

Request for Tenders for the Provision of a Capacity Auction Monitor. Joint request of the Commission for Regulation of Utilities ("CRU") and The Utility Regulator ("UR")

Competition Ref	011-03-639
Competition for	Request for Tenders for the Provision of a Capacity Auction Monitor. Joint request of the Commission for Regulation of Utilities ("CRU") and The Utility Regulator ("UR")
ID:	011-03-639
Tender Submission Date	By 12.00 noon on 10 July 2026

Post Tender Clarification Response Document
Clarification Deadline: 12.00 on 25 June 2026

#	Query	CRU Response
1	To what extent do you expect the proposed methodology to align with ISAE 3000 principles? Specifically, should bidders demonstrate full compliance with ISAE 3000 requirements, or is alignment at a principles level sufficient?	Alignment at a principles level is sufficient: bidders should demonstrate that their approach follows key ISAE 3000 requirements e.g. independence, evidence-based review, and clear reporting.
2	Do the RAs have any specific templates for the assurance reports, data assessment/analysis, issues logs, etc., that the Monitor would be expected to utilise or is it anticipated that such tools will be owned/developed by the appointed Monitor?	The Monitor will develop and own the reporting templates with the RAs providing oversight, review, and agreement on the methodology, rather than prescribing standard templates.
3	How will access to qualification and auction data from the SOs be managed? If we intend to use data analytic tools to support our assurance are there secure platforms for sharing/accessing any relevant data?	Access to qualification and auction data will be through secure, SO-managed systems, typically on a read-only basis with the Monitor fixed in the process. There are no standard analytics platforms provided by the RAs, so bidders are expected to bring their own tools, ensuring they can be used securely and in line with the SOs' and RAs' data access and confidentiality requirements.
4	The reports are required to be submitted to the RAs and SOs within two working days of provisional results. Is the Monitor or the client responsible for determining appropriate redactions for the published version?	Responsibility for redactions rests with the Monitor, who prepares a version of the report with any sensitive information removed. The RAs can review or request changes if needed, and the SOs are responsible for publishing the final redacted report.
5	The RfT notes that the Monitor is required to discuss draft reports with the Contract Manager. Given the short timeframe for delivery of reports, can you confirm how you envisage the review and feedback on drafts working.	The turnaround is currently tight; however, a Modification is currently under review with the potential to extend this period from 2 working days to 5 working days for both the Qualification and Auction reports. This should provide enough time for the Monitor and SOs to clarify outstanding issues before report is forwarded to the RAs.
6	Please could you clarify whether you expect the Fixed Fee to include or exclude travel expenses? In the overall RfT document, under section 2.10: Pricing, page 15, the text says "All prices quoted must be all-inclusive (i.e. including but not being limited to shipping, packaging, delivery, ancillary costs and all other costs/expenses)" which suggests inclusion of travel expenses. However, in Document C, which is the template for providing the price, the text says "All prices quoted must be inclusive of all costs	The Fixed Fee should be inclusive of all costs, excluding travel and subsistence expenses, which should be costed or claimed separately where relevant as per the process outlined at Section C3 of the TRD.

	(excluding travel expenses refer to Section C3)."	
7	Could you please clarify the following: a) The total number of Capacity Auctions that the indicative contract value of €883,000 (excl. VAT, including extension) has been based upon (i.e. seven or eight); and b) Whether the provision for any additional T-3, T-2, or T-1 auctions is included within this figure, or whether such auctions should be priced separately as additional auctions. Context of clarification In Part 1: Introduction, section 1.6 of the RFT, the following is stated "the proposed Services Contract is a total of approximately €883,000 (excl. VAT) including extension." In Appendix 1: Requirements and Specifications, section Confirmed Capacity Auction Timetable, the following is stated "It is expected that at least two Capacity Auctions will be held each Calendar year for future Capacity Years." In Annex A, section Period of Monitors Report of the RFT, the following is stated "In general, it would be expected that two Capacity Auctions will fall within each year for which the Capacity Market Auditor is appointed." However, the Confirmed Capacity Auction Timetable indicates that only one Capacity Auction (the T-4 for CY 2029/2030) is scheduled for 2026, which appears inconsistent with the expectation of two auctions per year referenced elsewhere. Tenderers note that these statements can be interpreted in two different ways: Based on the Confirmed Capacity Auction Timetable, one (1) Capacity Auction is scheduled for 2026 (the T-4 for CY 2029/2030), with two (2) Capacity Auctions in each of 2027, 2028 and 2029, resulting in a total of seven (7) Capacity Auctions over the four-year Term (including extension); or Based on the statement in Annex A that two Capacity Auctions are expected per year, this would result in two (2) Capacity Auctions in each of 2026, 2027, 2028 and 2029, resulting in a total of eight (8) Capacity Auctions over the four-year Term (including extension).	There will be two Capacity Auctions completed in 2026— a T-4 auction which took place in March, and a T-1 auction planned for July. The commencement of the T-4 2030/31 Capacity Auction has begun with Qualification likely to take place in November 2026. T-4 auctions occur annually, while the Capacity Market Code allows the RAs to determine whether additional T-1, T-2 or T-3 auctions are required; historically, most years have included both a T-4 and a T-1. Accordingly, it is expected that at least two Capacity Auctions will take place each year, although discussions are ongoing which may result in three auctions being held in 2027.
8	In Appendix 1: Requirements and Specifications, section Confirmed Capacity Auction Timetable, the following is stated "It is expected that at least two Capacity Auctions will be held each Calendar year for future Capacity Years."	The reference to "at least two Capacity Auctions per calendar year" should be understood as a general expectation rather than a fixed annual distribution across the contract term.

	Can you please clarify the assumed distribution of these auctions across each year of the Term (including extension).	While the documents indicate that two auctions per year is typical—reflecting the annual T-4 auction and the potential for an additional T-1, T-2 or T-3 auction—the exact number and timing in any given year cannot be confirmed in advance and may vary depending on system requirements. Accordingly, no defined distribution (e.g. two auctions in every year) should be assumed; instead, the timetable provided reflects only known or planned auctions at the time, with further auctions potentially arising over the term (including any extension). Tenderers should therefore take the approach that auction volumes may vary year-to-year.
9	In Appendix 1: Requirements and Specifications, section Deliverables/Tasks of the RFT, the following is stated, the Monitor is required to "ensure that the Capacity Auction is conducted in line with the Capacity Auction algorithm". Please clarify the following: a) There doesn't appear to be any specific mention of "Algorithm in other documents referenced within the RFT, can you please clarify what is meant by Algorithm in the context of the Capacity Auction b) Whether the RAs / SOs will provide the Monitor with the algorithm source code / specification.	The "Capacity Auction algorithm" refers to the underlying auction clearing methodology and calculations used by the System Operators to determine auction outcomes, as defined in the Capacity Market Code and associated processes. While not explicitly labelled as such in the documents, it covers the logic implemented within the auction systems. The Monitor will be given appropriate access to systems, data and documentation to assess compliance. This does not necessarily extend to full algorithm source code but will be sufficient to verify that the process has been correctly applied.
10	In Appendix 1: Requirements and Specifications, section Capacity Auction Report of the RFT, the following is stated, "the Monitor is to prepare a version (which is to exclude participant sensitive information) for the SOs." Please confirm if it is the responsibility of the Monitor to determine of what "participant sensitive information" is, or will this be defined and provided to the Monitor so that this can be complied with for the issuance of that particular report?	Responsibility for redactions rests with the Monitor, who prepares a version of the report with any sensitive information removed. The RAs can review or request changes if needed, and the SOs are responsible for publishing the final redacted report.
11	In Appendix 1: Requirements and Specifications, section Confirmed Capacity Auction Timetable of the RFT, the T-4 2029/30 cycle is shown to have commenced (Provisional Qualification 20/11/2025, Auction Date 26/03/2025, Provisional Results 14/04/2026, Final Auction Results 05/05/2026) Please confirm whether the newly appointed Monitor will be required to commence work on the T-4 2029/30 cycle, or whether the newly appointed Monitor would be required to commence it's role with regard to the next upcoming auction cycle following the appointment of the Monitor as part of this RFT process.	The newly appointed Monitor would be required to commence it's role with regard to the next upcoming auction cycle following the appointment of the Monitor as part of this RFT process. This will include the T-4 2030/31 Capacity Auction which has commenced with the Monitor responsible for the production of a Qualification report in November 2026 in line with the publication of the Provisional Qualification Results.
12	In Annex A Terms of Reference for Capacity Auction Monitor, section Contractual and	At present, it is not envisaged that a definitive list of named systems will be provided in advance, as these are

	Governance Arrangements of the RFT, the following is stated, "the Monitor will require read-only access to the qualification and auction systems and to the Qualification Capacity Register and Capacity and Trade Register." Please provide the names of the auction systems and registers including those involved in calculations that will be in scope, and to which the Monitor will require access to.	operational systems owned and maintained by the System Operators. Instead, the expectation is that the Monitor will be granted appropriate read-only access to all relevant systems and data necessary to fulfil its assurance role, regardless of system naming or underlying architecture.
13	In Annex A Terms of Reference for Capacity Auction Monitor, section Contractual and Governance Arrangements of the RFT, the following is stated, "the Monitor will require read-only access to the qualification and auction systems and to the Qualification Capacity Register and Capacity and Trade Register." Please confirm whether all of these systems are managed by yourselves or by a third-party.	From the perspective of the Regulatory Authorities (RAs), these systems are not directly managed by the RAs themselves. Instead, they are owned and maintained by the System Operators, who are responsible for the operation of the qualification process and capacity auctions. The RAs oversee the process from a regulatory and governance standpoint, while the System Operators may utilise third-party or internally developed systems to deliver these functions. As such, access for the Monitor will be facilitated via the System Operators regardless of whether the underlying systems are directly operated or supported by third-party providers.
14	In Annex A: Terms of Reference for Capacity Auction Monitor, section Limitations and exclusions from scope of the RFT, the following is stated "The determination of the Local Capacity Constraints and their underlying methodology (set out in section F.4 of the Code) is a technical area which will lie outside the Capacity Auction Monitor's area of expertise. As a result, the Monitor's scope shall be limited to including the compliance by the System Operators with the methodology for determining Local Capacity Constraints, including following of any relevant procedures and provisions of appropriate process documentation." Please clarify whether it is the responsibility of the Monitor to perform procedures to conclude whether the System Operators are compliant with the underlying methodology, or if this is to be determined by another stakeholder, the results of which will be provided to the Monitor for consideration within the scope of the RFT?	It is the responsibility of the Capacity Auction Monitor to perform procedures to assess whether the System Operators have complied with the defined methodology for determining Local Capacity Constraints. The Monitor is not expected to independently re-perform or opine on the technical design of the methodology. Other stakeholders are responsible for the development and approval of the methodology itself. The Monitor's role is therefore to review how the methodology has been applied in practice, using available evidence, rather than relying solely on conclusions provided by others.
15	In Appendix 1: Requirements and Specifications, section Introduction of the RFT, the following is stated "The successful awarding of capacity via the auction process has an annual cost in the order of €800-900m across the island." We also note in the 2022 RFT, this value was £300 -£400m. Please confirm the following: a) Whether the scope, scale, or complexity of the audit work has materially changed compared to previous contract terms; and b) Whether tenderers should anticipate any	Tenderers should not assume a material change in the volume of audit/assurance activity per auction relative to historical levels. While auction parameters (e.g. procurement volumes and market dynamics) may vary year-to-year, the nature and extent of the Monitor's processes, reporting requirements and timelines remain broadly consistent, with two reports required per auction and similar levels of engagement before, during and after the auction. In summary, although the monetary scale of the auctions has increased, this does not materially alter the expected level of effort per auction, which should be assumed to be in line with recent historical experience.

	change in the volume of audit activity per auction relative to historical levels.	
16	In Annex A: Terms of Reference for Capacity Auction Monitor, section Contractual and Governance Arrangements, the following is stated "An opinion is to be provided using the approach set out in the International Standard on Assurance Engagements 3000 (ISAE 3000) – Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information." Please confirm whether the ISAE 3000 opinions required to be issued within the scope of this RFT should be conducted as reasonable assurance engagements, or a limited assurance engagements.	Checks should be conducted to reasonable assurance standard.
17	In Appendix 1: Requirements and Specifications, section Deliverables/Tasks, the following is stated "Make recommendations on the changes to the Capacity Market Code, Auction Guidelines and User Guides." Tenderers note that the provision of recommendations of this nature is not typically included within the scope of an ISAE 3000 assurance engagement, as ISAE 3000 is focused on the provision of an assurance opinion rather than advisory or consultative output. Please clarify the following: a) The expected extent and depth of the recommendations required, for example, whether these would be limited to observations identified during the course of the assurance work (i.e. matters noted upon review that may warrant updating), or whether a more in-depth, standalone review of the Capacity Market Code, Auction Guidelines and User Guides is expected. b) Whether it is acceptable for any such recommendations to be presented in a separate deliverable or document outside of the ISAE 3000 assurance report, in order to maintain the integrity and independence of the assurance opinion. c) The expected timing and frequency of these recommendations (e.g. per auction, annually, or on an ad hoc basis).	Recommendations are intended to be proportionate and observation-based, arising from issues identified during assurance work rather than from a standalone review. They can be presented separately from the ISAE 3000 opinion to preserve independence. Timing is expected to align with auction reporting outputs, with flexibility to raise additional recommendations where material issues are identified.
18	General Question Is the expectation that the report will follow the same format / content as those previously published?	Although not strictly required, it would be beneficial to maintain consistency to ensure external readers have a stable and coherent understanding.
19	General Question How many calculations require testing?	There is no fixed or explicitly stated number of "calculations" that require testing. The Monitor is expected to review calculations on a risk-based basis, focusing on that material to the qualification and auction processes and necessary to

		conclude whether the Capacity Market Code has been applied correctly.
20	General Question: Outside of what is disclosed in the RFT are there any other rules and regulations that need to be adhered to?	The newly appointed Monitor should refer to B.10 of the capacity market code and the original terms of reference as linked in the RFT. The RAs may also alter the Terms of Reference during the term of the contract.
21	General Question: Do you have a list of controls/processes/checks that are mapped to the CMC. If so, could you please share these?	The Monitor should refer to the original terms of reference as reflected in the RFT as well as the Capacity Market Code by which they will assess the workings of the System Operators.
22	General Question: If you can't share your controls/processes/checks, could you please confirm how many there are in scope for this report?	As above.
23	General Question: Are there any third parties involved in your processes/checks?	There are no third parties involved in the processes or checks from an RAs perspective.
24	General Question: How many control owners / operators will be involved in the work?	There are no fixed number of control owners/operators is defined in the documentation; tenderers should assume engagement with multiple stakeholders across the System Operators' teams.
25	General Question: Is testing expected to be completed remotely or in person?	It is expected this could be completed via a hybrid approach and what is deemed suitable to complete the work required.
26	General Question: If testing is expected to be in person, where are control owners /operators based? Can you confirm this along with an estimation as to how many visits / meetings will be required.	As above.
27	General Question: Would you require us to present the report or any findings to any third parties?	As per the Capacity Market Code and the original terms of reference, the Monitor may be asked to present their findings with the SEM Committee – particularly if sensitive findings have been uncovered.
28	General Question: Our team is distributed across Ireland and India. Whilst there is no difference in quality, we appreciate that sometimes there are sensitivities around using an offshore team. Can you confirm if we are able to use the hybrid team or whether you require an Ireland only delivery team?	There is no specific requirement for the delivery team to be based in Ireland as work can be conducted remotely.
29	General Question: Is there any possibility of either downloading data to run through our analytics tools, or of installing tools in your environments to interrogate data?	The Monitor will be provided with sufficient access to data, systems and outputs to perform its assurance activities, and any specific requirements for data extraction or analytical tooling would need to be agreed with the System Operators subject to security and confidentiality controls.
30	Can you confirm what the expected date of appointment is and in particular the first expected capacity auction to fall into the scope of this RFT?	The appointment is ideally expected to be finalised as soon as practicable. The first Capacity Auction within scope will be the T-4 2030/31 auction, with the main Qualification review anticipated to take place in November 2026. A Qualification Report from the Capacity Auction Monitor will be required in line with the completion of the Qualification process by the System Operators.
31	Contract Queries	See Section 2.3 (Services Contract) of the RFT. Please refer to this section and the Services Contract included at Appendix 5 of the RFT. Please note that no amendments, qualifications, or changes to the Services Contract will be considered.

The Deadline for Clarifications: 25/06/2026