

FAIRNESS ADVISOR'S FINAL REPORT



Independent Electricity System Operator

Request for Proposals for the Procurement of Long Term Electricity
Reliability Services

RFP Name: LT1 RFP

RFP Issued: September 29, 2023

Proposal Submission Deadline: December 12, 2023, at 3:00 P.M. (EPT)

REPORT ISSUED: December 12, 2024

December 12, 2024



Ms. Sheri Bizarro
Supervisor Resource Acquisition, Resource Development and Procurement
Independent Electricity System Operator
120 Adelaide Street West, Suite 1600
Toronto, Ontario, Canada
M6H 1T1

Re: Fairness Advisor Report to the Independent Electricity System Operator for the Request for Proposals for the Procurement of Long-Term Electricity Reliability Services

Dear Ms. Bizarro,

Robinson Global Management Inc. ("RGM") was retained as the Fairness Advisor for the above-mentioned procurement process on May 3, 2022, to oversee the Long-Term Electricity Reliability Services procurement portfolio processes being administered by the Independent Electricity System Operator ("IESO").

A. Fairness Advisor Report Purpose and Background

1. Fairness Advisor Scope

We were engaged to provide Fairness Advisory Services to support procurements related to IESO's Resource Adequacy Framework which includes assistance with the Long-Term Request for Qualifications and Request for Proposal procurement processes for the Long-Term and Expedited procurement processes (collectively the "Procurement") from the development of solicitation documents until contract execution. Our role has been and continues to be, to ensure that the IESO is in compliance with the relevant procurement processes and laws and to ensure that all potential proponents are treated consistently and fairly. To date, RGM has monitored the RFQ for Long-Term and Expedited procurement process, and the RFP for Expedited Long-Term Procurement Process (E-LT1 RFP), and the RFP for Long-Term 1 (LT1 RFP or RFP) including the RFP Development, Open Period, Evaluation, and the Notification and Debriefing processes of the procurement.

This letter details our summarized fairness findings for the RFP procurement process we monitored. Neither RGM nor the individual author(s) of this report, are responsible for any conclusions that may be drawn from this opinion. For further detail on the above-mentioned process, we recommend that communication be sought from the IESO's Resource Acquisition contact directly, whom RGM also reported to.

In completing this report, we took the IESO's Ministerial Procurement Directives, IESO's internal policies and procedures, Ontario Public Sector Procurement Directive, Canadian Free Trade Agreement (CFTA), Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA), Canada – European Union (EU) policies and procedures and the provisions of the RFP as a standard against which to audit the process.

We have no objections to the recommendations made by the IESO's Resource Acquisition and Contract Management Department as it relates to the Selected Proponents that have been selected by the IESO.

Our monitoring and advice were in the capacity as Fairness Advisor and strictly limited to our responsibilities and deliverables listed on the following page.

2. *The FA's responsibilities and deliverables for the LT1 RFP included:*

1. Advising on, and monitoring, the procurement process for the acquisition of resources required as part of the procurement.
2. Performing activities including (but not limited to) the following tasks:
 - a. Supporting the procurement process from design to contract award – reviewing materials and providing advice and comments on the procurement documents and processes, including the form of agreement; evaluation process; and selection criteria.
 - b. Participating in all aspects of the procurement process, including (but not limited to):
 - i. Monitoring communications between the IESO and potential proponents;
 - ii. Attending any information sessions / webinars that the IESO may hold for potential proponents;
 - iii. If applicable, monitoring and facilitating any confidential individual information sessions between proponents and the IESO;
 - iv. Monitoring responses to inquiries from interested parties or potential proponents during formal question and answer periods;
 - v. Participating in orientation and training sessions for evaluations; and
 - vi. Monitoring the evaluation process
 - vii. Observing the debriefings with unsuccessful proponents.
 - c. Providing a written report that attests to the fairness observed during the entire procurement process (the "Fairness Report") and submit to a designated IESO recipient after the conclusion of the evaluation process.
 - i. The format of the Fairness Report, including the determination of key subject areas, will be mutually agreed to between the IESO and FA.
 - ii. The Fairness Report will be completed independently by the FA and submitted to a designated IESO recipient upon completion. For certainty, to maintain the integrity of the engagement, the FA will not seek input from the IESO and the IESO will not provide guidance or suggest edits to the Fairness Report at any time.

3. *Long-Term RFP Purpose and Background*

As per section 1.2(c) in the LT1 RFP document issued on September 29, 2023, "...Through the Request for Qualifications for the Procurement of Long-Term Electricity Reliability Services published on June 3, 2022, as amended (the "LT1 RFQ"), the IESO sought qualification submissions to qualify participants to participate in the E-LT1 RFP and LT1 RFP to develop and operate Electricity resources capable of providing capacity services to meet system reliability needs."

As per section 1.2(d) in the LT1 RFP document issued on September 29, 2023, "...Through the Expedited Long-Term Request for Proposals published on December 6, 2022, as amended (the "E-LT1 RFP") for New Build and Eligible Expansion Electricity resources able to commit to commercial operation as early as 2025, the IESO sought proposals to competitively procure up to 1500 MW of year-round capacity services on a maximum contract capacity basis."

As per section 1.2(e) in the LT1 RFP document issued on September 29, 2023, "...The LT1 RFP is intended to competitively procure up to 2518 MW of year-round capacity services (the "Total Target Capacity"), on a Maximum Contract Capacity basis, of which 1600 MW are targeted to be procured from Electricity Storage Facilities (the "Storage Target Capacity") and 918 MW from resources other than Electricity Storage Facilities (the "Non-Storage Target Capacity")."

As per section 1.2(g) in the LT1 RFP document issued on September 29, 2023, "...The Selected Proponents of the LT1 RFP are required to enter into an Long-Term Reliability Services 1 Contract in the form set out in Appendix B (the "LT1 Contract") with the IESO for a commitment period commencing on the commercial operation date of the Long-Term Reliability Project as set out in the LT1 Contract and expiring on April 30, 2048, in the case of Long-Term Reliability Projects that do not utilize natural gas as power-generating technology, and April 30, 2040 in the case of natural gas-fired Long-Term Reliability Projects (the "Commitment Period")".

B. LT1 RFP Development & Open Period Processes

1. LT1 RFP Development

We were retained prior to the LT1 RFP (or "RFP") development, well in advance of the RFP issuance. We were given multiple opportunities to review and provide meaningful fairness comment on the RFP documents and processes until they were issued to the market in draft and final versions. The IESO prepared Proposal workbooks for Proponents to allow them to submit fully compliant and complete Proposals which aligned with the RFP submission requirements. In our view this was both necessary and helpful for the Proponents and the IESO, in addition to the required forms and contract.

We were able to confirm that the IESO's RFP documents outlined a process that was in our opinion procedurally fair, open, and transparent, and that should it be followed, it would lead to the administration of the fair, open and transparent evaluation results.

2. LT1 RFP Engagement Webinar & Technical Meetings

In accordance with RFP, section 3.4 Communications, the IESO held optional virtual Long-Term Procurement Engagement Sessions for the purposes of RFP development. These sessions were held on March 28, 2023, May 4, 2023, June 29, 2023, July 11, 2023, and August 17, 2023 to allow for greater understanding of the Long-Term RFP, goals, objectives of the procurement process, and to provide an additional opportunity for stakeholders to ask questions and provide feedback. These meetings were approximately two (2) hours in duration.

In accordance with RFP section 3.4 Communications, the IESO held optional virtual Long-Term Procurement Technical Meetings held by IESO's Transmission Planning team focused on the Deliverability Process. Specific topics discussed were eligibility, roles and responsibilities, and test scope, test outputs and test schedule. Two meetings were held on May 3, 2024, and another on, June 14, 2024. We the Fairness Advisor, monitored these meetings, and any comments that were raised during or after them to confirm that the IESO resolved them prior to the RFP Proposal Submission Deadline.

3. LT1 RFP Open Period

The RFP was issued on September 29, 2023, and the Proposal Submission Deadline was December 12, 2023, at 3:00:00 pm EDT. The RFP was in the market, excluding weekends and holidays for fifty-two (52) business days or seventy-five (75) calendar days. This period represented the amount of time that the Proponents were provided to understand the RFP requirements, respond to, and submit Proposals to the IESO through the established specified IESO email LT.RFP@ieso.ca.

Milestone	Date
IESO's deadline for releasing the final LT1 RFP and LT1 Contract	September 29, 2023
Proponent's deadline for submitting questions and comments, if any	November 17, 2023 (the "Question and Comment

	Deadline")
IESO's deadline for issuing Addenda to LT1 RFP and LT1 Contract, if any	November 28, 2023
Proposal submission deadline	December 12, 2023 (the " Proposal Submission Deadline ")
Target date for notification to Selected Proponents	May 10, 2024

Though requests for a submission extension were submitted, the IESO determined that the amount of time was sufficient as is, and due to key timelines in the procurement process, an extension could not be accommodated and would not be issued. In our opinion, the RFP Open Period timeframe was a sufficient amount of time to prepare the requested response and IESO was within its rights to deny the request.

Minor Qualification:

During the RFP Open Period the IESO was directed by the Government of Ontario's Minister of Energy on November 14, 2023, to deliver Municipal Council Presentations to various municipalities on the:

"...provincial system needs in light of the province's goals of growing our reliable, affordable and clean electricity system to support electric vehicles, new homes, economic growth and the electrification of industry. In accordance with the procurement rules the IESO should not speak in support of or against any specific project seeking to participate in its procurement, including any projects currently before those Municipal Councils."

At the time, RGM raised the potential concern that this directive and the presentation itself at various Municipal Council meetings could be interpreted as the IESO prioritizing natural gas fired generation, given the projects being discussed at those councils were gas generation. This is why RGM had initial concerns with the presentations occurring at this point in time in the RFP open period, in addition to the fact that there was no opportunity for the Proponents to be socialized as to why these presentations were occurring while they may also be presenting their project for approvals at the same time that the IESO was delivering presentations to Municipal Councils, and recognizing that there could be unintended impacts as a result. RGM was also given a proactive opportunity to review the presentation and speaking notes of the IESO prior to the presentation's delivery in the various forums to provide any feedback to the IESO that could reduce this risk.

In our view, the IESO was left with no other choice but to proceed as directed by the Ministry and we monitored to see if there were any negative impacts to any of the projects that submitted to the RFP at closing that could be reasonably deemed to be as a result of the IESO's Municipal Council Presentations, which we were not notified of at anytime. Furthermore, we did not observe any negative impacts during the evaluation process to project evaluations which occurred after the RFP Open Period. Given this, our final opinion was that this matter remained a minor qualification for future improvement. In future, we recommend that while procurements are active and in the open period, the IESO ought not deliver such presentations which could potentially impact Projects in its procurement, particularly if other proactive options can be pursued or planned to avoid or reduce the potential impacts of such presentations.

4. Questions and Addenda

The RFP documents indicated that Proponents should review and present any questions by the Question and Comments Deadline on November 17, 2023. The Proponents presented questions throughout engagement and the open period and participated actively in this process, which resulted in the IESO issuing three (3) questions and answers (Q&A) batch releases representing a total of 86 questions being

asked and responded to. The final Q&A was released by the addendum deadline, November 28, 2023, which was two (2) weeks before the Proposal Submission Deadline which exceeds the established best practice of at least one (1) week. All Q&A's and addendums were reviewed by us, the Fairness Advisor as prepared by the IESO and there were no matters of fairness to note in our oversight of this process or the communication issued.

The IESO issued all amendments by the deadline for issuing addenda date of November 28, 2023.

5. Long-Term RFP Frequently Asked Questions, Key Feedback and IESO Responses

Since November 16, 2022, the IESO has maintained an ongoing posting of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) for the Long-Term procurement processes. The last issuance prior to the RFP closing of the FAQs was Stakeholder Feedback and IESO Responses dated August 17, 2023. FAQs were issued clearly and transparently based on the section and process of the RFP that they were in reference to. This allowed the information to be reviewed and understood with a greater level of diligence and clarity. All Proponents had access to and the benefit of the responses in this document posted on the IESO's procurement webpage, however only addenda issued in the RFP Open Period process were able to amend the RFP documents, which was made clear.

6. LT1 RFP Transparency

The RFP stated the process overview, communication protocols, proposal evaluation process, specified terms and conditions, the process and submission timeline information, required prescribed forms and workbook for submission, the applied glossary of terms, as required for transparency. The RFP further stated the assessment factors of each evaluated criterion, and any additional processes in accordance with the RFP documents. The transparency in the RFP documents ensured that all Proponents had the clarity required to review whether their Proposals could satisfy the RFP requirements prior to submission.

Where there were pass/fail requirements for all mandatory requirements evaluation sections, these were disclosed with a clear indication when such pass/fail tests would be applied, and the impact that would be applied if a Proponent failed to satisfy any of them.

Our Fairness Advisor was able to confirm that all requirements remained unchanged post RFP closing.

C. LT1 RFP Evaluation Processes

1. LT1 RFP Closing

The LT1 RFP Proposal Submission received fifty-two (52) attempts at Proposal Submission. Four (4) proposals were withdrawn before the Proposal Submission Deadline

All Proposals that passed the IESO's Intake Process proceeded to Stage 1 – Completeness Requirements.

2. Stage 1 – Completeness Requirements (PASS/FAIL)

The IESO received fifty-two (52) Proposals that contained both the Proposal Fees and a main Proposal submission and proceeded to this Stage 1 – Completeness Requirements evaluation process. In accordance RFP section 4.1, each Proposal passed or failed this Stage 1 depending on whether the Proposal was complete and contains all documents, forms and declarations required by RFP section 3.6. All Proposals needed to be complete in all respects at the time of Proposal submission.

However, "if a Proposal would otherwise fail the Stage 1 completeness review as a result of a manifest error or deficiency on a submitted Prescribed Form, such as a missing date, name, signature or a

typographical error (and not, for certainty, a failure to pay the Proposal Fee, a failure to deliver the Proposal Security as required by Section 3.6 or a failure to submit a Prescribed Form in its entirety that is required by Section 3.6), the IESO may, in its Discretion, issue a rectification notice identifying a perceived deficiency and in such case will provide the Proponent a single opportunity to rectify the perceived deficiency and submit the applicable corrected or completed materials within the time period specified by the IESO in such notice.”

This evaluation was completed by the qualified IESO procurement staff, who were tasked with evaluating the completeness review and assessing matters for clarification when raised throughout the process, with advice from the approved internal procurement Supervisor, with consultation from the Legal Advisor, and us, the Fairness Advisor as needed.

The failures at this stage included, ten (10) Proposal Security matters, and did not pass the legal review – wrong amount provided, or provided after the Proposal Submission Deadline, or the use of alternate and insufficient draw language was used. One (1) additional Proposal was identified for disqualification due to its Proposal Fee being submitted after the Proposal Submission Deadline.

As a result of the above confirmed matters, the eleven (11) Proposals which contained the above failures, did not proceed forward in the evaluation process. Thirty-seven (37) Proposals successfully passed the Stage 1 evaluation process and proceeded to Stage 2 – Mandatory Requirements.

We reviewed all failures and passes identified by the IESO’s evaluation team from a fairness perspective and were able to verify all Stage 1 results.

3. Stage 2 – Mandatory Requirements (PASS/FAIL)

This evaluation was conducted by the qualified IESO staff that formed the evaluation team that completed the entire Stage 2 and 3 evaluation processes. The evaluation team members were selected and trained to ensure that they had the expertise to critically review, understand, and evaluate the Proposals against the pass/fail criteria provided in the RFP documents. The evaluation team members were distinct from the designers of the RFP, which allowed them to objectively review the Proposals and RFP documents during their review based on what was asked for and what was submitted by the Proponents.

In accordance with RFP section 4.2, in the Stage 2 process, each Proposal passed or failed depending on whether, based on the information provided in the completed Prescribed Forms and the Proposal, the Proposal met the Mandatory Requirements to pass to proceed forward in the evaluation process.

At the completion of the Stage 2 evaluation process, of the thirty-seven (37) Proposals (of which six (6) were non-storage; and thirty-one (31) were storage Proposals), two (2) non-storage, and ten (10) storage proposals failed to satisfy the Mandatory Requirements in this evaluation. As a result, and twenty-five (25) Proposals successfully proceeded to the Stage 3 – Rated Criteria evaluation process.

We reviewed all failures and passes from a fairness perspective and were able to verify all Stage 2 results.

4. Stage 3 – Rated Criteria (10 points)

In accordance with RFP section 4.3, all Proposals that had passed Stage 2 had their Rated Criteria evaluated by the IESO. The IESO assigned “Rated Criteria Points” to such Proposals as set out in this Section. There was a maximum of ten (10) Rated Criteria points awarded to any Proposal. The evaluation team members who completed the Stage 2 evaluation process, additionally completed this Stage 3 evaluation process, afterwards, but only the Proposals that successfully completed Stage 2, based on the Proponent Indigenous Participation Level (out of 3 points), Local Indigenous Communication Participation (out of 3 points), and Local Governing Body Support Confirmation (out of 4 points).

We reviewed all points awarded from a fairness perspective and were able to verify all Stage 3 results.

5. Stage 4 – Review of Proposal Price

In accordance with RFP section 4.4, all Stage 3 Proposals that were evaluated by the IESO, had their Proposal Price submission opened and they were assigned to one of the following categories depending on whether the Long-Term Reliability Project is an Electricity Storage Facility: (i) the Non-Storage Category; or (ii) the Storage Category.

In accordance with RFP section 4.4(b) for the non-storage, "Proposals Subject to RFP Section 5.10(m), all Proposals in the Non-Storage Category whose Proposal Price exceeds the weighted average of the Proposal Price (based on Maximum Contract Capacity) of all Proposals in the Non-Storage Category by more than fifty percent (50%) will not be evaluated further and will be rejected."

In accordance with RFP section 4.4(c) for the Storage Proposals, "Subject to RFP Section 5.10(m), all Proposals in the Storage Category whose Proposal Price exceeds the weighted average of the Proposal Price (based on Maximum Contract Capacity) of all Proposals in the Storage Category by more than forty percent (40%) will not be evaluated further and will be rejected."

In accordance with the RFP section 4.4(d)(i-iii) Proposals Evaluated Proposal Prices were evaluated for both the Storage Category and the Non-Storage Category, which were only be used by the IESO to rank the Proposal. The Evaluated Proposal Price did not impact the pricing under the LT1 Contract, which shall be based on the Proposal Price. The Evaluated Proposal Price (EPP), for both the Storage Category and the Non-Storage Category was calculated using the EPP formula.

In accordance with the RFP section 4.4(d)(iv) Proposals were ranked within the Non-Storage Category and Storage Category in order of their Evaluated Proposal Price, with the lowest Evaluated Proposal Price receiving the highest priority, the second lowest Evaluated Proposal Price receiving the second highest priority, and so on until all of the Proposals have been ranked according to their Evaluated Proposal Price. This produced the Non-Storage Preliminary List and the Storage Preliminary List.

There was one (1) failure of a Storage proposal that exceeded the 40% upper limit.

We reviewed and were able to verify all Stage 4 results from a fairness perspective.

6. Stage 5 – Deliverability Test Results Assessment

In accordance with RFP section 4.5, Proposals will be reviewed through the deliverability test procedures to determine if they will be added to the offer lists.

In accordance with RFP section 4.6, Any Proponent whose Proposal is included on the Non-Storage Offer List or the Storage Offer List was identified as a "Selected Proponent" and was required to enter into an LT1 Contract as described in Section 2.2 in respect of the applicable Proposal(s), and to carry out the provisions of the LT1 Contract.

As a result of this evaluation three (3) Non-Storage Proposals were successfully added to the Non-Storage Offer List. Ten (10) Storage Proposals were successfully added to the Storage Offer List. Eleven (11) Storage Proposals were not added to the offer list at the completion of this process.

We reviewed and were able to verify all Stage 5 results from a fairness perspective.

D. LT1 RFP Evaluation Process Approach and Methodology

1. *Evaluator Training Session*

Prior to the start of evaluating submissions, the IESO evaluation team received a mandatory detailed evaluation training, provided by the IESO's procurement representatives and Fairness Advisor. The training covered all aspects of the evaluation process and how to execute the evaluators' roles and responsibilities effectively and fairly to maintain the integrity of the process planned. The evaluators were briefed thoroughly on the best practices with respect to confidentiality of Proposals; conflict of interest; undue influence; secure management of the Proposals; and preparing their individual evaluations and comments in conformance of an approved evaluation workbook and guideline prepared for each evaluation stage that aligned with the RFP evaluation requirements and processes.

2. *Conflict of Interest & Confidentiality Management*

We are not aware of the existence of any conflict of interest or a breach of confidentiality occurring at any point during the evaluation process. All perceived matters were brought to our attention, reviewed, assessed, and resolved if and where present.

3. *Undue Influence Management*

No evaluator or other individual participant in the evaluation process, exerted undue influence over the process. Each evaluation stage was completed in a sequential order, as presented in the RFP documents, and with the observance of IESO's Procurement representatives, Legal Advisor, and us, the Fairness Advisor. All key evaluation process decisions were made by more than one person, verified by at least one other person, and documented. We reviewed all decisions through our invitation by IESO to conduct live fairness monitoring of the evaluation process. This allowed the IESO to ensure that decisions had the benefit of verifications and validation by others external to itself.

4. *Scoring Methodology Relating to Stage 2 (Mandatory Requirements) and 3 (Rated Criteria) Evaluations*

The evaluations occurred between December 2023 to May 2024. The evaluation team completed the Stage 2 and Stage 3 evaluations using the established best practice consensus two - step method: firstly, each evaluator, working alone, reviewed, and evaluated with supporting comments, each Proposal workbook in its entirety for each evaluation stage; secondly, the evaluators met at a group consensus meeting, for each evaluation stage.

During the evaluation consensus meetings held on each of Stage 2 and 3, we witnessed the evaluators discuss their individual findings actively and thoughtfully. While largely relying on their initial individual comments, the evaluation team discussions which occurred during each consensus meeting, strived to, and successfully arrived at a consensus evaluation assessment and comment for each assessment criterion of each evaluation stage. The evaluation team which completed their duties throughout Stages 2 and 3 for each stream of Proposals (Non-Storage and Storage), always maintained five (5) evaluation team members.

Evaluators were given an ability to challenge comments or opinions with their own written comments and to engage in a healthy discussion on any evaluation item with the goal of aligning the evaluation comments and decisions for each Proposal to the RFP evaluation requirements. All discussions were respectful and informed, as evaluators were prepared for each and every meeting, as were the IESO Procurement representatives and the supporting advisors, where needed. Each meeting within each evaluation stage was logistically consistent and maintained a consistent and full compliment of the evaluation participants so that each Proposal received an equivalent level of consideration by the same group of persons.

The evaluation team ensured that their evaluation aligned with the disclosed evaluation and Proposal requirements, Proposal evaluation methodology, glossary of terms disclosed, and maintained the disclosed criteria throughout the processes, as stipulated in the RFP. All evaluation results were transparently verified by IESO Procurement representatives, their Legal Advisor, and us, the Fairness Advisor, who monitored the consensus meetings to ensure accuracy.

E. Fairness Advisor Attestation

1. Debriefing Process

In accordance with the IESO's RFP section 3.8 – Debriefing, RFP Proponents who were not identified as a Selected Proponent were permitted to request a debriefing on their Proposal from the IESO and did receive one. The IESO held single debriefing meetings with each Proponent that requested one for any number of Proposals that they required one for. The duration of each debrief for each Proposal was thirty (30) minutes.

In attendance during each debrief were IESO staff, Legal Advisor, and Fairness Advisor, in addition to the Proponent. The purpose of the meetings was to deliver the findings and comments prepared by the evaluation team, which resulted in the Proposal being unsuccessful, and explaining what could have been done to improve the Proposal's results, where possible. The debriefings were transparent and consistent with the process stipulated in the RFP, in which clear feedback and responsiveness to questions was conveyed and opportunities to seek further clarity were provided. The debriefings occurred between June and July 2024.

2. Summary Fairness Findings

In conclusion we attest that the RFP process was conducted in a procedurally fair, open, and transparent manner and in alignment with the applicable directives, policies, and trade agreements. We confirm that the IESO has executed contracts with 13 selected proponents, acquiring 2,194.91 MW of new capacity scheduled to come into service between 2026-2028. These Proposals demonstrated their verified satisfaction of all disclosed requirements to be selected, in addition to their competitive ranking which led to their award. With exception to the minor qualification for future improvement we have outlined in this report all other matters have been fully resolved.

We confirm that all Proponents were always treated even-handedly during the procurement process. We certify that the Selected Proposals identified in this process were generated through rigorous and well-documented evaluation processes that we oversaw and have no objections to the results produced, from a fairness perspective.

Sincerely,



Andrea Robinson, B.A, LL.M., Q. Arb., PMP.
Senior Fairness Advisor, Robinson Global Management Inc.

cc: Don Solomon, B.A., CERT. ARCH.TECH.
Senior Fairness Advisor, Robinson Global Management Inc.

Doreen Wong, B.A., B.COMM., LL.B., CRIO., PMP.
Senior Fairness Advisor, Robinson Global Management Inc.