Feedback Form

Capacity Accreditation for IESO – Date, October 22nd 2026

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Chinedu Okeke

Title: Manager, Energy Markets

Organization: Rodan Energy Solutions Inc.

Email: [redacted]

Date: October 30, 2026

To promote transparency, feedback submitted will be posted on the Capacity Accreditation for IESO engagement page unless otherwise requested by the sender.

- ☐ **Yes – there is confidential information, do not post**
- ☒ **No – comfortable to publish to the IESO web page**

Following the Capacity Accreditation for IESO October 22 2026, engagement webinar, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback from stakeholders on the items discussed. The presentation and recording can be accessed from the engagement webpage.

Note: The IESO will accept additional materials where it may be required to support your rationale provided below. When sending additional materials please indicate if they are confidential.

Please submit feedback to engagement@ieso.ca **by October 30th 2026.**

Transparency and Capacity Accreditation

Topic	Feedback
The IESO proposed three measures to provide transparency for stakeholders for use of the MRI capacity accreditation methodology. Are stakeholders supportive of these measures?	Rodan supports the three proposed measures and the move toward a probabilistic approach that reflects reliability contribution under future system conditions. However, MRI values cannot be independently reproduced and are sensitive to modelling choices. The results shared showed large swings across methods and against current UCAP values, for example for solar and 4-hour storage. For that reason, the measures need firm commitments behind them to be effective. Rodan asks the IESO to: • publish values, inputs and assumptions on a defined schedule, well before bid submission deadlines for each procurement; • explain the drivers of every change between updates, not only material ones; • clearly set out in the methodology document how each resource class's characteristics are represented, such as duration, energy limits, forced outages and location.
Beyond the three measures proposed, is there anything else you would like to see from the IESO to support transparency on capacity accreditation?	Rodan recommends that the IESO publish: • the modelled risk periods behind the LOLE results, including when loss-of-load events occur and how long they last, since these largely explain differences between resource classes; • sensitivity ranges on key study parameters, such as increment size, location, study year, and the exclusion of transmission constraints and planned outages. A forward view of indicative values across upcoming procurements, together with a

	defined update cycle and limits on year-over-year changes, would let participants anticipate how values are likely to evolve rather than react to them. Rodan also suggests that the IESO compare MRI results against historical resource performance before they directly influence procurement outcomes, and publish the comparison so stakeholders can see how well the model reflects operational experience.

General Comments/Feedback

Rodan supports modernizing capacity accreditation and recognizes the need for the IESO to procure capacity it can rely on. Because accreditation directly affects project economics, contracting and procurement outcomes, Rodan encourages a phased transition rather than a single switch. During the transition, UCAP and MRI values could be published in parallel, and transitional values or caps on changes could be used while the methodology is validated.

Rodan also encourages the IESO to clearly explain how MRI results will translate into procurement targets and design. As the methodology evolves, it should reflect how resources actually operate and the reliability value of diverse, aggregated portfolios whose resources complement one another across different hours and conditions.