

Feedback Form

Long-Term 2 RFP – April 21, 2026

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Nate VanGeest

Title: Director, Development

Organization: RES (Renewable Energy Systems)

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?

RES would propose providing no names data on the general location and sizes of unsuccessful projects

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

Provision of information on the general location (regions) and sizes of unsuccessful projects would give developers indication as to the competitive landscape and could allow better distribution of projects around the province.

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?

The decision to enter into a medium-term contract or a long-term contract should be solely decided by the proponent. The tariff paid for power produced by a renewable energy asset is typically calculated based on a fully amortized asset over the initial contracting period of the project; the assets have no lingering obligation to ratepayers.

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

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.).

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.

Any consideration or provision of alternative pathways should be done in such a way that it does not alter the competitive landscape between other repowered or new build assets.

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?

This should be left to the market to be decided.

Repowering Guardrails and Risk Mitigation

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

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

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

Deliverability Guidance and Timing

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

While the provision of which lines will be considered in deliverability testing for Bid Window 2 is helpful, RES would encourage the IESO to consider going further. Decisions on development are made years prior to bid submission and while releasing deliverability guidance several months advance of bid submission allows proponents to decide which project to submit and provide bid security against, it provides limited solid data in terms of prospecting.

IESO should also endeavor to provide greater transparency and objectivity as to how the values in the deliverability guidance are compiled. This would allow developers to better interpret the results of the information available and fill in inevitable gaps in the information.

General Comments/Feedback

Do you have additional feedback to share with the IESO?