

Evaluation Team Response to 83E Round 2 Bidder Questions

RFP Due Date, Submission and Future Schedule

Question 1: How do bidders submit their bid proposals in Section 83E Round 2? What is the deadline to request a ShareFile link for submission of bids?

Answer 1: In order to submit both Confidential and Public proposals, bidders must upload these proposals to a bidder-specific ShareFile URL. The Evaluation Team is clarifying that a bidder need only one ShareFile URL for all their proposals, though the proposals should be organized such that they are self-contained. Without a bidder-specific ShareFile URL bidders are unable to submit proposals in Section 83E Round 2.

Bidders are required to request a ShareFile URL by emailing marfp83E@gmail.com by October 2, 2026. Any bidders requesting a ShareFile URL after October 2, 2026 will not receive one and will be unable to submit proposals in Round 2.

Mid-Duration Energy Storage System

Question 1: *A DG BESS with a 4-hour duration on day one will degrade over time, such that at the same MW output, its duration will be less than 4 hours in later years. Please clarify whether the RFP requires a 4-hour DG BESS to:*

(a) augment over time to maintain a 4-hour duration despite degradation, or

(b) be initially oversized so that, after 20 years of degradation, it still delivers the same MWac at the point of interconnection for a full four hours.

For example, assuming a BESS has nameplate degradation/losses of 20% after 20 years, please clarify whether one or both of the following prospective RFP responses would meet the RFP's requirements:

(a) Would the RFP require a 5 MWac DG BESS project (with no planned augmentation) to be oversized to deliver 25 MWhac on day one, so that it maintains a full 5 MW × 4-hour duration through year 20 (after degradation and RTE losses)?

(b) Would the RFP permit a 5 MWac BESS sized to deliver 20 MWhac on day one (5 MWac × 4 hours), but bid at only 4 MWac on day one — thereby delivering a full 16 MWhac in years 1–20 without augmentation?

Answer 1: Please see the answer to Question 6.

Questions 2: *Confirm that the four-hour duration in the definition of Mid-duration Energy Storage System is a condition of eligibility, assessed against Full Rated Capacity as built and as certified by an Independent Engineer, and is not a continuing obligation for the term of the Long-Term Contract.*

If a continuing obligation is intended, confirm the section of B-3/B-4 in which it is expressed, the value against which duration is measured, the frequency and method of testing and the party responsible, and the consequence and cure that apply.

Confirm the basis on which duration is assessed. Manufacturers state energy capacity inconsistently — some at the direct-current terminal with auxiliary consumption excluded, others on a usable alternating-current basis — so the same nominal four-hour product can measure differently depending on supplier. The CPPD and the Round 1 Facility Description exhibits state duration as nominal energy capacity over Nameplate Capacity. Confirm that this is the basis the Evaluation Team will apply, so that bidders using different equipment are assessed consistently.

In the alternative, and only if the Evaluation Team does not confirm the reading in Request 1, confirm whether a bidder may state a contract capacity below its Full Rated Capacity for duration purposes, while retaining its full as-built Nameplate Capacity for all other purposes, including participation in the ISO-NE energy, capacity and ancillary services markets.

Answer 2: Please see the answer to Question 6.

Question 3: *Would a nameplate 100MW 2H BESS be able to bid as a 50MW 4H BESS?*

Answer 3: Please see the answer to Question 6.

Question 4: Please confirm whether a project that has a Dispatch Limiting Schedule or that is subject to Flexible interconnection will be considered 4-hour duration if it is technically able to dispatch for 4 hours at its full rate capacity, even if operations are limited by these arrangements?

Answer 4: Please see the answer to Question 6.

Question 5:

- *If a project is subject to a dispatch-limiting schedule that requires output to be reduced to 0 MW during a period that partially overlaps the Clean Peak Energy Standard hours, how will the project's capacity be determined for purposes of eligibility under the Phase II procurement?
Specifically, would the project be deemed to have a capacity of 0 MW for eligibility purposes, thereby rendering it ineligible to participate, or would capacity be evaluated based on the project's operational capability during other applicable periods?*
- *Please confirm the intended meaning of "nameplate capacity" for purposes of this procurement.
The definition appears to differ from the nameplate rating commonly used in Massachusetts tariffs, regulations, and energy programs, which generally refers to the manufacturer's rated capacity of the generating equipment.*
- *Is it the Department's intent that nameplate capacity instead be defined as the maximum capacity permitted or designed to be delivered at the Point of*

Interconnection (POI), after accounting for any permanent export limitations or operating restrictions?

For example, if a facility has a manufacturer-rated capacity of 6 MW but is permanently limited to 5 MW at the POI through controls, interconnection requirements, or operating restrictions, would the facility be considered a 5 MW project for purposes of procurement eligibility?

Answer 5: Please see the answer to Question 6.

Question 6:

- *Can the "Full Rated Capacity" certified by the Independent Engineer reflect a permanent operational or firmware-imposed power limitation that is lower than the Facility's original equipment (e.g., inverter) nameplate AC rating, for purposes of determining the Discharge Duration at Full-Rated Capacity and Mid-Duration Energy Storage System eligibility?*
- *Should the "Discharge Duration at Full-Rated Capacity (hours)" reported in Appendix A / the CPPD be calculated using gross nameplate values, or net values after accounting for round-trip efficiency losses and station service (auxiliary) load? Please confirm the intended methodology and whether the Independent Engineer's certification is expected to reflect net, as-delivered performance at the point of interconnection.*
- *Please confirm whether a bidder may propose a Net Contract MW AC (and corresponding Full Rated Capacity for discharge-duration purposes) that is lower than the Facility's original nameplate rating, in order to achieve or preserve a minimum 4-hour discharge duration, and whether such a configuration is acceptable for Mid-Duration eligibility even though the underlying equipment carries a higher original nameplate rating.*
- *If a permanent operational power cap is used to establish Full Rated Capacity, what documentation or verification (e.g., firmware configuration certification,*

commissioning test results, ongoing monitoring) would the Independent Engineer and/or Evaluation Team require, both at Commercial Operation Date and on an ongoing basis during the Services Term?

- *May a bidder propose an operational power limitation that changes over the Services Term (e.g., a lower MW cap in later contract years to preserve discharge duration as the Facility degrades), or must the Full Rated Capacity/Net Contract MWAC remain fixed for the life of the contract absent a formal contract amendment?*

Answer 6: The RFP and Section 83E legislation specifies that a Mid-Duration Energy Storage System means an energy storage system, as defined in section 1 of chapter 164 of the General Laws, that is capable of dispatching energy at its full rated capacity for a period equal to or greater than 4 hours and up to 10 hours. Full Rated Capacity is defined as the actual nameplate capacity, as built and certified by an independent engineer. Bidders' projects are required to meet the definition of Mid-Duration Energy Storage System continuously throughout the life of their contract and bid proposals must specify how they intend to meet that requirement. In their bid proposals, bidders must provide the Full Rated Capacity value of their Mid-Duration Energy Storage System and no other value, including but not limited to a de-rated capacity value.

The definition of "nameplate capacity" the Evaluation Team is applying is given as follows:

"Nameplate capacity" is a widely used term in the energy industry for both generation assets and energy storage systems to represent the maximum rated output from the facility as designated by the facility manufacturer. This aligns with the definition of "generator nameplate capacity" used by the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA), which the EIA applies to both generation assets and energy storage systems.

"Generator nameplate capacity (installed): The maximum rated output of a generator, prime mover, or other electric power production equipment under specific conditions designated by the manufacturer. Installed generator nameplate capacity is commonly expressed in megawatts (MW) and is usually indicated on a nameplate physically attached to the generator."

Appendix A Section A3, Question 3.11 of the RFP requires the bidder to provide a degradation mitigation plan which specifies the anticipated degradation rate (absent any mitigation) and plan for mitigation of output degradation (e.g., augmentation schedules or over build plans). The Evaluation Team is agnostic on whether the bidder augments over time, oversizes the project, or uses a different strategy to meet the Mid-Duration Energy Storage System requirement of the RFP.

The Evaluation Team confirms if a distribution-level proposal has a Dispatch Limiting Schedule or is subject to Flexible interconnection it will be considered as 4-hour duration provided it is technically able to dispatch for 4 hours at its Full Rated Capacity, even if its operations are limited by these aforementioned interconnection arrangements.

Distribution Project Definition

Questions 1:

- *For a DG BESS project that is behind the meter with BTM non-parasitic load, it is not possible to purchase energy on the wholesale distribution tariff (WDT). One must be on a distribution tariff, such as G-3. DG BESS projects on the G-3 tariff are eligible to receive CPECs. They are also eligible to participate in wholesale markets as a settlement only or modeled generator (For instance, see: [a5_distributed_connected_generation_guidance.pdf](#)).
The RFP states: “Distribution Projects that are also eligible for the FERC Wholesale Distribution Tariff must agree to enroll in it.”
Please clarify that a BTM BESS serving non-parasitic load at the BTM site can participate in the RFP even if it is on a distribution tariff based on its BTM non-parasitic load.*
- *Please confirm that a BTM BESS that serves on-site non-parasitic load for periodic EV charging stations can participate in this RFP assuming the BTM BESS meets all other requirements for the RFP.*

- *Can a distribution-connected BESS of this configuration connecting into a distribution system operated below 69 kV by one of the respective Distribution Companies in Massachusetts qualify to participate in the RFP?*
- *Please clarify whether [the RFP's] language is intended to exclude a BTM BESS that otherwise satisfies all applicable statutory, Clean Peak Standard, ISO-NE, interconnection, OPESS, eCNRC, and RFP requirements solely because qualifying BESS discharge may also serve or offset onsite EV charging load.*
- *Specifically, if a BTM BESS is an eligible Mid-Duration Energy Storage System under G.L. c. 164, § 1 and a Qualified Energy Storage System under 225 CMR 21.00, and the CPECs offered under the 83E contract are validly created, measured, and verified in accordance with the Clean Peak Standard, please confirm whether those CPECs may be offered into the 83E Round 2 solicitation notwithstanding that some BESS discharge may offset onsite EV charging load.*
- If such a project is not eligible, please clarify whether the onsite-load restriction in the definition of “Distribution Project” is intended to establish an additional eligibility restriction beyond the requirements applicable to Mid-Duration Energy Storage Systems under G.L. c. 164, § 1 and Qualified Energy Storage Systems under 225 CMR 21.00.

Answer 1: Please see the RFP’s definition of “Distribution Project,” which states:
““Distribution Project” means a proposed Energy Storage System that has one and only one point of interconnection into a distribution system operated below 69 kV by one of the respective Distribution Companies in Massachusetts, and which must not serve any associated on-site load other than parasitic load or station load utilized to operate the Energy Storage System.”

Eligible bids proposing to interconnect to a Distribution Company’s distribution system must meet the definition of Distribution Project.

For ISO New England, “behind-the-meter” (BTM) refers to distributed energy resources (DERs) that are located behind the retail electricity meter of the host customer, connected to the distribution system, and intended to serve that customer’s load. BTM facilities are not eligible for this solicitation.

Energy Storage Tariffs

Question 1: We have a question regarding the RFP for Long-Term Contracts for Energy Storage - when is the OPESS Tariff for Distribution-Level projects expected to be released/become effective?

Answer 1: The Order issued by DPU in Dockets 23-115/117/126 on August 11, 2026 requires the EDCs to submit a Compliance filing within 30 days of the Order's issuance. The OPESS tariffs should therefore become effective shortly after September 10, 2026, if DPU accepts the Compliance filings.

Question 2: How will auxiliary consumption be treated, assuming they are powered through the main transmission interconnection point, specifically according to whether or not they are consumed internal to the batteries and included within Roundtrip Efficiency losses, and whether they are for thermal management or other auxiliary loads? What will the bidder be responsible for paying for directly to the utility? Which tariff schedule would apply for a project with up to 20MW loads?

Answer 2: This question is related to the tariff and not the RFP Rules or Contract for this solicitation. The Evaluation Team, including representatives from the Distribution Companies may only answer questions related to the RFP and Contract.

CPS Multipliers

Question 1: *Please confirm that a Facility holding an approved Near-Term Resource Multiplier reservation under 225 CMR 21.00 is eligible to bid into this RFP, and that there is no exclusivity or conflict between NTRM participation and a Long-Term Contract awarded under this solicitation (as exists, for example, with the SMART program).*

Answer 1: Yes, Bidders holding a Near-Term Resource Multiplier reservation under 225 CMR 21.00 are eligible to bid into this RFP.

Question 2: Please confirm whether a bidder holding an NTRM reservation should reflect the resulting multiplier (currently 2x for the first 10 years following the resource's effective date) in its projected annual CPEC volumes reported in Appendix A / the CPPD, and where this should be disclosed.

Answer 2: Bidders should reflect all applicable CPEC multiplier assumptions in their bids.