

Feedback Form

Long-Term RFP – March 10, 2022

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Mike Fletcher

Title: Project Manager, Climate Change and Resilience

Organization: City of Ottawa

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: March 14th, 2022

Following the March 10th public webinar on the Long-Term RFP, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback from participants on a variety of elements to help further inform the draft RFP and Contract, including: term length, revenue streams, deliverability process and Draft RFQ.

The referenced presentation can be found on the [Long-Term RFP webpage](#).

Please provide feedback by March 17, 2022 to engagement@ieso.ca.

Please use subject header: **Long-Term RFP**. To promote transparency, this feedback will be posted on the [Long-Term RFP webpage](#) unless otherwise requested by the sender.

The IESO will work to consider and incorporate comments as appropriate and post responses on the webpage.

Thank you for your contribution.

Term Length

Topic	Feedback
Does the revised, 15-year term length provide stakeholders with sufficient certainty for project financing and development?	

Revenue Streams

Topic	Feedback
Are stakeholders supportive of the high level approach for additional revenue streams, discussed in slides 26-28?	
Does an option with a capacity payment and energy market hedge provide stakeholders with sufficient certainty?	More definition is required around an energy market hedge
Do stakeholders believe that the high level revenue stream option supports efficient market operation? Are there additional considerations that could help support energy market efficiency?	Consider balancing benefits to both the transmission and distribution systems

Deliverability Process

Topic	Feedback
Do stakeholders have any comments on the deliverability process laid out on slides 34-36?	
Does the general timing of the proposed deliverability process (i.e., a deliverability assessment window prior to proposal submission) provide stakeholders with enough clarity on the deliverability of their proposed project?	

Draft RFQ

Topic	Feedback
Do stakeholders have any general comments on the draft RFQ as discussed on slides 37-46? <i>Please note that specific draft RFQ feedback is requested on the feedback form sent alongside the draft RFQ on February 28.</i>	

General Comments/Feedback

I had a comment which are mostly discussed with Barbara about existing contracts. While trying to respect time I didn't get one last aspect across which well communicated this morning and although I suspect this is being considered but in the interests of diligence, I'll mention it.

It could be problematic for a site with an existing contract to end up with two contracts after the LT RFP procurement. The risk of course is gaming and the danger that a supplier could end up simply directing its limited resources into the more lucrative contract at any given time. Therefore, I discussed the idea have existing contracts being opened to accommodate expansions as opposed to just adding a second contract to a site. This is likely more work to set up but relative to the concern I have expressed here, it's likely the best way to proceed.

More generally, to be in alignment with the City of Ottawa's Energy Evolution strategy, all resources under consideration should be free of combustion of any fuels and consideration should be given to projects with low embodied carbon. Also, consideration of climate change resiliency would be valuable for this RFP.

With regards to energy, we note the increasing energy demand as outlined in the most recent APO and another Ontario steel mill has announced plans to electrify since this APO was published. Therefore, proposals which include significant amount of new net energy generation may be of considerable value.