



# QUARTERLY ENERGY PROCUREMENT COMPLIANCE AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES ENGAGEMENT

## San Diego Gas and Electric Company

Third Quarter of 2025 - Advice Letter 4745-E

Utility Audits, Risk and Compliance Division  
Utility Audits Branch  
March 27, 2026



## PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298



Transmitted via e-mail

March 27, 2026

Adam Pierce  
Vice President – Energy Procurement Rates  
San Diego Gas and Electric Company  
8330 Century Park Court, CP33B  
San Diego, CA 92123

Dear Adam Pierce:

**Final Report Transmittal Letter – Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagement of San Diego Gas and Electric Company’s Quarterly Energy Procurement Compliance Report for the Period of July 1, 2025, Through September 30, 2025**

The Utility Audits Branch (UAB) of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has completed its agreed-upon procedures (AUP) engagement of San Diego Gas and Electric Company’s (SDG&E) Quarterly Energy Procurement Compliance Report (QCR) filed for its Third Quarter of 2025 in Advice Letter (AL) 4745-E. The final AUP report is enclosed.

SDG&E’s response to the AUP engagement 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 (CAP) addressing the findings is required. SDG&E has already provided the information regarding its corrective actions planned and those responses have been included in the report. However, SDG&E is still required to file a supplemental AL 4745-E with amended Attachments H and M of its QCR by April 10, 2026. Once SDG&E submits the supplemental AL, no further action will be required.

We appreciate SDG&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](mailto:tracy.fok@cpuc.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

*Masha Vorobyeva for Angie Williams*

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

Adam Pierce  
Vice President – Energy Procurement and Rates  
San Diego Gas and Electric Company  
March 27, 2026  
Page 2

cc: Chris Summers, Director, Origination, Energy Supply and Dispatch, Energy Procurement and Rates, SDG&E  
Joe Pasquito, Market Analysis Manager, Origination and Portfolio Design, SDG&E  
Scott D Lewis, Electric & Fuels Trading Manager, Organization and Portfolio Design, SDG&E  
Anthony Deiko, Marketing Risk Principal I, Energy Risk Management, SDG&E  
Nick Santos, Regulatory Affairs & Compliance Associate II, Policy and Proceedings, SDG&E  
Eneida Alvarez – Regulatory Case Manager II, SDG&E  
Leuwam Tesfai, Executive Director, CPUC  
Kristin Stauffacher, Deputy Executive Director, Office of the Commission, CPUC  
Merideth “Molly” Sterkel, Director for Energy and Climate Policy, Energy Division (ED), CPUC  
Jaime Rose Gannon, Program & Project Supervisor, ED, CPUC  
Eric Dupre, Public Utilities Regulatory Analyst, ED, CPUC  
Natalie Guishar, Public Utilities Regulatory Analyst, ED, CPUC  
Theresa Buckley, Assistant General Counsel, CPUC  
Masha Vorobyova, Assistant Director, UAB, CPUC  
Tracy Fok, Program & Project Supervisor, UAB, CPUC  
Judith Mason, Public Utility Financial Examiner IV, UAB, CPUC  
Keen Banh, Associate Management Auditor, UAB, CPUC  
Yaelan Wong, Staff Services Management Auditor, UAB, CPUC

## **MEMBERS OF THE TEAM**

**Angie Williams, Director**

**Masha Vorobyova, Assistant Director**

**Tracy Fok aka Tracy Yeh, CPA, Supervisor**

**Judith Mason, Lead**

**Keen Banh, Staff**

**Paulina Zepeda Gomez, Staff**

**Yaelan Wong, Staff**

**A digital copy of this report can be found at:**

[Audit Reports by Industry \(ca.gov\)](#)

**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. REQUEST FOR OFFERS (RFO) CONTRACTS .....	6
D. BILATERAL CONTRACTS.....	7
E. STRONG SHOWING JUSTIFICATION.....	8
F. CONGESTION REVENUE RIGHTS (CRR) AND LONG TERM CRR (LTCRR)...	10

# 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 San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E or the utility) energy procurement compliance reporting period of July 1, 2025, through September 30, 2025, (Q3 2025). 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. SDG&E is one of these utilities<sup>1</sup> 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 SDG&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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pacific Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Edison Company 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 \(ca.gov\)](#).

*Masha Vorobyova for Angie Williams*

---

Angie Williams, Director  
Utility Audits, Risk and Compliance Division (UARCD)

## 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 2025 electric physical (and transmission) transaction details in Attachment A<sup>2</sup> contained any electronic solicitation or other competitive solicitation transactions, requiring performance of the audit procedures indicated under Section C – Request for Offers Contracts.

Finding: We found no electronic/competitive solicitation transactions reported in Attachment A as a result of this procedure.

2. Reconciled to determine whether the utility's Q3 2025 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 2025 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 2025 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 2025 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 2025 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: SDG&E failed to demonstrate compliance with D.02-10-062, Appendix B, and PU Code Section 581.** SDG&E incorrectly reported the execution date for the RFO contract executed with [REDACTED] in Attachment H – New Contracts Executed and Amended. For additional information about the finding, please see Finding #1 at procedure C.6 listed below.

**SDG&E's Response to Finding #1:** See C.6.

**Finding #2: SDG&E failed to demonstrate compliance with D.02-10-062, Appendix B, and PU Code Section 581.** SDG&E incorrectly reported [REDACTED] as a bilateral contract agreement instead of reporting it under the Informational Only section in Attachment H. For additional information about the finding, please see Finding #2 at procedure D.5 listed below.

**SDG&E's Response to Finding #2:** See D.5.

**Finding #3: SDG&E failed to demonstrate compliance with D.02-10-062, Appendix B, and PU Code Section 581.** SDG&E incorrectly reported the price (\$/kW-day) for the broker transaction executed with [REDACTED] in Attachment H. For additional information about the finding, please see Finding #3 at procedure D.5 listed below.

**SDG&E's Response to Finding #3:** See D.5.

**Finding #4: SDG&E failed to demonstrate compliance with D.02-10-062, Appendix B, and PU Code Section 581.** SDG&E incorrectly reported the counterparty, [REDACTED] as being executed via a broker transaction instead of a bilateral transaction in Attachment M – Transactions Subject to Strong Showing. For additional information about the finding, please see Finding #4 at procedure E.5 listed below.

**SDG&E's Response to Finding #4:** See E.5.

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.  
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 Independent System Operator (CAISO) electricity procurement information in the utility's QCR.

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

### C. 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: No contracts had any impact on the overall TeVAR.

5. Identified any contract related to a new fossil-fuel generation or Power Purchase 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 #1: SDG&E failed to demonstrate compliance with D.02-10-062, Appendix B, and PU Code Section 581.** SDG&E incorrectly reported the execution date for the RFO contract with [REDACTED] as [REDACTED], instead of [REDACTED], in Attachment H.

#### **SDG&E's Response:**

On February 18, 2026, SDG&E stated:

SDG&E acknowledges that Attachment H of the Q3 2025 QCR filing reported [REDACTED], as the execution date for the RFO contract with [REDACTED], while the DocuSign signature timestamp reflects [REDACTED]....SDG&E understands that the CPUC's QCR reporting requirements focus on the actual signature

execution date. SDG&E will revise Attachment H with the execution date reflecting [REDACTED]. Moving forward, SDG&E will use the DocuSign execution timestamp when reporting execution dates in Attachment H.

#### **UAB Comment:**

This is a repeat finding from the prior AUP QCR engagements for the second quarter of 2025 and the fourth quarter of 2024. SDG&E will need to ensure that appropriate corrective actions are implemented to prevent similar recurrences in future QCR filings.

#### **D. Bilateral 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 #2: SDG&E failed to demonstrate compliance with D.02-10-062, Appendix B, and PU Code Section 581.** SDG&E incorrectly reported [REDACTED] as a bilateral contract in Attachment H. This transaction is in reference to a product type [REDACTED] and is an amendment to an existing solar PPA. It should not have been reported as a regular bilateral contract in the QCR for approval. Instead, it should have been included in the Informational Purposes Only section of Attachment H.

**SDG&E’s Response to Finding #2:**

On December 19, 2025, SDG&E stated:

SDG&E acknowledges the findings in this Data Request and notes that the error occurred because [REDACTED] was inadvertently included in Section 1 under bilateral agreements of Attachment H instead of Section 2 for informational purposes only. To prevent this issue from recurring, SDG&E will implement an enhanced review process that includes a double-check of the checklist prior to filing to ensure accurate categorization and compliance. SDG&E will revise Attachment H and submit the updated version through a supplemental advice letter to AL 4745-E within a reasonable amount of time after the CPUC confirms that all findings regarding SDG&E’s Q3 QCR have been communicated.

**Finding #3: SDG&E failed to demonstrate compliance with D.02-10-062, Appendix B, and PU Code Section 581.** SDG&E incorrectly reported the price (\$/kW-day) for the broker transaction executed with [REDACTED] in Attachment H, as outlined in the table below. The notional value of this transaction was not affected by this reporting error.

Counterparty Name	Attachment H Price (\$/kW-day)	Confirmation Price (\$/kW-day)	Audit Adjustment (\$/kW-day)
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

**SDG&E’s Response to Finding #3:**

On January 6, 2026, SDG&E stated:

SDG&E erroneously added a “0” after the decimal in the Attachment H Contract Price field entry. As a manual report with manual auditing, inadvertent errors may occur from time to time. SDG&E will increase its internal audit vigilance to seek to prevent similar reporting errors in the future. SDG&E will increase its internal audit vigilance to seek to prevent similar reporting errors in the future

**E. 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 #4: SDG&E failed to demonstrate compliance with D.02-10-062, Appendix B, and PU Code Section 581.** SDG&E incorrectly reported the counterparty, [REDACTED], as being executed through a broker contract rather than a bilateral contract in Attachment M. Only bilateral contracts, not broker contracts, are subject to the strong showing reporting requirements in Attachment M.

**SDG&E's Response to Finding #4:**

On February 12, 2026, SDG&E stated:

SDG&E erroneously identified this transaction as "Brokered" instead of "Bilateral". As a manual report with manual auditing, inadvertent errors may occur from time to time. SDG&E will increase its internal audit vigilance to seek to prevent similar reporting errors in the future.

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.

## F. Congestion Revenue Rights (CRR) and Long Term CRR (LTCRR)

1. Inquired with the utility and inspected 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 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 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 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 contain, 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: We found no exceptions as a result of this procedure.

7. Inquired with the utility and inspected 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 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.