

## Questions and Answers Regarding EBCE's Scheduling Coordinator RFP

1. EBCE's website lists the following long-term PPAs under contract. Please confirm if this list is complete and identify for each contract if EBCE, or the generator, will be the Scheduling Coordinator (SC).

Answer: The list of resources on EBCE's website (at <https://ebce.org/power-projects/>) is incomplete. The website will be updated to include the entire list of EBCE's long-term offtake agreements in the coming weeks. EBCE is the SC for most of the resources listed. EBCE is *not* the SC for the Clearway Energy Group 112 MW solar resource.

2. The RFP cites the need to integrate with EBCE's energy storage optimization software. Please provide a description of this software and its intended purpose. Specifically, is the intended use of the software to suggest an optimized schedule for the Scheduling Coordinator to use as an input in bidding/scheduling the asset(s) with CAISO? Is the software also intended to directly control/dispatch the storage asset(s)?

Answer: EBCE will employ a cloud-based optimization and bid creation software for our storage and solar plus storage assets. This software will generate day-ahead bids and schedules for energy and ancillaries as well as create hourly updates to real-time bids and schedules. The software platform will allow for the SC to pull bids down via a secure API for submission to the CAISO. The software platform will require telemetry data (preferably via PI) funneled through the SC from the facility for both the State of Charge (SOC) and Maximum Discharge MW. It is expected that the SC will serve as a conduit to submit bids that are created via the platform and to rectify any issues or errors that arise from SIBR. The platform will also pull data via a CAISO certificate CMRI and OMS data to utilize within the optimization. The platform will NOT directly control the asset(s) and will only be delivering market bids and schedules. Lastly, the SC will have access to the platform and can utilize it to modify bids or limitations (if necessary to get picked up in optimization) and to also view the current and forecasted state of charge and market awards.

3. The RFP states in Section 3 that EBCE is interested in respondent's ability to support joint procurement opportunities. How does this support differ from the procurement advisory activities described in Section 2?

Answer: Section 2 describes products and methods of procurement the SC will be asked to support. Section 3 reference to "joint procurement activities" is likely for the procurement of any Emerging Technologies listed in Section 3, or potentially any of the products described in Section 2, but by EBCE and one or more additional load serving

entities. For example, would the candidate SC be able to support procurement of carbon-free import energy by EBCE and another California CCA. (This example is demonstrative only.)

4. Page 13 of the RFP lists required content and order for proposals. The Supplemental Questionnaire in Attachment A (item 4 of the outline on page 13) lists additional information/questions to be included in responses, some of which repeats information listed on page 13. We presume that it is ok to reference other sections of our response in responding to the Supplemental Questionnaire but want to confirm.

Answer: That is correct. Any duplication of required information is unintentional.

5. The Deal Capture section of the scope of services asks respondents to describe their ability to implement an API to connect to EBCE's internal BigQuery database. Please describe EBCE's objectives for this API. Is the API connection to create an efficient means of pulling transaction information from the BigQuery database into the Scheduling Coordinator's deal capture system for purpose of running risk and credit reports? (The risk and credit reports can then be transmitted back to EBCE via a secure web portal.) Alternatively, is the intent of the API connection to create a duplicate system of record?

Answer: The API is intended to pull data from the SC's deal capture system into EBCE's BigQuery database. At this time, we do not anticipate utilizing the API to "push" data from EBCE to the SC. EBCE may utilize this data to audit its own deal capture system or to perform supplemental analyses of CAISO settlements of our supply resources or demand.

6. Please elaborate on what is meant by "*...describe potential working capital management solutions to support CAISO settlement process*". Is EBCE seeking consultative input on potential solutions? Alternatively, is EBCE inquiring if a prospective Scheduling Coordinator is willing to settle with CAISO on a weekly basis while settling with EBCE on an alternative timeline (e.g., monthly)?

Answer: Yes, EBCE would appreciate consultative input to capital management. To the extent SC candidates are able to settle CAISO invoices with EBCE on a different timeline than with the CAISO, EBCE would like to know about this service offering and any fees associated with it.

7. Will EBCE be providing all collateral posting requirements to the ISO for market participation?

Answer: EBCE is capable of posting all CAISO collateral requirements, however if SC candidates are able to provide alternate/supplemental/other collateral support, please describe the service offering and indicate any applicable fees associated with the service.

8. In addition to submitting the CAISO RA and Supply Plans, will the Scheduling Coordinator be responsible for filing annual and monthly RA filings to the CPUC? Are there any other filings outside of the CAISO that the Scheduling Coordinator will be filing on EBCE's behalf?

Answer: Yes, SC will be responsible for year-ahead and monthly RA filings to the CPUC. The SC may be asked to support regular filings for contracted RA and the associated supply plan information for PCIA data filings and other ad hoc requests. Additionally, the SC will be asked to summarize and share e-tag data with EBCE for the associated products including imports for CARB filings.

9. Is EBCE intending to use the short-term load forecast for purposes other than scheduling load with CAISO? Our standard practice for scheduling purposes is to create a 10-day hourly load forecast, each day. Please describe if there is an alternative use that may require a different time horizon.

Answer: EBCE may seek SC's review and input into our internally-developed year-ahead load forecast.

10. Will EBCE be using its SC ID for load and resource scheduling or require a distinct SC ID from its new Scheduling Coordinator?

Answer: EBCE has an SC ID for load and resource scheduling.

11. Is the Scheduling Coordinator responsible for paying the ISO invoices and then seeking reimbursement from EBCE? If yes, can EBCE provide an estimate of weekly obligations to the ISO?

Answer: Yes, the SC is responsible for paying CAISO invoices on behalf of EBCE. EBCE will disclose average weekly obligations to shortlisted parties. SC candidates are encouraged to discuss how they propose to invoice EBCE for CAISO invoices and the applicable timescale (e.g. payment of forecast expenses in advance, payment in arrears, other).

12. Does EBCE have a desired start date for services?

Answer: Target: April 2022, however there is some flexibility in timing (e.g. +/- 2-3 months)

13. Are resource scheduling requirements for internal ISO resources or does EBCE envision its Scheduling Coordinator submitting imports bids and associated e-tags?

Answer: SC candidates should expect to submit import bids and associated e-tags.

14. Can EBCE provide an estimate on the number of Inter-SC Trades per day?

Answer: Approximately 15 per day