

Proposed Changes Summary

Section Reference	Topic	Recommendation/Proposed Change	Summary of Change(s)/Response
Sections 4.4 and 4.5 of the RFP	Evaluation Criteria - Price and Non-Price score ratio	<p>Change price criteria and non-price criteria scoring weighting from 60% price/40% non-price to 50% price/50% non-price weighting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commission Staff Report (“Staff Report”) evaluation criteria recommendation a): Change the weighting of the price criteria and non-price criteria so that community outreach and engagement plays a larger factor in bid evaluation. One option is increasing the weighting of non-price criteria to 50% and decreasing the weighting of price criteria to 50%. Because the pricing of a project itself is also an equity issue, an alternative is to separate community engagement and equity from other criteria, for example weighting 60% for price criteria, 30% for non-price criteria, and 10% for community engagement and equity criteria. Recommended by the Energy Equity Hui. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed change in weighting of the price and non-price components of the initial evaluation to 50% price/50% non-price split, together with the various changes to the threshold and non-price criteria described below, will increase impact of non-price criteria to better align with what was envisioned for the balance between price and non-price factors. As discussed in Hawaiian Electric’s Letter re: Comments to Commission Staff Report, the alternative recommendation would not prevent price from being the main selection point and would, in fact, lessen the importance of other significant non-price criteria, some of which are also related to community impact.
Evaluation Protocol ¹	Evaluation Criteria - Non-Price Scoring/Scoring Rubrics	Staff Report evaluation criteria recommendation b): Publicize threshold criteria (such as safety and community outreach requirements) and the scoring rubrics for evaluation criteria ² .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Release of the non-price criteria scoring rubrics will allow for greater transparency. Changes to criteria and requirements will be publicized during March public engagement meetings.
Sections 4.3 & 4.4 of the RFP	Evaluation Criteria - Threshold and Non-Price Criteria	<p>Staff Report evaluation criteria recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) Reduce number of non-price criteria by converting some to Threshold Requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hawaiian Electric proposes the following modifications of existing criteria and incorporation of additional requirements based on internal review and stakeholder feedback: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-price criteria reduced by four (4) criteria:

¹ Scoring rubrics will be made available in the filing of the draft IGP RFP.

² Note that this recommendation pertains to the disclosure of evaluation rubrics themselves, not evaluation results.

Section Reference	Topic	Recommendation/Proposed Change	Summary of Change(s)/Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • d) Consider including new criteria or updating existing criteria to reflect priorities emerging from this series of discussions, including resilience, project siting, local economic benefits, and community co-design elements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Two (2) non-price criteria were converted to Threshold Requirements: 1) Environmental Compliance and Permitting Plan and 2) Financial Strength and Financing Plan ○ Technical Model non-price criterion removed (Technical Model Threshold Requirement retained) ○ Land Use and Impervious Cover criterion incorporated into new Project Siting criterion. ○ Changes to Community Engagement-related criteria, as discussed below, including changes in scoring and the addition of new criteria. ○ Various refinements to existing Threshold Requirements and non-price criteria. • Other related changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fatal flaw analysis – reduction from “4 or more” to “3 or more” to correspond with the reduced number of non-price criteria. ○ Previous performance: This criterion resulted in deductions to the non-price total score in Stage 3. For this RFP, points will now be deducted from the total combined price/non-price score. Points have been scaled to retain a generally equivalent scoring impact as in Stage 3. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This criterion has also been streamlined to include deductions for only the most significant infractions. ○ See also below: updates to non-price criteria scoring scales and updates to existing criteria language; and the addition of Project Siting and Co-Creation criteria impacting the total price/non-price.
Section 4.4.2 of the RFP; Evaluation Protocol	Evaluation Criteria - Non-Price Criteria scoring	Staff Report evaluation criteria recommendation c): Expand the scoring range for individual non-price criteria from 1-5 to 1-10, allowing more differentiation in how well a project meets the non-price criteria.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scoring scales for Stage 3 RFP double-weighted criteria (Community Engagement, State of Project Development and Schedule, and Performance Standards) have been adjusted to allow for greater differentiation in scoring. These criteria were previously scored on a scale of 1 to 5 and double weighted. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Community Engagement will be scored on a scale 1 to 10 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Community Benefits Program, previously evaluated as part of the Community Engagement, is now a

Section Reference	Topic	Recommendation/Proposed Change	Summary of Change(s)/Response
			<p style="text-align: center;">standalone non-price criteria and will be scored on a scale of 1 to 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project Development and Schedule (formerly State of Project Development and Schedule) will receive a total score of up to 10, based on schedule and cost sub-score (each scored on a scale of 1 to 5) ○ Technical and Operational Requirements (formerly Performance Standards) will continue to be scored on a double-weighted scale of 1 to 5. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ With adjustments to the scoring rubric and criterion to allow for greater differentiation.
Section 4.4.2 of the RFP; Section 1.2 of Appendix N (Community Engagement); Evaluation Protocol	Community Benefits Framework	Staff Report community benefits recommendation a): Allow flexibility in how community benefits are calculated for a project, so long as the benefits meet the minimum threshold. For example, participants discussed a possible option of sharing of project profits or a percentage of project costs, rather than a minimum amount per year. This may allow more targeted customization of benefits for host communities with the caveat that customized benefits are equal or greater in value than the current minimum.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● As discussed in Hawaiian Electric’s Letter to the PUC re: Comments on Commission Staff Report, Hawaiian Electric supports efforts to refine the Community Benefits Program framework and clarifies that the current requirement allows for flexibility in how community benefits are calculated for a project, so long as the benefits meet the minimum threshold. ● Community Benefits Program, previously evaluated as part of the Community Engagement criteria, is now a standalone non-price criterion and will be scored on a scale of 1 to 5.
Evaluation Protocol	Community Benefits Framework	Staff Report community benefits recommendation e): Provide a publicly available scoring rubric for the community outreach criteria within the non-price criteria	Scoring rubrics are being revised in line with the evaluation protocol changes noted above and will be made available in the filing of the draft IGP RFP.
Section 3.15 and 4.4.2 of the RFP; Section 1.1.k of Appendix N (Community Engagement)	Community Engagement – Early Engagement	Staff Report additional recommendation c): Enable earlier opportunities for community involvement in the RFP process and project development process. This may include a requirement for developers to hold a public meeting within a certain number of days after submitting a bid into an active RFP, as well as	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A new pre-selection meeting requirement will mandate a public meeting within thirty (30) days after submitting a Proposal into RFP, in addition to public meeting(s) held after selection. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pre-selection meeting feedback: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. 14-day period post-meeting to collect community feedback and return to Hawaiian Electric

Section Reference	Topic	Recommendation/Proposed Change	Summary of Change(s)/Response
		<p>requiring a post-meeting period to collect community feedback and return to the utility for review as part of the community outreach criteria. This should also include collaboration between the Commission and the utility to establish a clear calendar of community outreach and input opportunities throughout RFP development and implementation, including commitments to track and respond to feedback to demonstrate how community input has influenced decision making.</p>	<p>ii. Will be used in evaluating the non-price Community Engagement score.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As with accelerating Hawaiian Electric’s engagement meetings, this requirement moves up the start of Proposers’ community engagement timeline with the intention that meaningful feedback can be better evaluated and incorporated into Proposals.
<p>Section 4.4.3.2 of the RFP; Section 1.1.1 of Appendix N</p>	<p>Additional Criteria – Co-creation</p>	<p>Staff Report additional recommendation b): Create a pathway for community co-creation in the upcoming IGP RFPs by giving preference to developers who commit to piloting the concept of community co-creation. In the evaluation criteria, award this commitment through bonus points (i.e., a points adder) to the total score of a bid, and require that developers demonstrate the plan to engage in this community co-creation concept, including identifying and coordinating with host communities. Commission staff imagines that starting this process may be a difficult venture for both developers and communities, so this should be viewed as a pilot concept for the upcoming round of IGP RFPs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This RFP will include a pilot criterion for co-creation, where the Proposal may receive additional points to its total price/non-price score if a Proposal is able to receive commitment from and plan for community collaboration in Project development. This criterion will give preference to Proposers that commit to piloting the concept of community co-creation by working with organizations and leaders in host communities to engage in project development, including community benefits. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposers would identify influential leaders and organizations in host communities through the scoping process willing to help shape proposed Projects and a Community Benefits Program. This would help prospective Proposers better understand the challenges, opportunities, assets, and demographics of the host community. ○ Community members will have an opportunity to have a “seat at the table” earlier in the planning process. This information from the community can be used by prospective Proposers to improve operations, inform strategy, and match community challenges and opportunities with local and organizational assets and advocacy efforts. ○ Lessons learned from the pilot can be documented to refine future RFPs. • A preliminary breakdown of scoring rubric is as follows, with incremental additional points added to the total price/non-price scores, up to a total of 80 points:

Section Reference	Topic	Recommendation/Proposed Change	Summary of Change(s)/Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Documentation of co-creation proposal/commitment explaining and committing to how the Proposers plans to engage people and stakeholder groups directly impacted by the renewable energy project (+20) ○ Collected community data to inform the process including information that helps identify which areas and communities have been historically underinvested in and have the greatest need (+20) ○ Defined scope of eligibility for community participation (individuals and organizations) in the co-creation process (+10) ○ Defined co-creation goals that are S.M.A.R.T and reflect expectations of co-creation partners and stakeholders (+10) ○ Defined quantitative and/or qualitative co-creation metrics to track and evaluate progress and results (+10) ○ Commitment to include groups typically underrepresented in decision-making with explanation of how Proposer will attract/reduce barriers to entry for new and underutilized partners (+10)
Section 4.4.3.3 of the RFP; Evaluation Protocol	Additional Criteria- Project Siting	Staff Report additional recommendation d): Provide preference to developers who site projects in preferred renewable energy zones, provided that community feedback has already been obtained as part of the IGP process for that zone and is reflected in the developer’s project. Commission staff believes that renewable energy zones are an innovative concept that require much more exploration to embed into the renewable energy procurement process, but supports improvements to the siting process that enable more equitable outcomes and more efficient interconnection timelines.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This new criterion considers preferential factors for Project siting by giving preference to Proposers that site Projects in a preferred Renewable Energy Zone (“REZ”), with additional preference based on the site’s land use classification and the Project’s impact to impervious cover. ● A combined score of up to 40 points to the total price/non-price score may be received, based on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Location: Proposals will receive 20 additional points to the total price/non-price score if sited in preferred REZ (0 points otherwise). ○ Proposals may receive incremental points up to 20 points based on land use classification and impact to impervious cover.
Sections 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 of the RFP	Rolling procurement	Hawaiian Electric proposes a rolling procurement concept for the IGP RFP, designed to align with the Integrated Grid Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The first iteration of the IGP RFP would require Commission review and approval, with subsequent years not needing approval unless there are significant changes.

Section Reference	Topic	Recommendation/Proposed Change	Summary of Change(s)/Response
		Preferred Plans and to allow for faster, subsequent issuances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject to approval of this concept, Hawaiian Electric intends to issue subsequent iterations of this RFP approximately fourteen (14) months after the issuance of the prior RFP, following a notification filing and thirty (30)-day notice period. • A rolling RFP would provide a time benefit to all parties as it streamlines the RFP drafting and approval process, leveling work by eliminating rework and resulting in a smaller number of applications under review at one time. It would also allow developers to plan for a regular schedule of RFPs and allows for steady stream of projects to come online, with subsequent procurements refined based on the results of the previous. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Round 1: Oahu and Hawai'i Island ○ Subsequent rounds: Oahu, Hawai'i and Maui; with targets adjusted based on what is procured in Round 1 and additional needs based on Stage 3 RFP withdrawals.
Section 2.1.10 of the RFP; Attachment B and Attachment G of the PPA ³ .	Structural and Wildfire Resilience	Additional requirements have been incorporated to align with Hawaiian Electric's broader wildfire mitigation and resilience efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of structural and wildfire resilience language re: Seller's Facility (including SOIF) and COIF in the IGP Contract • Structural resilience: Added language to the IGP Contracts to require facilities to be assigned a risk category pursuant to the International Building Code. • Wildfire requirements: Added language to the IGP Contracts to require consultation with the jurisdictional fire agencies during design phase and implementation of recommendations.
1.6; 2.4.7; 3.3; 3.13.1; 4.2 (item 12). See also Preliminary Interconnection Report & Pre-Bid Meeting	Pre-bid Meeting; Act 201 Report Recommendation (re: Companies' Interconnection Process)	Hawaiian Electric proposes the addition of a required pre-bid meeting to discuss interconnection matters. As part of this process, Proposers would receive a Preliminary Interconnection Report, addressing the IE's recommendation to provide interconnection information during the pre-bid period via a templated "Pre-Application" report Requires mandatory pre-bid meeting	<p>This Hawaiian Electric-initiated new concept provides an opportunity, pre-proposal submission, to discuss interconnection matters with prospective Proposers, with the intention that more accurate interconnection cost estimates and schedules will be reflected in Proposals, and that post-RFP interconnection issues may be mitigated. Hawaiian Electric is still working through the feasibility and timeline of this concept and may make further modifications.</p> <p>Overview of proposed concept as of 3/5/24:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary Interconnection Report

³ Model IGP PPAs will be included in the April filing of the draft IGP RFP.

Section Reference	Topic	Recommendation/Proposed Change	Summary of Change(s)/Response
Request Form. ⁴			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. All Proposers must request and will receive a Project-specific Preliminary Interconnection Report from Hawaiian Electric. ii. The report will identify potential interconnection requirements for the subject Project, based on information available to Hawaiian Electric and assuming it is the only project interconnecting to the Hawaiian Electric System. • Pre-Bid Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Each Proposer is required to participate in a virtual Pre-Bid Meeting with Hawaiian Electric, (and at least one of the Independent Observer or the Independent Engineer in attendance). ii. The purpose of the Pre-Bid Meeting is to discuss interconnection, including the potential requirements identified in the Preliminary Interconnection Report. Other topics will not be discussed. • Proposed Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Prospective Proposers must submit a Preliminary Interconnection Report & Pre-Bid Meeting Request, including supplemental materials and fee, by the due date stated in the RFP. Hawaiian Electric will schedule the Pre-Bid Meeting upon receipt of all required materials. ii. One request corresponds to one project. A prospective Proposer can submit up to 3 requests. iii. Hawaiian Electric will provide a written meeting summary to prospective Proposers after the meeting; only the written meeting summary will constitute Hawaiian Electric feedback. • Post-meeting project changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Any changes to the Project’s characteristics, as disclosed in a Preliminary Interconnection Report & Pre-Bid Meeting Request, must be memorialized in the written summary of the Pre-Bid Meeting or

⁴ The Preliminary Interconnection Report and Pre-Bid Meeting Request Form will be included in the April filing of the draft IGP RFP.

Section Reference	Topic	Recommendation/Proposed Change	Summary of Change(s)/Response
			<p>memorialized in email response from Hawaiian Electric after the Pre-Bid Meeting.</p>
<p>Section 2.4.1.5 of the RFP; Interconnection website (Pending); IGP Model PPAs</p>	<p>Act 201 Report Recommendation (re: Companies' Interconnection Requirements)</p>	<p>Hawaiian Electric will 1) provide a consolidated listing of interconnection resources and 2) revise the RFP documents to address IE recommendation re: streamlining technical requirements into single document (Rule 19 or otherwise) and how to reduce confusion on order of precedence/conflicts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This list is referenced in the RFP and will be provided as an “additional resource” on the IGP interconnection website. • To eliminate the possibility of inconsistencies between the RFP documents, references to specific Technical and Operational Requirements have been removed from the body of the RFP and Appendix B to the RFP. Proposers may find all specific Technical and Operation Requirements in the PPA. • Outside the RFP, additional efforts are being made to consolidate technical interconnection requirements where possible.
<p>Attachment 2b., 2c. and 4 of Appendix B⁵</p>	<p>Act 201 Report Recommendation (re: Companies' Interconnection Requirements)</p>	<p>Changes to datasheets to address IE recommendation that the Companies should consider using a multi-step approach to request interconnection data from the bidders to streamline and reduce costs of Bid Preparation for Developers.</p>	<p>While some of the data must remain in the current sequence of requests in order to facilitate the interconnection process in a timely manner, Hawaiian Electric agrees that it could require later submission for certain items of higher complexity not required for RFP evaluation and will revise certain requirements/deadlines in the Appendix B data request spreadsheet accordingly.</p>
<p>Section 2.3.2.2 of Appendix B</p>	<p>Act 201 Report Recommendation (re: Interconnection Costs)</p>	<p>Proposals submitted by the Hawaiian Electric Development Team will be required to provide COIF/SOIF cost breakdown to address IE recommendation that Companies should develop comparable interconnection cost metrics for self-build and IPP-built projects so that interconnection costs can be directly compared.</p>	<p>Added language to Appendix B of the RFP requiring Hawaiian Electric Development Team to use Appendix H and provide COIF and SOIF cost breakdown, and to identify COIF/SOIF demarcation in single-line diagram.</p>
<p>Interconnection website</p>	<p>Act 201 Report Recommendation (re: Companies' Interconnection</p>	<p>An IGP RFP version of interconnection website will be established to address IE's recommendation that Hawaiian Electric could develop a concise centralized location for</p>	<p>A version of this website specific to the Stage 3 RFP process went live on 2/20/2024. A revised version will be created to detail the new IGP steps once the IGP RFP is finalized.</p>

⁵ Appendix B will be included in the April filing of the draft IGP RFP.

Section Reference	Topic	Recommendation/Proposed Change	Summary of Change(s)/Response
	Process Reporting)	bidders to understand the interconnection process.	
Smartsheets Database ⁶	Act 201 Report Recommendation (re: Companies' Interconnection Process Reporting)	IE recommended that Hawaiian Electric have an internal database that could be used to better track projects through the interconnection process.	Hawaiian Electric has licensed a program to be used internally for this purpose.
Section 1.8.2 of the RFP	Act 201 Report Recommendation (re: Interconnection-Related Dispute Resolution Process (IDRP) for Utility-Scale Projects)	Revisions to address IE's recommendation that Hawaiian Electric should include the PUC-established IDRP process in future RFPs.	Added language to the RFP stating that the IDRP established by order by the PUC during the Stage 3 RFP process applies to interconnection-related disputes arising under this RFP.
Section 5.5 of the RFP	Act 201 Report Recommendation (re: Interconnection Costs)	Addition of requirements to address IE recommendation to enhance accuracy of interconnection costs in the PPA price	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early Engineering, which was optional in Stage 3, will be required for Projects awarded in this procurement. Implementing this requirement will result in a reduction of engineering time during Project development. • The Pre-Bid Meeting process (described above) is also intended to help increase accuracy of interconnection costs.

⁶ This is an internal process improvement and not included in the RFP.