

# Feedback Form

## Long-Term RFP – April 20, 2022

### Feedback Provided by:

Name: Mike Brugge

Title: Chief Technology Officer

Organization: BW Solar

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: May 2, 2022

Following the April 20<sup>th</sup> public webinar on the Long-Term RFP, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback from participants on the additional procurement mechanisms, as well as on proposed revenue streams.

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

**Please provide feedback by May 2, 2022 to [engagement@ieso.ca](mailto: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.

## Additional Acquisition Mechanisms: Expedited Procurement

Topic	Feedback
Considering higher security amounts, what incentives are sufficient to encourage expedited project development to meet the 2025 needs (e.g., increased term length, price adders, reduced RFP requirements)?	Increased term certainly makes the project more attractive to raise financing and would therefor be a nice incentive to encourage expedited project development.
What evidence can proponents include in the proposal to show the advanced stages of project development?	Proponents could should progress towards applicable MECF filing, zoning application, municipal planning application. We'd suggest providing proof that in each case the applications have been submitted or returned with approval.
Is there any other external support (e.g., from the IESO) that would be needed to help proponents meet expedited development timelines?	It could be helpful if the IESO could provide early collaborative market registration and expectations for commissioning as well as place pressure on the Hydro One side of the facility build out. Perhaps taking on some of the timing risks associated.
Are the proposed timelines acceptable to proponents? (slide 23 of April 20 presentation)	Timelines are tight. IESO should consider faster process to award as a couple months could make a difference. Alternatively, IESO could take equipment procurement risk during contract negotiations.
Do the timelines for the Expedited procurement offer sufficient time for proposal preparation? (slide 23 of April 20 presentation)	Yes
Any further general comments on the Expedited procurement?	

## Additional Acquisition Mechanisms: Same Technology Expansions

Topic	Feedback
What milestones (i.e., contract execution) and forward period would be required to support a 2025 in-service date?	N/A

Topic	Feedback
What considerations regarding the existing contracts does the IESO need to take into account in the design of the process?	
Is there any other external support (i.e.,, from the IESO) that would be needed to help proponents meet expedited development timelines?	
Any further general comments on the same technology expansions?	

### Additional Acquisition Mechanisms: Forward Capacity Auction

Topic	Feedback
To what extent does a forward capacity auction with longer forward and commitment periods increase interest for prospective auction participants?	N/A
Do stakeholders have any comments on expanded participation and eligibility for resources?	
Do stakeholders have any comments on demand curve parameters?	
Do stakeholders have any comments on interactions with the annual capacity auction including target capacities?	
Do stakeholders have any input to provide into the design of longer forward and commitment period?	
Do stakeholders have any further comments on other business/stakeholder considerations associated with longer forward periods?	
Any further general comments on the forward capacity auction?	

## LT1 Design Considerations: Revenue Streams

Topic	Feedback
Are stakeholders supportive of the concept of a bundled CFD style approach?	Yes, but would appreciate more detail.
As per slide 54, is a bundled CFD contract preferred that is either: (1) linked to energy market prices, with a strike price set at a \$/MWh value beyond a capacity payment, or (2) linked to a total revenue requirement \$/MW-month that includes both capacity revenues and energy market revenues?	
How can a bundled CFD be best designed in order to ensure resources adhere to energy market incentives, in exchange for investor certainty?	

## LT1 Design Considerations: Mandatory requirements

Topic	Feedback
Do stakeholders have any feedback on the examples of mandatory requirements on slide 63?	
Are stakeholders supportive of the Indigenous and Municipal mandatory requirements proposed for the LT1 RFP and Expedited procurement on slide 64?	yes

## LT1 Design Considerations: Rated criteria

Topic	Feedback
Are stakeholders supportive of the rated criteria approach that is proposed for the LT1 RFP and Expedited procurement?	Would like to further understand the scoring criteria, but concepts are fine. Would like to see online date be accounted for in the scoring criteria.
Are stakeholders supportive of the Indigenous participation rated criteria proposed on slide 66?	Yes.

# General Comments/Feedback