



QUARTERLY ENERGY PROCUREMENT COMPLIANCE AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES ENGAGEMENT

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Third Quarter of 2024 - Advice Letter 7418-E

Utility Audits, Risk and Compliance Division
Utility Audits Branch
April 4, 2025



PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Transmitted via e-mail

April 4, 2025

Marianne Aikawa, Director
Risk, Compliance & Reporting Department
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
300 Lakeside Drive
Oakland, CA 94612

Dear Marianne Aikawa:

Final Report Transmittal Letter – Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagement of Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s Quarterly Energy Procurement Compliance Report for the period of July 1, 2024, through September 30, 2024

The Utility Audits Branch (UAB) of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has completed its agreed-upon procedures (AUP) engagement of Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s (PG&E) Quarterly Energy Procurement Compliance Report (QCR) filed for its Third Quarter of 2024 in Advice Letter (AL) 7418-E. The final AUP report is enclosed.

PG&E’s response to the AUP report findings are incorporated into this report. As required by Public Utilities Code Section 454.5(g), the confidential market sensitive information contained in the AUP report is redacted. We will post the final redacted audit report on our website at [Audit Reports by Industry \(ca.gov\)](https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/Audit-Reports-by-Industry).

A corrective action plan addressing the findings is required. PG&E has already provided the information regarding its corrective actions planned and those responses have been included in the report. However, PG&E is still required to file a supplemental AL 7418-E with amended Attachments E, F, H, J and L of its QCR by April 18, 2025. Once PG&E submits the supplemental AL, no further action will be required.

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 or tracy.fok@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Angie Williams

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

Marianne Aikawa, Director
Risk, Compliance & Reporting Department
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
April 4, 2025
Page 2

cc: Christina Honey, Principal Analyst, Risk, Compliance & Reporting, PG&E
Angela Torr, Principal Analyst, Risk, Compliance & Reporting, PG&E
Bill Reinwald, Principal Analyst, Risk, Compliance & Reporting, PG&E
Melissa Hines, Manager, Risk, Compliance & Reporting, PG&E
Rachel Peterson, Executive Director, CPUC
Kristin Stauffacher, Deputy Executive Director, Office of the Commission, CPUC
Leuwam Tesfai, Deputy Executive Director, Energy Division (ED), CPUC
Meredith “Molly” Sterkel, Program Manager, ED, CPUC
Jaime Gannon, Program & Project Supervisor, ED, CPUC
Eric Dupre, Public Utilities Regulatory Analyst, ED, CPUC
Theresa Buckley, Staff Attorney, CPUC
Masha Vorobyova, Assistant Director, UAB, CPUC
Tracy Fok, Program & Project Supervisor, UAB, CPUC
Tim Baumgardner, Senior Management Auditor, UAB, CPUC
Judith Mason, Public Utility Financial Examiner IV, UAB, CPUC
Keen Banh, Associate Management Auditor, UAB, CPUC
Paulina Zepeda Gomez, Associate Management Auditor, UAB, CPUC

MEMBERS OF THE TEAM

Angie Williams, Director

Masha Vorobyova, Assistant Director

Tracy Fok aka Tracy Yeh, CPA, Supervisor

Tim Baumgardner, Lead

Judith Mason, Lead

Keen Banh, Staff

Paulina Zepeda Gomez, Staff

A digital copy of this report can be found at:

[Audit Reports by Industry \(ca.gov\)](https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/Audit-Reports-by-Industry)

**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.....	3
A. TRANSACTION RECONCILIATION/ANALYSIS	3
B. QUARTERLY COMPLIANCE REPORT (QCR).....	4
C. STRONG SHOWING JUSTIFICATION.....	6
D. REQUEST FOR OFFERS (RFO) CONTRACTS	7
E. ELECTRONIC SOLICITATION CONTRACTS.....	8
F. BILATERAL AND BROKER CONTRACTS	9
G. GREENHOUSE GAS ALLOWANCES (GHG).....	9
H. CARBON FREE ENERGY CONTRACTS	11
I. CONGESTION REVENUE RIGHTS (CRR) AND LONG TERM CRR (LTCRR)...	11

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

The 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 Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E or the utility) energy procurement compliance reporting period of July 1, 2024, through September 30, 2024, (Q3 2024.) 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 laws and CPUC energy procurement directives. PG&E is one of these utilities¹ and is responsible for complying with the energy procurement requirements.

ED engaged UAB to perform this AUP engagement. UAB is required to be independent and to meet other ethical responsibilities in accordance with the relevant ethical requirements related to the AUP engagement. We conducted this engagement in accordance with attestation standards established by the generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS). The sufficiency of the AUP procedures is solely the responsibility of ED. ED has agreed to and acknowledged that the procedures performed are appropriate for the intended purpose of the AUP engagement. 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 detailed in the 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.

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

In accordance with CPUC Decision (D.) 12-04-046, Ordering Paragraph (OP) 13, this report shall be made public. As required by Public Utilities (PU) Code Section 454.5(g), the confidential market sensitive information contained in the AUP report is redacted. The redacted report can be found on the CPUC public website through the following link: [Audit Reports by Industry \(ca.gov\)](#).

Angie Williams

Angie Williams, Director
Utility Audits, Risk and Compliance Division

II. PROCEDURES AND FINDINGS

Below are the results of the AUP performed and associated findings. 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. Inspected whether the utility's Q3 2024 electric physical (and transmission) transaction details in Attachment A² contained any electronic solicitation or other competitive solicitation transactions, requiring performance of the audit procedures under Section E - Electronic Solicitation Contracts.

Finding: We found ■ electronic solicitation electric physical transactions reported in Attachment A that required performance of the AUP indicated in Section E of this report. We combined performing the required AUP for these transactions along with other electronic solicitation contracts also reported in Attachment H – Contracts Executed/Contracts Amended.

2. Reconciled to determine whether the utility's Q3 2024 electric physical transaction details in Attachment A agreed to the corresponding transaction summary in Attachment C. Performed mathematical re-calculation and an analysis of 100 percent 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. Reconciled to determine whether the utility's Q3 2024 electric financial transaction details in Attachment A agreed to the corresponding transaction summary in Attachment C. Performed mathematical re-calculation and an analysis of 100 percent 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. Reconciled to determine whether the utility's Q3 2024 gas physical transaction details in Attachment A agreed to the corresponding transaction summary in Attachment D. Performed mathematical re-calculation and an analysis of 100 percent 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. Reconciled to determine whether the utility's Q3 2024 gas financial transaction details in Attachment A agreed to the corresponding transaction summary in Attachment D. Performed mathematical re-calculation and an analysis of 100 percent 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.

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

6. Reconciled to determine whether the utility's Q3 2024 transport, storage, park and lend transaction details in Attachment A agreed to the corresponding transaction summary in Attachment D.

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

7. Compared the utility's spot market (i.e., Day-Ahead, Hour-Ahead, and Real-Time energy) electric physical purchases to its monthly retail energy needs, or energy physical purchase requirement, to determine whether the spot market purchases exceed five percent of the monthly retail energy needs, or energy physical purchase requirement.

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

B. Quarterly Compliance Report (QCR)

1. Inspected QCR advice letter filing, including the attachments of supporting documentation, to determine whether the filing was accurate and complete.

Finding #1: PG&E failed to demonstrate compliance with D.02-10-062 – Appendix B and PU Code Section 581. PG&E failed to provide complete and accurate information in Attachments E and H when initially submitting their Q3 2024 QCR. PG&E executed [REDACTED] electronic solicitation contracts with [REDACTED]. However, PG&E failed to provide a confirmation letter for one of the electronic solicitation contracts executed with this counterparty.

PG&E's Response:

On February 19, 2025, PG&E stated:

PG&E agrees with this finding. The Q3 2024 QCR did not include the [REDACTED] confirm for log number [REDACTED] in Confidential Attachments E and H. Per PG&E's response to DR 002, PG&E inadvertently submitted the [REDACTED] confirmation associated with log number [REDACTED] twice. This finding will be reported in PG&E's Corrective Action Program (CAP) and additional controls and processes are being discussed to mitigate similar issues from happening in the future. After all Q3 2024 QCR findings have been communicated, PG&E will file a supplemental to replace the duplicate [REDACTED] confirm with [REDACTED].

Finding #2: PG&E failed to demonstrate compliance with D.02-10-062 – Appendix B and PU Code Section 581. PG&E incorrectly reported the delivery term of the E-Solicitation contract executed with [REDACTED]. For additional information about the finding, please see Finding #2 at procedure E.7 listed below.

PG&E's Response: See E.7

Finding #3: PG&E failed to demonstrate compliance with D.02-10-062 – Appendix B, PU Code Section 581 and Resolution E 4135. PG&E failed to include the required information regarding PG&E Monthly Congestion Revenue Rights (CRR) awards for [REDACTED] in its Q3 2024 QCR. For additional information about the finding, please see Finding #3 at procedure I.6 listed below.

PG&E's Response: See I.6

2. Identified any of the utility's authorized decision-makers that were not listed in QCR.
Finding: We did not find any of the utility's authorized decision-makers that were not listed in QCR.
3. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine 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. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine whether the utility explained or justified the timing of its transactions.
Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.
5. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine 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. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine 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. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine whether the utility provided a copy of each of the utility's procurement contracts reported in Attachment H – Contracts Executed/Contracts Amended.
Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.
8. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine whether the utility provided a reasonable number of analyses, as requested by CPUC or the Procurement Review Group (PRG) and provided the resulting outputs.
Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.
9. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine 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. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine 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. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine whether the utility provided average price information for non-standard transactions.

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

12. Inspected QCR and associated attachments to determine whether the utility provided California System Independent Operator (CAISO) procurement information in the utility's QCR.

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

C. Strong Showing Justification

1. Inspected Attachment A for any transactions subject to strong showing justification and inspected Attachment M – Transactions Subject to Strong Showing to determine whether the transactions were properly justified in Attachment M.

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

2. Compared the price of bilateral contracts for non-standard products in Attachment A, which are waived from strong showing justification under D.03-06-067, OP 3(d), to the prices of relevant market supporting documentation to determine whether the bilateral contract prices are reasonable based on available and relevant market data. Compared the buy and sell average price 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. Inspected Attachment H for any transactions subject to strong showing justification and inspected Attachment M to determine whether the transactions were properly justified in Attachment M.

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

4. Compared the price of bilateral contracts for non-standard products in Attachment H, which are waived from strong showing justification under D.03-06-067, OP 3(d), to the prices of relevant market supporting documentation to determine whether the bilateral contract prices are reasonable based on available and relevant market data. Compared the buy and sell average price 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. Inspected other bilateral transactions in QCR for any transactions subject to strong showing justification and inspected Attachment M to determine whether the transactions were properly justified in Attachment M.

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

6. Compared the prices of other bilateral contracts for non-standard products that are waived from strong showing justification under D.03-06-067, OP 3(d) to the prices of relevant market supporting documentation to determine whether the bilateral contract prices are reasonable based on available and relevant market data. Compared the buy and sell average price for other transactions 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. Request for offers (RFO) Contracts

1. Inspected PRG meeting documentation to ascertain that the utility consulted with its PRG in a timely manner for contracts that exceeded one calendar quarter.

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

2. Inspected the utility's Independent Evaluator (IE) report to determine whether IE evaluated any contracts executed with affiliate(s) or any contracts with terms greater than two years.

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

3. Inspected counterparties' credit supporting documentation to validate that the contracts derived from the RFO selection process were executed with investment-grade counterparties or non-investment grade counterparties that were supported with credit protection such as surety bonds, guarantee, collateral, and net provision.

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

4. Inquired with the utility as to 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.

5. Identified any contract related to a new fossil-fuel generation or Purchase Power Agreement (PPA) with a term of less than five years.

Finding: We did not identify any contract related to a new fossil-fuel generation or PPA with a term of less than five years.

6. Traced and agreed all RFO contracts executed during the quarter to supporting documentation to ensure that they were correctly and completely reported in attachments of the utility's QCR.

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

E. Electronic Solicitation Contracts

1. Inspected the utility's Q3 2024 electric physical transactions included in Attachment A to determine if there were any electronic solicitation or other competitive solicitation transactions.

Finding: We found [REDACTED] electronic solicitation electric physical transaction reported in Attachment A as a result of this procedure. We performed the required AUP for these transactions along with other competitive solicitation contracts reported in Attachment H following the procedures in this section.

2. Inspected PRG meeting materials to determine whether the utility consulted with its PRG for any contracts with terms over one calendar quarter before they were executed.

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

3. Inspected the utility's IE report to determine whether IE evaluated any contracts executed with affiliate(s) or any contracts with terms greater than two years.

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

4. Inspected counterparties' credit supporting documentation to validate that the contracts derived from the electronic solicitation selection process were executed with investment-grade counterparties or non-investment grade counterparties that were supported with credit protection such as surety bonds, guarantee, collateral, and net provision.

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

5. Inquired with the utility as to whether the contracts had any impact on the overall TeVAR.

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

6. Identified any contract related to a new fossil-fuel generation or PPA that was less than five years

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

7. Traced and agreed all electronic solicitation contracts executed during the quarter to supporting documentation to ensure that they were correctly and completely reported in attachments of the utility's QCR.

Finding #2: PG&E failed to demonstrate compliance with D.02-10-062 – Appendix B and PU Code Section 581. PG&E incorrectly reported the delivery term of the E-Solicitation contract executed with [REDACTED] as [REDACTED]. However, the contract confirmation letter indicates delivery term as [REDACTED].

PG&E's Response:

On March 12, 2025, PG&E stated:

PG&E agrees with this finding. Confidential Attachment H of the Q3 2024 QCR inadvertently reported a [REDACTED] delivery date instead of the correct [REDACTED] delivery date for [REDACTED]. This finding will be reported in PG&E's Corrective Action Program (CAP) and additional controls and processes are being discussed to mitigate similar issues from happening in the future. Upon conclusion of UAB's audit, PG&E will file a supplemental advice letter to correct the Q3 2024 QCR findings, including an update to the Confidential Attachment H spreadsheet with the correct delivery date.

F. Bilateral and Broker Contracts

1. Inspected PRG meeting materials to determine whether the utility consulted with its PRG for any contracts with terms over one calendar quarter before they were executed.

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

2. Inspected counterparties' credit supporting documentation to validate that the contracts were executed bilaterally with investment-grade counterparties or non-investment grade counterparties that were supported with credit protection such as surety bonds, guarantee, collateral, and net provision.

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

3. Inquired with the utility as to whether the contracts had any impact on the overall TeVAR.

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

4. Identified any contract related to a new fossil-fuel generation or PPA that was less than five years.

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

5. Traced and agreed all bilateral contracts executed during the quarter to supporting documentation to ensure that they were correctly and completely reported in attachments of the utility's QCR.

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

G. Greenhouse Gas Allowances (GHG)

1. Identified whether the utility procured GHG allowances, allowance futures and forwards and offsets and offset forwards within separately calculated Direct Compliance Obligation Purchase Limits and Financial Exposure Purchase Limits, as set forth in the utility's Bundled Procurement Plan (BPP) as instructed in Appendix I of D.12-04-046.

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

2. Inspected all GHG transactions to ascertain that the utility only procured offsets certified by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).
Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.
3. Totaled the volume of all offset transactions to determine whether the utility purchased no more than 8 percent of its compliance requirement in the form of offsets.
Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.
4. Inspected GHG offset contracts to determine whether the utility only purchased offsets if the seller contractually assumes the risk of invalidation.
Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.
5. Inspected the utility's GHG procurement supporting documentation to determine whether the utility procured allowances from CARB or other processes approved by CPUC.
Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.
6. Inspected relevant supporting documentation to determine that the utility applied its standard procurement credit and collateral requirements and, if appropriate, imposed additional credit and collateral requirements to those transactions, in which the utility procured allowances via forward contracts.
Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.
7. Inspected relevant supporting documentation to determine that the utility utilized a competitive request for offer process, consulted with its PRG, applied their approved procurement credit and collateral requirement, and applied the applicable affiliate transactions rules, if the utility procured authorized compliance instruments via bilateral transactions.
Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.
8. Inspected the utility's one-time Tier 2 advice letter to ascertain that the utility submitted such a letter to the Commission if the utility procured GHG compliance instruments through the exchanges not approved by the Commission.
Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.
9. Inspected PRG meeting documentation to determine whether the utility reported GHG sales to its PRG if the utility resold GHG compliance instruments.
Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.
10. Inspected PRG meeting documentation and QCR attachments to determine whether the utility reported its forecast updates and corresponding revisions to the procurement limits, along with all GHG compliance instrument transactions at its quarterly PRG meetings and QCR advice letter filings.
Finding: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

11. Traced and agreed greenhouse gas compliance instrument to invoices and payments to determine whether the utility correctly reported its greenhouse gas compliance instrument transactions.

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

H. Carbon Free Energy Contracts (Electronic Solicitation Process)

1. Inspected PRG meeting materials to determine whether the utility consulted with its PRG for any contracts with terms over one calendar quarter before they were executed.

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

2. Inspected the utility's IE report to determine whether IE evaluated any contracts executed with affiliate(s) or any contracts with terms greater than two years.

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

3. Inspected counterparties' credit supporting documentation to validate that the contracts derived from the electronic solicitation selection process were executed with investment-grade counterparties or non-investment grade counterparties that were supported with credit protection such as surety bonds, guarantee, collateral, and net provision.

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

4. Inquired with the utility as to 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-fuel generation or PPA that was less than five years.

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

6. Traced and agreed all carbon free energy contracts executed during the quarter to supporting documentation to ensure that they were correctly and completely reported in attachments of the utility's QCR.

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

I. Congestion Revenue Rights (CRR) and Long Term CRR (LTCRR)

1. Inquired with the utility and inspected relevant evidence to determine whether it consulted with ED and its PRG regarding its annual CRR nominations prior to submitting those nominations and participating in the CAISO's CRR nomination process.

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

2. Inquired with the utility and inspected relevant evidence to determine whether it consulted with ED and its PRG regarding any CRRs having a term greater than one calendar quarter prior to execution of such CRR.

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

3. Inquired with the Utility and inspected relevant evidence to determine whether the utility, prior to the PRG meeting, provided a list of proposed annual CRR and LTCRR nominations for allocation and auction, showing source (generation), sink (load), megawatt (MW) quantity, term, expected value, past performance (if applicable), bid price, and a description the underlying arrangement that the CRR will hedge.

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

4. Inquired with the utility and inspected relevant evidence to determine whether it consulted with ED and its PRG to review its CRR position during the periodic position update discussions and provided the PRG with information regarding the CRR, including but not limited to source, sink, MW quantity, term, expected value, past performance (if applicable), price and a description of the underlying arrangement that the CRR will hedge (or in the case of a CRR sale, no longer hedge).

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

5. Inquired with the utility whether its limits candidate CRRs to those CRRs with a source at which Utility reasonably expects to procure power.

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

6. Inspected QCR to determine whether utility reports CRRs, which contains, at minimum, for each CRR, source, sink, MW quantity, term, expected value, past performance (if applicable), bid price (for CRR auctions or secondary market transactions), and a description of the underlying energy supply arrangement that the CRR will hedge.

Finding #3: PG&E failed to demonstrate compliance with D.02-10-062 – Appendix B, PU Code Section 581 and Resolution E 4135. PG&E failed to include its monthly CRR awards for [REDACTED] in confidential Attachments F, J and L of its Q3 2024 QCR. The CRR detailed information provided in the QCR does not include all the detailed information that is required in the CPUC Resolution E-4135, such as CRR monthly award information.

Resolution E-4135 states, in part, that:

PG&E shall also report all CRR transactions in its Quarterly Compliance Report (QCR). The Commission expects that the QCRs will contain, at a minimum, for each CRR, source, sink, MW quantity, term, expected value, past performance (if applicable), bid price (for CRR auctions or secondary market transactions), and a description the underlying energy supply arrangement that the CRR will hedge.

PG&E's Response:

On February 6, 2025, PG&E stated:

PG&E agrees with this finding. The Q3 2024 QCR did not include the correct PRG email with PG&E's Monthly CRR Awards for [REDACTED] in Confidential Attachments F, J and L. Per PG&E's response to DR 002, PG&E inadvertently submitted a version of the PRG CRR [REDACTED] awards email in Confidential Attachments F, J, and L that did not include the attachment. However, PG&E did

send the PRG the correct email on [REDACTED], which included the [REDACTED] CRR monthly award attachment. This finding will be reported in PG&E's Corrective Action Program (CAP) and additional controls and processes are being discussed to mitigate similar issues from happening in the future. After all Q3 2024 QCR findings have been communicated, PG&E will file a supplemental to replace the PRG email with the correct Monthly CRR Awards for [REDACTED].

7. Inquired with the utility and inspected relevant evidence to determine whether it consulted with ED and its PRG regarding its LTCRR nominations prior to submitting those nominations and participating in the CAISO's LTCRR nomination process.

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

8. Inquired with the utility and inspected relevant evidence to determine whether it provided periodic updates at least quarterly to the PRG on how its previously obtained LTCRRs were performing. The PRG update should contain, at minimum, for each LTCRR, the term, source and sink, relation to grid use, expected value, and past performance.

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

9. Inspected QCR to determine whether the utility reported LTCRRs, which contained, at minimum, for each LTCRR, the term, source and sink, relation to grid use, expected value, and past performance.

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