Feedback Form

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

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Nate VanGeest

Title: Director, Development

Organization: RES

Email: [redacted]

Date: Oct 30, 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**

x **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?

RES welcomes closer alignment between rated criteria points and available transmission and the reward of generation which more closely suits IESO needs.

In consideration of ensuring developer investment is directed appropriately, RES would request that this feedback is provided significantly earlier to better align with project development timelines, providing at least 2 years notice as to desired areas/ incentives within the tender structure.

Non-Wires Alternatives (NWA)

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

RES supports closer alignment between IESO's actual physical needs and the tender, however recommends earlier, clearer signals to allow developers to plan accordingly.

Agricultural Land Considerations

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

To enable projects to be sited closer to areas of the province in which demand is located, RES recommends greater flexibility to allow municipalities and landowners to make decisions as to activities in their municipalities/ lands, which would include allowance for ground mount solar on Prime Agricultural lands, possibly through agrivoltaics.

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?

RES is supportive of technology-specific thresholds and treatment of monthly production factors to better align generation with load.

Evolving Value of Energy Storage

General - Internal

- 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?

RES recommends enabling pathways for hybrid energy and storage projects, allowing IESO to better utilize existing transmission assets and providing developers with more options on a limited transmission project. Hybrid projects are commonplace in other electricity markets around the world.

RES has been tracking the Capacity Accreditation engagements and supports the IESO's currently proposed Marginal Reliability Impact (MRI) methodology, however, IESO should provide further clarity on potential impacts to the LT2 Bid Window 2 Capacity stream with sufficient time so as to allow developers to make informed investment decisions.

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?

RES recommends that repowering projects do not compete directly with new build projects.

Regulation Service Readiness

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

No comment

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

No comment

Deliverability and System Performance

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

RES welcomes the release of deliverability guidance however requests that it is provided earlier in the tender process to provide better guidance around investment decisions. Projects, particularly wind farms are originated often years before being bid into a competitive process. With lower development costs, this ultimately translates into lower power prices required to cover these costs.

The current deliverability guidance does not detail capacities for substation connections, which would be helpful for developers looking to site projects connecting directly into transmission-level stations.

General - Internal

- 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?

  RES requests clarity to be provided on the following items within the updated Deliverability Guidance:

  - If the IBR values in Figures 6–8 are calculated at the HV bus of each station?
  - How will the determination be made if a grid-forming or synchronous condenser solution is required? What is required at bid? Would a co-located synchronous condenser or grid-forming battery be credited in the deliverability test?
  - Please publish the Available Fault Level (MVA) at each station and the circuit impedance data needed to estimate it along a line. Alternatively, offer a pre-submission screening process with a defined turnaround, where a proponent gives a tap location and gets the AFL there.
  - If a synchronous condenser is applicable to a project after the SIS, how will costs be attributed in consideration that it has grid benefits in addition to the benefits to the project

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

  To ensure a level playing amongst developers and to better decrease the possibility of unsuccessful projects, RES suggests that Hydro One to publish per circuit, the HONI required connection configuration (T-tap, breakered tap, or switching station), plus indicative cost ranges and station-space constraints before the proposal deadline.

  RES allows recommends that HONI makes itself available in pre-consultations through a transparent, objective standardized process.

General Comments/Feedback

Do you have additional feedback to share with the IESO?

RES strongly recommends at minimum maintaining the transmission upgrade cost sharing mechanism from Bid Window 1, so as to ensure a competitive process. Transferring all of the risk onto developers requires proponents to keep a higher degree of contingency in their financial models, implying higher power prices which will ultimately be passed on to ratepayers. Additionally, escalated transmission upgrade costs increase the risk of projects defaulting on their obligations and not completing due to cost overruns. If the risk is shared, lower contingencies are required as only the actual costs are passed on, as opposed to a worst case value. However, other options should be considered such as AESO's self-build option.

General - Internal