

# Green Choice Program (GCP)

## Proponent Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

Updated August 28<sup>th</sup>, 2024

Unless the context otherwise requires, all capitalized terms used but not defined herein shall have the meanings set forth in the RFP.

**Update from previous FAQ upload:** The PA has released an updated version of the Proponent FAQ for interested GCP Proponents. New responses are highlighted in yellow. The questions came from inquiries through our Contact Us page, and as questions posed during prior webinars. The PA holds the right to adjust information shared in the Proponent FAQ as needed to reflect the most updated information on the Procurement. Please note that questions regarding the PPA will be addressed through the formal UARB feedback process, which Proponents can learn more about [here](#).

RFP Section	Proponent Question	PA Response
2.7.1 CIB Funding	<b>If with the benefit of CIB funding Proponents are now able to bid below \$65/MWh who were not able to prior to the CIB funding, will they now also achieve the ten additional points in Section 6.1 of the GCP RFP?</b>	Proponents have the opportunity to resubmit pricing after incorporating CIB funding and all Proponents will be re-scored based on the new energy rate using the methodology prescribed in section 6.1. For avoidance of doubt, if Proponents bid below \$65/MWh after incorporating the CIB funding, they will receive 10 additional points under Section 6.1 of the GCP RFP.
2.7.1 CIB Funding	<b>Will the PPA will be amended to reflect the additional risk of uncertainty related to CIB funding availability in the future?</b>	<p>The Procurement Administrator does not intend to update the UARB Approved PPA to account for updated funding opportunities offered by the CIB. The Procurement Administrator does not view CIB funding as unique compared to other funding pathways and believes existing risks are manageable and have been considered in the PPA as drafted.</p> <p>The CIB will provide a term sheet that has been approved by their investment committee and board of directors to awarded projects. This term sheet will include the CIB's financing offer and conditions precedent that will</p>

		need to be fulfilled for each project to achieve financial close and access the capital.
<b>2.7.1 CIB Funding</b>	<b>Given that we have only had three working days with the CIB Pricing Template without any access to the CIB Project Loan and CIB Equity Loan agreements, will there be additional opportunities to submit questions and receive answers prior to the 9/13/24 deadline for the completed pricing models to CIB?</b>	The Procurement Administrator does not intend to update the UARB Approved PPA to account for updated funding opportunities offered by the CIB. Financing risks are typically monitored and managed by project developers. The Procurement Administrator does not view CIB funding as unique compared to other funding pathways and believes existing risks are manageable and have been considered in the PPA as drafted.
<b>General</b>	<b>Could the PA clarify whether projects that did not sign the RBP PPA will have negative points allotted to them under the GCP?</b>	<p>If a Proponent (i.e., a specific Project) executed a PPA with NSPI through the Rate Base Procurement and NSPI has terminated that PPA pursuant to a Seller Event of Default (under ss.10.1 and 10.2 of the PPA), they will receive a deduction of 7.5 points for their Proposal (3 points in Section 6.2.2 and 4.5 points in Section 6.2.3).</p> <p>In addition, a Project that is the subject of an existing PPA with Nova Scotia Power Incorporated may not apply to the GCP RFP, unless the application to this RFP involves a portion of the nameplate capacity that is not the subject of an existing PPA with Nova Scotia Power Incorporated.</p> <p>Lastly, pursuant to the regulations relating to the Procurement, the PA may exclude proposals from further evaluation if the PA is not satisfied that the proposal is technically feasible or if the bidder has the financial capacity or support to construct and operate the proposed facility.</p>
<b>General</b>	<b>Will there be another RFP/Bidding round for the GCP?</b>	RFP bids must be submitted during the submission window before the Proposal Submission Deadline, as outlined in Section 2.2 Milestones & Timeline of the RFP. There is anticipated to be only one round of submission and award for the GCP at this time.
<b>General</b>	<b>How many Proponents will be awarded in the GCP Procurement?</b>	To select the GCP portfolio, the PA will stack Proposals from the lowest to the highest Configuration Score. From this stack, it will select the Projects with the highest Configuration Scores to fill the GCP portfolio between 1,650 and 2,000 GWh, or a modified size in the appropriate circumstances. The PA

		estimates that it will select between 3 and 7 Proposals to fill this target. Each Selected Proponent will be required to execute the Agreement.
<b>General</b>	<b>What processes or projects are captured in the Minister of NRR's Directive issued to NSPI on January 16th, 2024?</b>	The Directive that was issued by the Minister on January 16 <sup>th</sup> to NSPI states that NSPI must provide the necessary equipment to maintain system reliability, stability and qualify for interconnected facilities procured under the Electricity Act's 4B (Rate Base Procurement) and 4BA (Green Choice Program). This excludes projects that have not been awarded as part of a government procurement process (e.g. Renewable to Retail or Designated Projects under 4AA).
<b>General</b>	<b>Will there be a minimum threshold for points for each section?</b>	The Minimum Criteria in the RFP must be satisfied to be considered for the RFP. Further, there are a number of Scored Criteria that require a minimum of 1 point in order to be eligible to become the Selected Proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 6.2.1 (Resource Assessment);</li> <li>• Section 6.2.2 (Financing Experience &amp; Plans);</li> <li>• Section 6.2.3 (Experience);</li> <li>• Section 6.2.5 (Project Site);</li> <li>• Section 6.3.1 (Engagement with the General Public); and</li> <li>• Section 6.3.2 (Engagement with the Mi'kmaq of Nova Scotia).</li> </ul>
<b>General</b>	<b>What is the expected PPA term?</b>	The Agreement Term is for a period of 25 years.
<b>General</b>	<b>Will projects be required to obtain third party certification of RECs (i.e., Green-e, ECOLOGO)?</b>	No. All RECs will be retired by Nova Scotia Power on behalf of GCP Participants because certification requires renewable energy generated to exceed any regulated renewable energy targets. You can make a credible renewable energy usage claim with GCP RECs that are not third-party certified according to the Greenhouse Gas Protocol Scope 2 Qualifying Criteria. Additional context is available under the GCP REC FAQ published to the <a href="#">Participant Resources</a> tab of the GCP website.
<b>General</b>	<b>How will the PA ensure fairness and transparency of the GCP? Will an audit be performed and made available to all Proponents?</b>	To ensure fairness and transparency, the PA will generally publicly post responses to comments and inquiries from interested parties on the GCP website.  Once the Selected Proponents have been awarded the opportunity to execute an Agreement with NSPI, the PA will write a report for the Minister which will contain, among other things, details of the steps the procurement administrator took to ensure a fair, transparent and competitive process.

		<p>Furthermore, all non-Selected Proponents will have the opportunity to request a debrief with the PA whereby the PA will provide Proponents guidance on how to improve their bids in future procurements.</p> <p>The release of the RFP and PPA draft documents for feedback is a key part of the fairness and transparency process.</p>
<b>General</b>	<b>Is the PA exploring the possibility to add hybrid project with energy storage in the Green Choice Program?</b>	The PA is not considering hybrid / energy storage solutions for the Green Choice Program at this time.
<b>1.1 Purpose</b>	<b>Could you please share which program, mechanism, or process enables the procurement of renewable electricity under the Green Choice Program?</b>	The Electricity Act allows the Green Choice Program to be carried out under the framework set out in the Green Choice Program Regulations. The Regulations were approved on August 29, 2023. An updated link will be provided once the Regulations are available online.
<b>1.1 Purpose</b>	<b>Can the PA define “Supplier?”</b>	Supplier is defined by the Green Choice Program Regulations and means an independent power producer as defined in the <i>Renewable Electricity Regulations</i> made under the Act.
<b>2.5.1 Milestones and Timeline</b>	<b>Does the Procurement Administrator have any updates on the timeline of the Green Choice Procurement?</b>	<p>Coho has issued Addendum 2 to the RFP to update the referenced milestones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NOITB Deadline – June 7, 2024</li> <li>• Inquiries Deadline – June 14, 2024</li> <li>• Proposal Submission Deadline – June 28, 2024</li> <li>• All subsequent milestones have been pushed back by 2 weeks to reflect the above delays</li> </ul>
<b>2.5.4.1 Notice of Intent to Bid</b>	<b>The Notice of Intent to Bid From indicates a provision of Class 3 estimate for Energy Rate and Capital Expenditure. Would a Proponent provide</b>	Yes, please provide this information for all outlined size configurations in the same form.

	<b>the following information for all outlined size configurations in the same form?</b>	
<b>2.5.4.2 Notice of Intent to Bid Fee</b>	<b>Can the Proponent request an invoice for the payment of the Notice of Intent to Bid Fees?</b>	The PA cannot provide an invoice for the NOITB payment, but we can provide confirmation of receipt. As a reminder, the Notice of Intent to Bid fee is payable by either a certified cheque, bank draft, or ACH. If you intend to use ACH to make the NOITB payment, please notify the PA via email as soon as possible and confirm the correct point of contact for any related communications.
<b>2.5.4.2 Notice of Intent to Bid Fee</b>	<b>Are ACH payments acceptable if making payments via certified cheque or bank draft is not possible for the NOITB payment?</b>	<p>If a Proponent is unable to pay the Notice of Intent to Bid fee via certified cheque or bank draft, ACH payments are acceptable. If a Proponent intends to use ACH to make the NOITB payment, please notify the PA via email (<a href="mailto:novascotia@cohoclimat.com">novascotia@cohoclimat.com</a>) <b>as soon as possible</b> and confirm the correct point of contact is for any related communications.</p> <p>The PA will then notify the Province, who will provide the contact with a letter on “Royal Bank” letterhead containing the account number, routing number, and Provincial contact information. Once payments are made, Proponents must forward us the proof of remittance or a payment confirmation to provide evidence that payment was made on or before the NOITB deadline.</p> <p>As a reminder, the NOITB form and fee is due for each Proposal intended to be submitted in the GCP.</p>
<b>2.7 Federal Funding</b>	<b>Will CIB or NRCan be providing federal funding opportunities for the GCP?</b>	As of now, CIB and SREPs will not be providing funding opportunities for Proponents seeking to bid into the GCP. Questions regarding federal programming should be submitted to the Government of Canada.
<b>3.1.1 Nova Scotia Transmission Network</b>	<b>Where can developers/ proponents gather transmission line data to support interconnection tie-in planning for their site?</b>	Please refer to the NSPI <a href="#">Generation Interconnection Procedures</a> for more information.
<b>3. Interconnection &amp; Ancillary Services</b>	<b>Can the PA clarify if NSP will require installation of centralized synchronous</b>	The PA will share updates regarding synchronous condensers when available, awaiting ongoing discussions with NSPI.

	<b>condensers or if each Proponent should budget separately for this equipment?</b>	
<b>3. Interconnection &amp; Ancillary Services</b>	<b>Can the PA clarify what interest is applicable to the repayment of amounts paid to NSP for Network Upgrades as stated in the GIA, and when such repayment would occur?</b>	The PA will share updates regarding repayment for Network Upgrades when available, awaiting ongoing discussions with NSPI.
<b>5.2 Renewable Low-Impact Electricity</b>	<b>Will technologies other than wind and solar (i.e., offshore wind, geothermal electricity) be eligible to participate in this RFP?</b>	No, only onshore wind and solar technologies will be considered in the GCP RFP.
<b>5.10 Nameplate Capacity</b>	<b>Is there a limit on the maximum project capacity?</b>	Yes, the PA will consider Proposals for Generation Facilities each up to 150 MW AC, up to an aggregate of 350 MW AC
<b>5.10 Nameplate Capacity</b>	<b>Is it correct to assume that the 150 MW limit is at the POI?</b>	The nameplate capacity limit is for the Project's nameplate capacity (i.e., as determined by the turbine manufacturer(s)) and must not exceed 150MW at alternating current (AC) capacity.
<b>6.1 Price</b>	<b>Will the PA consider lifting or raising the \$65 Price Cap, or indexing the Price?</b>	<p>The Procurement administrator has:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) amended the RFP draft to lift the Price Cap, and instead include language that Proposals with an Energy Rate below \$65/MWh will be awarded 10 additional points under Price. The remaining 25 points will be allocated based on the percentile ranking of the Proponent's proposed Energy Rate as currently described in Section 6.1 of the GCP RFP draft, and;</li> <li>2) amended the PPA draft to allow for indexation of the Energy Rate in accordance with the CPI published by <a href="#">Statistics Canada</a>. Escalation will be permitted to begin at the time of PPA execution until the earlier of: Project COD or December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2027.</li> </ol>

		Please note that submission of an RFI is required for consideration into the GCP RFP, and RFI deadline has now elapsed. The PA will not be considering Proposals who have not already submitted an RFI at this time.
<b>6.2.1 Resource Assessment</b>	<b>Under "Onsite Wind Data" it is specified that SCADA should be within 3 km of the site. Then part (b) specifies that the onsite data must either be co-located with sodar or lidar OR be 50m or higher and have a minimum of two heights. Does this apply to operational turbine SCADA as well? Would SCADA qualify if we only have one height and no co-located measurements?</b>	In Section 6.2.1 of the RFP, Point (a) references the requirements for the "location" of the tower. If using SCADA data, the collection point must be located within 3km of the site. Point (b) refers to the height and device criteria. Therefore, SCADA data must be both: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Located within 3km of the Site on which the Generating Facility is proposed to be located; AND</li> </ol> Meet one of the criteria for height and devices (in order to effectively measure the vertical wind profile)
<b>6.2.1 Resource Assessment</b>	<b>The language under the definition of Onsite Wind Data states "iv. if using operational turbine SCADA data, within 3 km of the portion of the Site on which the Generating Facility is proposed to be located;" Could the PA clarify what is defined as a "portion of the Site on which the Generating Facility is proposed"? Does this mean the Development Boundary of the project?</b>	'Portion of the Site on which the Generating Facility is proposed to be located' is not the same as the Project Boundary of the project. If providing operational turbine SCADA data, it should be within 3km from the proposed location of a Generating Facility (i.e., a turbine).
<b>6.2.1 Resource Assessment</b>	<b>Is LIDAR or SODAR that is located on the ground eligible to be considered as Onsite Wind Data?</b>	For LIDAR or SODAR to be considered as "Onsite Wind Data", the Meteorological Tower that has been co-located must meet one of the following criteria for height:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. 30 meters or higher and that has been co-located with remote sensing equipment (LIDAR or SODAR), for which the equipment has been calibrated. Evidence of equipment calibration must be included in the Resource Assessment report;</li> <li>ii. 50 meters or higher that has been co-located with remote sensing equipment (LIDAR or SODAR), for which the equipment has not yet been calibrated. Must include a minimum of two wind speed measurement heights, separated by at least 15 meters;</li> <li>iii. A minimum height coincident with or higher than the lowest measurement level of a vertically measuring co-located remote sensing equipment (LIDAR or SODAR) used in the acquisition of wind speed and wind direction at multiple levels, for which the equipment has been calibrated.</li> </ul>
<b>6.2.1 Resource Assessment</b>	<b>If co-location of the LIDAR or SODAR against a met mast needs to be done in order to verify the device was measuring correctly can it be done off-site and after the completion of the LIDAR or SODAR measurement onsite?</b>	Co-locating the remote sensing device (RSD – LIDAR or SODAR) with a met tower cannot be performed offsite for the Resource Assessment. The benefit of co-locating onsite is to measure the correlation between the two different measurement techniques in the site-specific terrain. Doing a post-deployment co-location offsite would help confirm proper functioning of the RSD, but it does not tell the Procurement Administrator anything about how well the device worked in the terrain at the project.
<b>6.2.1 Resource Assessment</b>	<b>As per section 6.2.1.3, to score maximum points for wind Projects, the Proponent must include Onsite Wind Data (per section 6.2.1) with a dataset of more than three years from at least one Meteorological Tower and at least one measurement location with at least one year of data per 25MW of nameplate capacity. Can the PA confirm that only the dataset of more than three</b>	Correct, at least one of the measurement locations must have 3 years or more of measurement data, but one location will suffice. Incremental measurement locations must have at least one year of data to be included as an additional location for part b.



	<b>years from one Meteorological Tower must conform to the definition of Onsite Wind Data and that all incremental Meteorological Tower datasets do not need to conform?</b>	
<b>6.2.1 Resource Assessment</b>	<b>Could the PA clarify how many measurement locations will be required for wind Projects of 26-50MW and 51-75MW nameplate capacity to score maximum points?</b>	To achieve maximum points in Resource Assessment for 26 – 50MW, there must be at least 3 measurement locations. For 51 – 75MW, there must be at least four measurement locations, etc.
<b>6.2.1 Resource Assessment</b>	<b>Does an operating wind turbine meet the definition of a Wind Meteorological Tower?</b>	Yes, an operating turbine can be counted as a Wind Meteorological Tower. However, for the Wind Data to be counted as “Onsite Wind Data” it must be within “3 km of the portion of the Site on which the Generating Facility is proposed to be located” in accordance with Section 6.2.1 of the RFP.
<b>6.2.1 Resource Assessment</b>	<b>Why is SCADA data limited to 3km instead of 5km like the met towers?</b>	Scoring for Resource Assessment took into consideration the differences in types of data and have determined a maximum of 3km for SCADA data to be most appropriate.
<b>6.2.1 Resource Assessment</b>	<b>If providing operational turbine SCADA data, it should be within 3km from the proposed location of a turbine. Can this also include any amount of rounding down to 3KM from 3.XXX KM?</b>	As stated in the RFP, the SCADA should be within 3km but the Procurement Administrator will consider accepting distances slightly above 3km.
<b>6.2.3 Experience</b>	<b>In order for experience to qualify, does the Project Team need to have planned, developed, financed, constructed and operated a project 80% of nameplate capacity wholly, or will</b>	The Procurement Administrator is looking to understand the Proponent’s experience with different stages of developing Renewable Low-Impact Electricity Generation Facilities that are in a similar size range as the Proponent’s proposed capacity. Hence, both scenarios will receive 3 points in 6.2.3.1 (four or more facilities with minimum 80% capacity) if the Proponent-provided information is deemed sufficient by the Procurement Administrator.

	pulling experience from different projects for different project phases be valid?	
<b>6.2.4 Environmental Risk</b>	<b>Do proposals that have received EA approvals with conditions required to complete an Environmental Risk Questionnaire?</b>	No, a Project that has received EA approval is not required to submit an Environmental Risk Questionnaire. However, they must submit evidence that they have received EA approval. In addition, Proponents are still required to create and submit Environmental Risk maps as described in section 6.2.4b.
<b>6.2.4 Environmental Risk</b>	<b>Question 7 of the Environmental Risk Questionnaire asks, "Does the Project Boundary avoid overlap with Wetlands?". Can the PA please clarify how this question should be answered if Project Boundary/Wetland overlap occurs on an existing road that is proposed to be used as an access road?</b>	The project boundary is defined as the "...footprints of land <b>disturbed</b> for the construction and development of the Generating Facility..." Existing access roads would not result in disturbance of land and should therefore not be considered as a part of the Project Boundary in the response to this (or other Environmental Risk Questionnaire) questions. For avoidance of doubt, any new access roads constructed for the purposes of the proposed Project will be considered as part of the Project Boundary.
<b>6.2.4 Environmental Risk</b>	<b>In the Environmental Risk scoring category, it is stated that "Proponents must include, if applicable, completed field investigations or field surveys." In many cases, the fieldwork has been completed but has not yet been written up as a report. Is this information only needed to support a statement that would contradict data on the landscape viewer, or do you want these in all cases if they have been completed?</b>	Please provide field surveys in all cases if they have been completed as applicable to the specific Project and ERQ response.

<p><b>6.2.4 Environmental Risk</b></p>	<p><b>A Project that has received EA approval receives full points without needing to submit an Environmental Risk Questionnaire (ERQ). However, an EA allows the Proponent to demonstrate mitigation to reduce negative impacts. Similarly, if the Proponent provides detailed mitigation for negative impact in the Proposal, can the Proponent respond to the questions in the ERQ based on the detailed mitigation?</b></p>	<p>An approved Environmental Assessment (EA) is a verifiable signal of development maturity in Nova Scotia and is evaluated as such in the RFP. Proponents who have not yet received an approved EA should answer the ERQ questions as they are posed. Kindly provide mitigation plans, and these may be taken into consideration in evaluation, but your responses to the ERQ should reflect the Yes/No answer as the Project is planned.</p>
<p><b>6.2.5 Project Site</b></p>	<p><b>Are collector lines that run from the Generating Facility (i.e. WTG) to the substation also considered part of the "Interconnection Facility"? If not, how are collector lines classified?</b></p>	<p>The Procurement Administrator apologizes for the prior miscommunication regarding this question. Collector lines (i.e., medium voltage lines that run from the turbine to a substations) should be classified as "Interconnection Customers' Interconnection Facilities" for the purposes of the GIA and Interconnection Facilities for the purposes of the GCP RFP (i.e., permitted to be sited on Crown lands). Please note, Proponents will be required to apply for an easement, following GCP award, for any Interconnection Facilities intended to be sited on Crown lands. Further, turbines are considered Generating Facilities and NOT permitted to be sited on Crown lands.</p>
<p><b>6.2.5 Project Site</b></p>	<p><b>What part of the Project Boundary is permitted to be sited on Ineligible Land?</b></p>	<p>Interconnection Facilities (such as transmission lines) and roads may be sited on Crown lands (but not Protected Land) on a case-by-case basis. Proponents intending to site Interconnection Facilities or roads on Crown lands must complete an <a href="#">application</a> with Land Services. Successful participation in the GCP RFP does not guarantee that the Project will obtain the required authorization to include Crown lands in the Site.</p>
<p><b>6.2.5 Project Site</b></p>	<p><b>What part of the Project Boundary is <u>not</u> permitted to be sited on Ineligible Land?</b></p>	<p>Generating Facilities and Major Equipment are not permitted to be sited on Ineligible Land. Any Proposals that contain Generating Facilities or Major Equipment proposed to be sited on Ineligible Land (i.e., Crown land or Parks and Protected Areas) will not pass the Minimum Criteria in the RFP.</p>

		No part of the Project Boundary may be sited within Protected Land. For avoidance of doubt, this includes Generation Facilities, Major Equipment, Interconnection Facilities, and roads.
<b>6.2.5 Project Site</b>	<b>What is the rationale for the Ineligible Land guidance?</b>	<p>Land conservation targets and the renewable energy targets have competing land interests both on the same timeline within the <a href="#">Environmental Goals and Climate Change Reduction Act</a>, which commits the Province to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserving 20% of total land and water mass in the Province by 2030; and</li> <li>• A protected areas strategy to be released by December 31, 2023; and</li> <li>• 80% of electricity in the Province will be supplied by renewable energy by 2030</li> </ul> <p>The total sum of all Crown lands in Nova Scotia is 26% meaning that Crown lands may be needed to meet the 2030 targets for land conservation; however, while the updated protected areas strategy is being drafted, we need to ensure that both interests are being addressed.</p> <p>Engagement on the strategy is open now, please find out more here: <a href="https://ns20by2030.ca/">https://ns20by2030.ca/</a></p>
<b>6.2.5 Project Site</b>	<b>If I applied for a Crown land lease for Generating Facilities prior to the GCP RFP launch, does this mean I am unable to access those lands for the submission to the Green Choice Program RFP?</b>	<p>Any Generating Facilities and Major Equipment proposed on Crown lands or Protected Land is not eligible for participation in the RFP irrespective of whether the Proponent has a pre-existing application for a Crown lands lease.</p> <p>Projects with current documented approvals for right of way access or easements for Interconnection Facilities or roads may submit this documentation as evidence of site control for this portion of their project; however, it is not a requirement to have obtained such pre-existing approvals.</p>
<b>6.2.5 Project Site</b>	<b>If I have applied to Crown Lands for an easement or right of way access to support my bid in the GCP</b>	An application to Crown Lands must follow proper procedure and there are no timelines that can be guaranteed. A decision on your application for an easement of right of way on Crown Lands may not be issued before the Proposal Submission Deadline.

	<b>RFP, will I have a decision before the RFP bid closes?</b>	
<b>6.2.5 Project Site</b>	<b>If I submitted an interconnection request for the GCP with a project that is no longer eligible due to the Project Site requirements surrounding Crown Lands, what should I do?</b>	<p>Proponents were given opportunity to modify their proposed Project to avoid siting Generating Facilities (including Major Equipment) on Crown lands. The GCP RFP states that “The nameplate capacity of the Project must be between 40% and 100% of the nameplate capacity submitted in the Interconnection Feasibility Study as permitted under Section 4.4.1 of the GIP”. For the avoidance of doubt, Proponents who resubmit an RFI in this instance will not be required to resubmit an Interconnection Request to NSPI, unless their modification results in a nameplate capacity less than 40% of the nameplate capacity submitted in the Interconnection Feasibility Study. Please note that any change to the IR’s siting location as part of this modification will be subject to a revalidation of site control by NSPSO per the GIP.</p> <p>If Proponents are unable to modify your proposed Project to avoid siting Generating Facilities (including Major Equipment) on Crown lands, the PA encourages Proponents to withdraw their Interconnection Request to ensure the timely processing of other requests. Please reach out to <a href="mailto:Mohit.agarwal@nspower.ca">Mohit.agarwal@nspower.ca</a> (with <a href="mailto:novascotia@cohoclimate.com">novascotia@cohoclimate.com</a> in CC) to confirm the withdrawal of your IX request.</p>
<b>6.2.5.3 Scored Criteria for Project Site</b>	<b>DNRR is currently not accepting applications for easements on Crown lands. Is this approach being taken across Proponents? How is the PA ensuring fairness?</b>	<p>The Procurement Administrator (PA) is only able to evaluate bids with the information that is submitted as part of a Proposal. If a Proponent can demonstrate evidence that they have achieved full Site Control, they will receive the appropriate points allocation. If another Proponent cannot demonstrate evidence of full Site Control, they will not receive the additional point.</p> <p>The PA’s understanding of DNRR’s current approach to applications for easements on Crown lands is that they are all being treated equally (i.e., no new applications are being accepted). If a Proponent received an easement several years ago and are able to demonstrate that they have secured an easement, they will be evaluated as such.</p>

<p><b>6.3.1 Engagement with the General Public</b></p>	<p><b>Is there is a limit to how far Proponents for the GCP bid can/should go back to detail community engagement efforts, if they were also a Proponent who also submitted Projects into the 2022 Rate Based Procurement?</b></p>	<p>Proponent should include all communications logs relevant to the proposed project for as long as you have been collecting them. This is because documentation that was submitted as part of the RBP proposal (i.e., submitted last year) will not be considered for GCP evaluation if it is not also submitted as part of the GCP proposal.</p>
<p><b>6.3.1 Engagement with the General Public</b></p>	<p><b>How was the Community Consultant selected?</b></p>	<p>The Community Consultant was selected by the PA. The Community Consultant will still evaluate projects that have already had open houses by evaluating Proponent records. Proponents will be expected to cooperate with any data requests made by the Community Consultant regarding community engagement. Note: No information will be requested that is not expected to be submitted as part of a Proposal.</p> <p>More information on the Community Consultant will be available shortly; however, in the interim, Proponents are encouraged to continue their planned engagement activities with communities without delay.</p>
<p><b>6.3.1 Engagement with the General Public</b></p>	<p><b>The Community Consultant will be conducting surveys among residents of the Communities that will be impacted by proposed GCP projects. Will Proponents be made aware of the timing of these surveys?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the Community Consultant will notify affected Proponents with general timeline details as soon as they are finalized, prior to the surveys being distributed to residents.</p>
<p><b>6.3.1 Engagement with the General Public</b></p>	<p><b>Regarding Community Liaison Committees (CLCs). In some cases, Proponents may offer to create CLCs, but Community members may not wish to participate. How will this impact scoring?</b></p>	<p>The formation of a CLC is intended to be a meaningful and formal way for Proponents to engage with impacted communities. The creation of a CLC awards one point for Proponent efforts, and additional points are awarded based on the level of meaningful engagement Proponents and the CLC have. Feedback from the CLC will be taken into consideration by the Community Consultant in evaluating this section.</p>

<p><b>6.3.1 Engagement with the General Public</b></p>	<p><b>Is the Proponent expected to create a CLC even though there is chance through the competitive procurement may not guarantee the project gets built?</b></p>	<p>No, Proponents will not be able to view, clarify, or contest the contents in the Community Consultant's final report to the Procurement Administrator. After the Bid Submission Deadline, the PA intends to evaluate bids independent of additional Proponent input out of principles of fairness. Therefore, the PA and Community Consultant encourage all Proponents to begin engaging with the public and sharing updates on the engagement early and often, while providing clarity on engagement efforts ahead of bid submission. Proponents who are not successful in the RFP will have an opportunity to request a debriefing on their proposal, which would include feedback on the Community Consultant's evaluation.</p>
<p><b>6.3.1 Engagement with the General Public</b></p>	<p><b>For the requirement in the RFP to give 30 notification after Final RFP Issuance, if Proponents keep the website updated with contact information and Proponents keep their notices up of intent to bid into the GCP, is this appropriate to receive points?</b></p>	<p>Correct. Proponents who had notices ahead of 30 days can rely on those notices as long as the notice remains public and viewable at the 30 days mark. Proponents are expected to provide documentation (i.e., screenshot that the notice remains on the website 30 days after RFP issuance) to demonstrate the requirement is met.</p>
<p><b>6.3.1 Engagement with the General Public</b></p>	<p><b>Can you give an example of how a proponent would score 1pt vs 3 pts with the CLC?</b></p>	<p>The formation of a CLC is intended to be a meaningful and formal way for Proponents to engage with impacted communities. The creation of a CLC awards one point for Proponent efforts, and additional points are awarded based on the level of meaningful engagement Proponents and the CLC have. Feedback from the CLC will be incorporated into the Community Consultant's evaluation of this section.</p>
<p><b>6.3.1 Engagement with the General Public</b></p>	<p><b>Prior to submission, will proponents have an opportunity to review your report on their Project to clarify any items?</b></p>	<p>No, Proponents will not be able to view, clarify, or contest the contents in the the Community Consultant's final report to the Procurement Administrator. After the Proposal Submission Deadline, the PA intends to evaluate bids independent of additional Proponent input out of principles of fairness. Therefore, the PA and Community Consultant encourage all Proponents to begin engaging with the public and sharing updates on the engagement early and often, while providing clarity on engagement efforts ahead of bid submission.</p>

<p><b>6.3.1 Engagement with General Public</b></p>	<p><b>Could you provide an update on the status of the surveys that are supposed to be sent out by the community consultant?</b></p>	<p>Generally, surveys will be conducted once open houses have taken place. There will be exceptions to this rule, notably in areas where more than one project is proposed, or to allow the Community Consultant time to review and interpret the results for inclusion in the final report to the Procurement Administrator. Generally, surveys will be conducted between the beginning of May and the middle of June.</p>
<p><b>6.3.1 Engagement with the General Public</b></p>	<p><b>Is the Report from m5 Public Affairs supposed to be “attached” to the Proposal? The RFP section 6.3.1 f seems to indicate that the Proponent is supposed to attach it to their bid.</b></p>	<p>This refers to the final report by the Community Consultant, which will be submitted separately by them, and considered by the Procurement Administrator in evaluating your submission. Their report is due at a later date, to allow the Community Consultant to consider and include an assessment of all community engagement materials a Proponent submits as part of the proposal. The Proponent will not be able to view, clarify, or contest the contents in the Community Consultant’s final report. For avoidance of doubt, Proponents are not expected to attach the Community Consultant Report to their Proposal (due on 6/28).</p>
<p><b>6.3.2 Engagement with the Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia</b></p>	<p><b>How should Proponents seek to engage with the Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia during development of renewable projects for the GCP?</b></p>	<p>Proponents will be required to meaningfully engage with the Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia. Proponents are expected to inform their engagement with the Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia based on the approach described in <a href="#">Proponents Guide: The Role of Proponents in Crown Consultation With The Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia</a>.</p>
<p><b>6.4.1 Ownership</b></p>	<p><b>How will the PA address the execution of exclusivity agreements between Mi’kmaq communities and proponents, and the advantages that result?</b></p>	<p>It is the responsibility of the Mi’kmaq Band councils and of Proponents to negotiate and enter into any ownership agreements with the Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia. Furthermore, in accordance with the RFP, each additional Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia entity entitling the Proponent to an additional point must deal at Arm’s Length with each other and with the Proponent.</p> <p>The Mi’kmaq of Nova Scotia determine what is in their best interests and may enter ownership agreements that are aligned with their interests. The Government of Nova Scotia and the Procurement Administrators will not be addressing this further. For further information, or to contact WMA please contact Crystal Nicholas, Interim General Manager at <a href="mailto:gm@wmalimited.com">gm@wmalimited.com</a> . For further information, or to contact WMA please contact Crystal Nicholas, Interim General Manager at <a href="mailto:gm@wmalimited.com">gm@wmalimited.com</a></p>



<p><b>Appendix 8.1</b></p>	<p><b>Can you please provide worked examples of the calculation of the adjusted energy rate for the following two scenarios? 1. If signing is 1 Dec 2024 and COD is 1 Jan 2028 2. If signing is 1 Dec 2024 and COD is 30 Jun 2028</b></p>	<p>The two scenarios would have the same adjusted energy rate. In accordance with the PPA, the adjustment period ends “on the earlier of (a) December 31, 2027, and (b) Commercial Operation Date”. Since the commercial operation date is after December 31, 2027, both scenarios will lead to the same adjusted energy rate:</p> <p>According to exhibit H (attached) in the PPA:  <math>ER = (ER_{CD} \times (CPI_Y / CPI_{ED}))</math></p> <p><i>Illustrative example and numbers:</i>  <math>ER_{CD}</math> (initial Energy Rate) = \$50/MWh  <math>CPI_Y</math> (month of December during the adjustment period, which will be December 2027 in both COD scenarios) = 325.89  <math>CPI_{ED}</math> (assume December 2024 as Effective Date) = 312.92  <math>ER = (\\$50/MWh \times (325.89/312.92)) = \\$52.07/MWh</math></p>
<p><b>8.2 Definitions</b></p>	<p><b>Can you please define the term "Generating Technology" and "Certified" to clarify how specific generation technology should be and what industry standard is required for certification compliance?</b></p>	<p>Generating Technology refers to the type of Renewable Low Impact technology, such as Wind or Solar. However, “Generating Technology” is not a defined term in the RFP.</p> <p>As stated in the PPA, “Certification or Certified – means (i) type certification of the Generating Technology by Det Norske Veritas, TUV Nord, DEWI-UL or another comparable, internationally recognized certifying body as reasonably determined by NSPI, and the Generating Technology having achieved industry standard certification(s) under International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) standards appropriate for such Generating Technology and reflecting a minimum operational lifetime or design lifetime of at least 25 years, or (ii) a type certification of the Generating Technology reflecting a minimum operational lifetime or design lifetime of at least 20 years and a 25-year site suitability assessment from the Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM)”.</p>
<p><b>Appendix – Zone</b></p>	<p><b>How are interconnection costs and loss factors accounted for in evaluation?</b></p>	<p>The impacts of interconnection costs and loss factors will be accounted for in the evaluation of 6.1 Price.</p>
<p><b>Appendix – 8.7</b></p>	<p><b>Under Appendix 8.7 of the RFP, are land leasing costs eligible to be accounted for</b></p>	<p>Land leasing costs can be counted as a Local Expenditure under the “Land costs” category in Row 25, but should not be counted in the “Rental and</p>

	<b>under the "Rental and leasing (excluding equipment)" line items in the Local Expenditure Table?</b>	leasing (excluding equipment). Please note that these costs are weighed at 5%.
<b>Appendix – 8.7</b>	<b>How are potential changes to Local Expenditure Table treated post the submission period?</b>	Proponents should submit their best estimates of local expenditures for evaluation in this Section. Changes to these estimates following submission will not impact scoring or evaluation of Proposals.