

Feedback Form

Draft Long-Term RFQ – Version 2 posted April 22, 2022

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Emma Coyle

Title: Director, Regulatory & Environmental Policy

Organization: Capital Power Corporation (“Capital Power”)

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: May 2nd 2022

The Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback from participants on the proposed revisions captured in version 2 of the draft Long-Term Request for Qualifications (LT1 RFQ). The LT 1 RFQ will seek to ensure that interested parties have sufficient financial capacity and experience to undertake project development for the LT1 RFP.

The draft LT1 RFQ can be found on the [Long-Term RFP webpage](#).

Please provide feedback by May 2, 2022 to engagement@ieso.ca.

Please use subject header: ***Draft Long-Term 1 RFQ***. 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.

Draft LT 1 RFQ

Topic/ RFQ Section	Feedback
Qualification Submission Qualification Submission / Section 2.7 (b)(i)	No comments at this time.
Team Member Mandatory Requirements Large-Scale Team Member Experience / Section 3.2 (a)	No comments at this time.
Team Member Mandatory Requirements Small-Scale Team Member Experience / Section 3.2 (b)	No comments at this time.
Evaluation of Entity Development Experience Threshold Large-Scale Entity Development Experience Threshold / Section 3.3 (a)	No comments at this time.
Evaluation of Entity Development Experience Threshold Small-Scale Entity Development Experience Threshold / Section 3.3 (b)	No comments at this time.
Determination of Eligibility Section 3.4	Please see May 2, 2022, comments in response to the IESO's LTRFP. No additional comments at this time.

General Comments/Feedback

The drafting of section 2.5 continues to be concerning and unclear with respect to the harm it is trying to prevent. As drafted the section appears to attempt to limit a wide range of otherwise acceptable communications. Further, given the IESO's position to date with respect to its role identifying and overcoming permitting timeline challenges, this section will likely frustrate good faith efforts from potential developers to proactively mitigate risks related to permitting. Section 2.5 is also arguably incongruent with the IESO's suggestion that a Municipal Council Support Resolution be included in the LTRFP Mandatory Criteria.