

Feedback Form

Long-Term RFP – June 29, 2023

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Bryce Nunley

Title: Director, Thermal Asset Management

Organization: Invenergy

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: July 13, 2023

Following the June 29th public webinar on the Long-Term RFP (LT1 RFP), the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) is seeking feedback from participants on design of the LT1 RFP and LT1 Contract.

The referenced presentation can be found on the [Long-Term RFP webpage](#).

Please provide feedback by July 13, 2023 to engagement@ieso.ca.

Please use subject header: **Long-Term RFP**. To promote transparency, this feedback will be posted on the [Long-Term RFP webpage](#) unless otherwise requested by the sender.

The IESO will work to consider and incorporate comments as appropriate and post responses on the webpage.

Thank you for your contribution.

Revised COD of May 1, 2028

Topic	Feedback
Are Proponents supportive of the revised COD date and the introduction of Capacity payment multipliers for early operation?	Invenergy is supportive.

Revised procurement targets

Topic	Feedback
Are Proponents supportive of the revised LT1 procurement targets on slide 15, which has increased the overall procurement target from 2,200MW to 2,505MW? This enables unused MWs in the Non-Storage Category from the E-LT1 RFP to the Non-Storage Category in the LT1 RFP. The IESO continues to reserve the right to accept the marginal bid above the Storage Category procurement target.	Invenergy supports this change.

Changes to Rated Criteria

Topic	Feedback
Are Proponents supportive of the revised Rated Criteria approach as laid out on slides 20 and 21? This includes the removal of the duration of service as a Rated Criteria and setting minimum duration requirements as a Mandatory Criteria for Storage Category and Non-Storage Category resources. Remaining Rated Criteria include: Local Governing Body Support, and Indigenous Participation.	Invenergy is generally supportive of the rated criteria. With respect to Municipal Resolutions, we are concerned with the requirement as stated in the meeting that a proponent would be required to obtain an additional resolution if they submitted a project in E-LT1 and now are submitting the same project for LT1. If the project has received local support as recently as last year, repeating the municipal resolution process would be a burden to the municipality and the local community (e.g., attending public meetings and using up time on the municipal agenda). We urge IESO to reconsider this position.

Inclusion of the MCIA in the LT1 RFP

Topic	Feedback
Are Proponents supportive of continuing to include MCIA options in the LT1 RFP?	Invenergy is not generally supportive, as the MCIA does not correlate with our exposure due to pricing escalation.

Changes to Proponent Group Award Limit

Topic	Feedback
<p>Are Proponents supportive of increasing the Group Award Limit for Storage Category resources from 600 MW to 900 MW?</p> <p>Additionally, the IESO invites Proponents to provide Group Award Limit feedback with regards to the Non-Storage Category.</p>	Invenergy is supportive.

Other or General Comments/Feedback: