

Integrated Resource Planning (R.25-06-019)

2026 IRP Filings

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

March 19th, 2026

Purpose:

This document serves as a reference guide for LSEs required to file Plans in the IRP process. It answers LSE questions and provides clarifying instructions on how to fulfill the LSE Plan requirements detailed in Decision (D.) Decision (D.) 18-02-018, and D.22-02-004. The questions included in this document reflect some of the questions IRP staff have received from various LSEs since the release of Filing Requirements in January 2026. Staff is documenting and sharing the questions and answers via this document to ensure all LSEs' Plans are developed in a consistent and comprehensive manner. This will serve as a living document.

IRP staff will continue to update this document until the August 10th, 2026, filing deadline with added guidance for LSEs as new questions arise. All updates to this document will be posted to the [2024-2026 IRP Cycle Events and Materials](#) webpage.

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

List of Questions

General Guidance:

- 1) What role does Table 1 of the Jan 16, 2026, ALJ Ruling play in LSEs' Preferred Conforming Portfolio? Is that table of resources just an example of how an LSE can meet its pro-rata carbon goals?
- 2) In the Jan 16 ALJ Ruling, the table on page 5 (RESOLVE-Selected New Resources) shows zeros for the "Location-Constrained Storage (12-hr)" line. In contrast, the PPT shows non-zero values for this line. Can someone confirm which version is correct? Also, is there a way to correct the other one?
- 3) For the non-CAISO LSEs, will there be a "Non-Standard" narrative template? Also please confirm which, if any, XLS will be required.
- 4) The filing requirements ask for any contract that delivers June 2026 onward. In the 2022 IRP, staff were responsive to a request to push the start out beyond YARA contracts which was really helpful in limiting small contracts. Would staff consider doing a 2028+ date for this cycle?
- 5) Both the IRP least-cost reference portfolio and the 2026-2027 TPP least-cost comparison portfolio are characterized as least-cost, meeting GHG targets, and based on the 2025 Inputs and Assumptions (I&A). However, the IRP least-cost portfolio replaces some of the geothermal, enhanced geothermal, and pumped storage that are present in the TPP least cost portfolio with additional in-state wind and solar. If both portfolios are "least-cost" and based on the same vintage of I&A, what is driving this difference in resource selection?
- 6) Various documents posted in the 2026 IRP website refer to different calendar years to be reported on. Please clarify which calendar years are to be reported on, given that different years are to be reported in the various documents to be filed.
- 7) Under the standard IRP filing cycle, LSEs submit IRPs on a biennial basis. Although the 2024–2026 IRP was delayed, under the typical cycle the 2027–2029 IRP would be due in November of this year. Does the Commission intend to address this in an upcoming ruling?

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

- 8) Is the joint filing, and the use of a singular RDT to do so, optional for LSEs?

Narrative Template:

- 1) At pp. 4-5 of the Filing Requirements Overview it states: "LSE may also study and report additional "Alternative Portfolios" developed from different assumptions (including different load and load modifier assumptions) from the 2025-2026 Transmission Planning Process (TPP) Portfolio with updates." At page 5 of the Narrative Template, it states "*LSEs may propose to meet their load and GHG requirements with both supply-side and demand-side investments and must explain how these resources meet or beat their assigned load levels and GHG target.*" (emphasis added) What does "beat their assigned load levels" mean? Is it supposed to be higher or lower?

Clean System Power (CSP) Tool:

- 1) Parties raised questions regarding potential errors in the CSP Tool's GHG emissions benchmarks tab. Given the difference between the standalone "Load Forecasts + GHG Benchmarks" doc differ from those in the CSP tool, can you confirm LSEs should use the GHG benchmarks from the standalone "Load Forecasts + GHG Benchmarks" file and, if so, publish an updated CSP Tool with the correct LSE benchmarks?
- 2) On the "IEPR CAISO Load Modifiers" tab, the source appears to be mislabeled in cell A1 as "CAISO Peak and Energy Forecasts: CED 2021 Mid Baseline / AAEE Scenario 3 / AAFS Scenario 3". The "Cover + Data Sources" tab and data itself reflect that the source is the CEC 2024 IEPR.
- 3) There is a Discrepancy in the CSP: The 2045 total in "emissions calcs" is roughly 11 MMT, but the target is 8 MMT.
- 4) Hydro capacity factor looks low in the CSP Tool (around 25%).
- 5) In terms of compliance years as LSEs model GHG compliance (i.e progress relative to assigned GHG target), do LSEs only need to model GHG compliance in the listed model years (2026, 2028, 2030, 2035, 2040 and 2045) or all intervening years?

Integrated Resource Planning (R.25-06-019)

2026 IRP Filings

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

- 6) Of the assumed 7.97% T&D losses, how much is distribution and how much is transmission?
- 7) Could the current version of the CSP tool could be improved if LSE could specify evolving load shapes? Some LSEs expressed concerns that selecting one load shape and applying it to the entire study period will result in inaccurate IRP results and suboptimal resource build outs.
- 8) The RDT guide states that CAM and GHG PCIA are not needed for compliance filings, but I assume they should be included for CSP and reliability calcs? Is there a standard assumption LSEs should use in estimating these?
- 9) Are REC and GHG purchases counted toward net load reduction, thus reducing emissions?

Resource Data Template (RDT):

a) General RDT Questions:

- i. In the Introduction of the RDT User Guide it states “...*staff released a slide deck that explains the results of the Marginal ELCC studies, and the Reliability Procurement Need calculations.*” Is the link to this slide deck within the 2/27/2025 IRP Workshop links? [2025 Draft I&A](#)
- ii. Does the resource sheet include all existing, in development and planned resources that LSEs can select to for the purposes of showing procurement and compliance? Are there any outside tables or lists of resources that LSEs will be referencing?

b) Reliability Planning Questions:

- i. Based on the reliability filing requirements, LSEs should be planning to meet their reliability procurement requirement (RPR). Why were peak load values given to LSEs, what should these be used for?
- ii. Are the ELCCs included in the RDT what LSEs should be using for their modeling?
- iii. There are two separate tabs that demonstrate portfolio reliability in the RDT tool, the “mtr_nqc_validation_tool” and the “Reliability - Planning” tab. Are LSEs

Integrated Resource Planning (R.25-06-019)

2026 IRP Filings

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

required to demonstrate sufficiency using both tabs? If so, are all years required for compliance or are there specific target years? Please also confirm if the ELCC values included in the "Reliability - Planning" tab will be used to determine compliance in the filing. If so, when will documentation be available for the study used to determine the ELCC values?

- iv. Will the change to the peak values in the latest RDT necessitate the CPUC sends updated LSE peak allocations, or can we proceed with what we were sent previously?
- v. 3CE notes that ELCCs in "reliability - planning" don't match MTR ELCCs from the Astrape study, and inconsistencies in these percentages may result in conflicting resource build out selections.

Inputs and Assumptions:

- 1) Can Energy Division clarify if there are specific assumptions we should make for allocations/ procurement orders, specifically:
 - a. DCP: Would Energy Division would like LSEs to ignore these per SB 846?
- 2) The I&A includes two sets of resource cost data. One that matches the LSE filing requirements that does not include recent policy tariff assumptions and one that matches the TPP which does include tariff assumptions. The released pro forma data do appear to have tariff impacts for solar and wind through 2029. Is this data intended to match the assumptions used in the TPP? Is there flexibility for LSEs in terms of which resource cost assumptions to use?
- 3) Are LSEs allowed to deviate from the inputs and assumptions in either the conforming or preferred portfolio if said deviations are documented and explained?
- 4) Will the CPUC be releasing the assumptions regarding hourly generation profiles for different resource types? Or are those already available somewhere?

AB-1373 Allocations:

- 1) Related to the AB 1373 resource allocations sent to LSEs - are those resources optional for LSEs to include? Or are they mandatory to include in the preferred portfolio?

Integrated Resource Planning (R.25-06-019)

2026 IRP Filings

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

- 2) What year should LSEs assume for the AB 1373 Allocations given in the 2026 Filing Requirements?
- 3) Will LSEs be given an 8760 profile for these resources considering the AB-1373 allocations are considered to be for optional use in planning scenarios?
- 4) AB-1373 Allocations contain some multi day storage, is the CSP tool set up for those resources?
- 5) Will ED send out updated workbooks with clarification on units for AB-1373 Allocations to LSEs?
- 6) How should LSEs model AB1373 Allocations in the CSP Tool?

**Integrated Resource Planning (R.25-06-019)
2026 IRP Filings**

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

General Guidance:

- 1) In the Jan 16 ALJ Ruling, Table 1 on page 5 (RESOLVE-Selected New Resources) shows zeros for the "Location-Constrained Storage (12-hr)" line. In contrast, the PPT shows non-zero values for this line. Can someone confirm which version is correct? Also, is there a way to correct the other one?

The PowerPoint (PPT) and RESOLVE results viewer both show the correct values (in GW) for Selected New Resources. The corrected version of Table 1 from page 5 of the ALJ Ruling is included below.

Table 1. RESOLVE-Selected New Resources (in Gigawatts (GW))

Resource Type	2026	2028	2030	2031	2035	2040	2045
Natural Gas	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Geothermal	0.1	0.6	2.4	2.4	3.2	3.2	3.2
Enhanced Geothermal Systems (EGS)	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.7
Biomass	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
In-state wind	0.3	0.8	1.3	2.3	6.3	8.3	10.9
Out of-State wind	1.4	4.0	5.5	5.5	7.0	15.8	19.0
Offshore Wind	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Solar	4.0	12.0	28.1	32.8	53.4	65.3	82.7
Li-ion Battery (4-hr)	2.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	6.8
Li-ion Battery (8-hr)	0.1	1.7	6.4	7.7	14.0	14.0	21.1
Location Constrained Storage (12-hr)	-	-	0.3	2.1	3.9	8.0	8.5
Generic LDES (12-hr)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Generic LDES (24-hr)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Generic LDES (100-hr)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Shed Demand Response	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gas Capacity Not Retained	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.3)	(0.3)

- 2) What role does Table 1 of the Jan 16, 2026, ALJ Ruling play in LSEs' Preferred Conforming Portfolio? Is that table of resources just an example of how an LSE can meet its pro-rata carbon goals?

Integrated Resource Planning (R.25-06-019)

2026 IRP Filings

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

Table 1 of the Ruling demonstrates a least-cost portfolio selected by RESOLVE to meet the statewide 8MMT trajectory by 2045 using updated inputs and assumptions. It can be considered an example of how LSEs collectively are able to meet GHG planning targets.

- 3) For the non-CAISO LSEs, will there be a "Non-Standard" narrative template? Also please confirm which, if any, XLS will be required.**

IRP Staff will provide more detailed guidance regarding which data templates are required for non-standard filers at a future date.

- 4) The filing requirements ask for any contract that delivers June 2026 onward. In the 2022 IRP, staff were responsive to a request to push the start out beyond YARA contracts which was really helpful in limiting small contracts. Would staff consider doing a 2028+ date for this cycle?**

Given the extension of the deadline of submissions for LSE Plans through August 10th, 2026, any contracts or resources online by August 10th, 2026, should be included in LSE Plans.

- 5) Both the IRP least-cost reference portfolio and the 2026-2027 TPP least cost comparison portfolio are characterized as least-cost, meeting GHG targets, and based on the 2025 Inputs and Assumptions (I&A). However, the IRP least-cost portfolio replaces some of the geothermal, enhanced geothermal, and pumped storage that are present in the TPP least cost portfolio with additional in-state wind and solar. If both portfolios are "least-cost" and based on the same vintage of I&A, what is driving this difference in resource selection?**

The 2026-27 TPP portfolio is derived in part from forcing in around half of the AB 1373 resources that were selected in the need determination decision for AB 1373, D.24-08-064. It is not a strictly least-cost portfolio, contrary to the filing requirements reference portfolio listed in Table 1 of the FR Ruling. The TPP portfolio was also informed with different cost assumptions impacted by recent federal policy changes, and was modeled after the filing requirements portfolio, which led to different resource selection. The final I&A slide deck posted on the IRP website describes the changes that occurred since the 2025-26 TPP, and the draft I&A presented at the MAG webinar in February 2025.

- 6) Various documents posted in the 2026 IRP website refer to different calendar years to be reported on. Please clarify which calendar years are to be reported on, given that different years are to be reported in the various documents to be filed.**

Integrated Resource Planning (R.25-06-019)

2026 IRP Filings

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

In the RDT, LSEs should report information for all resources under contract as of August 10, 2026, out to 2045, otherwise referred to as all intervening years.

In the CSP Tool Results Viewer, 2028 is for informational purposes only and LSEs must meet their assigned GHG Benchmarks in years 2030, 2035, 2040 and 2045.

In the Narrative template, under section 3ei) Cost and Rate Analysis, only IOUs are required to report on intervening years between 2027 and 2035, in addition to 2040 and 2045.

- 7) Under the standard IRP filing cycle, LSEs submit IRPs on a biennial basis. Although the 2024–2026 IRP was delayed, under the typical cycle the 2027–2029 IRP would be due in November of this year. Does the Commission intend to address this in an upcoming ruling?**

The only IRPs due in 2026 are those referenced in the January 16, 2026, ALJ Ruling. IRPs are submitted once per planning cycle.

- 8) Is the joint filing, and the use of a singular RDT to do so, optional for LSEs?**

Yes. Given the approval of the LSE requested extension for plan submissions through August 10th, IRP Staff does not recommend LSEs submit joint filings as they would need to meet the June 1, 2026, deadline for procurement compliance filings that still stands.

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

Narrative Template:

- 1) At pp. 4-5 of the Filing Requirements Overview it states: "LSE may also study and report additional "Alternative Portfolios" developed from different assumptions (including different load and load modifier assumptions) from the 2025-2026 Transmission Planning Process (TPP) Portfolio with updates." At page 5 of the Narrative Template, it states "*LSEs may propose to meet their load and GHG requirements with both supply-side and demand-side investments and must explain how these resources meet or beat their assigned load levels and GHG target.*" (emphasis added) What does "beat their assigned load levels" mean? Is it supposed to be higher or lower?

LSEs cannot beat their assigned load forecast level. So long as LSE plans meet their assigned load levels they can be considered conforming.

LSEs can beat their GHG Benchmarks by achieving lower emissions outputs in the CSP tool, relative to their assigned GHG Benchmark.

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

Clean System Power (CSP) Tool:

- 1) Parties raised questions regarding potential errors in the CSP Tool's GHG emissions benchmarks tab. Given the difference between the standalone "Load Forecasts + GHG Benchmarks" doc differ from those in the CSP tool, can you confirm LSEs should use the GHG benchmarks from the standalone "Load Forecasts + GHG Benchmarks" file and, if so, publish an updated CSP Tool with the correct LSE benchmarks?

Yes, an updated version of the CSP tool with corrected GHG Benchmark values has been posted to the IRP website: [2024-2026 IRP Cycle Events and Materials](#)

The GHG Benchmark values displayed in the updated CSP tool are now consistent with the standalone GHG Benchmarks from the [Load Forecasts + GHG Benchmarks](#) document posted on 01/16/2026.

- 2) On the "IEPR CAISO Load Modifiers" tab, the source appears to be mislabeled in cell A1 as "CAISO Peak and Energy Forecasts: CED 2021 Mid Baseline / AAEE Scenario 3 / AAFS Scenario 3". The "Cover + Data Sources" tab and data itself reflect that the source is the CEC 2024 IEPR.

This has been updated for a new version of the CSP Tool. On the "IEPR CAISO Load Modifiers" tab, the new label in cell A1 reads *CAISO Peak and Energy Forecasts: CEC 2024 IEPR*.

- 3) There is a Discrepancy in the CSP: The 2045 total in "emissions calcs" is roughly 11 MMT, but the target is 8 MMT.

Please see the CSP Tool Documentation for the explanation of this discrepancy: "The CSP calculator makes an adjustment to the calculated emissions from system power to account for a known difference in GHG emissions between RESOLVE, SERVM, and the CSP calculator, which stem from differences in modeling approach between the three tools. Per CPUC direction, LSEs should plan their portfolios to be consistent with RESOLVE resource portfolios. To align emissions calculated by the CSP calculator with the RESOLVE resource portfolios that LSEs must plan to, an adjustment is made each year based on the difference between GHG emissions in the 2025 Filing Requirements RESOLVE model and CAISO-wide GHG emissions calculated by CSP calculator (using inputs from the 2025 Filing Requirements SERVM model)."

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

4) Hydro capacity factor looks low in the CSP Tool (around 25%).

We updated the calculation for the capacity of the large hydro resource to normalize the SERVM hourly large hydro dispatch profiles with the SERVM large hydro resource capacity. Updating this value results in a new capacity factor of 37% (compared to 25% before the update). Note that this update has been included in the newest version of the tool, but because it results in a linear scaling of the large hydro profiles, it does not impact the functionality of the tool. Energy values are the input from the RDT into the CSP Tool, not capacity values. Therefore, RDT entries will ultimately result in a certain amount of energy regardless of the hydro CF; the CSP Tool simply takes the input energy and shapes it based on the SERVM hydro dispatch profile.

5) In terms of compliance years as LSEs model GHG compliance (i.e progress relative to assigned GHG target), do LSEs only need to model GHG compliance in the listed model years (2026, 2028, 2030, 2035, 2040 and 2045) or all intervening years?

In the CSP Tool's "Results" tab, emissions outputs are shown for years 2028, 2030, 2035, 2040 and 2045. Given no GHG Benchmarks have been assigned to LSEs for 2028, that 2028 emissions results are considered as informational only and will not be considered by IRP staff when evaluating LSE Plans. LSEs Preferred Conforming Portfolios must meet their assigned GHG Benchmarks in years 2030, 2035, 2040 and 2045.

6) Of the assumed 7.97% T&D losses, how much is distribution and how much is transmission?

The T&D losses value originates from the CEC IEPR. The breakdown between transmission and distribution losses may be available in IEPR documentation.

7) Could the current version of the CSP tool be improved if LSE could specify evolving load shapes? Some LSEs expressed concerns that selecting one load shape and applying it to the entire study period will result in inaccurate IRP results and suboptimal resource build outs.

The CSP tool allows for users to enter custom demand forecasts for each load modifier (electric vehicles, building electrification, energy efficiency, data centers, etc.) that can vary between years on the "Custom Demand Inputs" section of the "Demand Inputs" tab. It also allows LSEs to specify a custom fraction of commercial and industrial

Integrated Resource Planning (R.25-06-019)

2026 IRP Filings

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

demand in their baseline load forecast. For load profile hourly shapes, the CSP tool allows users to enter a custom demand shape for each load modifier or to use a default shape. The tool multiplies the annual load for each demand modifier by the hourly (8760) shape for each load modifier (either the default shape or user-entered custom shape), and the resultant 8760 load modifier demand profiles are added together to create the total demand on an hourly level for the LSE. To model an evolving load shape in future years, users should change the annual forecast for each load modifier; doing so will change the shape of the total LSE load over time because different amounts of each of the load profile shapes will be used in each year. Users can observe the results of the intermediate 8760 load profile calculations on the "Demand Calcs" tab; while this tab should not be changed by users, it demonstrates how the total load profile for each future year is created from load modifier shapes.

- 8) The RDT guide states that CAM and GHG PCIA are not needed for compliance filings, but I assume they should be included for CSP and reliability calcs? Is there a standard assumption LSEs should use in estimating these?**

If there are resources from CAM, these should be included in RDT and therefore should flow through to the CSP Tool. For the PCIA, we note that while the GHG cap-and-trade program does impact PCIA fees, this should not directly impact CSP Tool inputs or outputs. The CSP Tool is based on a predefined GHG allocation and on total load/load share, which are calculated independently.

- 9) Are REC and GHG purchases counted toward net load reduction, thus reducing emissions?**

The CSP tool allows LSEs to count renewables towards their GHG reduction goals as long as the power is delivered to a California balancing area. An LSE can include REC purchases in the CSP tool via the RPS Resource Custom Profile on the Supply Inputs tab; to be included the LSE must give the renewable purchases an hourly 8760 shape. The Documentation provides additional detail on PCC2 and PCC3 renewables: "Generation from PCC2 and PCC3 renewables are not included in the CSP calculator's renewable generation percentage but are eligible for RPS requirement compliance; the CSP calculator does not contain information on PCC2 and PCC3 RECs."

Resource Data Template (RDT):

- a) General RDT Questions:**

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

- i. In the Introduction of the RDT User Guide it states “...staff released a slide deck that explains the results of the Marginal ELCC studies, and the Reliability Procurement Need calculations.” Is the link to this slide deck within the 2/27/2025 IRP Workshop links? [2025 Draft I&A](#)

No, the slide deck is linked on [2024-2026 IRP Cycle Events and Materials](#) under Filing Requirements Analysis Materials, [Reliability Filing Requirements for Load Serving Entities' 2024-26 IRP Plans-Results of Marginal ELCC Studies slides \(2/10/2026\)](#).

- ii. Does the resource sheet include all existing, in development and planned resources that LSEs can select to for the purposes of showing procurement and compliance? Are there any outside tables or lists of resources that LSEs will be referencing?

The RDT resource list includes all resources that have been assigned a resource ID by CAISO. Additionally, the RDT contains several categories for more generic resources that LSEs can use to specify resources that are planned or under contract but do not have an assigned resource ID.

b) Reliability Planning Questions:

- i. Based on the reliability filing requirements, LSEs should be planning to meet their reliability procurement requirement (RPR). Why were peak load values given to LSEs, what should these be used for?

Peak load values were provided as information-only and are not direct inputs to the RDT.

- ii. Are the ELCCs included in the RDT what LSEs should be using for their modeling?

The marginal ELCC values on the “Reliability - Planning” tab in the RDT should be used by LSEs for evaluating whether their 2024-26 IRP plans will be sufficient for reliability planning purposes.

- iii. There are two separate tabs that demonstrate portfolio reliability in the RDT tool, the “mtr_nqc_validation_tool” and the “Reliability - Planning” tab. Are LSEs required to demonstrate sufficiency using both tabs? If so, are all years required for compliance or are there specific target years? Please also confirm if the ELCC values included in the “Reliability - Planning” tab will be used to determine compliance in the filing. If so, when will documentation be available for the study used to determine the ELCC values?

**Integrated Resource Planning (R.25-06-019)
2026 IRP Filings**

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

The “mtr_nqc_validation_tool” tab should be used to demonstrate sufficiency with IRP procurement requirements. As described in the [Filing Requirements Overview Document](#) (1/16/2026) on [2024-2026 IRP Cycle Events and Materials](#), all LSEs that have fulfilled their D.19-11-016 compliance obligations by December 1, 2026, with fully online projects do not need to report on D.19-11-016 compliance in the June 1, 2026, filing. In addition, all LSEs who fall within the Commission’s authority for the IRP proceeding and were given a procurement obligation for D.21-06-035 or D.23-02-040 are also required to file procurement data and supplemental documentation pursuant to the requirements set in D.21-06-035 and D.23-02-040. **The ELCC values in the “Reliability - Planning” tab should be used for planning; the MTR ELCC values should be used to assess MTR compliance.**

The “Reliability - Planning” tab should be used by LSEs for evaluating whether their 2024-26 IRP plans will be sufficient for reliability planning purposes. LSEs should model the reliability of their portfolios over the entire 2024-26 IRP planning horizon, which ends in 2045. The marginal ELCC values on the “Reliability - Planning” tab in the RDT should be used by LSEs for evaluating whether their 2024-26 IRP plans will be sufficient for reliability planning purposes. Documentation about the study used to determine the marginal ELCC values for 2024-26 IRP filing requirements can be found on [2024-2026 IRP Cycle Events and Materials](#) under Filing Requirements Analysis Materials, [Reliability Filing Requirements for Load Serving Entities' 2024-26 IRP Plans-Results of Marginal ELCC Studies slides](#) (2/10/2026).

iv. Will the change to the peak values in the latest RDT necessitate the CPUC sends updated LSE peak allocations, or can we proceed with what we were sent previously?

For 2024-26 IRP plans, CPUC staff sent the Critical Hours Load Shares across the planning horizon to LSEs individually. These values should be input into the RDT in “LSE share of load during critical hours (%)” on the “Reliability – Planning” tab, which will then automatically calculate the LSE’s Reliability Procurement Requirements. The managed peak load shares are not an input into the latest RDT for 2024-26 IRP filing requirements.

v. 3CE notes that ELCCs in "reliability - planning" don't match MTR ELCCs from the Astrape study, and inconsistencies in these percentages may result in conflicting resource build out selections.

The marginal ELCCs in the “Reliability – Planning” tab are based on a different set of assumptions (e.g., updated load forecast, new least-cost RESOLVE portfolios) than the

Integrated Resource Planning (R.25-06-019)

2026 IRP Filings

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

previous MTR ELCC study. The marginal ELCC values on the “Reliability -Planning” tab in the RDT should be used by LSEs for evaluating whether their 2024-26 IRP plans will be sufficient for reliability planning purposes. The MTR ELCC values should still be used for assessing MTR compliance.

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

Inputs and Assumptions:

1) Can Energy Division clarify if there are specific assumptions we should make for allocations/ procurement orders, specifically:

a. DCP: Would Energy Division would like LSEs to ignore these per SB 846?

Yes, LSEs should ignore Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP) in developing their plans.

2) The I&A includes two sets of resource cost data. One that matches the LSE filing requirements that does not include recent policy tariff assumptions and one that matches the TPP which does include tariff assumptions. The released pro forma data do appear to have tariff impacts for solar and wind through 2029. Is this data intended to match the assumptions used in the TPP? Is there flexibility for LSEs in terms of which resource cost assumptions to use?

Yes, so long as any deviations from the 2024-26 IRP Inputs and Assumptions are documented and explained in the narrative template.

Page 4 of the Narrative Template states: “A Conforming Portfolio is one that utilizes the LSE’s assigned load forecast and is consistent with the Commission-adopted Preferred System Portfolio according to the following criteria(.....)

- *Uses inputs and assumptions consistent with what will be finalized and posted on the 2024-2026 IRP Cycle Events and Materials Website ¹ with the following exceptions based on updated information:*
 - *If the LSE has better capital cost and financing information that more accurately reflects its situation, the LSE is free to use those inputs and/or assumptions. For example, an LSE may have its own view of future resource levelized costs and it is free to use this information to develop its portfolio. The LSE should clearly identify, and provide an explanation for, instances where it used its own assumption in lieu of the default Final 2024-2026 IRP Inputs and Assumptions.”*

3) Are LSEs allowed to deviate from the inputs and assumptions in either the conforming or preferred portfolio if said deviations are documented and explained?

¹ https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/divisions/energy-division/documents/integrated-resource-plan-and-long-term-procurement-plan-irp-ltpp/2024-2026-irp-cycle-events-and-materials/2025_inputs_and_assumptions_report_20260210.pdf

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

See answer above to Question #2.

4) Will the CPUC be releasing the assumptions regarding hourly generation profiles for different resource types? Or are those already available somewhere?

Hourly generation profiles for different resources were released with the filing requirements on January 16, 2026. They can be found on the [2024-2026 IRP Cycle Events and Materials](#) in the RESOLVE Code Base and Inputs link that is located under the Filing Requirements Analysis Materials section. Note: the file is 1.2 GB. The hourly generation profiles are in the data>profiles folder.

6) Will an updated resource cost workbook based on finalized I&A be published? If not, is the CPUC comfortable with us relying on the cost estimates in the draft resource cost workbook?

The cost estimates provided in the draft resource cost workbook have been superseded with the final Filing Requirements cost assumptions that were posted in the [2024-2026 IRP Cycle Events and Materials](#) website on January 16, 2026 under the Filing Requirements Analysis Materials section. The RESOLVE Workbooks and public Case Results Viewers link is a folder containing several files. The CPUC Pro Forma Data Viewer-2025 FR contains cost assumptions. In addition, the cost assumptions for the 2026-27 TPP were posted on the [Assumptions for the 2026-2027 TPP](#) website on October 6, 2025 under the Transmission Planning Process Ruling and Ruling Development Materials section. The RESOLVE Upstream Data Workbooks and Public Case Results Viewers link contains the CPUC Pro Forma Data Viewer - 26-27 TPP workbook which provides 2026-27 TPP cost assumptions. Cost assumptions workbooks for both the 2026 filing requirements and the 2026-27 TPP are referenced here because of guidance that we included in Section 4.6 of the 2026 I&A doc. IRP Staff does not recommend LSEs use the draft cost assumptions to develop their plans.

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

AB-1373 Allocations:

- 1) Related to the AB 1373 resource allocations sent to LSEs - are those resources optional for LSEs to include? Or are they mandatory to include in the preferred portfolio?**

LSEs are not required to include AB 1373 resources in their preferred conforming portfolio for 2024-26 IRP plans. Indicative allocations were provided with the filing requirements to give LSEs an idea about how the resources might be allocated, if central procurement is undertaken, to assist them in their planning for individual procurement needs for the outer years of the planning horizon. For LSEs that choose to include AB 1373 resource allocations in their portfolios, additional guidance was provided that includes forecast online dates and procurement quantities to assist them in modeling the resources in the RDT and CSP Tool.

- 2) What year should LSEs assume for the AB 1373 Allocations given in the 2026 Filing Requirements?**

Staff provided additional guidance in a separate document titled “Characterizing AB 1373 Allocations in LSE Portfolios” that can be found on the IRP website: [2024-2026 IRP Cycle Events and Materials](#) for LSEs that want to include AB 1373 allocations in their 2024-26 cycle preferred conforming portfolio. The guidance includes the forecasted online delivery timing and associated procured quantities to assist them in modeling these resources in the RDT and CSP Tool. The forecasted online dates for all AB 1373 resources span several years over the planning horizon.

- 3) Will LSEs be given an 8760 profile for these resources considering the AB-1373 allocations are considered to be for optional use in planning scenarios?**

No, LSEs should use the custom storage profile in the CSP tool to reflect the specific resources LSEs are planning to use to comply with AB 1373 requirements. LSEs were provided individual allocations for AB 1373 resources. Additional filing requirement AB 1373 specific guidance provides the forecasted online delivery timing and associated procured quantities. The forecasted dates/quantities would be used to populate fields in both the RDT and CSP Tool to reflect these resources. In the CSP Tool, the LSE will create an 8760 hourly load profile for the resources in the corresponding resource custom profile templates in the Supply Inputs tab. Note: The individual resources in each custom profile category type must be added together outside the tool and then input as a single 8760 load profile. profile.

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

4) AB-1373 Allocations contain some multi-day storage, is the CSP tool set up for those resources?

The Storage Resource Custom Profile is a template that enables LSEs to enter a custom 8760 load shape for either a single storage resource or multiple resources in one storage category that will be input into the user specified profile in the "Supply Inputs" tab. If multiple resources are represented in one profile, the resource 8760 load shapes should be added together before inputting into the profile.

Note: For AB 1373 resources, both multi-day storage and 12+ hour storage categories would be aggregated together in one storage load shape profile.

5) Will ED send out updated workbooks with clarification on units for AB-1373 Allocations to LSEs?

Yes, IRP Staff will add units and round allocations to the nearest whole number. The cleaned-up allocations will be distributed individually to all LSEs.

6) How should LSEs model AB1373 Allocations in the CSP Tool?

Before AB 1373 resources can be modeled in the CSP Tool, they must first be entered into the RDT as generic planned resources. Enter the resource in Column B (resource) of the unique_contracts_tab corresponding to one of the following resource categories:

- 12+ hour and multi day storage LDES resource types would be selected as either Generic_LDES_12hr, Generic_LDES_24hr, or Generic_LDES_100 hr.
- Offshore wind would be selected as one of the two generic OSW resource types (NEW_GENERIC_WIND_OFFSHORE_NORTH, _NEW_GENERIC_WIND_OFFSHORE_SOUTH)
- Geothermal resources would be selected from one of the two generic geothermal resources (_NEW_GENERIC_GEOTHERMAL, _NEW_GENERIC_GEOTHERMAL_ENHANCED).

Using the forecasted online delivery timing and associated procured quantities provided by CPUC staff populate the following columns in the unique contracts tab:

- Column I (total_nameplate_capacity)
- Column J (contracted_nameplate_capacity)
- Column AJ (COD_year)
- Column AK (COD_month) and

Integrated Resource Planning (R.25-06-019)

2026 IRP Filings

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

- Column AL (COD_day)

The selected generic resource must also be considered when populating additional columns for the CSP tool that are associated with it:

- Column BV (csp_resource_category) is used to select the CSP resource category. For AB 1373 resources, the following three categories apply:
 - OSW and geothermal selected as RPS Resource Custom Profile (GWh)
 - 12+hr and MDS LDES selected as Storage Resource Custom Profile (MW)
- Depending on the COD for the specific resource, the CSP resource category would be associated with one of the CSP study years
 - Column BW (csp_annual_2028); Column BX (csp_annual_2030); Column BY (csp_annual_2035); Column BZ (csp_annual_2040); and Column CA (csp_annual_2045)

The entire RDT portfolio (online + in-development + review + planned) would be imported to the CSP Tool:

- The CSPReportSheet tab in the RDT is pasted into the Supply Inputs tab of the CSP Tool
- Because the AB 1373 resources are generic planned resources they do not have a generation load profile; custom hourly profiles must be input into the Custom Hourly Profiles table in the Supply Inputs tab.
 - There are three separate custom resource profile tabs. Only one custom resource profile is allowed for each resource type in a CSP year. If multiple resources are represented in a single custom hourly profiles category, the resources must be added together to produce one load shape representing each hour in the 8760 profile.
 - For AB 1373 resources, only two of the three available custom resource profiles should be selected from.
 - RPS Resource Custom Profile for Offshore wind (OSW) and geothermal
 - Any AB 1373 OSW and geothermal procurement load shapes would be added to the load shape of all other planned resources in this category with online dates that match those for the CSP year (2028, 2030, 2035, 2040, 2045)

Integrated Resource Planning (R.25-06-019)

2026 IRP Filings

Filing Requirements' Questions and Answers

- Storage Resource Custom Profile for 12+hr and multi day storage LDES
 - Any AB 1373 storage procurement load shapes would be added to the load shape of all other planned resources in this category with online dates that match those for the CSP year (2028, 2030, 2035, 2040, 2045)
- The custom load profiles would be input into the User-Specified Profile rows of the portfolios selected by the LSE.