



---

# Expedited Long Term RFP (E-LT1 RFP) and Long Term RFP (LT1 RFP) Frequently Asked Questions, Comments and IESO Responses

Version 7

February 14, 2023

## Disclaimer

This document and the information contained herein is provided for informational purposes only. The IESO has prepared this document based on information currently available to the IESO and reasonable assumptions associated therewith. The IESO provides no guarantee, representation, or warranty, express or implied, with respect to any statement or information contained herein and disclaims any liability in connection therewith. The IESO undertakes no obligation to revise or update any information contained in this document as a result of new information, future events or otherwise. In the event there is any conflict or inconsistency between this document and the IESO market rules, any IESO contract, any legislation or regulation, or any request for proposals or other procurement document, the terms in the market rules, or the subject contract, legislation, regulation, or procurement document, as applicable, govern.

## Document Change History

Version	Reason For Change	Date
1	Expedited Long-Term RFP Frequently Asked Questions, Key Feedback and IESO Responses posted	November 16, 2022
2	New FAQs: 1.9, 2.7, 2.8, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4	December 6, 2022
3	Updated FAQs: 1.9, 2.4, 3.4, 4.2, 4.4 New FAQs: 1.10, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9	December 16, 2022
4	Long Term RFP Frequently Asked Questions Section added Updated FAQs: 4.2 NEW FAQs: 2.9, 5.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 7.1	January 25, 2023
5	New E-LT1 FAQs: 4.10, 4.11, 4.12, 4.13, 4.14	February 1, 2023
6	New E-LT1 FAQs: 4.15, 4.16	February 9, 2023
7	New E-LT1 FAQ: 4.17	February 14, 2023

# Overview

The IESO thanks stakeholders for the feedback and questions that have been submitted. This document outlines the IESO's responses to submissions that have been reviewed by the IESO prior to the publication of the final Expedited Long-Term Request for Proposal (E-LT1 RFP) and Contract (E-LT1 Contract), including questions and feedback on:

- Eligibility
- Mandatory Requirements
- Same Technology Expansions
- Additional Questions and Feedback

Additionally, the IESO has included a new section related to questions and comments received with regards to the upcoming Long Term RFP (LT1 RFP). This document will be continuously updated with questions and responses pertaining to the LT1 RFP throughout 2023.

## E-LT1 RFP

### 1. Eligibility

**The IESO engaged on eligibility for the Expedited Long-Term Request for Proposal (E-LT1 RFP) extensively from January to August 2022, and the IESO's responses to stakeholder questions and feedback from that period are available to view on the Long-Term RFP Engagement [webpage](#). The following are questions that have been commonly asked or that help clarify eligibility requirements for the E-LT1 RFP. Details of the eligibility requirements are provided in Section 2.1 of the E-LT1 RFP.**

- 1.1. Can a Proponent participate in the E-LT1 RFP if they did not participate or were unsuccessful in the Long-Term 1 Request for Qualification (LT1 RFQ)?

Per the eligibility requirements in Section 2.1 of the E-LT1 RFP only Qualified Applicants (an RFQ Applicant whose Qualification Submission has been selected and accepted by the IESO, in accordance with the LT1 RFQ), persons controlled by Qualified Applicants and Eligible Expansion Counterparties may submit proposals into the E-LT1 RFP.

- 1.2. Can an RFQ Applicant that did not submit a description of a specific Long-Term Reliability Project as a part of their Qualification Submission, submit that project into the Deliverability

Test and have it considered under the E-LT1 RFP, if said project was submitted by another RFQ Applicant that has decided not to proceed with the project.

No, an RFQ Applicant under the LT1 RFQ was only eligible to submit Long-Term Reliability Projects into the Deliverability Test for the Expedited Process and to submit proposals into the Expedited Process for which they had submitted a *Prescribed Form: Long-Term Reliability Project Description* as part of their LT1 RFQ Qualification Submission. However, projects for the LT1 RFP process may be submitted for a Deliverability Test without being identified as part of the LT1 RFQ Qualification Submission.

1.3. If a Proponent submits a project for a Deliverability Test, achieves a "Deliverable" result and then sells to another qualified bidder, will that bidder be eligible to bid that project?

A Qualified Applicant under the LT1 RFQ for the Expedited Process was entitled to submit a Long-Term Reliability Project into the Deliverability Test, where that Project was submitted as part of their LT1 RFQ Qualification Submission. Where that Project achieves a "Deliverable"/"Deliverable but Competing" result in the Deliverability Test, the Qualified Applicant or persons controlled by the Qualified Applicant, may submit a Proposal for that Project into the E-LT1 RFP. If that Project is purchased by a buyer that is also a Qualified Applicant, but that buyer did not submit that Project as part of its LT1 RFQ Qualification Submission, the buyer is not entitled to submit that Project into the E-LT1 RFP evaluation process.

1.4. Can a new corporation that includes the Qualified Applicant and the project host be created after deliverability test results are provided?

Yes, Qualified Applicants may form subsidiary entities to be the Proponents under the E-LT1 RFP as long as the Qualified Applicant Controls the newly formed Proponent entity.

1.5. Can a Qualified Applicant form multiple "unique project entities" for multiple project submissions?

Yes, as long as the Qualified Applicant remains the Controlling party in each project entity. However, each project submitted by the project entities Controlled by the same Qualified Applicant would have to meet the mandatory requirements of the E-LT1 RFP, and the Qualified Applicant and project entities controlled by the Qualified Applicant would be limited to ten (10) project submissions into the E-LT1 RFP, as stated in section 3.6(a) of the E-LT1 RFP.

1.6. Can these "unique project entities" submit different prices to reflect location specific requirements/costs?

Each Proposal must be specific to a single Long-Term Reliability Project as per Section 3.6(a) of the E-LT1 RFP. Each Proponent must be prepared to enter into an E-LT1 Contract for each Proposal it submits into the E-LT1 RFP. Qualified Applicants or newly formed subsidiaries Controlled by Qualified Applicants may submit multiple Proposals (provided each Proposal is specific to a Long-Term Reliability Project described in the corresponding LT1 RFQ Qualification Submission and subject to the

limits identified in section 3.6 (a) of the E-LT1 RFP), provided that they are prepared to enter into the E-LT1 Contract for each such Proposal.

- 1.7. If a Proponent submits a bid in response to the E-LT1 RFP, and is interested in submitting the same project in response to the LT1 RFP in the event the Proponent is not successful under the E-LT1 RFP, does the Proponent need to resubmit for the LT1 RFP Deliverability Test. Alternatively, can a bid that was not successful under E-LT1 RFP, be resubmitted under LT1 RFP without another Deliverability Test?

A Long-Term Reliability Project that was unsuccessful in the E-LT1 RFP may be resubmitted for consideration under the LT1 RFP. However, it will still be required to complete a new Deliverability Test for the LT1 RFP. The Deliverability Tests for the respective RFPs are two distinct processes with different input parameters and assumptions. Therefore, a project that receives a result of “Deliverable” or “Deliverable but Competing” under the E-LT1 Deliverability Test will not necessarily achieve the same result under the LT1 Deliverability Test.

- 1.8. Would a hybrid storage + solar project count as storage or non-storage under the procurement targets?

A New-Build generator coupled with battery storage equipment (e.g. solar + battery storage) that does not draw electricity from the grid for storage will participate under the Non-Storage Category under the E-LT1 RFP. The definition of “Electricity Storage Facility” under the E-LT1 RFP is based on the definition in the IESO Market Rules, which relies on the withdrawal of electricity from the grid as the Electricity being stored.

- 1.9. Are only Long-Term Reliability Projects that were submitted as part of the E-LT1 RFQ eligible to be submitted into the E-LT1 RFP?

Section 2.1(e) of the E-LT1 RFP sets out the mandatory requirements for Long-Term Reliability Projects to have gone through the Deliverability Testing process, and to have received a result of either “Deliverable” or “Deliverable but Competing”. A Long-Term Reliability Project submitted into the E-LT1 RFP must have a Contract Capacity, location and Connection Point that is consistent with the information submitted into the Deliverability Test (and in respect of Contract Capacity, may not be in excess of the capacity assessed and documented in the Deliverability Test results). Furthermore, the E-LT1 RFP points to the latest version of the IESO’s Deliverability Test Guidance Document, which outlines the methodology for the Deliverability Test. In that document it states that, with the exception of Eligible Expansions, “Only a project listed on the Long-Term Reliability Project Description Prescribed Form (as part of the LT1 RFQ) may be submitted into the Deliverability Test for the Expedited Process” (s. 3.2.1). As a result, only New Build projects that were submitted into the LT1 RFQ may be submitted into the Deliverability Test, and as a result as Proposals into the E-LT1 RFP.

- 1.10. Can Proponents change the name of the Long-Term Reliability Project which was submitted to the RFQ and Deliverability Test Request?

Yes, Proponents may change the name of the Long-Term Reliability Project that was submitted as part of the LT1 RFQ, as long as the Unique Project ID assigned by the IESO pursuant to the Delivery Test, remains the same.

## 2. Mandatory Requirements

**The following are questions that have been commonly asked or that help clarify Mandatory Requirements for the E-LT1 RFP. Details of the Mandatory Requirements are provided in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 of the E-LT1 RFP.**

2.1. The IESO proposes in Section 2.5(a)(i)(D) that a Facility cannot reach COD until 100% of the Contract Capacity and, if applicable, Storage Capacity are available. Would this mean the Contract Capacity for the month in which the Facility is entering operation, or the Maximum Contract Capacity, i.e., the highest Contract Capacity for the year?

A project has reached Commercial Operation when it is able to inject the Monthly Contract Capacity based on the Season in which COD occurs.

2.2. The proposal limit is set at 10 projects; however, could a Qualified Applicant submit more than 10 projects for deliverability tests?

The maximum number of Projects that can be submitted into the Deliverability Test process is ten (10). However, Proponents were eligible to submit up to three Project variations for each Project, as described further in the Deliverability Test Guidance Document. For additional information on the Deliverability Testing Process please refer to the document entitled 2022 Deliverability Test Process for IESO Acquisition Mechanisms on the Long-Term RFP webpage.

2.3. Can the IESO confirm whether lease financing is permissible under E-LT1, and if so, whether the IESO would be willing to amend the form agreement to clarify this point?

The Proponent must own and operate the proposed project, as set out further in section 2.1(d)(i) of the E-LT1 RFP and Section 7.1(i) of the E-LT1 Contract. However, a project can be located on leased land provided the Proponent has the contractual right to built, operate and maintain the Project on the Project Site.

2.4. Could Qualified Applicants have a single public meeting to share multiple projects with a community?

Yes, a single meeting can be held for multiple projects. However, The Qualified Applicant must present the information for each project individually, as set out in Section 2.1(f) of the E-LT1 RFP and communities must be given the opportunity to comment on all projects individually. Evidence of

project-specific community engagement is required in the bid submission so that the IESO can have the project-specific evidence when evaluating completeness.

2.5. Is it acceptable for public meetings to be held virtually?

Yes, the public meeting can be held in person or virtually, prior to the Proposal Submission Deadline, but no earlier than January 27, 2022.

2.6. Can the website described in the Prescribed Form: Community Engagement Requirements containing the community engagement plan be hosted as a section of a website owned by a parent company?

Yes, Proponents must ensure that a unique website URL is created for each individual Long-Term Reliability Project that provides the public with information regarding such Long-Term Reliability Project and community engagement initiatives in respect thereof.

2.7. Is there a Prescribed Form for Blanket Municipal Support Resolutions or does the IESO have a template or preferred language?

The IESO does not have a specific Prescribed Form or template for Blanket Municipal Support Resolutions. However, stakeholders and potential Proponents are reminded to review the definition of Blanket Municipal Support Resolution in the RFP. Furthermore, the Prescribed Form - Evidence of Municipal Support includes a template for a Municipal Council Support Resolution that can be adapted by Municipalities for use as a Blanket Support Resolution for multiple projects, if they so wish.

2.8. In the community and Indigenous engagement plan, as detailed in Section 2.1 of the RFP, is the Indigenous engagement plan portion of the requirement only necessary if the project is located in whole or in part on Indigenous Lands?

Section 2.1(f) of the E-LT1 RFP sets out requirements for what needs to be included in a community and Indigenous engagement plan, with respect to all Long-Term Reliability Projects regardless of location. However, the notification requirements for the public community meeting (Section 2(f)(iv)(B)), and Indigenous Support Confirmation requirements (Section 4.2(e)) differ based on whether or not the Project Site is located in whole or in part on Indigenous Lands.

2.9. Is a screenshot the only valid proof that a notice of public community meeting has been posted on the Project Website at least (15) days prior to date of the public community meeting identified in Section 2.1(f)(iii) of the E-LT1 RFP as outlined in section 2 of the Prescribed Form: Community Engagement Requirements.

The Prescribed Form: Community Engagement Requirements has been amended to say "Yes, a screenshot or other documentation of the posting of such notice of public community meeting is attached as Exhibit A to this Prescribed Form." Other documentation besides a screenshot that confirms the notice of public community meeting posting on the Project Website will be accepted.

## 3. Same Technology Expansions

3.1. Can an Upgrade (the refurbishment or replacement of equipment or technology) be considered for the Same Technology Expansion process?

No, an Upgrade such as a refurbishment or performance-enhancement to the existing Facility's generation assets would be eligible to participate in the [Same Technology Upgrades Solicitation –Call For Submissions](#).

3.2. The IESO differentiates between Existing Facility and Separate Facility for Same Technology Expansions. Could you please provide a definition for these two terms?

Please refer to the definition of Eligible Expansion and Upgrade in the E-LT1 RFP.

3.3. Would a new separately metered gas turbine installed on an existing site but not part of the existing Facility be considered an "on-site expansion" for the purpose of the E-LT1 RFP?

Yes, an eligible on-site expansion would entail the installation of additional generation equipment of the same technology type and be located within the existing site as the contracted Facility.

3.4. Would a new separately metered gas turbine installed on an existing site but separate from the existing Facility be required to qualify under the LT1 RFQ?

Proponents with an Eligible Expansion proposal are not required to have been qualified under the LT1 RFQ.

## 4. Additional Questions and Feedback Received

4.1. Will energy storage assets have to bear the demand charges or will there be a reimbursement?

Demand charges incurred on withdrawals do not fall within the definition of "Regulatory Energy Charges" and will not be reimbursed through the Regulatory Charge Credit, in accordance with Exhibit R of the draft E-LT1 contract.

4.2. Could a Qualified Applicant submit two projects for consideration, which are located at different street addresses, but which are located on the same legal land parcel? The projects would be located on different locations on the parcel of land.



There is no E-LT1 RFP restriction on a project sharing a parcel of land with another project. [A portion of the response previously posted was removed due to anticipated changes in Addendum no.2 to the E-LT1 RFP to Section 2.1]

#### 4.3. Can a Proponent bid storage capacities lower than what was submitted in the Deliverability Test?

Per Section 2.1(e)(iii) of the E-LT1 RFP, "The proposed Contract Capacity, location and Connection Point information in respect of the Long-Term Reliability Project must be consistent with that which is reflected in the results of the Deliverability Test (and in respect of Contract Capacity, may not be in excess of the capacity assessed and documented in the Deliverability Test results)."

As such, the Contract Capacity submitted into the E-LT1 RFP may be less than or equal to the capacity assessed and documented in the Deliverability Test results, but may not exceed it.

#### 4.4. Could a Proponent begin the Connection Impact Assessment (CIA) process with the local distribution company prior to submitting their proposal for the E-LT1 or LT1 processes? Are there any restrictions on when the CIA process can begin?

As described in Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 of the Deliverability Test Guidance document, "IESO does not expect to impose any restrictions on maintaining an existing or applying for a new connection assessment for both transmission and distribution connected projects". However, per Section 5.4(b)(ii) of the E-LT1 RFP, the return of Proposal Security for a Proposal that is not selected as a Selected Proposal will be contingent on the Proponent rescinding any CIAs for such projects.

#### 4.5. Are E-LT1 Proponents permitted to begin the SIA/CIA process now that the Deliverability Test results have been received?

Consistent with the IESO's [Deliverability Guidance Document](#), the IESO did not impose restrictions on applying for or maintaining a connection assessment for both transmission and distribution connected projects (see s. 3.3.1). However, in addition to the requirement that CIAs be rescinded for proposals that are not selected, the IESO advises Proponents that where an SIA is obtained prior to the E-LT1 results being announced, there's a risk the findings/requirements may be inaccurate, as it will not be known what other successful projects coming out of the E-LT1 RFP should be considered as "committed", and what system impacts may be.

#### 4.6. Which market charges are eligible under the Gross Reimbursable Energy Adder for reimbursement through the Regulatory Charge Credit?

With the exception of Charge Type 1148 (GA Energy Storage Injection Reimbursement), only those charges that are calculated on the basis of withdrawn units of energy are included in the definition of Regulatory Energy Charges. Any charges calculated based on demand or fixed monthly charges do not apply.

Please see the table below for a list of current Regulatory Energy Charges that are eligible for reimbursement through the Regulatory Charge Credit:

<b>Charge Type</b>	<b>Description</b>
148	CLASS B GLOBAL ADJUSTMENT SETTLEMENT AMOUNT
150	NET ENERGY MARKET SETTLEMENT UPLIFT
155	CONGESTION MANAGEMENT SETTLEMENT UPLIFT
169	STATION SERVICE REIMBURSEMENT DEBIT
183	GENERATION COST GUARANTEE RECOVERY DEBIT
186	INTERTIE FAILURE CHARGE REBATE
250	10-MINUTE SPINNING MARKET RESERVE HOURLY UPLIFT
252	10-MINUTE NON-SPINNING MARKET RESERVE HOURLY UPLIFT
254	30-MINUTE OPERATING RESERVE MARKET HOURLY UPLIFT
450	BLACK START CAPABILITY SETTLEMENT DEBIT
451	HOURLY REACTIVE SUPPORT AND VOLTAGE CONTROL SETTLEMENT DEBIT
452	MONTHLY REACTIVE SUPPORT AND VOLTAGE CONTROL SETTLEMENT DEBIT
454	REGULATION SERVICE SETTLEMENT DEBIT
752	DEBT RETIREMENT CHARGE
753	RURAL RATE SETTLEMENT CHARGE
1148	GA ENERGY STORAGE INJECTION REIMBURSEMENT
1351	CAPACITY BASED RECOVERY AMOUNT FOR CLASS B LOADS
1463	RENEWABLE GENERATION CONNECTION - MONTHLY COMPENSATION AMOUNT SETTLEMENT DEBIT
1550	DAY-AHEAD PRODUCTION COST GUARANTEE RECOVERY DEBIT
1650	FORECASTING SERVICE BALANCING AMOUNT
9990	IESO ADMINISTRATION CHARGE

**4.7. Would the IESO consider using a file sharing platform for Proposal submission?**

The IESO will solely be relying on the LT.RFP@ieso.ca inbox for E-LT1 RFP submissions, per Section 3.6 (c) of the E-LT1 RFP. The IESO advises against submitting Proposals from emails with public domains (e.g., Rogers.ca, Yahoo.ca, Hotmail.com, Gmail.com etc.) as they may be intercepted by the IESO’s corporate firewall.

Due to limitations on the size of electronic delivery of emails to the [LT.RFP@ieso.ca](mailto:LT.RFP@ieso.ca) inbox (20MB), Proponents may wish to submit their electronic Proposal submission through multiple emails. Proponents are reminded to clearly indicate the number of emails for any submission in the body of the email and label your submission attachments accordingly. Proponents are strongly encouraged to submit their complete Proposals, including fees and hard-copy requirements, sufficiently in advance of the Proposal Submission Deadline to avoid any unforeseen delays in electronic or physical delivery or processing of payments.

#### 4.8. Can the IESO provide an update on schedules for the Long-Term RFP (LT1 RFP), including the Deliverability Test originally scheduled for January, 2023?

Given the already established delays to the E-LT1 RFP, the IESO will be delaying the milestones originally contemplated for the LT1 RFP. For clarity, this includes the LT1 Deliverability Testing process, which will no longer open in January 2023. The IESO is working to establish revised schedules and milestones for the LT1 RFP and will be communicating them to stakeholders in early 2023.

#### 4.9. Have the changes to the E-LT1 RFP schedule impacted the LT1 schedule?

The LT1 RFP schedule has been impacted by the revised E-LT1 RFP schedule. Further information on the LT1 RFP schedule, including the Deliverability Test window, will be shared in early 2023. For further updates, please continue to follow the Long Term RFP website.

#### 4.10. The IESO has received feedback from a number of Proponents requesting that change of Project Site, permitted under Addendum no. 2, also be permitted after the Contract Date.

The IESO will introduce a further Addendum to the E-LT1 RFP (Addendum no.3) that will amend the E-LT1 Contract to specify that the IESO will consent to a Project Site change that is consistent with the requirements in Addendum no. 2, for a period up to 12 months after the Contract Date.

#### 4.11. The IESO received a number of questions from Proponents pertaining to the IESO's form of Letter of Credit, including the transferability provisions included in the language in Exhibit C.

The form of Letter of Credit to be used for Proposal Security under the E-LT1 RFP and for Completion and Performance Security under the E-LT1 Contract has remained substantially consistent across IESO procurements for many years, including in the contemplation of potential transfer by the beneficiary. A wide variety of Ontario financial institutions have issued letters of credit substantially in this form, including recently, for purposes of IESO procurements and contracts. To our knowledge the IESO (or its predecessor) have never transferred an issued letter of credit to another beneficiary. However, the possibility has remained contemplated in the IESO form of letter of credit in connection with the theoretical possibility of assigning the IESO's rights under the contract, as reflected in Sections 16.5(d) & (e) of the E-LT1 Contract. The transfer provisions in the form of letter of credit state that any such transfer is "subject to consent of the issuing financial institution, acting reasonably" and this has generally been workable for most Ontario financial institutions.

4.12. A number of Proponents have sought clarity on the limitations to project site changes as they pertain to the need to maintain the project's Connection Point, in order to maintain the integrity of the results of the Deliverability Test. Similarly, clarification was requested to confirm whether the Connection Point GPS coordinates are permitted to change due to a change in the Project Site GPS coordinates (within 2km).

The IESO reiterates that the Connection Point must be maintained, even when a Project Site change is contemplated per the allowance in Section 2.1(e)(iii) of the E-LT1 RFP, which was instituted by Addendum no. 2. For clarity, Proposals may specify a physical point of interconnection that has moved along the feeder/ circuit as long as the identified feeder/circuit name remains the same as that specified in the Deliverability Test.

Further, the Connection Point information will be considered to remain consistent with the Deliverability Test provided that the Distribution System feeder line information, transformer station and/or Transmission System circuit information (as applicable) remains the same, even if the GPS coordinates of the proposed physical interconnection on that feeder line or circuit (as applicable) may change in connection with a proposed change in the Project Site.

4.13. Proponents have sought clarification on whether the 40% weighted average outlier bid threshold is applied to the Category 2 resources only or the entirety of Proposals for Electricity Storage Facilities across Storage Categories 1 and 2.

The IESO confirms that an outlier bid threshold will not be used for Proposals that come under the Storage Price Threshold forming the basis of Storage Category 1 Proposals. Should the procurement target not be met under Storage Category 1, the IESO will proceed with Storage Category 2, where the 40% outlier bid threshold will apply to the weighted average Revised Proposal Prices within Storage Category 2. For greater clarity, if the CIB investment offer process described in Addendum no.2 is not being implemented, the 40% outlier bid threshold will be applied to all Proposals for Electricity Storage Facilities.

4.14. A Proponent requested confirmation that the Proponent name is able to change without redoing the community engagement activities completed to date (public community meeting, website, notices, CIEP), assuming the Qualified Applicants Control of the Proponent doesn't change.

Correct, a legal name change of a Proponent can be accommodated without requiring that past community and Indigenous engagement activities be redone. Notice of this legal name change should be reflected on the Project Website to avoid possible confusion by community stakeholders or the IESO in reviewing the community and Indigenous engagement activities and associated records.

4.15. A number of Proponents have requested clarity as to whether the CIB would allow for project aggregation in order to meet the CIB's minimum size threshold for Category 2 Storage resources?

The CIB will not be aggregating Proposals under a single portfolio, as outlined in the CIB E-LT1 Guidance document under the CIB E-LT1 Guidance Documents section of the Website.

4.16. A number of Proponents have sought clarity from the IESO regarding the Proposal Fee that is required to be submitted in advance of the Proposal Submission Deadline.

The IESO reminds Proponents that Proposal Fees should be submitted separately for each Proposal, per Section 3.6(c) of the E-LT1 RFP. It is the Proponent's responsibility to ensure the full amount of the Proposal fee is delivered to the IESO by the E-LT1 RFP Proposal submission deadline, inclusive of any wire transfer or additional fees charged by their financial institution(s). The IESO recommends Proponents to check with their financial institutions that the full amount of the fee has been delivered to the IESO.

4.17. Can Statutory Declarations be commissioned virtually?

Yes, virtual commissioning of any required Statutory Declarations is acceptable under the E-LT1 RFP.

## LT1 RFP

## 5.RFP Timelines

5.1. When will the updated timeline for the LT1 RFP be posted, including the revised LT1 deliverability testing period.

The IESO is currently working through the revised LT1 RFP Procurement timeline and will communicate the updated timeline to Proponents in 2023. The IESO advises Proponents to continue to monitor the Long Term RFP website for important developments in the Procurement.

## 6.Deliverability Test

6.1. Does the IESO contemplate changing the ten (10) project application limit utilized under the E-LT1 RFP Deliverability Test process?

In the E-LT1 RFP, the maximum number of projects that could be submitted into the Deliverability Test process was ten (10). However, Proponents were eligible to submit up to three project variations for each such project, as described further in the Deliverability Test Guidance Document. At this time, the IESO does not foresee amending the 10 project limit previously utilized for the E-LT1 RFP Deliverability Test Process.

#### 6.2. Does the IESO require a separate application fee for the LT1 RFP Deliverability Test?

No, the IESO does not require a fee for the Deliverability Test, however, there will continue to be a proposal submission fee for the LT1 RFP. This amount was \$13,000 under the E-LT1 RFP but is subject to change for the LT1 RFP.

#### 6.3. Could a Proponent submit a project into the Deliverability Test but later change the technology in a proposal submission? Could each project variation submitted into the Deliverability Test be a different technology?

No, a change of technology would invalidate the Deliverability Test results. Projects with different technologies would be considered separate projects.

#### 6.4. Could the Project site and GPS coordinates change slightly from the Deliverability Test to the RFP bid submission?

The IESO anticipates allowing limited adjustments to Project Site location relative to the location specified in the Deliverability Test (no greater than a two kilometre change), provided the Connection Point remains the same.

## 7. Additional Questions and Feedback

#### 7.1. Does the E-LT1 communications protocol also apply to the LT1 RFP?

No, the communications protocol currently in place for the E-LT1 RFP does not apply to the LT1 RFP. The LT1 RFP document will outline a separate communications protocol applicable to that procurement.