

Updated: 1/16/2019

**2019**  
**MARYLAND STANDARD OFFER SERVICE**  
**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR**  
**FULL REQUIREMENTS WHOLESALE ELECTRIC POWER SUPPLY**  
**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

**GENERAL QUESTIONS**

<b>DATE POSTED</b>	<b>QUESTION</b>	<b>ANSWER</b>
<b>09/14/2018</b>	<b>Q1.</b> <b>Who has the Maryland Public Service Commission chosen as a consultant for this procurement process?</b>	<b>A1.</b> The Maryland Public Service Commission has chosen Liberty Consulting Group.
<b>10/15/2018</b>	<b>Q2.</b> <b>Will standard offer service suppliers be responsible for providing Offshore Wind Renewable Energy Credits as a result of MD PSC Order 88192 referenced below? If so, what is the soonest date that suppliers could be responsible for providing the Offshore Wind component of the RPS obligation?</b>  <b>Reference:</b> <b><a href="https://www.psc.state.md.us/wp-content/uploads/Order-No.-88192-Case-No.-9431-Offshore-Wind.pdf">https://www.psc.state.md.us/wp-content/uploads/Order-No.-88192-Case-No.-9431-Offshore-Wind.pdf</a></b>	<b>A2.</b> Yes, SOS suppliers will be responsible for providing Offshore Wind Renewable Energy Credits (“OREC”) as a result of MD PSC Order 88192 referenced below. Please see Section 4.4 and Exhibit B in the Full Requirement Service Agreement.  The Maryland Utilities have no additional information on when the OREC obligation will begin beyond what the Commission has already provided.

<p><b>10/17/2018</b></p>	<p><b>Q3.</b>  <b>Will Maryland standard offer service suppliers be responsible for any potential increases in the cost of reserves such as those discussed in the following PJM presentation on reforms related to consolidating Tier I and Tier 2 reserves and changing the Operating Reserve Demand Curve?</b></p> <p><a href="https://www.pjm.com/-/media/committees-groups/task-forces/epfstf/20180926/20180926-item-04-simulation-results-pjm-proposal.ashx">https://www.pjm.com/-/media/committees-groups/task-forces/epfstf/20180926/20180926-item-04-simulation-results-pjm-proposal.ashx</a></p>	<p><b>A3.</b>  Per section 2.4 of the FSA, the supplier bears the risk of changes to PJM products and pricing with the exception of Network Integration Transmission Service and Distribution Service as defined in Section 2.3</p>
<p><b>10/18/2018</b></p>	<p><b>Q4.</b>  <b>Is the new line 1108A the responsibility of the Buyer or Seller?</b></p>	<p><b>A4.</b>  Billing Line Item 1108A will be the responsibility of the Buyer and will be handled as a billing line item transfer described in Exhibit D of the FSA.</p>
<p><b>11/07/2018</b></p>	<p><b>Q5.</b>  <b>The pre-bid security requirement appears to be \$600,000 per block, regardless of the size of block. Is it true that the pre-bid collateral is the same for the 3-month Type II as well as the 12- and 24-month Residential product?</b></p> <p><b>On a related note, it appears that the rounding amount is \$250,000 when determining the Performance Assurance amount, meaning that if the MTM</b></p>	<p><b>A5.</b>  Yes, per section 3.9 of the RFP...<i>For rated bidders the amount of the bid assurance collateral is \$300,000 per bid block. For unrated bidders who do not have a rated Guarantor, or whose Guarantor is not capable of executing a Guaranty on behalf of the bidder, the amount of the bid assurance collateral is \$600,000 per bid block.</i> The amount of collateral required is per bid block regardless of size of block and product type.</p>

	<p>exposure were \$10,000, a supplier would need to provide \$250,000 in collateral. Is this correct?</p>	<p>Yes, per section 14.1 of the Full Requirements Service Agreement...<i>With respect to Aggregate Transactions, if at any time and from time to time during the term of this Agreement, Aggregate Buyer's Exposure exceeds the Unsecured Credit on any Business Day, then Buyer shall request that Seller post Performance Assurance in an amount equal to the amount by which Aggregate Buyer's Exposure exceeds the Unsecured Credit (rounding upwards to the nearest \$250,000), less any Performance Assurance already posted with Buyer. Subsequent and incremental requests for Performance Assurance shall be in \$250,000 increments. Buyer's request for Performance Assurance shall not be disputed by Seller.</i></p>
<p>1/16/2019</p>	<p><b>Q6.</b></p> <p><b>After reading the FSA, RFP FAQs, Public Utilities Article 7-306.2, the Community Solar Pilot Program of the Maryland PSC website and utilities tariffs, it is still not clear to us as to the exact impact a community solar project will have on the Full Requirements Service obligation of a winning supplier ("Seller") under the 2019 Full Requirements Service Agreement. As a result, we would like to submit the following questions:</b></p> <p><b>Under Public Utilities Article 7-306.2 (d) (7) it states that any unsubscribed energy generated by a community solar project shall be purchased by the</b></p>	<p><b>A6.</b></p> <p><i>The entirety of the output from the Community Solar project(s) will offset EDC Zonal SOS Load. Since EDC Zonal SOS load is offset by Community Solar generation; it could potentially reduce Seller's Energy, Capacity, Ancillary Services and Renewable Energy obligations associated with the SOS Load. SumOfkWh_Premise_With_UFE will be offset by Community Solar generation which, in turn, could potentially reduce SOS payments to supplier.</i></p>

	<p>respective utility at the amount it would have cost the utility to procure the energy, and in Article 7-306.2 (d) (8) it states that the energy generated from a community solar project will be used to offset purchases from wholesale electricity suppliers for standard offer service. Is the amount that is used to offset purchases from a wholesale electricity supplier for standard offer service (i) the entirety of the output from the community solar project, or (ii) the portion that is unsubscribed, or (iii) the portion that is subscribed by SOS customers, or (iv) some other combination that is less than the entirety of the project?</p> <p>Under the 2019 Full Requirements Service Agreement, a Seller is paid the price listed in the Transaction Confirmation on the volumes associated with “SOS Load” (total sales at the retail meter plus UFE) multiplied by the Base Load Percentage associated with the award. In turn, the Seller’s obligation is to meet the Energy, Capacity, Ancillary Services and Renewable Energy obligations associated with the SOS Load. Which of these items will a community solar project impact? Will it reduce the SOS Load on which the Seller is paid? Will it also reduce the corresponding Energy, Capacity, Ancillary Services and Renewable Energy obligations associated with the SOS Load, or will it only impact a subset of these items? If it is a subset, which ones will it impact?</p>	
--	---	--

--	--	--

## SEPTEMBER 20, 2018 PRE-BID WEBINAR

### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

<b>DATE POSTED</b>	<b>QUESTION</b>	<b>ANSWER</b>
<b>09/20/2018</b>	<b>Pre-Bid Q1. How can I get a copy of the webinar presentation?</b>	<b>Pre-Bid A1.</b> The pre-bid webinar presentation is posted on each of the MD Utilities RFP websites.
<b>09/20/2018</b>	<b>Pre-Bid Q2. Where can I find what products will be procured and when? Slide 13 is unclear.</b>	<b>Pre-Bid A2.</b> You can find more detail on the bid plans on each Utilities RFP website. Specifically, in Sections 2.2 and 2.3 of the RFP document. Please note that the bid plans are updated and posted prior to each RFP.

## POTOMAC EDISON-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

<b>DATE POSTED</b>	<b>QUESTION</b>	<b>ANSWER</b>
<b>09/14/2018</b>	<b>PE Q1.</b> <b>The Historical PLC files for each Type (Residential, Type I, Type II) are no longer posted in the Load Data section of the website. Where can I find this information?</b>	PE A1. The Historical PLC files by Type have been consolidated into one file named <i>Historical PLC by Type</i> .

**DELMARVA POWER AND PEPCO-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS**

<b>DATE POSTED</b>	<b>QUESTION</b>	<b>ANSWER</b>
<p><b>10/18/2018</b></p>	<p><b>PHI Q1.</b>  <b>We noticed that the historical load data for “DPL MD ELIG - TYPE I - OL &amp; ORL” has a weird hourly shape after Jan2018.</b></p> <p><b>After Jan2018, there is a usage spike during HE21. It does not align with data from previous years, which had a smooth high usage during night time, and nearly zero usage during day time.</b></p> <p><b>Can you explain why the load shape of “DPL MD ELIG - TYPE I - OL &amp; ORL” changed drastically after Jan2018?</b></p>	<p><b>PHI A5.</b>  The profiling method used for DPL MD OL &amp; ORL class was changed starting with the 1/1/18 settlement B data. Upon further investigation, the new profiling method for this class is incorrect. Starting with the August 2018 settlement B data, the old profile method will be used for this class. The data from 2017 is representative of what the OL &amp; ORL hourly loads should look like.</p>



**BALTIMORE GAS & ELECTRIC-SPECIFIC QUESTIONS**

<b>DATE POSTED</b>	<b>QUESTION</b>	<b>ANSWER</b>