

4. Supply chain issues, due to the pandemic and tariffs on the solar industry, for example, have been widely acknowledged. Did these issues impact your ability to bid in the Spring 2022 Indexed REC RFP? If so, please explain and include a description of any related costs and risks to renewables developers.

Response: Clearway is aware of and has—like other industry participants—been directly impacted by supply chain issues. *Confidential*** XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX.***End Confidential*****

5. Please describe any current issues experienced related to siting, permitting, and interconnection and how these issues lengthen a project’s development timeline. How long should the deadline be for projects to become operational, without accounting for any extensions?

Response: Clearway’s observation is that generally speaking land use permits and other siting issues can be challenging in Illinois, primarily due to local ordinances. These are typically issues that would be addressed after an award is made for typical utility-scale procurements. To prevent unrealistic expectations and a bidding premium from the additional cost of pushing that work pre-bid (and the increased risk related to expanding the pre-bid scope of work), Clearway suggests allowing four years for a project to be operational without accounting for any extensions.

6. Under the Illinois RPS, payments for RECs are subject to available funds anticipated to be collected pursuant to Section 1-75(c)(6) of the IPA Act and Section 16-108(k) of the Public Utilities Act, and the utility counterparty is not required to advance payment that exceed such available funds. Section 16-108(k) of the Public Utilities Act, as amended by Public Act 102-0662, provides for unspent budget in a delivery year to roll-over to the following delivery year for a period of 5 years to improve the likelihood that funds are available for payment. Do you believe this change adequately mitigates non-payment risks or despite this change, do you perceive the statutory budget constraint to be an obstacle to your participation in the Indexed REC RFP?
 - a. Are there examples for how this issue is dealt with in other jurisdictions where there is a statutory budget constraint?
 - b. Is there additional information or analysis related to procurement budgets for Indexed RECs that would be helpful to be provided to prospective bidders?

Response: The statutory budget constraint, while somewhat improved by Public Act 102-0662 as it relates to carryforwards and preventing large customer refunds while funds are committed, non-payment risk still ultimately resides with the renewable developer. The non-payment risk is essentially any time over the 20-year contract obligations exceed the budget and carryforwards, which (due to the nature of indexed RECs) is difficult to predict too far into the future. The risk of non-payment for the Indexed REC Product creates challenges with respect to the prospects of tax equity financing as well as adversely effects the commercial viability of a project.

