This document is a reference guide for LSEs required to file in the upcoming **June 2, 2025, IRP compliance filing**.

This document is to address general questions or uncovered errors and provide clarifying instructions on how to fulfill the submission requirements. The responses included in this document reflect many questions IRP staff has received from various LSEs as well as the RDT “Office Hours” conducted on May 6, 2025.

We have produced a Table of Contents on the following page which lists general LSE questions received with the coinciding page number.

This document is intended to serve as a living document. The goal is for IRP staff to update this document as new questions arise. Note #: As new questions are added to the document, they will be marked with an asterisk (\*). All updates will be posted to the IRP Procurement Track webpage.
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1. **Column BJ “mtr\_contact\_changed” (under the "unique\_contracts" tab) is a new field added with no guidance. Could you please let us know what the expectations are?**

The following guidance has been added to the User Guide (pg. 34):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| mtr\_contract\_changed | TRUE: Any aspect of this contract (start date, contracted capacity, amount of capacity claimed toward a certain tranche, etc.) has changed since the last compliance filing (December 2024) |
|  | FALSE: No aspect of this contract has changed since the last compliance filing (December 2024) |

1. **From the User Guide under “2. Differences from Previous Version”, it mentioned “planned\_project\_retention\_priority” column is added but does not appear in the RDTv3\_4\_8 template.**

This is a typo and has been removed in the newer version.

1. **We enter hybrid resources as two rows under the "mtr\_nqc\_validation\_tool" tab because Section 3 of the CPUC’s User Guide requires LSEs to create distinct rows for the solar and storage in the unique\_contracts tab, and this distinction then flows into the validation tab. On the other hand, Section 8.H of the User Guide appears to provide different guidance. Can you please clarify?**

Staff added the following clarification in Section 8.H (pg. 43) of the User Guide: "1. Please use sperate rows for entering the technologies for hybrid contracts; make sure to use the separate resources IDs for each specific technology of the hybrid resource."

1. **How should a bridging contract for an LLT resource with an extension to 2031 be entered? Is it an LLT compliance target resource?**

Long-Lead Time (“LLT”) is a compliance target resource as it belongs to a separate

tranche. Each row of the unique\_contracts sheet should have a single resource

selected in the resource column. A hybrid/paired resource consists of a generator and

storage, and a row should be entered both reflecting the two technology types. This is

consistent with the previously provided direction.

1. **Please explain the direction that "Hybrid contracts should be listed on separate lines, with different lines for each technology." Is this intended to be a significant change from prior direction on hybrid resources?**

No, it is not a significant change from previous RDTs. However, we have noticed that

some LSEs have included the details of two technologies in single rows. If a solar plus

hybrid resource is participating , use two separate rows to demonstrate solar and

storage attributes in two separate rows.

1. **With an RA contract, where September MW NQC is stated, the amount of MTR compliance MW is equivalent to September contracted MW, correct?**

No, MTR NQC is calculated differently than RA NQC. For more details, please refer to

the to the “2021 Incremental ELCC Study for Mid-Term Reliability Procurement”

([20211022\_irp\_e3\_astrape\_incremental\_elcc\_study\_updated.pdf](https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/divisions/energy-division/documents/integrated-resource-plan-and-long-term-procurement-plan-irp-ltpp/20211022_irp_e3_astrape_incremental_elcc_study_updated.pdf)) and the

“Incremental ELCC Study for Mid-Term Reliability Procurement (January 2023 Update)”

([20230210\_irp\_e3\_astrape\_updated\_incremental\_elcc\_study.pdf](https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/divisions/energy-division/documents/integrated-resource-plan-and-long-term-procurement-plan-irp-ltpp/20230210_irp_e3_astrape_updated_incremental_elcc_study.pdf)) that are posted on

the CPUC IRP Procurement Track website.

1. **Where the delivery term for a bridge agreement does not include September, what value for September contracted NQC (if any) should we input?**

Zero (0). Check with the supplier to identify an estimated September NQC value.

1. **For the bridge agreements, what ELCC year(s) should be input? The year of deliveries?**

Yes, the ELCC year corresponds to the year the contract begins delivering. Note: Bridge

agreements are not to be entered into the validation tool. Please refer to the User

Guide, Section 12.2 (pg. 58) for more details.

1. **Bridge contracts are not reflected accurately under the “mtr\_nqc\_validation\_tool” tab.**

Bridge contracts are not to be entered into this tool. Please refer to the User Guide,

Section 12.2 (pg. 58) for more details.

1. **Do amended interconnection agreements need to be filed?**

If the core of the interconnection agreement is still in force and the details of the

resources in question have not changed, filing an amended agreement is not necessary.

1. **Why do we get these errors under the “mtr\_nqc\_validation\_tool” tab? “Warning-total capacity is equal to or greater than generator plus storage MWs for rows”: 6, 7, 6?**

The capacity entered by the RDT user equals or exceeds the capacity listed in the

"Max Gen" column of the Resources tab.

1. **ELCC drop-down options do not include an option for imports, which should have ELCC of 100% given that imports can be used for bridge capacity and are to follow the rules and accounting associated with the RA program. Can you please clarify how LSEs should address this and represent imports used for temporary bridge capacity?**

Bridge contracts are not to be entered into this tool. Please refer to the User Guide,

Section 12.2 (pg. 58) for more details.

1. **Under the "unique\_contracts" tab: "one and only one contract per resource, per compliance target": a. Please confirm what compliance target means; b. D.21-06-035 was written such that DCR was a subset of general procurement. Does this mean all DCR contracts are expected to be entered twice?; c. Should LLT contracts that also count toward general procurement tranches, be entered twice? Please explain how that will differentiate between the following examples: i. LLT resource comes online in 2026 and fills the 2026 general tranche and also satisfies the LLT requirement. LSE also procures general procurement-type resources for 2028 (refer to p. 27 of D.23-02-040: "If the LLT resources come online in a year prior to 2028, then the individual LSE would still have a generic capacity procurement obligation in 2028"). How should these resources be entered? ii. LLT resource comes online in 2027 and has enough capacity to fill the 2027 tranche and the LLT 2028 tranche. Is it entered twice or once?**

The compliance target refers to Tranches. A compliance target means general

procurement obligations ("general"), Diablo Canyon Replacement ("DCR"), and Long-

Lead-Time ("LLT"). Contracts applicable to DCR and general compliance targets require

two separate rows. The guidance "one and only one contract per resource, per

compliance target" broadly means please put one contract/per tranche per row.

However, in the recent past we noticed some LSEs want to use contracts for two

tranches with more capacity. Please use two separate rows if you want to use the same

contacts in the other tranche too. The RDT now has the option to identify DCR contact

separately, even if they are a part of general procurement according to D.21-06-035.

When entering a DCR please select DCR as a specific category instead of general and

select the specific tranche, and do not include them in the general section. This will

also require DCR capacity to be separately included in the NQC validation tool. If a

contact resource is fulfilling two procurement obligations please demonstrate them in

two separate rows, which means that they are entered twice with corresponding

obligations.

1. **Listed are errors that have been corrected in the updated RDT (RDTv3\_4\_9):**
2. **Error Checking Macro:** LSEs experienced the following error when running the macro with December filing inputs for testing: “’get\_resources\_data’ already associated with an element of this collection.”

**Under “mtr\_nqc\_validation\_tool” tab of RDT**

1. Row 2 is not being highlighted red for a hybrid project. We think this is unintended and due to the conditional formatting rule starting at H3 instead of H2 in the below two yellow highlighted sections.
2. Columns J:M (DCPP capacity) no longer highlight red if blank for Diablo Canyon Replacement (“DCR”)projects as shown below. Like #1, we believe this is unintended.
3. Column R (resource\_lookup) returns “N/A” for non-hybrid resources of resource ID: “\_NEW\_GENERIC\_BATTERY\_STORAGE “ of storage type only. Another resource ID example: “\_NEW\_GENERIC\_BATTERY\_STORAGE “ of storage type only. We believe these should be able to return “storage.”
4. Formula area where “dcr\_is\_storage” shows False. This is likely because formula looks for =”dcr” but the drop down in “mtr\_Compliance\_target” is “Diablo Canyon Replacement.” Either drop down should change to “dcr” or formula should change to look for = “Diablo Canyon Replacement”
5. DCR contracts do not show for general now. This is likely because in December filing there was a “is\_applicable\_to\_general” column that would show “true” for general or ze\_gen\_paired\_dr types. However, now because “calculated\_general\_nqc\_total looks at just “is general” a 0 gets populated for our DCR contract due to the selection of ze\_gen\_paired\_dr on the unique\_contracts tab. We believe this formula should be updated to consider looking at if “is\_ze\_gen\_paired\_dr is true too. See below in highlight.

=IF( AND([@[contract\_in\_uc]], [@[is\_general]]),SUM([@[calculated\_nqc\_hybrid\_total\_nqc]],[@[calculated\_nqc\_non\_hybrid]]),0)

1. “compliance\_target\_error” has the same issue as issue #4 and we believe this formula should be set at the end to “FALSE” not “0”?
2. Columns BP: “dcr\_nqc\_from\_gen”, BN: “dcr\_net\_energy\_available” have the same reference issue as #4 above of “dcr” vs “Diablo Canyon Replacement”.
3. LLT capacity is not being calculated. Geothermal capacity appears to not be calculated in the validation tab even if it appears the “unique\_contracts” tab. This may be due to the “resource lookup” column being broken.
4. Long-duration storage capacity is not being calculated. This may be due to the “resource lookup” column being broken.
5. New standalone storage capacity is not being calculated. This may be due to the “resource lookup” column being broken.
6. Double-counting hybrid capacity because hybrid resources are entered twice (one row for solar and one row for storage), but each row seems to require both the solar and storage inputs. The reason we are entering hybrid resources as two rows is because Section 3 of the CPUC’s User Guide requires LSEs to create distinct rows for the solar and storage in the “unique\_contracts” tab, and this distinction then flows into the validation tab. On the other hand, section 8.H of the User Guide appears to provide different guidance to LSEs: it seems to imply that LSEs should be using one row.
7. Contracted storage is not consistently pulling values from “unique\_contracts” tab.
8. ELCC columns are not clear and appear to be limiting and generating incorrect values: The ELCC drop-down options (columns G, H and I) don't appear to generate the correct values.
9. Errors in the following **columns** have been fixed:

Columns N, Q, R, AY, BB, BH, BJ, BK, BL, BM, BN, BO, BP, BQ, BR, BS

**Under “unique\_contracts” tab of RDT**

1. Column B does not appear to contain full list of resource IDs in the drop down. For example, we are not able to select “\_NEW\_GENERIC\_BATTERY\_STORAGE”. This appears to be due to the data validation allowing “resources” going from A2:A2024 but there are 2191 entries in column A of the resources tab. This could be changed to A:A to capture the entire list like the definition for the “lse\_names” tab is listed for “resources”.

**Under “mtr\_nqc\_summary” tab of RDT**

1. Errors in the following **rows** have been fixed: Rows 9, 15, 17
2. Contracts that are split between two tranches as reflected in columns A:B (“lse\_unique\_contract\_id” and “lse\_selected\_mtr\_tranche”) on the “mtr\_nqc\_validation\_tool” tab end up having their “Total reported MTR general NQC MW” in column K doubled. For example, if Contract A has 5 NQC for tranche 2 and 2 NQC for tranche 3 on columns A:B of tool, the summary will correctly show the calculated as 7 NQC total, which would be consistent with inputs on the “unique\_contracts” tab, but the “total reported MTR general NQC MW” column K will show 14 NQC. This is a change from how the December filing would show the reported output. Unsure what is causing this, other than two entries of the same contract ID in column A of the tool tab. Could this be due to reporting one contract per row on “unique\_contracts”, but listing the same contract twice on the tool tab if used in more than one tranche, that however the new pivot is displaying the nqc reported is accidentally doubling by taking the total reported and referencing that total for however many times that contract is reported on the tool tab.