





---

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

Amendment 003 is raised to address questions received from the industry.

Q14: Within the Rated Criteria, the descriptions of the Point Rated Technical Criteria for R5 and R7 note that “points will be allocated based on number of years of experience provided for each of the above areas, with a maximum of 10 points for year”. However, within the Points Breakdown for R5 and R7 it is noted that there is a “maximum 5 points per year up to a maximum of 40 points”. Can the Crown kindly clarify the requirement and confirm how points will be allocated for both of these rated criteria?

R14: R5 and R7 have been amended.

Q15: Within the Rated Criteria, the descriptions of the Point Rated Technical Criteria for R4 and R6 note that “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”. However, within the Points Breakdown for R4 and R6 it is noted that points will be allocated based on the level of understanding (e.g., excellent, good, weak, and very poor understanding). Can the Crown kindly clarify the requirement and confirm how points will be allocated for both of these rated criteria?

R15: To clarify, each example can potentially score up to a maximum of 10 points. If the bidder proposes four examples that are considered excellent, the bidder would receive the full 40 points. If the bidder proposed 4 examples that were considered good, the bidder would receive 32 points. If the bidder only proposes two examples but the examples are considered excellent, the bidder would receive 20 points.

Q16: Within the Rated Criteria, Amendment 002 has removed the requirement to demonstrate any experience linked to the Senior Financial Risk Analyst (i.e. R4 to R7 are all linked to the experience of the Senior Project Leader). Can the Crown kindly confirm that there is no longer a need to demonstrate the Senior Financial Risk Analyst’s experience within the rated criteria?

R16: R4 and R5 have been amended.

Q17: Will the deliverables provided to NRCan under this scope of work be distributed outside of NRCan? In particular, will the deliverables be shared with stakeholders outside of the Government of Canada, such as other stakeholders directly involved in the Atlantic Loop, the general public, or other third parties such as consultants?

R17: Canada has engaged or may engage a variety of third-party consultants, including policy and legal advisors. The information may be shared with stakeholders, third-party consultants, and others in confidence. Any sharing of material/advice will be discussed in advance with the Contractor.

Q18: In the rated criteria tables for section 1.2 (p.7-15), the column “Criterion ID” uses the same description for “Project Leader” in rows R4, R5, R6, and R7. Is this repetition intentional? Does it require bidders to submit four potential project leaders?

R18: Please refer to R16.

Q19: In the rated criteria table in section 1.2 (p.7-15), the Points Breakdown for Criterion ID’s R1, R2, R5, R7 and R8 are points-based while R3, R4 and R6 are weighted by level of understanding. Can you please elaborate on the significance between these differences in points breakdown?

R19: Please refer to R14 and R15.



---

**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 #
<b>BIDDER EXPERIENCE</b>		
<b>M1</b>	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.  <b>Note:</b> Two or more projects of a minimum six months duration related to this criterion in the last five years must be provided.	
<b>M2</b>	The Bidder must demonstrate experience in providing strategic financial advice on electricity projects.  Note: Two or more projects of a minimum six months duration related to this criteria in the last five years must be provided.	
<b>M3</b>	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.	
<b>M4</b>	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.	
<b>RESOURCE EXPERIENCE</b>		
<b>M5</b>	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.	
<b>M6</b>	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.	
<b>M7</b>	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 #
<b>BIDDER EXPERIENCE</b>				
<b>R1</b>	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate experience in conducting due diligence on comparative system costs.</p> <p>Points will be awarded to the Bidder with previous project experience related to due diligence on comparative system</p>	<p>(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. 0 point = 2 studies or less.</p>	<b>25</b>	



	<p>costs in the following categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Comparative jurisdictional electricity system costs.</li><li>2. New electricity transmission projects</li><li>3. Assessments and cost benefit analyses of energy markets</li><li>4. Bulk imports via HVDC infrastructure</li><li>5. Evaluation and comparison of revenue requirements for utilities.</li></ol> <p><b>Note:</b> 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</p>			
--	--	--	--	--



	**Recent is defined as within the last ten (10) years.			
R2	<p>The Bidder should demonstrate experience in providing Strategic Advice 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.</p> <p>*Recent is defined as within the last ten years.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> 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 6 point per example experience up to a maximum of 30 points). Maximum 30 points = 5 or more examples. Maximum 24 points = 4 examples. Maximum 18 points = 3 examples. 0 point = 2 examples or less.</p>	30	
R3	<p><b>Work plan</b> 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</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</p>	30	





	<p>familiarity with, the issues surrounding the project content such that an estimate of the Contractor's likely success with the project can be formed.</p> <p><u>Note: Bidder is requested to identify that the work plan address all aspects and tasks of the work; the schedule and respect all the deadlines.</u></p>	<p>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> <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**

<b>R4</b>	The Bidder should propose a senior resource ( <b>Financial Risk Analyst</b> ) with a	Excellent Understanding 40 Points Information provided clearly demonstrates in-	<b>40</b>	
-----------	--	---	-----------	--



	<p>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"> <li>1. Conducting financial due diligence and analysis</li> <li>2. Taking into account industry best practices, applicable standards and regulatory requirements</li> <li>3. Conducting energy market analysis and modelling</li> <li>4. Experience with senior positions in largescale energy projects</li> </ol> <p>A project in which the senior resource gained experience in the above</p>	<p>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 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>		
--	--	---	--	--



	<p>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><b>Note:</b> 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>			
<b>R5</b>	<p>The Bidder should propose a senior resource (<b>Financial Risk Analyst</b>) 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 project experience related to the following criteria</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 points = 5 years or less.</p>	<b>40</b>	



	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Conducting financial due diligence and analysis</li><li>2. Taking into account industry best practices, applicable standards and regulatory requirements</li><li>3. Conducting energy market analysis and modelling</li><li>4. Experience with senior positions in largescale energy projects</li></ol> <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><b>Note:</b> Points will be allocated based on number of years of experience beyond the minimum 5 years provided for each of the above areas.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--



	**Recent is defined as within the last ten (10) years.			
<b>R6</b>	<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"> <li>1. Clean electricity production</li> <li>2. Transmission and end-use demand</li> <li>3. Canada's electricity systems and markets.</li> </ol> <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><b>Note:</b></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>	<b>30</b>	



	<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><b>R7</b></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"> <li>1. Clean electricity production</li> <li>2. Transmission and end-use demand</li> <li>3. Canada's electricity systems and markets.</li> </ol> <p>A project in which the senior resource gained</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.          0 points = 5 years or less.</p>	<p><b>40</b></p>	



	<p>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><b>Note:</b> Points will be allocated based on number of years of experience beyond the minimum 5 years provided for each of the above areas.</p> <p>**Recent is defined as within the last ten (10) years.</p>			
<b>R8</b>	<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"> <li>1. Maximum 30 points = Six (6) years of combined experience.</li> <li>2. Maximum 25 points = Five (5) years of combined experience.</li> <li>3. Maximum 20 points = Four (4) years of combined experience.</li> <li>4. Maximum 15 points = Three (3) years of combined experience. Maximum 10 points = Two (2)</li> </ol>	<b>30</b>	



		<p>year of combined experience.</p> <p>5. Maximum 5 points = One (1) year of combined experience.</p> <p>6. 0 points = Less than one year (1) year of combined experience.</p>		
<b>Total Points Available</b>			<b>265</b>	
<b>Total Points needed to be Considered Compliant</b>			<b>183</b>	

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