Q&A Responses for CTEEB RFP  
2/14/19

PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL QUESTIONS

Proposal - 1. We appreciated having extra time to submit questions and the intent to bid. For similar reasons, would it be possible to extend the due date for this proposal one week (March 5)?

A. We adjusted the due date by the same 2 days we gave as the extension for the clarifications and questions. The proposals are now due 2/28/19, 5pm eastern, in the format described in the RFP.

Proposal - 2. Is there flexibility in the Section 1 sub-section organization (as outlined in Form C of the RFP)? For example, can the “Clear staffing plan, staff roles, and management of firms and input” be integrated into the “Project-tailored mini-bios and roles table.” Similarly, could the “References” be integrated into the “Descriptions of past projects most related to this project.” This could help eliminate redundancies and create less work for the reviewers.

A. No. We do not want to have to search to find the answers to the questions identified by the headings of the sections.

Proposal – 3 (Section 6-1). Section 6 of the RFP lists a set of roles that “shall have an individual identified.” Must all studies have representatives for the six roles listed? Does that mean that each study (even a process one) needs a Site level impact lead, for example? Can there be other roles which are not listed on the RFP, such as Advisor, Interviewer, Data Analyst, etc.?

A. Only the roles that are relevant to the project should be identified. The list was indicative of the types of key roles we care about, and we want to know clearly who will be taking lead on key aspects of the project. There can be other roles listed if you think it will better describe the capabilities of your team.

Proposal - 4. The table on Form C, reads, Section 2: The section cover page should read “Section 1 - Residential Qualifications.” Should it actually be “Section 2 – Residential Qualifications’’?

A. I don’t think so.

Proposal - 5. Our interpretation of the RFP is that the responses to individual projects in Section 1 are meant to be read as independent proposals. As such, are teams discouraged from repeating information just within each project response OR from repeating information across the whole document (for example, repeating full bios for each project where team members may overlap vs. including bios for all projects and qualifications in one place)?
A. The project-based mini-proposals should each read as a standalone document with all the sections listed. Per Form C, the resumes, detailed bios, firm qualifications, etc. are not repeated in each project proposal; they are specified to be included in the Research Area qualifications of the proposal, with residential resumes in the residential research area, and commercial in the commercial, and cross-cutting if proposed. Tailored repeats for some staff are expected if you are bidding on more than one research area.

Proposal - 6. Given the warning about repeating material, since team members may appear in multiple projects and under multiple areas for qualification, would it be permissible to put resumes in an appendix? Assuming this is the case, can the resume file be submitted as a pdf file separate from the Word file of the submission?

A. No, resumes may not be put in a separate PDF file. We provided page limits and a request for one document and a requirement that the document may not exceed a certain MB limit. See answer to previous questions for placement of the resumes, per Form C.

Proposal – 4. On page 15 of the RFP, the criteria for the Research Area Evaluation percentages do not sum to 100% (50%; 33%; 25%). Please provide revised values.

A. Thank you for pointing that out. Research Area Evaluation Weights should be: 45% Firm’s qualifications and experience / Team management Plan / roles / quality / depth of previous experience including references; 30% Qualifications of Team Staff included and Team manager; 25% reasonableness of Rates relative to qualifications.

Proposal – 6. As a small firm, we have billed individuals at different rates based on the type of work being completed for a project (e.g. administrative/data collection tasks vs. project management/analysis/reporting tasks). Is the EA Team open to that kind of pricing structure for this RFP?

A. You may submit your proposal in this way. We will look at the match between credentials and billing rates for the higher-level positions, of course.

Proposal-7. On Form D: Budget Format for 2019 Projects, the “Cost for 10 more of this type” and the “Cost for 10 fewer of this type” below the main table are Unit costs, correct?

A. The total extra cost for 10 more or less, not something we will then multiply by 10.

Survey-only - 1. Please confirm that if our team is presenting qualifications for both Commercial and Residential work (and bidding on specific projects in each as well) that we should not submit quals for the Survey-Only Research area.

A. The survey-only qualifications are generally a different track for firms only doing survey research and you are not generally expected to submit them if applying for the Commercial
and/or Residential pools. However, if an evaluation company happens to also have a survey house, they are welcome to bid on the survey-only portion as a separate proposal. If submitting to the residential or commercial pools, we would expect the high scorers to be firms or teams with substantial EM&V capabilities well beyond survey research.

**Survey-Only – 2.** If submitting a proposal for the Survey-only Research Area, does that preclude specifying Residential or Commercial? And the only forms needed for the Research Area qualifications are those contained in section 7, Forms E and F, correct?

A. **You are not precluded.** We are expecting survey-only pool participants to be survey-only firms, however, if an evaluation company happens to also have a survey house, they are welcome to bid on the survey-only portion as a separate proposal. If submitting to the residential or commercial pools, we would expect the high scorers to be firms or teams with substantial EM&V capabilities well beyond survey research. For survey-only submittals, we need forms E and F.

Research Areas 1 - Will you be selecting only a single contractor for the C&I research area? Will you be selecting only a single contractor for the residential research area?

A. **No, we intend to select several firms / teams as part of the pools for these research areas.**

**TEAMING QUESTIONS**

A number of questions arose about teaming. The questions are included in the boxed section below. The answers were provided by the two clarifications, reproduced below the box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaming-Related Questions Submitted:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaming - 1. Our understanding is that companies can team in a prime/subcontractor relationship for the 2019 opportunities. Our interpretation of the proposal process under these circumstances is that the company that is the prime for each project should submit those projects on their proposal. If that company is a sub to another company on a project, that other company would include those projects in the proposal they are priming. Can you confirm this understanding or provide guidance if incorrect?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaming - 2. Our interpretation of the research pool qualification submission is that each contractor submits their own qualifications for each research area for approval. Can that company then team with other companies on the future opportunities so long as both companies have been pre-approved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaming – 3. Is it okay for us to submit our own proposal (as the prime) for a few projects and for another firm to list us as a sub on their proposal for a project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaming – 4. Was the response (on teaming) meant to address just the pool qualification aspect of submittals, and individual 2019 RFP bid teams can be configured as desired? Prior to receiving your reply, we had been tailoring multiple different teams and solo bids to best meet each individual 2019 RFP’s needs. We can reconfigure our approach to submit three bids for the research pools and deliver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
strong proposals for each, one for each of residential and commercial as the follow-up specifies, and a third for crosscutting.

Teaming – 5. Regarding the individual 2019 RFP responses, as opposed to the pools: one of our preferred subcontractor team members would like to join us for a specific individual RFP and join another team for a different individual RFP we are not bidding within the category. Is this allowed?

Teaming – 6. Please confirm the crosscutting area can have its own “way” to bid for the individual 2019 RFP responses.

Teaming - 7. Please confirm that a subcontractor can be on different teams for different individual 2019 RFPs within the research area.

Teaming – 8. Our firm would like to prime a team in response to at least one RFP and bid solo on at least one other. Should we submit a single combined proposal with two Form Bs or two entirely separate proposals?

Teaming – 9. Our firm plans to submit qualifications for the Research Area Qualification Pool without any team members. If we qualify, will we be able to team with other qualified firms in a 2020/2021 project.

A. Responses provided via Email Clarifications Previously Sent, reproduced below.

Clarification 1 (issued 2/1/19): The question has arisen about whether firms can bid separately AND as part of a team. The following clarifies this issue:

- Each firm must choose ONE way to bid for the Residential Pool and ONE way to bid for Commercial Pool (can be different ways for residential vs. commercial). You cannot submit to those pools as an individual firm AND be a team member.
- Form B deletes the sub-areas under the Residential and Commercial Pools, matching Form A.
- We are looking for / will be selecting the strongest firms or teams in each research area (Residential and Commercial) and the firms or teams that are ultimately qualified for crosscutting are selected from the strongest submittals for residential and commercial combined. Note we are happy to entertain submittals from teams OR individual firms (again, one method only).
- The current-year projects are considered as part of the whole period. You must bid that in the same form you are considering yourself for the research area’s future projects.

Clarification 2 (issued 2/5/19): Regarding the formation of teams for the RFQ component of this solicitation: bidders may, if they wish, submit a qualifying proposal for the cross-cutting research area that consists of different team members than proposed in the Residential or Non-Residential research areas. This will be treated as an alternate route to qualifying for inclusion in miniRFPs for future cross-cutting projects. However, we note that the existence of multiple routes to qualification for the cross-cutting area raises the possibility of firms competing against themselves in the future in this research area, due to a firm that qualified on one team in one research area also qualifying on a different team in a different research area. To guard against this possibility, it is likely that, in future miniRFPs in the cross-cutting area, we would not allow individual firms to be considered in more than one proposal. Any
firms that qualified on multiple teams would thus need to choose which team to propose with for specific future projects, or for us to choose for them.

Note that our intention is to qualify more than one firm/team for each research area.

INDIVIDUAL PROJECT-RELATED QUESTIONS

R1973-1. The RFP states: “The core objective of this study is to develop improved impact parameters for participants in non-lighting retail products offerings.” Is the CT EEB looking for a particular set of impact parameters (such as energy and demand savings, NTG ratios, and in-service rates) to adjust program data, or is the CT EEB interested in direct estimates of energy and demand savings from the program?

A. We expect that there will be a fair amount of flexibility regarding the format of recommended impact parameters. However, the information we currently have available regarding how the companies are determining ex-ante tracking estimates of savings from these programs is limited to the contents of the PSD (pp. 197-207 of the 2018 version). Bidders may therefore want to anticipate the need for some preliminary investigation once the project begins to clarify issues such as the mix of measures for which savings are being claimed, the specific methods being used to determine ex-ante savings estimates, and the most useful form for recommended impact parameters from the study.

R1973-2. Is there a requirement to evaluate the impacts of the RPP program using a resource acquisition framework, or is there flexibility to use other statistical methods to understand the impacts of the program?

A. We recognize that there are some basic issues regarding the extent to which the guiding paradigm for impact evaluation of RPP should be based on resource acquisition (RA) vs market transformation (MT) principles. Our current preference is to emphasize the latter. However, we have not processed this issue with stakeholders as of yet, and we are not aware of any policy guidance in CT regarding the issue. Bidders should thus anticipate the potential need for some consensus building among stakeholders at the beginning of the project regarding how evaluation of RPP should be approached.

R1973-3. If the research objective is to develop improved impact parameters, does the CT EEB have a set of current impact parameters, or a framework in use that bidders should reference, such as relevant values in the PSD? Does the CT EEB want primary research to update the current energy and demand values contained in the PSD?

A. Yes, the RFP is seeking primary research to update the values in the PSD, although that research may need to be targeted. For the most part, the only information we currently have regarding how the utilities are establishing ex-ante estimates of savings is the contents of the PSD. However, our current understanding is that for RPP, the utilities have been basing the estimated NTGR in some manner on results from upstream interviews done for the national EM&V working group by Illume.
R1973-4. Besides targeting some of the same product categories, is there any overlap or coordination between RPP and the E-Commerce platform? For example, do the two initiatives utilize similar eligibility requirements for qualifying models?

A. We believe this is a good question, but unfortunately we cannot answer it at this time. We recommend that bidders anticipate a need to clarify issues such as this early in the project.

R1973-5. Will the selected consultant have access to customer contact information (either email or phone) for the E-Commerce platform in order to conduct customer surveys?

A. We believe this is a good question, but unfortunately we cannot answer it at this time. Bidders may wish to propose contingency plans based on the results of preliminary investigations into the issue once the project starts.

C1901-1. The 2019-2021 Conservation & Load Management Plan discusses the program theory for the programs to be evaluated under C1901, but the RFP does not request the development of program logic models as part of the process evaluation. Is this something that the EEB would find useful?

A. We did not intend to have logic models included in the base proposals at this time. The process evaluations are designed to identify and answer key questions. We have mentioned consultants are allowed to propose value-added refinements to their proposals (such as logic models).

C1901-2. Can you identify the approximate number of market actors by type (contractor, distributor, architect, engineer, etc.) that participate in each of the non-SBEA programs?

A. Not at this time. That information will be sought and obtained by the selected contractor as part of the development of the more detailed work plan after the kick-off meeting. You should budget for a minimum of 20 in-depth interviews with key market actors.

C1901-3. To what degree do market actors participate in multiple non-SBEA programs—which types of market actors overlap across which programs?

A. Some installation contractors participate in multiple programs. The specifics are not known at this point.

C1901-4. Do the programs have contact information for the market actors participating in the non-SBEA programs?

A. Assume they do have contact information for major market actors.
C1901-5. For C1901 (Commercial and Industrial Energy Efficiency Programs (Non-SBEA) Process Evaluation), what program years will be evaluated, and what are the estimated participation levels for each program for those years?

A. The process evaluation should concentrate on the last two years of program activity and practices as well as current practices.

R1982-1 “Metering Study”. Do you anticipate direct natural gas (and other fuel) usage measurement? Or could fan / burner runtime, combined with monthly or more granular billing data (i.e., AMI data), provide a reasonable enough estimate for natural gas usage as an alternative?

A. Bidders can offer alternative methods for measuring non-electric loads. Please elaborate on how your method handles equipment with multiple or variable operating levels. Bidders will need to explain fully the advantages and disadvantages of these methods; and provide references to their successful deployment.

R1982-2. The RFP outlines a desired timeline for R1982. It seems to imply that results would be expected by late fall of 2020 and late spring of 2021. Is that the expectation?

A. We are expecting as a minimum of 1 year of monitoring, though bids that support longer metering will be given greater consideration, all other factors being equal. The timing of that year will depend on how quickly bidders can get into the field. If team can get into the field in summer of 2019, then it may be possible to have reports in spring of 2020 and fall of 2020. As the RFP indicates, we “would be preferred to have a summer report in late fall and a winter report in late spring.” However, the RFP should have then said “but if on-site retrieval is NOT [word inserted] required and metering can extend to one year without on-site data retrieval, then one annual report might be considered.

R1982-3: HVAC/DHW Performance and Potential Assessment states that, “metering must provide hourly or finer load data (consistent with the 8760 requirements stated earlier), determine annual fuel use, and seasonal efficiency for all equipment”. Can you please describe your needs or design regarding seasonal efficiency? In our experience, hourly loads and annual fuel use are relatively simple to obtain. Seasonal efficiency is very costly to meter directly, and may require placement of multiple temperature and flow sensors. Furthermore, seasonal efficiency as measured in the field is often subject to case-specific circumstances, and will not align with manufacturer-stated or AHRI certified seasonal efficiency measurements that follow specific protocols in controlled, laboratory settings. Is it the intent of this study to capture all datapoints needed to complete estimation of SEER or Uniform Energy Factor, for example? Or was there a different metric/metrics the EEB had in mind?

A. It was not our intention to measure the efficiency component directly, but to derive it from manufacturer-stated, AHRI certified seasonal efficiency measurements, or other credible studies; or where relevant the above adjusted to incorporate findings from this metering.
R1982-4: HVAC/DHW Performance and Potential Assessment states that equipment seasonal efficiency is a desired study outcome. Is CT open to innovative, cost-cutting approaches that may leverage power-metering data to eliminate the need for direct efficiency measurements? If so, may bidders submit multiple pricing and approach scenarios?

A. See previous answer, though if bidders believe there is a better method, we encourage you to propose it, if it can be done within the proposed budget.

R1965-1. Does CT have a known source for existing sales data? If so, what is the cost to purchase? What is the assumed market coverage of the sales data?

A. We have not explored this for CT and call upon your expertise and experience to identify options.

R1965-2. We understand that the Utilities do not track costs at the program level. Are there plans for them to begin tracking costs at the program level, and will they have started tracking costs at the program level in time for this study to perform the cost effectiveness work?

A. Bidder will work with the utilities to determine the appropriate utility-related inputs to utility cost-effectiveness tests.

R1965-3. Since this study will likely need to draw on results from R1982, we expect R1982 data will be available before R1965 can be completed. If two different teams are awarded R1965 and R1982, will the R1965 team have input into the planning of R1982 to ensure that appropriate data are gathered for R1965? If so, how would this be coordinated and should we allocate budget for this coordination?

A. Bidders should bid R1965 assuming R1982 will not supply updated performance values, and bidder would then need to use values based on their literature research. However, if R1982 data are available, we expect R1965 to incorporate them.

R1965-4: Will the RASS data and results be available?

A. Yes, there is a RASS database and there is the RASS Study (and tables), both of which will be available to this project.

R1963-1. Is it certain that Lockheed Martin will conduct shelf-stocking visits in Connecticut, or is this simply noted in the RFP as a possibility?

A. Thank you for asking. Our best understanding as of this writing is that, contrary to the implications of the initial RFP text, there are no current plans to have Lockheed Martin conduct shelf-stocking data in CT. We therefore suggest that bidders: (1) make a case in their
proposals as to how high a priority shelf stocking data should be compared to other potential data sources given the available resources and the overall project objective of providing timely insights into near-term changes in the residential lighting market; and (2) based on their answer to that question, decide whether or not to include the collection, analysis and reporting of shelf-stocking data in their proposals.

X1932-1. Is there a rough estimate of the number and types of projects (designated as DR) installed through the pilot programs so far?

A. The Demand Response strategies are in the 2019-2021 C&LM plan, on page 89 for residential and page 149 for C&I.

X1932-2. In regards to Cross-Cutting Evaluation project X1932 DR EM&V support, because there is no specific scope, can you please provide additional guidance regarding how you wish respondents to provide detailed budgets for Form C Section 1?

- Is there a specific number of evaluation plans or results the review will entail, or should we provide a budget and schedule associated with the review of a single project example?
- What other specific activities does the provided maximum budget include?

A. For the bullets that are affected by the lack of specific information available, we would suggest you respond to this project like a “Task Order”, for example, explaining major types of assignments and the variations in approach and/or staffing, etc. that you have to offer.

X1931-1. The RFP states that the bulk of the budget for the PSD review is assigned for primary research but 25% will be conducted in late 2019 and into 2020. If the initial PSD review dictates more primary research in 2020 than 25% of budget would allow, what type of flexibility is there?

A. The split in dollars is not intended to identify the share for review vs. primary research, it was related to timing. We would, of course, hope for a high percent of the project to be allocated to primary research filing gaps and weaknesses, etc. identified in the review portion of the project. This is a high priority project, and the review should be completed asap. We recognize that some types of follow-up research that might be needed may take longer to accomplish than other types. Feel free to provide information about what might affect timing.

X1931-2. The RFP indicates “Changes that reflect the directions that Connecticut’s programs will be moving in the future will also be relevant.” Can you provide any additional information on the directions that the programs are anticipated to move in and the PSD changes that are likely to be needed?

A. A few of the possible measure additions and enhancements that might imply associated PSD changes and should be considered include: reduction / cessation of lighting as a program measure at retail and direct install and its implications for PSD values; expansion of DR activities; HP and HPWH fuel switching; all-electric residential new construction; addition of air-to-water HPs; energy storage; deep energy retrofits, and others. We rely on the expertise
of the proposers to identify relevant strategies on the horizon that fall under the purview of EE funds.

X1931-3. Is the PSD updating process expected to extend beyond this RFP/budget and is it within scope to outline the extension and structure of the PSD refresh process and future update efforts?

A. This comprehensive PSD review is expected to be the main effort for this 3-year period, and the product should clearly outline priorities of missing / weak information to be updated going forward. Connecticut’s EM&V budgeting process does not easily incorporate on-going efforts (outside a 3-year-period). Our RFP does request information on options that you believe are valuable.

X1931-4: Will any on-site data collection and/or metering be required as part of the primary research? Pricing of the primary research will depend upon the findings during the review of the PSD. As such, should we anticipate that the primary research budget will be detailed upon completion of the review?

A. If on-site data collection or metering is determined to be a priority for the primary data work portion of this project, then yes. Yes, pricing will vary based on the recommendations. You may strengthen your proposal if you identify the range of budgets needed for different types of primary data / analysis work that might arise; you should clearly identify your costs associated with the first part of the assignment. Bidder is also encouraged to suggest additional metering or other enhancements to existing or the proposed studies that can obtain the desired data.