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
	Environmental Assessment / Environmental Risk	
1.	If a proponent opts to use their EA approval instead of the Environmental Questionnaire, can the layout (turbines locations, substation location, interconnection and access routing, etc.) submitted in their RFP Proposal differ from the layout in the EA approval, so long as the infrastructure stays within the Project Development Area (PDA) associated with the EA approval?	Section 4.3 Stage 3 – Scored Criteria In the scenario described, a Proponent should confirm with the Department of Environment and Climate Change whether the proposed layout changes require an addendum to the Project's EA approval. The Proponent must submit documentation, as part of the Proposal, to support that the EA approval is wholly applicable to the submitted Primary Project Configuration, otherwise an Environmental Questionnaire must be completed and submitted as part of the Proposal.
2.	Where a proponent opts to use their EA approval in their Proposal instead of the Environmental Questionnaire, can the access roads and/or interconnection routing included in the Proposal deviate from the EA, provided the Generating Facilities (turbines) remain in the EA area?	Section 4.3 Stage 3 – Scored Criteria The RFP requires the EA approval must be wholly representative of the Primary Project Configuration being proposed which includes Interconnection Facilities and access roads.
3.	Can you include the EA approval in the Environmental Risk Prescribed Form to show that the Project is EA-approved, but still opt to do the Environmental Questionnaire?	Section 4.3 Stage 3 – Scored Criteria If an EA approval is not wholly representative of the Primary Project Configuration, the EA approval may be included with other supporting evidence for the Environmental Questionnaire to the extent it applies to the Project being proposed in the Proposal Submission.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
4.	If the proponent chooses to pursue an addendum to align a portion of the Primary Project Configuration with the approved EA, would proof of correspondence with the required consultants and regulators to initiate the addendum, and desktop studies for the new area, be sufficient to support the use of the existing EA approval instead of the Environmental Risk Questionnaire? Finalizing an addendum will involve field studies, updated effects assessments and mitigations, if necessary, and review by the NS Environment Department,	Section 4.3 Stage 3 – Scored Criteria The RFP requires the EA approval submitted as part of the Proposal must be wholly representative of the Primary Project Configuration being proposed which includes Interconnection Facilities and access roads. An addendum to an existing EA approval would have to be approved to be considered part of the EA approval. Pursuit of an addendum would not be considered as part of an existing EA approval for evaluation purposes and the Environmental Questionnaire would need to be completed.
	Glossary of Terms	
5.	The RFP defines Nameplate Capacity as the rated, continuous capability of the Facility to deliver energy to the Delivery Point. We would like to confirm whether the 150 MW maximum Nameplate Capacity requirement applies: • To the aggregate installed/rated capacity of all generating equipment (i.e., the sum of individual turbine ratings); or • To the maximum output capability delivered at the Delivery Point. For example, would a project with an aggregate installed turbine capacity exceeding 150 MW be considered compliant if a plant controller or other control system limits the Facility output at the Delivery Point to 150 MW or less under all operating conditions?	Appendix A – Glossary of Terms The Nameplate Capacity is in reference to the aggregate ratings of the individual turbines.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
	Federal Funding	
6.	Are Proponents expected to submit project information to SREP during the GCP process? Or is this only expected if Proponents are successful in the bid (Selected Proponents)? In either case, is there a timeline by which project-related information should be submitted?	Section 1.5 Questions regarding SREP would be best directed to sreps-erite@nrcan-rncan.gc.ca. Please use “Green Choice Program Inquiry: Applicant Name” as the subject line.
7.	Please confirm whether SREP funding is to be considered in our bid proposals? Some of the wording seems rather vague in the letter from SREP as to whether the funding is to be considered.	Section 1.5a) Per the RFP, "Proponents are encouraged to explore all federal funding opportunities to make their Energy Rate more competitive, including any available investment tax credits, Canada Infrastructure Bank (“CIB”) financing, and Natural Resources Canada’s Smart Renewables and Electrification Pathways Program (“SREPs”) funding." The Proponent determines how SREP funding is factored into the Energy Rate submitted as part of their Proposal.
8.	RFP references SREPs funding and the NRCan email states: "Consideration for Canada Infrastructure Bank loans in stacking limits is not applicable." What is meant by this?	Section 1.5(c) Questions regarding SREP would be best directed to sreps-erite@nrcan-rncan.gc.ca. Please use “Green Choice Program Inquiry: Applicant Name” as the subject line.
9.	"Project funding decisions will be made following receipt and review of a due diligence assessment." How is financial need determined? CIB/ITC is mentioned; however, those are assumed to be available to all proponents. Are there additional considerations?	Section 1.5(c) Questions regarding SREP would be best directed to sreps-erite@nrcan-rncan.gc.ca. Please use “Green Choice Program Inquiry: Applicant Name” as the subject line.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
10.	Proponents must describe expected Government-Sponsored Funding and why they believe the project qualifies. Will other sources of grant funding be taken into consideration when determining the amount of funding from SREPs (up to $150/kW)?	Section 1.5(c) Questions regarding SREP would be best directed to sreps-erite@nrcan-rncan.gc.ca. Please use "Green Choice Program Inquiry: Applicant Name" as the subject line.
11.	RFP encourages SREPs funding and separately scores Mi'kmaq ownership but does not state Indigenous ownership is required for eligibility. Are there any requirements for Indigenous ownership to be eligible?	Section 1.5(c) Questions regarding SREP would be best directed to sreps-erite@nrcan-rncan.gc.ca. Please use "Green Choice Program Inquiry: Applicant Name" as the subject line.
12.	"Project funding decisions will be made following receipt and review of a due diligence assessment." When is the SREPs commitment expected to be confirmed and/or available for use?	Section 1.5(c) Questions regarding SREP would be best directed to sreps-erite@nrcan-rncan.gc.ca. Please use "Green Choice Program Inquiry: Applicant Name" as the subject line.
	Renewable Low-Impact Electricity Generation Project	
13.	"Projects are encouraged to connect at a voltage at or above 138 kV." Our project connects to a 69 kV transmission line rated to 138 kV, with available capacity. How should we interpret this guidance in the context of our project? We have already made an IR and assume the feasibility study and deliverability study results will determine whether the project can be interconnected, rather than relying on the guidance in this section.	2.3(b)(iii)(A) Correct. Earlier drafts of the RFP required connection at or above 138 kV based on the PA's understanding that connection capacity on lower voltage transmission lines was limited. In response to stakeholder feedback and discussions with IESO N-S, the RFP now encourages connection at 138 kV but does not require it.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
	Interconnection Feasibility Study	
14.	For the Interconnection Feasibility Study, can a Proponent request that multiple interconnection alternatives be evaluated under the same Interconnection Request—for example, multiple Points of Interconnection (POIs) and/or different wind turbine models/configurations? If so, are there any limitations on the number or type of alternatives that can be assessed within a single Feasibility Study?	Section 2.8 Questions on specifics related to the Interconnection Feasibility Study should be directed to IESO NS.
	Access Rights	
15.	Please confirm whether the requirement is for land registry reports to be obtained and dated after the RFP Effective Date, rather than for actual access rights to the Properties to be granted after the RFP Effective Date?	Section 2.9(a)(ii) Confirmed, the applicable land parcel registers must be dated no earlier than the RFP Effective Date.
	Schedule	
16.	Regarding the Target Date for notification of Selected Proponents, could you please provide additional details regarding the project award process and associated timelines? For example, when will proponents be shortlisted, when will shortlisted proponents be contacted by the PA, when will the shortlist be made publicly available, and by what date will Selected Proponents be required to execute a PPA?	Section 3.10 The RFP outlines the process for the notification of Selected Proponents.
17.	Please consider extending the Question and Comment Deadline?	Section 3.3 The Question and Comment Deadline will not be extended.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
	Proposal Security / Letter of Credit	
18.	If a Proponent wishes to make minor modifications to Appendix G, should the Proponent notify the PA of the proposed changes and provide a revised version of Appendix G prior to Proposal Submission?	Section 3.9 The PA will not be pre-approving Proposal Security. Please refer to the definition of Proposal Security in the RFP.
	Zoning	
19.	Please consider amending the zoning confirmation criteria to include an alternative option allowing a letter of support from the municipality to be considered equivalent in scoring when the "As-of-Right" zoning does not exist within the municipality.	Section 4.3e)(v) Addendum No. 2 will include the addition of an option of an executed development agreement for the Scored Criteria.
	Prescribed Forms / Workbook	
20.	Can the restrictions on the RFP documents (RFP, Prescribed Forms, Proponent Workbook) be adjusted to allow the text to be copied and highlighted?	The permission rights in the writeable PDF Prescribed Forms and RFP have been updated to allow for copying and highlighting of text. The permission rights in the MS Excel Proposal Workbook have been updated to allow for copy cells and text.
21.	Regarding the Prescribed Form: Environmental Risk, one of the questions asks whether a Mi'kmaq Ecological Knowledge Study (MEKS) has commenced and/or been contracted for the Project. If a Proponent has received a service proposal from an entity qualified to conduct a MEKS, would such a proposal be accepted as evidence that a MEKS has been contracted? If not, could you please clarify what forms of documentation would be accepted as evidence?	A proposal from a consultant is not evidence that a MEKs has been contracted. As described in the Environmental Risk Questionnaire included in the Prescribed Form: Environmental Risk, Question 7 is in respect of whether a MEKS has been started and/or contracted in accordance with Assembly of Nova Scotia Mi'kmaw Chiefs, Mi'kmaq Ecological Knowledge Study Protocol, 2nd Edition (link to this protocol is provided in Appendix C of the RFP). Refer to the protocol section titled "Before You Begin a MEKS" for potential evidence to support a MEKS has been started and/or contracted.

Item #	Question/Feedback	Answer
22.	Regarding the Prescribed Form: Environmental Risk, could you please confirm whether the thresholds specified for the noise assessment and shadow flicker modeling are intended NOT to apply to permanent or seasonal receptors located on leased parcels? If these thresholds are applied to receptors on leased lands, it may significantly limit a landowner's ability to lease property for wind energy development. We also request that the noise assessment and shadow flicker modeling requirements in the RFP be aligned with applicable municipal and provincial regulations. For some projects, the current RFP requirements do not fully align with municipal guidelines, resulting in inconsistencies between the RFP requirements and local regulatory standards.	The thresholds for noise assessment and shadow flicker modelling results are aligned with the Environmental Assessment Supplemental Checklist: Wind Energy Projects (see Exhibit C of the RFP for link). Questions on these thresholds should be directed to the Department of Environment and Climate Change.