# Feedback Form

## Long-Term 2 RFP (Window 2) – October 14, 2026

### Feedback Provided by:

Name: Ivan Mednikov

Title: Project Manager

Organization: Neoen

Email: [redacted]

Date: 30 October 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 October 14th, Long-Term 2 RFP Window 2 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 October 30, 2026.**

## Rated Criteria

### Locational Criteria

- Do you have feedback on the proposed locational scoring framework, including the treatment of different zones, technology types, and repowering projects?

*For the capacity stream, we recommend expanding locational points beyond the North to include circuits and load pockets where energy storage can alleviate congestion.*

### Non-Wires Alternatives (NWA)

- Do you have feedback on the proposed NWA opportunities, including eligibility, scoring, and the approach to assigning points?

### Agricultural Land Considerations

- Do you have feedback on the proposed treatment of prime agricultural areas, agrivoltaics, and potential agricultural exemptions?

## LT2(e-2) Contract Design

### Non-Performance Charges (NPCs)

- Do you have feedback on the proposed NPC changes, including technology-specific thresholds and the treatment of monthly production factors?

## Evolving Value of Energy Storage

- Do you have feedback on how the evolving reliability and capacity value of energy storage should be reflected in LT2 evaluation, scoring, or procurement design?

## Repowering

- Do you have feedback on the proposed Independent Engineer certification requirements?

- Do you have feedback on the proposed treatment of repowering projects within LT2 competition and evaluation processes?

*The 3.6 TWh target for new-build projects should serve as a minimum. The repowering cap should be set as high as reliability requirements permit, with any shortfalls addressed within the same procurement window.*

## Regulation Service Readiness

- Do you have feedback on the proposal to require regulation-service readiness for LT2 projects?

- Do you have feedback on the proposed technical requirements and any associated cost, schedule, or implementation impacts?

## Deliverability and System Performance

- Do you have feedback on the proposed deliverability methodology, including regional congestion assumptions and transparency of information available to proponents?

- Do you have feedback on the proposed treatment of short-circuit strength, minimum system strength requirements, and emerging technologies such as grid-forming inverter-based resources?

- Do you have feedback on the proposed circuit availability maps and any additional information that would support project siting and proposal development?

*Any potential reduction in circuit availability from the October 15 preliminary guidance should be explained in the final guidance. The updated interconnection guidance should be issued at least three months before bid submission and should account for committed transmission reinforcements scheduled to enter service by 2033.*

*We also recommend providing the industry with circuit availability data in suitable GIS file formats.*

## General Comments/Feedback

Do you have additional feedback to share with the IESO?

*On capacity accreditation, we strongly recommend maintaining the existing framework for LT2(c-2) and introducing any new accreditation methodology no earlier than Window 3.*

*The proposed reduction in DARTA protection from 85% to 60%, together with the removal of Window 1's transmission connection cost protection, increases financing costs and bid prices for wind, solar and storage projects. We recommend reinstating protection of at least 80%. Weather variability and forecast errors cause deviations between day-ahead and real-time outcomes for*

*variable generation resources, including wind and solar. A longer market history helps price this risk but does not eliminate it.*

*For connection cost exceedances, we recommend retaining the Window 1 mechanism until a robust replacement, developed in consultation with industry, offers lenders a comparable level of certainty.*

*For tariff adjustments, we recommend reducing the capital cost threshold that triggers a price adjustment from 10% to 5% under section 2.14 of the draft LT2(e-2) contract and section 2.16 of the draft LT2(c-2) contract. Trade risk has increased since Window 1, and a lower threshold would reduce the risk premium proponents need to include in their bids.*

*On Canadian content, we do not object to a Supply Chain Disclosure Plan, provided it is non-binding.*

*For Prime Agricultural Areas, we recommend lifting the prohibition on ground-mounted solar and relying instead on municipal support and Agricultural Impact Assessments.*

*We recommend making hybrid and co-located projects, such as wind with energy storage or solar with energy storage, eligible in Window 2 and all subsequent windows, with hybrid resources explicitly recognized and assessed on equal terms. By using existing infrastructure, these projects would deliver lower-priced bids. The requirement for capacity-stream projects to use meters that are not used by another facility, in section 2.1(c)(i)(B) of the draft LT2(c-2) RFP, should not prevent separately metered storage from being co-located with new or existing generation. The IESO should also explain how hybrid facilities will be classified and assessed in each stream. Proponents should be able to pair an energy-stream proposal with a co-located capacity-stream storage proposal and offer a lower price conditional on both being selected. This would allow ratepayers to benefit from savings on shared interconnection, land and site costs.*

*We recommend 30-year contract terms for both new-build and repowering projects, consistent with BC, Quebec and Saskatchewan, so that costs can be spread over the life of the assets. The term-extension relief currently provided for delays in gas turbine delivery should also cover long-lead equipment across all technologies, including transformers, wind turbines, solar modules and inverters, and battery systems.*