Feedback Form

Long-Term 2 RFP – April 21, 2026

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Gordon Verok

Title: Director of Development

Organization: Horizon New Energy

Email: [redacted]

Date: May 8, 2026

To promote transparency, feedback submitted will be posted on the Long-Term 2 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 April 21st Long-Term 2 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 Long-Term Procurement 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 May 8, 2026.**

Transparency and Information Disclosure

Do you have feedback on whether the IESO should publish additional non-price information about proposals that were not selected in LT2 Window 1?

It would be beneficial for the IESO to publish additional non-price, qualitative information regarding proposals submitted under LT2 Window 1. Enhanced transparency—while maintaining commercial confidentiality—would help market participants better understand the overall composition of the submission pool and the broader development landscape.

Specifically, the following aggregated information would be valuable:

- Breakdown of proposed technologies (e.g., wind, solar, natural gas, biomass, hydro, storage) within proposals including additional details on the number of proposals for each technology type

- Nameplate capacities of submitted proposals, summarized by capacity ranges or technology categories. Non-specific information related to each technology type such as average project size, median project sizes, ranges of size of proposals, standard deviation of proposal sizes, etc

- Geographic distribution of proposals (including technology type) by IESO planning region

- Land tenure characteristics, including the number of proposals on private land, Crown land, Indigenous reserve lands, etc

Providing this type of high-level, non-identifying information would support developers in understanding broader market trends and assist with future project siting decisions without compromising the confidentiality of individual proponents.

Do you have feedback on the potential benefits and risks of increased transparency for unsuccessful proponents in future procurement windows?

There are both meaningful benefits and notable risks associated with increasing transparency for unsuccessful proponents in future procurement windows.

Risks:
The primary risk relates to the disclosure of detailed pricing information. If individual bid-level pricing were made public, proponents may be incentivized to anchor future submissions to competitors' pricing rather than relying on their own detailed financial modelling, cost structures, and risk assessments. This could distort competitive dynamics and undermine the integrity of the procurement process.

The identity of the unsuccessful proponents and their Indigenous partner(s) should also not be disclosed. This information is confidential and its disclosure does not help inform future project siting decisions.

It would be beneficial for the IESO to provide broad pricing statistics to help proponents better understand the competitive dynamics within the RFP without revealing site-specific confidential information. For example, pricing information related to project sizes, technology, IESO planning regions, and mean/median/standard deviations related to the additional would be helpful to siting decisions for future RFPs and increase overall competition

Benefits:
Conversely, the disclosure of additional qualitative, non-price information offers several advantages. Developers would be better positioned to make informed decisions regarding project siting, technology selection, and development strategy. For example, greater visibility into the geographic distribution of proposals could help proponents identify regions that are oversubscribed or underrepresented, enabling more efficient allocation of development resources.

Similarly, understanding the mix of land tenure types or technology categories submitted could help proponents refine their project concepts in advance of future procurement rounds. In effect, enhanced qualitative transparency would allow developers to make more strategic, data-driven decisions while awaiting formal updates to procurement rules, capacity guidance, or eligibility criteria. This would ultimately lead to stronger, more competitive proposals in subsequent rounds.

Repowering Eligibility Framework

Do you have feedback on the proposed requirement that facilities complete a minimum of three years of a medium-term contract before becoming eligible for repowering?

N/A

Do you have feedback related to scenarios where repowering work may overlap with existing contract obligations?

N/A

Alternate Eligibility Pathways for Repowering

Do you have feedback related to specific existing facilities that do not fit into the proposed repowering framework and may justify an alternate pathway? Please include as much detail as possible (technology type, facility age, contract history etc.).

N/A

Recognizing that such details are important to the IESO's decision making in this matter but potentially also commercially sensitive to asset owners, please feel free to mark such details as confidential on this form or, alternatively, reach out to the IESO by email to schedule a meeting to discuss your situation.

N/A

Definition of Repowering

Do you have feedback on the definition of repowering? i.e., on the potential use of technology specific equipment replacement thresholds to define repowering?

N/A

Repowering Guardrails and Risk Mitigation

Do you have feedback on the use of enhanced independent engineer certification as a key safeguard for repowering projects?

N/A

Do you have feedback on the potential application of modified or increased performance security requirements for repowered facilities?

N/A

Do you have feedback on whether these proposed guardrails are sufficient to manage performance and longevity risks?

N/A

Deliverability Guidance and Timing

Do you have feedback on the IESO's proposed phased approach to deliverability guidance updates for LT2 Window 2?

The development community welcomes the IESO's phased approach to updating deliverability guidance for LT2 Window 2. However, the current timeline—particularly the expectation that preliminary deliverability information may not be available until September 2026—poses significant challenges for proponents given the current development and submission timelines associated with the procurement.

To support effective project planning and to ensure that proponents can advance high-quality, well-sited proposals, we strongly encourage the IESO to release deliverability-related updates as early as practicable. In particular, the timely publication of regional capacity guidance would materially improve proponents' ability to assess the viability of prospective sites. Early clarity on whether capacity is expected to be available in the Northwest and Northeast (as well as other planning regions), and the extent to which generation may be transferable to southern regions, would meaningfully influence development decisions.

Furthermore, the three most critical system constraints—Wawa, Mississagi, and Hanmer/Essa—represent pivotal stage gates for many potential projects. Any preliminary insights into expected transfer capabilities or capacity constraint relief in these areas would provide substantial value to proponents and reduce the risk of misaligned development efforts.

LT2 Window 1 demonstrated that large (150MW+) utility scale wind and solar projects can be sited in northern Ontario and provide a significant new source of energy for Ontario at highly competitive prices. Because the timeline to develop wind projects is longer than solar projects, there are now several large-scale wind projects under development that will be in a more advanced bid ready stage for LT2 Windows 2 to 4. Unlocking this energy potential with key strategic transmission upgrades is critically important. The ability to move electricity from northern to southern Ontario should be a key priority for the IESO and focus of immediate near-term transmission network system upgrades. The volumes of new energy sources needed in Ontario will not come from southern Ontario due to the significant challenges of siting projects in southern Ontario. For example, siting large, utility scale wind and solar projects in southern Ontario is difficult due to a variety of factors including a lack of available land and current land use restrictions and municipal support requirements. LT2 Window 1 should not result in a "one-shot" opportunity for wind and solar developers in northern Ontario.

The summer and fall periods preceding LT2 Window 2 RFP submissions is a particularly important period for identifying new sites, securing land control, conducting environmental and technical studies, and initiating community and Indigenous engagement. Access to high-level deliverability guidance during this period would enable developers to focus resources on locations with a reasonable likelihood of interconnection feasibility. This, in turn, would support the development of proposals that are more competitive, cost-effective, and better aligned with system needs. Early deliverability guidance will also ensure that substantial proposals are submitted into window 2 to ensure similar or greater competitive tension than window 1 (which has been deemed a success).

Early and iterative transparency on deliverability constraints will ultimately contribute to a more efficient procurement process and stronger overall submissions in the LT2 Window 2 RFP.

General Comments/Feedback

Do you have additional feedback to share with the IESO?

N/A