

Feedback Form

Long-Term RFP – March 10, 2022

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Reza Lotfalian

Title: President and CTO

Organization: Kaaj Energy Inc.

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: 2022-03-18

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?	Some power generations can have a lifespan of more than 15 years (e.g., 20 years to longer) and it will be helpful for these technologies to get a longer contract term. On the other hand, 15 years of lifespan is a stretch for some technologies such as batteries and going above 15 years will eliminate them from the process. Would it be possible to add flexibility to the contract term to reflect the lifespan of each technology? For instance, a minimum term of 15 years with flexibility to go to 20 years if a specific technology/solution can reach that lifespan.

Revenue Streams

Topic	Feedback
Are stakeholders supportive of the high level approach for additional revenue streams, discussed in slides 26-28?	A UCAP + Energy Hedge seems to be a good approach as long as the IESO considers the differences between different power generators and energy storage solutions and tailors the contract to reflect the specifics of each plant.
Does an option with a capacity payment and energy market hedge provide stakeholders with sufficient certainty?	It is not clear to me that how a power plant bids to the energy market when the market clearing price or HOEP is below its contracted minimum Hedge value. I need clarification on how a minimum strike price will keep the electricity market a 'free market' based on a fair bidding process.

Topic	Feedback
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?	For energy storage (ES) plants, is this possible to consider than the plant is serving the grid both when charging and discharging? In other words, can it generate revenue when it charges (i.e., acts as a load to avoid curtailment of renewable power sources)? To provide an example, CAISO uses this model.

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?	If the outcome of the process for two or more proponents is 'Deliverable but competing', it is fair that IESO provides sufficient time for the competing resources to change their project location, if requested by the competitors.

Draft RFQ

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

General Comments/Feedback