



Q&A: Sonoma Clean Power Demand Response Partner Request for Proposals

Released March 10, 2026

Written Questions Received

Please see the following respondent questions and provided responses.

Respondent 1

- 1. If SCP begins bidding DR into the CAISO market, what level of performance risk or settlement exposure would be considered acceptable?**

To date, SCP's demand response (DR) program has focused on informal load modification only and pursued scaling as a top priority. Market feasibility study activities are included in the RFP on Page 5 under the Basic Offering, item 12 and again in the Enhanced Capabilities, Page 6, item 25. It is assumed that risk and settlement exposure tolerance would be evaluated during the contract term. Proposers should describe how their proposed solution supports transparent and auditable performance validation.

- 2. What level of transparency does SCP want to provide customers regarding their individual performance and value contribution?**

Customer engagement is likely enhanced by individual performance transparency. Proposers should describe customer engagement tools and reporting approaches that communicate program participation outcomes and customer value in an accessible manner. Demonstration of a customer facing portal (existing or in development) is encouraged.

- 3. Would SCP consider enhanced M&V approaches (e.g., weather normalization, control groups, advanced baseline modeling) to improve settlement confidence or support future regulatory filings?**

Measurement & Verification (M&V) is a critical component of SCP's DR program offering. Demonstration of M&V approach, expertise, and strategy will be evaluated and considered. Please see Enhanced Capabilities, Page 6, Item 24.

- 4. How quickly does SCP want results following events? Would SCP place increased value in rapid M&V results delivered?**

SCP prioritizes M&V accuracy over speed of delivery under our current framework. Any additional strategies to reduce performance result delivery time will be considered and appropriately weighted based on merit. Proposers should describe expected timelines for preliminary and finalized event performance reporting.



5. How important is defensible ex-post performance validation if SCP moves toward CAISO bidding or differentiated incentives?

Please refer to Question 1 above. SCP assumes that a feasibility study would inform the value of performance validation as it pertains to both CAISO bidding and performance-based incentive calculation.

6. Does SCP currently have a structured methodology for forecasting available DR capacity under different event types (4–9pm daily vs. emergency events)?

SCP's DR Program is currently an event-based DR offering only. Historical event performance informs forecasted available DR capacity. It is anticipated that additional dispatch strategies may be deployed under the future contract term and may provide additional dispatchable capacity forecasting capabilities. See Enhanced Capabilities, Page 6, Item 23.

7. Is there interest in optimizing fleet composition over time (e.g., thermostats vs. EV telematics vs. BESS) based on performance consistency and market value?

Fleet optimization, device performance analytics, and market feasibility continues to be a focus for SCP. Proposers may propose strategies for portfolio development and resource mix management over time. See Basic Offering and Enhanced Capabilities provided on Page 5 & 6.

8. What level of validation, persistence, and performance history would SCP's supply planning and power procurement teams require before confidently counting DR megawatts against the load forecast or procurement stack?

Fleet performance and results validation is an important aspect of SCP's DR offering. SCP has not defined a specific threshold for this solicitation. Proposers may describe how their solution demonstrates reliable performance and provides confidence in capacity estimates.

9. How does SCP internally quantify performance risk for demand response today, and what additional measurement or verification would increase confidence for planners to treat DR as firm or semi-firm capacity?

SCP's current DR offering is informal load modifying only. Ongoing performance validation will inform feasibility of shifting strategies.

10. How is SCP currently identifying EV-owning customers for outreach, and does that approach capture unmanaged Level 2 charging occurring outside of program participation?



SCP currently uses multiple methods to identify and engage EV Customers for program outreach. Proposers may describe approaches for identifying EV charging customers and targeting outreach strategies as part of their proposal.

11. Would SCP value AMI-based EV detection to identify Level 2 charging households and high evening peak chargers for targeted managed charging outreach?

SCP encourages respondents to include any services that could support, supplement, or optimize fleet development and performance.

12. Is SCP interested in shifting from broad EV marketing toward behavior-based targeting, for example, focusing on customers charging consistently during 4–9pm?

SCP encourages respondents to include any services that could support, supplement, or optimize fleet development and performance.

13. Does SCP currently measure disaggregated EV load impacts (separate from whole-home load) to quantify the true kW and kWh shift achieved through telematics?

SCP currently evaluates program performance primarily at the meter level in the event-based offering. In certain program contexts, SCP utilizes data sources that may support analysis of EV charging behavior. Proposers may describe approaches for measuring or estimating EV charging load impacts and quantifying demand response performance associated with EV telematics or managed charging strategies.

14. What level of direct data access does SCP expect into event-level and customer-level data, and device-level telemetry?

Please review the Basic Offering section of the RFP, Item 3. Access to pre-processed and final data that informs M&V is required. Proposers should describe the types of data available, reporting frequency, and access methodology.

15. Does SCP anticipate integrating demand response performance data with other load shifting or efficiency programs to evaluate stacked value?

SCP is requesting respondents with demonstrated expertise in evaluating and extracting value from DR programs to detail methodology in their proposal. Proposers may describe tested strategies that support data integration or interoperability for consideration.

16. Has SCP encountered barriers or challenges with claiming and/or reporting DR impacts?



Barriers and challenges applying DR benefits and impacts persist for most DR resources and aggregators and are widely known in the DR Provider landscape. DR partner suggestions to overcome these challenges are encouraged.

Respondent 2

- 1. Section VII.B notes that SCP may choose to contract with more than one firm. Does SCP have a strong preference for selecting a single Prime Contractor to deliver a comprehensive Universal DERMS platform via subcontractors, or is SCP equally open to directly contracting with multiple specialized vendors (e.g. one Prime for EV telematics / EVSEs and a separate Prime for smart thermostats/BESS to work in parallel)?**

SCP is seeking solutions capable of managing a diverse portfolio of DERs as described in the RFP. Respondents may propose architectures that deliver these capabilities through integrated platforms or coordinated systems. Proposers may submit proposals individually that meet Basic Offering requirements or collaboratively.

- 2. The RFP states a target of reaching 10 MW of demand response and load shifting capacity over the contract term. It requires the Implementation Plan to encompass a diverse portfolio of technologies including EVs, EVSEs, smart thermostats, electric water heaters, and residential/commercial BESS.**

Could SCP clarify if there is a desired capacity breakdown, specific sub-target, or expected portfolio makeup across these different Distributed Energy Resources (DERs) to achieve the 10 MW goal? For example, does SCP anticipate what percentage of the 10 MW target will be fulfilled by commercial BESS versus residential EVs or smart thermostats?

Currently, SCP is not targeting a specific capacity breakdown or portfolio makeup and welcomes suggested strategies to accomplish the addition of 5-6+ MW under the contract term.

- 3. Regarding the program expansion goals, the RFP states that the Implementation Plan must include offerings for commercial customers, explicitly requiring EV charging and commercial Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) direct control options. To ensure our proposed Trade Ally network and platform capabilities align precisely with your goals, could SCP clarify the following regarding the commercial sector? Does SCP view workplace charging and shared EV charging infrastructure at Multi-Unit Dwellings (MUDs) as key priority targets for this commercial expansion? What about other types of commercial customers, such as ride-share or EV fleet owner/operators? How much of this expansion should be on the HVAC side?**



SCP has not established specific priority subsegments for commercial participation under this solicitation. Proposers may describe the commercial customer segments they intend to target and the rationale for their proposed implementation strategy.

Respondent 3

- 1. How does SCP define the 10 MW total dispatchable capacity target: nameplate capacity, forecasted capacity, demonstrated event performance, or RA-qualifying capacity?**

The 10 MW dispatchable capacity target assumes meter level data acquisition to measure actual event performance. Proposers should describe the methodology used to estimate capacity and how event performance will be measured using available meter or device data.

- 2. Should Proposers assume diversified performance assumptions by resource type (e.g., EV telematics vs. thermostats vs. BESS)?**

Resource type is assumed to impact performance assumptions and baselining methodologies.

- 3. Is the 0.5 MW CARE/FERA goal measured by enrollment, forecasted capacity, or demonstrated performance?**

See Respondent 3, answer 1.

- 4. Does SCP intend to maintain the current flat monthly bill credit structure, or is SCP considering transitioning to a performance-based (\$/kWh or \$/kW) incentive model during the contract term?**

SCP has not finalized long-term incentive structures under this solicitation. Proposers may describe customer incentive structures that support participation and program performance.

- 5. Will SCP facilitate the transfer of existing Trade Ally and device integration agreements to the selected Proposer?**

SCP is requesting that Trade Ally networks be established or in progress and that the Respondent is prepared to facilitate and manage Trade Ally development and management.

- 6. Will historical event performance data and baseline methodologies be made available to support transition planning?**

Historic event performance results and baselining methodologies necessary to support transition planning may be made available as data privacy and proprietary rules allow.

Respondent 4

- 1. RFP page 17 states, “Include EV charging and commercial BESS direct control demand response options for commercial customers.” What kind of “commercial” EV chargers (e.g., L2/L3, Fleet, Workspace) does SCP want to include in the scope? What are the use cases SCP is planning to support?**

SCP is open to all suggested approaches for commercial customer integrations, including EV charging and BESS.

Respondent 5

- 1. Who sets trade ally goals? The number, the targets, etc.**

SCP views Trade Ally network development as a tool for scaling a diverse portfolio of integrated technologies, and greater accessibility for technologies currently available in the market. We do not have specific goals or targets although it is assumed that existing manufacturer networks will be maintained to ensure that SCP’s current device fleet can continue to participate in any future program offering. See integrated device manufacturers under Enhanced Capabilities, Page 6-7, Item 15.

- 2. What customer data systems does SCP currently use (CIS, billing platform, CRM)?**

SCP utilizes Salesforce and MySQL to manage customer data and relationships. Additionally, an external accounting team handles incentive delivery. Alternatives incentive fulfilment approaches are welcome.

- 3. What level of API access does SCP provide to customer eligibility and billing data?**

API integrations are available for customer eligibility verification only. Billing data is not currently supported via API access.

- 4. What proportions of meters are expected to provide data for M&V purposes?**

Currently, only participating meters contribute data for external M&V purposes. Proposers should describe their data requirements for M&V.

- 5. For the small commercial customer segment (<75 kW), does SCP have an existing list of target accounts or sectors, or would the Proposer be responsible for market identification?**

SCP will support commercial customer market identification and targeting strategy.

- 6. Is SCP open to larger C&I customers beyond small commercial? Why or why not?**



See Enhanced Capabilities, Page 7, Item 21. SCP is open to effective strategies to integrate medium and large commercial and industrial customers.

- 7. Is SCP open to a low-hardware or no-hardware behavioral DR pathway specifically designed to increase equity program participation? For example, an AMI bayed behavioral layer that doesn't require device ownership as a prerequisite.**

SCP's current DR offering hosts over 13K no-hardware behavioral DR participants. See Basic Offering, Page 5 Task 1. These participants receive a text, phone, or email alert in either Spanish or English when usage curtailment is requested and are incentivized based on performance.

- 8. How will SCP weigh customer experience quality (enrollment, UX dashboard, notification design) relative to operational metrics (MW delivered, event response rates) in evaluating proposals and ongoing performance?**

Customer experience and operational performance are important considerations for SCP. Proposers should describe how their solution supports a positive customer experience while delivering reliable demand response performance.

- 9. How does SCP define "universal DERMS platform" in the context of this RFP? Specifically, does this refer to a single integrated software system, or a functional capability that may be delivered through an integrated stack of complementary tools and APIs?**

A universal DERMS platform for the purpose of this RFP is defined as a single participant management tool which facilitates dispatch, calculates M&V, and collects and distributes customer messaging. How this is accomplished may be layered and tools and APIs may vary.