



REGIONAL EVALUATION,
MEASUREMENT & VERIFICATION FORUM

Request for Consultant
Proposals
(RFP)

Net Savings Definitions and Research

Issued by:

Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships, Inc
October 7, 2011 (EST)

Questions and Notice of Intent to Bid Due:
October 17, 2011, 4:00 PM (EST)

Proposals Due
October 25, 2011, 4:00 PM (EST)

[RFP website](#)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NET SAVINGS DEFINITIONS AND RESEARCH

1. Executive Summary and Project Objectives	4
2. Background	5
3. Work Scope and Deliverables	7
A. Background Information to Inform Project Approach	7
B. Project Client	9
C. Project Tasks	9
D. Project Budget and Schedule	12
4. General Submittal Information	13
A. Contact and Communications	13
B. Bidders' Q&A	14
C. RFP Submittal Format and Due Date	14
D. RFP Schedule	14
E. Minimum Qualifications	15
F. Modifications to the RFP	15
G. Post Proposal Negotiation and Awarding of Contracts	15
H. Acceptance of Terms and Conditions	15
I. All Submitted Proposals Become Exclusive Property of NEEP	15
5. Proposal Submittal Requirements	15
A. Submission of Proposals	16
B. Proposal Format	16
I. Section 1: Executive Summary	17



II.	Section 2: Work Scope and Schedule.....	17
III.	Section 3: Staffing Plan.....	17
IV.	Section 4: Firm Qualifications and Experience.....	17
V.	Section 5: Budget and Billing Rates.....	18
VI.	Section 6: Exceptions to contract terms.....	19
VII.	Section 7: Conflicts of Interest.....	19
VIII.	Section 8 (Appendix): Resumes.....	19
	Include resumes for key staff noting relevant experience and expertise.....	19
6.	Selection Process and Evaluation Criteria.....	20
	Appendix A: Required Proposal Checklist.....	21
	Appendix B: NEEP Professional Services Agreement.....	22

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PROJECT OBJECTIVES

On behalf of the Regional Evaluation, Measurement and Verification Forum (Forum), Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships, Inc. (NEEP) is issuing this request for proposals. The Forum is a regional project facilitated and managed by NEEP representing states in New England, New York and the mid-Atlantic. The Forum is undertaking a number of projects in 2011, including this effort to develop regionally common definitions for adjusted gross savings and net savings, and to conduct exploratory policy research to catalog and assess examples of how net, adjusted gross, and gross savings or other indicators are used in development and measurement of progress towards various state and regional energy and environmental policy goals.

This Project is intended to help the Forum make progress towards its goal of improving and ensuring the understanding, transparency, and credibility of both electric and gas energy efficiency resources implemented in the Northeast and mid-Atlantic region. This Project builds on a 2010 Forum Project, the Net Savings Scoping Study. One key objective of this Project is to increase clarity and regional consistency in the nomenclature used in describing and reporting modifications of gross savings (i.e. adjusted gross savings and net savings) from efficiency resources. Another objective of the Project is to increase understanding and transparency of efficiency resources by conducting exploratory policy research to catalog and characterize policies in the region with respect to how net, adjusted gross, gross, or perhaps other measures of efficiency impacts are used in the development and measurement of progress towards policy goals; this research can help inform discussions of whether and how policy goals are aligned with measurement parameters. Expected outcomes of the Project include:

1. Regionally common definitions for adjusted gross savings and net savings that can be recommended for future Forum adoption; Definitions based on background research in support of the proposed common definitions including identifying any weaknesses or gaps in current practice regarding existing definitions, reporting or related evaluation data regarding net savings that may need to be addressed by future evaluation, measurement and verification efforts to support common definitions of adjusted gross and net savings.
2. Exploratory policy research to catalog and assess various energy and environmental policies in the region and how net, adjusted gross, and gross savings, or other indicators are used in development and measurement of progress toward the policy goals as well as identifying the extent to which policy goals and measurement parameters are aligned.
3. Recommendations for future research or guidance, if any, based on findings from the research on common definitions, and recommendations of what types of or categories of savings (e.g. net, adjusted gross, gross) may be appropriate for future use in developing objectives and measuring progress towards goals for energy, economic, and environmental policies or markets.

Key project tasks include:

1. Organizing and hosting a kick-off meeting
2. Conducting background research on current practice regarding the definition, application and reporting of net savings
3. Developing definitions of adjusted gross savings and net savings
4. Conducting exploratory research to catalog and assess various state and regional energy and environmental policies with respect to how net, adjusted gross, gross or other indicators are used in development and measurement of progress toward policy goals, including consideration what types or categories of savings (e.g. net, adjusted gross, gross) may be appropriate for future use in developing objectives and measuring progress towards goals for energy,

- economic, and environmental policies or markets.
4. Producing a well written and documented report on the project and its results
 5. Managing the project

NEEP intends to enter into a contract with a Consultant or Consultant team, selected on behalf of the Forum, as a result of this RFP process. A NEEP project manager and a subcommittee of Forum members will provide oversight and guidance during the project. However, the consultant will only report to the NEEP project manager.

It is intended that this work be started as soon as possible in 2011 with the work on definitions completed in 2011, and as much of the policy research as possible completed in 2011, ideally including a draft report available in December, with the final project report in February. However, we are open to considering suggestions for alternative timelines. The budget proposed by the bidder for this project should be modest but realistic under the assumption that research should focus on a sample of programs, measures, and policies throughout the region that can produce meaningful, illustrative, results to meet the goal of increasing understanding of the issues, rather than being exhaustively comprehensive. It is expected that the selected consultant team will include senior, experienced EM&V experts.

2. BACKGROUND

The Regional Evaluation, Measurement and Verification Forum (Forum) includes public and private sector representatives from the New England states, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, the District of Columbia and Delaware.

The objective of the Forum is to support the successful expansion of demand-side resource policies and programs, by:

- Providing for consistent, credible and accessible savings data from demand resources to support state and regional energy, climate change and other environmental policy goals,
- Reducing the cost of evaluation, measurement and verification (EM&V) activities by leveraging resources across the region for studies of common interest, and
- Removing barriers to the participation of demand-side resources in regional markets by establishing regional protocols to be adopted by the states.

The Forum serves five core functions:

1. Provide a framework for multi-state agreement on consistent EM&V protocols;
2. Develop common/consistent protocols;
3. Coordinate multi-state research and evaluation;
4. Aggregate and provide access to state and regional level demand-side resource data, and
5. Provide access to, and visibility and technical support for Forum products and results.

NEEP staff serves as facilitators, conveners, project managers and administrators for the Forum and its

activities. A regionally representative Forum Steering Committee of stakeholders directs the Forum's agenda. Specific Forum projects are undertaken with the input and guidance of topical Project Committees, which recommend products to the Steering Committee for Forum adoption.

The three Project Committees are:

- Protocol Development Committee. Focus is to consider and develop a) common/consistent protocols for EM&V characteristics (e.g. EM&V methods, precision/accuracy guidelines); b) common energy and demand savings assumptions, including stipulated values for common measures, input assumptions (e.g. measure life/persistence), and coincidence factors, and potential supporting on-line database; and c) common reporting formats for savings data and associated cost and emission reductions.
- Research & Evaluation Committee. Focus is to undertake and support coordinated research and evaluation projects that serve as basis for protocol development (e.g. common assumptions). Examples of projects include savings load shape analyses (e.g. to inform coincidence factors); measure life and persistence studies; spillover and free-ridership approaches; and common measure cost input assumptions. Projects may include coordination of multi-state projects that involve a subset of the region.
- Education and Information Access Committee. Focus is to guide and help ensure Forum products and results (e.g. studies, reports, protocols, recommendations, references, etc.) are visible and readily accessible to stakeholders, while ensuring protection of any confidential information.

This Project falls within the purview of the Protocol Development Committee.

For more information on the Forum, please see: <http://neep.org/emv-forum>.

2010 EMV Forum Project - Net Savings Scoping Study: The EMV Forum recognizes that policy and methodological issues associated with measuring net savings from publicly funded energy efficiency programs have been a topic of discussion and research for many years. In 2010 NEEP's EMV Forum completed a Net Savings Scoping Paper (See Forum Products at <http://www.neep.org/emv-forum>). The purpose of the Scoping Paper was to improve Forum members' understanding of how net energy savings are defined, how stakeholders use net savings, and the opportunities and barriers to increasing the consistency of and quality in net savings definitions and measurement in the region. Based on findings from the research, the study recommended that a distinction be drawn between adjusted gross savings, referring to modifications that can be directly observed/measured, and net savings, referring primarily to behavior-related program attribution parameters such as free ridership and spillover. The paper offered numerous recommendations related to adopting consistent definitions of adjusted gross savings, net savings, and attribution, advocating for higher-quality data for use in methods to estimate net savings, moving toward consistency in approaches to net savings, and identifying ways of translating energy savings into emissions reductions through methods that are mutually acceptable to the energy efficiency and the air regulation communities.

For more information on needs and issues associated with common practices in energy efficiency EM&V please see:

- The Need for and Approaches to Developing Common Protocols to Measure, Verify and Report Energy Savings in the Northeast (http://neep.org/uploads/EMV%20Forum/Protocols_report.pdf)
- Survey of Energy Efficiency Evaluation Measurement And Verification (EM&V) Guidelines And Protocols - An Initial Review Of Practices And Gaps And Needs (<http://www.naesb.org/pdf2/dsmee061807w19.pdf>)

The Net Savings Subcommittee, which is comprised of representatives from the states and entities listed below, will provide input on this project.

Net Savings Project Subcommittee	
MD	Allegheny Power Baltimore Gas & Electric PEPCO Maryland Public Service Commission Maryland Energy Administration First Energy
CT	Connecticut Energy Efficiency Board United Illuminating Co Northeast Utilities
NY	New York Power Authority NYSERDA New York Department of Public Service
MA	Massachusetts Energy Efficiency Advisory Council NSTAR
MA/NH/NY/RI	National Grid
VT	VEIC/Efficiency Vermont Vermont Department of Public Service
Other	United States Environmental Protection Agency

3. WORK SCOPE AND DELIVERABLES

While information in this Section is being provided to assist potential bidders, bidders are requested to propose their own approach to meeting the project objectives, including their recommendations with respect to appropriate report contents, the schedule and budget, and possibly modified or additional tasks, given the Project objectives.

A. Background Information to Inform Project Approach

This section of the RFP provides an overview of the required perspective that responses to the RFP should take to achieve the following outcomes:

1. Regionally common definitions for adjusted gross savings and net savings that can be recommended for future Forum adoption; the definitions will be informed by background research in support of the proposed common definitions including identifying any weaknesses or gaps in current practice regarding existing definitions, reporting or related evaluation data regarding net savings that may need to be addressed by future evaluation, measurement and

- verification efforts to support common definitions of adjusted gross and net savings.
2. Exploratory policy research to catalog and assess various energy and environmental policies in the region and how net, adjusted gross, and gross savings, or other indicators are used in development and measurement of progress toward the policy goals as well as identifying the extent to which policy goals and measurement parameters are aligned.
 3. Recommendations for future research or guidance, if any, based on findings from the research on common definitions, and recommendations of what types or categories of savings (e.g. net, adjusted gross, gross) may be appropriate for future use in developing objectives and measuring progress towards goals for energy, economic, and environmental policies or markets.

Context: Development of Regionally Common Definitions¹. The research activities conducted for the scoping paper revealed that different jurisdictions in the Northeast Region and the nation vary in the degree to which they measure not only free ridership and spillover but also such parameters as rebound, leakage, hours of use, installation rates, and persistence rates, among others, and whether these additional parameters are considered to be adjustments to gross savings or elements of net savings. The Scoping Paper recommends that all of these concepts *except free ridership, spillover, and rebound* constitute adjustments to gross savings as they measure what actually *has* happened, as opposed to free ridership, spillover, and rebound which involve the measurement of what *would have* happened in the absence of the program. Development of formal definitions for adjusted gross savings and for net savings for Forum adoption ultimately require the Forum to decide if it agrees with the Scoping Paper recommendation and, if so, which of the possible adjustments will be included in a common definition of adjusted gross savings.

Similarly, development of a common definition of net savings—envisioned as separate from adjusted gross savings - requires the Forum to consider which concepts should be included in this definition, particularly focusing on the treatment of free ridership and spillover.

Context: Exploratory Policy Research. Section 2.1 of the Scoping Paper discusses the degree to which “the audiences interested in net savings estimates have recently grown and diversified, in large part because of newly created programs and expanded savings goals resulting from ambitious state, regional, and national energy, climate change, and economic recovery policies. These policies come not only with increased funds for implementing and evaluating energy efficiency programs, but also with increased scrutiny of program performance, as well as requirements for which outcomes are reported and in what manner. In some cases, energy or demand savings—be they gross or net—represent the primary outcome of interest (e.g. for the forward capacity markets), but in others, the calculation of energy savings is a critical step in the calculation of the targeted outcome, such as reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. The energy efficiency community had grown accustomed to—but by no means complacent about—debates regarding the advantages and disadvantages of various methods and definitions of net savings, or even whether it is necessary to calculate net savings at all. The community had consistently made strides in improving the conceptualization and measurement of net savings, but it had largely accepted, sometimes reluctantly, that reliability, validity, and bias concerns will persist and jurisdictions will continue to differ in their approaches to net savings. Newer audiences for energy savings estimates—whether gross or net remains unclear—have “stirred the pot.” They are expecting energy savings estimates to provide them with the vital information they need to

¹ Much of the content of this section is excerpted from the Recommendations Section of the Net Savings Scoping Paper.

assess the performance of their own programs and policies. With this expectation come new requirements for energy efficiency program administrators regarding the types and quality of information they must submit to the expanded audiences.” (Scoping Paper, p.43) One finding of the Scoping Paper was that opinions are mixed on the subject of whether current net savings approaches are meeting policy needs. In response to this information, NEEP and the Net Savings Subcommittee have identified exploratory policy research as one element of this RFP and a helpful step in increasing regional understanding of evaluation, measurement and verification needs in relation to state and regional policies. Providing a regional cross-sectional information about ‘who is doing what’ in effect cataloging various types of policies in effect in various states in the region can increase transparency and understanding of the role and contribution of energy efficiency resources in meeting policy goals in the region, and can provide information that may be useful in future policy development.

B. Project Client

The selected consultant’s client will be NEEP, which will have final say on scope issues and deliverables approval in consultation with the Forum project subcommittee. The subcommittee will be responsible for providing broader Forum participant input and comment; its support, interaction, and input will be critical to the success of the Project. NEEP will be responsible for managing an efficient interaction process between the Forum subcommittee, the Forum participants, and the consultant - where such process involves:

- Subcommittee reviews and provides input to the initial draft documents
- Discussion and input provided by Forum Project Committees on final drafts; and
- Project Committees provide recommendation to Steering Committee to adopt Forum product.

C. Project Tasks

Task 1: Kick Off Meeting. The Contractor will participate in a kick-off meeting, via conference call, with the NEEP project manager and a subcommittee of Forum members. The purposes of the meeting will be to introduce the Contractor to the Subcommittee, review the Contractor’s proposed approach to the scope of work and the timeline for completing it, discuss any questions subcommittee members may have on the work plan or timeline, identify any data or information the Contractor may wish to obtain from subcommittee members and discuss communication protocols for the project. The Contractor will be responsible for scheduling the meeting, developing the meeting agenda, running the meeting, and drafting and distributing a revised scope of work for the project if discussions lead to changes. Each of these responsibilities will be coordinated with the NEEP project manager.

Deliverable: Agenda, Minutes of meeting, Draft Revisions to Scope of Work (if any)

Task 2: Research to Inform Development of Definitions

In this task the Contractor will research, collect and review information which may be useful in developing regionally common definitions of adjusted gross savings and net savings. Research shall include collection of recent quantitative estimates of relevant parameters that are in current use in the region, including free-ridership, spillover, net to gross ratios, rebound, leakage, hours of use, installation rates, and persistence rates, among others for a small number of end-uses/measures, for illustrative purposes.

With respect to development of adjusted gross savings definition, research shall include:

- Identifying the adjustments that are currently submitted to the ISOs for reporting in support of the forward capacity markets.
- Consideration of adjustments that will be needed to address changes in upcoming changes in standards (the most imminent example is the 2012 EISA standard on lighting). This may include high level review of plans for how this type of adjustment to gross savings will be treated methodologically (e.g. different ways of incorporating the EISA standard into measure life estimation) and recommendations for how this type of adjustment should be identified in definitions².
- Examining the components that factor into realization rates, which also are not consistently defined from program to program, jurisdiction to jurisdiction, or evaluation to evaluation.
- Evaluating the degree to which our recommended components for adjusted gross savings meet the needs and requirements of the energy efficiency community in the Northeast, given that our efforts focused on net savings and not adjusted gross savings.

With respect to development of the net savings definition, research shall include:

- Enumerating in detail the similarities and differences between current definitions of net savings in use throughout the Northeast.
- Understanding the reasons for differences in definitions of net savings and potential ways to bring the definitions into alignment while meeting the needs of the diverse energy efficiency community in the Region.

Review findings and recommendations with NEEP and Forum subcommittee.

Deliverable: Memo summarizing research results and recommendations with appended documentation as necessary.

Task 3: Develop and Present Draft Definitions

Following the review of studies and other information gathered in the previous task, the Contractor will propose definitions of adjusted gross savings and net savings to NEEP and the Subcommittee. These shall be provided in the form of a draft and final recommended set of definitions with supporting material in a publishable format that could be provided as a stand-alone document for review by the Steering Committee. The Contractor will also present the definitions and findings to NEEP and the Subcommittee in a Power Point presentation during a conference call. Following the conference call and Subcommittee review, the Contractor will work with NEEP and the Subcommittee to address comments and finalize definitions. The draft definitions will be discussed with NEEP and the Subcommittee to seek/reach consensus agreement prior to inclusion in the final report.

² EMV Forum members recognize value in consistent methodology for treatment of federal changes into relevant parameters. While in-depth quantitative research and formal guidance to establish one common methodology on this issue are beyond the scope of this Net Savings study, some guidance or recommendations informed by any available information on ongoing approaches and their relation to adjusted gross or net savings definitions is of interest.

Deliverable: Draft and final version of recommended set of definitions and requirements in a publishable format that could be provided as a stand alone document for review by the Steering Committee.

Task 4: Exploratory Policy Research Prepare Recommendations

With the assistance of NEEP and the Subcommittee, the Contractor will inventory state and regional policies that include goals informed by energy efficiency program impacts. The Contractor will also identify a short list of state and regional policies to research, and the sequence in which the research shall take place. The final short list shall include policies that represent various geographic areas within the Forum region as well as various types of policies (energy portfolio standard/environmental/capacity market/ other). The Contractor will obtain the appropriate documents (regulations, legislation, commission decisions, utility policies, etc.) and examples of public reports and will identify key informants who can provide information about implementation experience. This task is expected to be undertaken at a relatively high level.

Types of policies will likely include:

- Regional wholesale markets for energy efficiency/demand resources (e.g. ISO New England and PJM Interconnection).
- Integrated Resource Plans, e.g. Connecticut's 2010 Integrated Resource Plan
- State Multi-year/multi-organization Energy Efficiency Plans , e.g.
 - a. S.B. 205 EmPOWER Maryland Initiative
 - b. New York Energy Efficiency Portfolio Standard
 - c. Order of Appointment for Efficiency Vermont and Energy Efficiency Programs
- Domestic efforts to quantify the energy savings associated with efficiency actions the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) rules and/or the RGGI Model Rule, State Implementation Plans (SIPs) or other EPA Guidance.
- ISO Regional Transmission Planning, e.g. VT/NH Transmission Needs Assessment and ISO-NE Regional System Plan (under development; public meeting draft was presented Sept 1, 2011)

The Consultant's review shall:

1. Identify and describe the policy, its goals, the role of energy efficiency, and associated performance metrics.
2. Assess how progress towards goals is measured, specifically whether net, gross, or other measurements are employed.
3. Identify similarities and differences between states, and between types of policies researched with respect to goals and measurement parameters.

4. Recommend what types or categories of savings (e.g. net, adjusted gross, gross) may be appropriate for future use in developing objectives and measuring progress towards goals for energy, economic and environmental policies or markets.

Research on each policy should address the following questions:

- What measurement of energy efficiency impacts is used (gross savings, net savings, other)?
- How are the measurements used?
- Why was the measurement selected for use? Were alternatives were considered?
- What challenges, if any, have been experienced in measuring and reporting progress towards goals generally, and with the measurement parameter in particular?
- How effective is the measurement parameter (e.g., gross, adjusted gross, net savings) as an indicator of progress towards goals?

Deliverable: Memo summarizing findings and recommendations

Task 5: Reports

The Contractor shall prepare a draft report for review and comment by NEEP and the Subcommittee. The report should include an Executive Summary, a description of the work undertaken, presentation of key results or findings, and appendices as appropriate. The draft report will be discussed with NEEP and the Subcommittee in one or (if necessary) more conference calls. Following feedback on the draft, the Contractor will produce a final report that will be published by NEEP.

Deliverables: Draft and final reports (Microsoft Word and Adobe Acrobat formats)

Task 6: Project Management

The Contractor will be expected to manage the project to high standards of quality and timeliness. To ensure that the project progresses smoothly and well, the Contractor will be expected to provide to NEEP, every two weeks, written or oral updates on project progress, any issue or concerns encountered and recommendations for resolving such issues.

The Contractor will also be expected to present the final results of the project at an EM&V Forum meeting.

Deliverables: Project updates every two weeks, presentation at EM&V Forum meeting (webinar or in person)

D. Project Budget and Schedule

It is intended that this work be started in early November. Our priority is to have definitions completed as soon as possible and ready to present to the Steering Committee in winter of 2012. While we would like the project as a whole completed in the first quarter of 2012, contractors are

invited to propose a schedule and deadlines that are achievable within their work environment and that allow for review periods needed between draft and final products by Forum members. Deadlines will be established at the kick off meeting. Some notes on the budget and schedule:

- This schedule is set aggressively in order to complete a project that was originally planned as a 2010 project.
- The amount of allocated funds is not being indicated in order to allow bidders to present their unbiased estimates.

SUMMARY OF TASKS AND DELIVERABLES

PROJECT TASKS	DELIVERABLES
Task 1 Kick-off Meeting	<i>Meeting Minutes</i>
Task 2 Background Research to Inform Development of Definitions	<i>Memo; Powerpoint</i>
Task 3 Draft Definitions	<i>Recommended definitions in a publishable format</i>
Task 4: Exploratory Policy Research	<i>Memo</i>
Task 5: Reports	<i>Draft and final reports</i>
Task 6: Project Management	<i>Project updates every two weeks; presentation at EM&V Forum meeting (webinar or in person)</i>

4. GENERAL SUBMITTAL INFORMATION

This Section of the RFP provides information for bidders concerning the submittal process, general requirements, schedule, and qualifications. Specific requirements for the content and preparation of bids are contained in Section 5.

A. Contact and Communications

All communications between bidders and NEEP are to be directed to:

Elizabeth Titus 781-860-9177 x111

Cecily McChalicher, cmcchalicher@neep.org 781-860-9177 x138

Any unauthorized contact may result in the disqualification of the contacting firm's proposal(s).

Potential bidders are encouraged but not required to submit a **notification of intent to submit a proposal in response to this RFP by 4pm on October 17 to NEEP contacts above.** This information helps NEEP plan and administer the RFP.

B. Bidders' Q&A

Bidders may submit questions via e-mail for this RFP. A website has been established for this Project RFP: [EM&V Forum RFP Website](#). **All questions submitted prior to 4pm on October 17, 2011 will be posted and answered on the website.** All questions and answers will be available to all respondents.

C. RFP Submittal Format and Due Date

Bidders are required to submit electronic versions of their proposal to:

Elizabeth Titus, etitus@neep.org

Cecily McChalicher, cmcchalicher@neep.org

The proposals should be submitted in both Microsoft WORD (97-2003) and Adobe Acrobat format. An electronic receipt will be sent to those who submit proposals on time.

Late submittals will be rejected.

Bidders are not required to submit print copies of their proposals.

The transmittal letter contained in the proposal package must have an electronic signature and must be signed by a person who is authorized to bind the proposing firm.

NEEP reserves the right to reject as non-responsive any proposals that do not contain the information requested in this RFP. NEEP is not liable for any costs incurred by any person or firm responding to this RFP or participating in best and final interviews.

D. RFP Schedule

RFP release	October 7, 2011
Intent to bid notice	October 17, 2011
Close of RFP question period	October 17, 2011
Electronic proposals due	October 25, 2011



Anticipated date of bidder selection	October 31, 2011
Anticipated contract start date	November 2, 2011

The above schedule is subject to change by NEEP.

E. Minimum Qualifications

A single firm or a team of firms under a single primary contractor may submit bids.

Key staff members must have demonstrated experience delivering high-quality EM&V services and/or studies for system benefit charge funded DSM programs. Changes in proposed key staff members may not be made during the execution of the work without written approval of NEEP.

F. Modifications to the RFP

NEEP may modify the RFP prior to the date fixed for submission of proposals by the issuance of an addendum to all parties who have submitted a notice of intent to bid by the required date.

G. Post Proposal Negotiation and Awarding of Contracts

NEEP reserves the right to negotiate both price and non-price factors during any post-proposal negotiations with a finalist. NEEP has no obligation to enter into an Agreement with any respondent to this RFP and may terminate or modify this RFP at any time without liability or obligation to any respondent.

H. Acceptance of Terms and Conditions

The submission of a proposal to NEEP shall constitute a Bidder's acknowledgement and acceptance of all the terms, conditions and requirements of this RFP.

NEEP will utilize its standard Services Agreement to contract for the services outlined in this RFP. **A list of exceptions to this document should be returned with bidder's response, see Section 5 of this RFP.** The Services Agreement is included as an attachment to this RFP, Appendix B.

I. All Submitted Proposals Become Exclusive Property of NEEP

All proposals submitted to NEEP pursuant to this RFP shall become the exclusive property of NEEP and may be used for any reasonable purpose by NEEP.

5. PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

A. Submission of Proposals

Proposals should provide straightforward and concise descriptions of the proposer's ability to satisfy the requirements of this RFP. Omissions, inaccuracies or misstatements will be sufficient cause for rejection of a proposal. Proposals not submitted as indicated may be rejected.

NEEP and the Forum are looking for proposals demonstrating creativity, expertise and experience in how bidders approach the work scope - not necessarily a detailed final approach. Once the consultant is selected, an initial task will be to review the scope and deliverables with the NEEP project manager, technical and policy advisor, and a Forum subcommittee.

Bidders are also invited to submit optional tasks and budgets if they believe there are additional or tangential tasks that they believe would benefit the objectives of the Project.

All proposals must include the documents identified in Appendix A "Required Proposal Checklist". **Proposals not including the Checklist may be deemed non-responsive.**

B. Proposal Format

Bidders are requested to provide concise yet complete description of the bidder's approach and capabilities for satisfying the required services outlined in this RFP. **Excessive length is discouraged.** In addition, bidders are encouraged to proactively present additional information and responses, not specifically requested, that help demonstrate understanding of this project's objectives and needs as well as bidder's creativity, experience, and/or expertise.

Proposals must adhere to the following set format (the numbers indicated are suggested maximum page limits):

- Proposal cover;
- Signed cover/transmittal letter;
- Table of Contents (include proposal date and page numbers on each page of proposal);
- Completed proposal checklist;
- Executive summary (2 pages);
- Work scope and schedule (10 pages);
- Staffing and subcontracting plan (2 pages);
- Qualifications and Experience (10 pages);
- Budget and Billing Rates (2 pages including tables);
- Exceptions to contract terms (if needed);
- Conflicts of Interest (if needed); and
- Appendix - Resumes (2 pages per resume).

The proposal cover must indicate the RFP name, the proposal date, bidder's name and list of subcontractors. The transmittal letter must also state that the person signing the letter is authorized

to commit the bidding organization to the proposed work scope, budget and rates; that the information in the proposal is accurate; and that the proposal is valid for 90 days from the date of submittal.

For the checklist please use the form in Appendix A.

I. Section 1: Executive Summary

Section 1 of the proposal should contain a high level summary of the proposal including the approach to the tasks, key staff assigned to the effort, and the consultant's or bidding team's qualifications to perform the services sought through this RFP.

II. Section 2: Work Scope and Schedule

Section 2 of the proposal should discuss bidder's approach to Tasks defined in the RFP with consideration of the objectives defined in Section 1. Describe bidder's approaches to each of the work scope tasks with sufficient detail to distinguish the strengths and unique features of the bidder's team and approach.

Section 2 must include a schedule for performing the work. The schedule should be presented graphically and supplemented with text explanations needed to provide a complete understanding of the proposed timeline.

III. Section 3: Staffing Plan

In Section 3 bidders are requested to provide a staffing plan. Note that assigned staff qualifications are more critical than firm qualifications and that staffing changes for key personnel are subject to approval by NEEP. In particular, a successful proposal will indicate one or more experienced principals that will direct and commit to the Project.

- Describe the roles of each of the positions listed in bidder's staffing plan.
- Identify the lead staff member assigned to manage the work, provide a short biography, and explain why he or she is qualified for this position. Describe this person's availability for the project, and the office where he or she will be based.
- Identify the key personnel to be assigned to this project, describe their responsibilities, and provide a paragraph biography for each person. Indicate availability and length of time commitment to project.
- Specify any anticipated subcontractors who will be used, roles, responsibilities, and proposed subcontractor mark-up percentage.

Include resumes for all individuals named in the staffing plan. Resumes and bios should describe relevant responsibilities from other projects that will help NEEP evaluate the qualifications and experience of key personnel. Please limit length of resumes to two pages and place in an appendix.

IV. Section 4: Firm Qualifications and Experience

Use this section to address bidding team's qualifications and experience, drawing on lessons learned and best practices experience. Bidders should also provide two to four references from current

(preferred) or recent clients for whom they have performed projects that are relevant to the work scope. References should include a brief synopsis of specific services provided, company name and location, contact name, contact title, telephone number and, email address of the reference. In the event the bidder is forming a new organization to bid on this proposal, the bidder should provide the related references for the key staff members proposed for the project.

References should be included (two to four each) for any major subcontractors.

V. Section 5: Budget and Billing Rates

Using the two tables shown below, bidders must provide labor and other direct costs proposed for this project.

Budget Table One - Billing Rates

Person	Title	2011 Hourly Billing Rate all inclusive)

Budget Table Two - Task by Task and Total Budget

Task	Personnel Assigned	Hours per Personnel Assigned	Labor Costs	Directs Cost (to be billed at cost to Consultant)	Per Task or Total Cost
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					



6					
7					
Total					

VI. Section 6: Exceptions to contract terms

Bidders must provide any requested exceptions to the Services Agreement included as Appendix B.

VII. Section 7: Conflicts of Interest

Bidders should identify, and address as they feel appropriate, potential situations that may be perceived as a conflict of interest in completing this work. Examples would be work performed implementing or evaluated programs in the Region. Such situations are not necessarily a conflict, and may speak to the bidder’s qualifications, but should be disclosed.

VIII. Section 8 (Appendix): Resumes

Include resumes for key staff noting relevant experience and expertise



6. SELECTION PROCESS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

NEEP and the project subcommittee will base their evaluation of proposals on a scoring matrix below. As noted above, the qualifications of key staff (principals) assigned to lead this Project and the amount of time (commitment) they commit to the Project will be weighed heavily.

RFP Evaluation Criteria/Scoring Matrix

Part A: Technical Approach
1. Proposal quality - comprehension and clarity regarding meeting project objectives and quality of proposed approach for meeting those objectives
2. Thoroughness and practicality of approach
3. Creativity of approach
Part B: Management Approach
1. Dedicated resources
2. Demonstrated management competence of key staff
3. Approach to use and management of subcontractors
Part C: Qualifications and Experience
1. Demonstrated competence and experience of key staff and firm(s)
2. References
Part D: Cost
1. Total costs
2. Billing rates and direct costs/subcontractor mark-up rates (if any)

APPENDIX A: REQUIRED PROPOSAL CHECKLIST

REQUIRED PROPOSAL CHECKLIST

Bidder Information		
Name of Bidder:		
Contact Name:		
Contact Phone:		
Contact Email:		
Subcontractors:		
Evaluation Scope		
Proposal Checklist & Locator	Included	Section/Page
Proposal Cover		
Transmittal Letter - signed original		
1. Executive summary		
2. Work scope and schedule		
Schedule figure		
3. Staffing and subcontracting plan		
4. Qualifications and Experience		
References		
5. Budget		
Budget Tables		
6. Exceptions to contract terms		
7. Conflicts of Interest		
8. Resumes (Appendix)		



APPENDIX B: NEEP PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT

Terms and Conditions and Non-Disclosure Agreement are posted on the EMV Forum website, www.neep.org/emv-forum/about-emv-forum, and are directly available through the following link: [Professional Services Agreement](#)