

# Feedback Form

## Transmitter Selection Framework – June 25, 2025

### Feedback Provided by:

Name: Shoshana Pasternak

Title: Manager, Government and Regulatory Affairs

Organization: Invenergy

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: July 15, 2025

To promote transparency, feedback submitted will be posted on the TSF engagement page unless otherwise requested by the sender.

- ☐ **Yes – there is confidential information, do not post**  
☒ **No – comfortable to publish to the IESO web page**

Following the Transmitter Selection Framework (June 25, 2025), 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 [Transmitter Selection Framework](#) 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](mailto:engagement@ieso.ca) by July 16.**

**Bid Structure & Risk Allocation:** Does the proposed form of RFP bid and high-level risk allocation strike the right balance between protecting ratepayers while providing an attractive proposition to transmitters and financiers?

Can IESO provide clarification on what the shared risk allocation for Force Majeure means?

Can the IESO provide more information on proponents' risk on routing? In a situation where a government approval or permit is a barrier to routing is that the proponent's risk?

**Reducing Bid Risk Premiums:** Are there mechanisms within the form of proposal submission (or within the contract) that the IESO should consider to reduce risk premiums included in bids?

Just like in LT2 RFP development we believe stakeholders and the IESO should find ways to share tariff risk.

**Evaluating Indigenous Participation within IEPP:** How should the IESO consider evaluating the IEPP, to support meaningful Indigenous economic participation and engagement amongst potentially impacted communities? Is it helpful (or a hindrance) for rated or mandatory criteria to set minimum levels of Indigenous participation?

Different Indigenous communities have different preferences around partnerships and how their communities' benefit from local infrastructure. Overly prescriptive partnership requirements gets in the way of the community and developer striking the best deal possible.

Access to capital and other barriers could make the community more interested in economic benefit agreements including employment or hiring Indigenous vendors.

The greater flexibility the RFP provides the more we can tailor agreements to the communities' needs.

**Cost Containment:** Should the IESO develop a highly prescriptive approach to cost-containment or leave it open for transmitters to develop within their proposals?

We recommend a balanced approach to define certain assumptions, terms, and inputs to support informed proposal comparisons, but encourage allowing flexibility in the actual terms to permit developers to propose, and IESO to benefit from the most robust cost containment provisions specific to the project opportunity.

**Schedule & Development Risks:** Do the proposed milestones and timelines for an initial TSF procurement (noted on slide 28) appear reasonable and appropriately reflect the time required for proposal preparation? Are there specific risks the IESO should plan for?

We are seeking clarification of timelines. Does the IESO plan on launching the RFP January 2026?

If we understand slide 28 correctly and the timeline is 6-12 months to prepare for a bid, we believe that is reasonable.

---

## General Comments/Feedback