

The Rhode Island Energy Efficiency and  
Resources Management Council  
("EERMC")

Request for Proposals  
("RFP")

RFP Title:	Rhode Island Energy Efficiency Market Potential Study
RFP Number:	EERMC-2019-01
RFP Issuance Date:	3/26/19
Mandatory Pre Proposal Conference	3:00 p.m. EST on 4/2/19
Due Date to submit Questions:	5:00 p.m. EST on 4/15/19
RFP Submission Deadline:	4:00 p.m. EST on 5/15/19

## SECTION 1: GENERAL INFORMATION

---

- 1.1. **Summary.** The Rhode Island Energy Efficiency and Resources Management Council (“EERMC”) is issuing this request for proposals (“RFP”) to solicit proposals from qualified offerors to conduct an Energy Efficiency Market Potential Study covering the State of Rhode Island, as described in Section 5 of this RFP.
- 1.2. **EERMC.** EERMC is a council authorized, created and established pursuant to the laws of the State of Rhode Island (“State”). See R.I. Gen. Laws §42-140.1-3. EERMC council members are appointed by the State Governor with the advice and consent of the State Senate, and the Commissioner of the Rhode Island Office of Energy Resources (“OER”) serves as the EERMC executive director. See R.I. Gen. Laws §42-140.1-4. In accordance with R.I. Gen. Laws §42-140.1-6, EERMC is authorized to engage consultants and professional services as necessary and appropriate to fulfil its statutory purposes which are to:
- Evaluate and make recommendations, including, but not limited to, plans and programs, with regard to the optimization of energy efficiency, energy conservation, energy resource development; and the development of a plan for least-cost procurement for the State;
  - Provide consistent, comprehensive, informed and publicly accountable stake-holder involvement in energy efficiency, energy conservation, and energy resource management;
  - Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of programs to achieve energy efficiency, energy conservation, and diversification of energy resources; and
  - Promote public understanding of energy issues and of ways in which energy efficiency, energy conservation, and energy resource diversification and management can be effectuated.
- 1.3. **State Purchases Act.** In general, the State Purchases Act, R.I. Gen. Laws §37-2-1 et seq., applies to every expenditure of public funds by any State governmental entity or public agency within the State. EERMC, as a council established by the Rhode Island General Assembly, is issuing this solicitation and selection for award in accordance with the underlying purposes and policies of the State Purchases Act. Any prospective offeror or offeror who wishes to submit a written protest in accordance with R.I. Gen. Laws §37-2-52, must submit the protest to the Commissioner of the Rhode Island Office of Energy Resources via mail or hand delivery to One Capitol Hill, 4<sup>th</sup> floor, Providence, RI 02908 or via email to [energyresources@energy.ri.gov](mailto:energyresources@energy.ri.gov).
- 1.4. **Equal Opportunity Policy.** In accordance with R.I. Gen. Laws §28-5.1-10, any selected offeror(s) who contract(s) with EERMC must possess the same commitment to equal opportunity as prevails under federal contracts controlled by federal executive orders 11246, 11625 and 11375. The selected offeror(s) may be required to submit an equal employment opportunity plan as proof of

commitment. For more information, please contact the Rhode Island Equal Opportunity Office within the Rhode Island Department of Administration's Office of Diversity, Equity & Opportunity at 401.222.6398 or visit <http://odeo.ri.gov/offices/eoo>.

- 1.5. Minority and Women Business Enterprises.** In accordance with R.I. Gen. Laws §37-14.1-4, small businesses owned and controlled by one or more women who are economically disadvantaged (“WBEs”) or small businesses owned and controlled by one or more minorities who are economically disadvantaged (“MBEs”) shall have the maximum opportunity to participate in all procurements of goods or services involving funds administered by EERMC.
- 1.6. Disability Business Enterprises.** In accordance with R.I. Gen. Laws §37-2.2-3.1, small disadvantaged businesses owned and controlled by one or more individuals who have a disability (“Disability Business Enterprise”) shall have the maximum opportunity to participate in all procurements of goods or services involving funds administered by EERMC.
- 1.7. ISBE Utilization.** The term “ISBE” pertains to individuals who own small business enterprises and means all businesses that are certified as a WBE or MBE by the Rhode Island Office of Diversity, Equity & Opportunity (“ODEO”) or as a Disability Business Enterprise by the Governor’s Commission on Disabilities. In order for an offeror to receive credit for ISBE utilization either as an ISBE itself or through the utilization of a subcontractor that is an ISBE, the business must possess certification at the time the proposal is submitted to EERMC. To determine whether a business is certified by the State as an MBE or WBE or to become certified, please contact ODEO at 401.222.6398 or visit <http://odeo.ri.gov/offices/mbeco/>. To determine whether a business is certified by the State as a Disability Business Enterprise or to become certified, please contact the Rhode Island Governor’s Commission on Disabilities at 401.462.0100 or visit <http://www.disabilities.ri.gov/>. Offerors will receive between 0-6 evaluation points based on their proposed ISBE utilization rates. Each offeror must submit its proposed ISBE utilization rate as part of its proposal as instructed herein.
- 1.8. Utilization of Subcontractors.** Subcontractors are permitted, provided that their use must be clearly indicated in the proposal. To the extent possible, all proposed subcontractors must be identified in the proposal.
- 1.9. Public Disclosure of Proposals.** All proposals received by EERMC in connection with this RFP are subject to the Rhode Island Access to Public Records Act (“APRA”), R.I. Gen. Laws §38-2-1, et. seq. Once an award is made and upon receiving an APRA request, all proposals will be released by EERMC unless EERMC finds that the certain portions of information contained within the proposals are exempt from public disclosure pursuant to R.I. Gen. Laws §38-2-2(4). Offerors are advised to clearly mark or label “confidential” any portions of information within their proposals that they believe are “[t]rade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person, firm, or corporation

which is of a privileged or confidential nature.” When responding to an APRA request, EERMC will take into consideration any information marked by the offeror as confidential. However, broad disclaimers that label the entire proposal as confidential will not help EERMC in its APRA analysis and may not be considered.

- 1.10. **Costs Associated with Submitting a Proposal.** All costs associated with developing or submitting a proposal in response to this RFP, or to provide oral or written clarification of its content shall be borne by the offeror. EERMC assumes no responsibility for these costs.
- 1.11. **Right to Cancel this RFP.** In accordance with R.I. Gen. Laws §37-2-23, this RFP may be cancelled at any time and/or all proposals may be rejected.
- 1.12. **Misdirected Proposals.** Any proposals misdirected to other state locations, or which are otherwise not present in the office of the Contact Person at the time of the submission deadline for any cause will be determined to be late and may not be considered.
- 1.13. **Proposals Irrevocable.** Proposals are considered to be irrevocable for a period of not less than sixty (60) days following the submission deadline, and may not be withdrawn, except with the express written permission of EERMC.
- 1.14. **EERMC Website.** Offerors are instructed to peruse the EERMC website and any other pertinent websites listed in Section 2.1 of this RFP on a regular basis, as additional information relating to this solicitation may be posted there from time to time. See Section 2.1 of this RFP for pertinent website address(es).
- 1.15. **Right to Transact Business in Rhode Island.** In accordance with R. I. Gen. Laws §7-1.2-1, et seq., no foreign corporation, a corporation without a Rhode Island business address, shall have the right to transact business in the State until it shall have procured a Certificate of Authority to do so from the Rhode Island Department of State. Please contact the Rhode Island Secretary of State’s Business Services Division at 401.222.3040 or visit <http://sos.ri.gov/divisions/business-portal> for more information. This is a requirement only of the selected offeror(s).
- 1.16. **Availability of Funds.** The purchase of services under an award made pursuant to this RFP will be contingent on the availability of funds.
- 1.17. **Insurance.** Prior to being issued a final award, the selected offeror(s) will be required to possess all necessary insurance, as determined by the EERMC, and continue to possess such insurance throughout the life of the award.
- 1.18. **Indemnification.** The selected and awarded offeror shall hold harmless and indemnify the EERMC and the State from and against any and all losses, damages, claims, suits, actions, liabilities, and/or expenses, including, without limitation, attorneys’ fees and disbursements of any character that arise from, are in

connection with or are attributable to the performance or nonperformance of the offeror or its subcontractors under an award stemming from this RFP.

**SECTION 2: AGENCY CONTACT PERSON AND OFFEROR SUBMISSION AND FORMATTING REQUIREMENTS**

---

**2.1 Contact Person.** Any communication regarding this RFP must be made in writing and directed to the Contact Person whose information is listed in the table below. Revised and/or additional information regarding this solicitation may be posted on the Pertinent Website(s) listed in the table below.

Contact Person	Becca Trietch
Mailing Address	Rhode Island Office of Energy Resources One Capitol Hill, 4 <sup>th</sup> floor Providence, RI 02908
Email Address	eermc.rfp@gmail.com
Pertinent Website(s)	<a href="https://rieermc.ri.gov/request-for-proposals/">https://rieermc.ri.gov/request-for-proposals/</a>

**2.2 Important Dates.** Important dates regarding this RFP are listed in the table below.

RFP Issuance Date	3/26/19
Mandatory Pre Proposal Conference Date, Time & Phone Number	Tuesday, April 2 <sup>nd</sup> at 3:00 p.m. (Eastern Time) Conference Line: 1-877-416-0724; 16266942#
Written Questions Due Date	Monday, April 15 <sup>th</sup> at 5:00 p.m. (Eastern Time).
Submission Deadline	Wednesday, May 15 <sup>th</sup> at 4:00 p.m. (Eastern Time).

**2.3 Mandatory Pre Proposal Conference.** There will be a mandatory pre-proposal conference for this RFP via conference line. Any prospective offeror must have a representative join the conference line at the time indicated above. A proposal from an offeror that did not attend the pre-proposal conference call will not be considered. If a team is likely to submit a proposal, only the lead offeror must join the pre-proposal conference call.

In preparation for the pre-proposal conference, please email the Contact Person by 4:00pm ET on Monday, April 1, 2019 with the names of the company and representative that will be joining the call.

**2.4 Written Questions.** Prospective offerors may submit written questions pertaining to this RFP. Questions must be emailed as a Microsoft WORD or searchable PDF attachment to the Contact Person. The deadline to submit

questions is listed within the table in Section 2.2 of this RFP. Questions and EERMC's responses will be posted on the Pertinent Website(s).

**2.5 Amendments to this RFP.** If this RFP is amended or addendums are issued, written notice of the amendments and/or addendums will be posted on the Pertinent Website(s).

**2.6 Submission Deadline.** Each Proposal will include three (3) components: technical, cost, and ISBE. All three components must be received by the Contact Person by the Submission Deadline as listed within the table in Section 2.2 of this RFP.

**2.7 Submission Requirements.** Each Proposal must be mailed or hand delivered to the Contact Person and must include the following:

- One (1) original technical component plus three (3) printed paper copies.
- One (1) original cost component plus three (3) printed paper copies. The original cost component and copies must be separated from the technical component and placed in a sealed envelope. Please label the sealed envelope as "Cost Proposal".
- One (1) original ISBE component plus three (3) printed paper copies. This original ISBE component and copies must be separated from the technical component and placed in a sealed envelope. Please label the sealed envelope as "ISBE Proposal".
- A thumb drive or CD-R that contains the electronic versions of the technical component, cost component (must be saved as a separate file from the technical component), and ISBE component (must be saved as a separate file from the technical component). The electronic versions must be in a searchable PDF or Microsoft WORD format unless otherwise permitted by the Contact Person. Please label each file on the thumb drive or CD-R as "Technical Proposal" or "Cost Proposal" or "ISBE Proposal".

**2.8 Formatting of Written Documents.** For clarity, the technical component should be typed and sections should be clearly labeled to correspond with the pertinent RFP sections. These documents should use 1" margins on 8.5"x 11" paper using a font of 12 point. Technical components should be a maximum of twenty (20) pages not counting any attachments. Each attachment should be referenced appropriately within the proposal section and the attachment title should reference the proposal section it is applicable to. The Cover Sheet, Cost component and ISBE component should be typed using the attached templates.

### **SECTION 3: EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS**

---

- 3.1 Technical Review Team.** Proposals will be evaluated and scored by a technical review team in accordance with the criteria contained herein. The chief purchasing officer, or the technical review team through delegated authority from the chief purchasing officer, will make a recommendation to the EERMC. An award shall be made to the responsible offeror(s) whose proposal is determined to be the most advantageous to the EERMC, taking into consideration price and the evaluation factors set forth in this solicitation. The EERMC is responsible for the final selection of an offeror. The EERMC reserves the right to award one, multiple, or no awards based on the proposals received. The EERMC also reserves the right to reissue the RFP at its sole discretion.
- 3.2 Technical Component Evaluation Stage.** To advance to the second stage of the evaluation process, which factors in the cost and ISBE components, the offeror must earn a technical component score of at least 60 (85.7%) out of the maximum 70 technical points. Any proposal with a technical component score of less than 60 points will not have the cost or ISBE components opened nor evaluated and the proposal will be dropped from further consideration.
- 3.3 Cost & ISBE Components.** Proposals scoring 60 technical points or higher will be evaluated for cost and assigned up to a maximum of 30 points in the cost category. In addition, proposals scoring 60 technical points or higher will be evaluated for ISBE participation and assigned up to a maximum of 6 points in the ISBE participation category bringing the potential maximum score to 106 points.
- 3.4 Scoring.**

**Minimum Proposal Requirements (a proposal missing any of these components will not be evaluated):**

- The proposal is responsive to the RFP
- A representative from the lead offeror of a proposal team called into the mandatory pre-proposal conference
- All required proposal components as listed in Section 4 are submitted and complete as well as the following specific required components:
  - Application contains at least three references, including name, position, email, phone, and relationship
  - Project team organization chart
  - Project team resumes/CV and demonstrated relevant experience
  - Timeline/Gantt chart of research tasks and milestones
- Proposal contains stated agreement to adhere to National Grid's data security protocol
- A bid alternate price is included in the cost proposal
- The conflict of interest form is included in the technical proposal and indicates no conflicts of interest (the disclosed program implementation contract amount may not be greater than \$0)

Proposals meeting the minimum proposal requirements will be reviewed and scored based upon the following criteria

Scoring Criteria	Points Available
<b>Overview and Work Plan</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall quality of the proposal, including strength, responsiveness, professionalism, and clarity (up to 8 points)</li> <li>• Strength and clarity of methods, identification of possible complexities with clear descriptions of how methods address those complexities, sufficient detail is provided (up to 8 points)</li> <li>• Proposal indicates a high likelihood of success (up to 8 points)</li> <li>• Demonstrated understanding of milestones and deliverables (up to 3 points)</li> <li>• Demonstrated understanding of Rhode Island energy, policy, and regulatory landscape (up to 8 points)</li> </ul>	35
<b>Qualifications and Experience</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal demonstrates technical expertise</li> <li>• Applicant has prior experience conducting MPS in energy space</li> <li>• Project team members have the appropriate expertise for each task they are assigned to</li> </ul>	25
<b>Project Management and Organization</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timeline is practical</li> <li>• Project team and management structure for each task and the proposal as a whole is</li> </ul>	10
<b>Total Technical Points</b>	70
<b>Cost</b>	30
<b>Total Possible Evaluation Points</b>	100
<b>ISBE Bonus Points</b>	6
<b>Total Possible Points</b>	106

**3.5 Calculation of Cost Points.** The offeror with the lowest cost proposal shall receive one hundred percent (100%) of the available points for cost. All other offerors shall be awarded cost points based upon the following formula:

$$(\text{lowest cost proposal} / \text{offeror's cost proposal}) \times \text{available points}$$

For example, if Offeror A is the offeror with the lowest cost proposal of \$65,000 and Offeror B proposes a cost of \$100,000 and the total points available are 30, Offeror A would get the full 30 points and Offeror B's cost points are calculated as follows:  $\$65,000 / \$100,000 \times 30 = 19.5$  points.



**3.6 Calculation of ISBE Points.** See Sections 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7 of this RFP for more information. EERMC adheres to 150-RICR-90-10-1 entitled *Regulations Governing Participation by Small Business Enterprises in State Purchases of Goods and Services and Public Works Projects*. The offer with the highest ISBE participation rate shall receive one hundred percent (100%) of the available points for ISBE. All other offerors shall be awarded ISBE points based upon the following formula:

$$(\text{offeror's proposed ISBE participation rate} / \text{offeror with highest ISBE participation rate}) \times \text{available points}$$

For example, if Offeror A has the highest ISBE participation rate of 20% and Offeror B proposes an ISBE participation rate of 12% and the total points available are 6, Offeror A would get the full 6 points and Offeror B's cost points are calculated as follows:  $12\% / 20\% \times 6 = 3.6$  points. See Sections 3.7 and 3.8 of this RFP for information on how ISBE participation rates are calculated.

**3.7 ISBE Participation Rate if the Offeror is an ISBE.** The ISBE participation rate for an offeror who is an ISBE shall be expressed as a percentage and shall be calculated by taking the sum of the amount of the offeror's total contract price that will be subcontracted to ISBEs and the amount that will be self-performed by the offeror and dividing that number by the ISBE offeror's total contract price. For example if the offeror's total contract price is \$100,000.00 and it subcontracts a total of \$12,000.00 to ISBEs and will perform a total of \$8,000.00 of the work itself, the offeror's ISBE participation rate would  $(\$12,000 + \$8,000) / \$100,000 = 20\%$ .

**3.8 ISBE Participation Rate if the Offeror is not an ISBE.** The ISBE participation rate for an offeror who is not an ISBE shall be expressed as a percentage and shall be calculated by taking the amount of the offeror's total contract price that will be subcontracted to ISBEs and dividing that number by the ISBE offeror's total contract price. For example if the offeror's total contract price is \$100,000.00 and it subcontracts a total of \$12,000.00 to ISBEs, the offeror's ISBE participation rate would  $\$12,000 / \$100,000 = 12\%$ .

## **SECTION 4: OFFEROR'S SUBMISSIONS**

---

Each offeror must submit a proposal containing the following information. When responding to each section below, please label responses with the corresponding RFP section.

- I. Cover Sheet.** The offeror must complete, execute, and submit the RFP Cover Sheet which is attached hereto.
- II. Technical Proposal.** An offeror's technical proposal must include the following information:

- A. **Overview.** The overview should lay out the offeror's understanding of the scope of work, describe the offeror's proposed project work plan and approach, and explain how the offeror is well suited to achieve the project objectives.
- B. **Work Plan.** The offeror should describe its proposed project work plan in detail. Specifically, the offeror should ensure their work plan describes how each key deliverable and task described in the Project Description & Scope of Work section of this solicitation (Section 5) will be developed and delivered on time and within the proposed budget.
- C. **Company Profile.** Provide an overview of history, length of time in business, organizational and staff capacity, core competencies, and any other resources uniquely suited to achieving project objectives.
- D. **Relevant Experience:** Describe offeror's experience with similar projects.
- E. **Examples of Prior Work:** If possible, reference two or three examples of previous projects that best display the offeror's ability and experience with work of a similar nature. Specify the role the offeror played in each project.
- F. **Reference Information:** Provide names, email addresses, telephone numbers, and permission to contact three former or current clients for which the offeror has performed work in the last three years.
- G. **Identification of Staff and Subcontractors.** List all staff and subcontractors proposed as members of the offeror's team.
- H. **Staff Responsibilities.** Specifically describe each of staff and subcontractor duties, responsibilities, and areas of concentration for the project.
- I. **Staff Experience.** Please include resumes, curricula vitae, or statements of prior experience and qualification. An organizational chart showing roles and responsibilities on the project is desirable. The team may include subcontractors; however, the lead offeror will be solely responsible for the management and deliverables of the team.
- J. **Conflicts of Interests.** Using the Conflict of Interest form attached hereto, describe any known conflicts of interest between offeror or an affiliate of offeror and any relevant distribution company, or any affiliates of the foregoing. In addition, describe any known conflicts of interest between offeror or an affiliate of offeror and any member of the EERMC.
- K. **Litigation.** Describe any litigation, disputes, claims or complaints, or events of default or other failure to satisfy contract obligations, or failure to deliver products, involving offeror or an affiliate of offer, and relating to providing services similar to the services being solicited by the EERMC.

- L. **Investigation.** Confirm that offeror, and the directors, employees and agents of offeror and any affiliate of offeror are not currently under investigation by any governmental agency and have not in the last four years been convicted or found liable for any act prohibited by state or federal law in any jurisdiction involving conspiracy, collusion or other impropriety with respect to bidding on any contract.
- III. **Cost Proposal.** Offerors must separate their cost proposals from their technical proposals and place cost proposals in a sealed envelope. Please complete, execute, and submit a cost proposal using the cost proposal form template attached hereto. Offerors must complete both Task Sheets Page(s) and the All-Inclusive Price Page.
- IV. **ISBE Proposal.** Offerors must separate their ISBE proposals from their technical proposals and place ISBE proposals in a sealed envelope. To be eligible for ISBE points, an offeror must complete, execute, and submit the ISBE form template attached hereto. Offerors must complete both the List of ISBE Page and the ISBE Participation Rate Page. Failure to submit an ISBE proposal will result in the offeror receiving 0 points in the ISBE scoring category. See RFP Sections 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8 for additional information.

## **SECTION 5: PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND SCOPE OF WORK**

---

### **5.1 Summary**

This RFP has been developed to solicit a services from a company (referred to throughout as “Evaluator”) to perform a Market Potential Study (MPS) for the State of Rhode Island covering energy efficiency, demand response, heating electrification, and combined heat and power, with the option, at the discretion of the State, to extend the study to include behind-the-meter distributed generation and renewable energy. The MPS will cover calendar years 2021-2026, and will be used as a key input in the process of setting performance targets for energy efficiency programs overseen by the Rhode Island Energy Efficiency and Resource Management Council (EERMC)<sup>1</sup>.

### **5.2 Background and Motivation**

The study’s core analysis is expected to be conducted between July and December of 2019, with revisions and reporting handled in the first quarter of 2020 (Section 5.4 contains a detailed timeline and list of deliverables). The MPS is expected to analyze a comprehensive list of existing and emerging technologies within each of the aforementioned areas, and to analyze these technologies using data from Rhode Island utilities, where that is unavailable using other Rhode Island-specific data sources, where that is unavailable using data from nearby states, and only where all of these are unavailable referring to regionally aggregated or geographically distant figures. In all cases, the most recent, high-quality, and comprehensive data sources are expected to be prioritized.

---

<sup>1</sup> See the EERMC website for more information about the Council: <https://rieermc.ri.gov/>

In addition to handling energy efficiency, demand response, heating electrification, and combined heat and power individually, the MPS’ input data and output data will be captured at a level of granularity which permits analysis and reporting across the different values of the variables in Table 1, below.

For this MPS, there is one additional axis of reporting that warrants specific discussion – utility territory. Rhode Island’s population and geography are overwhelmingly served by National Grid Rhode Island. However, there are two other small utilities, Pascoag Utility District and Block Island Power. Except where the latter two are specifically discussed, this scope of work should be construed as applying solely to National Grid’s territory, customers, and data.

This study is expected to follow industry best practices for energy efficiency market potential studies. This includes utilizing standard scenario definitions and quantification methods for estimating technical, economic, maximum achievable, and program achievable potential; relying on Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission Docket findings to guide cost-effectiveness screening and the calculation of benefit-cost ratios<sup>2</sup>; providing results separately for each Rhode Island Utility<sup>3</sup>; providing results in appropriate physical and dollar units across all study years; and other best practices as directed by the State of Rhode Island’s MPS Management Team.

The remaining three sections of the RFP provide more detail regarding the analytical, project management, and reporting expectations of the Evaluator, respectively.

**Table 1. Key Data Fields**

<b>Field</b>	<b>Description</b>
Sector	Residential, low-income residential <sup>4</sup> , commercial, industrial
Segment	New construction, renovation, retrofit/early replacement, market driven
Program Type	Upstream, midstream, others as needed
Primary Fuel	Electricity, natural gas, delivered fuels (measure-level value)
Primary Heating Fuel	Electricity, natural gas, delivered fuels (building-level value)
Building Type <sup>5</sup>	Specific list to be finalized after Evaluator selection
End Use	Specific list to be finalized after Evaluator selection
Measure	Specific list to be finalized after Evaluator selection

<sup>2</sup> Cost-effectiveness and benefit-cost calculations must comply with the Rhode Island Cost Test, as captured in the Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission Docket 4600: <http://www.ripuc.org/eventsactions/docket/4600page.html>

<sup>3</sup> In addition to National Grid, there are two small utilities serving the state. National Grid covers 99% of the electric customers and 100% of gas customers.

<sup>4</sup> 60% and below Rhode Island area median income

<sup>5</sup> Likely SF, MF for residential and for commercial: Colleges & Universities, Education, Food Sales, Food Service, Health, Hospital, Lodging, Office, Com – Other, Public Assembly, Retail, Warehouse, Other and industrial to be determined.

Year	The study period is 2021-2026. Inputs should have annual granularity where possible, and outputs must all be reported at annual granularity. It is important to note that modeling must extend through approximately 2050 to account for long-lived measures, though the MPS will not consider <i>program</i> years past 2026
Key Impact Metrics	Including but not limited to: generation capacity (summer peak), transmission and distribution capacity, energy savings, and all other impact streams reported separately, both in physical and dollar units

**5.3 Scope of Work**

Section 5.3 provides a detailed description of the tasks and deliverables expected to be completed in the course of the Rhode Island Energy Efficiency Market Potential Study.

**5.3.1 Analysis**

This section of the Rhode Island MPS scope of work covers the central analytical tasks required of the selected Evaluator.

**5.3.1.1 Analysis Task 1: Identify Data Sources and Collect Input Data**

*Objective:* Determine and gather all needed data sources to estimate electric, natural gas, and delivered fuel efficiency market potential in Rhode Island.

The selected Evaluator should undertake this task with a clear understanding of all remaining analytical tasks for the MPS, as well as a clear understanding of key data sets that are expected to be utilized during the study. This understanding will be demonstrated within the Work Plan, which is a formal deliverable early in the study implementation, as reflected in Section 5.4. In particular, the Evaluator will be expected to familiarize themselves with, and utilize as appropriate, at least the following data sources<sup>6</sup>, assuming that all are made available to the Evaluator in a timely manner:

- The Rhode Island Technical Reference Manual (TRM)
- National Grid’s Benefit-Cost model
- National Grid’s heat pump water heater heating electrification study
- The Rhode Island Office of Energy Resources (OER) jobs study
- National Grid’s C&I & residential baseline studies
- Data from past evaluation, measurement and verification (EM&V) studies in Rhode Island
- Data from recent studies on these and other relevant topics (e.g. LED lighting) conducted in the region, including up-to-date avoided energy supply

---

<sup>6</sup> Information about many of these studies is available at: <https://rieermc.ri.gov/plans-reports/evaluation-studies/>. Others will be provided and discussed as needed after an Evaluator has been selected.

costs (AESC study) and data from Massachusetts, where National Grid and the MPS Management Team have extensive energy efficiency and policy experience

It is important to recognize that the Evaluator will be expected to undergo, and successfully pass, National Grid's data security process (see Section 5.5 for a brief summary). However, to the extent possible data will be made available in an aggregated form and without personally identifying information to reduce the burden of this requirement. In addition, as a number of the listed data sources are studies which are currently underway, the Evaluator is expected to research and identify data input needs of the MPS which are not adequately met by these studies, and may need to provide alternative sources of data if any of the ongoing studies do not conclude within a timeframe that permits their data to be utilized during the MPS. As part of this task, in addition to the specifically listed data sources, the Evaluator will review previous potential studies and data collection activities in Rhode Island and other nearby states.

The Evaluator will, upon completion of a thorough search for needed inputs, provide an updated Work Plan to the MPS Management Team which identifies any gaps in input data, describes reasonable approaches to filling these gaps, and recommends a specific approach. The updated Work Plan will be discussed with the MPS Management team, who will then make a decision regarding the appropriate path forward. In addition, the Evaluator will be expected to keep clear, comprehensive records of which data sources are used, and where and how they are used, throughout the entire process of analysis and reporting. The scope of this study does not allow for additional primary data collection.

Respondents should include a description of the data sources that they expect to utilize, and how they expect to do so, in their response. In particular, clear descriptions of the data sources, methodologies, and anticipated structure of measure adoption projections during the study period should be included.

**5.3.1.2 Analysis Task 2: Estimate the net effect of exogenous factors affecting program and measure baselines over the course of the MPS study period, 2021-2026.**

*Objective:* Estimate the effects on program and measure baselines of, at minimum, building energy codes and appliance and equipment standards; planned enabling energy infrastructure investments by the State of Rhode Island such as advanced metering infrastructure and the potential for time-varying rates; and other state programs that impact energy efficiency and demand response potential such as weatherization assistance and low-income housing programs.

The selected Evaluator is expected to thoroughly research and understand both state and federal codes and standards, as these legal instruments represent baseline technology assumptions in potential studies (well-justified exceptions based on market conditions may be acceptable, such as Direct Install programs which specifically document the technology that is replaced). For markets which are

expected to undergo substantial change during the period of the MPS analysis, such as lighting, it is important to document and clearly articulate the reasoning behind penetration and related forecasts, including but not limited to assessments regarding changes in costs of efficient and baseline technologies. Though these data are necessarily a component of measure characterization, rapidly changing markets are highlighted in this section because they blur the line between measure data and baseline market assumptions.

In addition to codes and standards, the Evaluator is expected to research, understand, and propose baseline adjustments as appropriate for known forthcoming investments in enabling energy infrastructure in Rhode Island<sup>7</sup>. Though other enabling infrastructures may be included, this task will, at a minimum, explicitly account for the possible impact of advance metering functionality (AMF) and potential time-varying rates, and provide a clear explanation of what baseline adjustments were made, and why, or why none were made. A similar treatment of other state programs, such as WAP and LIHEAP, is also expected.

Respondents should address how these topics might be approached, including any challenges foreseen in the effort to create a baseline which accounts for codes, standards, enabling energy infrastructure and other state programs through the full time horizon of the study, and approaches to overcome or account for these limitations. Respondents should also note that the list of factors to consider in developing an accurate baseline forecast discussed in this section is illustrative, and may include further factors or, at the discretion of the MPS Management Team, the removal of some factors discussed in this section.

### **5.3.1.3 Analytical Task 3: Build measure list and gather all data needed to estimate potential**

*Objective:* Create a comprehensive list of technologies that will be included in the MPS, including existing and emerging efficiency technologies across electricity, natural gas, and delivered fuels, as well as technologies specific to energy efficiency, demand response, and heating electrification.

The selected Evaluator will be required to, informed by insights accumulated during Analytical Tasks 1 & 2, develop a comprehensive list of technologies to be included in the study, and provide this list for review, comment and approval by the MPS Management Team.

The final outcome of Analytical Task 3, composed of the outcomes from Analytical Tasks 3a-c, will be a list of technologies to characterize and incorporate in the MPS, as well as the data and methods needed to effectively and accurately characterize these technologies through cost-effectiveness screening and estimates of potential. Calculating cost-effectiveness and estimating potential are requirements under Analytical Task 4. This research, as well as the justifications and conclusions for

---

<sup>7</sup> One key source of this information will be the Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission Power Sector Transformation Docket: [http://www.ripuc.org/utilityinfo/electric/PST\\_home.html](http://www.ripuc.org/utilityinfo/electric/PST_home.html)

inclusion/exclusion in the list of technologies to characterize, must be documented clearly and included as an appendix in the final report.

At a minimum, the data associated with each measure, and each baseline technology where appropriate, should include (with relevant sources):

- **Costs** (e.g. \$/kWh or \$/MMBtu)
- **Savings** (e.g. % of applicable end use energy)
- **System impacts** (e.g. generation, transmission, and distribution savings)
- **Non-energy impacts**<sup>8</sup>
- **Penetration**
- **Saturation/applicability**
- **Total applicable end-use energy**
- **Effective useful life** (EUL)
- **All other fields** utilized or calculated in the analysis

Of note, in the context of the data fields above, measures almost certainly need to be broken out across at least the data fields described in Table 1 in the Introduction.

While the MPS Management Team is not specifying any single technology that must be covered (beyond LED lighting), the Evaluator is expected to systematically review utility program data, research efforts, pilot programs, potential studies, and other sources from Rhode Island, regionally and nationally, in that order of preference. Specific effort is expected to understand both established and emerging technologies and opportunities within energy efficiency, demand response and heating electrification, including a clear indication in all reporting of which measures are considered ‘emerging’, and to understand technologies’ suitability for Rhode Island. The latter should include consideration of the mix of buildings and industries, the current state and distribution of baseline and efficient technologies, and Rhode Island’s climate, among other factors.

#### **5.3.1.4 Analytical Task 3a: Build measure list and gather data for energy efficiency technologies**

*Objective:* Characterize the potential of energy efficiency technologies in Rhode Island.

The selected Evaluator is expected to thoroughly research a range of energy efficiency technologies, as well as to systematically review utility program data, research efforts, pilot programs, potential studies, and other sources from Rhode Island, from nearby states, and where appropriate, especially for emerging trends in the energy industry, from the rest of the country. The Evaluator is expected to assess each technology’s suitability as an energy efficiency resource within Rhode Island’s geography, economy, building stock, and regulatory environment. The

---

<sup>8</sup> Non-energy impacts must be compliant with the Rhode Island Cost Test, as captured in the Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission Docket 4600: <http://www.ripuc.org/eventsactions/docket/4600page.html>



outcome of this research step will be a list of efficiency technologies to characterize and incorporate in the MPS, as well as the data and methods needed to effectively and accurately characterize these technologies. This research, as well as the justifications and conclusions for inclusion/exclusion in the final list of efficiency technologies to characterize, should be documented clearly and included as an appendix in the final report.

Respondents are encouraged to include a list of technologies that they would explore, and if possible provisional opinions on their fit within the Rhode Island context.

#### **5.3.1.5 Analytical Task 3b: Build measure list and gather data for demand response, covering a range of technologies including energy storage**

*Objective:* Characterize the potential of demand response covering a range of technologies including energy storage, in Rhode Island.

The selected Evaluator is expected to thoroughly research a range of energy storage technologies, as well as to systematically review utility program data, research efforts, pilot programs, potential studies, and other sources from Rhode Island, from nearby states, and where appropriate, especially for emerging trends in the energy industry, from the rest of the country. The Evaluator is expected to assess each technology's suitability as a demand response resource within Rhode Island's geography, economy, building stock, and regulatory environment. The outcome of this research step will be a list of storage technologies to characterize and incorporate in the MPS, as well as the data and methods needed to effectively and accurately characterize these technologies. This research, as well as the justifications and conclusions for inclusion/exclusion in the final list of storage technologies to characterize, should be documented clearly and included as an appendix in the final report.

Of note, this task should not be limited to battery storage technologies. Additionally, if regulatory considerations are seen as barring significant demand response potential in Rhode Island, these limitations should be noted, but should not be construed as limiting the scope of assessing demand response potential (specifically, it is appropriate to ignore regulatory limits to potential in, at least, Technical, Economic, and Maximum Achievable potential scenarios, which are discussed further in Analytical Task 4). Lastly, it is critical for the Evaluator to accurately characterize and value technologies which provide both efficiency and demand response potential.

Respondents are encouraged to include a list of technologies that they would explore, and if possible provisional opinions on their fit within the Rhode Island context.

#### **5.3.1.6 Analytical Task 3c: Build measure list and gather data for heating electrification technologies**

*Objective:* Characterize the potential of heating electrification in Rhode Island. Note that this task does not cover CHP, which is discussed elsewhere.

The selected Evaluator is expected to thoroughly research a range of heating electrification technologies, as well as to systematically review utility program data, research efforts, pilot programs, potential studies, and other sources from Rhode Island, from nearby states, and where appropriate, especially for emerging trends in the energy industry, from the rest of the country. The Evaluator is expected to assess each technology's suitability as a heating electrification resource within Rhode Island's geography, economy, building stock, and regulatory environment. The outcome of this research step will be a list of heating electrification technologies to characterize and incorporate in the MPS, as well as the data and methods needed to effectively and accurately characterize these technologies. This research, as well as the justifications and conclusions for inclusion/exclusion in the final list of heating electrification technologies to characterize, should be documented clearly and included as an appendix in the final report. For the purpose of this study, Heating Electrification is considered to include both space and water heating, and apply to all residential, commercial, and industrial buildings.

In addition, the selected Evaluator is expected to research current best practices for valuing all applicable value streams<sup>9</sup> associated with technologies that result in a change in heating fuel source from natural gas or delivered fuels to electricity (in general, this analysis will assume that existing fuel infrastructure is permitted to remain in place). This should include, but is not limited to, clear analysis of technological lock-in, impacts of possible future de-carbonization of prior fuel delivery systems as compared to electricity, and appropriate management and valuation of different energy unit denominations to ensure clear and comparable data are utilized. Of note, the Evaluator will be asked to review, and incorporate as appropriate, data and information from National Grid's electric heat pump fuel switching market assessment as part of this task, as long as the National Grid study is completed in time for this to be feasible.

Respondents should clearly discuss the strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of the methodology they would utilize for valuing heating electrification if selected, including a clear articulation of how to handle any limitations. Though not a comprehensive list of these challenges, examples include how to handle system load impacts from heating electrification, and ensuring that environmental impacts are handled correctly and account for non-electric heating technologies' market shares in Rhode Island. In addition, respondents are encouraged to include a list of technologies that they would explore, and if possible provisional opinions on their fit within the Rhode Island context.

#### **5.3.1.7 Analytical Task 4: Estimate technical, economic, maximum achievable, and program achievable energy efficiency savings in Rhode Island**

---

<sup>9</sup> See Attachment 4 of PUC Docket 4888: [http://www.ripuc.org/eventsactions/docket/4888-NGrid-EEPP2019\(10-15-18\).pdf](http://www.ripuc.org/eventsactions/docket/4888-NGrid-EEPP2019(10-15-18).pdf)

*Objective:* Estimate electric, natural gas, and delivered fuel efficiency energy savings potential for the State of Rhode Island for each year from 2021 through 2026, and deliver associated data inputs and results, which will be used to inform energy efficiency savings targets and program design.

The selected Evaluator is expected to estimate technical, economic, maximum achievable, and program achievable energy efficiency savings potential in Rhode Island. These terms are briefly defined below. Of note, the Evaluator will only be expected to formally write up economic, maximum achievable, and program achievable potential, though data deliverables and appendices should include technical potential at the discretion of the MPS Management Team.

- **Technical Potential** – Captures all technologically feasible energy efficiency savings. Only limitations are based on engineering and design constraints, as well as mutual exclusivity among technologies (the highest-saving technology is always modeled in these cases). Technical potential specifically does not account for cost-effectiveness, realistic deployment timelines<sup>10</sup>, willingness-to-pay, or other financial, social, or psychological constraints to adoption. In addition, technical potential assumes that all equipment is replaced immediately, disregarding natural replacement cycles. Consequently, technical potential is a fairly abstracted theoretical concept, and just the starting point of estimated savings potential.
- **Economic Potential** – Starts with technical potential, and applies a cost-effectiveness<sup>11</sup> screening process to estimate the total energy savings that are available from technologies whose net present value benefits exceed their net present value costs, i.e. with a benefit-cost ratio greater than 0.8<sup>12</sup>. The measure-level benefit-cost screening results from the respondent’s model must be shown to provide results to within +/- 5% of the BCR ratios for a sample of measures provided by the MPS Management Team. The benefits of each technology are inclusive of avoided costs from traditional supply-side resources, such that they are cost-efficient relative to these resources. Economic potential is also a theoretical result, as it continues to disregard practical constraints such as program delivery, program budgets, policy constraints, and consumer demand<sup>13</sup>.

---

<sup>10</sup> Note that Technical, Economic, Maximum Achievable, and Program Achievable potential all account for the gradual deployment of technologies in the Market Driven segment. However, other deployment constraints, such as workforce deployment and ratepayer willingness to participate, do not affect Technical Potential.

<sup>11</sup> Cost-effectiveness tests, as well as benefit-cost ratios, must be compliant with the Rhode Island Cost Test, as captured in the Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission Docket 4600:

<http://www.ripuc.org/eventsactions/docket/4600page.html>

<sup>12</sup> Note that, though measures do not need to reach the standard 1.0 BCR, all modeled programs should do so, and the portfolio as a whole is required by law to do so. This primary goal of this threshold is to permit programs which bundle less cost-effective, more comprehensive measures with highly-cost effective measures.

<sup>13</sup> Note that economic potential does capture ‘demand’ insofar as early replacement of various measures should be modeled separately, and needs to be cost-effective to contribute to economic potential.

- **Maximum Achievable Potential** – Starts from economic potential, and applies more realistic assumptions regarding what is achievable under the most aggressive (and well-funded) program possible. Generally, this ‘aggressive program’ includes an assumption that all incremental costs of measures are covered by incentives, so consumers do not face out-of-pocket expenses, thus continuing to avoid restricting potential savings based on consumers’ willingness-to-pay. In contrast, maximum achievable potential includes realistic assumptions regarding the pace of technology deployment over time<sup>14</sup>, workforce capacity, marketing needs, consumer attitudes and willingness to adopt new technologies, and possible resource constraints in deploying required evaluation, monitoring, and verification activities.
  
- **Program Achievable Potential** – Adds further realistic assumptions to maximum achievable potential modeling approach. Specifically, program achievable accounts for program funding levels and specific design choices, as well as consumer willingness-to-pay. Essentially, program achievable considers a specific set of program choices and practical constraints such as workforce development and/or budget limitations. However, especially when MPS results will inform program design and targets (rather than vice versa), the program achievable potential scenario should reflect the potential available to a well-designed and efficiently administered portfolio of programs, accounting for realistic constraints related to workforce capacity, program implementation, and, where appropriate, budget. Of note, the specific program design and constraints that will be modeled for the MPS program achievable scenario are a required deliverable for review by the MPS Management Team, as reflected in Section 5.4.

Within each scenario, all impact streams should be reported separately in both native units and dollars, as well as aggregated into total dollar impacts. Examples of important impact streams include:

- Energy savings (e.g. kWh & \$)
- Generation capacity savings (e.g. KW & \$)
- Transmission and distribution capacity savings (e.g. KW & \$)
- Avoided greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. tCO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent & \$)
- Other energy and non-energy impacts that were quantified during the study
- Directional impacts for energy and non-energy impacts that were assessed qualitatively

These results should also be broken out across at least the data fields listed in Table 1 in the Introduction.

In addition to the above reporting requirements, while the Evaluator may use proprietary tools as part of the MPS, the Evaluator will be expected to openly and

---

<sup>14</sup> As noted, Technical, Economic, Maximum Achievable, and Program Achievable potential should all account for the gradual deployment of technologies in the Market Driven segment. Maximum Achievable is the stage where further constraints to deployment of technologies should begin to bind.

clearly discuss the methodology of any such tools, including answering any methodological questions from the MPS Management Team in writing. Further, it is expected that the Evaluator work with the MPS Management Team to identify a range of scenarios for which results will be calculated within the Maximum Achievable and Program Achievable scenarios. These may include sensitivity analyses covering a range of values for global inputs such as the discount rate, or a group of program design and budget scenarios intended to explore a few different reasonable sets of assumptions regarding the future of Rhode Island’s energy sector. These scenarios will be listed in the Work Plan deliverable, though the mix of scenarios may still be adjusted at the discretion of the MPS Management Team.

Respondents should identify and discuss their relevant experience conducting potential studies, as well as tools and methods they expect to utilize if selected. Please include a clear description of the modeling tools that would be used, including specifying whether the modeling will be entirely within excel, and if not which part(s) will be conducted in other tools and what those tools are (e.g. programming languages, software tools, etc.). In addition, specific attention should be paid to Rhode Island’s context, and any tradeoffs associated with the scope, timeline, budget, and proposed methods for the MPS.

#### **5.3.1.8 Analytical Task 4a: Estimate Potential by Utility Territory**

*Objective:* Ensure that all Rhode Island utility territories are adequately represented in the MPS.<sup>15</sup>

The selected Evaluator will be required to report on energy savings potential in each of Rhode Island’s three utility territories. However, due to the disproportionate footprint of National Grid within Rhode Island, it is expected that the study may need to model the state as a whole using National Grid data and program information, and scale results according to relative customer count. ***Results for the Pascoag Utility District and Block Island Power Company must be reported using this scaling approach.***

If timeline and budget permit, the Evaluator may be asked, with the approval of the MPS Management Team, to execute additional methods for calculating potential for Pascoag Utility District and Block Island Power Company, and to compare and contrast these methodologies and associated results in the final report.

Respondents should briefly discuss the methods that they would consider for this task, *including the method they would use if asked to conduct this analysis with a different method than simply scaling by customer count, and compare that method to the customer count scaling approach.*

#### **5.3.1.9 Analytical Task 5: Estimate Combined Heat and Power (CHP) Potential**

---

<sup>15</sup> In addition to National Grid, two small utility companies also provide electric energy to customers: Pascoag Utility District and Block Island Power Company.

*Objective:* Perform secondary research to inform Rhode Island’s combined heat and power net energy savings potential.

The selected Evaluator will need to conduct an assessment of CHP potential energy savings. Due to the custom nature of combined heat and power installations and the relatively small number of potential installations compared to energy efficiency, demand response, and heating electrification, the methods for estimating savings available from CHP are less well-established. Consequently, a thorough review comparing and contrasting existing approaches will be expected as a key output alongside quantitative estimates of CHP savings potential. In addition, the custom nature of these installations is also the key driving factor behind breaking CHP out into its own separate analytical task – it is expected that CHP potential will be researched, modeled, and reported separately (though concurrently) with tasks 3 and 4. It is also expected that CHP modeling and reporting are structured in the same way as other topics, up to and including the granularity of reporting and approaching the modeling through the same energy efficiency MPS best practices described in detail in Analytical Task 4.

For CHP, as for energy efficiency, demand response, and heating electrification, this scope of work does not include primary data collection. However, it is expected that CHP will be modeled according to the following general approach – identify a range or representative CHP installation generation capacities sizes, and treat each of these sizes as a separate measure for cost-effectiveness screening using Rhode Island data. Upon identifying those installation size ranges that are cost-effective in Rhode Island, estimate the potential for only these systems. The intention of this structure is to reduce market research efforts which identify opportunities for installations that are not cost-effective.

Respondents should discuss their opinion on the best available methods to estimate CHP potential, which methods are most applicable to Rhode Island, and any data sources they are aware of that could help inform CHP potential.

#### **5.3.1.10 Analytical Task 6 (Bid-Alternate Task): Estimate Potential for Behind-the-Meter Renewable Energy & Distributed Generation technologies**

*Objective:* Model total energy generation potential associated with existing and emerging renewable energy and distributed generation technologies.

The selected Evaluator may be asked, if budgets and timelines permit, to conduct a separate modeling exercise to estimate the potential energy generation, and avoided energy, capacity and transmission and distribution costs, associated with behind-the-meter renewable energy and other distributed generation in Rhode Island. This task will likely rely on additional data sets beyond those needed for the previously discussed analytical tasks, and include new analysis of inputs such as customer adoption forecasting, feeder-level system constraints on potential, and linkages with residential battery storage that provides demand response services as well as synergy with renewables deployment. This task will also include familiarization with Rhode Island’s System Reliability Procurement (SRP), including understanding how

non-wires alternatives, of which renewables and distributed generation are a subset, are valued as a system reliability resource.

Respondents should discuss in their proposal any methods and data sources they would utilize to estimate this potential, including reference to other studies that have implemented those methods well and to their prior experience with this type of analysis. Specific attention should be paid to Rhode Island's context. Of note, this additional task should not be construed as beholden to the same budget and timeline within which all other components of this study must be completed. In addition, the EERMC retains the right, at their discretion, to not execute this additional task, and also to separately solicit a renewable energy and distributed generation study through an unrelated and independently issued RFP.

### **5.3.2 Project Management**

This section of the MPS scope of work covers project management responsibilities required of the selected Evaluator.

#### **5.3.2.1 Project Management Task 1: Kick-off meeting with MPS Management Team**

Objective: Meet in person with the MPS Management Team to go over plan for MPS implementation, including but not limited to timeline, questions, concerns, and data needs and responsibilities.

The selected Evaluator will be required to travel to Providence, RI for a kick-off meeting with the MPS Management Team. The meeting will allow all members of both teams to meet one another, as well as cover any and all topics, questions, concerns, and plans either team feels warrant attention for the MPS to get off to a successful start. The Evaluator is expected to provide a comprehensive list of topics for discussion during the kick-off meeting, which will then be updated by the Evaluator to reflect their understanding of plans and timelines based on the Kick-off meeting discussions. This updated document will be distributed to the MPS Management Team for comment and response, to ensure that all members of both teams are satisfied that a mutually understood plan for implementation has been agreed upon.

The meeting is anticipated to take at least half a day, with possibility to extend to a full day if the anticipated list of topics for the meeting warrants this expansion, at the discretion of the MPS Management Team. Consequently, the Evaluator's travel plan should allow for a full day of meetings.

Respondents are encouraged to provide initial thoughts on key topics that might warrant discussion during the kick-off meeting, as well as comments on the project timeline and, if any concerns have already been identified, suggested solutions or paths forward.

#### **5.3.2.2 Project Management Task 2: Check-in meetings with MPS Management Team twice per month**

*Objective:* Meet remotely twice per month for approximately 30-60 minutes to discuss progress, challenges, and suggested solutions that come up during the MPS analysis and implementation.

The selected Evaluator will designate 1-2 staff, with others permitted to attend as needed based on topics to be discussed, for a phone-based update with the MPS Management Team twice per month. The Evaluator is expected to provide an agenda in advance, as well as to share meeting notes with the MPS Management Team after each meeting.

**5.3.2.3 Project Management Task 3: Independently manage correspondence with National Grid, their Consultants, and other data providers in order to fully understand the meaning, contents, and limitations of their data**

*Objective:* Ensure all data in the MPS is well-documented, well-understood, and used appropriately.

The selected Evaluator is expected to spend the necessary time to gain access to and understanding of data provided to them by National Grid and others. These data should be clearly documented, including all information necessary to fully explain the data's sources and limitations.

**5.3.3 Reporting**

This section of the scope of work covers key reporting requirements for the selected Evaluator. A full list of deliverables, and the timing of their expected delivery to the MPS Management Team, is covered in Section 5.4.

**5.3.3.1 Reporting Task 1: Clearly summarize all data, analysis, and results**

*Objective:* Establish an analytical process, including data sources used, data cleaning and aggregations, methodologies for analysis, overall results, and results at all requested levels of granularity.

This task's key deliverables will be components of the final MPS report. This includes clear, detailed methodological descriptions, a wide range of tables and images summarizing all different aspects of the MPS results, documentation of all data sources used including how and where they were used in the MPS, and a full data set including all inputs and outputs for the MPS. Of note, while methods and results must be discussed in the body of the report, full, detailed treatments of the methods, certain cuts of the results dataset, and the full input dataset may be structured as part of the appendices for the report. Lastly, the full input dataset includes both raw data sources which were subsequently cleaned and manipulated, as well as the final cleaned data which was a direct input into quantitative modeling tools.

**5.3.3.2 Reporting Task 2: Specify program, portfolio, and policy recommendations**



*Objective:* Show, through clear and concrete recommendations, that the MPS results are useful for program and portfolio planning, and for considering updates, additions, or other changes to policy.

The selected Evaluator is expected to describe clear recommended actions at the program and portfolio<sup>16</sup> level that are driven by the results of the MPS. For example, an individual utility energy efficiency program may benefit from emphasizing a particular technology due to its high benefit-cost ratio, or because it has a rapid payback from the consumer's perspective. Alternatively, the energy efficiency portfolio as a whole may need to shift and adapt to, for example, evolving market conditions, changes in federal or state product standards, or as a result of anticipated shifts in enabling infrastructure that will affect the cost-effectiveness or depth of savings available from a subset of evaluated measures. Finally, it may be that certain demand response technologies, for example, are only cost-effective under rate structures that are not currently available in Rhode Island. Such a finding might warrant a policy suggestion to explore alternative rate structures if demand response is a priority policy area.

The MPS will be referenced to inform three-year targets (2021 – 2023 and 2024 – 2026) for National Grid's Rhode Island energy efficiency savings goals, as well as specific suggestions in particular program areas such as energy efficiency, demand response, heating electrification, and others. Targets for these three-year periods are developed by the EERMC and submitted to the Rhode Island Public Utilities Commission for review and approval. In order to demonstrate the value of the MPS's results, the Evaluator is expected to draw concrete conclusions from their analysis in the context of Rhode Island's geography, economy, and existing utility programs for these periods.

The selected Evaluator is expected to interpret and apply the MPS results in the context of existing Rhode Island energy policy, and identify specific policy areas that might warrant further examination in light of specific elements of the MPS results. During this process, the Evaluator is expected to pay close attention to the limitations of the MPS, and to characterize their level of certainty in clear and consistent terms. In addition, the Evaluator should indicate when, and to the degree possible what, additional data would be useful or needed to corroborate MPS results before reaching a level of confidence that warrants spending resources re-examining particular areas of energy policy.

Respondents are encouraged to discuss how they see specific analytical tasks adding value to particular program areas, or to the overall portfolio, in Rhode Island. Respondents should detail their current working knowledge of Rhode Island energy policy, their understanding of the most appropriate application of MPS results, and the connection between the two in their response.

---

<sup>16</sup> Program refers to a specific, targeted effort to increase adoption of a certain group of efficiency, demand response, or heating electrification technologies, typically tracked separately from other efforts by a utility. Portfolio refers to the full set of, e.g. efficiency, programs run by a particular utility.

### **5.3.3.3 Reporting Task 3: Provide all required deliverables in a format acceptable to the MPS Management Team.**

*Objective:* Provide timely and complete deliverables throughout the process of implementing the MPS, and provide timely support and clarifications as needed for a period of 6 months after final deliverable.

The selected Evaluator is expected to provide the reporting deliverables below to the MPS Management Team. The full list of deliverables, and the timeline of their required delivery, is contained in Section 5.4.

#### *1. Write and deliver a draft and a final report to the MPS Management Team*

Draft and final versions of the report will be prepared and delivered during the course of the MPS. The draft report, to be delivered by Dec. 20<sup>th</sup>, 2019, will detail draft results for all analytical tasks, including discussions of limitations, interpretation, and directly addressing Reporting Tasks 1 and 2. The final report is expected to incorporate feedback from the MPS Management Team and other stakeholders provided in response to the draft report. The final report is expected to provide full, clear, and comprehensive summaries of data, methodology, results, limitations, and recommendations.

#### *2. Provide all data used in the MPS*

It is also expected that all data inputs used in the study, including measure-level costs, savings, and cost-effectiveness, penetrations, applicability factors, and other data related to specific measures or any other areas of the MPS, will be provided to the MPS Management Team in full in appendices to the final report as well as separately in excel documents to be delivered at the same time as the final report. As noted above, this includes raw data as well as cleaned and manipulated data used as modeling inputs.

#### *3. Prepare and Deliver Two Presentations*

At least two presentations will be prepared, presented in-person, and delivered electronically. Though the exact timing, number, and content of these presentations are at the discretion of the MPS Management Team, both planned in-person presentations will cover the final results of the MPS. One presentation thoroughly covers the results of the study, as well as the Evaluator's interpretation thereof and associated recommendations. The second presentation, while also covering the results, will focus on the technical details of the study, including data collection and management, with particular attention on methodological and analytical approach in all modeling.

#### *4. Prepare and deliver a graphical executive summary for public audience*

This deliverable should be aimed at a non-technical, public audience without a great deal of prior knowledge regarding energy efficiency and other covered technologies. Content should emphasize clear visual displays of key results and simple supporting text.

#### **5.3.3.4 Reporting Task 4: Hours and invoicing**

*Objective:* Maintain a clear and up-to-date log of all hours worked, and how those hours were spent broken down by task, throughout the process of conducting the MPS.

The selected Evaluator will be expected to provide monthly invoices detailing all hours worked by each staff member who has contributed to the MPS, how those hours were spent broken down by task, what the hourly billing rate is for that employee and that work area, and the total monetary cost associated with each employee's billable time and overall. Specifically, these invoices will be delivered to the Rhode Island Office of Energy Resources no later than the 5<sup>th</sup> business day of the month following the month for which work is being reported and billed. Invoices will be broken down by task, including a description of all work completed for each employee's hours during each day in which they performed any work for the MPS.

#### **5.4 Required Deliverables, Tasks and Timeline**



Event	Deliverable?	2019							2020			
		July	August	September	October	November	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar		
Contract Signed	Y	1st										
Kick-off Meeting with WG, Work Plan Delivered	Y	8-12th										
Bi-Weekly Check in Meetings	N		~1st & 15th	~1st & 15th	~1st & 15th	~1st & 15th	~1st & 15th	~1st & 15th	~1st & 15th	~1st & 15th	1st	
Measure List Delivered for Review	Y		1st									
Work Plan Updated for Review	Y		15th									
Measure Characterizations Completed	N			1st								
Program Potential Scenarios Proposed	Y			15th								
Technical & Economic Potential Calculated	N				1st							
Program Potential Scenarios Finalized	Y				15th							
Max & Program Achievable Potential Calculated	N					15th						
Interim Results Provided for Review	Y							20th				
Final Results Presentations Delivered	Y										TBD	
Final Report Submitted	Y											Mar 13th
All Data Inputs and Outputs from Study Delivered	Y											TBD
Graphical Executive Summary Delivered	Y											TBD

## **5.5 Data Security Protocols**

Data and reports from National Grid are required to complete the requirements of this study. Bidders should complete National Grid Digital Risk and Security Questionnaire and provide supporting documentation as needed. The selected vendor must comply with National Grid information security requirements and maintain appropriate measures for the protection of personal information.

National Grid is committed to responding to all relevant data requests within 3 weeks of the written request. A formal process for information sharing will be included in the contract for the selected evaluator.

# RFP Cover Sheet

<b>Offeror's Name:</b>	
------------------------	--

<b>RFP Information</b>	
Title of RFP:	
RFP Number:	

<b>Offeror Information</b>	
Legal Name of Offeror:	
Type of Entity (i.e. corporation, partnership, sole proprietorship):	
Mailing Address of Primary Place of Business:	
Phone Number:	
Website:	

<b>Contact Person for the Offeror</b>	
Name:	
Title:	
Mailing Address:	
Phone Number:	
Email Address:	

-----  
Signature of Authorized Person

-----  
Date

-----  
Printed Name, Title

## Cost Proposal - Task Sheets

<b>Offeror's Name:</b>	
------------------------	--

**Task Sheets.** Please add or delete rows for team members and add or delete task tables as needed. All Tasks as described in the Scope of Work should have a corresponding Task Sheet.

<b>Task 1:</b>			
<b>Labor Costs</b>			
Subcontractor or Team Member Name and/or Job Title	Hourly Rate	Estimated Hours	Evaluated Price (Hourly Rate * Estimated Hours)
<b>Additional expenses that are not included in hourly rate</b>			
Description of Expense		Price	
<b>Total Task Price:</b>		\$ _____	

## Cost Proposal - All-Inclusive Price and Signature Page

---

<b>Offeror's Name:</b>	
------------------------	--

**One All-Inclusive Price.** This number represents the sum of all total task prices (NOT including Analytical Task 6) and any other costs and expenses charged to EERMC.

<b>All-Inclusive Price:</b>	\$ _____
-----------------------------	----------

-----  
Signature of Authorized Person

-----  
Date

-----  
Printed Name, Title



# Bid Alternate Cost Proposal - All-Inclusive Price and Signature Page (Including Analytical Task 6 in the Scope of Work)

---

<b>Offeror's Name:</b>	
------------------------	--

**One All-Inclusive Price.** This number represents the sum of all total task prices (including Analytical Task 6) and any other costs and expenses charged to EERMC.

<b>Bid Alternate All-Inclusive Price:</b>	\$ _____
---	----------

-----  
Signature of Authorized Person

-----  
Date

-----  
Printed Name, Title

## ISBE Proposal – List of ISBEs Page

<b>Offeror's Name:</b>	
------------------------	--

Please see Sections 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8 of the RFP for additional information.

<b>Is the offeror a State certified ISBE (MBE, WBE or Disability Business Enterprise):</b>	YES <input type="radio"/>	NO <input type="radio"/>
	If YES, provide the total dollar amount representing work that will be done by the offeror: <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 10px;">\$ _____</div>	

<b>Identification of ISBE Subcontractors (Please add rows as necessary)</b>		
ISBE Subcontractor's Name	ISBE Mailing Address, Email Address, and Phone Number	The total dollar amount representing work that will be done by the ISBE Subcontractor
		\$ _____
		\$ _____
		\$ _____

# ISBE Proposal – Participation Rate and Signature Page

Offeror's Name:	
-----------------	--

<b>A. Total amount of dollars representing work that will be done by the ISBEs:</b>	\$ _____
<b>B. All-Inclusive Price Listed in the Cost Proposal:</b>	\$ _____
<b>ISBE Participation Rate (=A/B):</b>	_____ %

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Authorized Person

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name, Title

# Conflict of Interest Form

In order for a proposal to be complete this Conflict of Interest Form must be completely and accurately filled out.

1. Below or via attachment, the Proposer shall identify any relationships between itself or its employees and any Rhode Island electric and/or gas distribution company or its employees that may create a conflict of interest for the proposed scope of work. This includes any program implementation work currently being performed by the Proposer or any program implementation work performed by the Proposer during the past five (5) years related to the electric and/or gas distribution company including work performed in an adversarial proceeding. Also include a description of any relationship with the EERMC that may create a conflict of interest. If there have been no such relationships, a statement to that effect must be made below.

2. Combined <i>program implementation</i> contract amounts from, Pascoag Utility District, Block Island Power Company, National Grid RI and National Grid MA cumulative over 2013-2018 for the prime (only revenue derived from National Grid) and all subcontractors on the proposed project team	\$ _____
--	----------

By signing below, the Proposer is certifying that all information provided on or attached to this form is accurate

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Authorized Person

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name, Title