

# Feedback Form

## Long-Term RFP – June 9, 2022

### Feedback Provided by:

Name: Matt Lensink

Title: CEO

Organization: CEM Engineering

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: June 20, 2022

Following the June 9<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 June 20, 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 Mechanisms: Overview and Linkages

Topic	Feedback
Please provide any feedback on the IESO's overview of the Additional Mechanisms (Expedited Process, Same-Technology Expansions, FCA) and the linkages between acquisition mechanism (e.g., Expedited Process and LT1 RFP, or LT1 RFP and LT2 RFP)	The IESO should consider allowing projects to participate in the Expedited Process which were not included in the RFQ submission. For smaller projects (ie. < 20 MW) it is possible to plan, design, finance, construct, and commission a project within 2.5 years (ie. after the RFP results are announced in December 2022). If, between the submission of the RFQ and the start of the deliverability test, an Applicant can sufficiently develop additional projects, these should be allowed to apply in the Expedited Process (subject to the existing security requirements).

## LT1 RFP and Expedited Process: Mandatory Requirements and Rated Criteria

Topic	Feedback
Please provide any feedback on the Mandatory Requirements and Rated Criteria proposed for the LT1 RFP and Expedited Process.	IESO should consider allowing Applicants to modify their commercial structure between the RFQ and the RFP (provided that the Applicant is still a Controlling Member) to support Indigenous Participation.

## LT1 RFP and Expedited Process: Proposed Contract Design

Topic	Feedback
Please provide feedback on the proposed contract design for the LT1 RFP and Expedited Process. The IESO welcomes feedback on the proposed approach for qualifying capacity as well as the proposed Capacity Payment Adjustment Mechanism.	The IESO should consider contractual incentives for projects which use low-carbon fuels (ie. Renewable Natural Gas) and for projects which have a higher overall efficiency (ie. via heat recovery).

## LT1 RFP and Expedited Process: Proposed Term Lengths

Topic	Feedback
Please provide any feedback on the term length considerations proposed in addition to the incentive mechanism for the Expedited Process.	The 20+ year term length is sufficient.

## Deliverability Assessment

Topic	Feedback
Please provide feedback on the IESO's proposed process for deliverability testing and timelines.	The more transparency the IESO can provide to Applicants with respect to network constraints, the more efficient the applicants will be in finding ideal project sites. Specifically, any information on where peak demand is expected to be (ie. by Transformer Station) would help Applicants site projects.

## Additional Acquisition Mechanisms: Same Technology Expansions

Topic	Feedback
Are the descriptions of the different kinds of upgrades/expansions clear and reflective of the options?	
What are the interdependencies between the existing contract, any upgrades and on-site expansions that need to be considered?	
Are any interdependencies missing/not fully captured?	Are projects currently installed behind-the-meter under the Save-on-Energy program eligible for the Same Technology expansions?
What are the considerations for participating in the Expedited Process or LT1 RFP?	
What other key considerations/risks need to be included to help ensure this initiative is successful?	

## Additional Acquisition Mechanisms: Forward Capacity Auction

Topic	Feedback
<p>Is expanding eligibility to variable generation, self-scheduling and co-located hybrid facilities in the FCA and ACA a priority for stakeholders?</p> <p>(Refer to slide 99)</p>	
<p>Any feedback and suggestions on how the performance assessment framework may need to be modified to reflect the design differences?</p> <p>(Refer to slide 106)</p>	
<p>Any feedback on potential features that could be considered for the design of the FCA?</p> <p>(Refer to slide 108)</p>	
<p>Is expanding eligibility to variable generation, self-scheduling and co-located hybrid facilities in the FCA and ACA a priority for stakeholders?</p>	
<p>Any feedback and suggestions on how the performance assessment framework may need to be modified to reflect FCA design differences?</p>	
<p>What other design features should be considered to increase the attractiveness of a Forward Capacity Auction as part of IESO's suite of acquisition mechanisms?</p> <p>(Refer to slide 110)</p>	

## General Comments/Feedback