



FINANCIAL ANALYSIS ON ATLANTIC ELECTRIC SYSTEM COSTS RELATED TO A TRANSITION TO A 2035 NET-ZERO GRID

Amendment 002 is raised to address questions received from the industry and revise section 4.2 (Basis of Selection) of the RFP (Request for Proposal).

Q6. Based on the evaluation criteria in Appendix 1, would NRCan like to see resource experience demonstrated through a specific resume template or is there flexibility in how this information is presented as long as it meets the requirements?

R6. There is no set format for the response, however, please refer to section 1.2 of Appendix 1, which outlines how the examples/ studies related to the mandatory and rated criteria have to be presented.

Q7. The RFP references the March 11 2022 Atlantic Loop Roadmap as highly relevant to this work. Does NRCan have an existing model from prior research that it wants the respondent to use with respect to SW 4.1.1 A?

R7. The selected Contractor will receive the necessary data/model for the modelling and data analysis work in the SOW 4.1.1 A.

Q8. The financial proposal form in Appendix 2 specifies a level of expertise for each resource. Are proponents able to modify the estimated level of effort for each resource to reflect their intended contributions or are proponents to maintain these estimates in their submissions? Do these estimates reflect the weighting NRCan would like considered for price scoring purposes?

R8. See response to Q4 in Amendment 1.

Q9. In order to better align the sought experience for the Senior Financial Risk Analyst with the scope of work, would NRCan consider amending R4 to the following: Bidders proposed senior resource (Financial Risk Analyst) should have experience in conducting financial analysis on clean energy projects in Canada.

R9. Please see amendments in response to Q11.

Q10. In order to better align the sought experience for the Senior project Leader with the scope of work, would NRCan consider amending R5 to the following: Bidders proposed senior resource (Project Leader) should have experience in prioritizing or advising on potential federal support scenarios related to clean energy projects in Canada.

R10. An amendment has been made to R4 and R5 to factor in both quality of experience and years of experience as graded criteria.

Q11. In order to ensure that the two senior resources proposed for R4, R5 and R6 have provided comparable advice that is directly relevant to the scope of work, would NRCan consider modifying the point allocation by not solely assessing the years of experience (which simply shows that, for example, the resource has conducted financial analysis on projects, where such analysis could be very basic or not aligned with the needs of NRCan) to assessing the pertinence and complexity of the projects the resources have worked on (which is also typically done in federal procurements)? This can be achieved by amending the points for these criteria as follows:

- a. Same point ladder to ensure the resource has the years of experience
- b. Ask for 3 project descriptions where each resource will: present, succinctly, 3 projects they worked on, describe their role, describe the alignment with NRCan Scope of work. These can then, for example, be rated on a scale of 1-5 based on **quality and relevance**.

R11. An amendment has been made to R6 and R7 to factor in both quality of experience and years of experience as graded criteria.



Q12. R6 is seeking up to 3 resources at the intermediate and junior levels with maximum points being achieved with a combined 4 years of experience between the 3 resources (which means an average of 1.3 years per resource). Typically, intermediate resources need to demonstrate at a minimum 5+ years of experience and juniors at a minimum 1 to 4 years depending on certifications obtained and completed education. In order for NRCan to ensure that the senior resources are supported by quality resources that have relevant experience, would NRCan consider:

- c. A similar evaluation scheme as described in question 4 above
- d. Aligning the evaluation of years of experience with what is typically seen in GoC procurements

R12. An amendment has been made to R8 to require a minimum of 6 years of combined experience

Q13. It seems that NRCan is only looking for specific headings in the workplan? If so, how will you be assessing the quality of the proposal and the demonstrated understanding of the workplan?

R13: An amendment has been made to R3.

DELETE: Section 1.2.4

DELETE: Section 4.2 Basis of Selection, in its entirety

INSERT: Section 4.2 Basis of Selection

4.2.1 Highest Combined Rating of Technical Merit and Price

1. To be declared responsive, a bid must:
 - a. comply with all the requirements of the bid solicitation; and
 - b. meet all mandatory criteria; and
 - c. obtain the required minimum of 183 points overall for the technical evaluation criteria which are subject to point rating. The rating is performed on a scale of 265 points.
2. Bids not meeting (a) or (b) or (c) will be declared non-responsive.
3. The selection will be based on the highest responsive combined rating of technical merit and price. The ratio will be 70 % for the technical merit and 30 % for the price.
4. To establish the technical merit score, the overall technical score for each responsive bid will be determined as follows: total number of points obtained / maximum number of points available multiplied by the ratio of 70 %.
5. To establish the pricing score, each responsive bid will be prorated against the lowest evaluated price and the ratio of 30%.
6. For each responsive bid, the technical merit score and the pricing score will be added to determine its combined rating.
7. Neither the responsive bid obtaining the highest technical score nor the one with the lowest evaluated price will necessarily be accepted. The responsive bid with the highest combined rating of technical merit and price will be recommended for award of a contract.

The table below illustrates an example where all three bids are responsive and the selection of the contractor is determined by a 70/30 ratio of technical merit and price, respectively. The total available points equal 135 and the lowest evaluated price is \$45,000 (45).



Basis of Selection - Highest Combined Rating Technical Merit (70%) and Price (30%)				
	Bidder 1	Bidder 2	Bidder 3	
Overall Technical Score	115/135	89/135	92/135	
Bid Evaluated Price	\$55,000.00	\$50,000.00	\$45,000.00	
Calculations	Technical Merit Score	115/135 x 70 = 59.63	89/135 x 70 = 46.15	92/135 x 70 = 47.70
	Pricing Score	45/55 x 30 = 24.55	45/50 x 30 = 27	45/45 x 30 = 30
Combined Rating	84.18	73.15	77.70	
Overall Rating	1st	3rd	2nd	

DELETE: APPENDIX “1” – EVALUATION CRITERIA in its entirety
INSERT: APPENDIX “1” – EVALUATION CRITERIA

APPENDIX “1” - EVALUATION CRITERIA

Bidders are advised to address these criteria in the following order and in sufficient depth in their proposals to enable a thorough assessment. NRCan’s assessment will be based solely on the information contained within the proposal. NRCan may confirm information or seek clarification from bidders.

Bidders are advised that only listing experience without providing any supporting data to describe responsibilities, duties and relevance to the criteria will not be considered demonstrated for the purpose of this evaluation. The Bidder should provide complete details as to where, when (month and year) and how (through which activities/ responsibilities) the stated qualifications/experience were obtained. Experience gained during formal education shall not be considered work experience. All criteria for work experience shall be obtained in a legitimate work environment as opposed to an educational setting. Co-op terms are considered work experience provided they are related to the required services.

1. Technical Criteria

1.1 Mandatory Evaluation Criteria

- The Mandatory Criteria listed below will be evaluated on a simple pass/fail basis. Proposals, which fail to meet the mandatory criteria, will be deemed non-responsive and will not be considered for point rated evaluation.
- The Bidder must provide documented substantiation that sufficiently supports claims of compliance with each criterion. Each criterion should be addressed separately. Canada reserves the right to request references from a bidder to conduct a reference check to verify the accuracy of the information provided.
- It is requested that supporting technical documentation, be provided with the bid at solicitation close and be cross-referenced on the Compliance Matrix for each criteria to outline where in the supporting technical documentation it demonstrates compliance. It is the Bidders responsibility to ensure that the submitted supporting technical documentation provides detail to prove that the technical proposal meet the requirements of the criteria.



- If the supporting documentation referenced above has not been provided at bid closing, the Contracting Authority will notify the Bidder that they must provide supporting documentation within two (2) business days following notification. Failure to comply with the request of the Contracting Authority within that time period, will deem the bid non-responsive and the bid will be given no further consideration

Criterion ID	Mandatory Criteria	Reference to Bidder's Proposal/Proposal Page #
	BIDDER EXPERIENCE	
M1	<p>The Bidder must demonstrate three (3) or more years of direct experience in conducting project due diligence through financial and risk analysis relating to clean energy projects in Canada.</p> <p>Note: Two or more projects of a minimum six months duration related to this criterion in the last five years must be provided.</p>	
M2	<p>The Bidder must demonstrate experience in providing strategic financial advice on electricity projects.</p> <p>Note: Two or more projects of a minimum six months duration related to this criteria in the last five years must be provided.</p>	
M3	<p>The Bidder must identify a detailed work plan for the entire project due diligence in its proposal, which must include each item listed under section SW4.1.1 Phase 1.</p>	



M4	The Bidder must identify a detailed work plan for the Strategic Advice on Federal Financial Support, in its proposal, which must include each item listed under section SW4.1.2 Phase 2.	
RESOURCE EXPERIENCE		
M5	The Bidder must provide one proposed senior resource (Financial Risk Analyst) with three (3) or more years of direct experience in at least one of the following areas: clean electricity production, transmission and end-use demand, and Canada's electricity systems and markets.	
M6	The Bidder must provide <u>one proposed senior resource (Project Leader)</u> with three (3) or more years of direct experience for the work to be performed as outlined in the Statement of Work. <u>Note:</u> Bidder is requested to provide the name of the resource and their projects (s) to demonstrate experience/qualifications to indicate compliance.	
M7	The Bidder must provide <u>one proposed intermediate/junior resource</u> for the work to be performed as outlined in the Statement of Work. <u>Note:</u> Bidder is requested to provide the name of the resource and their projects (s) to demonstrate experience/qualifications to indicate compliance.	

1.2 Evaluation of rated criteria

The criteria contained herein will be used by NRCan to evaluate each proposal that has met all of the mandatory criteria.

Proposals must achieve the stated minimum points required overall for the rated criteria to be assessed as responsive under the point rated technical criteria section; proposals not meeting the minimum required points will be deemed non-responsive.

Please note:

- Simply providing project examples from previous work experience that are not directly related to the required task will result in point loss.
- When referencing the company's or companies' previous experience, as part of the Mandatory Requirements or point-rated evaluation criteria, the bid must specifically demonstrate how previous projects relate to renewable energy deployment policies, in general, and to renewable energy procurement mechanisms and required electricity markets regulatory measures, in particular.
- When referencing team member's previous experience, as part of the Mandatory Requirements or point-rated evaluation criteria, the bid must specifically demonstrate how individual team member's previous experience relates to renewable energy deployment policies, in general, and to renewable energy procurement mechanisms and required electricity markets regulatory measures, in particular.



- The month(s) of experience listed for a study /project whose period overlaps that of another referenced project will only be counted once. For example: study one time frame is July 2001 to December 2001; study two time frame is October 2001 to January 2002; the total months of experience for these two studies references is seven (7) months
- A Bidder with mixed number of years experience will be treated the same as exact number of requested years of experience. Example: A bidder with nine (9) years of experience would be awarded eighteen (18) points and a bidder with nine and a half (9.5) years of experience would also be awarded eighteen (18) points.
- It is requested that supporting technical documentation, be provided with the bid at solicitation close and be cross-referenced on the Compliance Matrix for each criteria to outline where in the supporting technical documentation it demonstrates compliance. It is the Bidders responsibility to ensure that the submitted supporting technical documentation provides detail to prove that the technical proposal meet the requirements of the criteria.
- If the supporting documentation referenced above has not been provided at bid closing, the Contracting Authority will notify the Bidder that they must provide supporting documentation within two (2) business days following notification. Failure to comply with the request of the Contracting Authority within that time period, will deem the bid non-responsive and the bid will be given no further consideration

All of the study summaries are to be summarized in a table with the following information:

- The criteria under which the project summaries are being evaluated;
- The name of the study;
- The name of the client organization;
- Month/year and duration of the study;
- The dollar value of the study
- A brief description of the contract including scope, objective, methodology and results
- The page in the proposal where the study summary can be located;
- The name of the resources involved;
- The non-overlapping experience gained by each resource for this scoring category.

Proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

Criterion ID	Point Rated Technical Criteria	Points Breakdown	Maximum Points	Illustrated Compliance / Proposal Page #
BIDDER EXPERIENCE				
R1	The Bidder should demonstrate experience in conducting due diligence on comparative system costs. Points will be awarded to the Bidder with previous project experience related	(Maximum 5 point per study up to a maximum of 25 points). Maximum 25 points = 5 or more studies. Maximum 20 points = 4 studies. Maximum 15 points = 3 studies.	25	



	<p>to due diligence on comparative system costs in the following categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comparative jurisdictional electricity system costs. 2. New electricity transmission projects 3. Assessments and cost benefit analyses of energy markets 4. Bulk imports via HVDC infrastructure 5. Evaluation and comparison of revenue requirements for utilities. <p>Note: Points will be allocated based on number of recent studies. Bidder is requested to demonstrate how each example relates to specific category. The examples can be in any combination of the above categories, i.e. 5 examples of experience with new High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) transmission projects, or 3 examples of cost benefit analyses and 2 examples of bulk imports via HVDC infrastructure would both receive the full 25 points **Recent is defined as within the last ten (10) years.</p>	0 point = 2 studies or less.		
R2	The Bidder should demonstrate experience in providing Strategic Advice	(Maximum 6 point per example experience up to a maximum of 30 points).	30	



	<p>on Financial investment and clean energy. Points will be awarded to the Bidder's with previous project experience related to offering strategic advice to clients on financial investment in clean energy projects. *Recent is defined as within the last ten years. Note: Points will be allocated based on number of project examples. Bidder is requested to demonstrate how each example relates to the above criteria.</p>	<p>Maximum 30 points = 5 or more examples. Maximum 24 points = 4 examples. Maximum 18 points = 3 examples. 0 point = 2 examples or less.</p>		
<p>R3</p>	<p>Work plan The Bidder should outline in its detailed work plan, specific steps in accomplishing the Statement of Work in this Request for Proposal (RFP) within the timelines indicated. Points will be awarded for a detailed work plan that demonstrates sufficient background knowledge of, and familiarity with, the issues surrounding the project content such that an estimate of the Contractor's likely success with the project can be formed. <u>Note: Bidder is requested to identify the the work plan address all aspects and tasks of the work; the schedule and respect all the deadlines.</u></p>	<p>Excellent Understanding 30 Points Information provided clearly demonstrates in-depth understanding and knowledge and the Bidder has fully tailored its response to NRCan's requirements and expectations. Good Understanding 24 Points Information provided demonstrates a good understanding that is relevant to a sufficient number of the elements of the rated criteria. The Bidder has sufficiently tailored its response to NRCan's requirements and expectations. Weak Understanding 12 Points Information provided demonstrates some understanding that is relevant but is deemed weak</p>	<p>30</p>	



		<p>because it does not demonstrate a good or full range of understanding of the stated criteria. The Bidder has attempted to tailor its response to NRCan's requirements and expectations however there are some deficiencies.</p> <p>Very Poor, minimal Understanding 6 Points Information provided demonstrates a poor and minimal understanding that is relevant to the stated criteria and has not tailored its response to NRCan's requirements and expectations.</p> <p>Non-response or information provided does not address the criteria. (0 points)</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

RESOURCES' EXPERIENCE

R4	<p>The Bidder should propose a senior resource (Project Leader) with a minimum 5 years of experience, prior to bid closing, in at least one of the following areas: clean electricity production, transmission and end-use demand, and Canada's electricity systems and markets.</p> <p>Proposed senior resource should have had a significant role in f the following areas (1-4):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conducting financial due diligence and analysis 	<p>Excellent Understanding 40 Points Information provided clearly demonstrates in-depth understanding and knowledge and the Bidder has fully tailored its response to the criteria.</p> <p>Good Understanding 32 Points Information provided demonstrates a good understanding that is relevant to a sufficient number of the elements of the rated criteria. The Bidder has sufficiently tailored its response to the criteria.</p> <p>Weak Understanding 16 Points Information provided demonstrates some understanding that is relevant but is deemed weak</p>	40	
-----------	--	---	-----------	--



	<p>2. Taking into account industry best practices, applicable standards and regulatory requirements</p> <p>3. Conducting energy market analysis and modelling</p> <p>4. Experience with senior positions in largescale energy projects</p> <p>A project in which the senior resource gained experience in the above categories (1-4) may be cited multiple times, i.e., a senior resource might gain both financial due diligence (1) and energy market analysis (3) from the same project.</p> <p>Note: Points will be allocated based on the quality of examples provided for each of the above areas, with a maximum of 10 points per example.</p> <p>**Recent is defined as within the last ten (10) years.</p>	<p>because it does not demonstrate a good or full range of understanding of the stated criteria. The Bidder has attempted to tailor its response to the criteria however there are some deficiencies.</p> <p>Very Poor, minimal Understanding 8 Points Information provided demonstrates a poor and minimal understanding that is relevant to the stated criteria and has not tailored its response to the criteria.</p> <p>Non-response or information provided does not address the criteria. (0 points)</p>		
R5	<p>The Bidder should propose a senior resource (Project Leader) with a minimum 5 years of experience, prior to bid closing, in at least one of the following areas: clean</p>	<p>(Maximum 5 point per year up to a maximum of 40 points)</p> <p>Maximum 40 points = 8 or more years.</p>	40	



	<p>electricity production, transmission and end-use demand, and Canada's electricity systems and markets.</p> <p>Proposed senior resource should have had a significant project experience related to the following criteria</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conducting financial due diligence and analysis 2. Taking into account industry best practices, applicable standards and regulatory requirements 3. Conducting energy market analysis and modelling 4. Experience with senior positions in largescale energy projects <p>A project in which the senior resource gained experience in the above categories (1-4) may be cited multiple times, i.e., a senior resource might gain both financial due diligence (1) and energy market analysis (3) from the same project.</p> <p>Note:</p>	<p>Maximum 35 points = 7 years. Maximum 30 points = 6 years. 0 point = 5 years or less.</p>		
--	---	--	--	--



	<p>Points will be allocated based on number of years of experience provided for each of the above areas, with a maximum of 10 points per year.</p> <p>**Recent is defined as within the last ten (10) years.</p>			
R6	<p>The Bidder should propose a senior resource (Project Leader) with a minimum 5 years of experience. The Bidders proposed <u>senior resource (Project Leader)</u> should have experience in prioritizing or advising on potential federal support scenarios related to the following categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clean electricity production 2. Transmission and end-use demand 3. Canada's electricity systems and markets. <p>A project in which the senior resource gained experience in the above categories (1-3) may be cited multiple times, i.e., a senior resource might gain both clean electricity production (1) and Canada's electricity systems and markets (3) from the same project.</p> <p>Note:</p>	<p>Excellent Understanding 30 Points Information provided clearly demonstrates in-depth understanding and knowledge and the Bidder has fully tailored its response to NRCan's requirements and expectations.</p> <p>Good Understanding 24 Points Information provided demonstrates a good understanding that is relevant to a sufficient number of the elements of the rated criteria. The Bidder has sufficiently tailored its response to NRCan's requirements and expectations.</p> <p>Weak Understanding 12 Points Information provided demonstrates some understanding that is relevant but is deemed weak because it does not demonstrate a good or full range of understanding of the stated criteria. The Bidder has attempted to tailor its response to NRCan's requirements and expectations however there are some deficiencies.</p>	30	



	<p>Points will be allocated based on the quality of examples provided for each of the above areas, with a maximum of 10 points per example.</p> <p>**Recent is defined as within the last ten (10) years.</p>	<p>Very Poor, minimal Understanding 6 Points Information provided demonstrates a poor and minimal understanding that is relevant to the stated criteria and has not tailored its response to NRCan's requirements and expectations.</p> <p>Non-response or information provided does not address the criteria. (0 points)</p> <p>-</p>		
<p>R7</p>	<p>The Bidder should propose a senior resource (Project Leader) with a minimum 5 years of experience. The Bidders proposed <u>senior resource (Project Leader)</u> should have experience in prioritizing or advising on potential federal support scenarios related to the following categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clean electricity production 2. Transmission and end-use demand 3. Canada's electricity systems and markets. <p>A project in which the senior resource gained experience in the above categories (1-3) may be cited multiple times, i.e., a senior resource might gain both clean electricity production (1) and Canada's electricity</p>	<p>(Maximum 5 point per year up to a maximum of 40 points)</p> <p>Maximum 40 points = 8 or more years. Maximum 35 points = 7 years. Maximum 30 points = 6 years.</p> <p>0 point = 5 years or less.</p>	<p>40</p>	



	<p>systems and markets (3) from the same project.</p> <p>Note: Points will be allocated based on number of years of experience provided for each of the above areas, with a maximum of 10 points per year.</p> <p>**Recent is defined as within the last ten (10) years.</p>			
R8	<p>The Bidder should propose no more than three resources at the intermediate or junior level, where resource (s) provided advice on clean energy project, for a combined total of 6 years of experience.</p> <p>Note: Combined experience example: Resource 1 – 2 years Resource 2 - 3 years Resource 3 – 1 year Total combined experience = 6 years</p>	<p>(Maximum 5 point per year up to a maximum of 30 points).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maximum 30 points = Six (6) years of combined experience. 2. Maximum 25 points = Five (5) years of combined experience. 3. Maximum 20 points = Four (4) years of combined experience. 4. Maximum 15 points = Three (3) years of combined experience. Maximum 10 points = Two (2) year of combined experience. 5. Maximum 5 points = One (1) year of combined experience. 6. 0 points = Less than one year (1) year of combined experience. 	30	
Total Points Available			265	
Total Points needed to be Considered Compliant			183	



Natural Resources
Canada

Ressources naturelles
Canada

Solicitation No. - N° de l'invitation
NRCan - 5000066775
Client Ref. No. - N° de réf. du client
171581

Amd. No. - N° de la modif.
002

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN THE SAME AND IN FULL EFFECT.