



QUARTERLY ENERGY PROCUREMENT COMPLIANCE AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES ENGAGEMENT

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Third Quarter of 2020 - Advice Letter 5986-E

Utility Audits, Risk and Compliance Division
Utility Audits Branch
April 19, 2021



PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Transmitted via e-mail

April 19, 2021

Ms. Kelly Everidge, Director
Risk, Compliance & Reporting Department
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
P.O. Box 770000
San Francisco, CA 94177-0001

Dear Ms. Everidge:

Final Report Transmittal Letter – Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagement of Pacific Gas and Electric Company Quarterly Energy Procurement Compliance Report for the period of July 1, 2020 through September 30, 2020

The Utility Audits Branch of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has completed its agreed-upon procedures (AUP) engagement of Pacific Gas and Electric's (PG&E) Third Quarter of 2020 Quarterly Energy Procurement Compliance Report -Advice Letter 5986-E. The final AUP report is enclosed.

We will post the final audit report on our website at <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/utilityaudits/>.

The completed audit resulted in no reportable findings relating to PG&E's Third Quarter 2020 QCR filed in AL 5986-E.

We appreciate PG&E's assistance and cooperation during the engagement. If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Tracy Fok, Program and Project Supervisor, at (415) 703-3122 tracy.fok@cpuc.ca.gov or Tim Baumgardner, Senior Management Auditor, at (916) 894-5603 tim.baumgardner@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Angie Williams

Angie Williams, Director
Utility Audits, Risk and Compliance Division
cc: See next page

Ms. Kelly Everidge, Director
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
April 19, 2021
Page 2

cc: Marianne Aikawa, Senior Manager, Risk, Compliance & Reporting, PG&E
Christina Honey, Expert Analyst, Risk, Compliance & Reporting, PG&E
Rachel Peterson, Executive Director, CPUC
Edward Randolph, Deputy Executive Director, Energy Division, CPUC
Pete Skala, Director of Efficiency, Electrification, and Procurement, Energy Division, CPUC
Judith Ikle, Program Manager, Energy Division, CPUC
Michele Kito, Program & Project Supervisor, Energy Division, CPUC
Nick Dahlberg, Public Utilities Regulatory Analyst, Energy Division, CPUC
Mitchell Shapson, Public Utilities Counsel IV, CPUC
Theresa Buckley, Staff Attorney, CPUC
Masha Vorobyova, Assistant Director, Utility Audits Branch, CPUC
Tracy Fok, Program & Project Supervisor, Utility Audits Branch, CPUC
Tim Baumgardner, Senior Management Auditor, Utility Audits Branch, CPUC
Jeffrey Walter, Public Utilities Regulatory Analyst, Utility Audits Branch, CPUC
Keen Banh, Staff Service Management Auditor, Utility Audits Branch, CPUC

MEMBERS OF THE TEAM

Angie Williams, Director

Masha Vorobyova, Assistant Director

Tracy Fok aka Tracy Yeh, CPA, Supervisor

Tim Baumgardner, Lead

Jeffrey Walter, Staff

Keen Banh, Staff

A digital copy of this report can be found at:

<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/utilityaudits/>

**You can contact our office at:
California Public Utilities Commission
Utility Audits, Risk and Compliance Division
400 R Street, Suite 221
Sacramento, CA 95811**

Table of Contents

I. INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES	1
II. PROCEDURES AND FINDINGS	2
A. Transaction Reconciliation/Analysis	2
B. Quarterly Compliance Report (QCR).....	3
C. Strong Showing Justification.....	4
D. Electronic Solicitation and Related Contracts	4
E. Bilateral and Broker Contracts	5
F. Physical Gas Transaction Deep Dive	6

I. INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

Utility Audits Branch (UAB) of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) performed the agreed-upon procedures (AUP) enumerated in Procedures and Findings section of this report for the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E or the utility) compliance reporting period of July 1, 2020 through September 30, 2020 (Q3 2020). These procedures were agreed to between CPUC's Energy Division (ED) and UAB solely to assist ED in determining whether the three large investor-owned electric utilities are in compliance with certain energy procurement-related state law and CPUC energy procurement directives. PG&E is one of these utilities.¹ PG&E is responsible for complying with the energy procurement-related state laws and the CPUC's energy procurement directives.

UAB conducted the AUP engagement in accordance with attestation standards established by the generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS). The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of ED. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described herein either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose. The results of the engagement are also detailed in Procedures and Findings section of this report.

We were not engaged to, and did not, perform an examination or review of the subject matter, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on PG&E's compliance with the energy procurement-related state laws and the CPUC's energy procurement directives. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to ED.

The purpose of this report is to communicate to ED the utility's compliance and the results of the AUP performed. The report may not be suitable for any other purposes. The procedures performed may not address all the items of interest to users other than ED and may not meet the needs of all users of this report and, as such, users are responsible for determining whether the procedures performed are appropriate for their purposes.

In accordance with CPUC Decision (D.) 12-04-046, Ordering Paragraph (OP) 13, this report shall be made public. The report can be found on the CPUC public website through the following link:
<https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/utilityaudits/>

Angie Williams

Angie Williams, Director
Utility Audits, Risk and Compliance Division

¹ San Diego Gas and Electric Company and Southern California Edison Company are the other two electric utilities subject to the agreed-upon procedures engagements.

II. PROCEDURES AND FINDINGS

Below is the summary of the AUP performed and associated findings noted if any. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of ED. Thus, UAB makes no representation regarding the sufficiency of the following procedures used for this engagement for the purposes for which this report has been requested.

A. Transaction Reconciliation/Analysis

1. Ascertained whether the utility's Q3 2020 electric physical transaction details (Attachment A) contained any electronic solicitation or other competitive solicitation transactions, requiring additional review in D. Electronic Solicitation and Related Contracts.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

2. Verified whether the utility's Q3 2020 electric physical transaction details (Attachment A)² agreed to the corresponding transaction summary (Attachment C). Performed mathematical re-calculation and an analysis of 100% of transactional average prices, volumes, and notional values for the detection of a reporting anomaly.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

3. Confirmed whether the utility's Q3 2020 electric financial transaction details (Attachment A) agreed to the corresponding transaction summary (Attachment C). Performed mathematical re-calculation and an analysis of 100% of transactional average prices, volumes, and notional values for the detection of a reporting anomaly.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

4. Ascertained whether the utility's Q3 2020 gas physical transaction details (Attachment A) agreed to the corresponding transaction summary (Attachment D). Performed mathematical re-calculation and an analysis of 100% of transactional average prices, volumes, and notional values for the detection of a reporting anomaly.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

5. Determined whether the utility's Q3 2020 gas financial transaction details (Attachment A) agreed to the corresponding transaction summary (Attachment D). Performed mathematical re-calculation and an analysis of 100% of transactional average prices, volumes, and notional values for the detection of a reporting anomaly.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

6. Determined whether the utility's Q3 2020 transport, storage, park and lend transaction details (Attachment A) agreed to the corresponding transaction summary (Attachment D).

² All references to attachments in the list of Procedures and Findings are to the attachments to the utility's Quarterly Compliance Report subject to this engagement.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

B. Quarterly Compliance Report (QCR)

1. Confirmed whether the quarterly advice letter filing, including the attachments of supporting documentation, was accurate and complete.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

2. Identified any of the utility's authorized decision-makers that were not listed in the QCR.

Finding: We did not find any of the utility's authorized decision-makers that were not listed in the QCR.

3. Verified whether the utility provided its descriptions of and justifications for its procurement processes used to select the transactions.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

4. Determined whether the utility explained or justified the timing of its transactions.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

5. Affirmed whether the utility discussed the system load requirements/conditions underlying the need for the quarter's transactions.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

6. Ascertained whether the utility provided a copy of any data of forecasts used by the utility to analyze transactions.

Finding: We found the utility provided a copy of forecast data used to analyze transactions.

7. Validated whether the utility provided a copy of each of the utility's procurement contracts reported in Attachment H – Contracts Executed/Contracts Amended in the utility's QCR.

Finding: We found not exceptions as a result of this procedure.

8. Ascertained whether the utility provided a reasonable number of analyses, as requested by the CPUC or the Procurement Review Group (PRG) and provided the resulting outputs.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

9. Confirmed whether the utility's QCR included its briefing package provided to the ultimate decision maker.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

10. Ascertained whether the utility provided the break-even spot prices equivalent to the contracts.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

11. Validated whether the utility provided average price information for non-standard transactions.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

12. Determined whether the utility provided California Independent System Operator electricity procurement information in the utility's QCR.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

C. Strong Showing Justification

1. Affirmed whether any transactions subject to strong showing justification in Attachment A of the utility's QCR were properly justified in Attachment M – Transactions Subject to Strong Showing.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

2. Ascertained whether the price of bilateral contracts for non-standard products that are waived from strong showing justification under D. 03-06-067, OP 3(d) in Attachment A, is reasonable based on available and relevant market data. Compared the buy and sell average price paid or sold in Attachment A, to the market high and low prices to ensure a reasonable deal was completed.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

3. Ascertained whether any transactions subject to strong showing justification included in Attachment H of the utility's QCR were properly justified in Attachment M.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

4. Affirmed whether the price of bilateral contracts for non-standard products that are waived from strong showing justification under D.03-06-067, OP 3(d) in Attachment H, is reasonable based on available and relevant market data. Compared the buy and sell average price paid or sold in Attachment H, to the market high and low prices to ensure a reasonable deal was completed.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

5. Verified whether any other transactions included in the utility's QCR are subject to strong showing justification and if any, whether they are properly justified in Attachment M.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

6. Ascertained whether the price of bilateral contracts for non-standard products that are waived from strong showing justification under D.03-06-067, OP 3(d) in other transactions, is reasonable based on available and relevant market data. Compared the buy and sell average price paid or sold to the market high and low prices to ensure a reasonable deal was completed.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

D. Electronic Solicitation and Related Contracts

1. Verified whether the utility's Q3 2020 electric physical transaction details (Attachment A) contained any electronic solicitation or other competitive solicitation transactions.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

2. Validated whether the utility consulted with its PRG in a timely manner if any contract term was over one calendar quarter.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

3. Ascertained whether the utility's independent evaluator (IE) evaluated the contracts with terms greater than 2 years.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

4. Determined whether the contracts derived from the electronic solicitation selection process were executed with investment-grade counterparties or non-investment grade counterparties that were supported with surety bonds, guarantee, collateral, etc.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

5. Determined whether IE had evaluated the counterparty regardless of contract duration if the counterparty was an affiliate.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

6. Evaluated whether the contracts had any impact on the overall Time to Expiration Value at Risk (TeVAR).

Finding: We found no contracts had any impact on the overall TeVAR.

7. Identified any contract related to a new fossil generation or Purchase Power Agreement (PPA) that was less than 5 years.

Finding: We did not identify any contract related to a new fossil generation or PPA that was less than five years.

8. Verified whether all electronic solicitation contracts executed during the quarter were correctly and completely reported in attachments of the utility's QCR.

Finding: We found not exceptions as a result of this procedure.

E. Bilateral and Broker Contracts

1. Ascertained whether the utility consulted with its PRG in a timely manner for contracts exceeded one calendar quarter.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

2. Validated whether the contracts executed bilaterally with investment-grade counterparties or non-investment grade counterparties that were supported with surety bonds, guarantee, collateral, etc.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

3. Determined whether the utility's IE had evaluated the counterparty regardless of contract duration if the counterparty was an affiliate.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

4. Evaluated whether the contracts had any impact on the overall TeVAR.

Finding: We found no contracts had any impact on the overall TeVAR.

5. Identified any contract related to a new fossil generation or PPA that was less than 5 years.

Finding: We did not identify any contract related to a new fossil generation or PPA that was less than 5 years.

6. Verified whether the bilateral contracts executed during the quarter were correctly reported in the utility's QCR.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

F. Physical Gas Transaction Deep Dive

1. Determined whether the utility executed the transactions with adequate justifications (e.g. fulfilling its net residual open positions and using the least-cost-best-fit approach).

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

2. Verified transaction volumes, prices, and notional values to invoices.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

3. Evaluated whether the sampled transactions had any impact on the overall TeVAR.

Finding: We found no transactions had any impact on the overall TeVAR.

4. Verified that the product types, transaction processes, brokers and exchanges used for procurement during the quarter were approved in PG&E's Bundled Procurement Plan. Ascertained that PRG consultation properly took place for transactions with terms over 90 days. Confirmed that transactions did not have terms longer than five years and did not involve affiliates of PG&E.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

5. Confirmed whether quarter's transactions were executed with investment-grade counterparties or non-investment grade counterparties that were supported with surety bonds, guarantees, collateral, etc.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

6. Determined whether the utility demonstrated that prices of over the counter (OTC) transactions were equivalent to exchanges.

Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.