

Stakeholder Feedback and IESO Response

Long Lead-Time Request for Proposals (LLT RFP) – February 18, 2026

Following the [December 18 2025, Long Lead-Time RFP Engagement Webinar](#), the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) invited stakeholders to provide feedback on the following design items: Buy Local Policy Provisions, Municipal Support Confirmations, Team Member Experience, Independent Engineer Report Requirement, Early Commercial Operation, Post Proposal Applicable Tariffs, Mid-Term Extended Outages, Must Offer Requirements (Capacity), Draft RFP and Contract, and other procurement design considerations. Non-confidential feedback is posted on the [Long Lead-Time RFP Engagement Webpage](#). Feedback identified as confidential by stakeholders is not posted but reflected as part of the common feedback themes. Please reference the feedback forms for specific feedback as the information below is provided in summary.

Note on Feedback Summary and IESO Response

The IESO appreciates the feedback received from stakeholders and communities. The tables set out below respond to the feedback received and are organized by topic. Capitalized terms used in the IESO responses below not otherwise defined herein, have the meaning given to such terms in the draft LLT(e) RFP, LLT(e) Contract, LLT(c) RFP or LLT(c) Contract (each, as applicable) posted to the [Long Lead-Time RFP Webpage](#).

Disclaimer

This document and the information contained herein is provided for informational purposes only. The IESO has prepared this document based on information currently available to the IESO and reasonable assumptions associated therewith. The IESO provides no guarantee, representation, or warranty, express or implied, with respect to any statement or information contained herein and disclaims any liability in connection therewith. The IESO undertakes no obligation to revise or update any information contained in this document as a result of new information, future events or otherwise. In the event there is any conflict or inconsistency between this document and the IESO market rules, any IESO contract, any legislation or regulation, or any request for proposals or other procurement document, the terms in the

market rules, or the subject contract, legislation, regulation, or procurement document, as applicable, govern.

A) Buy Local Policy Provisions

Stakeholders estimated that ~20-50% of capital expenditures for goods, services and labour related to the project can be sourced from Ontario and/or Canada. In general, labour, consulting (engineering, permitting, etc.), site preparation costs, construction services, and certain construction materials can be sourced from Ontario/Canada; percentages depend on the project type. Specific feedback is cited below.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>Stakeholders noted that their ability to source certain components within Ontario or Canada is limited, and requiring domestic sourcing could increase project costs.</p>	<p>The IESO understands stakeholder concerns regarding the potential for increased project costs if domestic sourcing requirements are introduced, particularly given the limited availability of certain components within Ontario and Canada. At this time, any requirements related to domestic content would be a policy decision made by the Government of Ontario. The IESO will be able to provide further information and guidance once a formal directive is received.</p>
<p>The IESO should consider linking the types of project components it deems eligible in procurements to those that qualify for technology specific Capital Cost Allowance (CCA) in Canada, used for the purpose of reporting business expenses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This could help support or align with any preference for “Made in Ontario” or “Made in Canada” content in current or future procurement processes.	<p>At this time, any requirements related to domestic sourcing (including how project components will be reported) would be a policy decision made by the Government of Ontario. The IESO will be able to provide additional details once a formal directive is received.</p>

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>The definition of “Buy Local” should include not only Canadian registered businesses but also foreign companies that subcontract work to Canadian firms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would encourage major non-Canadian industry players to hire Canadian suppliers for materials and components whenever possible. 	<p>The IESO appreciates this feedback and will share with government, who will determine the formal policy direction that will apply.</p>
<p>The IESO should require bidders to provide a standardized, verifiable “Canadian content” cost breakdown to enhance transparency.</p>	<p>At this time, the IESO expects that Proponents would be required to submit a Supply Chain Disclosure Plan that identifies major goods, services and workforce resources and their source (e.g., Ontario made, Canadian made or sourced elsewhere), including rationale for any elements that cannot be sourced domestically. For successful Proponents, this plan would be shared with the Ministry of Energy and Mines.</p> <p>Under the LLT Contract, Suppliers would be required to report on progress against their Supply Chain Disclosure Plan, and any changes thereto, providing rationale in instances where they were not able to accomplish parts of the plan (reporting expected to be annual).</p>

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>Buy Local should preferentially support low-impact solutions (storage, DSM, renewables):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision should not support high-impact water infrastructure proposals • The IESO must not weaken environmental standards, consultation requirements, or scientific evaluation in order to secure “local economic benefit” narratives. 	<p>At this time, eligible resource types for the LLT RFP have been finalized, and the procurement design will continue to reflect those defined resource categories (e.g., generally hydro for the LLT(e) RFP and certain LDES technologies for the LLT(c) RFP). As such, the buy local considerations will be developed to encourage domestic sourcing to the extent reasonably possible for these project types.</p> <p>Buy local provisions would have no impact on applicable environmental standards or consultation requirements.</p>

B) Municipal Support Confirmations

Stakeholders were largely concerned with obtaining Municipal Support Confirmations (MSC) before August 21, 2026. Stakeholders felt no deadline was necessary as the responsibility still fell on Proponents to manage the process. Specific feedback is provided below.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>The IESO should not require the Municipal Support Confirmation process for any large provincial projects connected to HONI’s major TX lines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Councils simply do not have the staff expertise to assess provincial grid planning or needs. Alternatively, Municipal Support Confirmations should be replaced for large projects with a standard, province wide Community Benefits Agreement set per MW payment that eliminates municipal veto power allowing IESO-approved projects to proceed as needed as determined by the provincial electricity planning system always in the public interest. 	<p>The Municipal Support Confirmation (MSC) is a policy-related requirement that the IESO expects to be included as part of formal government direction required to proceed with the LLT RFP. The IESO expects this requirement to align with the LT2 RFP whereby any Proposal for a project proposing to locate its Project Site in whole or in part on Municipal Project Lands must obtain an MSC prior to Proposal Submission. The IESO does not have the authority to exempt certain projects or replace the MSC requirement with an alternative mechanism.</p>

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>The IESO should not have a specific deadline for the issuance of Municipal Support Confirmations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IESO has not yet set an RFP submission date, other than indicating it is intended to occur before the end of 2026. However, the exact timing remains unknown due to outstanding “buy local provision” contracting considerations. It is not prudent to establish an MSC deadline without first having clarity on the RFP submission deadline. • Responsibility will still fall on proponents to ensure they manage their MSC processes in a manner that accounts for this being a Municipal election year. • The municipal councils would not appreciate a rushed approach, which may impact the award of the Municipal Support resolutions. • The municipal staff and city councils have provided feedback to avoid summer months if possible as they often break for the summer. 	<p>Following further engagement with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and stakeholders, the IESO has decided to remove the "no-later-than" limitation for the issue date of MSCs. The IESO encourages Proponents to engage with municipalities early and often, to understand any implications of the 2026 Municipal election and timing of municipal council meetings, to ensure that in instances where a municipality wishes to provide an MSC, it is obtained prior to Proposal submission.</p>

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>The IESO should allow for contracts to be awarded conditionally on obtaining an MSC by or within a reasonable period post-contract award.</p>	<p>The Municipal Support Confirmation (MSC) is a policy-related requirement that the IESO expects to be included as part of formal government direction required to proceed with the LLT RFP. The IESO expects this requirement to align with the LT2 RFP whereby any Proposal for a project proposing to locate its Project Site in whole or in part on Municipal Project Lands must obtain an MSC prior to Proposal Submission. The IESO does not have the authority to allow for the provision of an MSC at a time other than Proposal Submission.</p>
<p>The IESO should move the RFP submission deadline to Q1 2027:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would allow for additional time for meaningful communications between the Proponent and the impacted communities. 	<p>At this time, the submission deadline for the LLT RFP is anticipated to be around Q4 2026. The IESO understand that this falls around the time of the municipal election period. To mitigate risks related to obtaining Municipal Support Confirmations the IESO will be releasing usable versions of prescribed forms that can be used for the purposes of obtaining Municipal support.</p> <p>The IESO encourages proponents to begin engaging with municipalities as soon as possible to ensure that they are aware of the project under consideration.</p>

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>The IESO should remove the 60 day minimum period between delivery of Pre-Engagement Confirmation and the date of Municipal Support Confirmation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creates an unnecessary procedural bottleneck when early and frequent engagement by the Proponent with the Municipality has already been taking place. 	<p>This requirement is intended to ensure that municipalities receive adequate notice and have sufficient time to review, consider, coordinate with community members and respond to project information in a consistent and transparent manner.</p> <p>The IESO encourages proponents to make use of the sample Pre-Engagement Confirmation Notice that will be included in the usable version of the Prescribed Form: Evidence of Municipal Support as soon as this is available (expected to be at the end of February).</p>

C) Team Member Experience

Some stakeholders were fully supportive of current team member experience requirements; Specific feedback is provided below.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>Experience with conventional hydroelectric facility should qualify as same technology experience for pumped storage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pumped storage is a direct variant of hydroelectric generation, and the relevant development expertise is transferable. Few domestic projects exist in Canada, and most are owned by government utilities that do not share team members Same technology team experience is important for other LDES technologies, like compressed air, because these are new technologies, which is not the case for pumped storage hydro and hydro. 	<p>The Same Technology Qualifying Project requirement only applies to Class II LDES Technologies, which are defined as Liquid Air Energy Storage and Pumped Thermal Energy Storage.</p> <p>All other project types are required to have Designated Team Members with the required experience with Qualifying Projects, which can be of any technology type as long as the project meets the minimum size requirement identified in the RFP (i.e. 10 MW for LLT Capacity Projects and 1 MW for LLT Energy Projects).</p>

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>For Class II LDES Technologies, the Team Member Experience requirements should be revised to allow Proponents to meet the requirements by engaging engineering consultants with specialized expertise, without requiring them to be Designated Team Members.</p>	<p>Under the LLT RFP, a Designated Team Member means an individual who is either a director, officer or an employee of the Proponent or a Control Group Member of the Proponent. The requirement was designed to ensure that experienced team members will be directly involved in the project and continue to be part of the project team and not involved in any other Proponent's project team, through to commercial operation. While consultants can be used to support project development, they may not be enduring or exclusive members of the project team and as such cannot be used to meet this requirement. This element of team member experience has remained consistent across the LT2 RFP and LLT RFP.</p>
<p>The IESO should add South Africa and Slovakia to the list of applicable jurisdictions for Same Technology Qualifying Projects.</p>	<p>After further consideration, the IESO will no longer restrict eligible jurisdictions for Same Technology Qualifying Projects. While the Qualifying Projects experience requirement is intended to ensure proponents have broad experience delivering utility-scale energy projects in markets similar to Ontario, the Same Technology Qualifying Projects requirement is focused solely on confirming that proponents have minimum experience developing the specific technology, regardless of jurisdiction.</p>

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>Proponents should be required to demonstrate Team Member Experience with a record of at least two (2) Qualifying Projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hydropower is more complex and impactful on the ecosystem and must be properly planned and mitigated. 	<p>The IESO believes that the minimum requirement to have at least two (2) Designated Team Members that have experience with at least one (1) Qualifying Project in each Team Member Experience category provides an appropriate minimum experience requirement in these circumstances.</p> <p>As a reminder, projects are required to comply with all related Laws and Regulations (including those related to environmental permitting) throughout project development and operation.</p>

D) Independent Engineer Report Requirement

Many stakeholders provided project-specific information they believe should be included in the Independent Engineer’s report. Specific feedback is provided below.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>The Independent Engineer Template should require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hydrology and climate stress testing Sedimentation and reservoir capacity risk analysis Lifecycle GHG analysis Fish passage objectives Cumulative effects assessment Decommissioning and end of life planning Upfront financial securities 	<p>The IESO will take these suggestions into consideration as we continue to develop the Independent Engineer Report Prescribed Form.</p>
<p>The IESO should provide a Prescribed Form in which a Professional Engineer can attest that they have reviewed relevant materials and can attest to the Class II project submission meeting the requirements.</p>	<p>The IESO is developing a Class II LDES Independent Engineer Report Prescribed Form for Proponents to complete and submit as part of the proposal submission.</p>

E) Early Commercial Operation

Stakeholders were largely supportive of the IESO taking a more flexible approach when assessing deliverability, including allowing Supplier to come into service earlier than the milestone COD of 2035 if the grid conditions can support an earlier COD. Specific feedback is provided below.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>The IESO should require the following from Proponents before allowing Early Commercial Operation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental authorizations are complete • Indigenous consultation obligations have been meaningfully addressed • Major transmission dependencies are credible and not speculative assumptions. 	<p>Environmental authorizations are the responsibility of Proponents, who must ensure that all applicable approvals are obtained in accordance with regulatory requirements, considering project development timelines. In addition, it is the Proponent's responsibility to ensure that applicable Indigenous consultation obligations are fulfilled within any prescribed timelines. The Contract will require Proponents to comply with all applicable laws and regulations in developing their Facility.</p> <p>The IESO is still finalizing the deliverability approach that will apply under the LLT RFP, however it is expected that only transmission enhancements that have been committed and would be expected to be in service by 2034, would be included as part of the deliverability assessment.</p>
<p>The IESO should extend the term of the contract to include the early operation timeframe.</p>	<p>Early operation incentives would provide an unfair advantage to technologies with shorter lead times, which is not the intent of the procurement. Additionally, early operation incentives are intended to incentivize projects reaching commercial operation early to meet system needs identified in those early years. The IESO has other available procurement mechanisms (e.g. LT2, MT) to meet system needs in the years before the proposed LLT MCOD.</p>

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>The IESO should not have limitation on early COD of 5-8 years after contract date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The only restriction to obtaining early COD should be related to transmission upgrades required to secure connection. 	<p>The IESO is in the process of developing the approach that will apply for projects that are seeking to attain commercial operation under the Contract between Contract Year 5 and the Milestone Date for Commercial Operation (MCOB).</p> <p>An updated proposal will be presented at the next stakeholder engagement session.</p>

F) Post-Proposal Applicable Tariffs

Specific feedback is provided below.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>The IESO should allow the Supplier the option of not terminating the contract if the revised price is not accepted by the IESO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The contract currently states the contract will be terminated without any cost or payments of any kind to either party, the Supplier should have the option to proceed with the original price. 	<p>The IESO will not be removing the automatic termination of the agreement in the case of a rejected Tariff Adjustment Notice (TAN) price; this language is consistent with the LT2 Contracts.</p> <p>Submitting a TAN should be done with careful consideration, only if and to the extent the submitted price change is absolutely critical to maintain the viability of the Facility and should not be used or considered as a negotiating mechanism. This measure is intended to ensure that all price notices are submitted with due diligence and seriousness, and only to the extent necessary.</p>

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>If the evidence in the Tariff Adjustment Notice(s) provided by a supplier is substantiated, the IESO should not have the absolute discretion to terminate a contract without payments of costs incurred to date by the Supplier.</p>	<p>Submitting a TAN should be done with careful consideration, and only if the proposed price change is absolutely critical to maintain the viability of the Facility. A TAN should not be used or viewed as a negotiating mechanism. This approach helps ensure that all price adjustment requests are submitted with due diligence and only to the extent necessary.</p> <p>Where a TAN is submitted and the IESO exercises its contractual right to terminate, the Supplier is not left without protection. In such cases, the Completion and Performance Security would be returned in full.</p>
<p>Could the IESO confirm if Tarriff Adjustment Events are considered Force Majeure.</p>	<p>A Tarriff Adjustment Event would not be considered Force Majeure.</p>
<p>The IESO should reduce TAN timelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IESO has 50 business days to review the documentation submitted for a tariff adjustment event (two months) and the Supplier is required to respond in 10 business days for additional supporting documentation if requested. • Suppliers are effectively putting at least 2.5 months of construction time at risk if they wait for a decision, which can be critical as in-water work is time constrained due to spring spawning periods (no in-water work from April 1 to July 15). 	<p>The IESO is not considering making changes to the timelines related to the TAN process, which are consistent with the LT2 RFP. It should be noted that these times are upper limits and in the event a Tariff Adjustment Notice is submitted by the Supplier, the IESO will process these as soon as possible, which may result in a shorter timeline.</p>

G) Mid-Term Extended Outages

Stakeholders welcomed the added flexibility the IESO introduced, allowing suppliers to take multiplied mid-term extended outages that add up to a total period of 12 months. Specific feedback is provided below.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>Mid-term extended outages should be limited and clearly defined to major refurbishment events that cannot be addressed through ordinary planned outages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outage flexibility must not become a loophole to mask chronic hydrology-related underperformance, especially as drought risk increases. 	<p>Mid-term Extended Outages are intended to address required maintenance and activities that occur over the life of the contract for long-lived resources that are the subject of the LLT RFP. For clarity, the IESO does not expect major refurbishment events for new hydro facilities that will be contracted through the LLT RFP. Rather, Mid-term Extended Outages are intended to address required maintenance and refurbishment activities that occur over the designed useful life of the Facility. Given their purpose and limited applicability, midterm outages would not be a practical or effective means to address or conceal performance issues related to hydrology. These outages are structured to support the long-term reliability and sustainability of assets, not to provide flexibility for managing resource variability.</p>
<p>The IESO should use the agreed upon terms for the Northern Hydro Program (NHP) to inform decisions on the design of the LLT(e) contract.</p>	<p>While the IESO will take into consideration the agreed-upon terms and lessons learned from the development of the NHP, it is important to emphasize that the NHP and LLT are distinct procurements. Both have different objectives, timelines, and design features that differ significantly, particularly in relation to existing versus new-build projects.</p>

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>The IESO should account for unanticipated maintenance outside of supplier control:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern is that Section 11.2(i) indicates that such a failure could possibly be excluded as a force majeure event 	<p>In cases where unanticipated maintenance events outside of a Supplier’s control occur, these types of events would likely fall under Section 11.3(j), which addresses unanticipated outages that may qualify as Force Majeure, even if not explicitly listed in Section 11.2.</p> <p>However, it is important to note that the determination of whether a specific event constitutes Force Majeure must be made on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the facts and contractual criteria applicable to each situation.</p>

H) Must Offer Requirements (Capacity)

Stakeholders were supportive of the expansion of qualifying hours to include weekends and holidays. Specific feedback is provided below.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>The IESO should include contractual coverage mechanisms in the event LLT LDES resources are energy-constrained due to being dispatched during qualifying hours, without risking non-performance charges.</p>	<p>While Suppliers are expected to make commercially reasonable efforts to charge overnight, they would still be able to meet Must Offer Obligations under the LLT(c) Contract by offering their full Contract Capacity into the DAM, even if they are not able to fully charge overnight. Market enhancements contemplated under the Enabling Resources Program (ERP) will provide the IESO with more visibility into parameters such as state of charge, so that resources will only be scheduled based what they can provide.</p>

I) Draft RFP and Contract

Multiple stakeholders stated they would be reviewing the draft RFP and contracts in the coming weeks. Specific feedback is provided below.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>Clarity is requested about Section 11.2(e) which excludes force majeure for outages if the System Operator amends the schedule of Planned Outages for the facility as set out in the Operating Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specifically, what recourse is available to the Supplier to negotiate any changes to the Operating Plan made by the System Operator? 	<p>This section (which has existed in IESO contracts for several years across several procurements) is intended to ensure that the mere fact of the System Operator exercising its powers under the IESO Market Rules to manage Planned Outages, does not, in and of itself, constitute Force Majeure and Suppliers must be prepared to comply with the IESO Market Rules as it relates to Planned Outage management by the System Operator.</p>
<p>The IESO should provide a detailed comparison of the Northern Hydro Program contract and the draft LLT(e) contract.</p>	<p>The LLT RFP is a distinct procurement with objectives and design features that differ significantly from the NHP contract; as such, it should be reviewed as a standalone framework rather than compared directly.</p>

J) General Feedback

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>Is there a mechanism to address major price increases that are beyond the control of the Supplier:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suppliers will receive indicative pricing from vendors to support the proposal price. There is likely a three-to-four-year gap when the equipment will be finalized and the service agreements will be completed. It is possible for prices to go up quite a bit in that time frame. 	<p>It is the responsibility of Proponents to account for potential cost escalations and associated risks within their bid Proposal price. Proponents are expected to incorporate appropriate contingencies, risk management strategies, and commercial assumptions when preparing their submissions.</p> <p>That being said, to acknowledge price increases commensurate with the longer development timeline of long lead-time resources, 100% of contract prices will be indexed at the Consumer Price Index (CPI) prior to Commercial Operation. In addition, the Post Proposal Applicable Tariff provisions are intended to offer some protection against capital cost impacts due to tariffs.</p>
<p>The IESO should maintain consistency with the LT2 RFP and not have a reserve price.</p>	<p>The IESO has made the decision to proceed with establishing a Reserve Price for the LLT RFP. Reserve prices allow the IESO to prioritize rate payer value by procuring cost-effective resources while managing the uncertainty associated with the cost of developing long lead-time resources and maintaining the objective of broadening Ontario’s supply mix.</p> <p>Further details will be shared during an upcoming stakeholder engagement.</p>

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>The IESO should quantify the full value stack of long lead time technologies when establishing the Reserve Price:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operating lives beyond a 40-year contract. • Local economic development benefits, including job creation, regional investment, and support for aging infrastructure. • Resource diversity, helping avoid long-term overreliance on technologies subject to global price volatility. 	<p>As part of the next stage of engagement, the IESO will be presenting greater detail on the proposed methodology for calculating the Reserve Price, with consideration for stakeholder feedback.</p>
<p>The IESO should publish the Reserve Price:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure transparency by publishing the methodology used to determine the Reserve Price, allowing proponents to understand and respond appropriately. • This remains a significant risk for Proponents without understanding what the upper limit is. Significant investment is required to develop a Proposal, much more so than wind, solar or battery energy storage projects. 	<p>To preserve competition and ensure the most cost-effective outcomes, the Reserve Price will be confidential and will be determined by the IESO and documented with its Fairness Advisor prior to the Proposal Submission Deadline.</p>

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>The IESO should allow for a second bid submission if the initial bid exceeds the Reserve Price:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This second round would occur only if the IESO does not procure the full targeted MW in the first round. • The second round would be shorter, with updated bid prices submitted within one month of IESO notification. • Only remaining MWs would be re-tendered; initial Selected Proponents would not be affected, preserving fairness. 	<p>If the initial Proposal price exceeds the Reserve Price, the IESO is not contemplating allowing for a second round of Proposal price submissions under the LLT RFP. Only one round of Proposal price submissions will be allowed, in order to maintain fairness in the procurement process, provide all Proponents with an equal chance, and administer the LLT RFP through an efficient Proposal Evaluation process.</p>
<p>The IESO should increase the percentage of the contract price that is escalated during the Commitment Period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended that the IESO allow 60% of the Year 1 Contract price for LLT resources to escalate with inflation. • LLT projects have long operating lives and higher ongoing operating and sustaining capital costs, making them more exposed to long-term inflation than shorter-lived technologies (e.g., batteries, wind, solar). • A 60/40 inflation-linked split better reflects real cost drivers such as labour, sustaining capex, and maintenance, which track actual inflation over a 40-year contract. • Allowing more inflation coverage would reduce this risk, enabling more competitive bids, benefiting both the IESO and ratepayers. 	<p>The IESO has decided to maintain the escalation of 20% of the Fixed Price/Fixed Capacity Payment during the Commitment Period. This is reflective of the IESO’s level of willingness to take on expected cost increases during the Commitment Period, in conjunction with assumptions in respect of the portion of the overall cost of the facility post-COD that is exposed to escalation. If Suppliers require more protection against perceived escalation risk, this can be included in a higher bid Proposal price.</p>

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
<p>The IESO should not include rated criteria points for avoiding Prime Agricultural land for capacity projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LLT LDES projects are few in number, have very high energy density, and have long operational lives, making strategic grid siting more important than land-use scoring. • These projects should be encouraged to locate where they provide maximum long-term system benefits, not where they maximize points for avoiding prime farmland. 	<p>How rated criteria points are awarded for avoiding prime agricultural areas remains a policy matter currently under review as part of the upcoming directive.</p> <p>Further detail on this topic will be provided at the next stakeholder engagement session, where we will outline the latest direction.</p>