

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
PSEP Update
Application 13-10-017
Data Response**

PG&E Data Request No.:	ORA_004-14		
PG&E File Name:	PSEP-Update_DR_ORA_004-Q14		
Request Date:	February 13, 2014	Requester DR No.:	ORA 4
Date Sent:	February 28, 2014	Requesting Party:	Office of Ratepayer Advocates
PG&E Witness:	Sumeet Singh	Requester:	Tom Roberts/Alaine James

SUBJECT: PWC QUALITY ASSURANCE: PIPELINE PROGRAM DATA VALIDATION PROCESS

QUESTION 14

Page 3-8 of PG&E’s Testimony states than “if the minimum success criteria for a given workbook were not met, then the workbook was rejected as “defective” and subsequently corrected.” The table provided by PwC to ORA during the week of January 25, 2014 shows that in some cases, “inconsistencies” between data in different files (e.g. PFL vs. project workbook) were not changed.

- a) What was PG&E’s general procedure for correcting data errors uncovered by PwC? If this procedure is documented, please provide a copy.
- b) Did this procedure require that “defective” projects be corrected, but that other “defects” or inconsistencies were not required to be corrected?
- c) Was this procedure strictly adhered to, or were there deviations? Describe any deviations noted either during or after the audit.

ANSWER 14

- a) The discrepancies identified by PwC were reviewed by the PSEP Engineering team to validate the apparent discrepancy was in fact a defect. Defects were corrected using the appropriate process described in Chapter 2 Attachment B Update Filing Work Papers Preparation (Attachment C – Work Paper Quality Control).
- b) PG&E believes that all defects or inconsistencies in the sample workbooks tested were reviewed and corrected.
- c) There were no planned deviations to this process. It is believed that all discovered defects or inconsistencies were corrected in the sample workbooks.