SILICON VALLEY CLEAN ENERGY

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

FOR

ETRM, PORTFOLIO ANALYTICS MODELING, RESOURCE PLANNING MODELING AND FUNDAMENTALS CONSULTING

Q&A Period: Sept 02 to Sept 08, 2026

Answers Posted: Sept 11, 2026

SVCE is appreciative of the overwhelming response to its notification about its ETRM, PORTFOLIO ANALYTICS MODELING, RESOURCE PLANNING MODELING AND FUNDAMENTALS CONSULTING RFP, as evidenced by the number of questions it received from a variety of firms. Thank you, to all potential respondents, for your patience as we worked to provide thoughtful responses. In some cases, the details requested are not something SVCE can provide at this stage of the RFP or in this format; however, SVCE has attempted to clarify adequately as it judged the intent of the question. SVCE has taken the liberty to organize Q&A by the nature of the questions, as opposed to grouping by anonymized vendor. If SVCE missed inclusion of any submitted questions, please advise, and it will consider incorporating the missing Q&A. SVCE looks forward to vendor proposals.

GENERAL

Question 1: Can SVCE provide responses to other vendor questions, please?

Answer: *As planned in the RFP, all questions from vendors are required in writing, and SVCE is sharing its answers in this document to all Proposers via a posted Q&A document alongside the RFP on SVCE's solicitations page.*

Question 2: Can SVCE elaborate on the primary operational or business drivers initiating this solicitation at this time? Specifically, is SVCE seeking to upgrade, augment, or completely consolidate its legacy third-party risk simulation software layers to reduce vendor redundancies and data silos?

Answer: *The subscopes of this RFP address portfolio management, planning and risk-related systems, for which SVCE has incumbent vendors. SVCE* ***neither*** *has a preference for retaining incumbent vendors* ***nor*** *is it conducting this RFP for the purpose of replacing them.*

- *SVCE's policies require that these services go out for competitive solicitation at this time.*
- *Since selecting its current set of third-party tools, SVCE has embarked on its internal RADaR data reporting project. It is using this RFP to consider the long-run integration planning for its internal RADaR platform; much of RADaR's data comes from the systems described in the subscopes. SVCE wants to ensure it has the best systems for its needs.*
- *SVCE wants to build a best-in-class analytic system. It may select the same vendor for multiple subscopes, or it may select different vendors if it believes that will yield the best overall solution.*

Question 3: Given the September 30 deadline coincides with quarter-end activities across our operations, finance, and pre-sales teams, would SVCE consider a short extension to the proposal submission date? Even a brief extension would help us ensure a more complete and thoughtful response.

Answer: *SVCE reserves the right to accept responses after the stated proposal deadline. However, in the interest of this request and in order to extend the same time to all vendors,* ***SVCE will extend the deadline to October 7 by 5:00pm PT.*** *SVCE will shorten its proposal clarification window to accommodate a later proposal deadline. However, please note that SVCE welcomes submissions ahead of the extended deadline to enable comprehensive review of vendor submissions and permit time for follow-up on clarifications.*

Question 4: To ensure Bidders can propose the most efficient deployment roadmap, can SVCE share any key "lessons learned" or specific technical hurdles encountered during recent portfolio data integration efforts—particularly regarding automated data flows between transaction systems and risk simulation layers?

Answer: *As with any IT project, challenges like the volume of data and data translation exist in the space of system integrations. SVCE seeks to hear from vendors on their experience, expertise, and ease of systems integration based upon how their solutions are structured. SVCE's RADaR system may create the ability to provide a hub and spoke approach to systems integration as opposed to making every individual system talk to every other individual system.*

Question 5: Will SVCE evaluate and award individual scopes (Scope A, Scope B, and Scope C) completely independently of one another? Specifically, will a pure-play software platform bidding exclusively on Scope A face any evaluation penalties or lower scoring compared to an omnibus consulting group providing a bundled software and human advisory services proposal?

Answer: *To the former, SVCE may award different scopes or subscopes to different Bidders. To the latter, SVCE will be seeking the best overall solutions for each subscope and will weigh the pros and cons of using the same or different vendors across any of the different subscopes.*

Question 6: We are planning on submitting a proposal for two of the scopes, but we know other vendors that can provide the other scopes, whose products mesh particularly well with our product. With this in mind, would it be helpful for us to submit a joint bid, with the intention of providing SVCE with one integrated suite of tools that all work well together? Or would you prefer for individual vendors to submit proposals for the scopes they are qualified for, and SVCE can mix and match? I suppose this is a bit of a spectrum, in that there is a middle ground where we and our preferred partners could submit coordinated, but still separate, bids.

Answer: *SVCE prefers that vendors submit individual proposals for the scopes they are qualified to perform. This approach provides flexibility to evaluate each solution independently and select the combination of vendors that best meets our needs.*

Vendors are encouraged to clearly describe:

- *Systems and platforms their solution integrates with.*
- *Any established partnerships or interoperability with other vendors.*
- *The benefits of those integrations, such as improved implementation, user experience, data sharing, and long-term support.*

While coordinated proposals may be referenced, SVCE generally prefers separate submissions rather than joint bids, allowing us to assess both individual solutions and potential integration opportunities across vendors.

If you'd like to submit a joint response with other vendors, you are welcome to do so. However, if you do so, please note that in the RFP SVCE retains the ability to select some or all of the solutions offered in a proposal.

Question 7: I didn't find any information in the RFP on intended budget. Does SVCE have a preferred maximum budget for the solicitation, either total or by scope?

Answer: *SVCE has not established a preferred maximum budget for this solicitation, either in total or by scope. Respondents are encouraged to submit a competitive budget offer that reflects their proposed approach. The budget should include a detailed breakdown of costs for the various components of the response. As described in the RFP, cost is an important element of proposal evaluations, and SVCE will select based on the value offered by a solution in addition to cost.*

Question 8: We would be interested in submitting a proposal for subset of the full RFP specifically for Scope 3 Energy Trading and Risk Management (ETRM) section 3 settlements. Would you be open to receiving a proposal just for that section?

Answer: *Yes. SVCE will accept proposals for the full RFP, an individual scope, or any subset or partial portion of a scope, including Scope 3, ETRM, Section 3, Settlements. Please clearly identify the proposed services and any related assumptions, dependencies, or exclusions.*

Question 9: Subscope coverage: The RFP permits consulting-only responses. Within Scope 3, Item 10, may a proposal address selected services, or must it cover all required services listed under that item? For example, could a Proposer respond solely to Item 10(b), Regulatory Compliance Consulting?

Answer: *Yes. A proposal may address selected consulting services, including only Item 10(b). Clearly identify the services, assumptions, dependencies, and exclusions.*

Question 10: SVCE mentions the RADaR data warehouse in various places. What SVCE resources will be available to support this project, e.g. Project Manager, Data Architect, etc.? Please delineate by Scope/section, if applicable.

Answer: *Bidders must identify required SVCE roles, responsibilities, technical needs, and weekly effort by implementation stage. Specific SVCE staffing by scope is not committed in the RFP. SVCE has staff with technical and project management skills that can contribute toward implementation, and their level of effort will be dependent on the vendor's solutions and onboarding technical experts. SVCE staff will be available with respect to integrations with its RADaR system.*

Question 11: SVCE states that "Bidders shall plan around the schedule established by the CPUC and shall describe how implementation, testing, and filing support would be accelerated or re-sequenced if the regulatory calendar changes." And also that "SVCE anticipates approximately two months of parallel operation" (presumably with the existing solution). Does SVCE have an initial go-live date planned or time period for when it makes the most sense to have parallel operations?

Answer: *Scope 3 targets go-live on August 1, 2027, followed by approximately two months of parallel operation. Scope 4 must go live no later than February 2028 with approximately* *two months of parallel operation. Scope 5 timing should follow the CPUC calendar and the proposed implementation plan.*

Question 12: Scope 3, Item 1(a) refers to Appendix E for the list of required product types, but the product list appears in Appendix C. Please confirm that Appendix C is the applicable product list.

Answer: *Yes. Appendix C is the applicable CCA product list. The Scope 3 reference to Appendix E is a cross-reference error and has been corrected in a new version posted on the RFP website.*

Question 13: Please confirm the expected data-migration acceptance criteria and the respective responsibilities of SVCE, the incumbent vendor, and the selected vendor for extraction, cleansing, mapping, reconciliation, validation, and final approval. Will the agreed acceptance criteria be incorporated into the applicable agreement?

Answer: *The selected vendor must migrate historical deals, contracts, counterparty data, and settlement records. Acceptance includes reconciliation, historical validation, back-testing against the incumbent, traceability, and documented SVCE approval. Detailed responsibilities and thresholds will be finalized during implementation and contracting.*

Question 14: Scope 3 states that MtM, GM@R, and PFE produced under Scope 4 should be viewable in the ETRM, while Scope 3 also includes requirements for calculating MtM exposure and PFE. Please clarify which system is expected to calculate each metric and which is expected to receive or display it, particularly if Scopes 3 and 4 are awarded to different vendors.

Answer: *Scope 4 is expected to calculate portfolio MtM, GMaR, P&L, and counterparty PFE. Scope 3 calculates and tracks operational credit exposure and should display Scope 4 risk metrics where integrated. If awarded separately, data should flow through documented APIs and RADaR without double counting.*

Question 15: Would it be possible to receive the questionnaire in a separate format prior to completion, such as an Excel spreadsheet or Word document? This would help us coordinate responses across our subject matter experts before entering them into the SurveyMonkey tool.

Answer: *You may find formatted questions at the end of this document and copy and paste them into your preferred format.*

Question 16: Please confirm that a proposal in which a prime contractor delivers a Scope using named subcontractors for portions of the work (e.g., stochastic modeling, CRR valuation, data integration) is acceptable, and that identifying those subcontractors in the proposal will satisfy the prior-written-consent requirement.

Answer: *It would be acceptable to offer a proposal with prime and subcontractors. Satisfying the prior written consent requirement requires SVCE's affirmative written consent.*

ETRM

Question 17: Is SVCE strictly looking for a SaaS ETRM, or would they be open to a cloud-hosted platform on GCP or Azure?

Answer: ~~SVCE will consider cloud hosted (e.g. GCP or Azure). It will not accept an on-premise solution for the UI or database.~~ *SVCE will consider either a multi-tenant SaaS solution or another vendor-managed cloud-hosted solution, including solutions hosted on GCP or Azure. SVCE will not accept a solution that requires SVCE to host or manage the application servers or database on premises. The primary user interface should be web-based, but user interfaces installed on a local machine will be acceptable. Any required locally installed client, plug-in, agent, or other desktop component must be clearly identified, including its purpose, security requirements, deployment method, support requirements, and limitations.*

Question 18: Item 8a (Technical Requirements, Cloud-Hosted SaaS) states the system will be cloud-hosted software-as-a-service. Is SVCE strictly requiring a multi-tenant SaaS platform, or would a cloud-hosted solution (e.g. GCP or Azure) with no on-premises database management by SVCE also meet this requirement?

Answer: ~~SVCE will consider cloud hosted (e.g. GCP or Azure). It will not accept an on-premise solution for the UI or database.~~ *SVCE does not strictly require a multi-tenant SaaS platform. SVCE will consider either a multi-tenant SaaS solution or another vendor-managed, cloud-hosted solution, including a single-tenant solution hosted on GCP or Azure. The solution must not require SVCE to host or manage application servers or databases on premises. The preferred primary user interface should be web-based, but a locally installed user interface will be accepted. Bidders must clearly identify any required locally installed client, plug-in, agent, or other component, including its purpose, security requirements, deployment method, maintenance responsibilities, and support requirements.*

Question 19: Item 1a references support for more than 40 product types. To help us size our proposal accurately, could you share estimated annual trade volume by product type and the expected number of authorized users?

Answer: *Authorized users requirements total ~12 total users and ~ 5 authorized traders currently, but should be able to accommodate more with relative ease and without significant additional cost. SVCE completed transactions are public information via its Board materials posted on its website, the latest of which is here:* https://www.svcleanenergy.org/wp-content/uploads/2026-0909-SVCE-September-BOD-Agenda-Packet-scrubbed.pdf.

Its Energy Risk Management Policy is also a public-facing document on its website, the latest of which is here: https://www.svcleanenergy.org/wp-content/uploads/SVCE_Energy_Risk_Management_Policy_March_2025.pdf.

If an RFP response is shortlisted to the interview stage, SVCE is happy to discuss the nuance of its market and compliance product requirements. Generally, SVCE requires market products common to Load Serving Entities in CAISO who also have PPAs for supply and must meet all state-mandated obligations and reporting.

Question 20: Beyond 'bill.com' (Item 3f) and the credit rating agencies referenced in Item 4b, are there other systems in SVCE's environment the ETRM platform will need to integrate with, e.g. GIS, budgeting/ERP, or market data feeds, beyond what's described for RADaR?

Answer: *Other data feeds should not be required. The ETRM should be able to present the metrics communicated in the RFP based on forward curves. Those should be off-the-shelf capabilities, like MtM. If a respondent wanted to source curves exclusively through RADaR, that would be acceptable. If capabilities exist to source from third parties, that would be optional yet desirable.*

Question 21: Per the Scope 3 subscope language, is a Bidder responding to the Software (SaaS) subscope only (Items 1-9) required to also submit a response to the Consulting Services subscope (Item 10), or can Software be bid independently?

Answer: *No, responding to the Consulting Services aspect of the subscopes is not required. However, SVCE may use consulting capabilities as a differentiator of respondents, particularly with respect to their in-house subject matter expertise and the potential bench strength SVCE could utilize to accomplish scoped tasks.*

Question 22: Project experience: For the three similar or related projects requested in

Section 5, may Proposers include projects performed by proposed key personnel at previous employers, with their roles and the performing organizations clearly identified?

Answer: *Yes. Projects performed by proposed key personnel at prior employers may be included if the individual's role, dates, prior employer, client, scope, cost, timeline, and reference information are clearly identified.*

Question 23: Regarding the preferred automated data loop with the incumbent ETRM system: Will the selected Scope A vendor be responsible for the full development cost of custom API integrations from scratch, or will SVCE provide comprehensive database schemas, existing endpoints, and internal IT partner support to facilitate secure data transfer?

Answer: *As a clarifying point, this would be with any ETRM system, whether the incumbent system is retained, or this RFP yields an alternate system. Bidders must separately price and schedule the required RADaR integration and describe the transfer method, authentication, frequency, and ongoing costs. SVCE will provide reasonable cooperation, and will have a data engineer and project manager available to support integration.*

Question 24: To ensure commercial proposals align with SVCE's fiduciary targets and avoid unnecessary technical over-engineering, can SVCE disclose the anticipated annual budget range or the maximum contract value cap allocated specifically for the Scope A Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) component?

Answer: *Bidders should submit competitive, detailed pricing by scope, subscope, deliverable, one-time cost, recurring cost, and optional integration. SVCE will be considering each proposal's total value proposition.*

Question 25: Which Appendix C product types does SVCE currently transact and require at initial go-live, including physical versus financial products, swaps, options, shaped products, BESS and tolling arrangements, capacity contracts, RA, RECs, and carbon instruments? Which product types are future-state requirements? Please provide approximate transaction volumes by major category.

Answer: *SVCE generally requires products common to California load-serving entities with PPAs and state compliance obligations. The portfolio includes fewer than 50 PPAs and thousands of other trades. Product-by-product current volumes and go-live versus future-*

state classifications are not provided.

Question 26: Does Scope 3 require the creation, validation, and direct submission of CAISO bids, offers, and base schedules? If so, please identify the required schedule types and markets—including CAISO MRTU, EIM, and EDAM—and confirm whether automated submission and post-submission validation must be operational by August 1, 2027.

Answer: *No direct bid, offer, or base-schedule submission requirement is stated. Scope 3 requires CAISO market and settlement support, including DAME, real-time, EDAM, MRI-S data, and three environments. Automated CRR bid-file support is addressed in Scope 6. These systems are not expected to deliver bidding or scheduling functionality and therefore Bidders should not include pricing for such modules or capabilities in their proposals. However, if a solution provider has off-the-shelf modules or capabilities related to bidding and scheduling, SVCE would welcome such information for future consideration.*

Question 27: Does SVCE require automated integration with ICE, CME, brokers, FCMs, or other exchange platforms? If so, please identify the platforms, required data flows, and whether manual entry or bulk upload would be acceptable at the initial go-live.

Answer: *Not specified as required. The system must support applicable exchange-traded products, broker fees, margin tracking, external market data, and ad hoc import/export. Required platforms and initial go-live methods are not identified. Preferred solution would involve obtaining market quotes from SVCE's RADaR GCP database, but alternative approaches will be considered.*

Question 28: Please identify the incumbent ETRM product and version, the available export or API mechanisms, and the approximate volume and history of contracts, trades, settlements, credit records, attachments, and audit data expected to be migrated.

Answer: *SVCE currently uses Adapt2. The portfolio includes fewer than 50 PPAs and thousands of other trades. API and table extract capabilities exist. Compared with many power trading companies, SVCE, as a relatively small local CCA/LSE, will have a modest amount of ETRM data.*

Question 29: Please describe the current non-CAISO meter-data sources, formats, frequency, volume, and manual processing SVCE wants to eliminate. Is direct submission of meter data to CAISO in scope, or is the requirement limited to ingestion, normalization, validation, and use in settlements and billing? Can SVCE provide representative anonymized files?

Answer: *The RFP states that supplier-provided non-CAISO meter data requires excessive manual formatting and must be streamlined. There is no requirement for submission of data to CAISO. It is limited to the use cases listed in the question. Sources, formats, volumes, sample files vary, and SVCE cannot provide them as part of this RFP Q&A. Vendors that deem this important for implementation pricing may qualify their price quote to an assumed value and final contract cost can be defined through a project discovery phase.*

Question 30: Please confirm whether the expected hourly ETRM-to-RADaR integration is entirely one-way or whether any information must flow from RADaR back into the ETRM. Please identify the required data objects and direction of each flow and provide available API specifications, sample payloads, authentication requirements, and testing-environment details.

Answer: *It is bidirectional by requirement. ETRM exports deal, profile, counterparty, location, settlement, CRR, and credit data to RADaR; ETRM ingests load forecasts, generation forecasts, forward curves, counterparty data, planning targets, and historical actuals from RADaR. Appendix D defines minimum export fields. Detailed payloads and test-environment specifications are not available but can be discussed during interviews following shortlisting. Vendors that deem this important for implementation pricing may qualify their price quote to an assumed value and final contract cost can be defined through a project discovery phase.*

Question 31: For the regulatory requirements identified under Scope 3, is the ETRM expected to produce filing-ready submissions, or to provide the underlying data, calculations, workflows, alerts, and exports that SVCE will use to prepare its filings?

Answer: *The ETRM must support the underlying data, calculations, workflows, alerts, exports, and specified report generation. The RFP does not require the SaaS vendor to prepare or submit filings on SVCE's behalf; consulting support may be proposed separately.*

Question 32: Please distinguish the regulatory and business-process changes that must be included in the base subscription from net-new functionality that may qualify for separate scoping, pricing, or a change order. How would a future CAISO change requiring a new module or material product capability be treated?

Answer: *Existing, new, or modified CAISO market and regulatory requirements affecting California load-serving entities are included in the base contract cost. Approved SVCE process changes are also supported through configuration or development. Unrelated new modules or expanded scope may be handled through the agreement's change-control process.*

Question 33: Should the base Scope 3 proposal include CAISO MRTU, EIM, and EDAM capabilities and all three required environments—CAISO DEV, SVCE DEV, and PROD—or should individual markets, modules, add-ons, and environments be separately itemized as options?

Answer: *Include required CAISO settlement capabilities and all three environments in the base Scope 3 proposal. Separately itemize optional modules or add-ons, but do not exclude required functionality from the base response.*

Question 34: The RFP background identifies up to 60 ETRM users, while Scope 3 requires support for up to 100 concurrent users. For licensing and technical sizing purposes, should Bidders propose 60 named users, 100 concurrent users, or another anticipated configuration?

Answer: *Propose licensing for up to 60 ETRM users and technical capacity for up to 100 concurrent users. Clearly state named-user, concurrent-user, role, and growth pricing assumptions. If there are material differences in cost related to user counts, please detail through footnoted pricing breakpoints on those material differences (e.g. Below or above 60 users, what if there are only 30 users? The cost impact of 100 users?)*

Question 35: Scope 3: The RFP references a portfolio consisting of solar, solar-plus-storage, wind, hydropower, and geothermal resources. Can SVCE provide additional details regarding its current generation and contracted resource portfolio, including any other asset classes or resource types that should be considered within the scope of ETRM, Analytics, Resource Planning, and Forecasting services (e.g., standalone BESS, demand response, biomass, biogas, long-duration storage, thermal resources, firm clean resources, virtual resources, or emerging technologies)?

Answer: *See other responses for links to public data regarding SVCE's portfolio. Solutions should be able to handle and model all technologies and should have a roadmap for development of capabilities as new technologies emerge. Vendors are welcome to propose modular pricing, or note proposed technology exclusions, for technologies that are complex and not found in SVCE's current portfolio (e.g. cascade hydropower).*

Question 36: Scope 3: Section 8, Can SVCE share the key evaluation criteria, business drivers, or technology strategy considerations that resulted in the preference for a cloud-hosted SaaS solution? Understanding these drivers will help Bidders appropriately align their proposed architecture and delivery model with SVCE's long-term objectives.

Answer: ~~*SaaS and/or cloud hosted solutions are acceptable. SVCE understands that in the technical sense these are alternative solutions; however, it recognizes that for various subscopes, and across the respective solution industries, some vendors create solutions that blur the lines between SaaS and cloud hosted. On-premise/client hosted solutions are not acceptable. Any proposed solutions will need to be able to integrate with SVCE's RADaR GCP database.*~~ SVCE will consider either a multi-tenant SaaS solution or another vendor-managed, cloud-hosted solution. The solution may be hosted in a dedicated or shared cloud environment, including GCP or Azure. SVCE will not accept a deployment model that requires SVCE to host or manage the core application servers or databases on premises. The primary user interface should be web-based, but a locally downloaded user interface will be accepted. The solution must integrate securely with SVCE's RADaR GCP environment. Bidders must disclose any locally installed client, plug-in, agent, gateway, or other component and describe its purpose, security requirements, deployment method, maintenance responsibilities, and support requirements.

Question 37: Section 10, How does SVCE envision leveraging the selected consulting partner across the ETRM transformation journey? Specifically, does SVCE expect support in areas such as business process assessment, operating model design, ETRM solution evaluation and selection, implementation governance, organizational readiness, and ongoing process optimization in addition to the consulting services outlined in Scope 3?

Answer: *Vendors are welcome to propose additional services but those should be priced separately as optional services. Consulting Services are core areas and may be awarded by*

SVCE depending on the nature of all responses and the ETRM vendor selected.

Question 38: Scope 3: Section 10, The Consulting Services scope appears primarily focused on functional, operational, regulatory, and process-related advisory support. Does SVCE also anticipate a need for technical consulting services, including solution architecture, integration strategy, data migration, testing and release governance, and ETRM implementation advisory support as part of Scope 3?

Answer: *Vendors are welcome to propose additional services but those should be priced separately as optional services. Consulting Services are core areas and may be awarded by SVCE depending on the nature of all responses and the ETRM vendor selected.*

Question 39: Scope 3: Section 10, To help appropriately scope the ETRM & Settlements Advisory services, can SVCE provide additional insight into the key challenges, process gaps, or operational inefficiencies that exist within its current settlement processes and supporting systems? Specifically, are there known opportunities related to settlement configuration, shadow settlement accuracy, exception management, dispute resolution, reconciliation, controls, automation, or reporting that SVCE would like the selected consultant to address?

Answer: *Those would all be valuable areas to learn about, however please propose pricing as separate from the needs listed in the RFP requirements. Please see the General section of this Q&A response to understand SVCE's motivations behind this RFP.*

Question 40: Scope 3: Section 10, The RFP primarily references California markets and associated regulatory requirements (CAISO, CPUC, CEC, CARB, Resource Adequacy, RPS, CRRs, etc.). Should Bidders assume that the scope is limited to CAISO and California market operations, or are there current or anticipated requirements to support transactions, analytics, forecasting, reporting, or compliance activities in other organized markets or regions (e.g., ERCOT, PJM, MISO, SPP, NYISO, ISO-NE, WECC bilateral markets, or broader Western market initiatives such as EDAM)?

Answer: *CAISO only. SVCE is a California Community Choice Aggregator locally controlled public entity. It does not operate in other markets. It may incorporate assets in WECC with import capabilities to CAISO.*

Question 41: Scope 3: Section 9, Can SVCE provide additional detail regarding its expected data migration strategy and success criteria for transitioning from the incumbent ETRM platform to the future-state solution? Specifically, please clarify expectations related to historical data retention and migration, active versus inactive transaction conversion, settlement history, audit requirements, data validation and reconciliation, parallel-run support, data ownership, and cutover methodology.

Answer: *Should this RFP result in a move from an incumbent ETRM to an alternate solution SVCE would expect the selected solution to provide a robust implementation strategy to achieve go-live with its system. SVCE recognizes that the specifics around that transition for any of the items listed may be unique to an alternate solution should that be the direction SVCE chooses to take. Consulting vendors are welcome to offer services in these areas though they may not be known or necessary until a solution is selected.*

Question 42.a: Is SVCE looking to bring in house their CAISO market operations (Bidding, Generation mgmt. Settlements, etc.)?
Question 42.b: Can SVCE clarify whether the ETRM platform is expected to serve as the primary system for CAISO Schedule Coordinator activities (e.g. bid and offer management, market award processing, and settlements), or whether these functions will be performed through separate third-party systems and integrated into the ETRM solution?
Answer: *Not in scope.*

Question 43: If the ETRM software and consulting services are awarded to separate vendors, would SVCE expect the consulting services provider to assume the role of implementation lead and systems integrator for the selected ETRM solution?
Answer: *No.*

Portfolio Analytics Modeling (Valuation & Risk)

Question 44: for the Analytics scope, it is very clear that you are looking for a software solution. For the Resource Planning and Modeling scope, it is not as clear whether a services-only approach would be acceptable. Would [it] be appropriate to respond to the Resource Planning and Modeling scope as a service?

Answer: *Yes. SVCE will accept a services-only response for the Resource Planning and Modeling scope. Consulting services may include resource planning, modeling, analysis, and related support. However, SVCE is not seeking consulting services for the preparation or submittal of Integrated Resource Plan filings or other regulatory compliance filings.*

Question 45: Scope 4, 3.c – The required variable list referenced in this section is not provided in the RFP. Can SVCE provide the required variable list?

Answer: *The appendix has been added to the RFP document available at the same original link here: https://www.svcleanenergy.org/wp-content/uploads/RFP_ETRM_ANALYTICS_CAPACITY_CRR_FUNDAMENTALS.pdf*

Question 46: Scope 4, 4.h – Is SVCE planning on archiving its own risk reports within the RADaR framework or are reports expected to be archived within the analytics SaaS offering?

Answer: *SVCE is planning to archive its own risk reports within the RADaR framework for summarized output. SVCE hopes to retain more granular data in the analytics SaaS solution with the following retention intended:*

- All budget studies (two per year)

- All month-end studies for 24 months (12 per year for at least 2 years)

- All weekly studies for two months (4-5 per month for two months)

- Not current practice, but may want to retain daily studies for up to two weeks

If retention of detail in the vendor's platform is prohibitive or expensive, SVCE would <u>consider</u> migration of these outputs to RADaR for retention, or solutions that could guarantee replicated results upon rerun.

Question 47: Scope 4, 6.e – Is SVCE planning to have 100 users concurrently using the analytics model? If not, can SVCE provide an expected number of concurrent users

Answer: *SVCE expects fewer than 10 users to access the analytics model concurrently under normal operating conditions. However, the proposed solution should support up to 100 concurrent users to accommodate peak usage and potential future growth.*

Question 48: For Scope A (Portfolio/Risk Management Software), is the selected platform strictly required to inherently simulate the entire macro-CAISO grid topology to derive its own baseline forward price curves? Alternatively, will SVCE fully evaluate a standalone risk platform that fulfills all Scope A criteria by natively consuming and executing stochastic risk calculations on top of externally sourced, third-party simulated curves via API or automated data ingest?

Answer: *No to the former, yes to the latter. SVCE will evaluate a risk platform that consumes externally sourced curves, provided it satisfies Scope 4 modeling, valuation, stochastic analysis, nodal and hourly requirements, transparency, and integration requirements. That said, it is fully open to hearing how vendors' systems may take different approaches to solving the risk requirements.*

Question 49: Can a vendor submit a fully compliant and competitive proposal for Scope A that focuses exclusively on middle-office risk metrics, asset/PPA valuation, and mark-to-market calculations, while leaving back-office CAISO shadow settlements and invoicing entirely to SVCE's existing transactional systems of record?

Answer: *Yes, for Scope 4. Scope 4 may be bid independently and focuses on portfolio risk analytics. CAISO shadow settlements and invoicing are Scope 3 requirements.*

Question 50: Regarding vendor evaluation and risk management: What are the strict, mandatory minimum qualifications required for a software vendor's track record, corporate tenure, or active user-base size under Scope A? Additionally, is SVCE open to evaluating highly advanced, newly launched commercial platforms if the vendor can demonstrate robust technical performance, modern security frameworks, and a highly competitive total cost of ownership?

Answer: *The RFP does not set minimum corporate tenure or user-base thresholds. Evaluation considers relevant experience, key personnel, financial viability, references, technical fit, implementation risk, security, cost, and ability to meet timelines. Newer platforms may be evaluated against the same criteria. SVCE is absolutely open to evaluating highly advanced, newly launched commercial platforms with robust technical performance, modern security frameworks, and a highly competitive total cost of ownership.*

Question 51: SVCE requests a SaaS solution. How many users will need access to the Cloud platform?

Answer: *For Scope 4, the platform must allow an unlimited number of SVCE users and support up to 100 concurrent users; SVCE expects fewer than 10 concurrent users under normal conditions. For Scope 3, plan for up to 60 users and 100 concurrent-user capacity.*

Question 52: Is there a predictable cadence or seasonality to this activity [RFO Evaluation]? Is so, when?

Answer: *The RFP anticipates periodic or ad hoc consulting. RFO valuation and comparative scoring are expected approximately once per calendar year; timing is not specified. There are occasional needs for ad hoc analysis.*

Question 53: RFO Services: Valuation, comparative scoring, and/or SME consulting, one each per calendar year?

Answer: *SVCE anticipates one RFO valuation, comparative-scoring, and/or subject-matter consulting engagement per calendar year.*

Question 54: SVCE requests a SaaS solution. How many users will need access to the Cloud platform?

Answer: *For Scope 4, the platform must allow an unlimited number of SVCE users and support up to 100 concurrent users; SVCE expects fewer than 10 concurrent users under normal conditions. For Scope 3, plan for up to 60 users and 100 concurrent-user capacity.*

Question 55: Scope 4: Section 7, How does SVCE envision leveraging the selected consulting partner within its portfolio and risk management organization? Does SVCE primarily anticipate SME support, independent advisory services, periodic risk reviews, staff augmentation, methodology development, or ongoing strategic partnership support?

Answer: *SVCE primarily contemplates leveraging a consulting partner in the areas listed, if needed for external expertise or bench strength.*

Question 56: Scope 4: Section 7, Can SVCE provide additional insight into the limitations, challenges, or improvement opportunities associated with its current portfolio analytics and risk management processes? Understanding current-state challenges will help Bidders tailor their consulting services and recommended approach.

Answer: *Please see the General section of this Q&A response to understand SVCE's motivations behind this RFP.*

Question 57: Scope 4: Section 7, With respect to the annual RFO support services, can SVCE provide additional detail regarding the expected activities, deliverables, and level of consultant involvement in valuation, bid scoring, comparative analysis, recommendation development, stakeholder presentations, and procurement decision support?

Answer: *Consultation in this area may be to help perform analysis and offer expertise. SVCE has in-house experts, portfolio-management and risk-management professionals that handle selection decisions, stakeholder presentations and other related activities.*

Question 58: Could you please provide the approximate total MW portfolio size that you expect to be modeled and optimized within the portfolio optimization engine?

Answer: *SVCE publicly shares information about its portfolio here Building New Renewables in California - SVCE and in our monthly Board packet here* https://www.svcleanenergy.org/wp-content/uploads/2026-0909-SVCE-September-BOD-Agenda-Packet-scrubbed.pdf *(on pages 127-128 of the PDF file)*

SVCE currently has approximately 425-525 MW average annual load with a non-coincident (with system) peak around ~925-1025 MW at the PG&E DLAP.

CRR Advisory Services

Question 59: Does SVCE currently engage a third party to manage its CRR allocation process?

Answer: *SVCE manages it in coordination with its scheduling coordinator.*

Question 60: Does SVCE expect the allocation and auction strategies to be integrated, or is the auction manager expected to develop a standalone strategy?

Answer: *Yes. SVCE expects integrated allocation and auction strategies.*

Question 61: If the allocation and auction functions are managed by separate parties, how does SVCE expect the two managers to coordinate strategy development and information sharing?

Answer: *Per the previous Q&A, SVCE CRR allocation and auction strategies are managed by its own front office staff with an all-of-portfolio perspective and in a coordinated fashion. SVCE seeks consulting services to provide analysis, insights, and perspectives that help inform and advise the portfolio manager.*

Question 62: How many generation resources does SVCE expect to hedge for congestion risk over the next three years? Could you provide a breakdown by resource type, including the number of resources and MW capacity?

Answer: *SVCE publicly shares information about its portfolio here [Building New Renewables in California - SVCE] and in our monthly Board packet here* https://www.svcleanenergy.org/wp-content/uploads/2026-0909-SVCE-September-BOD-Agenda-Packet-scrubbed.pdf *(on pages 127-128 of the PDF file)*

SVCE currently has approximately 425-525 MW average annual load with a non-coincident (with system) peak around ~925-1025 MW at the PG&E DLAP which represents the potential volume of congestion risk SVCE must manage.

Market Forwards & Fundamental Price Forecasts

Question 63: Does SVCE request its own presentation [of fundamental forecast releases], or will a client-invite-only presentation be sufficient (to discuss results)?

Answer: *A staff presentation is desired. The RFP does not specify whether a shared client-only presentation is sufficient.*

Question 64: Does SVCE have a desire to produce its own LMP/nodal price forecast - or does SVCE prefer to have an off-the-shelf nodal forecast on a regular cadence with the ability for some custom runs? If the latter, are there a certain number of known or anticipated nodes?

Answer: *SVCE is open to either provider-produced nodal forecasts or configurable forecasts within the analytics solution. Bidders should state node coverage, methodology, included nodes, custom-run capability, and pricing. SVCE currently has 25-30 nodes in its active portfolio with a periodic need for 25-50 more for PPA RFO response screening and analysis.*

Question 65: What is the desired frequency for updates and scenarios?

Answer: *State the standard release cadence and off-cycle update process. Scope 4 requires weekly forward-price refreshes and daily portfolio revaluation. Custom scenarios are desired; a fixed cadence for Scope 7 custom scenarios is not specified.*

Question 66: When is the first need for a price forecast (e.g., month/year)?

Answer: *SVCE could make use of alternate price forecasts as soon as practical upon vendor selection.*

Question 67: How many recipients will need access to the price forecasts?

Answer: *Anywhere from 12-24 SVCE staff may have interest in price forecasts. 2-4 would likely be heavier users.*

Cyber Security Requirements

Question 68: Security assurance: Appendix B, Exhibit E requires an annual independent SOC II Type II audit. For consulting-only engagements, would SVCE accept alternative security assurance based on the scope of services and data access? If so, what documentation would be acceptable?

Answer: *SVCE may tailor privacy and cybersecurity requirements based on the consulting scope and data access. Proposers should identify the requested alternative and provide relevant independent security reports, policies, controls, and evidence for SVCE review.*

Contracting / Legal

Question 69.a: Can you please provide a Word version of APPENDIX A: SAAS Agreement and APPENDIX B: Standard Consulting Agreement for review and redline/commentary? With all Exhibits, please?

Question 69.b: Is there a preferred format for submitting exceptions (e.g., a redlined Word version of Appendix A/B, or a separate schedule listing section references and requested changes)?

Question 69.c: Can we get a copy of the desired MSA in a word .doc so we can easily provide redlines?

Answer: Yes. *SVCE prefers a redlined Word document. It is making Appendix A and Appendix B materials available as Word documents for download and redline here:*
Appendix A: https://svcleanenergy.box.com/s/i17ao1tb3o663aaq7k6udjii8vyowbcx
Appendix B: https://svcleanenergy.box.com/s/ll7wb84667j5wfqj5dxt6r3rk2cd98l8

Question 70: Section 5, Proposal Requirement 8 states that the proposal must include a "Confirmation of acceptance of contract terms or explanation of proposed contract modifications," and that "items not excepted will not be open to later negotiation." Section 8 (Agreement Terms) further provides that proposed modifications are not guaranteed to be accepted, and that rejection of SVCE's final terms is grounds for disqualification. Is the exceptions list submitted with the September 30 proposal the sole and final opportunity to flag contract exceptions, with no further exceptions permitted during the contracting period (targeted Nov 18 – Dec 16, 2026)?

Answer: *Yes. All requested contract exceptions must be listed with the proposal. Items not excepted will not be open to later negotiation.*

Question 71: If SVCE and the Proposer are unable to reach agreement on a properly-excepted term during contracting, what is the process — does SVCE's rejection of the Proposer's position automatically constitute grounds for disqualification, or is there a further negotiation or escalation step before that occurs?

Answer: *SVCE may negotiate properly identified exceptions, but acceptance is not guaranteed. Rejection of SVCE's final terms through the negotiation is grounds for disqualification with no additional escalation process.*

Question 72: Section 10 (California Public Records Act) describes SVCE's own disclosure obligations and confirms that after a recommended award, proposals become subject to CPRA disclosure except for properly marked “Confidential,” “Proprietary,” or “Trade Secret” portions, with the Proposer responsible for seeking protection from a court if a records request is made. Section 10 does not appear to separately address access by non-participating agencies considering whether to piggyback on the awarded contract under Section 9. Is access by non-participating agencies to the awarded Proposer's pricing and proposal terms governed entirely by the CPRA framework in Section 10, or is there a separate confidentiality mechanism (NDA or otherwise) for those agencies?

Answer: *It is governed by the RFP’s California Public Records Act provisions and the Bidders’ expressed willingness to extend the terms of resulting contracts inclusive of price.*

Question 73: If a non-participating agency requests unredacted pricing or proprietary technical information in order to evaluate whether to enter its own contract under Section 9, what process, if any, does SVCE follow before that information is shared?

Answer: *If information is requested under the California Public Records Act, the way SVCE handles this is that if it does get a public records request, it notifies the Bidder and asks the Bidder to identify anything it provided that is confidential. When the Bidder identifies such things, and when SVCE’s Counsel agrees that those items are confidential, SVCE redacts/does not disclose. If for any reason SVCE Counsel disagrees that something the Bidder wishes to keep confidential is not confidential information under the public records act, then SVCE affords the Bidder time to obtain a protective order in court to prevent public agency disclosure. If the Bidder expressed willingness to extend the terms of resulting contracts inclusive of price, SVCE will share those elements.*

Question 74: Section 9 states that contracts entered into by non-participating agencies are separate transactions between that agency and the awarded Proposer, and that SVCE bears no responsibility or liability for them. Do exceptions or modifications negotiated into the Proposer's contract with SVCE carry over automatically as the template for agreements with non-participating agencies, or does each such agency negotiate its own terms independently with the Proposer?

Answer: *Each non-participating agency contracts directly and independently with the awarded Proposer. Section 9 requests willingness to extend SVCE contract terms, including* *price, but SVCE is not responsible for those separate contracts. A Proposer may express that they are unwilling to do so.*

RFP Survey Response Questions List. **Proposers must respond via RFP SurveyMonkey links.** Note, numbers here correspond to the numbering in the online survey. In between numbers are fields for Proposers to supply reference to their written proposal.

Responses only due for scopes for which the Proposer is offering its solutions.

Unless alternative options are provided, for each question, respond with the standard response question denoted by scope, and provide reference to where SVCE staff can find the topic addressed in the supplier's written proposal.

Scope 3: Energy Trading and Risk Management (ETRM)

Standard response options for all questions:

- Offered with standard configuration
- Offered with special configuration
- Offered with development
- Not offered

2. How is product coverage supported: support more than 40 product types covering all standard CCA California transactions (see Appendix C~~E~~), including energy, PPAs of varying structure, resource adequacy, RECs, carbon instruments, Congestion Revenue Rights (CRR), and other wholesale products?

4. How is out-of-box CCA configuration supported: standard California CCA deal types should be supported out of the box, without custom development or vendor intervention for routine setup?

6. How are new product types supported: natively support newer product types entering SVCE's portfolio, including BESS, Slice-of-Day RA, 24/7 CFE, long-duration storage, carbon allowances and offsets, capacity contracts, and shaped products?

8. How is deal workflow supported: provide a full front, middle, and back office deal workflow with role-based access control (RBAC), deal status tracking, configurable approval processes, and configurable email alerts?

10. How is granular data support supported: generation, load, and settlement data supported as 8760 hourly profiles and at sub-hourly intervals (5, 10, 15, and 30 minutes)?

12. How is self-service configuration supported: users can add or modify products, attributes, fields, deal templates, workflows, thresholds, settlement bill determinants, and business rules without vendor intervention?

14. How are trade templates supported: users can create and manage trade templates for recurring deal types?

16. How are deal contingencies supported: capture deal contingencies, basis differentials, exchange deals, multiple deal components, and broker fees?

18. How is portfolio reconstruction supported: recreate portfolio status, including deal statuses, as of any historical date?

20. How is risk display supported: risk metrics (MTM, GM@R, PFE) viewable within the ETRM interface?

---

22. How is contract lifecycle supported: manage the full contract lifecycle from negotiation through retirement?

24. How are document attachments supported: contracts support multiple document attachments?

26. How are profile attachments supported: attach multiple 8760 generation profiles directly to contracts?

28. How is contract organization supported: support parent-child relationships between contracts, unique Contract IDs, and searchable contract attributes?

30. How are PPA performance metrics supported: track GEP, curtailment, degradation curves, BESS metrics, and expected versus actual production?

32. How is milestone tracking supported: track contract milestones individually and at the portfolio level with automated alerts?

34. How is counterparty relationship management supported: track counterparty information, master agreement terms, and alternative suppliers?

36. How is storage contract support supported: support standalone and paired BESS contracts, tolling agreements, and capacity contracts natively?

38. How are novel deal types supported: accommodate new and creative deal types through software configuration without vendor intervention?

40. How is document management integration supported: integrate with external document management systems?

---

42. How are CAISO shadow settlements supported: automate retrieval, storage, calculation, archiving, and future CAISO market readiness requirements?

44. How are PPA settlements supported: calculate settlements at 5-60 minute intervals and automate meter data ingestion?

46. How are trade settlements supported: settle ISTs, bilateral trades, and index-based transactions while producing structured accounting exports?

48. How are counterparty settlements supported: automate reconciliation, exception processing, netting agreements, invoice matching, and prior-period adjustments?

50. How is load reconciliation supported: capture actual load data, apply loss factors, convert monthly consumption to hourly profiles, and reconcile imbalances?

52. How is accounting system integration supported: interface with Bill.com or equivalent AP/AR systems?

---

54. How is MTM exposure supported: track mark-to-market exposure in real time by counterparty and transaction type?

56. How is credit ratings integration supported: integrate with Moody's, S&P, and preferably Fitch ratings?

58. How are credit limits supported: configurable limits and thresholds by counterparty with contractual and internal policy controls?

60. How are counterparty hierarchy and legal-entity resolution supported: manage hierarchies, rating inheritance, thresholds, and legal-name changes?

62. How is threshold and credit-limit determination supported: calculate contractual, guideline, and overall thresholds using minimum applicable values?

64. How is credit spread supported: support manually maintained credit-spread values?

66. How are exposure classification and calculation supported: calculate exposure from collateral, receivables, payables, and MTM positions?

68. How are time-effective valuation and controls supported: support separate MTM and simulation scenarios with configurable escalation statuses?

70. How are automated alerts supported: notify users of threshold breaches, rating changes, and credit events?

72. How is margin management supported: track and maintain settlement margin requirements?

74. How is FERC compliance supported: support FERC credit information sharing rules and CRR/FTR collateral methodologies?

76. How is credit reporting supported: provide reports aggregated by counterparty, product type, and time horizon?

---

78. How are product types supported: support CRR Obligations, CRR Options, and bilateral CRR transactions?

80. How is auction award capture supported: automate or streamline CAISO CRR auction award ingestion?

82. How is bilateral transaction capture supported: capture CRR purchases and sales with approval, audit, and status controls?

84. How is portfolio tracking supported: track CRR positions and reconstruct historical CRR portfolios?

86. How is congestion credit settlement supported: calculate and settle CRR auction charges and congestion credits?

88. How is revenue reconciliation supported: reconcile CRR settlement revenue, auction charges, and position quantities?

90. How is CAISO data integration supported: automatically retrieve, archive, and store CRR auction and settlement data?

92. How is credit exposure supported: reflect CRR collateral, margin, and exposure in credit monitoring without double counting?

94. How is RADaR export supported: export CRR transaction, position, settlement, and exposure data to RADaR?

---

96. How is data export scope supported: export deal, generation, counterparty, location, settlement, and credit exposure data to RADaR?

98. How are external data feeds supported: automatically ingest data from CAISO MRI-S, meter sources, rating agencies, and RADaR?

100. How is ad-hoc export supported: export data in CSV, JSON, and Excel formats?

102. How is integration adaptability supported: enable configurable and extensible interfaces, mappings, validation rules, and synchronization processes?

---

104. How is Slice-of-Day RA supported: support CPUC Slice-of-Day RA requirements and filings?

106. How is RPS compliance supported: track PCC1, PCC2, PCC3 compliance and generate required reports and filings?

108. How is regulatory update responsibility supported: support new and modified California regulatory requirements as part of the base contract?

---

110. ~~How is cloud-hosted SaaS supported: provide a cloud-hosted SaaS solution, preferably on GCP or Azure?~~ Provide a vendor-managed, cloud-hosted software solution, which may be delivered as multi-tenant SaaS or through another vendor-managed cloud deployment model, preferably hosted on GCP or Azure, without SVCE-managed application servers or databases.

112. How is data hosting supported: store and utilize data from SVCE's RADaR BigQuery or Google Cloud Storage environment?

114. How is REST API supported: provide a RESTful API with OpenAPI/Swagger documentation and OAuth 2.0 authentication?

116. How are availability and performance supported: provide 24/7 availability with sub-second response times?

118. How is environment strategy supported: support DEV, CAISO DEV, and PROD environments with promotion and rollback procedures?

120. How is scalability supported: support multi-site usage and up to 100 concurrent users?

122. How is data granularity supported: store all time-series data at 5-minute intervals in UTC with display conversion to PPT?

124. How is disaster recovery supported: provide an RPO of zero and an RTO of one business day?

126. How is role-based access control supported: support six defined user roles?

128. How is audit trail supported: capture user activity, role assignments, timestamps, and historical changes with seven-year retention?

130. How are API standards supported: provide versioned endpoints, rate limiting, error handling, and documentation?

132. How are RADaR integration cost and timeline supported: provide separate cost and timeline estimates for RADaR connectivity?

134. How is SSO integration supported: integrate with SVCE's identity provider for single sign-on?

---

136. How is go-live timeline supported: support SVCE's phased six-month implementation plan?

138. How are go-live, cutover, and parallel operation supported: support a two-month parallel run and implementation schedule aligned with required deadlines?

140. How is user acceptance testing supported: provide UAT for functionality, integrations, settlements, and historical validation?

142. How is data migration supported: migrate historical deals, contracts, counterparties, and settlement data from the incumbent system?

144. How is training supported: provide initial and ongoing training within the base contract cost?

146. How is support model supported: align support with SVCE's existing vendor support structure?

148. How is business-process evolution supported: support future process refinement, configuration, development, testing, and deployment?

150. How are regulatory updates supported: implement California regulatory and CAISO market changes as part of the base contract?

152. How is CCA expertise supported: demonstrate California CCA operational and market expertise?

154. How is demo/POC requirement supported: provide a live demonstration or proof-of-concept including API integration?

156. How is ETRM and settlements advisory supported: provide consulting support for settlements, shadow settlements, disputes, and back-office design?

158. How is regulatory compliance consulting supported: provide advisory support for RA, RPS, emissions reporting, Cap-and-Invest, and compliance workflows?

160. How is subject matter expertise supported: provide consulting on deal lifecycle controls, credit policy, and front/middle/back office best practices?

162. How is bench strength/staff augmentation supported: provide operational support during staff transitions or peak workload periods?

164. How is process enhancement support supported: assess, recommend, configure, document, test, and implement workflow changes?

Scope 4: Analytics

Standard response options for all questions:

- Offered with standard configuration
- Offered with special configuration
- Offered with development
- Not offered

2. How does your solution support SVCE's complete power portfolio, including wind, solar, battery storage, thermal assets, and inter-scheduling coordinator trades? (Scope 4, 1, a)

4. How does your solution provide a graphical user interface for an unlimited number of SVCE users? (Scope 4, 1, b)

6. How does your solution provide in-application user, training, and technical model documentation? (Scope 4, 1, c)

8. How does your solution provide access to raw inputs and computed financial results for each load, asset, and hedge? (Scope 4, 1, d)

10. How does your solution integrate by API with external systems, including the ETRM platform and SVCE's RADaR data warehouse? (Scope 4, 1, e)

12. How does your solution provide both deterministic and stochastic net revenue modeling? (Scope 4, 2, a)

14. How does your solution model 25 forward? (Scope 4, 2, b)

16. How does your solution calculate power supply costs for load obligations, regulatory requirements, and congestion revenue rights positions? (Scope 4, 2, c)

18. How does your solution calculate customer revenue from provided rates by load segment? (Scope 4, 2, d)

20. How does your stochastic engine run enough iterations to demonstrate mean and tail convergence for weekly and daily studies through the current year plus five full calendar years? (Scope 4, 3, a)

22. How does your stochastic engine preserve appropriate correlations and structural relationships rather than applying arbitrary randomness? (Scope 4, 3, b)

24. How does your solution meet the required simulation, weekly refresh, and daily revaluation runtimes while producing at least 62~~80~~ variables listed in Appendix F, percentile summaries, and iteration-level monthly and annual outputs? (Scope 4, 3, c)

26. How does your engine model hourly and sub-hourly hub and nodal prices, price shapes, day-ahead and real-time volatility, forward volatility, and commodity correlations? (Scope 4, 3, d)

28. How does your solution provide historical and current market data and configurable fundamentals reflecting changing CAISO market dynamics? (Scope 4, 3, e)

30. How does your solution optimize renewable, conventional generation, standalone battery, and paired battery assets using perfect and imperfect foresight? (Scope 4, 3, f)

32. How does your solution report mark-to-market, gross margin at risk, and profit and loss for weekly and daily prompt-month-forward studies? (Scope 4, 4, a)

34. How does your solution aggregate mark-to-market and potential future exposure by counterparty for wholesale transactions, including inter-scheduling coordinator trades and congestion revenue rights? (Scope 4, 4, b)

36. How does your solution aggregate project-level mark-to-market for power, environmental attributes, and resource adequacy across power purchase agreements and owned assets? (Scope 4, 4, c)

38. How does your solution report market prices, price movements, and forward price uncertainty? (Scope 4, 4, d)

40. How does your solution report energy, resource adequacy, environmental attribute, and congestion revenue rights positions and hedge ratios? (Scope 4, 4, e)

42. How does your solution report budget gross margin using both market-settlement and traditional utility accounting approaches? (Scope 4, 4, f)

44. How does your solution compare current results with prior studies and attribute variances from budget, beginning-of-month, or prior-week studies? (Scope 4, 4, g)

46. How does your solution save and archive portfolio risk reports with defined storage limits and reliable SVCE backup access? (Scope 4, 4, h)

48. How does your proposal provide a phased implementation plan coordinated with the ETRM implementation timeline? (Scope 4, 5, a)

50. How does your implementation plan support a February 2028 go-live, two months of parallel operation, back-testing, issue correction, and the required contract-execution lead time? (Scope 4, 5, b)

52. How does your proposal identify implementation activities, responsibilities, and required weekly SVCE staff hours by activity? (Scope 4, 5, c)

54. How does your proposal identify SVCE technical and operational requirements for implementation and ongoing use? (Scope 4, 5, d)

56. How does your solution support acceptance testing through back-testing and validation of weather, load, price, renewable generation, and result distributions? (Scope 4, 5, e)

58. How does your proposal separately state the cost and timeline for secure automated integration with SVCE's RADaR GCP and BigQuery environment? (Scope 4, 5, f)

60. ~~How does your solution provide cloud-hosted software as a service without SVCE-managed on-premises databases, preferably on GCP or Azure?~~ Provide a vendor-managed, cloud-hosted software solution, which may be delivered as multi-tenant SaaS or through another vendor-managed cloud deployment model, preferably hosted on GCP or Azure, without SVCE-managed application servers or databases. (Scope 4, 6, a)

62. How does your solution use SVCE RADaR BigQuery or Google Cloud Storage data directly while operating as a presentation and application layer? (Scope 4, 6, b)

64. How does your solution provide a REST API with an OpenAPI specification, versioned endpoints, documentation, and OAuth 2.0 authentication? (Scope 4, 6, c)

66. How does your solution provide continuous web availability, sub-second response for most transactions, uninterrupted background processing, and hot standby capability? (Scope 4, 6, d)

68. How does your solution support multiple sites and up to 100 concurrent users? (Scope 4, 6, e)

70. How does your solution meet a zero-data-loss recovery point objective and a one-business-day recovery time objective? (Scope 4, 6, f)

72. How does your API provide versioning, rate limiting, error handling, and comprehensive developer documentation? (Scope 4, 6, g)

74. How does your proposal separately state the cost, timeline, transfer method, and security approach for RADaR connectivity? (Scope 4, 6, h)

76. How does your team provide periodic or ad hoc portfolio risk management consulting with sufficient expertise and bench strength? (Scope 4, 7, a)

78. How does your team provide annual valuation, comparative scoring, and subject-matter support for resource solicitations? (Scope 4, 7, b)

80. How does your team provide periodic or ad hoc guidance on modeling and risk management best practices? (Scope 4, 7, c)

82. How does your solution track budget, actual month-to-date and year-to-date day-ahead and real-time volumes and prices, month-to-go and year-to-go forecasts, and comparisons across budget and forecast versions? (Scope 4, 8, a)

Provide your feedback on BizChat

Explain how your solution supports the complete power portfolio. Describe your phased implementation plan. How does your solution handle zero-data-loss recovery?

<u>Scope 5: Resource Planning and Modeling</u>

Standard response options for all questions:

- Fully meets the requirement with native or proven capability and specific evidence
- Meets most of the requirement with minor configuration or limited gaps
- Partially meets the requirement with material configuration, services, or gaps
- Provides limited capability or only a planned or roadmap-based approach
- Does not meet the requirement or no evidence is provided

Capacity and Resource Planning

2. Does the proposed capability support annual planning, interim updates, configurable horizons and study resolution, and repeatable portfolio refreshes as assumptions change? (Scope 5, 1, a)

4. Can the solution model load and obligation forecasts with uncertainty, interval shapes, customer programs, electrification, distributed resources, demand response, migration, sensitivities, and version history? (Scope 5, 1, b)

6. Can the solution maintain a time-differentiated inventory of resources, contracts, attributes, obligations, storage characteristics, expirations, deliverability, development status, and grid constraints? (Scope 5, 1, c)

8. Can the solution quantify policy, compliance, reliability, energy, capacity, renewable, emissions, and risk gaps by period, including timing, magnitude, duration, location, drivers, and need type? (Scope 5, 1, d)

10. Can the solution compare candidate resources and procurement structures across cost, reliability, deliverability, emissions, development risk, concentration risk, and optionality? (Scope 5, 1, e)

12. Can SVCE staff configure and rerun capacity-expansion studies without vendor intervention, including scenarios, assumptions, constraints, candidate resources, objectives, and risk-informed portfolio development? (Scope 5, 1, f)

14. Does the modeling represent hourly chronology, renewable profiles, storage operations, outages, curtailment, market transactions, and operating constraints, with Scope 4 dependencies clearly identified? (Scope 5, 1, g)

16. Can users define, compare, and attribute sensitivities for load, electrification, migration, prices, technology costs, resource availability, project delays, contract expirations, hydrology, weather, transmission, policy, and market rules? (Scope 5, 1, h)

18. Can the solution assess reliability with deterministic and probabilistic metrics, Slice-of-Day requirements, applicable ELCC accreditation, critical periods, binding constraints, and resource contributions under normal and stressed conditions? (Scope 5, 1, i)

20. Can the solution produce annual and net-present-value costs, stochastic cost distributions when applicable, rate or bill-impact inputs, and clearly separated material cost components? (Scope 5, 1, j)

22. Can the solution produce decision-ready outputs for staff, executives, committees, and the governing board, including portfolio comparisons, procurement recommendations, assumptions, risk tradeoffs, and changes from the prior cycle? (Scope 5, 1, k)

CPUC Integrated Resource Planning Support

24. Can the bidder develop and evaluate conforming and alternative filing-ready portfolios under SVCE direction using applicable CPUC requirements, templates, adopted inputs, and schedules? (Scope 5, 2, a)

26. Can the bidder convert CPUC requirements into a documented study plan, map SVCE data to required inputs, identify assumption differences, and produce reconciliation tables? (Scope 5, 2, b)

28. Can the approach support configurable IRP scenarios, portfolio optimization, emissions accounting, reliability, Resource Adequacy, procurement-need analysis, and evolving CPUC frameworks and templates? (Scope 5, 2, c)

30. Can the bidder provide optional post-filing support for data requests, corrections, supplemental submissions, and method or result explanations using the controlled submission model and source data? (Scope 5, 2, d)

Model Governance, Transparency, and Data

32. Does the proposal disclose material assumptions, sources, transformations, methods, constraints, and post-processing, and fully document proprietary data source, vintage, coverage, updates, licensing, limitations, and result impacts? (Scope 5, 3, a)

34. Can SVCE trace material outputs to source data, assumptions, algorithms, constraints, and processing, with validation, benchmarking, diagnostics, and sensitivities where proprietary methods limit disclosure? (Scope 5, 3, b)

36. Will SVCE retain continuous and post-termination access to inputs, assumptions, scenarios, configurations, outputs, and workpapers, with documented exports, licensing limits, transition support, and vendor-only functions? (Scope 5, 3, c)

38. Does the solution preserve dated data, assumptions, configurations, software versions, scenarios, and outputs so authorized users can reproduce approved runs, compare later runs, and review change logs? (Scope 5, 3, d)

40. Does the solution include automated, documented quality checks and defined validation, benchmarking, peer-review, and issue-resolution practices covering data, units, time alignment, balance, constraints, anomalies, and filing consistency? (Scope 5, 3, e)

42. Will the bidder provide data dictionaries, methodology documentation, user guides, process maps, training, and hands-on knowledge transfer sufficient for SVCE staff to operate, review, and explain the process and results? (Scope 5, 3, f)

44. Does the software proposal separately state the cost and timeline for secure RADaR integration and support automated machine-readable import and export through an API or equivalent cloud transfer method, including run metadata and quality-control results? (Scope 5, 3, g)

Implementation, Operations, and Consulting Services

46. Does the implementation plan cover discovery through steady-state operations and identify SVCE resources, Scope 4 dependencies, critical-path decisions, and the latest contract date needed to meet production? (Scope 5, 4, a)

48. Does the proposal include a risk-based parallel-operation period with common inputs, acceptance criteria, discrepancy thresholds, issue resolution, retirement evidence, and alignment to the anticipated two-month period? (Scope 5, 4, b)

50. Can the implementation and filing-support schedule be accelerated or resequenced when the CPUC regulatory calendar changes, without assuming a fixed IRP filing year? (Scope 5, 4, c)

52. For software, does the proposal fully describe licensing, hosting, security, environments, roles, support, releases, performance, run times, data limits, required third-party tools, unlimited SVCE viewers, and modeler or concurrency limits? (Scope 5, 4, d)

54. For consulting services, does the proposal define available service models and distinguish recurring services, filing-cycle services, and optional hourly support? (Scope 5, 4, e)

56. Can Scope 4 forecasts and risk inputs flow into Scope 5 without manual re-entry, with authoritative sources, time-granularity and scenario differences resolved, and assumptions kept consistent? (Scope 5, 4, f)

Bidder Qualifications and Proposal Requirements

58. Does the bidder demonstrate recent California CCA or load-serving-entity experience in resource planning, capacity expansion, reliability analysis, and CPUC IRP support, with proposed team members and roles identified? (Scope 5, 5, a)

60. Does the bidder demonstrate practical knowledge of CAISO markets, CPUC IRP and Resource Adequacy, RPS compliance, California clean-energy policy, greenhouse-gas accounting, and CCA planning needs? (Scope 5, 5, b)

62. Does the proposal describe modeling tools, major datasets, validation history, typical run times, known limitations, and how clients modify assumptions, run scenarios, diagnose results, and reproduce studies? (Scope 5, 5, c)

64. Does the work sample cover assumptions, scenario design, expansion, reliability, cost, emissions, quality controls, and decision support, and can the bidder demonstrate reruns, comparisons, and input-to-output traceability? (Scope 5, 5, d)

66. Does pricing separately identify software, implementation, integration, data licenses, training, recurring support, planning updates, filing support, optional studies, and transition services, with deliverables, assumptions, exclusions, limits, and pass-through costs? (Scope 5, 5, e)

Scope 6: CRR Auction Bidding Consulting Services

Standard response options for all questions:

- Fully addressed with specific methods, controls, deliverables, and relevant evidence
- Substantially addressed, but minor details or evidence are missing
- Partially addressed with significant gaps, vague commitments, or limited evidence
- Not addressed, contradicted, or unsupported

2. How well does the proposal demonstrate that recommendations will hedge identifiable congestion exposures from SVCE load, generation, power purchase agreements, scheduling locations, and delivery patterns? (Scope 6, 1, a)

4. How well does the proposal prevent recommendations based mainly on directional speculation, merchant trading returns, or exposures not tied to documented SVCE portfolio fundamentals? (Scope 6, 1, b)

6. How well does the proposal align each recommended path, time-of-use period, term, and quantity with the underlying exposure and explain basis, over-hedge, under-hedge, and mismatch risks? (Scope 6, 1, c)

8. How completely does the proposal disclose and control conflicts involving proprietary CRR trading, other auction participants, outcome-linked compensation, and non-public client information? (Scope 6, 1, d)

10. How clearly does the proposal preserve SVCE approval authority over strategy, limits, bids, position changes, and exceptions while limiting the consultant to advisory authority unless separately authorized? (Scope 6, 1, e)

12. How well does the proposal provide a repeatable calendar for every monthly, quarterly, and annual CAISO CRR auction, from data delivery through post-award review? (Scope 6, 2, a)

14. How well does the proposal quantify historical and forecast congestion exposure by source, sink, path, time-of-use period, season, and term using identified portfolio and market data? (Scope 6, 2, b)

16. How well does the proposal create a traceable, exposure-linked candidate path set and exclude immaterial, infeasible, weakly supported, or speculative paths? (Scope 6, 2, c)

18. How completely does the proposal provide expected value, uncertainty, quantity, bid price or curve, budget impact, rationale, assumptions, data vintages, limitations, and sensitivities for each recommended path? (Scope 6, 2, d)

20. How well does the proposal address diversification, concentration, correlated exposures, counterflow, source-sink mapping, tenor, time-of-use alignment, liquidity, and existing CRR holdings? (Scope 6, 2, e)

22. How well does the proposal convert SVCE risk boundaries into controls for budget, quantity, concentration, exposure linkage, collateral, and exception escalation? (Scope 6, 2, f)

24. How well does the proposal prepare or validate CAISO-compatible bid files, perform control checks, preserve version history, support submission, and require reapproval of changed recommendations? (Scope 6, 2, g)

26. How well does the proposal analyze relevant congestion scenarios, including transmission, dispatch, load, hydro, renewable output, outages, topology, portfolio changes, and expected underfunding-related CRR revenue offsets? (Scope 6, 3, a)

28. How well does the proposal quantify negative congestion revenue, auction overpayment, collateral pressure, path reversal, basis mismatch, and stranded-hedge risk? (Scope 6, 3, b)

30. How well does the proposal test material forecast inputs and assumptions and identify those with the greatest effect on valuation and bid selection? (Scope 6, 3, c)

32. How clearly does the proposal reject positions supported only by expected auction profit without a documented SVCE exposure or approved risk-management purpose? (Scope 6, 3, d)

34. How completely does the proposed pre-auction package cover exposures, primary and alternative bids, valuation ranges, controls, assumptions, downside cases, underfunding offsets, collateral, and SVCE decisions? (Scope 6, 4, a)

36. How well does the proposal assign each bid a unique identifier linking exposure, analysis, approval, submission, award, and performance review? (Scope 6, 4, b)

38. How well does the proposal document each guideline or limit exception with rationale, quantified impact, approver, approval date, and expiration or remediation condition? (Scope 6, 4, c)

40. How well do the proposed workpapers, input inventories, model descriptions, calculations, and version records allow SVCE or an independent reviewer to reproduce material conclusions? (Scope 6, 4, d)

42. How well does the proposal reconcile submitted bids to CAISO awards and charges, identify rejected or partial awards, and explain material portfolio differences? (Scope 6, 5, a)

44. How well does the proposal evaluate whether awarded CRRs offset documented exposure while separating hedge performance from stand-alone CRR revenue? (Scope 6, 5, b)

46. How well does the proposal attribute results to exposure and congestion forecast errors, auction price variance, quantity or basis mismatch, outages, topology changes, and other material drivers? (Scope 6, 5, c)

48. How well does the proposal benchmark CAISO CRR clearing prices, participation, awards, and other market outcomes for paths and source-sink combinations relevant to SVCE? (Scope 6, 5, d)

50. How well does the proposal turn auction and settlement lessons into specific improvements to exposure mapping, data controls, path screening, valuation, bid limits, and approvals? (Scope 6, 5, e)

52. How well does the proposal use available Scope 3 ETRM and RADaR CRR data, define supplemental data needs, and avoid requiring a separate CRR software platform? (Scope 6, 6, a)

54. How well does the proposal structure inputs and outputs for Scope 4 portfolio risk analysis without inconsistent assumptions or double counting? (Scope 6, 6, b)

56. How well does the proposal deliver human-readable and machine-readable files suitable for review, audit, retention, and RADaR ingestion while disclosing third-party restrictions? (Scope 6, 6, c)

58. How well does the proposal retain recommendations, approvals, bid files, model versions, source references, workpapers, and reviews and support audit or regulatory requests? (Scope 6, 6, d)

60. How well does the proposal monitor CAISO CRR policy and market changes and assess impacts on bidding, hedge design, credit, collateral, settlements, and governance? (Scope 6, 7, a)

62. How well does the proposed training cover CRR fundamentals, exposure mapping, valuation, bid review, non-speculative controls, auction operations, awards, and hedge effectiveness? (Scope 6, 7, b)

64. How well does the proposal provide periodic or ad hoc support for CAISO questions, settlement or auction issues, internal reviews, and CRR governance procedures? (Scope 6, 7, c)

66. How strong is the proposed team's documented experience supporting monthly, quarterly, and annual CAISO CRR auctions for load-serving entities, including California Community Choice Aggregators where applicable? (Scope 6, 8, a)

68. How complete and credible is the proposed methodology for exposure mapping, congestion forecasting, valuation, portfolio construction, scenarios, bid optimization, review, and prevention of speculative recommendations? (Scope 6, 8, b)

70. How complete and relevant are the redacted samples for pre-auction recommendations, bid-level approvals, post-auction reviews, and hedge-effectiveness analysis? (Scope 6, 8, c)

72. How well does the proposal address key personnel, quality review, auction-window availability, business continuity, data security, and conflicts controls? (Scope 6, 8, d)

74. How clearly does pricing separate annual, quarterly, and monthly auction support, onboarding, training, ad hoc rates, travel, and third-party data or model costs? (Scope 6, 8, e)

76. How well do the proposed measures assess timeliness, accuracy, control compliance, bid-file quality, documentation, and reduction of documented exposure without using speculative profit as an objective? (Scope 6, 8, f)

Scope 7: Market Forward Curves and Fundamental Price Forecasts

2. How completely does the proposal cover the required commodities and identify separately priced products?

- **A.** Covers all listed power, gas, REC, Resource Adequacy, carbon allowance, and GHG products across CAISO and WECC, including ELCC and Slice-of-Day considerations, with separately priced products clearly identified
- **B.** Covers nearly all listed products and regions, with only minor gaps or limited pricing detail
- **C.** Covers several core products but has material product, regional, or pricing-detail gaps
- **D.** Does not demonstrate usable coverage of the required commodities and regions

4. How well does the proposal define the forecast horizon and time granularity for every curve?

- **A.** States a clear tenor and time granularity for every proposed curve
- **B.** Provides the information for most curves, with minor omissions
- **C.** Provides partial or high-level information with material omissions
- **D.** Does not state usable tenor and granularity information

6. How well does the nodal pricing offer meet SVCE needs?

- **A.** Identifies availability at all relevant CAISO resource nodes, the base node allowance, and whether each forecast is forward-modeled or based on historical basis
- **B.** Addresses relevant nodes and base allowance but has minor gaps in methodology or coverage detail
- **C.** Offers limited nodal coverage or gives incomplete allowance and methodology information
- **D.** Does not offer or clearly describe suitable nodal pricing

8. How are stress cases included and priced?

- **A.** Stress cases are included with clear scope, or separately priced with complete and transparent terms

- **B.** Stress cases are available and pricing is mostly clear, with minor qualifications
- **C.** Stress cases may be available but inclusion, scope, or price is unclear
- **D.** Stress cases are not available

10. How completely do the proposed scenarios address SVCE portfolio drivers?

- **A.** Addresses load growth, weather, hydro, gas prices, resource build-out, and California policy change
- **B.** Addresses most listed drivers with only minor gaps
- **C.** Addresses some drivers but omits multiple material drivers
- **D.** Does not provide relevant scenario coverage

12. What level of custom scenario capability is offered?

- **A.** Supports requested custom scenarios and direct adjustment of material assumptions
- **B.** Supports custom scenarios with some limits on assumptions, timing, or volume
- **C.** Offers limited customization through vendor-defined options only
- **D.** Does not support custom scenarios or assumption changes

14. How complete and usable are the proposed curve files, reports, and supporting delivery tools?

- **A.** Provides machine-readable files with assumptions and outputs, a release report covering methodology, assumptions, and change drivers, plus staff presentation and an interactive platform
- **B.** Provides machine-readable files and complete release reports, plus either staff presentations or an interactive platform
- **C.** Provides machine-readable outputs but supporting assumptions, reports, presentations, or platform capability are materially limited
- **D.** Does not provide usable machine-readable curves and adequate release documentation

16. How well does the proposed release schedule address regular and off-cycle updates?

- **A.** States a clear release frequency and commits to off-cycle updates after material market or policy changes
- **B.** States a clear frequency and offers qualified or discretionary off-cycle updates
- **C.** States a frequency but does not clearly address off-cycle updates
- **D.** Does not provide a clear release schedule

18. How well does the proposal support automated delivery into RADaR?

- **A.** Provides a production-ready API or other automated transfer method suitable for direct RADaR ingestion
- **B.** Provides an automated method that appears suitable but requires manageable integration work
- **C.** Offers only a partially automated or unproven delivery approach
- **D.** Offers manual delivery only or no viable RADaR delivery method

20. How clearly does the proposal itemize automated RADaR delivery cost and timeline?

- **A.** Separately itemizes complete costs, milestones, dependencies, and timeline consistent with Scope 1
- **B.** Provides costs and timeline with only minor missing detail
- **C.** Provides a high-level estimate with material assumptions or omissions
- **D.** Does not provide a usable cost and timeline

22. How well do the proposed data-use rights meet SVCE requirements?

- **A.** Expressly permits use in third-party analytic models and recognizes that resulting analysis may be presented publicly
- **B.** Permits both uses subject only to reasonable, clearly defined conditions
- **C.** Permits one use or leaves material restrictions unresolved
- **D.** Prohibits required use or does not address the rights

24. How credible is the implementation plan for go-live and parallel delivery?

- **A.** Works backward from go-live, includes feed setup and two months of parallel delivery, and states the latest feasible contract-execution date before the incumbent contract ends
- **B.** Provides a credible schedule covering these elements with minor gaps
- **C.** Provides a high-level plan but omits a material date, dependency, or parallel-delivery detail
- **D.** Does not provide a credible implementation schedule

26. How well does the proposal explain the curve-modeling methodology?

- **A.** Clearly identifies and explains the model type, key mechanics, and whether it solves for long-run resource equilibrium
- **B.** Explains the model and equilibrium treatment with only minor gaps
- **C.** Provides a high-level description but omits material mechanics or equilibrium treatment
- **D.** Does not provide a meaningful methodology description

28. What level of IRP modeling support is offered?

- **A.** Curves support Scope 3 IRP filings and the bidder performs the required modeling directly
- **B.** Curves support IRP filings, with modeling delivered through a qualified partner or clearly defined support model
- **C.** Provides limited IRP compatibility or advisory support only
- **D.** Does not support the required IRP work

30. How complete and transparent is the cost proposal?

- **A.** Separately identifies base subscription, included node count, additional-node cost, fixed nodal pricing cost, and stress-case and scenario costs
- **B.** Separately identifies nearly all requested cost components with minor omissions
- **C.** Provides partial pricing with material bundling or missing cost components
- **D.** Does not provide a usable itemized cost proposal

32. How well do the proposed consulting services support SVCE?

- **A.** Offers an hour bank covering methodology and portfolio-fit review plus design and interpretation of custom scenarios, available with or without a curve subscription
- **B.** Offers both service areas with minor limits on packaging or availability
- **C.** Offers only one service area or a materially restricted consulting model
- **D.** Does not offer relevant consulting services