

Feedback Form

Hybrid Integration Project – June 23, 2021

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Julien Wu

Title: Director – Regulatory Affairs

Organization: Evolgen by Brookfield Renewable

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: July 16, 2021

Following the June 23, 2021 webinar on the Hybrid Integration Project, the IESO is seeking feedback from participants on the types of Hybrid pairings most likely to be developed in Ontario, as well as on the appropriateness of the proposed Vision questions. The IESO will work to consider feedback and incorporate comments as appropriate and post responses on the engagement webpage.

The referenced presentation can be found under the June 23, 2021 entry on the [Hybrid Integration Project webpage](#).

Please provide feedback by July 14, 2021 to engagement@ieso.ca. Please use subject: *Feedback: Hybrid Integration Project*. To promote transparency, this feedback, if provided in an AODA-compliant format (e.g. using this form) will be posted on the [Hybrid Integration Project webpage](#) unless otherwise requested by the sender.

Thank you for your time.

Hybrid Pairings

Topic	Feedback
What types of Hybrid pairings (technology and storage-to-generation ratios) are most likely to be developed in Ontario? Why?	<p>Likely hybrid pairings are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Wind and storage to shift generation profile and to improve wind capacity rating.2. Large hydro and hydrogen electrolysis: using baseload and renewable generation to produce blue hydrogen.3. Wind and solar acting as complements to each other's profile. <p>Investments to enable such pairings require long term contracts, a significantly larger capacity auction that reflects Ontario's true resource adequacy needs, pricing mechanisms to adequately value a project's ancillary benefits, and/or renewable portfolio standards or other renewable procurement requirements that provide long term funding.</p>

Draft questions for Hybrid Vision Phase

Topic	Feedback
Are the Vision questions appropriate given IESO's intent to pursue a foundational participation model?	<p>The visioning questions are appropriate. We also recommend the IESO to further consider the visioning exercise from the perspective of potential investors. Most of the draft visioning questions are understandably raised from a system needs perspective. However, if the IESO wished to rely on market mechanisms to promote hybrid projects, it should publicly consider whether current market designs are sufficient for investors to take action. For example, would revenue sources be different for FTM and BTM projects (e.g. how would grid benefits be valued differently)? Would FTM and BTM projects incur different infrastructure costs (e.g.</p>

Topic	Feedback
	delivery charges)? Would projects incorporating existing assets (e.g. existing wind + new storage) be treated differently than new projects? These questions remain relevant even if the IESO intends to reward long-term contracts via RFPs to enable hybrid projects.

General Comments/Feedback