

# LT2 RFP Question and Comment Period (July 09, 2025)

## Questions and Comments

The following document summarizes IESO responses to the questions and comments submitted to the IESO in respect of the final LT2 RFP documents posted on June 27, 2025, that were submitted pursuant to section 3.2(a) of the Long Term 2 Request for Proposals (LT2 RFP) prior to the Question and Comment Deadline.

### Disclaimer

This document and the information contained herein are provided for information purposes only. The IESO has prepared this document based on information currently available to the IESO and reasonable assumptions associated therewith. The IESO provides no guarantee, representation, or warranty, express or implied, with respect to any statement or information contained herein and disclaims any liability in connection therewith. The IESO undertakes no obligation to revise or update any information contained in this document as a result of new information, future events or otherwise. In the event there is any conflict or inconsistency between this document and the IESO market rules, any IESO contract, any legislation or regulation, or any request for proposals or other procurement document, the terms in the market rules, or the subject contract, legislation, regulation, or procurement document, as applicable, govern.

### Defined Terms

Capitalized terms used in the IESO Responses in this document, unless otherwise defined herein have the meaning given to such terms in the LT2(e-1) RFP, LT2(c-1) RFP, LT2(e-1) Contract, and LT2 (c-1) Contract, as applicable.

Question/Comment	IESO Response
<p>1) Does the Registration Fee have to be "delivered" to the IESO prior to the Proponent's deadline for Registration?</p>	<p>Per section 3.4 of the LT2(e-1) and LT2(c-1) RFPs, interested Proponents must submit a Prescribed Form: Registration Form to the IESO, specific to an individual proposed Long-Term Project, together with a registration fee of five hundred dollars (\$500) (the "Registration Fee").</p> <p>The Prescribed Form: Registration Form and the Registration Fee must be submitted by the Proponent deadline for Registration specified in section 3.1 of the LT2(e-1) and LT2(c-1) RFPs.</p> <p>The Registration Fee must be sent to the banking information provided in section 3.4(b) of the LT2(e-1) RFP or LT2(c-1) RFP.</p>
<p>2) Is the Registration Fee of \$500 inclusive of HST?</p>	<p>Yes, the Registration Fee is inclusive of HST.</p>
<p>3) Are project connection and deliverability assessment-related discussions and meetings with the IESO and Transmitter's transmission teams considered communications under "Permitted Purposes" per section 3.5(a) of the RFP?</p>	<p>Yes, the IESO will continue holding pre-submission consultations on connection guidance and deliverability with potential Proponents. In order to help ensure all potential Proponents have the ability to schedule a consultation, should they wish, the IESO will be implementing certain restrictions. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultations will be held up until 2 weeks prior to the applicable Proposal Submission Deadline.</li> <li>• Individual consultations will be scheduled for no more than one hour.</li> <li>• Potential Proponents requesting a consultation are encouraged to submit a list of questions to the IESO in advance.</li> <li>• The consultations will permit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Answering questions on the <i>Preliminary Connection Guidance for Long-Term 2 Procurement</i> document.</li> <li>○ Answering questions on the <i>Evaluation Stage Deliverability Test Methodology for the Long-</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Question/Comment	IESO Response
	<p><i>Term 2 Energy Supply (Window 1) Request for Proposals</i> document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consultations will not permit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Answering questions on the requirements/provisions of the LT2 RFPs or Contracts</li> <li>○ Any communications for Excluded Purposes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• At this time, the IESO does not intend to limit to the number of consultations a potential Proponent is able to schedule. The IESO will, however, prioritize scheduling consultations with those potential Proponents that have not had a consultation before scheduling a subsequent consultation with a potential Proponent that has already had one.</li> </ul>
<p>4) Could the IESO please advise how the results of the MT2 RFP would affect the Preliminary Connection Guidance for LT2 Energy &amp; Capacity streams?</p>	<p>Window 1 of the LT2 RFP is designed to procure services from new, separately metered facilities. The results of the MT2 RFP are expected to have minimal impact on the Preliminary Connection Guidance for the LT2 Energy and Capacity streams. This is primarily due to the fact that the MT2 procurement was limited to existing, operating facilities. Additionally, any facilities with renewed contracts were considered dispatched in line with assumptions outlined in the guidance and methodology documents across all facilities.</p>
<p>5) How are connection upgrades going to be accounted for under the Deliverability Assessment?</p>	<p>Bulk or regional transmission upgrades scheduled to be completed by Milestone Date for Commercial Operation will be factored into the Deliverability Assessment.</p> <p>During the Deliverability Assessment itself, new connections will not trigger new system-level upgrades. If a new connection results in a system violation during the study, the project will be deemed undeliverable. However, it is assumed that any new connection equipment</p>

Question/Comment	IESO Response
	will be designed appropriately to accommodate the project's needs and will not constrain deliverability on its own.
<p>6) For Proponents that are planning to connect to parallel 230kV circuits, how does the available capacity of one parallel circuit impact the maximum available capacity on the other circuit? For projects proposing connections to both parallel circuits, would the maximum available capacity be the sum of both the circuit capacities?</p>	<p>The transmission circuit capacity tables in Appendix A of the preliminary connection guidance documents indicate the incremental generation that could connect to each circuit, based on the assessments described therein, which looked at single point injection. Per Chapter 8 of the preliminary connection guidance document, the transmission circuit capacities are highly dependent on the size and location of LT2(e-1) RFP or LT2(c-1) RFP proposals in the same electrical proximity. For example, the total amount that could be injected into a multi-circuit line or corridor could be less than the sum of the maximum single circuit injection value. As a result, proposals in the LT2(e-1) RFP or LT2(c-1) RFP may compete for the same transmission system availability during the evaluation stage deliverability test.</p>
<p>7) Are LT2(c-1) Proponents allowed to submit multiple Proposals that reference the same Property under PF AR-100? For clarity, can the same property be used for submitting two separate proposals?</p>	<p>Yes, Proponents may submit multiple Proposals that reference the same Property. While there are no restrictions on two projects being located on the same Property, Proponents would need to ensure they have sufficient access rights and the ability to develop their facility and comply with the contractual requirements even in a situation where both projects were awarded contracts.</p>
<p>8) Can the IESO confirm that Electricity Storage Facilities will be able to achieve Commercial Operation prior to the COD Bonus End Date? For clarity, what is the earliest date any Electricity Storage Facility will be able to achieve commercial operations?</p>	<p>There are no restrictions in the LT2(c-1) RFP or LT2(c-1) Contract on how early an Energy Storage Facility can achieve Commercial Operation. Per Section 2.3(b) of the LT2(c-1) Contract, however, the early operation incentive is only for facilities that are not Electricity Storage Facilities.</p>
<p>9) Can the IESO clarify the maximum cumulative project-life reduction (in percentage) in Summer Contract Capacity and/or Winter Contract Capacity that will be allowed under the LT2(c-1) Contract section 4.3?</p>	<p>Per section 4.3 of the LT2(c-1) Contract a Supplier may reduce their Summer Contract Capacity and/or Winter Contract Capacity on three (3) occasions by an amount that is not more than seven percent (7%) of the original</p>

Question/Comment	IESO Response
	<p>Summer Contract Capacity and/or Winter Contract Capacity as set out in exhibit B.</p> <p>For greater clarity the maximum allowable reduction to the original Summer Contract Capacity and/or Winter Contract Capacity would be 21% cumulatively, over the life of the Project.</p>
<p>10) For Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) proposals, could the IESO clarify whether HVAC, PCS cooling systems, control systems, relays, fans, pumps, etc. qualify under the definition of Station Service Loads? If not, could the IESO clarify what equipment is to be considered?</p>	<p>Station Service Loads means energy consumed to power the on-site maintenance and operation of the Facility but excludes energy consumed in association with activities which could be ceased or moved to other locations without impeding the normal and safe operation of the Facility.</p>
<p>11) Can the IESO confirm whether the "Capacity for IBR (MW)" listed refers to the thermal rating of the project substation transformer, the Nameplate Capacity, or the Maximum Contract Capacity for the circuit?</p>	<p>Capacity for IBR (MW) refers to the incremental generation that could connect into each circuit should the project be an IBR resource (e.g. BESS) based on the assessments performed under the guidance documents. Per chapter 2.2 of the <i>Preliminary Connection Guidance and Evaluation Stage Deliverability Test Methodology for Long-Term 2(c-1) RFP</i>, IBR resources can have additional restrictions from synchronous units such that the available capacity on a circuit is further restricted.</p>
<p>12) Could the IESO advise why is circuit S47C marked "Avoid" despite having 250MW Capacity for IBR?</p>	<p>As described in the notes of the Appendix A Transmission Circuit Capacities, Table 10, and elaborated on in Chapter 2.4.4 in the Preliminary Connection Guidance and Evaluation Stage Deliverability Test Methodology for Long-term 2(c-1) RFP:</p> <p>S47C is to be avoided due to line protection constraints. S47C is protected by line differential. Connecting into circuits limited by line protection, especially those protected by line differential may introduce major complexities and costly solutions. It is, therefore, recommended to avoid connecting into these circuits.</p>
<p>13) Could the IESO advise if they plan on updating the deliverability guidance for</p>	<p>The IESO does not plan to update the LT2(c) Preliminary Connection Guidance &amp; Evaluation</p>

Question/Comment	IESO Response
<p>LT2(c) Preliminary Connection Guidance &amp; Evaluation State Deliverability Test Methodology document in advance of the bid window 1 submission deadline? As it currently stands, LT2(c) Proponents will not have adequate line-of-sight on the deliverability of their projects since the Energy stream awards will have downstream impacts and can impact Stage 5 of proposal evaluation.</p>	<p>Stage Deliverability Test Methodology documents prior to the Proposal Submission Deadline for the LT2(c-1) RFP.</p> <p>The IESO recognizes that Energy Stream contract awards under the LT2(e-1) RFP may have downstream impacts that could influence deliverability outcomes and Stage 5 evaluations for Proposals submitted under the LT2(c-1) RFP. However, based on the current timelines, LT2(e-1) contracts will not be awarded in advance of the LT2(c-1) Proposal Submission Deadline.</p> <p>The IESO remains committed to transparency and will continue to keep Proponents informed of any updates or new information as it becomes available.</p>
<p>14) Could the LT2 team provide real-life scenario examples of the five different experience categories of Proponent Team Members?</p> <p>From our view, the definitions are open worded which allows a variety of experiences to qualify so long as they fit into the parameters. When our team thought through our experience and compared it to the definition, some concerns arose around this specific example meeting the open-worded definitions. Having some examples of management experience shared on the engagement portal would help with this comparison.</p> <p>Personally, I am comfortable with our experience meeting the criteria; I can see the parameters of each experience bucket within the requirements of the energy asset. Others team members would benefit from specific examples.</p>	<p>The experience required for Designated Team Members must have been obtained on Qualifying Projects where individuals had managerial authority with respect to the described identified functions. The IESO will not be providing specific examples of such experience that would qualify as Team Member Experience. Proponents must satisfy themselves, and attest in their Proposal, that the information submitted in their Proposal meets the requirements of the LT2 RFPs.</p>
<p>15) I am reaching out on behalf of [Company Name Redacted], a Canadian company developing modular, fire-safe energy</p>	<p>The IESO is not involved in creating partnerships in project or technology development. Prospective Proponents or technology partners</p>

Question/Comment	IESO Response
<p>storage systems paired with an ethical AI for smart microgrid management.</p> <p>We are submitting our [Name Redacted] solution for consideration under Ontario's Long-Term 2 RFP. Please find attached our application document for review. Our system is scalable from 10 kWh to 200+ kWh per unit, with manufacturing based in Québec (and possible expansion into Ontario). We would be pleased to integrate our technology into an eligible LT2 project, or to collaborate with developers seeking a robust BESS partner.</p> <p>Looking forward to your feedback or interest.</p>	<p>are encouraged to seek out partnerships themselves and submit Proposals accordingly.</p>
<p>16) Will a previous (draft) version of the Prescribed Form: Evidence of Municipal Support satisfy the requirements of Section. 4.2(c)(iii) of the final LT2(e-1) RFP and LT2(c-1) RFP, as applicable?</p>	<p>There are two inconsistencies between previous (draft) versions of the Prescribed Form: Evidence of Municipal Support and the final version of the Prescribed Form: Evidence of Municipal Support which was posted on June 27, 2025.</p> <p>Firstly, previous (draft) versions of the Prescribed Form: Evidence of Municipal Support make reference to "Section 4.2(b)(iii)" of the LT2(e-1) RFP or LT2(c-1) RFP (as applicable); this will be deemed by the IESO to reference Section 4.2(c)(iii) of the applicable RFP that is the mandatory requirement for Municipal Support Confirmation, and any such inaccurate section reference in any issued resolution by a municipal council will not, on its own, invalidate the resolution or be evaluated as a failure to meet the requirement of Section 4.2(c)(iii) of the final LT2(e-1) RFP or LT2(c-1) RFP, as applicable.</p> <p>Secondly, previous (draft) versions of the Prescribed Form: Evidence of Municipal Support did not make reference to the AIA Component One Requirement. In cases where a Proponent obtained a municipal council resolution utilizing</p>

Question/Comment	IESO Response
	<p>a previous (draft) version of the Prescribed Form: Evidence of Municipal Support <u><i>and where the Project Site is located in whole or in part in Prime Agricultural Areas, as reflected in such resolution</i></u>, the Proponent must either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) obtain a new resolution from the council using the final form of the template resolution attached as Exhibit A to the Prescribed Form (posted June 27), or;</li> <li>(ii) include a supplementary resolution from the municipal council stating that “the Proponent has satisfied the AIA Component One Requirement (as defined in the LT2(e-1) RFP or LT2(c-1) RFP, as applicable) to the satisfaction of the Local Municipality” and include this supplementary resolution as part of Proposal submission.</li> </ul>
<p>17) The <a href="#">Draft LT2(e) Proposal Workbook</a> (November 6, 2024) is protected and cannot be edited. Can IESO please upload a version that can be modified? This will help understanding what inputs exactly are required for the bids and hence guide preparation of relevant information in the appropriate format.</p>	<p>The LT2 team published the final Proposal Workbook on Thursday June 26<sup>th</sup>. This workbook is unlocked so that Proponents can better familiarize themselves with the document, as many cells contain hardcoded conditions/submission rule dependencies.</p>
<p>18) With regards to the possibility to identify an alternative connection point and to propose connection to multiple circuits, we would like to make sure to correctly understand the flexibility provided. We would like to use the case of a site with &gt; 250MW max. nameplate capacity that is adjacent to four eligible transmission circuits. For example, is it possible to propose two different double circuit connections for the main proposal and</p>	<p>Yes, the approach described is permitted, provided it aligns with the requirements set out in the RFP. A Proponent may propose one double-circuit connection for their Primary Proposal PQ, along with one alternate allocation on a different double-circuit configuration, provided all four circuits are Common Corridor Circuits of each other. For example, if circuits C1, C2, C3, and C4 are part of the same Common Corridor, the Primary Proposal PQ could allocate capacity on C1 and C2, and the</p>



Question/Comment	IESO Response
<p>two different single circuit connections for the PQ Alternates?</p>	<p>alternate allocation could use any other combination of those four circuits (e.g., C3 and C4, or C1 and C4).</p> <p>For PQ Alternates, a Proponent may propose two different single-circuit connections, provided each circuit is included in the Primary Proposal PQ configuration (not the alternate allocation). So, if the Primary Proposal PQ uses C1 and C2, then each PQ Alternate may propose connection to either C1 or C2. Additionally, each PQ Alternate may include one alternate allocation, and this alternate allocation may use other circuits from the same Common Corridor (e.g., C3 or C4 from the example above).</p> <p>Please be mindful that the transmission circuit capacities listed in the preliminary connection guidance documents are highly dependent on the size and location of RFP proposals in the same electrical proximity. For example, the total amount that could be injected into a multi-circuit line or corridor could be less than the sum of the maximum single circuit injection value.</p>
<p>19) In the definition of nameplate capacity solar resources have an exemption - can this be applied to wind facilities?</p>	<p>The LT2 team is considering the appropriateness of this request. This question will be revisited in a future batch of Questions and Comments and, if a revision to the definition is warranted, it will be made in an Addendum to the LT2(e-1) Contract.</p>