

# Feedback Form

## Long-Lead Time RFP – January 28, 2026

### Feedback Provided by:WIFN

Name: Peter

Title: Community Engagement Programs Officer

Organization: Walpole Island First Nation

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: January 28 2026

To promote transparency, feedback submitted will be posted on the Long Lead-Time RFP engagement page unless otherwise requested by the sender.

- NO - There is confidential information, do not post**
- YES - Comfortable to publish to the IESO web page**

Following the January 28<sup>th</sup> Long Lead-Time RFP 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 [LLT RFP 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](mailto:engagement@ieso.ca) by February 11, 2026.**

## Policy Considerations

### Buy Local Policy Provisions

The IESO is seeking stakeholder feedback to understand:

1. Whether proponents were already planning to source at least 50% of goods, services and workforce related to the project locally (i.e., from Ontario/Canada)
  - a. For those Proponents that were not planning this, is it possible and what would the cost implications be?
2. An indication of Projects that would be unable to source at least 50% of goods, services and workforce locally regardless of cost implications

Are there any other considerations the IESO should be aware of?

Is there any additional feedback you would like to provide in response to the proposed local supply plan requirement currently under consideration?

## LLT Design Considerations

### Resource Eligibility – Capacity

Do you have any feedback on the proposed updates to resource eligibility requirements for LLT Capacity Projects?

### Access Rights for LLT Energy Projects

The IESO is seeking feedback on the following:

#### Requirements for Projects Locating on Federal Crown Lands

- Process for obtaining access rights to federal Crown lands.
- Timelines related to obtaining a federal priority permit and what stage Proponents would expect to have reached by the Proposal Submission Deadline (e.g., priority permit granted)

#### Modifications Required to the Project Site Definition

The LLT(e) RFP currently defines Project Site as all Properties on which the proposed LLT Energy Project is to be located, excluding any Connection Line.

- The IESO would like to understand whether this should be updated to consider other impacts of hydro projects (e.g., flood zones) that will be known at the time of Proposal Submission Deadline

Is there any other feedback regarding access rights that the IESO should be aware of?

## Periods of Reduced Water Availability (Energy)

Do you have any feedback on the proposed approach for mitigating financial impacts in instances of high-market pricing where Facility production is impacted by conditions outside of the Suppliers' control?

## Regulation Service Readiness Requirements

Do you have any feedback on the proposed regulation service readiness requirements?

## Prescribed Forms

Do you have additional feedback to share on the draft Prescribed Forms?

*Note: Stakeholders are welcome to attach a separate document that contains comments on the draft documents. Please indicate if separate documents are confidential.*

## General Comments/Feedback

Do you have additional feedback to share with the IESO?

I have a major concern about how the current points system for Indigenous participation is being handled. Right now the system seems to favor groups with the most money over the people who actually have the rights to the land where these projects are built. We see this as a form of predatory equity because it allows wealthy nations from far away to parachute into our territory and outbid us just because they have more cash to invest. The current math means an outside group with a fifty percent stake looks better to the system than a local community with a smaller stake. This turns reconciliation into a financial competition and ignores our actual jurisdiction.

There is also a significant difference in how different nations operate that is currently being ignored. Many local nations like ours follow traditional community engagement protocols. These processes require time and deep discussion with our community members to ensure we are being good stewards of the land for future generations. Other nations follow a corporate driven model that is much faster and more business focused. While that corporate speed matches the timeline the government and developers desire it creates an unfair advantage for outside groups. The system should not reward speed and capital over the rights of the people who actually live on the land and follow their traditional protocols.

We believe that having a local host support resolution should be mandatory for any project in our territory. This should be just like the municipal support resolutions you already require for cities and towns. We also recommend that the IESO implement a proximity multiplier where communities located within twenty kilometers of a project get the highest weighting. If the local nation does not support a project then outside entities should not be allowed to claim any participation points for it. We want to ensure that the energy transition respects our rights and stays rooted in the communities that will actually host the infrastructure.