REGIONAL EVALUATION,
MEASUREMENT & VERIFICATION FORUM

Request for Consultant Proposals

Estimating Building Energy Code Savings Attributable to Energy Efficiency Programs

Issued by:

Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships, Inc
February 9, 2012 (EST)

Questions and Notice of Intent to Bid Due:
February 20, 2012, 4:00 PM (EST)

Proposals Due
March 9, 2012, 4:00 PM (EST)

RFP website

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ESTIMATING BUILDING ENERGY CODE SAVINGS ATTRIBUTABLE TO ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS

Executive Summary and Project Objectives

On behalf of the Regional Evaluation, Measurement and Verification Forum (the 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 project is being funded by the Institute for Market Transformation (IMT), the Institute for Electric Efficiency (a program of the Edison Foundation), and by NEEP's Northeast States Building Energy Code Project (collectively, the 'Project Funders').

The purpose of this project is to:

1. Advance knowledge on how to capture and account for energy efficiency benefits available from policies and utility program activities that advance residential and commercial building energy codes by building and expanding on the Forum's September, 2010 Workshop.
2. Recommend next steps available to policymakers to help capture energy efficiency benefits from codes.
3. Encourage quality and consistency in EM&V approaches used or available for use to account for energy efficiency benefits by interested states within the region and country.

This project will be managed by NEEP, as a project of the Regional EM&V Forum, with guidance from a Project Advisory Committee. The scope of the project shall focus on identified issues related to residential and commercial building energy codes, and shall also include procedural guidance for policymakers on how to navigate the efficiency program approval processes. The Project aims to focus on the specific issues that are most crucial in advancing the concept of attributing savings to program building code activities, with applicability to all regions in the U.S.

Important to the overall objective of this project is to build an understanding of energy savings potential associated with improved code requirement levels, as well as improved compliance levels, by state. This is particularly important in the context of recent public policy directives – legislative or otherwise – that require ratepayer funded efficiency programs to capture "all cost-effective energy efficiency." Such context can help to inform regulatory review and consideration of proposed building energy codes program activities and associated savings impacts where energy efficiency program administrators are required by law or regulation to meet strict evaluation, measurement and verification requirements in order to claim savings from such activities. This RFP and scope of work does not include a specific task to research savings potential, but rather will incorporate such information as developed by IMT, as laid out in the work plan described in Appendix A.

The project will result in a final report that includes a summary and conclusions from the overview research conducted, state level estimates of savings potential (material to be provided by IMT and incorporated into final report by Contractor), high level guidelines on methods to measure and attribute savings from codes work, and recommendations on pathways to securing savings from codes work by energy efficiency programs. In addition, it will include a presentation to an EM&V Forum meeting.

Note that while both building energy codes and appliance efficiency standards are of interest, this project focuses only on building energy codes. There is also interest in addressing the issue of attribution of savings associated with advancing minimum efficiency appliance standards in the future, contingent upon available resources.

NEEP intends to enter into a contract with a Consultant or Consultant team, selected on behalf of the Project Funders, as a result of this RFP process. A NEEP project manager and the Advisory Committee 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 in March 2012, and completed by year end 2012. It is expected that the selected consultant team will include senior, experienced EM&V experts with experience working on building code issues.

1. BACKGROUND

This section provides background on the Forum, NEEP's Building Codes Project, IMT and IEE, and demonstrates the magnitude of interest in this topic both regionally and nationally, as well as the important and unique opportunity to leverage funds across the three organizations to support this project.

The **Regional Evaluation, Measurement and Verification Forum** (the 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.

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 is characterized as a Protocol Development project. Due to the national scope of the project, it will be informed by an Advisory Committee represented by EM&V Forum stakeholders, as well as other regional and national stakeholders.

NEEP's Northeast States Building Energy Code Project aims to achieve significant energy savings in new construction, remodeling and renovations by advocating for strong building energy codes and code-related public policies, such as building energy rating and disclosure. NEEP has long used a system of advisory committees to help guide its work, including a diverse set of expert stakeholders that it works with on the Building Energy Codes Project. In particular, NEEP works directly with the utilities and other efficiency program administrators to coordinate their efforts.

The **Institute for Market Transformation** (IMT) focuses on promoting energy efficiency, green building and environmental protection in the United States and abroad. The organization's activities include technical and market research, educational outreach, and the crafting of building codes and other policy and program initiatives. IMT works to strengthen linkages among property value, green building and energy performance. IMT's focus on market transformation is the underlying goal to change standard business practices, focusing on energy codes and standards. IMT advocates for better building codes through code design, development, training, research, outreach, and advocacy. We also collaborate with numerous national and regional organizations (see full list of resources below) to make building standards more effective worldwide. One of IMT's newest program areas is building code compliance. Its efforts, in collaboration with partner organizations, focus on research, training, and outreach on code compliance and enforcement.

The **Institute for Electric Efficiency** is a program of the Edison Foundation. The Institute acts as a forum to 1) Advance energy-efficiency and demand response among electric utilities; 2) Promote the sharing of information, ideas, and experiences in energy efficiency and demand response in the power sector; and 3) Develop a resource base of effective business models, practices, and processes. The Institute serves electric utilities, regulators, and stakeholders.

2. 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

The Northeast Regional Evaluation, Measurement and Verification (EM&V) Forum delivered a workshop, "**Roadmap to Claiming Savings from Building Energy Codes and Appliance Standards**," on September 28, 2010. The workshop presented a compelling case for why energy efficiency program administrators should play a stronger role in the development and adoption of improved building energy codes and appliance efficiency standards (codes and standards), as well as in the enhanced compliance of such codes and standards.

The workshop highlighted several key issues[1]:

1. Potential savings realized from code and standard upgrades as well as from increased compliance can be substantial;
2. Precedents exist in several states for Societal Benefits Charge (SBC)-funded energy efficiency programs to promote code and standard development and to claim savings associated with the relevant program activities;
3. Information and guidance directed to the regulators could help keep the momentum going for states to capture and increase benefits associated with codes and standards;
4. Information and guidance on EM&V issues is needed to a) address regulators' concerns, b) meet program evaluation needs, c) increase consistency, transparency and quality of evaluation activities to increase the usefulness and cost-effectiveness of results that document benefits of improving codes, standards, and compliance with state and/or federal code and standards requirements, and d) help meet greenhouse gas and other environmental goals.

As the Forum learned from the Workshop, most states in the region have some interest in capturing savings from codes and standards activities but are lacking information, resources, or policy direction needed to move forward. One exciting recent development is that several stakeholders in Massachusetts have launched efforts to explore the concept of a codes and standards energy efficiency program more formally (this effort is still in progress).

In order to maintain the momentum that exists, and complement the recent regional and other activities that have sought to develop codes and standards initiatives, the Project Funders see further research and development of guidance resources as the necessary next step forward, with a premium on information and guidance to the EM&V community as well stakeholders involved in energy efficiency program planning.

Forum Workshop Overview: Roadmap to Claiming Savings from Codes and Standards

The Forum workshop provided examples of how codes and standards are currently included in energy efficiency programs or plans in various states throughout the region and the country. Furthermore, it invited discussion between regulators, energy efficiency program administrators, evaluators and other stakeholders about how to best capture and account for energy efficiency opportunities available from building codes and standards. One goal was to identify priority next steps and the topics for further research needed by regional stakeholders. Both during and after the workshop, stakeholders in several states expressed an interest in keeping this momentum going by developing a process that integrates work on codes and standards into efficiency programs and in seeking/obtaining regulatory approval that would allow them to claim savings from such activities.

After identifying the significant potential energy savings associated with the adoption and revision of codes and standards, based on high level estimates, workshop discussions centered on why these savings were not being realized in the region. Many of the steps in the process that spans from codes

[1] Note that while the Workshop addressed both codes and standards, this project is focused on building codes only.

and standards development to compliance cause savings to be "left on the table." Key barriers include insufficient and/or unsustainable resources, training infrastructure, technical knowledge, and enforcement.

Through a number of informative presentations, it became clear that ratepayer efficiency programs make logical candidates to help bolster the areas and actors that are currently incapable of providing the support necessary to sustain the process. In addition to technical expertise, financial resources (i.e. SBC funds) and mandates to achieve energy savings, these programs possess extensive touch points or relationships with stakeholders involved in these markets. While administrators of utility and other ratepayer-funded energy efficiency programs have occasionally assisted in codes and standards development or upgrades, by lending technical and policy expertise, or other advocacy support, a more permanent and established role and structure that incentivizes them to do so would bring key players to the table on the side of strong codes and standards on a more sustained and formalized basis.

Ratepayer-funded efficiency programs are carefully evaluated by state regulators tasked with ensuring that monies spent on program activities create quantifiable energy savings. While anecdotally the potential energy savings from activities promoting codes and standards appear very cost-effective for programs, the Workshop confirmed that experience in the regulatory community approving and evaluating these types of activities is minimal. Program advisors and regulators are understandably cautious. In order to help move beyond the concept stage, additional resources and guidance materials are needed.

Key Workshop Findings on Priority Needs within the Region

1. The workshop confirmed that codes and standards is a "hot topic"; however, states in the region vary widely in their readiness to take on codes and standards as part of efficiency program activity.
    - One challenge related to next steps is to communicate the salient issues at a high enough level to inform those who have not been actively involved in these issues, while also answering the more immediate methodological and technical questions for others more experienced with the issue.
    - States that are more "ready," typically have stronger regulatory interest or more robust efficiency program infrastructure. However, none of the states in the Forum region currently have regulatory approval, program designs, and evaluation frameworks addressing codes and standards.
2. Overall, facilitating ongoing discussion and information sharing is a high priority, and should include regulatory/program administrator/other stakeholder interface as well as information sharing about program designs and activities that lead to savings. A working group was recommended as one useful vehicle for information sharing.
3. The research topics of foremost interest to Workshop participants were ranked equally high, and included:
    - Methodologies for measuring and attributing savings from activities in support of advances in both codes and standards.
    - Identification of needs and best practices for enhancement of building code-compliance rates.

Information Gaps: Research and Guidelines Are Needed

Based on insights gained from the Workshop, other resources available, and discussions with Forum members, there are several important gaps in EM&V-related research and information. These include:

1. Need for information that helps communicate the savings potential from codes work (e.g. savings estimates that could serve as preliminary planning estimates)
2. Need to make complex information more accessible to a broad stakeholder audience (e.g. high level summaries of reports and a model evaluation framework that helps states and policymakers achieve consistent and/or transparent measurement and attribution of savings from codes activities)
3. Other regulatory support

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 Project Advisory Committee. The Committee will be responsible for providing broader stakeholder 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 Committee and the consultant – where such process involves:

- Committee review and input to the initial draft documents
- Discussion and input provided by Committee on final drafts; and
- Committee recommendation to the Forum Steering Committee to adopt the Forum product.

C. Project Tasks and Supporting Resources

The Scope of Work for this project includes the following tasks:

Task 1. Participation in Advisory Committee Meetings

The Contractor will participate in a project kick-off meeting with the Project Manager and Advisory Committee to review and confirm the project work plan, scope of all tasks, project budget, and project schedule. In addition, the Contractor will participate in two additional Advisory Committee meetings to present draft and final draft materials.

Deliverables: Kick-off meeting presentation with overview of work plan, budget and schedule.

Task 2: Prepare overview of current policy and practice in key states in the U.S.

Task 2.1 Review and summarize the status of policy and practice relating to codes in several of the states within the EMV Forum region, and in other states in the U.S. where there is interest in an expanded role for energy efficiency programs to capture benefits from building code advances. In the Forum region, these include MA[2], RI, CT, VT, NY, and MD. Outside of the Forum region, relevant states include CA, AZ, WA, OR, OH, MN, CO, and IL. This task should utilize existing literature/resources before conducting primary investigations.

Researchable questions include:

- What organizations play roles in advancing building codes and compliance?
- What relevant state policies/codes are in place?
- What role(s) have program administrators played, if any, in advocacy, training, or research related to national or state code changes?

Task 2.2 Research and provide high level summary of key resources available to inform energy efficiency programs. These include regulatory direction to efficiency providers to claim savings from codes activities that has been provided in CA and AZ[3], as well as a review of national studies, including the National Action Plan for Energy Efficiency (NAPEE) Guide to Codes and Standards and the Pacific Northwest National Lab (PNNL) Report on Compliance Methodology. A high level summary of this material would make this information more accessible to a broad audience of interested stakeholders.

Task 2.3 Review existing roles and pathways for which program administrators and policymakers (program regulators, energy efficiency board members, etc) typically propose and adopt new activities for rate-payer energy efficiency programs in the states identified in Task 2.1, and as further guided by the Project Advisory Committee. This task is critical to understanding the evolution of how new program concepts grow from idea to adopted program metric in various states. Researchable questions include:

- What individuals/groups/committees are the key actors?
- What path do proposals to add or expand energy efficiency program activities follow?
- What kind of supporting documentation is necessary?

Deliverable: Draft section of report for Advisory Committee review

Task 3. Catalog activities suitable for energy efficiency program administrators to support or influence the development, adoption, implementation, and compliance of national model and state codes

Task 3.1 Prepare annotated list of activities and strategies available to residential and commercial energy efficiency program administrators to advance building energy codes. The list should be based on consideration of the following:

a. Potential program activity associated with building energy codes, both commercial and residential
    i. Development of code proposals (national model codes, state "stretch codes", etc.), including:

---

[2] Some of the components of this task may be addressed in greater or more state-specific detail for Massachusetts as part of the activities under development by Massachusetts' program administrators.

[3] California has been operating a regulated Codes and Standards Program since 2006, and Arizona approved the strategy of claiming savings via an order issued in 2010.

1. Research and analysis of cost impacts of proposed codes, including, potentially, market assessments of building stock and new construction potential
2. Advocating for strong new model building energy codes, including sharing experiences from SBC new construction programs to provide technical support and evidence of new code provision effectiveness.

ii. Support/advocacy of state adoption (national model codes, state "stretch codes, etc.)
1. Provide analysis of cost impacts of new code adoption based on relevant experience with SBC new construction program models.
2. Provide technical support of new code provisions based on experiences from SBC new construction programs.
3. Support integration of code savings into state and/or regional energy and/or resource plans.

iii. Support/enhancement of code compliance (at state/municipal levels), including:
1. Enhanced training/education activities for both the regulated (builders, architects, engineers, etc.) and the regulator (building inspectors and officials) communities.
2. Funding of materials for training and education, including code books.
3. Assessments of code-compliance rates to measure both baseline and post education efforts.
4. Establishment of 3rd party enforcement ("specialized inspectors") to complement the existing infrastructure.

Task 3.2 Identify and recommend other building energy codes activities and strategies (beyond those identified in Task 3.1) that are currently underutilized or not addressed, and may be appropriate for inclusion in program administrator program portfolios.

Task 3.3 Prioritize the activities listed and/or identified in Tasks 3.1 and 3.2, and recommend which are most practical and would address the greatest need and potential for energy savings. This task should also assess the applicability of above recommended codes activities and strategies to a sample of representative states.

The Contractor will work closely with NEEP staff on the above tasks in order to build on NEEP's expertise in this area and so as to not duplicate research unnecessarily.

Deliverable: Draft section of report for Advisory Committee review.

Task 4. Prepare guidelines that recommend approaches for attributing savings associated with energy efficiency program activities.

The strategy in this task is to prepare guidelines addressing codes, based on review of secondary source information currently available on attribution frameworks for codes (e.g., from California and Arizona, depending on when materials are developed in the ongoing state-specific project).

Task 4.1 Critical review of existing attribution frameworks as well as investigation of other potential evaluation mechanisms or frameworks that might be applicable to building code activity attribution, but have not yet been implemented; assess their applicability to a sample of states, as identified by the project Advisory Committee.

Task 4.2 Recommend evaluation (i.e., measurement) method(s) that support the options for attributing savings. Any framework must provide technical methodologies (logic models) that describe exactly how savings would be calculated from a defined list of activities. It must be clear to program evaluation staff and program regulators how the savings are calculated, and assigned to program administrators. Any assumptions used to create frameworks must also be presented.

Deliverable: Draft guidelines for Advisory Committee review.

Task 5. Recommend roles and pathways for program administrators, policymakers and advocates to secure regulatory approval of selected activities and associated attribution frameworks.

Task 5.1 Identify and summarize opportunities, challenges, including resources and information that is available and/or needed to support next steps at the policy level.

Task 5.2 Recommend future roles/steps for policy stakeholders. Based on an understanding of how new program concepts have historically gained regulatory acceptance/approval, prepare a process roadmap, specific to this concept, for stakeholders in states to follow.

Deliverable: Draft recommendations for Advisory Committee review.

Task 6: Reports

The Contractor shall prepare a full draft report covering the tasks above for review and comment by NEEP and the Advisory Committee. 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 section reports identified in the Tasks 2-5 will be discussed with NEEP and the Advisory Committee in one or more conference calls. Following feedback on the draft sections, the Contractor will produce a final report that will be published by NEEP.

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

Task 7: 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 Advisory Committee meetings (webinar or in-person)

Available/Expected Supporting Resources Include:

1. Forthcoming ACEEE Summer Study Paper: *Role for Utilities in Enhancing Building Energy Code Compliance*. This paper will help to inform in particular Tasks 2 and 3 of this project scope.
2. National Action Plan for Energy Efficiency (NAPEE) Report; Energy Efficiency Program Administrators and Building Energy Codes (http://www.epa.gov/cleanenergy/documents/suca/codes.pdf)
3. Forthcoming: NMR's MA Residential New Construction Report
4. PNNL Measuring State Energy Code Compliance Study (http://www.energycodes.gov/arra/documents/MeasuringStateCompliance.pdf)
5. ACEEE/PNNL Paper; Building Energy Code Compliance Evaluation:
6. Lessons Learned and New Directions - DOE Building Energy Codes Program (http://www.energycodes.gov)
7. CA, AZ models for state level building code activities
8. 2005 Heschong-Mahone Group California Savings Estimate
9. 2008 Cadmus California Revision
10. 2010 KEMA California Program Evaluation
11. September, 2011 NEEP Memo; An Expanded Role in Appliance Standards: Recommendations for Program Administrators
12. MA Building Energy Stretch Code – See BBRS website or Summary of MA Stretch Code
13. Forthcoming: Information from Massachusetts Program Administrator on Codes and Standards Program Implementation and Attribution Strategies
14. NEEP Model Progressive Building Energy Codes Policy white paper

D. Project Budget and Schedule

It is intended that this work be started in March. 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 2011 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	PROPOSED TIMEFRAME
Task 1: Kick-off Meeting	*Presentation, Meeting Minutes*	March 2012
Task 2: Prepare overview of current policy and practice in key states in the U.S.	*Draft report section*	May 2012
Task 3: Catalog Activities	*Draft report section*	July 2012
Task 4: Prepare Guidelines	*Draft guidelines*	October 2012
Task 5: Recommended Roles and Pathways	*Draft recommendations*	October 2012
Task 6: Final Report	*Final draft and final report*	December 2012
Task 7: Project Management	*Project updates every two weeks; presentation at Advisory Committee meeting (webinar or in person)*	Ongoing throughout project

3. 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 4.

A. Contact and Communications

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

Julie Michals, jmichals@neep.org 781-860-9177 x135

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 4:00pm on February 20, 2012 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 4:00pm on February 20, 2012 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:

Julie Michals, jmichals@neep.org

Cecily McChalicher, cmcchalicher@neep.org

The proposals should be submitted in both Microsoft Word 2007 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	February 9
Intent to bid notice	February 20 by 4:00pm
Close of RFP question period	February 20 by 4:00pm
Electronic proposals due	March 9 by 4:00pm
Anticipated date of bidder selection	By March 19
Anticipated contract start date	Last week of March 30 Kick off Meeting

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 4 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.

4. 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 project Advisory Committee.

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 C "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 C.

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	2012 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.

5. Selection Process and Evaluation Criteria

NEEP and the project Advisory Committee 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: IMT SAVINGS POTENTIAL WORK Plan

Institute of Market Transformation
Supplementary Work Plan

(To be incorporated into Final Project Report)

To supplement the research and tasks provided in this Request for Proposal, IMT will develop a high level estimate of gross energy savings associated with improved code levels, as well as improved compliance levels, by state. This effort recognizes that understanding of savings potential is helpful when seeking regulatory approval for energy efficiency program activities, but that potential studies can be very involved and costly. IMT's estimates will be based on previously available studies (national[4], regional or other), rather than in-depth, bottom-up modeling effort or analysis. Results will be presented as electric, gas and oil, if possible, or total energy savings, depending on availability of source materials.

IMT's estimates will be developed by state and will identify results and assumptions for the following:

1. **Baseline level of code compliance by state:** Based on available information (current studies, interviews with key stakeholders, other information/assumptions as appropriate).
    - Project new construction and renovation levels by state (how many, building type, building size)
    - Project baseline energy use of these buildings (using EIA data as a baseline for existing buildings and state-level data where available for baseline efficiency of new buildings)
    - Determine the energy use differential in a non-compliant building (by state, fuel type, building type as appropriate)
    - Determine the energy use differential by code level (leveraging existing PNNL, DOE, and BCAP studies on the national implications of IECC 2009, IECC 2012 and other state-specific research)

2. **Results:**
    - State-by-state results accompanied by a calculator for more fine-tuned estimates for specific utility territories
    - Savings associated with either the implementation of IECC 2009 or the potential of going to IECC 2012 at current compliance rates
    - States of interest include: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and Washington D.C. (possibly others)

3. **Proposed timeframe:** IMT's secondary research and write-up is estimated to be complete in April-May timeframe

[4] IMT's work will build on previous national estimates: http://imt.org/files/FileUpload/files/FactSheet-EnergyCodeComplianceFunding.pdf

APPENDIX B: NEEP PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT

Terms and Conditions and Non-Disclosure Agreement are posted on the EM&V Forum website, www.neep.org/emv-forum/about-emv-forum, and are directly available through the following link: Professional Services Agreement

APPENDIX C: 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)		