

Question 1: Some projects in cluster 12-14 will not have deliverability until 2034 and therefore plan to begin delivery in 2034. Will Ava/SJCE accept any Tranche 2 offers for projects that have an initial delivery date later than Q4 of 2033?

Answer: Ava/San José prefers offers for this RFO that have CODs between the dates as posted in the RFO. However, Ava/SJCE may consider other COD offers as they may be competitively offered or fit well within Ava's and/or SJCE portfolio.

Question 2: It is our understanding that all LSEs are granted TPD and EO commercial interest points for Cluster 16. Will Ava/SJCE accept any Tranche 2 proposals for EO Cluster 16 projects in this solicitation or are you planning to release a separate RFO for those projects?

Answer: Ava/SJCE will accept EO QC16 proposals through Tranche 2 of this RFO only.

Question 3: Are RA-only products from pseudo-tied projects eligible to bid into this RFP?

Answer: While the preference is for projects that offer all attributes (RA, RECs, Energy optimization, Ancillary Services) and a Pseudo-Tied resource would require Maximum Import Capability (MIC), which is limited, Ava/SJCE may consider for RA-only products requiring MIC.

Question 4: In the protocol and on the solicitation website, the due date is listed as 7/14/26 at 5pm PT; however, an email that announced the solicitation had a due date of 7/26/26 at 5pm PT. Could you clarify the due date for materials being submitted under this solicitation?

Answer: The due date is 7-14-26 at 5pm. In the event of inconsistencies the protocol will control and we appreciate issues being flagged so that we can update as appropriate.

Question 5: Is it possible to provide more detailed information on the evaluation techniques that Ava and SJCE will employ to score offer competitiveness criteria specific to Tranche 2 (economic value, labor and workforce development)?

Answer: We take the information provided to us and through monte carlo simulations create an NPV based on contract cost vs simulated settlement/forecasted attribute value for each offer that are compared across all project offers submitted in the RFO. We then use the qualitative factors described in the solicitation protocol to evaluate if and how well projects contribute to the qualitative priorities of Ava and SJCE

Question 6: It is stated that "Ava has a preference for deliveries beginning by 2028 and San José prefers deliveries beginning by 2030". Does this mean that San José is the primary buyer for Tranche 2 offers (because of the time required for projects that enter the CAISO Cluster 16 interconnection study process eligible for Full Capacity Deliverability Status to enter CAISO's New Resource Implementation process)?

Answer: No, while Ava may prefer CODs in 2028 that does not mean they would not be interested in awarding Commercial Interest Points under an IPE OA agreement.

Question 7: How much MIC allocation do you need/have for a 150 MW standalone BESS?

Answer: This will depend on ELCCs and some other project specific characteristics. In general, we expect to need the full amount of 150 MW of MIC for stand alone BESS of 150 MW.

Question 8: In the context of Tranche 2 submissions, given that the RFO submission deadline (7/14) is the same time as the expectation of the CAISO constraint mapping results release (mid-July), would it be possible to extend the deadline for Tranche 2 submissions by a few weeks so that all parties will have more information about the TPD availability zones and constraints?

Answer : Upon further review, we will adjust the TRANCH 2 due date to July 24th. TRANCH 1 projects are still due July 14th. The website will be updated June 17th.

Question 9:

For bids of 8 hr duration storage, is the max capacity requested 100 MW or any size?

Answer: Any size is allowed

Question 10: For Tranche 2 projects, what is the smallest amount of Commercial Interest Points (CIPs) that Ava/SJCE are willing to allocate to one project?

Answer: There is no minimum.

Question 11: Will Ava/SJCE consider allocating fewer than 25 MW of CIPs or equivalent to less than 5% of the full project size?

Answer: We will consider all possibilities when deciding how to allocate points.

Question 12: What is the target capacity this RFO is seeking. And, for an RPS + storage product, is there a preference for 4- or 8-hour storage duration?

Answer: There is no set target for either CCA. The 2026 Integrated Resource Proceeding (IRP) compliance analysis and filing are currently underway, the results of which will inform procurement decisions. We are also looking to meet recent CPUC procurement mandates via this RFO and Respondents can review those Decisions to see what LSEs are ordered to procure. Four-hour storage is preferred from a cost perspective but procurement mandates do require certain amounts of eight-hour storage. If your project is at a point where you can show pricing for both durations we strongly encourage you to offer both.

Question 13: Would a mid-2028 COD project potentially qualify for accelerated review / shortlist and execution?

Answer: Potentially yes, but we would want to understand your reasons for requesting acceleration. Rationale could include simply the earlier COD, your need to retain TPS allocation, schedule for placing equipment orders, etc.

Question 14: Does Ava/SJCE know how many commercial interest points they have to allocate to projects?

Answer: This will not be known until 8/7/2026.

Question 15: For pseudo-tied projects, should developers assume that Ava/SJCE will procure the MIC?

Answer: Yes, only LSEs can acquire MIC, so this would fall to the CCAs to do via the CAISO 13-step allocation process or via market trades. One edge case could be that Respondent is an LSE and is selling off a proportional share of an upstream contract and could include MIC/IAR in the offer.

Question 16: Is there a preference for storage projects located in San Jose's city geography?

Answer: No

Question 17: Since CODs for some of these C16 projects is still unknown and pricing is therefore difficult to nail down, are bidders obligated to submit pricing for C16 projects in order to be considered? In other words, will bidders be penalized in the evaluation process for not providing indicative pricing for Tranche 2 projects?

Answer: We understand price and COD cannot be known at this time but are requesting indicative estimates. See Tranche 2 Offer Process on Page 6 of the RFO Protocol.

Question 18: Updated CAISO mapping resources for Cluster 16 are anticipated to be released in July, but potentially after the July 14 submission deadline for the Ava/SJCE RFO. Prior to that release, we will not know if Cluster 16 projects will be located in energy-only or deliverable zones. The last report that is linked in the RFO is from the Cluster 15 process in 2024, but these zones and deliverability information are expected to change materially for Cluster 16. Without this mapping resource from CAISO, can you please note an example of supporting documentation we can provide to fulfill Section 5.C and support Ava & San José's review process?

Answer: Our Understanding is that the info will be released by July 12th. If not, then you can update the supplemental documentation once the information becomes available via the drop box with a note to rfo@avaenergy.org (Also See Question #9).