecurity standards; (2) the parties’ respective obligations in the event that applicable standards change, or any contractual representation with respect to security proves false.<sup>126</sup>

EPIC takes a different route, recommending that the Commission adopt end-to-end security requirements. Among other things, EPIC recommends that the Commission specifically “establish robust cryptographic standards,”<sup>127</sup> as well as that the Commission “eliminate the use of wireless technology” for the Smart Grid.<sup>128</sup>

CEERT seeks to tie California security efforts closely to national standards. CEERT argues that “to the greatest extent possible, CERRT recommends that the Commission adopt the standards, guidelines, and protocols adopted by NIST”<sup>129</sup> and “that the Commission adopt the cyber-security standards adopted by NIST in 2010.”<sup>130</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup> *Id.* at 17.

<sup>127</sup> EPIC Opening Comments at 27.

<sup>128</sup> EPIC Reply Comments at 3.

<sup>129</sup> CEERT Opening Comments at 9-10.

<sup>130</sup> CEERT Reply Comments at 14.

AT&T also suggests that the Commission defer adopting state specific protocols and rules until NIST adopts national standards and protocols.<sup>131</sup> In addition, AT&T encourages the Commission to remain active in coordinating with NIST and FERC particularly regarding cyber security standards.<sup>132</sup> Similarly, TIA argues that “[t]he Commission should work with stakeholders to identify cybersecurity best practices and consider seeking the opinion of a qualified neutral third party on technical aspects related to cybersecurity.”<sup>133</sup>

HomeGrid<sup>134</sup> and Lantiq<sup>135</sup> also support a NIST-based approach.

Cisco points out the complexity of the security issue, noting “[t]here is not one technology or approach that will secure the Smart Grid completely; however, there are industry best practices and approaches to public-private partnership that have proved effective and valuable in addressing security threats to other communications systems.”<sup>136</sup> Cisco recommends that “[f]or cyber security, the CPUC should encourage best practices sharing with and among utilities, and explore public-private, security event-related information sharing.”<sup>137</sup>

EDF asks that the Commission act “without slowing innovation.”<sup>138</sup> Wal-Mart responds affirmatively to whether the Commission should undertake

---

<sup>131</sup> AT&T Opening Comments at 11.

<sup>132</sup> *Id.*; AT&T Reply Comments at 7.

<sup>133</sup> TIA Reply Comments at 5.

<sup>134</sup> HomeGrid Reply Comments at 7.

<sup>135</sup> Lantiq Reply Comments at 6-7.

<sup>136</sup> CISCO Opening Comments at 15.

<sup>137</sup> *Id.* at 4.

<sup>138</sup> EDF Reply Comments at 22.

reviews of Smart Grid developers to assure that privacy and security issues are addressed appropriately. Greenlining asks that in addressing cyber security “care be taken to not impede the participation of third parties in the Smart Grid as that could impede innovation.”<sup>139</sup>

Tendril argues that “[c]yber security is a critical component of any smart grid deployment.”<sup>140</sup> EnergyHub argues that “[t]he utility must allow consumers to connect Home Area Network equipment to the smart meter in a way that ensures adequate security for the grid without restricting consumers’ choice of technology.”<sup>141</sup>

CFC emphasizes cost-effectiveness when considering security<sup>142</sup> and also stresses its concern that advanced metering infrastructure security weaknesses could enable penetration of presently secure systems.<sup>143</sup> CLECA believes it is premature to adopt detailed standards and protocols for the customer side of the Smart Grid.<sup>144</sup>

Google comments that it agrees “that the Commission should issue clear guidance and rules on how consumer’s privacy and security will be protected by utilities and those authorized third parties with whom utilities share user data.”<sup>145</sup>

---

<sup>139</sup> Greenlining Opening Comments at 23.

<sup>140</sup> Tendril Opening Comments at 11.

<sup>141</sup> EnergyHub Opening Comments at 2.

<sup>142</sup> CFC Opening Comments at 2.

<sup>143</sup> CFC Reply Comments at 15.

<sup>144</sup> CLECA Opening Comments at 5.

<sup>145</sup> Google Reply Comments at 5.

### **3.6.2. Discussion: Deployment Plans Should Provide Assurance of Security of Smart Grid**

With the current and planned deployment of a Smart Grid, there is an urgent need to ensure that the utilities have appropriate security programs in place for physical and cyber threats and/or attacks. Smart Grid technologies will introduce millions of new intelligent components to the electric grid that communicate in much more advanced ways than in the past. The Commission and the public have a right to be assured that the electric grid will remain secure with the deployment of Smart Grid technologies. The goal of a security program is to provide security while not impeding operations.

The critical role of security, including cyber security, in ensuring the effective operation of the Smart Grid is cited in both state and federal law.<sup>146</sup> Physical and cyber security of the Smart Grid is needed to ensure the reliability of the grid and the privacy and confidentiality of the information that is transmitted.

The Smart Grid deployment plans can provide the Commission and the public with insight into the security of the Smart Grid. The security strategies should address physical, cyber and human threats for grid operations with implementation of Smart Grid technologies.

Like many commenters, we conclude that the developing NIST framework will address many of the security issues that are arising. For this reason, we conclude that every Smart Grid deployment plan should discuss how

---

<sup>146</sup> In state law, references to cyber security include sections 8360 and 8362 of the Pub. Util. Code and in federal law, references include the provisions of Title XIII (commencing with Section 1301) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-140).

it plans to incorporate NIST requirements and guidelines into the security program of the utility.

Still, we note that the February 2010 Draft National Institute of Standards and Technology Smart Grid Cyber Security Strategy and Requirements (February 2010 Draft NISTIR 7628) stated: “The security requirements and the supporting analysis that are included in this report may be used by implementers of the Smart Grid, e.g., *utilities*, equipment manufacturers, *regulators*, as input to their risk assessment processes.”<sup>147</sup> Thus, NIST sees a continuing role for regulators in risk assessment.

Following the work of NIST, we find that “cyber security includes preventing damage to, unauthorized use of, or exploitation of electronic information and communications systems and the information contained therein to ensure confidentiality, integrity, and availability. Cyber security also includes restoring electronic information and communications systems in the event of an attack or natural disaster.”<sup>148</sup>

As SCE points out, the NIST Framework and Roadmap for Smart Grid Interoperability Standards, Release 1.0 identifies smart grid standards, including those for which “there is a strong stakeholder consensus.”<sup>149</sup> NIST and the Department of Homeland Security have prepared and identified several key documents that provide guidance on cyber security issues that are applicable to Smart Grid deployment plans. These include:

- Security Profile for Advanced Metering Infrastructure, v 1.0, Advanced Security Acceleration Project –

---

<sup>147</sup> February 2010 Draft NISTIR at 1-2, emphasis added.

<sup>148</sup> Section 1.2 of the February 2010 Draft NISTIR.

<sup>149</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 32.

Smart Grid, December 10, 2009 provides guidance and security controls to organizations developing or implementing AMI solutions, including the meter data management system (MDMS) up to and including the Home Area Network (HAN) interface of the smart meter;<sup>150</sup>

- Catalog of Control Systems Security: Recommendations for Standards Developers, U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), National Cyber Security Division, September 2009 presents a compilation of practices that various industry bodies have recommended to increase the security of control systems from both physical and cyber attacks;<sup>151</sup> and
- Department of Homeland Security developed the Cyber Security Procurement Language for Control Systems to provide guidance to procuring cyber security technologies for control systems products and services.<sup>152</sup>

Although it is premature to adopt specific Smart Grid security standards at this time, we note that the three documents listed above provide guidance on cyber security issues and issues affecting the Smart Grid. Therefore, the Commission will require that each utility as part of its Smart Grid deployment plan's security strategy consider these to be guidance documents that they should use in preparing security plans.

---

<sup>150</sup> Available at:

[http://osgug.ucaiug.org/utilisec/amisec/Shared%20Documents/AMI%20Security%20Profile%20\(ASAP-SG\)/AMI%20Security%20Profile%20-%20v1\\_0.pdf](http://osgug.ucaiug.org/utilisec/amisec/Shared%20Documents/AMI%20Security%20Profile%20(ASAP-SG)/AMI%20Security%20Profile%20-%20v1_0.pdf)

<sup>151</sup> Commission staff notes that there has been a recent new release of the Catalog of Control Systems Security in March 2010 available at: [http://www.us-cert.gov/control\\_systems/pdf/Catalog%20of%20Recommendations%20March%202010.pdf](http://www.us-cert.gov/control_systems/pdf/Catalog%20of%20Recommendations%20March%202010.pdf).

<sup>152</sup> Available at: [http://www.us-cert.gov/control\\_systems/pdf/FINAL-Procurement\\_Language\\_Rev4\\_100809.pdf](http://www.us-cert.gov/control_systems/pdf/FINAL-Procurement_Language_Rev4_100809.pdf)

Each security strategy should include a systematic risk assessment, including a security audit based on industry best practices, that addresses the prevention of, preparation for, protection against, mitigation of, response to, and recovery from security threats for the utilities' advanced meter and communications infrastructure, distribution grid management, and distribution grid management with implementation of other Smart Grid technologies and infrastructure, including all major subsystems and utility storage of customer information. If deemed necessary, the utilities should file appropriate portions of this material under seal.

In addition, because of the special emphasis in SB 17 on security issues relating to customers, we order that the Smart Grid deployment plans discuss the following:

- What types of information about customers are or will be collected via the smart meters, and what are the purposes of the information collection? Could the information collection be minimized without diminishing the specified purposes?
- Does the utility have or expect to have other types of devices, such as programmable communicating thermostats (PCTs), which can collect information about customers? If so, what types of information is collected, and what are the purposes of the information collection? Could the information collection be minimized without interfering with the specified purposes?
- What types of information, if any, does the utility plan to collect from the smart meter and HAN gateway?
- How frequently will the utility take readings from the smart meter? Is this frequency subject to change? Will customers control this frequency?

- For each type of information identified above, for what purposes will the information be used? The purposes should be articulated with specificity, e.g., “targeted marketing” instead of “promoting energy efficiency.”
- For each type of information collected, for how long will the information be retained, and what is the purpose of the retention? Could the retention period be shortened without diminishing the specified purpose?
- What measures are or will be employed by the utility to protect the security of customer information?
- Has the utility audited or will it audit its security and privacy practices, both internally and by independent outside entities? If so, how often will there be audits? What are the audit results to date, if any?

### **3.7. What Should be in the Smart Grid Roadmap?**

Any deployment plan requires a roadmap that indicates where the utility is going and how it proposes to get there. We discuss what the Smart Grid roadmap should contain.

#### **3.7.1. Position of Parties**

SCE provides the most thoughtful statement of what a Smart Grid Roadmap should include:

Each Deployment Plan should contain a Roadmap that lists the areas of technology evaluation and deployment under consideration by the IOU. The Roadmap should also provide provisional guidance on the timing of evaluations and deployments in each of these areas between years 2011 and 2020. The Commission should not dictate specific technology areas to be covered in Deployment Plans; instead, the Commission should ensure that the Plans address the Commission’s eight Smart Grid objectives. Technology areas included in the Deployment Plans are dynamic and evolving, and are subject to change as public



policy, business conditions, and technological capabilities change over time.<sup>153</sup>

SDG&E endorses a “roadmap of technologies and/or functionality planned over time as SDG&E drives towards meeting its Smart Grid vision.”<sup>154</sup> PG&E also advocates a similar approach.<sup>155</sup> DRA endorses SCE’s proposal for a roadmap.<sup>156</sup>

### **3.7.2. Discussion: A Roadmap Can Help Identify How Technology Deployment Aligns with Policy and Statutory Deadlines**

There is a consensus among those parties providing comments that a roadmap can provide useful information concerning technologies and their deployment, even though they will remain subject to change. The projection of the timing of Smart Grid investments can help the Commission and stakeholders plan to review the projects that are part of a utility’s infrastructure plans in a timely fashion and assist the Commission in its own budgeting and planning.

A key part of the roadmap should lay out how the proposed deployment of infrastructure would help to achieve important statutory and other policy requirements including the greenhouse gas reduction goals under Assembly Bill 32, the renewable portfolio standard, and the California Solar Initiative. The roadmap should also include the essential infrastructure steps that must be taken to provide customers with the access to consumption and pricing data pursuant to D.09-12-046.

---

<sup>153</sup> SCE Reply Comments at 3.

<sup>154</sup> SDG&E Reply Comments at 5.

<sup>155</sup> PG&E Reply Comments at 3.

<sup>156</sup> DRA Reply Comments at 2.

### **3.8. What Should the Section on Cost Estimates Include?**

It is reasonable that parties would seek to have an assessment of both the costs and the benefits that a Smart Grid deployment would produce. Due to the rapidly evolving state of Smart Grid technology, it is likely that costs will change as time goes on. Nevertheless, an early analysis of costs and benefits can help identify which technologies are mature enough to deploy. This section will provide guidance on how, in the face of uncertainty, Smart Grid deployment plans can provide useful information on Smart Grid costs.

#### **3.8.1. Position of Parties**

SDG&E argues that cost estimates “can only be of a very general nature” due to the early state of Smart Grid technology and that actual deployment will be based on lessons and pilots that have not been implemented.<sup>157</sup> Additionally, SDG&E warns that public estimates could create a technology backlash based on estimates that include a large amount of unknowns, including costs and technology viability. SDG&E suggests that any cost benefit analysis be specifically identified with the benefits outlined in Pub. Util. Code §§ 8360(a)-(g) as well as the Energy Action Plan adopted by the California Public Utility Commission and California Energy Commission. SDG&E advises that any review of the deployment plans’ cost effectiveness “should be limited to whether the utility’s proposal for achieving those objectives through smart grid investments is the most cost-effective alternative available in light of the specific system requirements and customer needs confronted by that particular utility.”<sup>158</sup>

---

<sup>157</sup> SDG&E Opening Comments at 6.

<sup>158</sup> SDG&E Opening Comments at 6-7.

SCE states that it “will provide filed costs or conceptual cost ranges for technologies” that are being evaluated or considered for deployment during the period covered by the deployment plans,<sup>159</sup> but that the estimates should be regarded as provisional and subject to change, and should be used for informational purposes only. SCE argues that its estimates can also include future technologies but “costs, benefits and ensuing rate impacts associated with these emerging technologies ... may prove impossible to accurately estimate” within the timeframe set by SB 17.<sup>160</sup>

PG&E states that there should be an estimate of costs necessary to build a Smart Grid. However, “the assessment of costs and benefits needs to continually be updated as new technologies develop” since some technologies may work and some may fail; as such, it will be difficult to provide specific costs to specific technologies and functions.<sup>161</sup>

Greenlining requests that a preliminary cost-benefit analysis take place during the consideration of the deployment plans. Greenlining suggests that utilities prepare “information on various alternatives in each phase of the Smart Grid” with an associated cost-benefit analysis for each alternative. Greenlining states that it is important for the Commission to consider costs and benefits at an early stage as it will allow the Commission and the utility “to make a fully considered decision regarding the best means to implement the Smart Grid.”<sup>162</sup>

---

<sup>159</sup> SCE Reply Comments at 3.

<sup>160</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 6-7.

<sup>161</sup> PG&E Opening Comments at 7-8.

<sup>162</sup> Greenlining Opening Comments at 12-13.

CLECA states that the Commission should ensure that “all associated utility investments are cost-effective.”<sup>163</sup> CLECA also argues that due to a large amount of uncertainty regarding future investments, “there is likely to be insufficient information on the costs and benefits of most smart grid applications.”<sup>164</sup> Furthermore, “smart grid technology should be deployed in a manner to maximize benefit and minimize cost to ratepayers.”<sup>165</sup> Finally, CLECA recommends that a deployment plan should include an explanation of how a cost-effectiveness analysis will be performed, using which data, how reliability and other benefits will be determined and how those will be linked. Additionally, costs per customer for each project should also be estimated in the plans.<sup>166</sup>

CFC suggests that the IOUs prepare a joint implementation plan on upgrades needed to meet national and state design standards and find efficiencies through consolidation of systems. This joint implementation plan would include a business case analysis with detailed cost estimates for bringing their systems into compliance with national and state standards and would be subject to public review.<sup>167</sup> In addition, CFC suggests that any deployment plan should include “an estimate of the financial investment necessary to build” a Smart Grid and demonstrate that the investment is cost-effective.<sup>168</sup>

---

<sup>163</sup> CLECA Opening Comments at 2.

<sup>164</sup> *Id.* at 3.

<sup>165</sup> *Id.*

<sup>166</sup> *Id.* at 4.

<sup>167</sup> CFC Opening Comments at 3.

<sup>168</sup> *Id.* at 6.

DRA supports a requirement for cost estimates in the deployment plans. DRA cautions that “any provision of cost estimates does not eradicate the need for a full reasonableness review.”<sup>169</sup> Further, DRA suggests that the Energy Division develop a standard business plan outline for use by the IOUs to allow a side-by-side comparison of the deployment plans.<sup>170</sup>

### **3.8.2. Discussion: Smart Grid Deployment Plans Should Include Cost Estimates**

No party disagrees on the need for the inclusion of cost estimates in an IOU’s deployment plan. In addition, there is near universal agreement that it is difficult to provide a reliable cost estimate based on future and unknown technologies and infrastructure investments. Nevertheless, as DRA comments, that does not dismiss the need for a cost estimate. As SCE states in its comments, it is already beginning preparation of projected costs for Smart Grid investments as part of the 2012-2014 General Rate Case (GRC) cycle.<sup>171,172</sup> The Commission understands the concerns raised by Greenlining and CFC regarding the need for detailed cost estimates as part of the deployment plans, but the Commission does not find that it would be possible to require detailed, projected cost estimates for technology that is undergoing dramatic changes in costs and technology today, or has yet to be invented.

The Commission understands that cost estimates provided as part of a deployment plan will be preliminary and conceptual. Commission approval of

---

<sup>169</sup> DRA Reply Comments at 4.

<sup>170</sup> *Id.* at 5.

<sup>171</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 3.

<sup>172</sup> PG&E, on the other hand, comments that it will provide “detailed and specific Smart Grid related investment proposals” in its next GRC filing for 2011-2013. See PG&E Opening Comments at 9.

costs for specific investment projects will still require either a GRC or special application process, as explained in Section 4.2 below. IOUs in their deployment plans shall provide high level (or aggregated), conceptual cost estimates of Smart Grid technologies and infrastructure investments that they expect to undertake in the next five years, and provisional cost ranges for potential Smart Grid technologies and investments for the following five years. IOUs shall also explain how their cost-effectiveness analysis was performed, stating any specific legislated or Commission ordered goal and clearly identifying which cost and performance data is used, and the reliability of both cost and performance estimates. Additionally, to facilitate Commission review, the cost per customer (or participating customer) for each project should also be estimated in the plans. If an IOU cannot provide this information, it should explain why this information cannot be provided. Such information will help the Commission in our planning and make the deployment plans more useful.

### **3.9. What Should the Section on Benefits Include?**

Logically, the benefits that arise from the deployment of the Smart Grid fall into several categories: 1) economic benefits that result in lower electric bills and better use of the electric infrastructure; 2) difficult to quantify benefits, such as increased reliability of electric power and the safety of grid operations; and 3) benefits that arise from the fact that the deployment of the Smart Grid facilitates compliance with California energy policies, such as the renewable portfolio standard and the ability to serve the charging needs of electric vehicles.

This section will address how the deployment plans should structure the discussion of the benefits that will result from a Smart Grid. This discussion, when combined with the discussion on costs directly above, seeks to facilitate a

comparison of a utility's Smart Grid costs and benefits and to enable comparison with the Smart Grid deployment plans of other utilities.

### **3.9.1. Positions of Parties**

SCE provides the most extensive statement of what this section of the deployment plan should include, arguing that:

IOUs should identify the types of benefits that they expect will be generated by each technology included in a Deployment Plan. SCE proposes that three overall categories of benefits should be used for this section of the Deployment Plans:

- (1) Policy Requirements – the technology is beneficial because, after evaluation and study, the utility believes the technology serves as a “best fit” for achieving compliance with regulatory or statutory mandates.
- (2) Reliability and Safety – the technology is beneficial because the utility deems it a “best fit” technology for improving system reliability, or maintaining or improving safety for our customers, employees, and members of the public.
- (3) Business Case – the technology is beneficial based on traditional net present value revenue requirement cost-benefit analysis.<sup>173</sup>

On the other hand, SCE cautions that

Costs, benefits and ensuing rate impacts associated with these emerging technologies may not yet be fully understood, and it may prove impossible to accurately estimate such items in the timeframe set by statute for Deployment Plans.<sup>174</sup>

---

<sup>173</sup> SCE Reply Comments at 4.

<sup>174</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 7.

PG&E similarly cautions that "... the assessment of costs and benefits needs to continually be updated as new technologies develop, are proven and then scaled up."<sup>175</sup> PG&E argues that "a 'Smart Grid' is not an end in itself, but is a process leading to a series of technology choices made in light of accepted and focused objectives and cost-benefit analyses."<sup>176</sup> In its Reply Comments, PG&E asks that deployment plans include "[e]stimates of the potential benefits of deployment plans in quantitative or qualitative terms where available and current."<sup>177</sup>

SDG&E also advises caution in assessing a program, stating that:

Smart Grid Deployment Plans should follow two paths for decision criteria: one path necessary to comply with state policy goals and the second path designed to pilot new technologies, learn, and on the basis of this experience, to build business cases based on existing technology and agreed-upon methods and procedures for evaluating costs and benefits.<sup>178</sup>

DRA provides broad support for the explicit consideration of the benefits that arrive from a Smart Grid plan, arguing:

Plans should include descriptions of how Smart Grid technology can be "deployed in a manner to maximize the benefit and minimize the cost to ratepayers and to achieve the benefits of smart grid technology" as stated in Public Utilities Code § 8366.<sup>179</sup>

---

<sup>175</sup> PG&E Opening Comments at 7-8.

<sup>176</sup> *Id.* at 4.

<sup>177</sup> PG&E Reply Comments at 3.

<sup>178</sup> SDG&E Opening Comments at 4.

<sup>179</sup> DRA Opening Comments at 7.



EDF sees environmental benefits as a key element of the Smart Grid and wants to ensure that such benefits are considered so that they become “a clear objective of smart grid deployment in California.”<sup>180</sup>

CEERT argues that “[b]enefits from Smart Grid deployment may also be measured in terms of reduced growth in annual consumption or peak load or reductions in the average cost of capacity or energy.”<sup>181</sup>

HomeGrid argues that “the Commission should evaluate utility proposals based on benefits to the ratepayer; attempting to mandate specific technologies, standards, or protocols at the current time in no way translates into ratepayer benefit, and could in fact be detrimental to the short-term and long-term health of California’s Smart Grid.”<sup>182</sup>

Concerning the Smart Grid and the provision of data to customers, TURN states:

“... the Commission should focus on providing ‘actionable’ data to residential customers. Moreover, irrespective of any quantitative cost/benefit analysis, any significant spending to provide wholesale prices to residential customers must at a minimum show that there are at least some qualitative ‘benefits’ resulting from these data.”<sup>183</sup>

CESA asks that the Commission track “all storage-related benefit streams including those related to cost, demand reduction, energy usage, and overall system efficiency enhancement.”<sup>184</sup>

CCTA comments that § 8360 itself:

---

<sup>180</sup> EDF Reply Comments at 2.

<sup>181</sup> CEERT Reply Comments at 16.

<sup>182</sup> HomeGrid Reply Comments at 4.

<sup>183</sup> TURN Reply Comments at 5.

<sup>184</sup> CESA Opening Comments at 6.

“... highlights several benefits of smart grid technologies including increased use of *cost-effective* digital information and control technology to improve reliability, security, and efficiency of the electric grid; dynamic optimization of grid operations and resources; deployment and integration of *cost-effective* distributed resources and generation; development and incorporation of *cost-effective* demand response, demand-side resources, and energy-efficient resources; and deployment of *cost-effective* smart technologies.”<sup>185</sup>

CFC endorses the use of a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis, stating “the utilities should sponsor a cost-benefit analysis supporting their planned development of the smart grid, in which the benefits and costs have been quantified, then allow others to critique the utilities work and develop alternative analyses.”<sup>186</sup>

CLECA asks for a stringent use of cost-benefit analyses, arguing that “SB 17 makes it clear that Smart Grid technology should be deployed in a manner to maximize benefit and minimize cost to ratepayers and to achieve the benefits of smart grid technology, including meeting stringent cost vs. benefit assessments.”<sup>187</sup> More specifically, CLECA recommends (quoting directly):

- Each deployment plan should also include an explanation of how the cost-effectiveness analysis of elements of the plans will be performed, using which data, how the reliability and other benefits will be determined, and how the two will be linked. Costs per customer for individual projects should also at least be estimated in the plans.

---

<sup>185</sup> CCTA Opening Comments at 3, emphasis in original, footnotes omitted.

<sup>186</sup> CFC Opening Comments at 4.

<sup>187</sup> CLECA Opening Comments at 3.

- Each deployment plan should demonstrate how the technology would be targeted in order to maximize customer benefits. Certain technologies for analyzing the state of the transmission grid, for example, may be best located only on certain parts of the grid rather than the entire grid.<sup>188</sup>

MegaWatt argues that in evaluating the planned deployment of storage as part of a Smart Grid, care should be taken to evaluate all the benefits, including, “transmission or distribution deferral benefits, reliability benefits, VAR management benefits, blackstart benefits, power quality benefits, ancillary service benefits, and other benefits. Moreover, since many forms of storage have zero emissions, zero water usage and are quiet, permitting is easier, increasing the probability of successful deployment.”<sup>189</sup>

### **3.9.2. Discussion: Smart Grid Deployment Plans Should Assess All Benefits**

There is significant agreement that the deployment plans should include a discussion of the benefits of proposed Smart Grid projects.

The parties see three general types of benefits. Parties view achievement of policy requirements as one of the benefits that we would expect from a Smart Grid. In those cases, where the investment in a Smart Grid is necessary to achieve a policy requirement, then the proper method for evaluating the investment is a least-cost analysis, rather than a cost-benefit analysis.

In addition to facilitating the achievement of other policy goals, Smart Grid investments could produce other benefits that are difficult to quantify, but potentially significant. Smart Grid investments could both improve the overall reliability of the electric grid and enable the development of work procedures

---

<sup>188</sup> *Id.* at 4.

<sup>189</sup> MegaWatt Opening Comments at 5.

that improve worker safety. In particular, knowing quickly whether a section of the grid is energized could enable the development of additional procedures to protect workers. Although these benefits are also identified in SB 17, we believe separating these from other energy and environmental-related policies is appropriate.

Furthermore, Smart Grid investment could also produce quantifiable economic benefits. The benefits estimates in the deployment plans should identify and estimate such benefits.

Finally, we note that several parties commenting on the role of storage commonly view storage as not just a simple substitute for fossil generation, but a technology that fulfills a complex role. As these parties point out, storage benefits can include reduced emissions, a reduced need for transmission, and a technology that both shaves peaks and increases the reliability of the grid. These benefits should be part of the assessment of the storage component of any Smart Grid project.

Those filing deployment plans should make every effort to assess all the benefits associated with the implementation of this new technology.

### **3.10. What Metrics Should Be Included in the Deployment Plans?**

The Ruling Amending Scope proposed a series of metrics that could be used to measure progress towards the implementation of a Smart Grid. The metrics were structured according to the characteristics as stated in SB 17. The Ruling Amending Scope's preliminary proposal was to adopt metrics, require the utilities' deployment plans to measure their performance against the adopted

metrics, and submit updates to the metrics as part of their annual report to the Commission.<sup>190</sup>

### **3.10.1. Positions of Parties**

PG&E cautions that it may be a challenge to choose the right metrics that will provide useful and objective information on achieving Smart Grid goals, “because the Smart Grid itself is still a ‘concept,’” and that choosing the wrong metrics may negatively impact incentives for development of new Smart Grid technologies and projects.<sup>191</sup> PG&E comments that until there are specific programs and projects, it may be difficult for parties to settle on the right types of metrics “that would apply for purposes of regulating or monitoring various Smart Grid activities and projects.”<sup>192</sup> PG&E further comments that the lack of national consensus on standards also makes it difficult to create a set of useful metrics. However, PG&E does provide an initial list of ten metrics based on the proposed list of metrics in the Ruling Amending Scope. The ten proposed metrics (quoting directly from the PG&E filing) are:

- Reliability Metrics – System Average Interruption Duration Index (SAIDI);
- Reliability Metrics – System Average Interruption Frequency Index (SAIFI);
- Renewable Resources Integrated – MWh of delivered renewables (prior year);
- AMI Meters Installed – Total Number and as a % of Total Customers;
- Home Area Network Coverage – Number and % of Customers registered to use 1 or more HAN devices;

---

<sup>190</sup> Ruling Amending Scope at 24-25.

<sup>191</sup> PG&E Opening Comments at 12.

<sup>192</sup> *Id.*

- Demand Response – Total MW of Dispatchable Demand Response;
- Energy Efficiency – GWh of EE Savings;
- Dynamic Pricing – Number and % of Customers enrolled in time differentiated rate programs; and
- Customer Information Access – Number and % of Customers enrolled with utility to access customer usage and pricing data.<sup>193</sup>

PG&E argues that there is a need for a workshop on metrics “so that all parties and Commission staff can arrive at a final precise set of metrics that meet the needs of the Commission while at the same time not overburdening or stifling the development of Smart Grid technologies in the marketplace.”<sup>194</sup>

SCE endorses the same ten metrics as PG&E. SCE also cautions against creating “costly, potentially ambiguous or onerous metrics that may not be correlated with the achievement” of the Smart Grid.<sup>195</sup> SCE submits that more metrics may be needed in the future, and SCE may propose additional metrics as part of their initial deployment plan filing in 2011.<sup>196</sup> SCE argues that the utilities’ proposed list of metrics should be adopted by the Commission for the “near term” so as not to “impose substantial incremental costs on IOU ratepayers for the IOU to collect and store the information.”<sup>197</sup> SCE cautions that the adoption of metrics for today’s technologies or future technologies that have not been evaluated “risks creating incorrect incentives for IOUs’ Smart Grid

---

<sup>193</sup> *Id.* at 12-13.

<sup>194</sup> PG&E Reply Comments at 4.

<sup>195</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 21.

<sup>196</sup> *Id.* at 21-22.

<sup>197</sup> SCE Reply Comments at 8.

investments.”<sup>198</sup> SCE opposes the inclusion of cost-effectiveness metrics commenting that development of such metrics is more appropriate for a GRC or other application instead of in the deployment plans. Finally, SCE does not support a separate workshop on metrics at this time.<sup>199</sup>

SDG&E also endorses the same ten metrics as PG&E. SDG&E cautions that a “fixed set of metrics may be counter-productive as a means to achieve the ten characteristics of a smart grid as defined” by SB 17.<sup>200</sup>

Tendril supports the use of qualitative metrics as “important and valuable tools to inform smart grid deployment strategies.” Tendril also proposes eight additional metrics related to distributed generation, carbon emissions, demand response and energy efficiency.<sup>201</sup>

EDF supports the initial list of metrics as found in the Ruling Amending Scope, as metrics will allow the Commission and the public “to monitor the implementation of the smart grid, without being overly burdensome to utilities.”<sup>202</sup> EDF proposes that new metrics be added that address greenhouse gas reduction and energy efficiency and that such metrics should better reflect SB 17. EDF suggests that these new metrics should set environmental targets for Smart Grid and measure that performance. EDF also provides comments on the proposed metrics and how to make the metrics more in line with current state energy policy goals.<sup>203</sup> EDF, on the other hand, does not support the short list of

---

<sup>198</sup> *Id.*

<sup>199</sup> *Id.* at 9.

<sup>200</sup> SDG&E Opening Comments at 19-20.

<sup>201</sup> Tendril Opening Comments at 9-10.

<sup>202</sup> EDF Opening Comments at 17.

<sup>203</sup> *Id.* at 17-20.

metrics proposed by the utilities. EDF states that those proposed metrics do not “reflect the nuances required to determine if the investments are working towards California’s policies.” Rather, EDF argues that the metrics proposed by EDF will allow parties “to have the level of detail ... to monitor the progress of the system on the mandated environmental policies listed in SB 17.”<sup>204</sup>

DRA supports the adoption of metrics “to measure progress in implementing a Smart Grid in California,” and supports requiring the IOUs to file them annually.<sup>205</sup> DRA argues that the Commission’s Energy Division should be required to “evaluate and report on the metrics after their submission.” DRA comments that the proposed metrics “are a good starting point,” but a workshop is necessary to develop the metrics even further.<sup>206</sup> Additionally, DRA states that new metrics may be necessary in the future as new technology is developed. DRA provides comments on several of the proposed metrics including those addressing cost-effectiveness and grid asset management, and questions the need for metrics on specific technologies on which the Commission has yet to take a position.<sup>207</sup> DRA does not support the ten metrics proposed by the utilities as they do not “go far enough to assure consumer protections, nor do they include any measurements of cost-effectiveness.”<sup>208</sup> DRA supports a workshop on metrics with the Commission’s

---

<sup>204</sup> EDF Reply Comments at 23.

<sup>205</sup> DRA Opening Comments at 18.

<sup>206</sup> *Id.*

<sup>207</sup> *Id.* at 18-19.

<sup>208</sup> DRA Reply Comments at 15.



Energy Division proposing a new list of metrics based on comments received in this phase.<sup>209</sup>

CFC comments that using metrics to measure progress “means achieving predicted efficiencies and lowering the cost of electricity,” and suggests that cost-effectiveness is a necessity “to measure the success of smart grid installations.”<sup>210</sup> CFC argues that any adopted metrics should not simply encourage the installation of Smart Grid technologies where new technology may not be needed as new technology may be installed prematurely.<sup>211</sup>

UCAN supports the use of metrics as an important way to measure “the achievement of deployment plan objectives.”<sup>212</sup> UCAN states that the Commission “should focus on results and net benefits more than build metrics.”<sup>213</sup> UCAN is concerned that the proposed metrics may not yield valuable information regarding Smart Grid investments and Commission review of those investments.<sup>214</sup> UCAN argues that if the metrics are too specific, the utility may attempt to build out to those metrics and miss potentially other, more cost-effective technologies that when combined with other technologies may provide more benefits to ratepayers.<sup>215</sup> Additionally, UCAN cautions that any metrics adopted up front “may be premature until more is known about

---

<sup>209</sup> *Id.*

<sup>210</sup> CFC Opening Comments at 8.

<sup>211</sup> *Id.* at 9.

<sup>212</sup> UCAN Opening Comments at 12.

<sup>213</sup> *Id.*

<sup>214</sup> *Id.* at 15-16.

<sup>215</sup> *Id.* at 16.

technology change and commercial viability.”<sup>216</sup> UCAN also provides specific edits to the proposed metrics.

CLECA is concerned that the proposed metrics presume that more is better, which may not be true. CLECA also states that the metrics do not address cost-effectiveness and should include “an assessment of the costs and benefits of deployment.” CLECA also provides specific comments on the proposed metrics.<sup>217</sup>

CEERT states that the proposed metrics are a good starting point, but should also address how existing infrastructure is being used more efficiently, how toxic and greenhouse gas emissions are reduced or avoided, and how the deployment plan helps meet renewable portfolio standard goals for distributed and non-distributed resources.<sup>218</sup> Additionally, CEERT comments that the proposed metrics do not address § 8366(g) of SB 17 that relates to worker safety, protection and productivity, nor do the metrics address utility employment and contributions to clean technology.<sup>219</sup> CEERT also states that any adopted metrics should be uniform and apply uniformly to all utilities.<sup>220</sup> CEERT does not support the proposed ten metrics offered by the utilities as the proposed metrics are not in keeping with SB 17 and do not acknowledge how the Smart Grid is helping the State’s ability to meet its policy goals.<sup>221</sup>

---

<sup>216</sup> *Id.*

<sup>217</sup> CLECA Opening Comments at 8-11.

<sup>218</sup> CEERT Opening Comments at 18-19.

<sup>219</sup> *Id.* at 19.

<sup>220</sup> *Id.*

<sup>221</sup> CEERT Reply Comments at 15.

Greenlining supports the use of the proposed metrics as a practicable way of measuring the deployment of Smart Grid against the goals of EISA and SB 17. Greenlining supports a yearly update by utilities to show how their Smart Grid deployment is measuring up against the adopted metrics. Additionally, Greenlining proposes several additional metrics that “would measure whether certain regions and/or communities” are able to “achieve the individual customer benefits of the Smart Grid.”<sup>222</sup> Greenlining also agrees that metrics on cost-effectiveness should be included in the final list of adopted metrics.<sup>223</sup>

IREC states that metrics will “provide an important means of measuring progress toward desired Smart Grid outcomes.”<sup>224</sup> However, IREC comments that progress toward achieving “outcome-related” metrics “will not only be a function of whether utilities have installed necessary infrastructure, but will also depend on the extent to which the Commission has adopted necessary policies to facilitate the outcomes identified in the metrics”<sup>225</sup>; as such, “progress toward achieving identified metrics will not solely be the sole responsibility of the utilities.”<sup>226</sup> IREC states that the best use of adopted metrics “will be to identify the need for new policies or changes to existing policies” that will allow the Commission to measure progress towards a Smart Grid.<sup>227</sup>

---

<sup>222</sup> Greenlining Opening Comments at 15-17.

<sup>223</sup> Greenlining Reply Comments at 10.

<sup>224</sup> IREC Opening Comments at 8.

<sup>225</sup> *Id.*

<sup>226</sup> *Id.* at 9.

<sup>227</sup> *Id.*

CDT-EFF supports the use of metrics “as a measure of Smart Grid deployment” and argues for the addition of several additional metrics focused on cyber-security and privacy.<sup>228</sup> CDT-EFF argues that the metrics should be “required components of all Smart Grid deployment plans and should be updated” regularly in subsequent proceedings on Smart Grid.<sup>229</sup> Additionally, CDT-EFF opposes a proposed metric that would provide specific information about appliances within a consumer’s home. CDT-EFF argues that any metrics associated with in-home deployment of Smart Grid technology may not be visible to the utility, and the Commission “should respect customers’ desire for privacy.”<sup>230</sup>

CESA supports the use of metrics as a useful way to track Smart Grid deployment success, and to provide “feedback on an ongoing basis so that program/policy adjustments may be made over time.”<sup>231</sup> CESA suggests several metrics that address the integration of storage resources, and that these storage related metrics “need to measure both the energy storage systems themselves and their grid-wide impacts.”<sup>232</sup>

Wal-Mart supports adopted quantitative metrics as a way to “assure accuracy and transparency in measurement of utility smart grid deployment.”<sup>233</sup>

---

<sup>228</sup> CDT-EFF Opening Comments at 35.

<sup>229</sup> *Id.*

<sup>230</sup> *Id.* at 37.

<sup>231</sup> CESA Opening Comments at 7.

<sup>232</sup> *Id.*

<sup>233</sup> Wal-Mart Opening Comments at 2.

### **3.10.2. Discussion: Quantitative Metrics Should be Part of Deployment Plan, but Workshops Are Needed to Develop Metrics**

The Commission agrees with parties that metrics should be adopted for inclusion in the Smart Grid deployment plans and subsequent utility reports because they will provide the Commission with a means to assess the state of the electric grid.

As the review of the comments of parties makes clear, the Commission received many comments from parties that recommended revisions to the proposed metrics, made arguments for numerous additions to that list, and called for workshops addressing these issues.

However, we find that the ten metrics proposed by the utilities are inadequate to meet the goals of SB 17 and do not address other important Commission goals. Therefore, the Commission declines to adopt the limited set of metrics proposed by the utilities.

We conclude that the limited record developed on this point is insufficient to adopt a full set of useful and informative metrics that are not unduly burdensome. Therefore, we decline to adopt an initial set of metrics at this time. Instead, we find merit in DRA's suggestion that a workshop is needed in order to create successful metrics that allow the Commission and stakeholders to measure the state of the grid. The Commission staff should review the revisions and additions proposed by parties so far in this proceeding, create a new list of proposed metrics, serve that new list to parties on the service list, and convene a workshop for the purposes of creating a final list of metrics to present to the Commission for adoption. We are aware of the time-sensitive nature of this process in order to be useful for the utilities' July 1, 2011 deployment plan filing. Therefore, we direct Commission Staff to issue a list of proposed metrics

within 60 days of this decision, and to hold a workshop within 30 days of that issuance. Upon the completion of the workshops, the Commission will invite further comments and subsequently issue a decision on this new set of metrics.

In conclusion, Smart Grid deployment plans will include metrics, but the specific metrics require further development.

#### **4. Other Issues Pertaining to Deployment Plan and SB 17 Requirements that Require Resolution at this Time**

##### **4.1. How Should the Commission Consider/Approve Deployment Plans?**

SB 17 requires IOUs to file Smart Grid deployment plans with the Commission by July 1, 2011 for Commission approval. The Ruling Amending Scope proposed that the IOUs file and the Commission review Smart Grid deployment plans in a single regulatory proceeding. The ruling directed parties to provide comments on whether this is the appropriate process for consideration and approval of deployment plans, or whether the Commission should review deployment plans via separate utility applications.

##### **4.1.1. Positions of Parties**

Of the parties that expressed an opinion on this issue, most agree with the Ruling Amending Scope's proposed single-proceeding process for initial deployment plan approval.<sup>234</sup> Greenlining supports the proposed process, arguing that:

... a single proceeding will allow parties interested in Smart Grid matters to participate more easily. In addition,

---

<sup>234</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 8; Greenlining Opening Comments at 14; Tendril Opening Comments at 5-6; CLECA Opening Comments at 5; TURN Opening Comments at 3 and Reply Comments at 1; DRA Opening Comments at 7; EDF Opening Comments at 13 and Reply Comments at 17; CFC Opening Comments at 2; PG&E Opening Comments at 8-10 and Reply Comments at 2; CEERT Reply Comments at 2.

the single proceeding can lead to more effective collaboration and a central clearinghouse with information about best practices and other beneficial information. A single proceeding would also better allow parties and the Commission to compare each utility's deployment plan to ensure parity between service territories.<sup>235</sup>

CLECA similarly argues that a single proceeding would allow utilities to learn from the experiences of other utilities, "as opposed to having [them] all pursue numerous similar initiatives at once."<sup>236</sup> TURN agrees, stating that it is "more efficient and sensible to evaluate all utility deployment plans in a single proceeding, so as to best compare the technologies, baselines and plans."<sup>237</sup> EDF explains similarly that "having plans considered in the same proceeding ensures[s] that they are based on the same standards and principles across utilities."<sup>238</sup>

While PG&E supports the review of initial deployment plans in a single proceeding, it also urges the Commission to "allow a good deal of flexibility and leeway in what the plans must contain and demonstrate."<sup>239</sup>

UCAN does not directly support the single-proceeding review process. Instead, it recommends deferring that issue to the IOUs, two of which have expressly supported it.<sup>240</sup> UCAN further states that it "envisions an annual or biannual submission of deployment plans by each utility, akin to the utility

---

<sup>235</sup> Greenlining Opening Comments at 14.

<sup>236</sup> CLECA Opening Comments at 5.

<sup>237</sup> TURN Opening Comments at 3.

<sup>238</sup> EDF Reply Comments at 17.

<sup>239</sup> PG&E Opening Comments at 10.

<sup>240</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 8; PG&E Opening Comments at 8-10 and Reply Comments at 2.

Long-Term Resource plans that are currently submitted to the Commission.”<sup>241</sup>

It also urges the Commission to require the IOUs to submit these plans to an organized set of stakeholders similar to the Technical Advisory Panel established for SDG&E’s smart meter deployment prior to submission to the Commission.<sup>242</sup>

SCE agrees that the deployment plans should be evaluated and approved in a single proceeding and further recommends the Commission approve or deny the initial deployment plans within 120 days of submission.<sup>243</sup>

#### **4.1.2. Discussion: Combined Proceeding with All Companies**

In providing input on how the Commission should consider and approve Smart Grid deployment plans, most parties support the single-proceeding process. Some parties, however, confound this issue with how the Commission should consider and approve Smart Grid investments.<sup>244</sup> For example, CESA identifies problems with considering Smart Grid investments in GRCs and then recommends against considering deployment plans using that process.<sup>245</sup> Review of investments and review of the deployment plans are two different things. CESA, however, seems to reason that because the GRC process

---

<sup>241</sup> UCAN Opening Comments at 4.

<sup>242</sup> *Id.*

<sup>243</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 8-9 and Reply Comments at 5.

<sup>244</sup> TURN Opening Comments at 3; CESA Opening Comments at 6; Tendril Opening Comments at 5-6 (Tendril recognizes that GRCs may be the most appropriate venue for cost recovery issues but may also be too burdensome. It then concludes that a single proceeding should be used to address as many issues as possible. We surmise the Tendril must be referring to approval of the deployment plans); CLECA Opening Comments at 5 (CLECA raises concerns with reviewing Smart Grid investments in GRCs and then concludes that the Commission should review deployment plans in a single proceeding.).

<sup>245</sup> CESA Opening Comments at 6.



may be inappropriate for consideration of Smart Grid investments, it is also inappropriate for consideration of deployment plans.<sup>246</sup>

Upon our review of the comments, we conclude that a single proceeding involving SCE, PG&E and SDG&E will ensure the most efficient and thorough review of the initial Smart Grid deployment plans. Not only will a single proceeding process “help ensure some congruity”<sup>247</sup> in the Commission’s consideration of baselines, plans, and technologies, but it will also allow interested parties to participate more easily. We therefore reject separate review of each utility’s deployment plan. While each utility is required to file a separate application submitting its Smart Grid deployment plan, we expect to review the plans in a consolidated proceeding.

In response to parties that confounded the issue of how the Commission should review specific proposed Smart Grid investments with Smart Grid deployment plans, we also agree that the GRC process is not appropriate for consideration and approval of Smart Grid deployment plans. The GRC process is used by the Commission to determine the reasonableness of investments and is used by the utilities to seek recovery and approval of investment costs. Section 8364(a) requires the IOUs to submit a Smart Grid deployment plan for Commission approval by July 1, 2011. The purpose of § 8364(a) is not to approve or deny specific investments, but rather to approve or deny the IOUs’ proposed deployment plans.

---

<sup>246</sup> *Id.*

<sup>247</sup> DRA Opening Comments at 7.

## **4.2. How Should the Commission Review Proposed Revisions to Deployment Plans?**

The Ruling Amending Scope proposed that approved Smart Grid deployment plans be used to establish a baseline for measuring deployment of Smart Grid technologies and capabilities. It also proposed requiring the IOUs to file status reports that update the plan every year starting October 1, 2010 and continuing through October 1, 2020. The ruling proposed that the reports reflect information that is current as of June 30 of the year in which the report is filed.

### **4.2.1. Positions of Parties**

While the parties agree that the Commission should review and approve initial deployment plans in a single proceeding, there is a wider variety of opinions regarding the Commission's review of annual status reports, including updates to the deployment plans. Most parties agree that the Commission should provide a process for annual approval of deployment plan updates.<sup>248</sup> Parties differ, however, on whether this process should take place as part of a single proceeding or via separate advice letter filings or applications.<sup>249</sup> These updates are important as a reference point for Smart Grid investments and to inform the Commission's annual report to the Legislature, as required by SB 17.<sup>250</sup>

---

<sup>248</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 8 and Reply Comments at 5; DRA Opening Comments at 3; SDG&E Opening Comments at 4-5 and Reply Comments at 4; CEERT Opening Comments at 4-5 and Reply Comments at 2; SCE Opening Comments at 5.

<sup>249</sup> CEERT Reply Comments at 2 (recommends a single proceeding); EDF Reply Comments at 17 (recommends a single proceeding); PG&E Opening Comments at 8-9 (recommends separate proceedings); DRA Reply Comments at 6-8 (recommends the Commission review updates via advice letter and an application process after the initial five years); SDG&E Reply Comments at 4-5 (recommends the advice letter process).

<sup>250</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 4; DRA Opening Comments at 3; CEERT Opening Comments at 4-5.

SCE argues that:

. . . updates will . . . prove critical if Deployment Plans are referenced in reasonableness reviews of specific Smart Grid investment proposals. In order that Deployment Plans effectively serve this function, they must reflect a current description of the policy, operational, and business drivers of Smart Grid development.<sup>251</sup>

CEERT recommends the Commission review annual deployment plan progress reports and updates as part of a single proceeding.<sup>252</sup> PG&E disagrees, arguing that “updates and revisions to individual utility plans should be considered in individual utility proceedings, consistent with the different procedural schedules for utility GRCs and individual applications in which Smart Grid deployment plans may be implemented or used.”<sup>253</sup> EDF, in contrast, asserts that “considering updates in one proceeding allows utilities to learn from each other and the public to better monitor the progress,” and “having plans considered in the same proceeding ensures that they are based on the same standards and principles across utilities.”<sup>254</sup>

SDG&E and DRA propose that the IOUs should update deployment plans annually via the advice letter process.<sup>255</sup> “SDG&E believes an annual update process can provide for adequate flexibility and opportunity for utilities to refresh and update . . . their deployment plans” and “will present an opportunity for others to submit suggested revisions and refinements to [their

---

<sup>251</sup> SCE Comments of 3/9/10 at 8.

<sup>252</sup> CEERT Opening Comments of 4/7/10 at 2.

<sup>253</sup> PG&E Opening Comments at 8-9.

<sup>254</sup> EDF Reply Comments at 17.

<sup>255</sup> SDG&E Opening Comments at 4-5; DRA Reply Comments at 6-8.

plans].”<sup>256</sup> DRA suggests using a Tier 3 advice letter with an extended protest period of 30 days to allow parties the opportunity to comment on updates.<sup>257</sup> It further suggests requiring the IOUs to file updates through an application after five years.<sup>258</sup> While SDG&E agrees with annual updates, it cautions against “overly burdensome procedures” in response to DRA’s proposal to allow thorough vetting of the updates through an extended advice letter process.<sup>259</sup> SDG&E is concerned that such a process will enable the re-litigation of earlier agreed-upon deployment plan components.<sup>260</sup> Therefore, it agrees with the “need to modify and adapt Smart Grid Deployment Plans to changes in technology and to accommodate consumer behavior” and supports annual updates, but it recommends that these annual submissions serve to “maintain an updated smart grid vision [rather than to] advise the Commission on a [utility’s] progress in implementing smart grid activities that have already been addressed.”<sup>261</sup> SDG&E asserts that thorough vetting can take place in the context of the Commission’s review of Smart Grid investments – through GRCs or special applications.<sup>262</sup>

The Ruling Amending Scope proposes that status reports be filed every year starting on October 1, 2010. PG&E disagrees with this proposed update

---

<sup>256</sup> SDG&E Reply Comments at 4-5.

<sup>257</sup> DRA Reply Comments at 6-8.

<sup>258</sup> *Id.*

<sup>259</sup> SDG&E Reply Comments at 3-4.

<sup>260</sup> SDG&E Opening Comments at 4-5.

<sup>261</sup> *Id.*

<sup>262</sup> SDG&E Reply Comments at 4.

schedule.<sup>263</sup> Instead of “establish[ing] a particular frequency of updating or reporting on Smart Grid progress,” the Commission should require an initial status report two years after approval of the initial plans and decide the frequency of subsequent reports based on that report.<sup>264</sup> SCE also opposes the Ruling Amending Scope’s proposed start date of October 1, 2010 for status report filings. Instead, it recommends these filings begin July 1, 2011 since the IOUs will not have a deployment plan in place to update by October 1, 2010.<sup>265</sup> DRA similarly agrees that requiring an update filing on October 1, 2010 is illogical and instead recommends annual updates commence one year from the date the deployment plans are adopted, in 2012.<sup>266</sup>

The Ruling Amending Scope proposes that annual reports “should also reflect information that is current as of June 30 of the year in which the report is filed.” SCE supports annual reporting but recommends that status reports be current as of December 31 of the preceding year because the utility planning cycle and compilation of metrics occurs on a calendar-year basis.<sup>267</sup>

Finally, in terms of Commission action on annually submitted updates, SCE recommends the Commission decide whether to accept or reject the updates within 75 days of submission.<sup>268</sup>

---

<sup>263</sup> PG&E Opening Comments at 7.

<sup>264</sup> *Id.*

<sup>265</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 10.

<sup>266</sup> DRA Reply Comments at 7-8.

<sup>267</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 10.

<sup>268</sup> SCE Reply Comments at 5.

#### **4.2.2. Discussion: Commission Will Set Update Procedure Following Review of Initial Deployment Plans**

Due to the importance of the Smart Grid, because this technology is rapidly changing and because the Commission will use deployment plans in assessing proposed investments, it is critical that these plans be up-to-date and “reflect a current description of the policy, operational, and business drivers of Smart Grid development.”<sup>269</sup> The plans should “be flexible and considered as living documents, which can be updated and revised as necessary when new technologies and standards emerge.”<sup>270</sup>

At this time, we conclude that the best way for the Commission to proceed is to review the first Smart Grid deployment plan for each utility, as discussed above, and as part of that proceeding, we will address when and how an update should be filed.

#### **4.3. How Should the Commission Review/Consider Specific Smart Grid Investments?**

The Ruling Amending Scope sought comments from parties to determine whether a GRC, special application or some other procedure offers the best venue for the review of Smart Grid investments. The Ruling Amending Scope noted that the parties addressing this issue had not voiced a clear preference on which venue would be best.<sup>271</sup> The Ruling Amending Scope invited parties to comment further.

---

<sup>269</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 8.

<sup>270</sup> DRA Reply Comments at 6-7.

<sup>271</sup> Ruling Amending Scope at 17.

#### **4.3.1. Positions of Parties**

DRA, in its comments argued that “[g]iven the evolving and vague nature of the Plans envisioned by SDG&E, there is no basis for compliance with Plans serving as strong evidence in reviewing specific investment requests.<sup>272</sup>

SCE argues in support of either GRC or special application reviews of infrastructure investments, stating:

SCE also agrees with the position stated in the Ruling that “Smart Grid expenditures should be considered in GRCs, and in limited cases in special applications.” While SCE supports the use of the GRC proceedings to consider many Smart Grid investment proposals, SCE reaffirms its comments made in Phase I of this rulemaking. Our earlier comments indicated that some Smart Grid projects may need to be considered in special proceedings. The Commission’s flexibility with regard to regulatory approach is essential.<sup>273</sup>

PG&E raises the practical issue of timing:

Because utilities are on different GRC schedules, the level of detail available regarding specific Smart Grid projects, investments and programs may vary, depending on whether a utility is ready to propose specific investments and expenditures in their detailed, current GRC applications or other applications.<sup>274</sup>

#### **4.3.2. Discussion: Application or GRC Offer Appropriate Procedures for Reviewing Smart Grid Investments**

No party expressed a strong preference over whether Smart Grid investments should be considered in a GRC or a special application, although PG&E has raised issues practical issues that arise from the timing of GRCs. Our

---

<sup>272</sup> DRA Reply Comments at 5.

<sup>273</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 9, footnotes omitted.

<sup>274</sup> PG&E Opening Comments at 10.

own conclusion is consistent with these observations – either a review in a GRC or in an application can provide sufficient Commission oversight of an investment.

Furthermore, since SB 17 aims to promote the deployment of a Smart Grid in California, we conclude that a utility may seek approval for Smart Grid investments either in its GRC **or** in applications filed no sooner than the filing of the first Smart Grid deployment plan (July 1, 2011). We believe either review path – as part of a GRC review of investments or in a separate application – offers a practical way to review proposed investments in a manner consistent with the goals of SB 17.

#### **4.4. What Reports Should the Commission Require Pertaining to Smart Grid Investments? When Should They be Filed?**

##### **4.4.1. Positions of Parties**

SDG&E states that annual updates “should provide an opportunity for utilities to refresh and update ... their deployment plans without re-litigating” the deployment plans that reflect technology developments and customer needs. Additionally, SDG&E states that it is more important that annual reports maintain “an updated smart grid vision than to advise the Commission on a utilities progress in implementing smart grid activities” already addressed elsewhere.<sup>275</sup> SDG&E comments that the Scoping Ruling proposes a status report to be filed by October 1, 2010, but the deployment plan will not be filed until July 2011, so “it is unclear what form this first status report should take, given that each utility will not have yet filed or received approval of their plans.”<sup>276</sup>

---

<sup>275</sup> SDG&E Opening Comments at 5, 7.

<sup>276</sup> *Id.* at 9.



SCE supports an annual deployment plan report that will inform the Commission's annual report to the Governor and Legislature. SCE comments that this update will also be critical to the extent a deployment plan is referenced in any reasonableness review of specific Smart Grid investments. SCE disagrees with the Scoping Ruling's proposal that the annual report be "current as of June 30 of the year in which the report is filed."<sup>277</sup> SCE states that since the utility planning cycle and compilation of metrics will occur on a calendar-year basis, the annual report should be current as of December 31<sup>st</sup> of the preceding year.<sup>278</sup> Furthermore, SCE argues that since the first deployment plan will not be filed until July 1, 2011, the utilities should not be required to file a deployment plan report until 2012. In the alternative, SCE proposes that for 2010 and 2011, the IOUs file a report based on their adherence to metrics as approved by the Commission, as well as any new metrics that may be appropriate as the Smart Grid develops.<sup>279</sup>

PG&E argues that the Commission should not "establish a particular frequency of updating or reporting on Smart Grid progress"<sup>280</sup>; instead, PG&E proposes to provide an initial status report on the deployment plan two years after approval of its initial deployment plan, or 2013. Only after that report is reviewed should the Commission set a schedule for subsequent reports and updates.<sup>281</sup>

---

<sup>277</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 8.

<sup>278</sup> *Id.*

<sup>279</sup> *Id.* at 22. See also, SCE Reply Comments at 6.

<sup>280</sup> PG&E Opening Comments at 7.

<sup>281</sup> *Id.*

IREC encourages the Commission to keep this proceeding open as a means to continue identification of evolving infrastructure needs. In order to accommodate this evolving process, IREC recommends that the Commission require updated deployment plans to identify new and additional infrastructure needs and functionalities.<sup>282</sup>

EDF supports requiring annual reports on the deployment plan.<sup>283</sup> Cisco also states support for annual updates “since it is likely that plans will be modified over time.”<sup>284</sup>

CEERT supports requiring an annual status report, including any updates to a deployment plan. CEERT argues that this annual status report would assist the Commission in preparing its annual report to the Governor and Legislature, as required by SB 17. Additionally, CEERT argues that SB 17 does not contain a sunset date and the Commission may want to consider extending utility reporting requirements beyond 2020. Furthermore, CEERT suggests that the Commission may choose to use the updates in a more programmatic fashion, analogous to an approved procurement plan. According to CEERT, this process “can accelerate the maturation of” the Smart Grid.<sup>285</sup>

DRA supports the submission of annual status reports “to measure progress relative to the baseline that reflects historical developments and includes an update of future plans.”<sup>286</sup> DRA suggests that the Commission provide more specifics about how the Commission will treat an update of future

---

<sup>282</sup> IREC Opening Comments at 7.

<sup>283</sup> EDF Opening Comments at 8.

<sup>284</sup> Cisco Opening Comments at 7.

<sup>285</sup> CEERT Opening Comments at 4-5.

<sup>286</sup> DRA Opening Comments at 3.

plans in the case of less cost-effective technology or optimistic forecasts than originally included in the initial deployment plan.<sup>287</sup> DRA also recommends that the Commission use annual status reports “as a means to track and review all Smart Grid investments as a whole,” that will allow the Commission to evaluate and potentially restructure Smart Grid policy where necessary.<sup>288</sup> DRA agrees with SCE and SDG&E that the initial status report should not be filed until 2012, and agrees with SCE that the initial reports should focus on metrics. Additionally, DRA does not oppose SCE’s request that annual reports be filed on a calendar year basis.<sup>289</sup>

TIA states that annual reports will be helpful to the Commission “as utilities continue to adopt and integrate new solutions as they become available.” Additionally, TIA comments that the Commission should expect flexibility in the updates as they will change over time.<sup>290</sup>

#### **4.4.2. Discussion: Annual Reports Are Needed to Provide Annual Data to Legislature**

There is general consensus for an annual report on the utilities’ deployment actions. However, there is some disagreement about the content of the initial annual reports and when they should start. SCE, PG&E and DRA agree that the first deployment plan report should not occur until 2012. SCE proposes that the 2010 and 2011 annual reports should focus on meeting any adopted metrics, which DRA does not oppose. Additionally, DRA proposes that the 2010 report include the initial baseline assessment.

---

<sup>287</sup> *Id.*

<sup>288</sup> *Id.* at 8-9.

<sup>289</sup> DRA Reply Comments at 8-9

<sup>290</sup> TIA Reply Comments at 3.

As discussed above,<sup>291</sup> we will reject DRA's request that the 2010 annual report have a baseline measurement; instead, the baseline is to be included in the utilities' initial deployment plan filing on July 1, 2011.

The Commission is sympathetic to the arguments of SCE that since the deployment plans are not scheduled to be filed until July 1, 2011, the 2010 and 2011 annual reports will not contain very much information on the deployment of a Smart Grid.

SB 17 is very clear. The Commission is to file a report with the Governor and the Legislature by January 1, 2011, and every year thereafter, with the Commission's "recommendations for a smart grid, the plans and deployment of smart grid technologies by the state's electrical corporations, and the costs and benefits to ratepayers."<sup>292</sup> We anticipate that the January 1, 2011 report will include a review of the steps taken by this Commission and the January 1, 2012 report will be based on the filings made in the utilities' first Smart Grid deployment plans that will describe the current state of the grid.

The Commission will require the IOUs to file an annual report that describes their current initiatives in regards to Smart Grid deployments and investments. The first report shall be due on October 1, 2012. Each annual report must include the following:

- A summary of the utility's deployment of Smart Grid technologies during the past year and its progress toward meeting its Smart Grid deployment plan;
- The costs and benefits of Smart Grid deployment to ratepayers during the past year; and

---

<sup>291</sup> See 3.4.2, above.

<sup>292</sup> § 8367.

- Current initiatives for Smart Grid deployments and investments.

Additionally, as described above,<sup>293</sup> the annual reports shall also include updates to a utility's security risk assessment and privacy threat assessment. Furthermore, the Commission will require the annual reports starting on October 1, 2012 to address the utility's compliance with North American Electric Reliability Corporation security rules, as well as future security guidelines and standards as identified by NIST and adopted by FERC. This will allow the Commission to monitor and ensure that the utilities are being pro-active in protecting the grid from security risks or threats.

The parties agree that October 1 of each year is satisfactory for the filing of annual reports. However, SCE requests that the reports be current as of December 31 of the previous year. DRA does not oppose this request. The Commission will reject this request. A nine month gap between the end of the calendar year and filing of the October report would not provide the Commission with timely information to report to the Governor and Legislature, as directed by SB 17. Therefore, the annual reports filed on October 1 of each year shall include information current as of July 1 of each year. This will provide the Commission with the most recently available information on the utilities' Smart Grid actions, and will allow the Commission to provide the Governor and Legislature the best available information. If we were to agree to SCE's request, the Governor and Legislature would be receiving a report using information that is over a year old, which would not be in keeping with the statute.

The Commission expects the annual report to inform the Commission, the public, interested parties and market participants of the utilities' Smart Grid

---

<sup>293</sup> See 3.4.2 and 3.6.2.

actions. The Commission will use the annual reports as a way to measure utilities' adherence to the vision and roadmap, as well as allowing the Commission to track investments against any adopted metrics.

Finally, CEERT comments that the statute does not contain a sunset provision for an annual report. At this time, the Commission will require a report every year through 2020, beginning in 2012. The Commission may decide to extend this requirement at a future date depending on the progress toward a Smart Grid over the next 10 years. Additionally, depending on the progress made by the utilities and the state, the Commission may choose to seek a sunset provision in the statute.

#### **4.5. Should the Commission Set a Demarcation Point for Utility Investments**

The Joint Assigned Ruling sought comments from parties regarding the potential for a Commission determined demarcation point for utility investments. Specifically, the Ruling Amending Scope asked whether the Commission should prohibit utility ownership of devices installed on the customer-side of the meter.<sup>294</sup> The Ruling Amending Scope did not propose a solution, but sought comments about how best could the Commission create a “regulatory approach to spur the creation of Smart Grid services, devices, and functions that allow for” interoperability between devices and whether a demarcation point would be an appropriate regulatory response.<sup>295</sup>

##### **4.5.1. Positions of Parties**

Tendril supports the use of a demarcation point to help the market develop. Tendril comments that there may need to be multiple demarcation

---

<sup>294</sup> Ruling Amending Scope at 26.

<sup>295</sup> *I d.* at 28.

points because placing a demarcation point at a central facility or utility office may hinder “the ability of a third-party service provider to effectively participate,” and therefore multiple demarcation points “may be advisable in order to anticipate multiple parties and business models.”<sup>296</sup>

CCTA comments that it “may be premature to determine whether a clear demarcation point between utility and consumers is necessary or appropriate” for Smart Grid devices to foster a market.<sup>297</sup> Nevertheless, CCTA suggests that the Commission should consider the issues surrounding a demarcation in a future proceeding.<sup>298</sup>

CLECA strongly believes “that a utility should not own equipment on the customer side of the meter” and that the “utility’s ownership should stop at the meter.”<sup>299</sup> CLECA warns that allowing the utility to provide technology to consumers would likely “stifle innovation and could lead to wasteful investment.”<sup>300</sup> Additionally, CLECA argues that customers may be unwilling to allow utilities to “reach into their homes and businesses.”<sup>301</sup>

Google supports a demarcation point at the meter, noting that “upstream of the meter has traditionally been viewed as exclusive utility domain while downstream of the meter has traditionally been viewed as an area of customer investment.”<sup>302</sup> Google comments that no party has “presented a

---

<sup>296</sup> Tendril Opening Comments at 10-11.

<sup>297</sup> CCTA Opening Comments at 6.

<sup>298</sup> *Id.* at 6-7.

<sup>299</sup> CLECA Opening Comments at 11.

<sup>300</sup> *Id.*

<sup>301</sup> *Id.*

<sup>302</sup> Google Opening Comments at 9.

compelling need” to change this structure, and that “there does not appear to be any need for utilities” to own devices that communicate with the meter.<sup>303</sup>

PG&E does not support the use of a demarcation point, “other than in a legal, jurisdictional sense.” PG&E comments that “the appropriate demarcation point between the utility and non-utility will depend on the systems integration function that the utility must perform,” and that a demarcation point could discourage competition and investments in Smart Grid technologies.<sup>304</sup>

SCE also opposes using a demarcation point as it is “impractical and ignores the nature and complexities of the architecture for advanced metering and home area networks,” and a demarcation point may be “irrelevant if consumer devices communicate with the electric grid over the internet.”<sup>305</sup> SCE argues that a demarcation point can be constructed through functional roles, rather than physical interconnection. SCE provides a proposed definition for a “functional demarcation point of utility service.”<sup>306</sup> Specifically, the utility would be responsible for functions essential to grid reliability, Smart Grid cyber security, and back office support to enable the HAN interface.<sup>307</sup> SCE proposes several functions that third parties could provide for a customer, including installation of devices, phone support, in-home support, and demand response.<sup>308</sup> SCE comments that any new services or technologies enabled by the

---

<sup>303</sup> *Id.*

<sup>304</sup> PG&E Opening Comments at 17.

<sup>305</sup> SCE Opening Comments at 23.

<sup>306</sup> *Id.*

<sup>307</sup> *Id.* at 24.

<sup>308</sup> *Id.*



Smart Grid “should not interfere with SCE’s ability to provide safe and reliable electrical service.”<sup>309</sup>

Wal-Mart supports the meter as the demarcation point.<sup>310</sup>

Greenlining supports the adoption of a demarcation point as it “would foster participation and innovation by third parties ... to develop technologies and consumer devices that will be compatible and interoperable” with the Smart Grid.<sup>311</sup> Greenlining supports the meter as the demarcation point, but it should not be a rigid demarcation point as it “may not be completely appropriate where innovative communications technology may break through the Smart Grid at a different point of interconnection.”<sup>312</sup> Additionally, Greenlining would not support a prohibition against utility participation on the customer side of the meter, as a utility may be able to out-compete a competitor in services and innovations.<sup>313</sup>

EnergyHub “does not believe a demarcation point is prudent” due to the early stages of technology development for customers and “care must be taken to ensure maximum flexibility as the market evolves.”<sup>314</sup>

DRA “continues to believe that customers should own all equipment on the customer side of the meter,”<sup>315</sup> and that a demarcation point should be set at

---

<sup>309</sup> *Id.* at 25.

<sup>310</sup> Wal-Mart Opening Comments at 2.

<sup>311</sup> Greenlining Opening Comments at 18.

<sup>312</sup> *Id.* at 19.

<sup>313</sup> *Id.* at 20.

<sup>314</sup> EnergyHub Opening Comments at 4.

<sup>315</sup> DRA Opening Comments at 20.

the meter.<sup>316</sup> DRA “sees no need for the IOUs to provide customers” with in-home devices and argues that “the market for consumer-owned devices and energy management tools should be allowed to fully develop.”<sup>317</sup>

TURN supports a demarcation point “for purposes of utility investments.”<sup>318</sup>

CEERT supports the adoption of a demarcation point at the meter, asserting that the utility can provide applications “relevant to delivery services,” and that applications “relative to after-the-meter services can be competitively provided by third parties.”<sup>319</sup> CEERT comments that utilities could also provide these “after-the-meter services,” but “should not have an exclusive right to do so.”<sup>320</sup> Fundamentally, CEERT argues that utilities should “not extend beyond their core competencies at a significant ratepayer cost or inappropriately constrain the ability for third parties ... to provide their services.”<sup>321</sup>

SDG&E supports the adoption of a demarcation point at the meter.<sup>322</sup> SDG&E argues that “the demarcation point should be based upon the services that are being provided by the utility and should not create utility obligations with respect to equipment and services that are not provided by the utility.”<sup>323</sup> However, the Commission “should not prohibit IOU’s from participating in

---

<sup>316</sup> DRA Reply Comments at 16.

<sup>317</sup> *Id.* at 17.

<sup>318</sup> TURN Opening Comments at 27.

<sup>319</sup> CEERT Opening Comments at 23-24.

<sup>320</sup> *Id.* at 24.

<sup>321</sup> CEERT Reply Comments at 17.

<sup>322</sup> SDG&E Opening Comments at 25.

<sup>323</sup> *Id.* at 25.

activities, or owning equipment, on the customer side of the meter that could potentially facilitate the development of smart grid interoperability.”<sup>324</sup> The demarcation point should not be set at a place that discourages “development of new consumer interoperability technologies and/or the utility’s efficient management of the electric grid.”<sup>325</sup>

EDF does not take a position on a demarcation point, but supports a process for an open and competitive market for providing Smart Grid products and services to customers by a wide variety of providers, including the utility.<sup>326</sup> EDF states “that it is essential that third parties are able and encouraged to provide behind the meter services.”<sup>327</sup>

GroundedPower cautions against the adoption of a demarcation point stating that utilities may own certain equipment inside the home such as rental water heaters or direct load control devices.<sup>328</sup> GroundPower suggests that “[t]he question of ownership should be viewed with flexibility to ensure that deployment of smart technologies is encouraged and not impeded.”<sup>329</sup>

AT&T encourages the Commission to set a demarcation point at the meter as “establishing such a demarcation point will promote investment and innovation in the sphere of home energy management.”<sup>330</sup> AT&T also states that

---

<sup>324</sup> SDG&E Reply Comments at 9.

<sup>325</sup> *Id.* at 2.

<sup>326</sup> EDF Opening Comments at 20.

<sup>327</sup> EDF Reply Comments at 24.

<sup>328</sup> GroundedPower Reply Comments at 12.

<sup>329</sup> *Id.*

<sup>330</sup> AT&T Reply Comments at 9.

“the location of the demarcation point should confer no advantage to one market participant over another.”<sup>331</sup>

Sigma Designs encourages the adoption of a demarcation point where devices outside a home are the utility’s responsibility, but devices inside the home are the customer’s responsibility.<sup>332</sup> Sigma Designs comments that setting a demarcation point at the home provides several benefits, including enabling innovation, improving price/performance, mitigating privacy issues, increases flexibility, simplifies the grid, clarifies responsibility, and improving security.<sup>333</sup>

#### **4.5.2. Discussion: Commission Declines to Adopt a Demarcation Point at this Time**

All parties support the ability of third parties to provide devices and technology that can be used by customers to become better informed, better manage their own consumption, and obtain new technologies as they become available to customers. Permitting non-utilities to provide devices and technology used by consumers beyond the meter facilitates the deployment of Smart Grid technologies.

In the Ruling Amending Scope, the Assigned Commissioner and ALJ sought additional comments from parties regarding the efficacy of the Commission instituting a demarcation point that would effectively prohibit the utility from providing and owning devices located inside a customer’s home or establishment. As the Ruling Amending Scope noted, the experience of a demarcation point in the telecommunications industry provides a useful example of how a demarcation point allowed for innovation of technology and

---

<sup>331</sup> *Id.*

<sup>332</sup> Sigma Designs Reply Comments at 1.

<sup>333</sup> *Id.* at 1-3.

overall reduced costs for customers. Many parties, notably PG&E and SCE, caution that the telecommunications industry may not be an accurate comparison, as there are many differences between the telecommunications industry and the electricity industry. Other parties, such as TURN, CLECA and DRA, warn the Commission that without a demarcation point, the utility could be allowed to ratebase investments that not all customers may want or need, thereby raising costs to ratepayers. Parties such as CEERT and Sigma Designs suggest that a demarcation point allows for increased innovation and allows for products to be marketed to customers in a timely manner, without needing to wait for a utility or regulatory body to act.

The Commission declines to adopt a demarcation point at this time. The Commission is certainly aware of the concerns raised by parties advocating for a demarcation point, but this is not the proper vehicle to address those concerns. The Commission does not have a sufficient record to make a decision on this topic at this time. The Commission will consider parties' arguments at the time the utility proposes investments in these devices, be it in an application or in a GRC. Nevertheless, the Commission is fully supportive of a competitive and innovative market for customer-owned technology and devices. Should a utility request ratepayer funds for a device or technology that it anticipates owning and operating and that is placed inside a customer's home or establishment, we will expect the utility to fully explain and justify why such an investment is needed, and explain why such devices or technologies have failed to be adopted widely. The Commission has generally supported the contention that costs should be borne by those who will benefit from the product rather than

by the ratepayers, and we will expect the utility to justify why the Commission should veer from this preference.<sup>334</sup>

## **5. Comments on Proposed Decision**

The proposed decision of Commissioner Ryan in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 of the Pub. Util. Code and comments were allowed under Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Comments were filed on \_\_\_\_\_, and reply comments were filed on \_\_\_\_\_.

## **6. Assignment of Proceeding**

Nancy E. Ryan is the assigned Commissioner and Timothy J. Sullivan is the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

### **Findings of Fact**

1. The Commission has consulted with the State Energy Resources and Conservation Commission (CEC) in developing standards and guidance concerning Smart Grid deployment plans.
2. The California Independent System Operator is a party to this proceeding and has provided the Commission with input on issues that affect it.
3. The Commission has permitted all stakeholders who desire to participate in this proceeding.
4. National standard setting bodies and other public and private entities, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gridwise Architecture Council, the International Electrical and Electronics Engineers, and the National Electric Reliability Organization recognized by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission are in the process of developing standards and protocols for the Smart Grid.

---

<sup>334</sup> See, D.10-02-032 at 107 (2010).

5. The timely adoption of communications protocols and interoperability standards by the Commission can speed development of the Smart Grid.

6. Deployment plans can create a “baseline” describing Smart Grid investments that can permit the Commission to determine progress by a utility in implementing a Smart Grid.

7. An approved Smart Grid deployment plan can provide a utility with guidance concerning Smart Grid investments and a rationale that can support a proposed investment during review of the project and help in the determination that the project is reasonable and consistent with the Commission’s overall Smart Grid vision.

8. The technologies that are used in the Smart Grid are undergoing rapid changes in capabilities and costs.

9. The best estimates of rapidly changing technologies capabilities and costs can be obtained close to the point of the implementation of a project that uses these technologies.

10. Because of the rapidly changing capabilities and costs of Smart Grid technologies, an assessment of the reasonableness of a project cannot be made accurately at the time that deployment plans are constructed.

11. A Smart Grid deployment plan that includes the following 8 topic areas offers a practical way of presenting a deployment plan that can demonstrate compliance with the policy initiatives of SB 17:

- a. Smart Grid Vision Statement;
- b. Deployment Baseline;
- c. Smart Grid Strategy;
- d. Grid Security and Cyber Security Strategy;
- e. Smart Grid Roadmap;

- f. Cost Estimates;
- g. Benefits Estimates; and
- h. Metrics.

12. The systematic presentation of a Smart Grid deployment plan can enable the Commission to understand and assess the baseline condition of today's grid even as it keeps its eyes trained on the grid of the future.

13. A common format for the Smart Grid deployment plan can facilitate Commission review and participation by interested parties in Commission proceedings.

14. A vision statement is needed for the Smart Grid deployment plan.

15. A vision statement will help orient a utility's efforts to upgrade its electrical system to meet today's requirements and tomorrow's needs using the latest technologies.

16. A presentation of a Smart Grid Vision Statement that shows that the proposed deployment plan advances a "Smart Electric Market" that is transparent and demand responsive, provides pricing information and promotes distributed power would be consistent with SB 17 policies and initiatives.

17. A presentation of a Smart Grid Vision Statement that shows that the proposed deployment plan promotes a "Smart Customer" who is informed, empowered and able to use electricity efficiently would be consistent with SB 17 policies and initiatives.

18. A presentation of a Smart Grid Vision Statement that shows that the proposed deployment plan promotes a "Smart Utility" whose grid is predictive and enabling, self-healing, and able to resist physical and cyber attacks while protecting customer privacy would be consistent with SB 17 policies and initiatives.



19. A baseline of current Smart Grid infrastructure investments is necessary to enable the Commission to understand where utilities are today.

20. DRA requests that the Commission set an October 1, 2010 deadline for the submission of a Smart Grid inventory of technologies.

21. A thorough inventory of Smart Grid investments can ensure that ratepayers do not pay twice for the same Smart Grid investment.

22. A Smart Grid strategy section of the Smart Grid deployment plan can offer a sense of direction and guidance for the development of the Smart Grid.

23. Setting rigid requirements as part of a Smart Grid strategy is not in the public interest.

24. A Smart Grid strategy that demonstrates how a utility can achieve the goals set out in SB 17 is useful for planning purposes.

25. There exist several communications networks in California's current infrastructure that may offer cost-effective means for providing the data communication that a Smart Grid requires.

26. A Smart Grid strategy that considers how to support the goals of General Order 156 as utilities purchase and build the Smart Grid is useful for Commission planning.

27. Grid security and cyber security are key components of a Smart Grid and important elements in any deployment plan.

28. Because of the current and planned deployment of Smart Grid technologies, there is also an urgent need to ensure that the utilities have appropriate security programs for physical and cyber threats/attacks.

29. Smart Grid technologies will introduce millions of new intelligent components to the electric grid that communicate in much more advanced ways than in the past.

30. The Commission and the public would benefit from assurances that the electric grid will remain secure with the deployment of Smart Grid technologies.

31. The goal of a security program for the Smart Grid is to provide security while not impeding the functioning of the grid.

32. Physical and cyber security of the Smart Grid is needed to ensure the reliability of the grid and the privacy, reliability and confidentiality of the information that is transmitted.

33. The Smart Grid deployment plans can provide the Commission and the public with insight into the security of the Smart Grid.

34. A robust Smart Grid security strategy should address physical, cyber and human threats to the Smart Grid's operations.

35. The developing NIST framework will address many of the security issues that are arising from the Smart Grid technology deployment.

36. NIST and DHS have identified and prepared key documents concerning cyber security 'standards' that provide guidance on cyber security issues that are applicable to Smart Grid deployment plans. These include:

- a. Security Profile for Advanced Metering Infrastructure, v 1.0, Advanced Security Acceleration Project - Smart Grid, December 10, 2009 provides guidance and security controls to organizations developing or implementing AMI solutions, including the meter data management system up to and including the HAN interface of the smart meter;<sup>335</sup>
- b. Catalog of Control Systems Security: Recommendations for Standards Developers, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, National Cyber Security Division, September 2009 presents a compilation of practices that various industry

---

<sup>335</sup> Available at:

[http://osgug.ucaiuug.org/utilisec/amisec/Shared%20Documents/AMI%20Security%20Profile%20\(ASAP-SG\)/AMI%20Security%20Profile%20-%20v1\\_0.pdf](http://osgug.ucaiuug.org/utilisec/amisec/Shared%20Documents/AMI%20Security%20Profile%20(ASAP-SG)/AMI%20Security%20Profile%20-%20v1_0.pdf)

- bodies have recommended to increase the security of control systems from both physical and cyber attacks; and
- c. Department of Homeland Security developed the Cyber Security Procurement Language for Control Systems to provide guidance to procuring cyber security technologies for control systems products and services ms.

37. An effective security strategy should include a systematic risk assessment that addresses the prevention of, preparation for, protection against, mitigation of, response to, and recovery from security threats for the utilities' advanced metering infrastructure, distribution grid management, and Smart Grid operations.

38. Answering certain questions in a Smart Grid deployment plan will help the Commission ensure that the information pertaining to customers and their usage of electricity and power is secure. These questions include:

- a. What types of information about customers are or will be collected via the smart meters, and what are the purposes of the information collection? Could the information collection be minimized without diminishing the specified purposes?
- b. Does the utility have or expect to have other types of devices, such as programmable communicating thermostats, which can collect information about customers? If so, what types of information is collected, and what are the purposes of the information collection? Could the information collection be minimized without interfering with the specified purposes?
- c. What types of information, if any, does the utility plan to collect from the smart meter and HAN gateway?
- d. How frequently will the utility take readings from the smart meter? Is this frequency subject to change? Will customers control this frequency?
- e. For each type of information identified above, for what purposes will the information be used? The purposes

- should be articulated with specificity, e.g., “targeted marketing” instead of “promoting energy efficiency.”
- f. For each type of information collected, for how long will the information be retained, and what is the purpose of the retention? Could the retention period be shortened without diminishing the specified purpose?
  - g. What measures are or will be employed by the utility to protect the security of customer information?
  - h. Has the utility audited or will it audit its security and privacy practices, both internally and by independent outside entities? If so, how often will there be audits? What are the audit results to date, if any?
39. A Smart Grid Roadmap can provide useful information concerning technologies and their deployment, even though a roadmap remains subject to change.
40. A Smart Grid Roadmap can assist the Commission in conducting timely reviews and in the Commission’s own budgeting and planning.
41. A Smart Grid Roadmap can show how a proposed deployment of infrastructure can aid California in meeting the deadlines adopted in legislation for renewable energy projects.
42. A Smart Grid Roadmap can facilitate the identification of essential infrastructure steps needed to provide customers with access to consumption and pricing data.
43. A section on Cost Estimates in Smart Grid deployment plans can include preliminary and conceptual costs.
44. Cost estimates for technologies associated with the Smart Grid are undergoing dramatic changes.
45. The technologies used in the Smart Grid are undergoing dramatic changes.

46. Preliminary information on costs will help the Commission in its planning and make Smart Grid deployment plans more useful.

47. Estimates of costs over a 5-year planning horizon are useful.

48. The Benefits Estimates section should discuss the range of benefits that a proposed Smart Grid project will produce.

49. The benefits of the Smart Grid can be efficiently organized into three broad categories: 1) benefits of compliance with legal and regulatory goals and requirements; 2) other benefits that are difficult to quantify or price, such as safety benefits; and 3) benefits that are simple to quantify and are sometimes called “business-case” benefits.

50. An assessment of the incremental benefits that arise from incremental expenditures will be most useful in deployment plans.

51. The benefits of storage extend beyond substituting for fossil generation.

52. The inclusion of a section on Metrics in the Smart Grid deployment plan will provide the Commission with a means to assess the state of the electric grid.

53. The choice of metrics raises questions that are not resolved at this time.

54. The consideration of all utility Smart Grid deployment plans in a single proceeding offers administrative efficiencies.

55. Because of the importance of the Smart Grid, because this technology is rapidly changing and because the Commission will use deployment plans in assessing proposed investments, it is critical that these plans be up-to-date.

56. Smart Grid technologies and investments are most similar to the technologies and investments considered under the Advanced Metering Infrastructure, which the Commission reviewed through applications.

57. A General Rate Case encompasses a utility's entire portfolio of investments as well as operating and maintenance costs and occurs at intervals of 3 to 5 years.

58. SB 17 requires that Smart Grid deployment plans be filed by July 1, 2011.

59. The Smart Grid deployment plans filed by July 1, 2011 will contain a report on the current state of the Smart Grid.

60. SB 17 requires an annual report to the Governor and Legislature by the Commission on the status of the Smart Grid.

61. An annual report filed by utilities on Smart Grid developments will facilitate the Commission's preparation of the report required annually by SB 17.

### **Conclusions of Law**

1. The Commission has complied with the terms of § 8362 (a) of the Pub. Util. Code which requires that the Commission consult with the Energy Commission, the ISO and other key stakeholders in determining the requirements for Smart Grid deployment plans.

2. It is reasonable and consistent with Senate Bill 17 to defer consideration of standards and protocols for the Smart Grid until further action by National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gridwise Architecture Council, the International Electrical and Electronics Engineers, and the National Electric Reliability Organization recognized by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

3. It is reasonable to require utilities to seek the Commission adoption of communications protocols and interoperability standards in their deployment plans.

4. It is reasonable and consistent with Senate Bill 17 to use Smart Grid deployment plans to develop a baseline against which to measure a utility's progress towards deploying a Smart Grid.

5. It is reasonable and consistent with Senate Bill 17 to use the Smart Grid deployment plans to guide utility investments in the Smart Grid to ensure that they promote the policy goals adopted by the Commission pursuant to SB 17 and EISA.

6. It is reasonable and consistent with Senate Bill 17 to use the Smart Grid deployment plans as a rationale that supports a proposed investment during the determination of whether a specific project is reasonable and consistent with the Commission's overall Smart Grid vision.

7. It is not reasonable to use a Smart Grid deployment plan to confer a presumption of reasonableness on a specific investment project.

8. It is reasonable to require Smart Grid deployment plans to follow the eight-element format as follows:

- a. Smart Grid Vision Statement;
- b. Deployment Baseline;
- c. Smart Grid Strategy;
- d. Grid Security and Cyber Security Strategy;
- e. Smart Grid Roadmap;
- f. Cost Estimates;
- g. Benefits Estimates; and
- h. Metrics.

9. Smart Grid policy goals consistent with the initiatives and policies of SB 17 include that the Smart Grid:

- a. Be self-healing and resilient;

- b. Motivate consumers to actively participate in the operations of the grid;
- c. Resist attack;
- d. Provide higher quality of power and avoid outages;
- e. Accommodate all generation and storage options,
- f. Enable electricity markets to flourish;
- g. Run the grid more efficiently; and
- h. Enable penetration of intermittent power generation sources.

10. It is reasonable to require that each Smart Grid deployment plan has a Smart Grid Vision Statement that includes three areas: "Smart Market," "Smart Customer," and "Smart Utility."

11. It is reasonable to require a baseline inventory of Smart Grid investments in the Deployment Baseline section of the Smart Grid deployment plan.

12. Requiring a Smart Grid inventory by October 1, 2010 is inconsistent with the intent of SB 17, which does not require the filing of Smart Grid deployment plans until July 1, 2011.

13. It is reasonable to determine the current state of privacy actions by asking utilities, as part of their Smart Grid deployment plan, to answer the following questions concerning the data of customers:

- a. What data is the utility now collecting?
- b. For what purpose is the data being collected?
- c. With whom will the utility currently share the data?
- d. How long will the utility currently keep the data?
- e. What confidence does the utility have that the data will be accurate and reliable enough for the purposes for which the data will be used?
- f. How does the utility protect the data against loss or misuse?



- g. How do individuals have access to the data about themselves? and
- h. What audit, oversight and enforcement mechanisms does the utility have in place to ensure that the utility is following their own rules?

14. It is reasonable to require the Smart Grid strategy component of the Smart Grid deployment plan to offer a sense of direction and guidance for future investments and to show how a utility can achieve the goals set out in SB 17.

15. It is reasonable to require the strategy section of the Smart Grid deployment plan to include an assessment as to whether current telecommunications infrastructure can plan a role in providing cost-effective data communications that the Smart Grid requires.

16. It is reasonable to require the strategy section of a Smart Grid deployment plan to consider how interoperability standards will be used and how the utility will minimize the risk of stranded costs in cases where consensus standards do not yet exist.

17. It is reasonable to require the strategy section of a Smart Grid deployment plan to assess how Smart Grid acquisitions can promote the goals of General Order 156.

18. It is reasonable to require that the Grid Security and Cyber Security Strategy section of the Smart Grid deployment plans address the guidance documents that NIST and DHS are developing.

19. It is reasonable to require that the Grid Security and Cyber Security Strategy section of the Smart Grid deployment plan include a systematic risk assessment that addresses the prevention of, preparation for, protection against, mitigation of, response to, and recovery from security threats for the utilities'

advanced metering infrastructure, distribution grid management, and Smart Grid operations.

20. SB 17 places a special emphasis on security issues relating to customers.

21. It is reasonable to require that the Grid Security and Cyber Security Strategy section of the Smart Grid deployment plan address questions relating to the security of information pertaining to customers.

22. It is reasonable to require that the Smart Grid Roadmap section of the Smart Grid deployment plan provide the timetable for Smart Grid infrastructure investments.

23. It is reasonable to require that the Cost Estimates section of the Smart Grid deployment plan include cost estimates, even though these estimates are necessarily preliminary due to the rapidly changing technologies and costs involved with the Smart Grid.

24. It is reasonable to require that the Cost Estimates section of the Smart Grid deployment plan include 5-year estimates of costs.

25. It is reasonable to require that the Benefits Estimate section of the Smart Grid deployment plan be organized into three broad categories: (a) benefits of compliance with legal and regulatory goals and requirements; (b) other benefits that are difficult to quantify or price, such as safety benefits; and (c) benefits that are simple to quantify and are sometimes called “business-case” benefits.

26. It is reasonable to require Smart Grid deployment plans to include a section on Metrics that go beyond simple “build” measurements.

27. It is reasonable to order further workshops and to seek additional comments on the choice of Smart Grid metrics for inclusion in deployment plans.

28. It is reasonable to consider all utility Smart Grid deployment plans in a single proceeding.

29. There is insufficient record to permit a determination as to whether prohibiting utility investment beyond the meter is in the public interest.

30. It is reasonable to determine the next steps in updating Smart Grid deployment plans during the proceeding to review the initial deployment plans.

31. It is reasonable to review proposed Smart Grid investments in either a General Rate Case or in an application, provided that the application is not filed before the filing of the utility's first Smart Grid deployment plan.

32. It is reasonable to require annual reports on the status of the Smart Grid commencing on October 1, 2012 that will provide the status of Smart Grid investments as of July 1 of the year in which the report is filed.

## **O R D E R**

### **IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company each shall file an application no later than July 1, 2011 submitting its Smart Grid deployment plan, consistent with Senate Bill 17 (Padilla), Chapter 327, Statutes of 2009, and the requirements in this decision. Each utility shall serve its application on the service lists for Rulemaking 08-12-009 and any open Long Term Procurement Plan proceedings. If the utility has a pending general rate case proceeding, it shall also serve its application on that proceeding's service list.

2. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company each shall follow an eight-element format in its Smart Grid deployment plan as follows:

a. Smart Grid Vision Statement;

- b. Deployment Baseline;
- c. Smart Grid Strategy;
- d. Grid Security and Cyber Security Strategy;
- e. Smart Grid Roadmap;
- f. Cost Estimates;
- g. Benefits Estimates; and
- h. Metrics.

3. In the Smart Grid Vision Statement section of its Smart Grid deployment plan, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company each shall address how the grid can achieve the following policies contained in Senate Bill 17:

- a. Be self-healing and resilient;
- b. Motivate consumers to actively participate in the operations of the grid;
- c. Resist attack;
- d. Provide higher quality of power and avoid outages;
- e. Accommodate all generation and storage options;
- f. Enable electricity markets to flourish;
- g. Run the grid more efficiently; and
- h. Enable penetration of intermittent power generation sources.

Each Smart Grid Vision Statement must also include three sections addressing: (a) Smart Market; (b) Smart Customer; and (c) Smart Utility.

4. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company each shall include in its Smart Grid deployment plan an inventory of current Smart Grid infrastructure investments and a baseline assessment of privacy and security issues affecting the Smart Grid. Each plan must answer the following questions:

- a. What data is the utility now collecting?
- b. For what purpose is the data being collected?
- c. With whom will the utility currently share the data?
- d. How long will the utility currently keep the data?
- e. What confidence does the utility have that the data will be accurate and reliable enough for the purposes for which the data will be used?
- f. How does the utility protect the data against loss or misuse?
- g. How do individuals have access to the data about themselves? and
- h. What audit, oversight and enforcement mechanisms does the utility have in place to ensure that the utility is following their own rules?

5. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company each shall include in its Smart Grid deployment plan a Smart Grid Strategy section that demonstrates how a utility can achieve the goals in Senate Bill 17 and promote the goals of General Order 156. In addition, the Smart Grid Strategy section must consider whether using existing communications infrastructure can reduce the costs of deploying the Smart Grid. The Smart Grid Strategy section must also consider how interoperability standards will be used and how the utility will minimize the risk of stranded costs in cases where consensus standards do not yet exist.

6. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company each shall recommend in the Smart Grid Strategy section of its Smart Grid deployment plan the adoption of communications protocols and interoperability standards.

7. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company each shall include in its Smart Grid deployment plan a section on Grid Security and Cyber Security Strategy.

8. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company each shall use, in the section on Grid Security and Cyber Security Strategy in its Smart Grid deployment plan, the guidance documents that the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the United States Department of Homeland Security have developed or are developing to promote cyber security. Specifically, cyber security sections must use the latest versions of the following three documents to guide their preparations:

- a. Security Profile for Advanced Metering Infrastructure, v 1.0, Advanced Security Acceleration Project – Smart Grid, December 10, 2009;
- b. Catalog of Control Systems Security: Recommendations for Standards Developers, United States Department of Homeland Security, National Cyber Security Division, September; and
- c. United States Department of Homeland Security Cyber Security Procurement Language for Control Systems.

9. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company each shall include in the section on Grid Security and Cyber Security Strategy in its Smart Grid deployment plan a systematic risk assessment that addresses the prevention of, preparation for, protection against, mitigation of, response to, and recovery from security threats for its advanced metering infrastructure distribution grid management, and Smart Grid operations.

10. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company each shall address in the section on Grid Security and Cyber Security Strategy in its Smart Grid deployment plan the following questions concerning the security of customer information:

- a. What types of information about customers are or will be collected via the smart meters, and what are the purposes of the information collection? Could the information collection be minimized without diminishing the specified purposes?
- b. Does the utility have or expect to have other types of devices, such as programmable communicating thermostats, which can collect information about customers? If so, what types of information are collected, and what are the purposes of the information collection? Could the information collection be minimized without interfering with the specified purposes?
- c. What types of information, if any, does the utility plan to collect from the smart meter and Home Area Network gateway?
- d. How frequently will the utility take readings from the smart meter? Is this frequency subject to change? Will customers control this frequency?
- e. For each type of information identified above, for what purposes will the information be used? The purposes must be articulated with specificity, e.g., “targeted marketing” instead of “promoting energy efficiency.”
- f. For each type of information collected, for how long will the information be retained, and what is the purpose of the retention? Could the retention period be shortened without diminishing the specified purpose?
- g. What measures are or will be employed by the utility to protect the security of customer information?

- h. Has the utility audited or will it audit its security and privacy practices, both internally and by independent outside entities? If so, how often will there be audits? What are the audit results to date, if any?
11. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company each shall include in its Smart Grid deployment plan a Smart Grid Roadmap that projects the timing of the utility's Smart Grid investments.
12. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company each shall include in the Cost Estimate section of its Smart Grid deployment plan estimated costs for the Smart Grid for the next five years.
13. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company each shall seek approval of Smart Grid investments either through an application filed no sooner than the filing of its Smart Grid deployment plan or through General Rate Cases.
14. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company each shall file an annual report in Rulemaking 08-12-009 on the status of Smart Grid investments commencing October 1, 2012 and annually thereafter through October 1, 2020. The filing of the annual reports will not reopen this proceeding after it is closed. Each annual report must cover Smart Grid investments up to July 1 of the year in which the report is filed, and must include the following:
  - a. A summary of the utility's deployment of Smart Grid technologies during the past year (July through June) and its progress toward meeting its Smart Grid deployment plan;
  - b. The costs and benefits of Smart Grid deployment to ratepayers during the past year;



- c. Current initiatives for Smart Grid deployments and investments;
  - d. Updates to the utility's security risk assessment and privacy threat assessment; and
  - e. The utility's compliance with North American Electric Reliability Corporation security rules and other security guidelines and standards as identified by the National Institute of Standards and Technology and adopted by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
15. This proceeding remains open for further consideration of metrics to be used to assess progress toward the implementation of a Smart Grid, and other matters within the scope of this proceeding.

This order is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at San Francisco, California.

**INFORMATION REGARDING SERVICE**

I have provided notification of filing to the electronic mail addresses on the attached service list.

Upon confirmation of this document's acceptance for filing, I will cause a Notice of Availability of the filed document to be served upon the service list to this proceeding by U.S. mail. The service list I will use to serve the Notice of Availability of the filed document is current as of today's date.

Dated May 21, 2010, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ ANTONINA V. SWANSEN  
Antonina V. Swansen

**N O T I C E**

Parties should notify the Process Office, Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2000, San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address to ensure that they continue to receive documents. You must indicate the proceeding number on the service list on which your name appears.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Commission's policy is to schedule hearings (meetings, workshops, etc.) in locations that are accessible to people with disabilities. To verify that a particular location is accessible, call: Calendar Clerk (415) 703-1203.

If specialized accommodations for the disabled are needed, e.g., sign language interpreters, those making the arrangements must call the Public Advisor at (415) 703-2074 or TDD# (415) 703-2032 five working days in advance of the event.

\*\*\*\*\* PARTIES \*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\* SERVICE LIST

**Last Updated on 21-MAY-2010 by:  
AMT  
R0812009 LIST**

Marc D. Joseph  
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO  
601 GATEWAY BLVD. STE 1000  
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO CA 94080  
(650) 589-1660  
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com  
For: Coalition of California Utility Employees

---

Nora Sheriff  
ALCANTAR & KAHL  
33 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1850  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 421-4143  
nes@a-klaw.com  
For: EPUC

---

Keith Krom  
AT&T SERVICES, INC.  
525 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2027  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 778-1420  
keith.krom@att.com  
For: AT&T Services, Inc.

---

Len Canty  
BLACK ECONOMIC COUNCIL  
484 LAKE PARK AVENUE, SUITE 338  
OAKLAND CA 94610  
(510) 452-1337  
lencanty@blackeconomiccouncil.org  
For: Balck Economic Council

---

Robert Smith, Ph.D.  
BUILDING INFORMATION MODEL-CALIFORNIA  
21352 YARMOUTH LANE  
HUNTINGTON BEACH CA 92646-7058  
(714) 536-1084  
bobsmithtl@gmail.com  
For: Building Information Model-California (BIM Education Co-  
op)

---

Xavier Baldwin  
BURBANK POWER & WATER

Lesla Lehtonen  
Vp, Legal & Regulatory Affairs  
CALIF. CABLE & TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSN.  
1001 K STREET, 2ND FLOOR  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 446-7732  
Lesla@calcable.org  
For: California Cable & Telecommunications Association  
(CCTA)

---

David Zlotlow  
CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPRTR CORP  
151 BLUE RAVINE RD  
FOLSOM CA 95630  
(916) 608-7007  
dzlotlow@caiso.com  
For: California Independent System Operator Corporation

---

Sara Steck Myers  
Attorney For  
CEERT  
122 28TH AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94121  
(415) 387-1904  
ssmyers@worldnet.att.net  
For: Center For The Energy Efficiency & Renewable  
Technologies

---

Marty Kurtovich  
CHEVRON ENERGY SOLUTIONS  
345 CALIFORNIA STREET, 18TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104  
(415) 733-4540  
mkurtovich@chevron.com  
For: Chevron Energy Solutions

---

Jeff Campbell  
MARY BROWN; JENNIFER SANFORD  
CISCO SYSTEMS  
1300 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W., STE. 250  
WASHINGTON DC 20004  
jeffrcam@cisco.com  
For: Cisco Systems

---

Alexis K. Wodtke  
Staff Attorney  
CONSUMER FEDERATION OF CALIFORNIA  
520 S. EL CAMINO REAL, STE. 340  
SAN MATEO CA 94402  
(650) 375-7847  
lex@consumercal.org

164 WEST MAGNOLIA BLVD.  
BURBANK CA 91502  
(818) 238-3557  
xbaldwin@ci.burbank.ca.us  
For: Burbank Power & Water

---

Dennis De Cuir  
DENNIS W. DE CUIR, A LAW CORPORATION  
2999 DOUGLAS BOULEVARD, SUITE 325  
ROSEVILLE CA 95661  
(916) 788-1022  
dennis@ddecuir.com  
For: Golden State Water Company

---

Daniel W. Douglass  
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL  
21700 OXNARD STREET, SUITE 1030  
WOODLAND HILLS CA 91367  
(818) 961-3001  
douglass@energyattorney.com  
For: Western Power Trading Forum/ Alliance for Retail Energy  
Markets (AReM)

---

Donald C. Liddell  
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL  
2928 2ND AVENUE  
SAN DIEGO CA 92103  
(619) 993-9096  
liddell@energyattorney.com  
For: California Energy Storage Alliance/ Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. &  
Sam's West, Inc./Ice Energy, Inc.

---

Lee Tien  
ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION  
454 SHOTWELL STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94110  
(415) 436-9333 X-117  
tien@eff.org  
For: Electronic Frontier Foundation

---

Lillie Coney  
Associate Director  
ELECTRONIC PRIVACY INFORMATION CENTER  
1718 CONNECTICUT AVE., NW SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON DC 20009  
(202) 483-1140 X111  
coney@epic.org  
For: Electronic Privacy Information Center

---

For: Consumer Federation of California

---

Rich Quattrini  
JACK ELLIS  
ENERGYCONNECT, INC.  
901 CAMPESI WAY, SUITE 260  
CAMPBELL CA 95008  
(408) 340-7940  
rquattrini@energyconnectinc.com  
For: EnergyConnect, Inc.

---

Field Pickering  
ENERGYHUB, INC.  
760 MARKET STREET, SUITE 1028  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102  
pickering@energyhub.net  
For: EnergyHub, Inc.

---

Mona Tierney-Lloyd  
Senior Manager Western Reg. Affairs  
ENERNOC, INC.  
PO BOX 378  
CAYUCOS CA 93430  
(805) 995-1618  
mtierney-lloyd@enernoc.com  
For: Eneroc, Inc

---

Lauren Navarro  
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND  
1107 9TH ST., STE. 540  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 492-7074  
lnavarro@edf.org  
For: Environmental Defense Fund

---

Robert Ginaizda  
Counsel  
1918 UNIVERSITY AVE., 2ND FL.  
BERKELEY CA 94704  
(415) 307-3320  
robertginaizda@gmail.com  
For: Latino Business chamber of Greater Los Angeles

---

Steven G. Lins  
Assistant General Manager Supply

Chase B. Kappel  
ELLISON SCHNEIDER & HARRIS LLP  
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400  
SACRAMENTO CA 95816-5905  
(916) 447-2166  
cbk@eslawfirm.com  
For: Sierra Pacific Power Co.

---

Marlo A. Go  
BRIAN T. CRAGG  
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI DAY & LAMPREY LLP  
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 392-7900  
mgo@goodinmacbride.com  
For: North America Power Partners, LLC

---

Michael B. Day  
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI DAY & LAMPREY LLP  
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-3133  
(415) 392-7900  
mday@goodinmacbride.com  
For: Counsel for Current Group, LLC

---

Michael Terrell  
GOOGLE INC.  
1600 AMPHITHEATRE PKWY  
MOUNTAIN VIEW CA 94043  
(650) 214-6398  
mterrell@google.com  
For: Google Inc.

---

Gregg Morris  
GREEN POWER INSTITUTE  
2039 SHATTUCK AVE., SUITE 402  
BERKELEY CA 94704  
(510) 644-2700  
gmorris@emf.net  
For: Green Power Institute

---

Carl Gustin  
GROUNDEDPOWER, INC.  
15 PLUM STREET  
GLOUCESTER MA 01930  
(617) 216-5765  
carlgustin@groundedpower.com  
For: GroundedPower, Inc.

---

Norman A. Pedersen

GLENDALE WATER AND POWER  
141 N. GLENDALE AVENUE, LEVEL 4  
GLENDALE CA 91206-4394  
(818) 548-2136  
slins@ci.glendale.ca.us  
For: Glendale Water Power

---

Lee Burdick  
Attorney At Law  
HIGGS, FLETCHER & MACK LLP  
401 WEST A STREET, STE. 2600  
SAN DIEGO CA 92101  
(619) 236-1551  
lburdick@higgslaw.com  
For: Higgs Fletcher & Mack

---

Martin Homec  
PO BOX 4471  
DAVIS CA 95617  
(530) 867-1850  
martinhomec@gmail.com  
For: CARE

---

Michael Coop  
HOMEGRID FORUM  
3855 SW 153RD DRIVE  
BEAVERTON OR 97006  
(503) 619-0676  
mcoop@homegridforum.org  
For: HomeGrid Forum

---

Joseph F. Wiedman  
KEVIN T. FOX  
KEYES & FOX LLP  
5727 KEITH AVENUE  
OAKLAND CA 94618  
(415) 829-2354  
jwiedman@keyesandfox.com  
For: Google Inc.

---

Kevin T. Fox  
KEYES & FOX LLP  
5727 KEITH AVENUE  
OAKLAND CA 94618  
(510) 381-3052  
kfox@keyesandfox.com  
For: Interstate Renewable Energy Council

---

Vladimir Oksman

HANNA AND MORTON LLP  
444 S FLOWER ST., SUITE 1500  
LOS ANGELES CA 90071-2916  
(213) 430-2510  
npedersen@hanmor.com  
For: Southern California Public Power Authority

---

William H. Booth  
Attorney At Law  
LAW OFFICES OF WILLIAM H. BOOTH  
67 CARR DRIVE  
MORAGA CA 94556  
(925) 376-7370  
wbooth@booth-law.com  
For: Counsel for California Large Energy Consumers Association

---

Edward G. Cazalet  
Vp And Co-Founder  
MEGAWATT STORAGE FARMS, INC.  
101 FIRST STREET, SUITE 552  
LOS ALTOS CA 94022  
(650) 949-5274  
ed@megawattsf.com  
For: MegaWatt Storage Farms, Inc.

---

Lara Ettenson  
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL  
111 SUTTER STREET, 20TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104  
(415) 875-6100  
lettenson@nrdc.org  
For: Natural Resources Defense Council

---

Scott Tomashefsky  
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA POWER AGENCY  
651 COMMERCE DRIVE  
ROSEVILLE CA 95678  
(916) 781-4291  
scott.tomashefsky@ncpa.com  
For: Northern California Power Agency

---

Mike Tierney  
Attorney At Law  
NRG ENERGY & PADOMA WIND POWER  
829 ARLINGTON BLVD.  
EL CERRITO CA 94830  
(510) 898-1847  
kerry.hattevik@nrgenergy.com  
For: NRG Energy

---

LANTIQ INC.  
67 CULFORD PLACE  
MORGANVILLE NJ 07751  
(732) 591-1790  
vladimir.oksman@lantiq.com  
For: Lantiq Inc.

---

Farrokh Aluyek, Ph.D.  
OPEN ACCESS TECHNOLOGY INTERNATIONAL  
1875 SOUTH GRANT STREET, SUITE 910  
SAN MATEO CA 94402  
(763) 201-2035  
farrokh.albuyeh@oati.net  
For: Open Access Technology International

---

Christopher J. Warner  
Attorney At Law  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
77 BEALE STREET B30A  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 973-6695  
cjh5@pge.com  
For: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

---

Peter A. Casciato  
Attorney At Law  
PETER A. CASCIATO P.C.  
355 BRYANT STREET, SUITE 410  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107  
(415) 291-8661  
pcasciato@sbcglobal.net  
For: Time Warner Cable Informat Service CA, LLC/Comcast  
Phone of CA, LLc

---

Dean R. Brenner  
QUALCOMM INCORPORATED  
1730 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W., STE. 850  
WASHINGTON DC 20006  
(202) 263-0020  
dbrenner@qualcomm.com  
For: Qualcomm Incorporated

---

Allen K. Trial  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY  
101 ASH STREET, HQ-12B  
SAN DIEGO CA 92101  
(619) 699-5162  
ATrial@SempraUtilities.com  
For: San Diego Gas & Electric

---

R.08-12-009 COM/NER/JT2

Margarita Gutierrez  
Deputy City Attorney  
OFFICE OF SF CITY ATTORNEY  
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, RM. 234  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102  
(415) 554-4632  
margarita.gutierrez@sfgov.org  
For: City & County of San Francisco

---

Fraser D. Smith  
City And County Of San Francisco  
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMM  
1155 MARKET STREET, 4TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103  
(415) 554-1572  
fsmith@sflower.org  
For: San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

---

Sandra Rovetti  
Regulatory Affairs Manager  
SAN FRANCISCO PUC  
1155 MARKET STREET, 4TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103  
(415) 554-3179  
srovetti@sflower.org  
For: San Francisco PUC

---

Theresa Burke  
SAN FRANCISCO PUC  
1155 MARKET STREET, 4TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103  
(415) 554-1567  
tburke@sflower.org  
For: San Francisco PUC

---

Harold Galicer  
SEAKAY, INC.  
PO BOX 78192  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107  
For: Seakay, Inc.

---

Michael Weissman  
SIGMA DESIGNS, INC.  
1778 MCCARTHY BLVD.  
MILPITAS CA 95035  
(925) 200-1047  
michael\_w@copper-gate.com  
For: Sigma Designs, Inc.

---

Steven Moss  
SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY POWER  
2325 THIRD STREET, STE 344  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107  
(415) 626-8723  
steven@sfpower.org  
For: San Francisco Community Power

---

Michael Rochman  
Managing Director  
SPURR  
1430 WILLOW PASS ROAD, SUITE 240  
CONCORD CA 94520  
(925) 743-1292  
Service@spurr.org  
For: School Project for Utility Rate Reduction

---

Lisa-Marie Salvacion  
Legal Division  
RM. 4107  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2069  
lms@cpuc.ca.gov  
For: DRA

---

Jim Hawley  
California Director And General Counsel  
TECHNOLOGY NETWORK  
1215 K STREET, STE.1900  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 238-1271  
jhawley@technet.org  
For: Technology Network

---

Joseph Andersen  
Consultant  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION  
10 G ST. NE, SUITE 550  
WASHINGTON DC 20002  
(202) 346-3249  
jandersen@tiaonline.org  
For: Telecommunications Industry Association

---

Cameron Brooks  
TENDRIL NETWORKS, INC.  
5395 PEARL PARKWAY  
BOULDER CO 80304  
(303) 468-4455  
cbrooks@tendrilinc.com

Kris G. Vyas  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY  
QUAD 3-B  
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE  
ROSEMEAD CA 91770  
(626) 302-6613  
kris.vyas@sce.com  
For: Southern California Edison Company

---

Marcel Hawiger  
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK  
115 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104  
(415) 929-8876 X311  
marcel@turn.org  
For: TURN

---

Judith Schwartz  
TO THE POINT  
2330 BRYANT STREET, SUITE 2  
PALO ALTO CA 94301  
(650) 906-9927  
judith@tothept.com  
For: To The Point

---

Steve Boyd  
TURLOCK IRRIGATION DISTRICT  
333 EAST CANAL DRIVE  
TURLOCK CA 95381-0949  
(209) 883-8364  
seboyd@tid.org  
For: Turlock Irrigation District

---

Jennifer Lynch  
JENNIFER URBAN  
Samuelson Law, Tech. & Public Policy  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIF, BERKELEY LAW SCHOOL  
396 SIMON HALL  
BERKELEY CA 94720-7200  
(510) 642-7515  
jlynch@law.berkeley.edu  
For: Center for Democracy & Technology

---

Aaron J. Burstein  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY  
SCHOOL OF INFORMATION  
SOUTH HALL  
BERKELEY CA 94720

For: Tendril Networks, Inc.

---

Enrique Gallardo  
SAMUEL S. KANG; STEPHANIE CHEN  
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE  
1918 UNIVERSITY AVE., 2ND FLOOR  
BERKELEY CA 94704  
(510) 926-4018  
enriqueg@greenlining.org  
For: The Greenlining Institute

---

Longhao Wang  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY  
SCHOOL OF INFORMATION  
SOUTH HALL  
BERKELEY CA 94720  
(510) 642-0499  
longhao@berkeley.edu  
For: Privacy and Cybersecurity Law and Policy Reseachers

---

Michael Shames  
MICHAEL SCOTT  
UTILITY CONSUMERS' ACTION NETWORK  
3100 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE B  
SAN DIEGO CA 92103  
(619) 696-6966  
mshames@ucan.org  
For: Utility Consumers' Action Network

---

Charles R. Toca  
UTILITY SAVINGS & REFUND, LLC  
PO BOX 54346  
IRVINE CA 92619-4346  
(949) 474-0511  
ctoca@utility-savings.com  
For: Utility Savings & Refund, LLC

---

Elaine M. Duncan  
VERIZON CALIFORNIA, INC.  
711 VAN NESS AVENUE, SUITE 300  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94102  
(415) 474-0468  
elaine.duncan@verizon.com  
For: Verizon California, Inc.

---

\*\*\*\*\* STATE EMPLOYEE \*\*\*\*\*

Wendy Al-Mukdad  
Energy Division  
AREA 4-A



R.08-12-009 COM/NER/JT2

(510) 642-0499  
aaron.burstein@gmail.com  
For: Privacy and Cybersecurity Law and Policy Researchers

---

Deirdre K. Mulligan  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY  
SCHOOL OF INFORMATION  
SOUTH HALL  
BERKELEY CA 94720  
(510) 642-0499  
dkm@ischool.berkeley.edu  
For: Privacy and Cybersecurity Law and Policy Researchers

---

Allen Benitez  
Consumer Protection & Safety Division  
RM. 1119  
180 PROMENADE CIRCLE, SUITE 115  
Sacramento CA 95834 2939  
(916) 928-2271  
ab2@cpuc.ca.gov

Bryan Lee  
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION  
1516 NINTH STREET - MS 43  
SACRAMENTO CA 95678  
(916) 653-8906  
BLee@energy.state.ca.us

Andrew Campbell  
Executive Division  
RM. 5203  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2501  
agc@cpuc.ca.gov

Laurence Chaset  
Legal Division  
RM. 5131  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 355-5595  
lau@cpuc.ca.gov

Michael Colvin  
Policy & Planning Division  
RM. 5119  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 355-5484  
mc3@cpuc.ca.gov

Matthew Deal  
Policy & Planning Division

505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2311  
wmp@cpuc.ca.gov

Valerie Beck  
Consumer Protection & Safety Division  
AREA 2-D  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-5264  
vjb@cpuc.ca.gov

Gretchen T. Dumas  
Legal Division  
RM. 4300  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1210  
gtd@cpuc.ca.gov

Damon A. Franz  
Energy Division  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2165  
df1@cpuc.ca.gov

Farzad Ghazzagh  
Division of Ratepayer Advocates  
RM. 4102  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1694  
fxg@cpuc.ca.gov

Aloke Gupta  
Energy Division  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-5239  
ag2@cpuc.ca.gov

Julie Halligan  
Consumer Protection & Safety Division  
RM. 2203  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1587  
jmh@cpuc.ca.gov

Risa Hernandez

RM. 5119  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2576  
mjd@cpuc.ca.gov

Kevin R. Dudley  
Energy Division  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2557  
kd1@cpuc.ca.gov

Edward Howard  
Policy & Planning Division  
RM. 5119  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1114  
trh@cpuc.ca.gov

Anthony Mazy  
Division of Ratepayer Advocates  
RM. 4209  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-3036  
am1@cpuc.ca.gov

David Peck  
Division of Ratepayer Advocates  
RM. 4103  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1213  
dbp@cpuc.ca.gov

Steve Roscow  
Energy Division  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1189  
scr@cpuc.ca.gov

Timothy J. Sullivan  
Administrative Law Judge Division  
RM. 2106  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2726  
tjs@cpuc.ca.gov

Division of Ratepayer Advocates  
RM. 4209  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2132  
rhh@cpuc.ca.gov

Karin M. Hieta  
Division of Ratepayer Advocates  
RM. 4102  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-4253  
kar@cpuc.ca.gov  
For: DRA

Christopher R Villarreal  
Policy & Planning Division  
RM. 5119  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1566  
crv@cpuc.ca.gov

Jake Wise  
Energy Division  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1677  
jw2@cpuc.ca.gov

Marzia Zafar  
Consumer Service & Information Division  
RM. 2-B  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-1997  
zaf@cpuc.ca.gov

Joyce de Rossett  
Division of Water and Audits  
AREA 3-C  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-5472  
jdr@cpuc.ca.gov

\*\*\*\*\* INFORMATION ONLY \*\*\*\*\*

Ben Boyd  
ACLARA TECHNOLOGIES  
3001 RIVER TOWNE WAY, SUITE 403  
KNOXVILLE TN 37920  
(314) 482-2854  
bboyd@aclaratech.com

R.08-12-009 COM/NER/JT2

Sarah R. Thomas  
Legal Division  
RM. 5033  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2310  
srt@cpuc.ca.gov

Rebecca Tsai-Wei Lee  
Energy Division  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVE  
San Francisco CA 94102 3298  
(415) 703-2140  
wtr@cpuc.ca.gov  
For: DRA

Evelyn Kahl  
Attorney At Law  
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP  
33 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1850  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94015  
(415) 421-4143  
ek@a-klaw.com

Michael P. Alcantar  
Attorney At Law  
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP  
33 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1850  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 421-4143  
mpa@a-klaw.com

Mike Cade  
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP  
1300 SE 5TH AVE., 1750  
PORTLAND OR 97201  
(503) 402-8711  
wmc@a-klaw.com

Joseph Weiss  
APPLIED CONTROL SOLUTIONS, LLC  
10029 OAKLEAD PLACE  
CUPERTINO CA 95014  
(408) 253-7934  
joe.weiss@realtimeacs.com

Barbara R. Barkovich  
BARKOVICH & YAP, INC.  
44810 ROSEWOOD TERRACE  
MENDOCINO CA 95460  
(707) 936-6203  
brbarkovich@earthlink.net

Reed V. Schmidt  
BARTLE WELLS ASSOCIATES

Case Administration  
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE  
ROSEMEAD CA 91770  
(626) 302-3003  
case.admin@sce.com

Karen Terranova  
ALCANTAR & KAHL  
33 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1850  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 403-5542  
filings@a-klaw.com

Tracey L. Drabant  
Energy Resource Manager  
BEAR VALLEY ELECTRIC SERVICE  
PO BOX 1547  
BIG BEAR LAKE CA 92315  
(909) 866-1666  
traceydrabant@bves.com

Caryn Lai  
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN, LLP  
1900 UNIVERSITY AVENUE  
EAST PALO ALTO CA 94303  
(650) 849-4960  
caryn.lai@bingham.com

Bob Stuart  
BRIGHT SOURCE ENERGY, INC.  
1999 HARRISON STREET, SUITE 2150  
OAKLAND CA 94612  
(510) 550-8905  
rstuart@brightsourceenergy.com

Richelle Orlando  
CA CABLE & TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOC  
1001 K STREET, 2ND FLOOR  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 476-3168  
ro@calcable.org

Jan Mcfarland  
CAEATFA  
915 CAPITOL MALL, RM. 468  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 651-8157  
jmcfarland@treasurer.ca.gov

Michelle Garcia  
CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD  
1001 I STREET

R.08-12-009 COM/NER/JT2

1889 ALCATRAZ AVENUE  
BERKELEY CA 94703-2714  
(510) 653-3399 X111  
rschmidt@bartlewells.com

Peter T. Pearson  
Energy Supply Specialist  
BEAR VALLEY ELECTRIC SERVICE  
42020 GARSTIN DRIVE, PO BOX 1547  
BIG BEAR LAKE CA 92315-1547  
(909) 866-4678 X186  
peter.pearson@bves.com

Jon Fortune  
CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY  
8690 BALBOA AVE., STE. 100  
SAN DIEGO CA 92123  
(858) 244-1196  
jon.fortune@energycenter.org

Sephra A. Ninow  
CALIFORNIA CENTER FOR SUSTAINABLE ENERGY  
8690 BALBOA AVENUE, SUITE 100  
SAN DIEGO CA 92123  
(858) 244-1186  
sephra.ninow@energycenter.org

David L. Modisette  
Executive Director  
CALIFORNIA ELECTRIC TRANSP. COALITION  
1015 K STREET, SUITE 200  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 551-1943  
dave@ppallc.com

Linda Kelly  
Electricity Analysis Office  
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION  
1516 9TH STREET, MS 20  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 654-4815  
lkelly@energy.state.ca.us

CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS  
425 DIVISADERO ST STE 303  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94117-2242  
(415) 963-4439  
cem@newsdata.com

Karen Norene Mills  
Attorney At Law  
CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION  
2300 RIVER PLAZA DRIVE  
SACRAMENTO CA 95833  
(916) 561-5655  
kmills@cfbf.com

SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 322-8387  
mgarcia@arb.ca.gov

Tom Pomales  
CALIFORNIA AIR RESOURCES BOARD  
1001 I STREET  
SACRAMENTO CA 95812  
(916) 322-2052  
tpomales@arb.ca.gov

Heather Sanders  
CALIFORNIA ISO  
151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD  
FOLSOM CA 95630  
(916) 608-5850  
hsanders@caiso.com

John Goodin  
CALIFORNIA ISO  
151 BLUE RAVINE RD.  
FOLSOM CA 95630  
(916) 608-7154  
jgoodin@caiso.com

Martin Homec  
CALIFORNIANS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY, INC.  
PO BOX 4471  
DAVIS CA 95617  
(530) 867-1850  
martinhomec@gmail.com

Michael E. Boyd  
President  
CALIFORNIANS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY, INC.  
5439 SOQUEL DRIVE  
SOQUEL CA 95073  
(408) 891-9677  
michaelboyd@sbcglobal.net

John Quealy  
CANACCORD ADAMS  
99 HIGH STREET  
BOSTON MA 02110  
(617) 371-3837  
john.quealy@canaccordadams.com

Mark Sigal  
CANACCORD ADAMS  
99 HIGH STREET  
BOSTON MA 02110  
(617) 788-1591  
mark.sigal@canaccordadams.com

E-Recipient  
CALIFORNIA ISO  
151 BLUE RAVINE ROAD  
FOLSOM CA 95630  
e-recipient@caiso.com

John Shears  
CEERT  
1100 11TH STREET, SUITE 311  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 442-7785  
shears@ceert.org  
For: The Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable  
Technologies

---

Jennifer Sanford  
CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.  
1300 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W., STE. 250  
WASHINGTON DC 20004  
jennsanf@cisco.com  
For: Cisco Systems, Inc.

---

Mary Brown  
CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.  
1300 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W., STE. 250  
WASHINGTON DC 20004  
marybrow@cisco.com  
For: Cisco Systems, Inc.

---

Mary Tucker  
CITY OF SAN JOSE  
200 EAST SANTA CLARA ST., 10TH FLOOR  
SAN JOSE CA 95113-1905  
(408) 975-2581  
mary.tucker@sanjoseca.gov

Jeffrey Sinsheimer  
COBLENTZ, PATCH, DUFFY & BASS, LLP  
ONE FERRY BUILDING, STE. 200  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 391-4800  
jas@cpdb.com

Norene Lew  
COBLEUTZ PATCH DUFFY & BASS, LLP  
ONE FERRY BUILDING, STE.200  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 772-5718  
nml@cpdb.com

John Gutierrez

Danielle Osborn-Mills  
Regulatory Affairs Coordinator  
CEERT  
1100 11TH STREET, SUITE 311  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 340-2607  
danielle@ceert.org

Monica Merino  
COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY  
440 S. LASALLE STREET, SUITE 3300  
CHICAGO IL 60605  
(312) 394-3250  
monica.merino@comed.com

David X. Kolk  
COMPLETE ENERGY SERVICES INC  
41422 MAGNOLIA STREET  
MURRIETA CA 92562  
(512) 283-1097  
dkolk@compenergy.com

Barbara R. Alexander  
CONSUMER AFFAIRS CONSULTANT  
83 WEDGEWOOD DRIVE  
WINTHROP ME 04364  
(207) 395-4143  
barbalex@ctel.net

Docket Coordinator  
5727 KEITH ST.  
OAKLAND CA 94618  
(510) 597-1798  
cpucdockets@keyesandfox.com

Esther Northrup  
COX CALIFORNIA TELCOM II, LLC  
350 10TH AVENUE, SUITE 600  
SAN DIEGO CA 92101  
(619) 266-5315  
esther.northrup@cox.com

Doug Garrett  
COX CALIFORNIA TELCOM LLC  
2200 POWELL STREET, SUITE 1035  
EMERYVILLE CA 94608  
(510) 923-6222  
Douglas.Garrett@cox.com

Janine L. Scancarelli  
CROWELL & MORING LLP  
275 BATTERY STREET, 23RD FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 986-2800  
jscancarelli@crowell.com

Director Of Government Affairs  
COMCAST  
3055 COMCAST PLACE  
LIVERMORE CA 94551  
(925) 973-7214  
john\_gutierrez@cable.comcast.com

Jay Birnbaum  
General Counsel  
CURRENT GROUP, LLC  
20420 CENTURY BLVD  
GEMANTOWN MD 20874  
(301) 944-2700  
jay.birnbaum@currentgroup.com

David Kates  
DAVID MARK & COMPANY  
3510 UNOCAL PLACE, SUITE 200  
SANTA ROSA CA 95403  
(707) 570-1866

Joshua Davidson  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE  
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 276-6501  
joshdavidson@dwt.com

Suzanne Toller  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE  
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533  
(415) 276-6500  
suzannetoller@dwt.com

Salle Yoo  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP  
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 276-6500  
salleyoo@dwt.com

Katie Nelson  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP  
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-6533  
(415) 276-6500  
katiensel@dwt.com

Megan Kuize  
DEWEY & LEBOUF  
1950 UNIVERSITY CIRCLE, SUITE 500  
EAST PALO ALTO CA 94303  
(650) 845-7024

Douglas M. Grandy, P.E.

Jackie Mccarthy  
CTIA - THE WIRELESS ASSOCIATION  
1400 16TH STREET, NW, SUITE 600  
WASHINGTON DC 20036  
(202) 736-3246  
jmccarthy@ctia.org

Cassandra Sweet  
DOW JONES NEWSWIRES  
201 CALIFORNIA ST., 13TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 439-6468  
cassandra.sweet@dowjones.com

Brian Theaker  
Dir., Regulatory Relations  
DYNEGY, INC.  
980 9TH STREET, SUITE 2130  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(530) 295-3305  
brian.theaker@dynegy.com

Rick Boland  
E-RADIO USA, INC.  
1062 RAY AVENUE  
LOS ALTOS CA 94022  
(650) 949-1032  
rboland@e-radioinc.com

Angela Chuang  
ELECTRIC POWER RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
PO BOX 10412  
PALO ALTO CA 94303  
(650) 855-2488  
achuang@epri.com

Ellen Petrill  
Director, Public/Private Partnerships  
ELECTRIC POWER RESEARCH INSTITUTE  
3420 HILLVIEW AVENUE  
PALO ALTO CA 94304-1338  
(650) 855-8939  
epetrill@epri.com

Greggory L. Wheatland  
ELLISON SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.  
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400  
SACRAMENTO CA 95816-5905  
(916) 447-2166  
glw@eslawfirm.com  
For: Sierra Pacific Power Corp.

---

Brian S. Biering  
ELLISON SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP  
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400

R.08-12-009 COM/NER/JT2

California Onsite Generation  
DG TECHNOLOGIES  
1220 MACAULAY CIRCLE  
CARMICHAEL CA 95608  
(916) 871-2432  
dgrandy@caonsitegen.com

Andrew B. Brown  
Attorney At Law  
ELLISON SCHNEIDER & HARRIS, LLP (1359)  
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400  
SACRAMENTO CA 95816-5905  
(916) 447-2166  
abb@eslawfirm.com  
For: Constellation Commodity Group & Constellation New  
Energy Inc./ Sierra Pacific

---

Lynn Haug  
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.  
2600 CAPITAL AVENUE, SUITE 400  
SACRAMENTO CA 95816  
(916) 447-2166  
lmh@eslawfirm.com

Chris King  
President  
EMETER CORPORATION  
2215 BRIDGEPOINTE PARKWAY, SUITE 300  
SAN MATEO CA 94404  
(650) 227-7770 X187  
chris@emeter.com

Sharon Talbott  
EMETER CORPORATION  
2215 BRIDGEPOINTE PARKWAY, SUITE 300  
SAN MATEO CA 94404  
(650) 227-7770 X117  
sharon@emeter.com

Jerry Melcher  
ENERNEX  
4623 TORREY CIRCLE, APT Q303  
SAN DIEGO CA 92130  
(858) 437-2242  
jerry@enernex.com

Richard H. Counihan  
Sr. Director Corporate Development  
ENERNOC, INC.  
500 HOWARD ST., SUITE 400  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 343-9504  
rcounihan@enernoc.com

Norman J. Furuta

SACRAMENTO CA 95816-5905  
(916) 447-2166  
bsb@eslawfirm.com

Jeff Cox  
FUELCELL ENERGY  
1557 MANDEVILLE PLACE  
ESCONDIDO CA 92029  
(760) 741-3970  
Jcox@fce.com

Craig Kuennen  
GLENDALE WATER AND POWER  
141 N. GLENDALE AVENUE, 4TH LEVEL  
GLENDALE CA 91206  
(818) 548-4000  
cjuennen@ci.glendale.us

Robert Gnaizda  
1918 UNIVERSITY AVE., 2ND FLOOR  
BERKELEY CA 94704  
(415) 307-3320  
RobertGnaizda@gmail.com

Nguyen Quan  
GOLDEN STATE WATER COMPANY  
630 EAST FOOTHILL BOULEVARD  
SAN DIMAS CA 91773  
(909) 394-3600  
nquan@gswater.com

Brian Cragg  
Attorney At Law  
GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI, DAY & LAMPREY  
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 392-7900  
bcragg@goodinmacbride.com  
For: North America Power Partners LLC

---

Mike Ahmadi  
GRANITEKEY, LLC  
1295 HEATHER LANE  
LIVERMORE CA 94551  
(925) 413-4365  
mike.ahmadi@Granitekey.com

Tam Hunt  
HUNT CONSULTING  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY CA 00000-0000  
(805) 963-0583 X 122

FEDERAL EXECUTIVE AGENCIES  
1455 MARKET ST., SUITE 1744  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103-1399  
(415) 503-6994  
norman.furuta@navy.mil

Stephen J. Callahan  
IBM  
425 MARKET STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 846-6018  
stephen.j.callahan@us.ibm.com

Stephen Thiel  
IBM  
1856 LANTANA LANE  
FRISCO TX 75034  
(972) 841-9427  
sthiel@us.ibm.com

Ed May  
ITRON INC.  
6501 WILDWOOD DRIVE  
MCKINNEY TX 75070  
(214) 906-4330  
ed.may@itron.com

Gayatri Schilberg  
JBS ENERGY SERVICES  
311 D STREET, SUITE A  
W. SACRAMENTO CA 95605  
(916) 372-0534  
gayatri@jbsenergy.com

Bryce Dille  
Clean Technology Research  
JMP SECURITIES  
600 MONTGOMERY ST. SUITE 1100  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 835-8916  
bdille@jmpsecurities.com

Nellie Tong  
Senior Analyst  
KEMA, INC.  
492 NINTH STREET, SUITE 220  
OAKLAND CA 94607  
(510) 891-0446  
nellie.tong@us.kema.com

Valerie Richardson  
KEMA, INC.  
492 NINTH STREET  
OAKLAND CA 94605  
(510) 891-0446  
Valerie.Richardson@us.kema.com

tam.hunt@gmail.com  
For: Community Environment Council

---

Kim Kiener  
504 CATALINA BLVD  
SAN DIEGO CA 92106  
(619) 990-6627  
kмкиener@cox.net

Kingston Cole  
KINGSTON COLE & ASSOCIATES  
1537 FOURTH STREET, SUITE 169  
SAN RAFAEL CA 94901  
(415) 455-0800  
kco@kingstoncole.com

Jorge Corralejo  
Chairman, Lbc-Gla  
LATINO BUSINESS CHAMBER OF GREATER L.A.  
354 S. SPRING STREET, STE 818  
LOS ANGELES CA 90013  
(213) 347-0008  
jorgecorralejo@sbcglobal.net  
For: Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles

---

Roger Levy  
LEVY ASSOCIATES  
2805 HUNTINGTON ROAD  
SACRAMENTO CA 95864  
(916) 487-0227  
rogerl47@aol.com

Thomas W. Lewis  
116 GALISTEO CT.  
SAN RAMON CA 94583  
(925) 989-9480  
lewis3000us@gmail.com

Christopher Johnson  
LG ELECTRONICS USA, INC.  
910 SYLVAN AVENUE  
ENGLEWOOD CLIFFS NJ 07632  
(201) 266-2419  
crjohnson@lge.com

Leilani Johnson Kowal  
LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER & POWER  
111 N. HOPE STREET  
LOS ANGELES CA 90012  
(213) 357-3023  
leilani.johnson@ladwp.com



David Schneider  
LUMESOURCE  
8419 LOYOLA BLVD  
LOS ANGELES CA 90045  
(310) 216-5624  
dschneider@lumesource.com

David Marcus  
PO BOX 1287  
BERKELEY CA 94701  
(510) 528-0728  
dmarcus2@sbcglobal.net

C. Susie Berlin  
Attorney At Law  
MCCARTHY & BERLIN LLP  
100 W. SAN FERNANDO ST., SUITE 501  
SAN JOSE CA 95113  
(408) 288-2080  
sberlin@mccarthylaw.com

Barry F. Mccarthy  
MCCARTHY & BERLIN, LLP  
100 W. SAN FERNANDO ST., SUITE 501  
SAN JOSE CA 95113  
(408) 288-2080  
bmcc@mccarthylaw.com

Sean P. Beatty  
Sr. Mgr. External & Regulatory Affairs  
MIRANT CALIFORNIA, LLC  
696 WEST 10TH ST., PO BOX 192  
PITTSBURG CA 94565  
(925) 427-3483  
sean.beatty@mirant.com

Faramarz Maghsoodlou  
President  
MITRA POWER  
PO BOX 60549  
SUNNYVALE CA 94088  
(408) 368-9613  
faramarz@ieee.org

Joy A. Warren  
MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT  
1231 11TH STREET  
MODESTO CA 95354  
(209) 526-7389  
joyw@mid.org

Tom Kimball  
MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT  
PO BOX 4069  
MODESTO CA 95352  
(209) 557-1510  
tomk@mid.org

David E. Morse  
1411 W. COVELL BLVD., STE. 106-292  
DAVIS CA 95616-5934  
(530) 756-5033  
demorse@omsoft.com

John Dutcher  
MOUNTAIN UTILITIES  
3210 CORTE VALENCIA  
FAIRFIELD CA 94534-7875  
(707) 426-4003  
ralf1241a@cs.com

Wayne Amer  
President  
MOUNTAIN UTILITIES (906)  
PO BOX 205  
KIRKWOOD CA 95646  
(209) 258-7444  
wamer@kirkwood.com

MRW & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY CA 00000  
(510) 834-1999  
mrw@mrwassoc.com

Kristin Grenfell  
Project Attorney, Calif. Energy Program  
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL  
111 SUTTER STREET, 20TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104  
(415) 875-6100  
kgrenfell@nrdc.org

Michael G. Nelson  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY CA 00000  
(408) 288-2080  
MNelson@MccarthyLaw.com

David Nemptzow  
NEMTZOW & ASSOCIATES  
1254 9TH STREET, NO. 6  
SANTA MONICA CA 90401  
(310) 622-2981  
david@nemptzow.com

Andrew Meiman  
Senior Program Manager  
NEWCOMB ANDERSON MCCORMICK  
201 MISSION STREET, SUITE 2000  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 896-0300  
andrew\_meiman@newcomb.cc

Terry Fry  
Sr. Vp, Energy & Carbon Management  
NEXANT INC  
101 SECOND ST. 10TH FLR  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 369-1021  
tmfry@nexant.com

Robert C. Rowe  
NORTH WESTERN ENERGY  
40 EAST BROADWAY  
BUTTE MT 59701  
(406) 497-2150  
bob.rowe@northwestern.com

Diane I. Fellman  
NRG WEST  
73 DOWNEY STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94117  
(415) 665-3824  
Diane.Fellman@nrgenergy.com

Ali Ipakchi  
Vp Smart Grid And Green Power  
OPEN ACCESS TECHNOLOGY, INC  
1875 SOUTH GRANT, SUITE 910  
SAN MATEO CA 94402  
(651) 335-9867  
ali.ipakchi@oati.com

Matt Mccaffree  
OPOWER  
1515 NORTH COURTHOUSE ROAD, SIXTH FLOOR  
ARLINGTON VA 22201

Michael Sachse  
OPOWER  
1515 N. COURTHOUSE RD., SUITE 610  
ARLINGTON VA 22201  
(646) 265-0556  
michael.sachse@opower.com  
For: OPOWER

---

Puja Deverakonda  
OPOWER  
1515 NORTH COURTHOUSE ROAD, SIXTH FLOOR  
ARLINGTON VA 22201  
puja@opower.com

Janet Peterson  
OUR HOME SPACES  
20 PIMENTEL COURT, B8  
NOVATO CA 94949  
(415) 883-8051  
j\_peterson@ourhomespaces.com

Benjamin Schuman  
PACIFIC CREST SECURITIES  
111 SW 5TH AVE, 42ND FLR  
PORTLAND OR 97204  
(503) 727-0627  
bschuman@pacific-crest.com

Annabelle Louie  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
245 MARKET STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 973-1116  
ayl5@pge.com

Case Coordination  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
PO BOX 770000; MC B9A, 77 BEALE STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 973-4744  
regrelcpucases@pge.com

Dionne Adams  
Operation Revenue Requirements Dept  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
77 BEALE ST., MAIL CODE B9A  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 973-6157  
DNG6@pge.com

Frances Yee  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
77 BEALE STREET, MC B10A  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 973-6057  
fsc2@pge.com

Kimberly C. Jones  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
77 BEALE STREET, MC B9A, ROOM 904  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94105  
(415) 973-8844  
Kcj5@pge.com

R.08-12-009 COM/NER/JT2

Paul Prudhomme  
Operations Revenue Requirements  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
77 BEALE ST., MC B10B., ROOM 1001  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94120  
(415) 973-3962  
prp1@pge.com

Mark Tucker  
PACIFICORP  
825 NE MULTNOMAH, SUITE 2000  
PORTLAND OR 97232  
(503) 813-5269  
californiadockets@pacificorp.com

Reid A. Winthrop  
Corporate Counsel  
PILOT POWER GROUP, INC.  
8910 UNIVERSITY CENTER LANE, SUITE 520  
SAN DIEGO CA 92122  
(858) 678-0118  
rwinthrop@pilotpowergroup.com

Lisa Weinzimer  
PLATTS MCGRAW-HILL  
695 NINTH AVENUE, NO. 2  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94118  
(415) 387-1025  
lisa\_weinzimer@platts.com

Jessica Nelson  
Energy Services Manager  
PLUMAS SIERRA RURAL ELECTRIC COOP.  
73233 STATE RT 70  
PORTOLA CA 96122-7069

Sharon K. Noell  
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY  
121 SW SALMONT ST.  
PORTLAND OR 97204  
(503) 464-7003  
sharon.noell@pgn.com

Donald J. Sullivan  
QUALCOMM INCORPORATED  
5775 MOREHOUSE DRIVE  
SAN DIEGO CA 92121  
(858) 845-4060  
djsulliv@qualcomm.com

Richard W. Raushenbush  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY CA 00000-0000  
(415) 518-7887  
r.raushenbush@comcast.net

Jack Ellis  
RESERO CONSULTING  
1425 ALPINE WAY, PO BOX 6600  
TAHOE CITY CA 96145  
(530) 581-2134  
jellis@resero.com

Sue Mara  
RTO ADVISORS, LLC.  
164 SPRINGDALE WAY  
REDWOOD CITY CA 94062  
(415) 902-4108  
sue.mara@rtoadvisors.com

Timothy N. Tutt  
SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITIES DISTRICT  
6201 S. STREET, M.S. B404  
SACRAMENTO CA 95817-1899  
(916) 732-5038  
ttutt@smud.org

Jim Parks  
SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DIST.  
6301 S STREET, A204  
SACRAMENTO CA 95817-1899  
(916) 732-5252  
jparks@smud.org

Lourdes Jimenez-Price  
Office Of The General Counsel  
SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT  
6201 S STREET, MS B406  
SACRAMENTO CA 95817-1899  
(916) 732-6441  
ljimene@smud.org

Vicky Zavattero  
SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT  
6301 S STREET, MS A204  
SACRAMENTO CA 95817-1899  
(916) 732-5483  
vzavatt@smud.org

Vikki Wood  
SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT  
6301 S STREET, MS A204  
SACRAMENTO CA 95817-1899  
(916) 732-6278  
vwood@smud.org

R.08-12-009 COM/NER/JT2

Carol Manson  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC CO.  
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT CP32D  
SAN DIEGO CA 92123-1530  
(858) 650-4119  
CManson@SempraUtilities.com

Despina Niehaus  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY  
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32D  
SAN DIEGO CA 92123-1530  
(858) 654-1714  
DNiehaus@SempraUtilities.com

Kelly M. Foley  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY  
101 ASH STREET, HQ12  
SAN DIEGO CA 92101-3017  
(619) 696-4287  
KFoley@SempraUtilities.com

Todd Cahill  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY  
8306 CENTURY PARK COURT  
SAN DIEGO CA 92123  
(858) 654-1745  
TCahill@SempraUtilities.com

Central Files  
SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP31-E  
SAN DIEGO CA 92123  
(858) 654-1148  
CentralFiles@SempraUtilities.com

Phillip Muller  
SCD ENERGY SOLUTIONS  
436 NOVA ALBION WAY  
SAN RAFAEL CA 94903  
(415) 479-1710  
philm@scdenergy.com

Gregory Healy  
SEMPRA UTILITIES  
555 WEST FIFTH STREET, 14TH FLR. -GT14D6  
LOS ANGELES CA 90013  
(213) 244-3314  
GHealy@SempraUtilities.com

Kellie Smith  
SENATE ENERGY/UTILITIES & COMMUNICATION  
STATE CAPITOL, ROOM 2195  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 651-4107  
kellie.smith@sen.ca.gov

Michael E. Carboy  
SIGNAL HILL CAPITAL LLC  
343 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 950  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104  
(415) 364-0363  
mcarboy@signalhill.com

Michael Jung  
Policy Director  
SILVER SPRING NETWORKS  
555 BROADWAY STREET  
REDWOOD CITY CA 97063  
(503) 360-3881  
michael.jung@silverspringnet.com

Steve Kromer  
SKEE  
3110 COLLEGE AVENUE, APT 12  
BERKELEY CA 94705  
(510) 655-1492  
jskromer@qmail.com

Mark S. Martinez  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON  
6060 IRWINDALE AVE., SUITE J  
IRWINDALE CA 91702  
(626) 602-4223  
mark.s.martinez@sce.com

Michael A. Backstrom  
Attorney At Law  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY  
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE  
ROSEMEAD CA 91770  
(626) 302-1903  
michael.backstrom@sce.com

Steven A. Lipman  
STEVEN LIPMAN CONSULTING  
500 N. STREET 1108  
SACRAMENTO CA 95814  
(916) 442-2101  
steven@lipmanconsulting.com

Steve Hilton  
STOEL RIVES LLP  
555 MONTGOMERY ST., SUITE 1288  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111  
(415) 617-8943  
SDHilton@stoel.com

Janice Lin  
Managing Partner  
STRATEGEN CONSULTING LLC  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY CA 00000  
(510) 665-7811 X1  
jlin@strategen.com

Erin Grizard  
THE DEWEY SQUARE GROUP  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY CA 00000-0000  
(916) 447-4099  
EGrizard@deweysquare.com

Grey Staples  
THE MENDOTA GROUP, LLC  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY CA 00000  
(651) 204-0458  
gstaples@mendotagroup.net

Nina Suetake  
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK  
115 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104  
(415) 929-8876 X 308  
nsuetake@turn.org

Robert Finkelstein  
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK  
115 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104  
(415) 929-8876 X-307  
bfinkelstein@turn.org

Margaret L. Tobias  
TOBIAS LAW OFFICE  
460 PENNSYLVANIA AVE  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94107  
(415) 641-7833  
info@tobiaslo.com

Juan Otero  
Attorney At Law  
TRILLIANT NETWORKS, INC.  
1100 ISLAND DRIVE  
REDWOOD CITY CA 94065  
(650) 204-5280  
juan.otero@trilliantinc.com

David Rubin  
TROUTMAN SANDERS, LLP  
401 9TH STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON DC 20004  
david.rubin@troutmansanders.com  
For: GroundedPower, Inc.

---

Julien Dumoulin-Smith  
Associate Analyst  
UBS INVESTMENT RESEARCH  
1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK NY 10019  
(212) 713-9848  
julien.dumoulin-smith@ubs.com

Kevin Anderson  
UBS INVESTMENT RESEARCH  
1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK NY 10019  
(212) 713-2595

Jennifer Urban  
Samuelson Law, Tech & Public Policy  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIF, BERKELEY LAW SCHOOL  
396 SIMON HALL  
BERKELEY CA 94720-7200  
(510) 642-7515  
jurban@law.berkeley.edu

Jim Sueuga  
VALLEY ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION  
PO BOX 237  
PAHRUMP NV 89041  
(775) 727-5312

Phil Jackson  
System Engineer  
VALLEY ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION  
800 E. HWY 372, PO BOX 237  
PAHRUMP NV 89041  
(775) 727-5312

Dan Mooy  
VENTYX  
2379 OATEWAY OAKS DRIVE  
SACRAMENTO CA 95833  
dan.mooy@ventyx.com

Mozhi Habibi  
Sr. Director Strategic Marketing  
VENTYX  
1035 DRAKE COURT  
SAN CARLOS CA 94070  
(650) 832-1602  
mozhi.habibi@ventyx.com

R.08-12-009 COM/NER/JT2

Amanda Wallace  
10 MINT PLAZA NO. 4  
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94103  
(410) 493-4465  
mandywallace@gmail.com

Raymond Gifford  
WILKINSON, BARKER, KNAUER, LLP  
1515 ARAPAHOE STREET  
DENVER CO 80202  
(303) 572-5644  
rgifford@wbklaw.com