

As part of the Program Administrator's commitment to an effective procurement process, Power Advisory encouraged feedback from interested parties regarding the Nova Scotia Green Choice Program Procurement – RFP II ("RFP").

Below is a summary of the questions and comments received from interested parties along with a response.

Please note: comments regarding to Federal Funding, IESO NS processes, and NS Government processes have been forwarded to appropriate parties.

Capitalized terms used in this document and in the RFP but not otherwise defined in the Appendix A – Glossary of Terms have the meanings given to them in the PPA.

Disclaimer: This document is provided for informational purposes only and does not amend, modify, interpret, or replace the terms of any the RFP or PPA. It should not be relied upon as a statement of contractual rights, obligations, or commitments. In the event of any inconsistency or conflict between this document and the applicable PPA and/or RFP, the terms of the PPA and/or RFP will prevail.

RFP - Frequently Asked Questions/Feedback

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
	Federal Funding / Canadian Investment Bank (CIB)	
1.	Please provide further clarity with respect to CIB and SREPs including: (i) terms of any CIB participation, (ii) financing agreements, and (iii) the consultation and engagement process, to enable proponents to incorporate such funding into their Proposals in a robust and consistent manner.	1.5 Federal Funding Inquires with respect to CIB offerings for GCP II projects can now be made directly to CIB (see updated Section 1.5 of the RFP for more information).

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
2.	When considering the benefit of the CIB loans on enabling First Nations ownership we recommend publishing formal inclusion of CIB's involvement and specific loan terms as soon as possible to maximize time available to partner with First Nations and structure equity partnerships.	1.5 Federal Funding Inquires with respect to CIB offerings for GCP II projects can now be made directly to CIB (see updated Section 1.5 of the RFP for more information).
3.	Please clarify whether a CIB product will be offered under this procurement? The deletion of all reference to CIB in the PPA leads to the conclusion that CIB funding will not be available and should not be considered by Proponents in their bids.	1.5 Federal Funding Inquires with respect to CIB offerings for GCP II projects can now be made directly to CIB (see updated Section 1.5 of the RFP for more information).
	Financing Plan	
4.	Please clarify what level of disclosure is expected from bidders? Specifically, are they looking for: - A qualitative list of tariffs considered in pricing; or - A quantified tariff impact, such as bid pricing with and without tariffs?	2.11 Financing Plan The PA is expecting a qualitative list of tariffs based on the information known at the time of Proposal submission and as reflected in the Energy Rate.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
	Proponent Structure	
5.	The RFP requires that the Proponent have a controlling interest in the Project at the time of Proposal submission and at PPA execution. However, the RFP does not include a definition of “controlling interest in the project”. Please amend/provide clarification, that such requirement may be satisfied through contractual arrangements (e.g., option or definitive acquisition agreements) rather than immediate equity ownership.	2.2 Proponent Structure Control is defined in the RFP as having the meaning of that term in the PPA (which includes Controls, Controlling, and Controlled).
	Renewable Low-Impact Electricity Generation Project	
6.	Please clarify whether to demonstrate that any portion of Generating Facility or Interconnection Facilities is not located on Protected Land, is it correct that the Proponent just needs to provide a map using the geographic data of the Nova Scotia?	2.3 Renewable Low-Impact Electricity Generation Project The Proponent must make a declaration in the Prescribed Form: Proponent Information, Declarations, and Workbook. The PA will confirm this declaration using information provided in the Proposal (e.g. boundary maps).

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
7.	Please provide clarity on the interaction between Section 2.3 of the Draft Green Choice Program Procurement – Request for Proposals II, which permits a Project to be either a “New-Build or an Expansion” project, and Section 2.3(iv), which requires that “a Project must not be the subject of an existing power purchase agreement with NSPI, the Government of Nova Scotia, or any other Load Serving Entity”, specifically where a project would be developed at or adjacent to an existing wind generation facility that is currently operating under an existing PPA with a remaining term extending beyond the anticipated commercial operation date of the proposed GCP project.	2.3 Renewable Low-Impact Electricity Generation Project The proposed Project must meet the definition of Expansion in the RFP and would be evaluated in isolation of an existing, contracted project. The Expansion itself must meet the requirements of Section 2.3 of the RFP. A Project may be constructed on the site of a previously operating Generating Facility if it meets the definition of a New-Build.
8.	Please consider removing the requirement in S. 2.3b)(iii), as classifying point of interconnection (POI) locations by general area-based zones is too general and does not reflect actual system constraints. POI limitations should be based on specific transmission line capacity, which can be assessed through the Interconnection Feasibility Study.	2.3 Renewable Low-Impact Electricity Generation Project A Zone Definitions table has been added to the Appendix E of the RFP. A Proponent may seek clarification as to which Zone is applicable to their Project upon request by emailing IESO Nova Scotia at interconnect@ieso-ns.ca.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
9.	The revised RFP encourages proponents to connect to 138kV and above. This does not seem to be a Mandatory Criteria or have a points impact, so we suggest this reference be removed from the RFP entirely. We generally agree with the published zone restrictions for interconnection but think a clearer map, or better a list of lines and substations in each zone, is required for developers to plan properly.	2.3 Renewable Low-Impact Electricity Generation Project A Zone Definitions table has been added to Appendix E of the RFP. A Proponent may seek clarification as to which Zone is applicable to their Project upon request by emailing IESO Nova Scotia at interconnect@ieso-ns.ca.
	Engagement	
10.	Please clarify if further open houses are required if a Project has already had multiple open houses in previous years, has an approved EA, and there are no significant changes to the project design/layout, or would the previous open houses satisfy this requirement?	2.7 Engagement The situation described appears to meet the requirement.
11.	Is there any specific distance a Proponent should consider or are there any rules/guidelines to determine the definition of "close proximity" for the purposes of public notice requirements?	2.7 Engagement There is no specific definition for close proximity in the RFP. Appendix C of the RFP references for Proponent Resources with respect to engagement.
12.	Please consider awarding additional points (+2) for having established Community Liaison Committees in place that have had 2 or more meetings and have been established for more than 1 year before the submission deadline demonstrating a regular, long standing and locally informed relationship with community representatives.	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
13.	Please consider awarding points (+1 or +2) for providing clear, accurate and comprehensive information about Projects in an accessible manner, through a detailed public website. Many proponent websites are lacking information that members of the public need to be informed about projects being proposed where they live.	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
14.	Please consider replacing the Community Liaison Committee criterion with an assessment of the volume of engagement activities undertaken by the Proponent to date. Specifically, we recommend the wording be adjusted to: "The Proposal demonstrates that the Proponent has documented engagement efforts of 3+ community meetings with organizations, communities and/or local governments over the last 5+ years"	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
15.	Please consider weighing engagement efforts equally with the formation of the Community Liaison Committee If the recommendation above is not implemented, and that the wording be changed to: "The Proposal demonstrates the Proponent has formed, or has made ongoing and documented efforts to form, a community liaison committee...."	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
16.	Please provide further clarification with respect to whether "local governments" can include individual elected officials (e.g., 0.5 points each for a LOS from the area's MLA, MP and individual Councillor).	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria Section 4.3(f) provides for 0.5 points for each letter of support up to a maximum of 4 points.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
	Environmental Risk	
17.	Please consider awarding 10 points for having an EA and up to 6 points for no EA and proponent fills out own form.	2.12 Environmental Risk The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
18.	The wording in Section 4.2 a) xiii) should be updated to align with section 2.12 as at present they are incongruent.	2.12 Environmental Risk The RFP has been updated to align with Section 4.2 a) xiii) with Section 2.12 and Prescribed Form: Environmental Risk.
	Schedule	
19.	The PA should consider awarding PPAs earlier than May 2027 to allow for field work to begin earlier in the year.	3.3 Schedule No changes to RFP will be made. May 6, 2027, is the target date for awarding PPAs to allow sufficient time for the proposal evaluation process described in Section 4 of the RFP to be completed.
20.	Please consider delaying the Proposal submission date from January 14, 2027, to at least January 28, 2027 - NS First Nations staff and elected Chief/Council traditionally close down fully for the December/Christmas holiday until the new year.	3.3 Schedule The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
21.	The RFP should establish a minimum period between publication of the final, Board-approved PPA and each of the Registration Deadline, Interconnection Feasibility Study Submission Deadline, and Proposal Submission Deadline. Proponents should not be required to make material, non-refundable bid expenditures or finalize project structures before the definitive commercial framework is available. We recommend that the Registration Deadline be no earlier than 10 business days after publication of the final PPA, and that the Proposal Submission Deadline provide at least 60 days following the later of: (i) publication of the final PPA and prescribed forms; (ii) receipt of interconnection feasibility results; and (iii) publication of the final Deliverability Test methodology.	3.3 Schedule The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
	Proponent Registration	
22.	Please consider either changing the Registration Deadline until a date that is after the NSEB approval of the PPA, or that no payment should be required for registering in the GCP RFP II.	3.6 Proponent Registration The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
	Experience	
23.	Please consider adding a 1-point criterion for Proponents that have maintained ownership of a transmission-connected project with an Indigenous partner for at least five (5) years. This point can be reallocated from the other Experience category above.	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
24.	Please consider adding a 1-point criterion for Projects that have not failed to sign a PPA awarded to them as per Section 4B (1) (a), (b), or (e) of the Electricity Act. We suggest this point be reallocated from the 3 points allocated to Wind Resource Assessment.	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
25.	Please consider adding a 1-point criterion for Projects that are proposing to work with a turbine manufacturer that has established operating and maintenance personnel currently operating turbines in Nova Scotia. We suggest this point be reallocated from the 2 points allocated to as-of-right zoning in the Project Site section.	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
26.	Please consider awarding the final 1-point to North American and European experience as well and not limited to Nova Scotia.	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
27.	Please consider balancing the points to 2 points each instead of 3 and 1. It will be hard for more local proponents to satisfy the 80% nameplate criterion even though several have developed transmission-connected projects in the past several years, because there has been less opportunity to develop large projects locally.	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
28.	Please consider adding a 1-point criterion for Proponents that have maintained ownership of a transmission-connected project with an Indigenous partner for at least five (5) years. This point can be reallocated from another Experience category.	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
29.	We recommend replacing the 80% Nameplate Capacity requirement with a criterion based on experience developing, constructing, and operating transmission-connected projects. We also suggest reducing this to being worth 2 points to allow different points allocation, as below. Specifically, we recommend the wording be changed to: "...experience with respect to at least three (3) transmission-connected onshore wind projects that have achieved commercial operation since 2020.'	4.3 Stage 3 – Scored Criteria Section 4.3e)(iii) of the RFP has been updated, reducing the Nameplate Capacity criterion to 50% from 80%.
	Economic Benefits	
30.	Please consider an additional point be awarded to Proponents whose Project Partners are headquartered in Nova Scotia. To accommodate this, we recommend reducing the maximum score for the Local Benefit Percentage to 4 points and allocating the remaining point for Nova Scotia-based partnerships.	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
31.	Please consider adding a 1-point criterion for Projects that are proposing to work with a turbine manufacturer that has established operating and maintenance personnel currently operating turbines in Nova Scotia.	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
	Project Site	
32.	Please clarify if full points will be considered if a Proponent is able to make use of an existing easement for a t-line through a Crown land parcel (i.e. no new land rights required). If not, consider the following language: "100% of the Project's Interconnection Facilities and access roads can be located on private land and/or can use existing public roads and the Proponent demonstrates that it has successfully secured the right to construct and/or install 100% of the Interconnection Facilities and access roads on private land having obtained..."	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria No changes to the RFP were made. Suggested language appears to be the same as RFP language.
33.	Please clarify if there is any specific setback distance that should be maintained to demonstrate that it is NOT adjacent?	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The second draft of the RFP was previously updated to "Project Boundary is not Adjoined to any Protected Land". Adjoined is defined in the RFP.
34.	Please consider this criterion include an alternative option allowing a letter of support from the municipality to be considered equivalent in scoring when the "As-of-Right" zoning criterion is not met. We also recommend the point allocation to this criterion be reduced to 1-point.	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made at this time. Potential alternative criterion is being considered (would require Addendum to RFP).
35.	Please consider clarifying that an existing road through Crown Land qualifies as a public road referenced in this criterion.	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria An existing road public road through Crown Land qualifies as an existing public road. No changes to the RFP were made at this time.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
36.	Please consider a point deduction for a Project Site boundary adjoining Protected Lands. Adjust language as follows: "The Project Boundary is not Adjoined to any Protected Land, OR the proponent has received EA approval for adjoining boundaries".	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
	Energy Rate	
37.	Please consider deducting 5 points for Projects that were awarded a PPA through the previous Green Choice Program but refused to sign the awarded PPA. This criterion would ensure that the evaluation would be reflective of the inherent risk of awarding PPAs to projects with a history of building unattainable proposals and deceitful energy rates.	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
	Resource Assessment	
38.	Please consider awarding 5 points for Projects with 2 years or greater onsite data provided that said data was collected with LIDAR and/or a met tower 80m or greater to reflect current turbine technology and assessment best practices.	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
	New Scored Criteria Category	
39.	Please consider adding a 1-point criterion for Projects that have not failed to sign a PPA awarded to them as per Section 4B (1) (a), (b), or (e) of the Electricity Act. We suggest this point be reallocated from the 3 points allocated to Wind Resource Assessment.	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
	Ownership	
40.	Please consider adding a 1-point criterion for Proponents that have maintained ownership of a transmission-connected project with an Indigenous partner for at least five (5) years. This point can be reallocated from another Experience category.	4.3 Stage 3 - Scored Criteria The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
	Glossary of Terms	
41.	The Wind Energy Resource Assessment Professional currently requires a minimum of five years of experience "in North America performing wind energy resource assessments." This should be worded to provide clarity that the experience must be on North American projects but does not require that the professional be located in North America.	Appendix A – Glossary of Terms The definition for Wind Energy Resource Assessment Professional has been updated in the RFP.
42.	The draft version of the RFP pointed to the PPA for a Definition of Energy Resource Interconnection Service (ERIS); however, the definition of ERIS was removed from the PPA in the clean version presented to the Board.	Appendix A – Glossary of Terms The definition for Energy Resource Interconnection Service has been updated in the RFP.
43.	"Protected Land" is not defined anywhere in the RFP.	Appendix A – Glossary of Terms RFP has been updated to include definition of Protected Land as having the meaning of that term in the PPA.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
	Transmission Zone Map	
44.	The map resolution/quality makes it difficult to see clearly defined zone boundaries. We would like to request that shapefiles or a high-resolution map is provided in the final RFP for better visibility.	Appendix E - Transmission Zone Map The Zone Definitions table of transmission circuit by Zone has been added to Appendix E in the RFP. A Proponent may seek clarification as to which Zone is applicable to their Project upon request by emailing IESO Nova Scotia at interconnect@ieso-ns.ca.
	Scored Criteria	
45.	The points in the Scoring Criteria Table do not match the points written in the text. Environmental Risk is listed at 6 points in the table, but it is worth 7 points in the text. Project Site is listed at 7 points in the table, but it is worth 6 points in the text.	4.3 – Scored Criteria The RFP has been updated to correct this.
	Notification of Selected Proponents	
46.	Please clarify whether the Proponent will receive the PPA on the PPA Receipt Date fully executed by Nova Scotia Power? Otherwise, the obligation to provide a significant Performance Security to Nova Scotia Power happens without contractual basis between the Proponent and Nova Scotia Power.	3.1 Notification of Selected Proponents and Other Proponents Section 3.10 of the RFP describes the PPA offering and execution process and will be conducted in accordance with the Act.
	General Feedback	
47.	Please clarify if Proponents should bid under the assumption that interconnection assets are ITC eligible.	Proponents should consult with their own accounting / legal advisors.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
	Prescribed Forms	
48.	We recommend that the 500 m setback from Parks/Protected Areas be changed to 1x turbine height. The current 500 m setback requirement is not rooted in any provincial policy and does not link to a particular potential impact. 1x turbine height is a better project-specific measure of proximity-based concerns and a distance at which these are mitigated.	Prescribed Form: Environmental Risk The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
49.	Please consider changing Exhibit C - Section 2. As drafted, it is inconsistent with the definition of "Soft Commitment". A Soft Commitment is defined as a letter of intent and is expressly non-binding and conditional on completion of credit approval, satisfactory technical and legal due diligence. These are, by their nature, matters within the lender's discretion. A financing commitment that removes them is not a soft commitment; it is a fully underwritten commitment letter which is not feasible at this stage.	Prescribed Form: Financing Plan Exhibit C, Section 2 — Conditions Precedent Language in Exhibit C of the Prescribed Form: Financing has been modified in Section 2.
50.	Please consider removing the requirement that lenders providing debt be listed in Schedule I/II of the Bank Act or be a rated institution in Section 4 of Exhibit C. We request that this requirement be waived or substituted if a proponent can demonstrate a track record of financing projects with their chosen lender.	Prescribed Form: Financing Plan The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
51.	Please consider exempting turbine supply from the direct local manufacture and purchase requirements, as they cannot meet these criteria. Wind turbine components are not manufactured or sold in Nova Scotia.	Prescribed Form: Social and Economic Benefits Exhibit E – 1 Local Expenditure Table Instructions The suggestion was considered and no changes to the RFP were made.
	Interconnection Feasibility Study	
52.	The Draft RFP II indicated in 2.8 (i) that each proponent must apply for Energy Resource Interconnection Service (ERIS). We don't view this as valid approach as it might artificially restrict or eliminate projects that could otherwise provide cost effective wind energy to Nova Scotians via NRIS due to their location on the transmission system and the available wind resource where a relatively cost-effective Network Upgrades, like Remedial Action Schemes (RAS), can go a long way in allowing a project to interconnect cost-effectively. Furthermore, our understanding is that ERIS has the potential to introduce uncompensated curtailment risks that developers have very little visibility to assess and price.	2.8 Interconnection Feasibility Study No changes to the RFP will be made. The treatment of Foregone Expected Output from curtailment is addressed in the PPA in Section 4.2(b) and is not conditional on the type of service elected in the Interconnection Request.
53.	Please confirm whether an existing Interconnection Request may be amended or designated for GCP II and ERIS, and whether doing so would affect its existing queue position.	2.8 Interconnection Feasibility Study Language in the Section 2.8 of the RFP has been updated to provided additional clarity.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
54.	Please clarify whether Proponents are required to apply for Energy Resource Interconnection Service (ERIS) AND Network Resource Interconnection Service (NRIS) rather than JUST Energy Resource Interconnection Service. If Proponents are required to apply for ERIS only (as the PA's feedback to the NSEB seems to indicate), we kindly ask the Procurement Administrator to confirm that projects that have already filed an interconnection request for ERIS AND NRIS, are still admissible to participate in the procurement.	2.8 Interconnection Feasibility Study Language in the Section 2.8 of the RFP has been updated to provided additional clarity.
55.	Please clarify whether it is acceptable for a study to include both the ERIS and NRIS options where an ongoing study that includes both and but will be submitted as ERIS in the GCP RFP II Proposal.	2.8 Interconnection Feasibility Study Language in the Section 2.8 of the RFP has been updated to provided additional clarity.
	Approvals and Permits	
56.	(Adding back the previous question submitted which has not been addressed yet) We would appreciate clarity on instances in which the cost and/or responsibility of a facility's compliance with the TSIR is not assigned to the Proponent (e.g., Inertia Equivalent Response, s. 7.6.11 and 7.6.12).	2.6 Approvals and Permits Please refer to Section 2.8a)(i) of the RFP.