

# Illinois Solar for All

## Request for Comments on the Approved Vendor registration process and selection criteria.

The Illinois Solar for All program administrator invites interested parties to submit their comments on the proposed Approved Vendor registration assessment criteria. Below are specific areas of interest to the administrator. Commenters may submit responses to these specific questions, referencing the specific questions and question numbers. They may also provide feedback on any other aspect of the process or criteria based on the framework released on December 18, 2018.

All comments received in accordance with the process outlined below will be reviewed by representatives from the IPA and the Program Administrator. The timeline and process for interested parties to provide comments is as follows:

- Please submit your comments on the Approved Vendor registration assessment criteria by email to the Program Administrator at: [comments@illinoissfa.com](mailto:comments@illinoissfa.com)
- Comments should be submitted via Microsoft Word or PDF file.
- Please provide telephone and email contact information in the event the Program Administrator seeks clarification regarding your comments.
- The deadline to provide comments is 12 PM (Noon) Central Prevailing Time (“CPT”) on Monday, January 7, 2019.

Written comments submitted to the Program Administrator according to the process above and submitted prior to the deadline will be posted to the [illinoissfa.com](http://illinoissfa.com) website and made publicly available. Upon request, the Program Administrator will redact the name of the submitter, but will not attempt to redact any information that may otherwise identify the submitter.

Please direct all questions to the Program Administrator at: [comments@illinoissfa.com](mailto:comments@illinoissfa.com)

1. Are there any perceived barriers or concerns with the proposed two-stage registration process; i.e. first qualifying for the Adjustable Block Program, then registering for IL Solar for All?
2. Will the online portal approach streamline or complicate the registration process?
3. Does the proposed Approved Vendor registration assessment rubric approach allow for the right level of detail and expectation?
4. The administrator evaluated several methods for developing assessment criteria for individual registration questions, including 1) binary, pass/fail, 2) a weighted score and 3) a rubric approach. Are there other assessment methods not accounted for here?
5. Are the category weights used in the proposed rubric appropriate?
6. Is it realistic that Approved Vendors will know the communities they will target at the registration stage?
7. Is it appropriate to weight the future engagement plan higher than past experience?
8. Is the “probability of meeting requirements” an appropriate measurement for the required responses to the Applicants proposed outreach and engagement plan?
9. With what degree of accuracy can vendors project the ratio of low-income subscribers for community solar projects at registration? Is this an appropriate indicator to be measured?
10. Are the intended anchor types likely to be known at registration?

11. Is a three year plan for meeting job training requirements realistic at registration?
12. Is it more appropriate to ensure job training plans are detailed or realistic? Can these be appropriately measured at registration?
13. What is the right level of detail for submitting proposed business models, including illustrating approaches to savings, no upfront costs and financing terms?
14. Attestations are required for minimum site suitability and for sharing resources with participants. Is this understood and appropriate?
15. Is the minimum score requirement of at least 70% of total possible score realistic and appropriate considering the rubric?