

**Central Coast Community Energy**  
**RFP – On-Demand Energy Rate Comparison and Cost Analysis Tool**  
**Responses to Questions Received**  
**04.20.26**

- 1. Section 10.5 of the Sample Services Agreement grants 3CE "a royalty-free, exclusive and irrevocable license to reproduce, publish, and use, and authorize others to do so, all original computer programs, writings, sound recordings, pictorial reproductions, drawings, and other works of similar nature produced in the course of or under this Agreement."**

**As written, this language would convey an exclusive license to the vendor's underlying software platform itself and not just to the customer-specific configuration, integrations, reports, and outputs delivered to 3CE. For vendors offering a productized or commercially available SaaS platform that is licensed to multiple customers, this provision is incompatible with the underlying business model and would effectively preclude continued commercialization of the platform.**

**Will 3CE consider modifications to Section 10.5 that:**

- a. Reserve to the CONTRACTOR all right, title, and interest in pre-existing intellectual property, the underlying software platform, and any general-purpose tools, libraries, or methodologies used in performing the services;**
- b. Grant 3CE a perpetual, royalty-free, non-exclusive license to use the platform and its outputs for 3CE's internal business purposes during and after the contract term; and**
- c. Convey ownership (or an exclusive license) to 3CE only with respect to 3CE-specific data, configurations, custom reports, and deliverables uniquely created for 3CE under the Agreement?**

**This bifurcation in SaaS contracting would allow productized platform vendors to participate in the procurement without forfeiting their underlying IP.**

*Vendors may submit proposed alternative language for Section 10.5. 3CE will consider reasonable modifications that support the vendor's ownership of the underlying software while meeting the business needs of 3CE.*

2. **What is the underlying technology of 3CE's data warehouse (e.g., Snowflake, BigQuery, SQL Server, Redshift, other)?**

*The underlying technology is SQL Server.*

- a. **Does it expose a RESTful API, ODBC/JDBC connections, or another access method for third-party tools?**

*We provide a RESTful API.*

- b. **Is there integration middleware (e.g., MuleSoft, Boomi, an API gateway) that third-party tools are expected to route through, or would we exclusively connect to the data warehouse directly?**

*You would exclusively connect to the data warehouse directly.*

3. **Beyond the data warehouse, what are the "other data sources" referenced in the RFP? Are these additional databases, flat files, third-party platforms, or internal applications? Or are they publicly available resources (ie, CAISO data) we can access without 3CE's involvement/support.**

*The other sources are a mixture of 3CE-provided and publicly available resources. They could include flat files, 3CE-managed Salesforce Implementation, and/or IOU rate sheets found on the IOU website. The selected vendor will be responsible for maintaining current and past rates in the tool following any IOU or 3CE rate or fee changes.*

4. **Is account and usage data in the data warehouse updated in real time, near-real time, or on a batch schedule (e.g., nightly, weekly)? What is the typical latency between a meter read and its availability in the warehouse?**

*Account and usage data are updated on batch schedules. These batches could range from 3 times per week to once per year depending on the frequency the data is available. For example, meter reads are currently available only once per year.*

5. **Are there existing API contracts, data dictionaries, or technical documentation for the data warehouse that could be shared with shortlisted vendors during the evaluation period or after award?**

*Yes, these can be provided after the award.*

6. **Can you confirm that 3CE is open to a cloud-hosted (SaaS) deployment? Specifically, that there aren't any privacy restrictions that would require an on-prem solution.**

*We are open to SaaS deployment.*

7. **What is 3CE's IT security review process for new software vendors? Could you share any security questionnaires required prior to contract execution or go-live, and typical timelines 3CE sees? Once we have short-listed vendors we will request that vendors provide details on the security measures they have implemented to protect data. Based on the documentation and responses received, we may follow up within one week with additional questions or request further information as needed.**

- 8. The RFP mentions the tool must support the account hierarchy (principal, parent, and account levels). Approximately how many hierarchy levels exist, and how many principal/parent groupings are currently defined in the data warehouse? For example, how many principal groupings are there?**

*There are about 560,000 records at the lowest of four levels, grouped into about 380,000 records at the highest level (Principal).*

- 9. How many 3CE/CAS staff members would use this tool, and are there distinct user roles with different access levels (e.g., a frontline agent who runs comparisons vs. a manager who views aggregate reports or approves outputs)? If roles exist, could you describe them briefly?**

*We need just two levels: administrators (4) and users (an additional 6). Please allow for slight variances as our staffing levels and use of the tool develops over time. At this time, the tool is scoped for staff use only. Vendors are welcome to describe how their platform would accommodate read-only executive views, but are not expected to scope this functionality at this time.*

- 10. What percentage of 3CE's active customer accounts and their associated usage data currently resides in the data warehouse? Are there account types, service territories, or data fields (e.g., demand intervals, NEM export data) that are stored elsewhere or not yet warehoused?**

*All 3CE active customer data is stored in the data warehouse. There are additional flat files in the warehouse that can also be provided separately. These flat files are the hourly usage files and are, most likely, integral to the creation of this tool.*

- 11. Is the data in the warehouse validated and gap-filled through an existing 3CE process before it reaches downstream tools, or should we expect to encounter raw data requiring normalization, gap-filling, or error handling within the analysis tool itself? If there are known data quality issues (e.g., missing interval data, estimated reads, duplicate records), is there any additional context this RFP response should account for?**

*You should expect to encounter raw data requiring normalization, gap-filling, or error handling in the interval usage data. The most likely source of interval usage has a subset of both 3CE and non-3CE customers who are not included, requiring additional sources or special handling.*

- 12. Does 3CE have an existing brand style guide? If yes, could 3CE share a copy with top-scoring teams?**

*3CE is in the process of developing a brand style guide; expected to be complete near the end of May 2026.*

- 13. Will 3CE provide a sandbox or test environment with representative (anonymized or synthetic) data for development and integration testing prior to go-live?**

Yes.

**14. Are there lessons from past software implementations or vendor engagements that 3CE would want us to keep in mind as we scope this work?**

*We serve customers in two IOU territories and using two billing methods. This means that the data structure varies because the sources are not the same. This can be challenging when organizing the data to be used for any tool or process.*

*While there is potential for some data aggregation on the 3CE side, the majority of aggregation or analysis will be on the vendor's side.*

*During the development phase a single point-of-contact/project manager on the vendor's side is essential, along with frequent communication and status meetings.*

*Written status reports are necessary for phase or feature tracking. Finally, responsiveness and fast turnaround for updates such as rate changes, calculation of service offerings and so on, is required.*

**15. Section 6.1 describes a 5-year term with a 2-year extension option. For pricing purposes, should vendors assume a flat rate across all five years, or is 3CE open to an escalation structure (e.g., annual CPI adjustment)?**

*At minimum, fee schedules should separately itemize: (1) one-time implementation and setup costs; (2) annual licensing fees by year; (3) annual maintenance and rate update fees by year; (4) training and onboarding; and (5) any per-incident or overage charges. If selecting CPI, please include details about the first year cost and the price increase methodology.*

**16. The scoring criteria allocate 30 points to Pricing. Is 3CE looking to evaluate the lowest total cost over the 5-year term, 7-year term, initial setup, or recurring maintenance?**

*Lowest total cost over five years.*

**17. The RFP suggests a tight timeline from contract signature (May 26) to desired launch (July 1). We are able to achieve this tight turnaround, but 3CE would not benefit from the typical discovery & design reviews we perform with users and stakeholders that have driven our best work. Would 3CE prefer to (a) stick to the July 1 launch date, (b) launch a core scope on July 1, and follow it with any lessons learned from discovery/design/user-testing, or (c) adjust the launch date.**

*3CE is open to a revised launch date that allows for adequate discovery, design, and user testing. Vendors should propose a realistic implementation timeline in their proposal, including key milestones and the factors that would drive the proposed go-live date. 3CE will evaluate proposed timelines as part of the Scope of Work scoring criteria.*