



SOLICITATIONS WORKING GROUP MEETING 1/25/22

Agenda

1. Prepare for January 31 Solicitations Stakeholder meeting
 - a. [Zoom link](#)
 - b. Access code: 2492 988 5020; Event password: cX3SFiGhr53
2. Discuss Draft 3P Solicitations for EE Process [Evaluation](#)

Meeting Notes

Prepare for January 31 Stakeholder meeting

- Agenda from CPUC not yet released
- CPUC and IE requested that the Council offer some questions and topics that could be included in the 1/31 solicitations stakeholder meeting
- Greg reached out to the CEDMC Solicitations Member Working Group for input on topics that they would like to see for the 1/31 meeting
- The following list was sent by Greg Wikler to Justin Galle at CPUC on 12/13/21:
 1. Update from IEs on the contents of next Semi-Annual IE Report (to be published in early January 2022)
 2. Update from IOUs on status of 3rd Party Solicitations process evaluation report recently completed by Opinion Dynamics but not yet released to stakeholders.
 3. Include launch dates for all 3rd party programs in the current Excel based solicitation matrix maintained by the IOUs.
 - Jim Dodenhoff emailed Justin from CPUC. He responded he has approached IOU's and they haven't pushed back, but no timing provided for implementation. It would be nice to have it implemented as soon as possible.
 4. Include timelines in the same matrix for EE programs that IOUs are directly administering.
 5. Update from CPUC/IOU steps being taken to include more meaningful DBE (e.g., small businesses, women-owned businesses, minority-owned businesses, etc.) participation for each solicitation.

6. Update from IOUs on solicitation timing as CA's process takes far longer than any other region in the US. What urgency is put on IOUs by the CPUC to speed up the solicitation process?
7. Update from IOUs on efforts made to provide meaningful feedback to unsuccessful RFA and RFP bidders.
8. Address stakeholder issues related to recent cost-effectiveness tool (CET) updates and explore possibility of CET training workshop by CPUC to review changes over the past year.
9. How are new and innovative program ideas being addressed by CPUC and/or IOUs for upcoming solicitation stages?
10. What are IOUs plans for the \$30M CPUC just authorized for RFPs around peak savings?
 - What opportunities should 3Ps be looking to take in the other \$150M put aside for summer reliability?
 - Each IOU to administer this program in their own respective service territories
 - PG&E likely launching market access solicitation in June, with single stage reliability solicitation apparently arriving earlier in March

Discuss Draft 3P Solicitations for EE Process Evaluation

- Presented in Policy Call on 1/21
- Key findings include:
 - Lack of supplier diversity
 - Unclear whether this means DBEs or a range of different suppliers
 - Current process inhibits meaningful innovation
 - Since the current process inhibits any meaningful innovation, the report recommends that innovation should be encouraged by PAs throughout the implementation process and that prime contractors must be given the flexibility to hire and replace subcontractors to foster innovation
 - Questionable need for two separate stages
 - Is an RFA stage necessary?
 - RFAs in current process had significant stipulations in sourcing documents
 - A report (IE report?) noted difficulty stemming from de facto third stage when bringing more than one party into a competitive negotiation to meet onerous conditions
 - Also brought up by CPUC Commissioner Shiroma in one of the stakeholder meetings, but no resolution as yet
 - Report recommends more objective and transparent scoring approaches

- Due to an inadequate feedback process, the report recommends more objective and transparent scoring approaches that tie directly to required information, narrative responses, and the intended outcomes of cost-effective savings achievement, innovation, and diversity in the 3P process
 - Differences RFP Instructions Across IOUs
 - The report did not weigh in on a recommendation to this challenge but tied this issue back to diversity mandates.
 - Need for consistency across IOUs
 - Awarding and Negotiating Contracts
 - The P4P approach was cited by bidders as unsustainable, and IEs noted that there are too many sticks and not enough carrots.
 - Since then, [comments were submitted](#) on this evaluation
 - CEDMC staff will review comments ahead of 1/31 solicitations meeting
- P4P has some major pitfalls, and may be a significant issue with the IOUs paying contracts based on TSB performance for market access program
 - IOUs filed TSB very differently in their respective 2022–2023 BBALs, which may not portend well for market access program
 - SCE states that all contracts have to be 100% P4P
 - [Decision language](#) seems to indicate some degree of P4P
 - Instances of bidders walking away from contracts where strict P4P is enforced
 - In some cases collateral is required, engendering significant financial risk
- Joint IOU Supplier Summit hosted by SDG&E
 - Commitments made to exchange material, provide evaluation of event (not received)
 - Was not smooth sailing, and has not been the initiation to networking amongst bidders, suppliers, etc. that was hoped
 - Virtual nature of event hampered experience compared to past in-person experience

Next Meeting

Our next Working Group meeting will be on February 21, 2022. This meeting will recur on a monthly basis on the Fourth Tuesday at 2 – 3 pm. An invite from Admin@cedmc.org has gone out to all folks on the Working Group.