



NEW MEXICO
**PUBLIC REGULATION
COMMISSION**

COMMISSIONERS

GABRIEL AGUILERA
GREG NIBERT
PATRICK O'CONNELL

P.O. Box 1269
Santa Fe, NM 87504-1269

CHIEF OF STAFF

Cholla Khoury

RFP 2027-0001 Questions & Answers

Question:

1 Regional scope and site entitlement

RFP reference: I A and I C; IV B 3 d

Please define Southwest United States coverage and the required nodal and zonal footprint, including whether WECC plus Eastern Interconnection/SPP coverage is required for PNM and SPS/Xcel. May one site-wide regional entitlement bundle multiple regional datasets?

Answer:

The commission requires a regional dataset, at minimum, the Southwest United States, with sufficient geographic and modeling coverage to support both nodal and zonal analysis. Vendors should clearly identify the geographic coverage of their proposed datasets, including WECC and SPP coverage where applicable, particularly for the regions relevant to PNM and SPS/Xcel Energy. Vendors may propose multiple regional datasets under a single site-wide entitlement, provided they clearly explain the coverage, licensing arrangements, and any associated limitations.

Question:

2 Current IOU model inputs

RFP reference: IV A; IV B 3 h and i

Which modeling applications and versions are currently used by PNM and SPS/Xcel for the cases PRC intends to examine? Will documented structured-data conversion satisfy the requirement when direct proprietary-format conversion is unavailable?

Answer:

The Commission intends to use the modeling software to conduct independent regulatory analyses, including utility modeling assumptions, inputs and results. Vendors should illustrate compatibility with, or straightforward conversion of, modeling inputs used by PNM and SPS/Xcel energy. Where direct proprietary format conversion is unavailable, vendors may describe the structured-data conversion approach, including supported formats, data mapping, validation procedures and any limitations. The proposed conversion approach should illustrate that the necessary modeling information can be

preserved to support accurate, transparent and reproducible analysis. The Commission would evaluate the adequacy of the proposed approach against the RFP requirements.

Question:

3 Managed conversion and COTS scope

RFP reference: I A; IV A

Does the commercial off-the-shelf requirement allow vendor-managed adapter and evidence utilities delivered alongside the commercial engine? Please confirm that ongoing source-format maintenance is expected from the vendor and how new or undocumented IOU format changes will be treated.

Answer:

It does allow for a vendor-managed adapter. Ongoing source-format maintenance is not expected but may be requested on a case-by-case basis. If it is necessary, we will plan to do a separate procurement.

Question:

4 Five-day deployment trigger

RFP reference: I C; Appendix C Exhibit A

Section I.C permits deployment within five days of acceptance of the contract, whereas Exhibit A lists delivery upon full execution. Please confirm the controlling trigger, whether the five days are calendar days, and whether deployment is distinct from training and deeper case acceptance.

Answer:

The deployment trigger is five (5) business days. The deployment is distinct from training and deeper case acceptance. The deployment trigger is simply either the install of the base software on local servers or granting logins to cloud portals in the case of hybrid deployments.

Question:

5 Cost form tax treatment

RFP reference: Appendix D; V B 7

Please confirm the GRT estimate and taxable basis and whether scoring uses totals including or excluding GRT.

Answer:

PRC is tax exempt for goods. However, we pay tax on services. The scoring totals do include any estimated GRT. Please see Appendix D. It states on the form that Total Offeror's cost = Total Annual Software Licenses Cost + Total Annual Regional Dataset Site License Cost + Estimated GRT.

Question:

6 Security scope and evidence

RFP reference: IV B 3 j

Which NIST SP 800-53 revision and assessment evidence are expected for the Moderate baseline, and which controls are Agency responsibilities for on-premises software? Does the SOC 2 Type II requirement apply to the vendor, the hosted service, or both? What is the approved submission route for restricted assurance reports and CEII?

Answer:

The Agency expects NIST SP 800-53 Rev. 5, including updates through Release 5.2.0, at the Moderate baseline defined in SP 800-53B. A report should be included that shows that you've met the baseline specified. The following is a table outlining offeror responsibilities.

Family	Family Name	Agency Responsibility	Offeror Responsibility	Shared (Offeror supplies capability, Agency configures)
AC	Access Control	AC-1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 17-22	None	AC-3, AC-6 (roles and least privilege inside the application)
AT	Awareness and Training	AT-1 to AT-4	None	None
AU	Audit and Accountability	AU-1, 4-9, 11	None	AU-2, 3, 12 (application audit events)
CA	Assessment, Authorization and Monitoring	CA-1, 2, 5, 6, 7; CA-3 and CA-9 only if cloud	Evidence supporting CA-2	None
CM	Configuration Management	CM-1 to CM-6, CM-8 to CM-12	CM-7 (least functionality; no undocumented telemetry or call-home)	CM-7
CP	Contingency Planning	CP-1 to CP-10	None	None
IA	Identification and Authentication	IA-1 to IA-4, 6-8, 11, 12	None	IA-5 (license credentials and any application logins)
IR	Incident Response	IR-1 to IR-5, IR-8	Notify the Agency of product vulnerabilities and of incidents involving vendor-held data	IR-6, 7
MA	Maintenance	MA-1 to MA-6	None	None
MP	Media Protection	MP-1 to MP-7 (Agency media and disks)	Certified destruction of any vendor-held data (Spec m)	None
PE	Physical and Environmental Protection	PE-1 to PE-17	None	None
PL	Planning	PL-1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 11	None	None
PS	Personnel Security	PS-1 to PS-9 (Agency staff)	PS-7 for its own personnel with any access	None

RA	Risk Assessment	RA-1, 2, 3, 7, 9; RA-5 on the host	RA-5 on its own releases	RA-5
SA	System and Services Acquisition	SA-1, 2, 4 (writing the requirements); SA-9 if cloud	SA-3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 15, 22	SA-4 (Agency specifies, Offeror delivers evidence)
SC	System and Communications Protection	SC-1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20-23, 28, 39	None	SC-13 (cryptography)
SI	System and Information Integrity	SI-1, 3, 4, 8, 12, 16; deploying patches under SI-2	SI-2 (patch and advisory delivery), SI-7 (signed releases), SI-10, SI-11 (input validation, error handling)	SI-5 (Offeror issues advisories, Agency acts on them)
SR	Supply Chain Risk Management	SR-1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12	SR-3, 11 (its own supply chain and component authenticity)	None

A full assessment is not required. A control-by-control mapping showing, for each Moderate baseline control and enhancement, whether the product implements, partially implements, or does not implement it, with a brief implementation statement. Identification of each gap, with a remediation plan and target date, or a statement that the Offeror does not intend to remediate it.

SOC 2 Type II applies to both with the report specifically focusing on the hosted service.

Restricted assurance reports and CEII can be submitted to the procurement manager along with the main proposal. Per instructions in section III.B.2.a all vendors are required to submit two (2) separate electronic technical files by email to the procurement manager. Therefore, the vendor should have one (1) email that submits a redacted copy and an unredacted copy of the technical files. If each file exceeds the 20mb limit, then each version can be sent in separate emails.

Question:

7 Software contract inconsistencies

RFP reference: Appendix C Articles 2 D through F and 9

Article 2.D requires escrow and source-code release, Article 2.E says there is no source code, Article 2.F.1 says software is not involved, and Article 9 says no intellectual property exists. Please identify the intended provisions for licensed commercial modeling software and whether COTS escrow is required.

Answer:

This is a draft contract made a few assumptions but can be revised and finalized before execution if any of those assumptions are incorrect.

Section 2.D.1 is contractual language provided by New Mexico Department of Information Technology. The section provides that a Software Source Code will be kept by an Escrow Agent. If there is no Source Code, then there would be nothing for an Escrow Agent to hold.

With regard to Section 2.E, it is our assumption that there will be no developed software involved, only a commercial off the shelf software, so there will be no source-code for this project. This can be amended if this assumption proves incorrect.

Section 2.F.1 can be revised to state “Procuring Agency will have rights to the software as stated in Article 2.D., above.

In regard to Article 9, it is our assumption that no Intellectual Property will exist. If that assumption is incorrect after going through the RFP process, this Article can be amended.

Per II.C.15 Should an Offeror object to any of the terms and conditions as set forth in the RFP Draft Contract (APPENDIX C) strongly enough to propose alternate terms and conditions in spite of the above, the Offeror must propose **specific** alternative language. However, the Agency may or may not accept the alternative language.

Question:

8 Dataset ownership and disclosure

RFP reference: IV B 4 h; Appendix C Articles 1 S and 10

Please distinguish ownership of PRC-generated models and results from title to pre-existing commercial datasets. Must the dataset license permit public disclosure of underlying licensed inputs without restriction, and how should third-party CEII or protective-order restrictions be addressed?

Answer:

Data ownership extends only to Agency-generated models and both the inputs and outputs for those models. The vendor should refer all requests for controlled data to the Agency.

Question:

9 Historical reruns and offline licensing

RFP reference: IV B 4 g and j

Are historical models required to remain executable after contract expiration as well as after upgrades? Please state the required archival period and whether an ongoing runtime license is expected. Is completely air-gapped offline activation required, or is a documented offline license procedure sufficient?

Answer:

Historical models are not required to remain executable as a result of vendor adapters. The Agency will maintain historical model compatibility. For cloud model runs, if applicable, the required archival period is 2 years. A documented offline license procedure is sufficient.

Question:

10 Read-only access

RFP reference: IV B 4 e

Does unlimited read-only access require unlimited native software or cloud viewer accounts, or may PRC provide unlimited review through documented exported models, assumptions and reports? Please identify the required model inspection functions for reviewers.

Answer:

It does not require unlimited native software or cloud viewer accounts, but that is the preferred method. The vendor should specify what type of access is available whether it's native software or cloud viewer accounts, or through a documented model export process that includes assumptions and reports.

Question:

11 Tamper-evident records

RFP reference: IV B 3 n

May a vendor-supplied manifest and PRC-managed immutable archive satisfy the requirement, or must tamper evidence be generated natively inside the modeling product? Please state any required signature, timestamp or validation standard.

Answer:

A vendor-supplied manifest with PRC-managed immutable archive would satisfy the requirement. We would require current validation standards including SHA-256 hash algorithm at minimum with timestamps.

Question:

12 Regulatory support

RFP reference: IV B 3 g and l

Please specify minimum support and permanent-remediation times during a filing window, after-hours expectations and whether named expert-witness testimony or hearing attendance is required beyond software and modeling support.

Answer:

No expert-witness testimony or hearing attendance is required beyond software and modeling support. The minimum support and remediation times during a filing window would be 1hr response time and 4hr remediation for critical incidents. There are no after-hours expectations.

Question:

13 References and project lessons

RFP reference: IV B 1 c and 2; Appendix F

For the two failures involving expert testimony, may anonymized cases with approved descriptions and verifiable outcomes be used when disclosure restrictions apply?

Answer:

Yes, anonymized cases with approved descriptions and verifiable outcomes may be used when disclosure restrictions apply.

Question:

14 Submission and confidential materials

RFP reference: II C 8; III B

Please confirm preferred electronic file formats and the process for confidential SOC reports within the single technical file requirement. If the proposal contains no qualifying confidential information, is a separate identical public copy unnecessary?

Answer:

We do not have a preferred electronic file format. If the proposal contains confidential information, as defined in Section I.F.5 of the RFP and detailed in Section II.C.8, Offeror must submit two separate electronic technical files via email to the Procurement Manager. One electronic version of the proposal should be an unredacted version for evaluation purposes. The second electronic file should be a redacted electronic file for the public file, in order to facilitate eventual public inspection of the non-confidential version of the proposal. The redacted version must be clearly marked as “REDACTED” or “Confidential” on the first page of the electronic file. If either file exceeds the 20mb limit, then each version can be sent in separate emails. If the proposal does not contain any confidential information, then a second copy is unnecessary.

Question:

15 Nodal and Zonal Analysis

RFP reference: 3. B.3.2

Will you receive runnable models and perform your own simulations on data from PNM, SPS/Xcel, EPE; or will you receive completed results to review?

Answer:

The Agency will be doing both; the Agency will perform its own simulations as well as receive completed results to review.

Question:

16 Cost Response Form

The cost response form only allows for a Per User Cost (quantity of 2). Energy Exemplar's PLEXOS system comes with a base package for a specific price and then there is additional Per User Costs for each Analyst License. How should we represent the cost of the base package?

Answer:

Please adjust pricing so that it fits within the RFP cost sheet.