

# Feedback Form

## Long-Term RFP – June 29, 2023

### Feedback Provided by:

Name: Marilyn Robbins

Title: Click or tap here to enter text.

Organization: Member of the Public

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: July 13, 2023

Following the June 29<sup>th</sup> public webinar on the Long-Term RFP (LT1 RFP), the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback from participants on design of the LT1 RFP and LT1 Contract.

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

**Please provide feedback by July 13, 2023 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.

## Revised COD of May 1, 2028

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Feedback</b>
Are Proponents supportive of the revised COD date and the introduction of Capacity payment multipliers for early operation?	No comment.

## Revised procurement targets

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Feedback</b>
Are Proponents supportive of the revised LT1 procurement targets on slide 15, which has increased the overall procurement target from 2,200MW to 2,505MW? This enables unused MWs in the Non-Storage Category from the E-LT1 RFP to the Non-Storage Category in the LT1 RFP. The IESO continues to reserve the right to accept the marginal bid above the Storage Category procurement target.	I appreciate the balanced approach IESO staff mentioned in the webinar in responding to the suggestion that the unused MWs in the Non-Storage Category be added to the Storage Category. I support the rationale for keeping the unused MWs in the Non-Storage Category therefore keeping with overall planned needs in what is already a historic procurement with new technology in an environment where regulation and guidance is not yet available.

## Changes to Rated Criteria



Are Proponents supportive of the revised Rated Criteria approach as laid out on slides 20 and 21? This includes the removal of the duration of service as a Rated Criteria and setting minimum duration requirements as a Mandatory Criteria for Storage Category and Non-Storage Category resources.

Remaining Rated Criteria include: Local Governing Body Support, and Indigenous Participation.

Pleased to see the IESO's ongoing commitment to genuine public engagement and its consideration of community feedback to date. It is positive that Local Governing Body Support is still a contract requirement as is the additional guidance offered to municipalities to better understand what constitutes evidence of municipal support and what exactly they are supporting. I would suggest that the IESO require proponents to provide governing bodies with IESO contact information so that they might reach out with any further questions on the process rather than relying only on the project proponent for information as the conflict of interest is inherent.

The IESO acknowledging that a lot has changed since the E-LT1 process is appreciated and I'm glad to see that proponents will not be permitted to recycle their engagement and municipal support evidence, and will be required to complete engagement work specific to the LT1 process with meeting and municipal support not to be dated prior to February 17.

Further to the requirements for notice of public meeting, the definition of "adjacent" has been problematic. Perhaps "surrounding" or within a 2 km radius could be the requirement. Would also advise that 15 days notice is a challenge for municipalities where newsletters/bulletins to residents are issued on a monthly basis.

While engagement materials and information need to be accessible so should public meeting venues/formats. I'm glad to see the greater emphasis on what constitutes a public meeting – available to members of the public at large and a question-and-answer opportunity where questions are accessible to all other members in attendance.

Could Rated Criteria include land use? In the previous round Criteria points were available to incentivize location in the province. In Ontario, we have finite land resources available and growing

Topic	Feedback
	competition for those lands to meet our housing, food, jobs, energy, recreation, and environmental needs. Would like to see consideration given to incentivizing these developments on brownfield lands – or other not suitable for agriculture, housing, etc.

### Inclusion of the MCIA in the LT1 RFP

Topic	Feedback
Are Proponents supportive of continuing to include MCIA options in the LT1 RFP?	No comment.

### Changes to Proponent Group Award Limit

Topic	Feedback
<p>Are Proponents supportive of increasing the Group Award Limit for Storage Category resources from 600 MW to 900 MW?</p> <p>Additionally, the IESO invites Proponents to provide Group Award Limit feedback with regards to the Non-Storage Category.</p>	As a developer suggested at the webinar, this does seem to be a higher-risk approach putting a lot of eggs in one basket.

### Other or General Comments/Feedback:

Thanks for this opportunity to participate and for making your materials so readily available.