

Questions and Answers from Technical and Bidders' Conference

November 30, 2020

1. Is there a file size restriction in the submission of proposals?
 - A *The technical limit to what our email system will accept is 25 MB. Should you have a file that will be larger please reach out to us ahead of the due date so we can recommend how we will accommodate the file.*
2. Section IV of the RFP indicates that the cost evaluation will be conducted using “the functionality of an industry standard model tailored to MISO Zone 9”. It is unclear if the forecast model will be tailored to each coop specifically taking into account power delivery points, rather than general MISO Zone 9.
 - A *MISO Zone 9 is considered of sufficient granularity to support differentiation of supply alternatives available to the Cooperatives; this is the level of analysis of our model. If the analysis of an individual proposal requires a location-specific price forecast, we will apply an appropriate adjustment factor to the MISO Zone 9 price.*
3. It is unclear on how to address the potential ARR value. Will the volumes and paths (POR, POD) be provided to potential suppliers in order to analyze value to be assigned to the ARR portfolio?
 - A *Bidders are asked to specify their assumptions about ARRs (will ARR revenue be retained by bidders or passed through directly to the cooperatives?) The Cooperatives are seeking proposals relative to the services requested and we are seeking the Bidders knowledge and recommendations regarding ARRs and their advantages or disadvantages for the Bid. As needed, the Cooperatives will use estimates of ARR revenues based on past values to compare bids that include ARR pass-through with bids that do not.*
4. RFP is silent on the Meter Data Management Agent (MDMA) requirements. Will the coops require that the respondent supply MDMA services? Who will be responsible to owning and maintaining the revenue quality meters?
 - A *The expectation is that a full-requirements bidder would take on the responsibility of reporting MDMA data to MISO. For other bids, we will ask bidders to specify whether this service is provided. If this service is not provided, a cost for the Cooperatives to provide the service will be factored into the analysis of bid economics.*

The ownership and maintenance of the revenue quality meters will be an item for negotiation in the final contract. The Cooperatives will update the RFP seeking clarification on Bidder offered MDMA services – in their RFP responses, bidders should be prepared to identify whether they will offer these services and at what cost or if they prefer not to offer the services.
5. Appendix A: Buyer Delivery Points, please include IOU, Average Yearly MW Peak and Yearly MWh for each delivery point.

- A This information, where available, will be provided to bidders after execution of the final Confidentiality Agreement.*
6. Please provide SWPA hourly historical data and capacity accreditation for each coop separately
- A This information will be provided to bidders after execution of the final Confidentiality Agreement.*
7. From review of the proposed Confidentiality Agreement, it appears the proposed form of agreement is intended to cover the protection of confidential bidder materials during the RFP analysis process, but is not intended as the form of agreement that would be used in follow-up LPSC certification proceedings for any resources selected from the RFP. In any such LPSC certification proceedings, competing bidders may be participating as intervenors and thus there should be additional protections included in the form of agreement for materials designated as Highly Sensitive Protected Materials consistent with established practice in LPSC proceedings. To that end, can language be added to the RFP Appendix C Confidentiality Agreement at Section 11.0 to the effect of: "Any future regulatory or governmental certification approval procedure will require a separate form of agreement to provide appropriate confidentiality protection for certain proprietary confidential information including Highly Sensitive Protected Materials."
- A This suggestion has been adopted in the updated confidentiality agreement.*
8. Would it be possible to ask the Buyers for shape files of their transmission infrastructure?
- A Upon request, and with an executed Confidentiality Agreement, each Cooperative will determine whether to provide this information.*
9. Section 2, Part A of the Draft RFP on p. 11 states that "Buyers anticipate entering contracts for a minimum five-year up to a maximum twenty-year period." This is stated again on p. 12 in the context of Full Requirements proposals. Can you indicate whether Buyers are more inclined to prefer contracts with a term closer to 5 years or 20 years? If the answer varies by product type, can you indicate whether their preference is closer to 5 years or 20 years for full requirements proposals?
- A The Cooperatives' preference is for a low-cost, reliable solution, not a specific contract duration.*

10. Section 2, Part B of the Draft RFP on p. 12 states that Buyers are interested in considering Full Requirements bids that allow them "to supply up to 15% (carve-out) of their annual requirements from other providers for renewable, battery, DSM resources, or new technologies." Can you indicate whether this 15% carve-out preference relates to capacity, energy or both? If both, can you indicate whether there is a stronger preference for an energy carve-out or a capacity carve-out? Can you provide any guidance around when Buyers would be expected to bring these other resources online?

A The Cooperatives would consider either a 15% energy carve-out or a 15% capacity carve-out (or both) as responsive to this request.

11. Section 2, Part B of the Draft RFP on p. 12 states that Buyers would consider unbundled products, including individual project PPAs. All else equal, do Buyers have a preference for requirements proposals or a portfolio-based approach of various products?

A The Cooperative's preference is for a low-cost, reliable solution, and they are open to different approaches.

12. When can we expect a response to comments already submitted on the Confidentiality Agreement?

A The Cooperatives are now taking comments and feedback received on the draft Confidentiality Agreement and reviewing any change requests. A final Confidentiality Agreement will be issued with the final RFP.

13. Will bidders be notified as to whether they are moving forward from Phase 1 to Phase 2 and from Phase 2 to Phase 3? In other words, will bidders receive any updates regarding whether their proposal(s) are continuing to be considered?

A Bidders who do not move from Phase 1 to Phase 2 will be notified. We are not currently planning a notification between Phase 2 and Phase 3.

14. Should the bidders anticipate receiving any written questions or other forms of communication from Daymark regarding their bids prior to Phase 3?

A If bid clarification is necessary in order to complete Phase 2 bid evaluation, Daymark will reach out to bidders prior to Phase 3 to request such clarification.

15. Can we get a redline of the Confidentiality Agreement so can see the changes?

A When the final Confidentiality Agreement is issued, the Cooperatives will provide a redlined copy to those who request it.

16. We would like to confirm the viability of a specific SLEMCO substation as a Delivery Point. Can you confirm 1) correct substation name, 2) substation voltage characteristics, and 3) Delivery Point viability for the substation?

A Cypress Island is not tied into the bulk electric system. It is tied into SLEMCO's 138 kv system with a 20 MVA base rated, 138 kv transformer. It is not suitable as a delivery point without significant modifications.