

# Feedback Form

## Long-Term 2 RFP – July 4, 2024

### Feedback Provided by:

Name: Paul Young

Title: Vice President – Generation Development

Organization: Orillia Power Generation Corporation

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: July 18, 2024

To promote transparency, feedback submitted will be posted on the Long-Term RFP engagement page unless otherwise requested by the sender. If you wish to provide confidential feedback, please mark "Confidential".

Following the LT2 RFP July 4, 2024, engagement webinar, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback from stakeholders on the items discussed. The presentation and recording can be accessed from the LT RFP [engagement web page](#).

**Please submit feedback to [engagement@ieso.ca](mailto:engagement@ieso.ca) by July 19, 2024.**

## MT2 RFP

Topic	Feedback
Do you have any feedback regarding resource eligibility under the MT2 RFP?	No comment
Do you have any feedback regarding the IESO's proposed method of determining the procurement target for the MT2 RFP?	Since a premise of IESO Pathways to Decarbonization report was that all existing contracted generation was to continue, it makes no sense to cap MT2 at 80% of existing contracts.
Do you have any feedback regarding the contract structure or term length under the MT2 RFP?	No comment
Do you have any feedback regarding capacity qualification for the MT2 RFP?	No comment
Do you have any feedback regarding proposal submission fees and proposal security requirements for the MT2 RFP?	No comment
Do you have any feedback to share regarding the IESO's proposed method of proposal evaluation under the MT2 RFP	No comment

## LT2 RFP Capacity Stream

Topic	Feedback
Do you have any feedback to share regarding the capacity stream under the LT2 RFP?	The LT2 capacity stream will be evaluated separately from the LT2 energy stream. This is consistent with every procurement that the IESO had conducted. That is, energy competes with energy and capacity competes with capacity which makes sense as they are quite different products. It therefore makes no sense that IESO is contemplating having Energy and capacity projects compete with each other under the LT2's Long Lead Time stream. The methodology chosen to compare energy and capacity projects could unintentionally bias one technology over the other.

## LT2 RFP Proposal Evaluation

Topic	Feedback
Do you have any feedback to share regarding the IESO's proposed method of proposal evaluation under the LT2 RFP?	<p>Final details are needed related to how indigenous equity ownership will lower the Evaluated Price. Municipal ownership should likewise be treated the same, resulting in a lowering of the Evaluated Price.</p> <p>Clarity should be provided regarding monthly production factors, as these change particularly with solar projects, as panels degrade over time.</p> <p>The submitted Proposal Price (\$/MW) should increase at full CPI between bid submission and COD. IESO should then make it clear how escalation will be treated post-COD</p>

## LT2 RFP Proposal Security

Topic	Feedback
Do you have any feedback to share regarding the proposal security requirements under the LT2 RFP?	Proposal security requirements are too high and will unnecessarily tie up capital. These requirements should be the same as the MT2 RFP, that is, \$10,000 per MW with no minimum.

## General Comments/Feedback

A stakeholder engagement session needs to be held related to the Long Lead Time Stream. No details are available related to evaluation and this is likely to be an area that receives a lot of feedback.