



**FILED**

12-29-10  
02:47 PM

TJS/gd2 12/29/2010

**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)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING SEEKING COMMENTS ON  
PROPOSED INTERIM METRICS TO MEASURE PROGRESS BY PACIFIC  
GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON  
COMPANY AND SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY IN  
IMPLEMENTING A SMART GRID**

This Administrative Law Judge's Ruling seeks comments to enable the Commission to adopt metrics to measure the progress by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE), and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) in implementing a Smart Grid in California and in achieving the benefits identified in SB 17.

On October 22, 2010, PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E (collectively, IOUs) distributed a "Report on Consensus and Non-Consensus Smart Grid Metrics" (Report) to the service list in this docket.<sup>1</sup> This report includes 19 metrics that are considered as consensus, with a table listing other topics and metrics as non-

---

<sup>1</sup> The Report is included as Attachment A.

consensus. This Report was prepared at the direction of Commission staff, and was the result of a workshop, opening comments, four “webinars” facilitated by Commission staff, and additional discussions with other parties. As explained in the Report, “the consensus metrics ... reflect the efforts of the IOUs to determine what information is or could be feasible to collect by IOUs in the near term.”<sup>2</sup> Additionally, the Report notes that “these consensus metrics should be considered preliminary and for initial guidance only.”<sup>3</sup> Further, the Report suggests that these consensus metrics should be reviewed routinely and may be revised accordingly.<sup>4</sup>

The purpose of these consensus metrics is to assist the Commission in evaluating and measuring the performance and the progress of a utility’s Smart Grid deployment, and to provide the Commission with information to assist in the production of an annual report to the Legislature, as required under Public Utilities Code Section 8367. It is important that these metrics allow parties, the public, and the Commission the ability to effectively measure and monitor a utility’s progress in moving toward a smarter grid.

The consensus metrics cover the following topics: Customer/Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI), Plug-in Electric Vehicle, Storage, and Grid Operations. This ruling seeks comments from parties to this proceeding about the consensus metrics attached. Are these metrics appropriate and reasonable? Will the information that these metrics yield efficiently and effectively serve the

---

<sup>2</sup> Report at 2.

<sup>3</sup> Report at 3.

<sup>4</sup> Report at 3.

public interest. Additionally, do these consensus metrics appropriately reflect the input of parties?

The areas of non-consensus include the measurement of benefits and capabilities of the SmartGrid, and certain topics including Customer/AMI Metrics, Advanced Automation and Measurement Technologies, Cyber Security, Plug-in Electric Vehicles, Energy Storage,<sup>5</sup> and Environmental Metrics. The Report states that the utilities will continue to work with interested parties, including the Environment Defense Fund, to develop additional metrics “for consideration for inclusion in the July 2011 deployment plans.” This ruling therefore seeks comments covering these areas of non-consensus. Are these accurately presented as “Non-Consensus”? What recommendations do parties have for creating metrics or addressing the issues and topics covered in this section?

This order also notes that in the informal “webinar” process, Commission staff proposed creating a “Technical Working Group” to begin a dialogue concerning cyber security metrics. This “Technical Working Group” would remain informal, but would provide interested parties an opportunity to participate in the development of cyber security metrics. This order invites comments from parties on this proposal and suggestions on whether and how to proceed.

This ruling also invites proposals from parties on the best process to review and revise these metrics in the future. Should a Technical Working

---

<sup>5</sup> Staff is aware of efforts underway by parties to develop additional metrics around energy storage that may be available in time for the July 2011 deployment plan filings.

Group be convened by topics? Should the Commission hold a workshop at a later date to discuss any potential revisions? The Report suggests either a workshop or additional informal meetings that should be held prior to the October 2012 deadline for the utilities' first annual report.

Finally, the Report seeks comment on the appropriate reporting period. Specifically, the Report asks the Commission to revisit the "decision to use a June 30 annualized date for metrics going forward."<sup>6</sup> The Report requests that metrics be reported "as of December 31, 2010."<sup>7</sup>

### **Schedule**

Comments in response to the questions identified above are due by January 24, 2011 and reply comments are by February 14, 2011.

**IT IS RULED** that parties to this proceeding may file comments on the metrics contained in Attachment A to this ruling and may comment on the questions contained in this ruling. Open comments are due no later than January 24, 2011 and reply comments are due no later than February 14, 2011.

Dated December 29, 2010, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ TIMOTHY J. SULLIVAN  
Timothy J. Sullivan  
Administrative Law Judge

---

<sup>6</sup> Report at 7.

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

**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 December 29, 2010, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ GLADYS M. DINGLASAN  
Gladys M. Dinglasan

**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.