

# Feedback Form

## Long-Term RFP – August 17, 2023

### Feedback Provided by:

Name: John Partyka

Title: Director, Commercial Transactions

Organization: Boralex Inc.

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: September 1, 2023

Following the August 17<sup>th</sup> public webinar on the Long-Term RFP (LT1 RFP), the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback from participants on the changes to the rated criteria proposed in the meeting.

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

**Please provide feedback by September 1, 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.

## Changes to Rated Criteria: Indigenous Community Participation

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Feedback</b>
Are Proponents supportive of the revised Rated Criteria approach as laid out on slide 20 with respect to Indigenous Community Participation? This includes the introduction of more granularity to the economic interest segments, as well as an increase overall to the total points available for Indigenous Community Participation.	Boralex is supportive of the revised Rated Criteria points with respect to Indigenous Community Participation. In our June 29 Feedback we requested that the points for equity participation be on a sliding scale between 10-50% which was accommodated. We are also supportive of the local indigenous community participation points and greater weighted value for Indigenous Community Participation.

## Changes to Rated Criteria: Local Governing Body Support

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Feedback</b>
Are Proponents supportive of the revised Rated Criteria approach as laid out on slide 21 with respect to Local Governing Body Support? This includes increasing the Rated Criteria points for Local Governing Body Support to 4, as well as changing the evaluation criteria weighting in the formula in section 4.4(d)(iii) from 0.3 to 0.2.	We are supportive of the approach for local governing body support as well as the modification to the weighting criteria evaluation formula.

## Changes to Indigenous Consultation (Duty to Consult)

Topic	Feedback
<p>Are Proponents supportive of the new Development and Construction Covenant added to the draft LT1 Contract (s2.2e), as well as process outlined in the Ministry of Energy’s draft Duty to Consult Delegation Letter template?</p>	<p>Boralex is concerned with the timing of the process of Duty to Consult (“DTC”). Ministry of Energy recommendations indicate that we are to start the DTC consultation with Indigenous communities after the contract is awarded. However we are also not allowed to commence or conduct any site preparation (clearing, grading etc) until we have received a DTC Letter. We are concerned that this limits the developer’s time needed to perform the work. We request that if a proponent wants to start the DTC engagement during the RFP and prior to a contract award that the Ministry provide the necessary information in a timely manner, within 4 weeks of request. This would help to reduce the developer’s risk.</p>

### Other or General Comments/Feedback:

Re: Sec. 3.6(a)(iii) of the LT1 RFP instructions:

As currently written, the paragraph states that if the aggregate total of all Proposals submitted by a Group (i.e. a Proponent) is greater than 900MW then no Proposal submitted by the Group will be selected. This becomes effectively a limit on the aggregate MWs that the Group is allowed to submit in their proposals and still be considered for an award. However, verbal indication in the last two webinars was that there is to be no limit on the aggregate MWs that can be proposed, but there is only a limit of 900MW (for storage) that can be awarded to any one Proponent. We suggest that the language in Sec. 3.6(a)(iii) be amended to allow selection of a Proposal regardless of the aggregate MWs proposed in all of such Proponent’s Proposals, provided however that the total of all MWs awarded to such Proponent will not exceed 900MW.