

Long Lead-Time RFP

Frequently Asked Questions, Key Feedback and IESO Responses

Version 5
November 9, 2026

Public

ieso
Connecting Today.
Powering Tomorrow.

Disclaimer

This document and the information contained herein is provided for informational 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 and all 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.

Document Change History

Version	Reason For Change	Date
1	Long Lead-Time (LLT) RFP Frequently Asked Questions, Key Feedback and IESO Responses	June 12, 2026
2	New FAQs: 2.6, 11.8 Updated FAQ: 1.3, 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 5.7, 8.5, 8.7, 8.8. 9.1, 9.2, 10.1, 10.4, 10.5	August 12, 2026
3	New FAQs: 11.9, 11.10	September 11, 2026
4	New FAQs: 1.7, 1.8, 8.10, 11.11	September 21, 2026
5	New FAQ: 5.9	November 9, 2026

Frequently Asked Questions

The following questions have been submitted to the IESO via the LLT.RFP@ieso.ca inbox and through stakeholder engagement feedback. Capitalized terms used but not defined in this FAQ have the meanings given to them in the LLT(e) RFP or the LLT(c) RFP (each, an "LLT RFP", and collectively, the "**LLT RFPs**", and the LLT(e) Contract or the LLT(c) Contract (each an "LLT Contract", and collectively, collectively, the "**LLT Contracts**"), as applicable. Italicized terms have the meaning given to them in the IESO Market Rules. For the purposes of this FAQ, the term "Project" refers to either a proposed LLT Capacity Project or LLT Energy Project, as applicable.

This document will be continuously updated with questions and responses pertaining to the LLT RFPs.

1. LLT RFP Registration

1.1 How long before the Proposal Submission Deadline will Registration occur?

As reflected in the LLT RFPs posted to the Website on May 6, 2026, the Registration period will be open from September 23, 2026 to October 6, 2026 at 3:00 PM EPT. The Proposal Submission Deadline will follow approximately 7 weeks after, on November 26, 2026 at 3:00 PM EPT.

1.2 The RFP indicates that a Maximum Contract Capacity needs to be stated at Registration. Does this mean that the Contract Capacity at Proposal submission can be less than the Maximum Contract Capacity indicated at the time of registration?

Yes, the Contract Capacity indicated within a Proposal may be less than the Maximum Contract Capacity indicated at the time of registration.

1.3 Can the Maximum Contract Capacity be increased between Registration and the Proposal Submission Deadline?

Yes, a Proponent may increase the Maximum Contract Capacity between the registration period and the Proposal Submission Deadline. Indicative project information submitted during the registration period is intended solely to aid the IESO in preparing for the LLT RFP Evaluation Process and may be changed up until the Proposal Submission Deadline.

1.4 Do the Indigenous partners for a proposed Project need to be identified at Registration?

No, Proponents do not need to identify Indigenous Community partners or any anticipated Proponent Indigenous Participation Level as part of the Registration process. The Prescribed Form: Registration Form requires the Proponent to: (i) identify the prospective Proponent; (ii) specify the Project's generating or storage technology; (iii) identify the anticipated Maximum Contract Capacity for the Project; (iv) identify whether the Project is proposing to connect to the Transmission System or the

Distribution System and identify the name of the transmitter or local distribution company, as applicable; and (v) identify the proposed Connection Point in respect of the Project.

1.5 Will Proponents be permitted to change the Connection Point of the Project after Registration and prior to the Proposal Submission Deadline?

Yes, Proponents are not required to indicate the same Connection Point in their Registration and Proposal.

1.6 Is the Registration Fee required per Proposal or per Proponent?

The Registration Fee of five hundred Dollars ($500), inclusive of HST, is required for each individual LLT Capacity Project or LLT Energy Project that is submitted for registration. If a Proponent intends to register multiple Projects, Proponents must make a separate Registration Fee payment for each Project being registered.

1.7 Can an interested Proponent submit an electronic funds transfer for the Registration Fee with a Registrant ID that is truncated, for example, if there is a character limit that does not allow them to input the full Registrant ID, or if the Registrant ID has to be inputted in multiple lines?

For purposes of a deposit reference identifier for submitting the Registration Fee the IESO suggests a Registrant ID format of LLT(c/e)-Proponent Name-Project Name-Year (Example: LLT(c)-Company A-Project A-2026). While the payee/payment system may impose character limits, Proponents should ensure that the payment reference field includes enough identifying detail (e.g., "LLTc-CompA-Project1" or "LLTc-A-Proj") to reasonably identify the interested Proponent seeking registration. To avoid delays or potential confusion in reconciling payments, interested Proponents may use a shortened but still recognizable form of their legal name together with the RFP and Project Name. After making the payment, an email must be sent to LT2.RFP@ieso.ca with a copy to ieso.treasury@ieso.ca with the following information: (a) Proponent name (and if different from depositor, depositor name); (b) Project Name; (c) expected deposit date; and (d) amount of Registration Fee deposited. This email may also include any shortened name used solely for purposes of the deposit identifier and will further assist in proper attribution of the payment of the Registration Fee.

1.8 If an interested Proponent includes a request for a "Delivery Receipt" when submitting materials to the IESO, would it cause problems on the IESO's side?

The IESO is not confidently able to confirm whether a request for an email "Delivery Receipt" would cause delivery problems on the IESO's side. Please note, interested Proponents are solely responsible for their technology and the transmission of the Registration Form and Proposal (including the full amount of the Registration Fee and Proposal Fee). The IESO will utilize the time stamp generated at the time of receipt into the LLT.RFP@ieso.ca inbox. This time stamp (being the time that the email is received by the IESO) will be the sole determinant of whether electronic Proposal documents were received prior to the Proposal Submission Deadline. The IESO will not be responsible for late

deliveries, deliveries to the incorrect email address or location or other electronic delivery failures, and documents submitted after the deadline for registration or the Proposal Submission Deadline will not be accepted.

Pursuant to Section 3.7(c)(iii), with respect to the submission of Proposals, any delays due to firewalls, technical faults, file size, unreadable or partial scans of compiled documents, forms or attachments, electronic funds transfers, or a high volume of Proposals will not be taken into account.

2. Resource Eligibility and Project Design

2.1 What resources are eligible to participate in the LLT RFP?

The eligibility requirements can be found in Section 2.1 of the LLT(e) RFP or the LLT(c) RFP, as applicable. Generally:

- the LLT(e) RFP is open to New Build hydroelectric resources that do not utilize Pumped Hydroelectric Storage, with a Nameplate Capacity that is equal to or greater than 1 MW; and
- the LLT(c) RFP is open to New Build Electric Storage Facility resources that use Eligible LDES Technologies (i.e., Compressed Air Energy Storage, Pumped Hydroelectric Storage, Liquid Air Energy Storage and Pumped Thermal Energy Storage) with a Nameplate Capacity equal to or greater than 10 MW and that have a Duration Capability of at least eight (8) consecutive hours during Qualifying Hours, have Withdrawal Capability that is equal to or greater than the Contract Capacity in each of Winter and Summer, and, in the case of Regulation Ready-Required Facilities, meet the Regulation Services Readiness Requirements.

2.2 Are redeveloped facilities eligible to participate in the LLT RFP?

No, redevelopments, upgrades, or expansions that are not separately metered are not eligible to participate in the LLT RFP. The LLT RFP is open to Facilities that are New Build only.

The IESO is considering the eligibility of repowered facilities in future windows of the LT2 RFP. Interested stakeholders are encouraged to participate in engagements for the LT2 RFP to provide feedback on this item.

2.3 Are separately metered expansion projects eligible to participate in the LLT RFP?

Yes, separately metered expansion projects are eligible to participate in the LLT RFP. These resources must meet all requirements outlined in the RFPs, just as any other individual eligible resource.

2.4 Can Proposal PQ Alternates be equal to the Primary Proposal PQ?

No, Proposal PQ Alternates are intended to reflect a ranked alternative smaller capacity size, with each alternate being smaller than the last. For clarity, PQ Alternate 2 must reflect a Contract Capacity that is smaller than PQ Alternate 1, and both alternates must be smaller than the Primary Proposal PQ.

2.5 Is a project that is located outside of Ontario but directly connected to a Distribution System or a Transmission System in Ontario eligible to participate in the LLT RFP?

No, to be eligible to participate in the LLT RFP projects must be located in the Province of Ontario. Per Section 2.2(a) of the LLT(c) Contract and the LLT(e) Contract, the Supplier covenants that the Facility shall be located in the Province of Ontario.

2.6 Are compressed CO2 energy storage facilities eligible to participate in the LLT(c) RFP? Do these types of facilities qualify as Pumped Thermal Energy Storage?

No, the IESO considers compressed CO2 energy storage facilities a form of compressed gas energy storage and not Pumped Thermal Energy Storage.

The IESO previously clarified that compressed gas energy storage (other than Compressed Air Energy Storage) is not eligible to participate in the LLT RFP and shared this information as part of the November 28, 2025 Response to Feedback. As stated in the response, while the technology is not eligible to participate in the LLT RFP, it remains eligible to participate in future windows of the LT2 RFP.

The IESO has revised the definition of Pumped Thermal Energy Storage in the LLT(c) RFP to provide further clarity. The revised definition, issued through Addendum No. 1, is as follows:

"Pumped Thermal Energy Storage means an electricity storage system that, during charging, uses Electricity to drive a heat pump to store energy principally in the form of a thermal potential and, during discharging, uses the stored thermal potential to drive a heat engine to generate Electricity."

The revised definition is also aligned with the definition of Pumped Thermal Energy Storage that is included on page 25 of the Pathways to Decarbonization: Appendix B that was published by the IESO on December 15, 2022.

3. Regulation Services Readiness Requirements

3.1 What are the Regulation Services Readiness Requirements and who are they applicable to?

All LLT Capacity Projects that are proposing to connect directly to a Transmission System and have a Nameplate Capacity that is greater than or equal to **40 MW** are considered Regulation Ready-Required Facilities and will be required to meet the Regulation Service Readiness Requirements, and subsequently the Regulation Services Testing Requirement.

Under the Regulation Service Readiness Requirements, these Facilities must be designed and constructed such that they are capable of providing Regulation Services with a magnitude of no less than ± ten (10) MW and with a Ramp Rate of no less than fifty percent (50%) of such magnitude per minute. As part of this requirement, Facilities will be required to install the necessary information technology, telemetry, automatic generation controls and any other system, equipment or technology that is required for a 'major generation facility' to provide Regulation Services, as defined in the IESO Market Rules.

Under the LLT(c) Contract, as a requirement to achieving commercial operation, an Independent Engineer must verify that the Facility has met the Regulation Services Readiness Requirement (i.e., the Facility has installed the Regulation Services Equipment and is capable of providing Regulation Services). Within 18 months of the Commercial Operation Date, Suppliers will be required to use Commercially Reasonable Efforts to satisfy all Regulation Services Testing Requirements, per the applicable IESO Market Rules and Manuals.

3.2 Will the Regulation Service Readiness Requirements obligate a Facility to provide Regulation Services to the IESO?

No, the Regulation Service Readiness Requirements and the Regulation Services Testing Requirement do not obligate a Facility or Supplier to provide Regulation Services under the LLT(c) Contract or the IESO Market Rules. If a Supplier is interested in providing Regulation Services to the IESO, the Supplier would need to enter into a separate agreement to do so, such as through a bilateral contract negotiated with the IESO or through a contract awarded through a future Ancillary Services procurement.

3.3 What Market Rules apply to regulation providers?

The Regulation Services Equipment that is required to be installed as part of the Regulation Services Readiness Requirement is the telemetry, information technology, automatic generation control and other systems/technology required under the IESO Market Rules for the provisions of Regulations Services by a "major generation facility" as that term is defined in the IESO Market Rules. For general inquiries regarding the provision of Regulation Services, questions can be directed to IESOCustomerRelations@ieso.ca.

4. Performance Obligations

4.1 Does the Facility need to be 100% charged before Qualifying Hours each day in order to meet the Must-Offer Obligation of the LLT(c) Contract?

No, a Facility does not need to be Fully Charged to meet the Must Offer Obligation outlined in the LLT(c) Contract. Suppliers must offer their Contract Capacity, that is not subject to an outage, into the Day Ahead Market during the Qualifying Hours (currently 7am to 11pm EST on Business Days). Until such time as dispatch tools are able to factor in State-of-Charge, Suppliers will be required to manage energy limits through the "Maximum Daily Energy Limit" parameter. This will allow Suppliers to offer in their full capacity but will only result in Facilities being dispatched up to what they can provide based on their charge status.

Per Section 2.6(e) of the LLT(c) Contract, the Supplier shall use Commercially Reasonable Efforts to maintain sufficient State-of-Charge to enable the Facility to satisfy dispatch instructions that correspond with the offers the Supplier submits in satisfying its Must-Offer Obligation.

4.2 Will a Facility, that is subject to the LLT(c) Contract, be required to comply with the Must Offer Obligation during a Withdrawal Capability Check Test?

No, where a Withdrawal Capability Check Test is conducted during Qualifying Hours, these hours will be included as part of the calculation of the Outage Hour Capacity Reduction Factor (OHCRF) for that Settlement Month, which will factor into the Adjusted Monthly Contract Capacity, thereby excluding them from the availability calculations in Exhibit E of the LLT(c) Contract.

5. Deliverability

5.1 Will the IESO be conducting pre-deliverability testing for the LLT RFP?

Yes, the IESO will be offering pre-deliverability testing for prospective Proponents seeking to participate in the LLT RFP. Further details, including the Pre-Deliverability Intake Forms and submission deadlines, can be found on the Website. Please note that results of these tests are for informational purposes only and are not tied to Proposal evaluation under the LLT RFP. Deliverability consultations will be offered until two weeks prior to the Proposal Submission Deadline, that is, they will be offered until November 11, 2026.

5.2 Can projects connect to 500kV circuits for the LLT RFP?

In alignment with guidance provided under previous procurements, connection to 500 kV circuits should be avoided for the LLT RFP. If Proponents believe they have a sound technical and financial basis for their proposed Facility to connect to the 500kV system, they should engage with Hydro One.

5.3 Will the IESO allow Proponents to make investments in the Ontario electricity system to allow their Proposals to pass the Deliverability Test?

No, Projects will be tested for deliverability based on the expected system configuration, including transmission reinforcements considered committed for the purposes of long-term planning, as outlined in Appendix A of the Deliverability Test Methodology.

5.4 How will the results of the LLT RFP capacity stream factor into Deliverability Tests for the energy stream?

The IESO will conduct evaluation stage Deliverability Tests for the LLT(c) RFP before Deliverability Tests for the LLT(e) RFP. This means that LLT Capacity Projects that are awarded contracts will be factored into the base case for Deliverability Tests for the LLT Energy Projects, per the Deliverability Test Methodology.

5.5 When will the IESO start hosting deliverability consultations?

The IESO began offering deliverability consultations on April 1, 2026. Prospective Proponents can schedule a meeting directly with the IESO. Consultations will continue until 2 weeks prior to the Proposal Submission Deadline.

In order to help ensure all prospective Proponents have the opportunity to schedule a deliverability consultation, should they wish, the IESO will be implementing certain restrictions now that the procurement has launched. These include:

- Individual deliverability consultations will be scheduled for no more than one hour.
- Prospective Proponents requesting a deliverability consultation are encouraged to submit a list of questions to the IESO in advance of the consultation.
- As part of deliverability consultations:
    - the IESO will answer questions on the evaluation stage deliverability test methodology for the LLT RFPs and the pre-deliverability test intake forms/results.
    - The IESO will not answer questions on the general requirements/provisions of the LLT RFPs or Contracts; and
    - Potential Proponents may not communicate for Excluded Purposes.

At this time, the IESO does not intend to limit to the number of deliverability consultations a prospective Proponent is able to schedule. The IESO will, however, prioritize scheduling deliverability consultations with those prospective Proponents that have not requested a consultation before scheduling a subsequent consultation with a prospective Proponent that has already had one.

5.6 Can a Proponent propose two different double-circuit connections for the Primary Proposal PQ and two different single-circuit connections for the Proposal PQ Alternate(s)?

Yes, this is permitted provided it aligns with the requirements set out in Section 2.1(g) of the LLT(c) RFP or LLT(e) RFP, as applicable. A Proponent may propose one double-circuit configuration for their Primary Proposal PQ, along with one alternative allocation on a different double-circuit configuration, provided all four Circuits are Common Corridor Circuits. 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 alternate allocation could use any other combination of those four circuits (e.g,. C3 and C4, or C1 and C4).

For Proposal PQ Alternate(s), 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 a single circuit 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).

5.7 How does deliverability testing relate to the connection process with the transmitter/distributor? Does the deliverability test reserve capacity on the system?

No, the Deliverability Test conducted as part of Stage 5 evaluation under the LLT RFP does not reserve connection capacity for the proposed LLT Energy Project or LLT Capacity Project.

The Deliverability Test assesses the ability of a project, as an energy or capacity resource, to deliver the intended energy or capacity during the contract term. Deliverability Test results are distinct from, and in addition to, any Connection Impact Assessment, System Impact Assessment or Customer Impact

Assessment, connection or connection cost agreement required pursuant to Laws and Regulations. Receiving a result of "Deliverable" in a Deliverability Test does not imply that the project will pass the connection assessment and approval process, or that connection costs or connection in-service dates will be within any specific range or estimate, or otherwise affect a Market Participant's obligations under the Market Rules. For clarity, the Deliverability Test does not evaluate the technical solution to connect a proposed project. Proponents are encouraged to discuss that aspect with applicable Transmitters and Local Distribution Companies (LDCs) prior to submitting a proposal into the LLT RFP.

5.8 Does the pre-deliverability test include testing of both the charge and discharge capability? Will results indicate whether or not the charging capacity is "deliverable"?

Yes, the pre-deliverability test includes both a charge and a discharge test for LLT Capacity Projects. as detailed in Section 3.2.2.1 of the LLT RFP Deliverability Test Methodology. Results will indicate if the project fails the pre-deliverability test due to charging.

5.9 What capacity is used in the Pre-Deliverability Test and the Evaluation Stage Deliverability Test?

The following values are used in each of the respective tests:

Pre-Deliverability Test

- LLT(c): Maximum Summer/Winter Injection Capability as provided in the Pre-deliverability intake form. The charging value being tested is derived from the maximum summer/winter injection capability.
- LLT(e): Nameplate Capacity as provided in the Pre-deliverability intake form.

Evaluation Stage Deliverability Test

- LLT(c): Contract Capacity (Summer/Winter) as provided in the Proposal Workbook. The charging value being tested is derived from the Contract Capacity.
- LLT(e): Nameplate Capacity as provided in the Proposal Workbook.

The short-circuit test will be conducted using the Project nameplate rating (MVA) as indicated in the respective LLT(c)/LLT(e) RFP Pre-deliverability Test Intake Form; or, the Proposal Workbook in the case of the Evaluation Stage Deliverability Test.

The IESO updated the LLT RFP Deliverability Test Methodology on November 9, 2026, to reflect these clarifications.

6. Projects Proposed to be Located in Prime Agricultural Areas

6.1 For Projects proposed to be located in Prime Agricultural Areas, when does an Agricultural Impact Assessment need to be completed and what documentation is required to be submitted to the IESO as part of Proposal submission?

Proponents wishing to participate in the LLT(e) RFP or the LLT(c) RFP will need to:

1. Demonstrate municipal support to locate on lands subject to municipal land use authority; and,
2. Where the Project is located in Prime Agricultural Areas, as designated by the Local Municipality's Official Plan or Northern planning board's Official Plan, complete an Agricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) to the satisfaction of the Local Municipality.

An AIA includes three components that may be completed in two separate stages under the LLT RFPs and Contracts. The two stages are:

1. AIA Component One Requirement: Proposal Submission Requirement

The AIA Component One Requirement considers ways to avoid potential impacts and is completed as part of the site selection process. Confirmation that the Proponent has satisfied the AIA Component One Requirement to the satisfaction of the Local Municipality is reflected in the required form of Municipal Support Confirmation.

2. AIA Components Two and Three Requirement: Contractual Requirement

While a Proponent or Supplier may choose to complete the AIA Components Two and Three Requirement at any point, subject to individual business decisions, the AIA Components Two and Three Requirement is required to be completed by the Supplier to the satisfaction of the Local Municipality within 18-months of Contract execution, as evidenced by the submission of form attached as Exhibit T to the LLT Contact (Form of AIA Confirmation Certificate of the LLT Contract).

For further FAQs regarding AIA's please refer to the following guidelines that documents that were prepared for the LT2 RFP, but are still applicable for the LLT RFP:

- OMAFA Guidelines for the AIA Component One Requirement
- OMAFA Guidelines for the AIA Components Two and Three Requirement
- LT2 Agricultural Impact Assessment Q&A V4

7. Reserve Price

7.1 What is the purpose of the Reserve Price? How will it be calculated?

The Reserve Price is being implemented as part of the LLT RFPs in order to ensure cost-effective procurement outcomes and manage cost uncertainties related to Projects.

To preserve cost-effective procurement outcomes, the baseline for the Reserve Price will be the outcomes of window 1 of the Long-Term 2 RFP for the applicable stream. This will be adjusted with consideration for a range of relevant inputs such as longer development periods, inflation, Clean

Economy Investment Tax Credit (ITC) risks and other value attributes (e.g., Regulation Services Readiness Requirements, operational life, diversity value). For clarity, the Reserve Price is intended to serve as a price ceiling that reflects the IESO's willingness to pay for LLT Energy Projects and LLT Capacity Projects, rather than a target price or an estimate of the underlying cost of specific technologies or projects.

7.2 Will the Reserve Price be shared with Proponents?

No, the Reserve Price will be a confidential price threshold determined by the IESO and documented with the Fairness Advisor prior to the Proposal Submission Deadline.

7.3 Will the Reserve Price apply to the Evaluated Proposal Price or the Proposal Price?

The Reserve Price will apply to the Proposal Price (i.e., the proposed Fixed Price or Fixed Capacity Payment, as applicable); the Evaluated Proposal Price is used for the purposes of ranking Proposals only.

8. Community Engagement & Support Confirmations

8.1 What support confirmations are required for a Project located on Provincial Crown Land within the boundaries of a Local Municipality?

A Proposal for a Project that is located on Provincial Crown Lands that falls within the boundaries of a Local Municipality must include a Municipal Support Confirmation as well as a Ministry of Natural Resources Confirmation Letter confirming that a completed Public Land Site Report (PLSR) Form has been acknowledged by the Ministry of Natural Resources in respect of the applicable lands ("MNR Confirmation Letter").

8.2 Under what circumstances is a Municipal Support Confirmation not required?

A Municipal Support Confirmation is not required in the following instances:

1. where a Project Site is located wholly on an Unincorporated Territory

   (In this case, the RFP requires the submission of a letter issued by a land use planner confirming that the Project Site is located on Unincorporated Territory, using the Prescribed Form: Confirmation of Unincorporated Territory.);

2. where a Project Site is located wholly on Provincial Crown Land managed by MNR and not within the boundaries of a municipality

   (In this instance, a Proponent must submit a MNR Confirmation Letter.); or

3. Where a Project Site is located wholly on Federal Crown Land and not within the boundaries of a municipality

(In this instance, a Proponent must submit a valid Survey Permit, a valid Priority Permit or an existing executed lease, in favour of the Proponent for the subject lands comprising the Project Site, as applicable.).

8.3 Will a template be provided for the Pre-Engagement Confirmation Notice?

Yes, a sample Pre-Engagement Confirmation Notice has been included as part of the Prescribed Form: Evidence of Indigenous Support (for Projects located on Indigenous Lands), and the Prescribed Form: Evidence of Municipal Support (for Projects located on Municipal Lands).

Proponents are not required to include the Pre-Engagement Confirmation Notice letter as part of Proposal submission. To demonstrate that the Pre-Engagement Confirmation Notice was provided to the Local Body Administrator at least 60 days prior to the date of the support confirmation, and in accordance with Section 2.1(c) of the LLT(c) RFP and LLT(e) RFP, the Proponent must declare that this requirement has been met in their submitted Prescribed Form: Evidence of Indigenous Support or Prescribed Form: Evidence of Municipal Support, as applicable. The Indigenous community or Local Municipality, as applicable, must also confirm that the Pre-Engagement Confirmation Notice was provided at least sixty (60) days prior to the date of the support confirmation as part of the Indigenous Support Confirmation or Municipal Support Confirmation.

8.4 Can a Municipality override the requirement that the Pre-Engagement Confirmation Notice must be sent no later than 60 days prior to the date of the Municipal Support Confirmation (i.e., can the Municipality support a Project if it received the Pre-Engagement Confirmation Notice less than 60 days prior to the date of the Municipal Support Confirmation)?

No, per Section 2.1(c) of the LLT(c) RFP and LLT(e) RFP, delivery of a Pre-Engagement Confirmation Notice to the applicable Local Body Administrator no later than sixty (60) days prior to the date of the Municipal Support Confirmation is a Mandatory Requirement. Please see FAQ 8.3 for further details of the applicable requirements.

8.5 What is the difference between a Municipal Resolution in Support of Proposal Submission and a Blanket Municipal Support Resolution accompanied by a Blanket MS Confirmation Letter?

A Municipal Resolution in Support of Proposal Submission (MRSPS) is intended to be a Project-specific instrument of support by the applicable Local Municipality.

A Blanket Municipal Support Resolution is intended to cover a single or multiple Projects for the purposes of the LLT(c) RFP or LLT(e) RFP, or other IESO long-term procurements. Each individual Proposal would need to be accompanied by a copy of the Blanket Municipal Support Resolution and a project-specific Blanket MS Confirmation letter signed by the Chief Administrative Officer or equivalent indicating support for submission of that particular Project into the LLT(c) or LLT(e) RFP.

In other words, whereas a MRSPS can only be valid for a single Project, the blanket resolution may be used to indicate a council's support for a group or category of projects.

8.6 Does the maximum potential Contract Capacity included as part of the Indigenous Support Confirmation or the Municipal Support Confirmation, as applicable, need to be the same as the Contract Capacity for the Primary Proposal PQ included as part of the Prescribed Form: Proponent Information, Declarations and Workbook?

No, the maximum potential Contract Capacity included as part of the support confirmation does not need to be the same as the Contract Capacity for the Primary Proposal PQ. However, the Contract Capacity for the Primary Proposal PQ cannot exceed the maximum potential Contract Capacity for the subject Proposal included as part of the applicable support confirmation.

8.7 Does the Municipal Support Confirmation override or negate permitting or Indigenous consultation requirements?

No, the Municipal Support Confirmation does not supersede any applicable permits or approvals under applicable Laws and Regulations, including any delegated aspects of the Crown's duty to consult. Proponents are encouraged to contact the appropriate regulatory/permitting ministries as early as possible in the project planning process to clarify requirements and timelines, including those related to Indigenous consultation and engagement. Further details can be found in the Indigenous Information Consultation Package for the LLT RFP, available on the Website.

8.8 Does a strong mayor bylaw meet the requirements for the Municipal Support Confirmation?

No, a strong mayor bylaw does not meet the requirements for the Municipal Support Confirmation. A Municipal Support Confirmation must be an instrument executed by municipal council and substantially in accordance with the Prescribed Form.

8.9 Will the Prescribed Form: Evidence of Municipal Support posted to the Long Lead-Time RFP Website on February 27, 2026, satisfy the requirements of Section 4.2(a) of the LLT(c) RFP and LLT(e) RFP, as applicable?

Yes, although a revised version of the Prescribed Form was posted to the Website on May 6, 2026, submitting the version of the Prescribed Form: Evidence of Municipal Support posted on February 27, 2026, will not, on its own, invalidate the resolution or be evaluated as failure to meet the requirements of Section 4.2(a) of the LLT RFPs.

8.10 Does the requirement to deliver a Pre-Engagement Confirmation Notice at least 60 days in advance apply only to the Municipal Resolution, or does it also apply to the Blanket Municipal Support Resolution?

A Pre-engagement Confirmation Notice must be delivered to the applicable Local Body Administrator no later than 60 days prior to the date of a Municipal Resolution in Support of Proposal Submission and the Blanket MS Confirmation Letter, as applicable, pursuant to Section 2.1(c)(vi) of the LLT(e) RFP and LLT(c) RFP. Under the LLT(e) RFP and LLT(c) RFP, the Municipal Support Confirmation may

take the form of either i) a Municipal Resolution in Support of Proposal Submission, or ii) a Blanket Municipal Support Resolution, together with a Blanket MS Confirmation Letter. Where the Municipal Support Confirmation takes the form of a Blanket Municipal Support Resolution, together with a Blanket MS Confirmation Letter, the date of the Pre-Engagement Confirmation is only referenced in and tied to the date of the Blanket MS Confirmation Letter (not the Blanket Municipal Support Resolution).

9. Access Rights

9.1 Can Proponents submit a copy of their option to lease agreement to satisfy the requirements of Section 2.1(c)(ix)(C) of the LLT(c) RFP and LLT(e) RFP, as applicable?

No, the IESO will not be accepting, reviewing or assessing the validity of Proponents' private land tenure documents as part of the evaluation of the LLT RFPs. Whether a Proponent holds an option to lease, an executed lease, or an option to purchase the applicable Property(ies), the existence of such contractual rights must be confirmed through a letter by the documented title holder of the Property(ies) in the context of submitting a Proposal to participate in a LLT RFP.

9.2 Is a Federal Crown Land Shapefile required for all Federal Crown Land Projects?

No, the Federal Crown Land Shapefile is only required for Proposals where the Project is subject to either a Survey Permit or a Priority Permit. A Federal Crown Land Shapefile is not required for Proposals where the Project is not subject to either a Survey Permit or a Priority Permit, e.g. where an existing lease of Federal Crown Land already exists.

9.3 For Proposals with Project Sites located on both Provincial Crown Land **and** Federal Crown Land subject to a Survey Permit or a Priority Permit, can Proponents combine both the Provincial Crown Land Shapefile and Federal Crown Land Shapefile into a single shapefile?

No, the Provincial Crown Land Shapefile and the Federal Crown Land Shapefile must be provided in separate shapefiles and cannot be combined into a single shapefile. For greater clarity, if a Proposal is subject to both Provincial Crown Land Shapefile requirements and Federal Crown Land Shapefile requirements, the Proponent must submit a separate Provincial Crown Land Shapefile and a separate Federal Crown Land Shapefile. For further information on shapefile requirements, please see the LLT RFP Crown Land Shapefile Guidelines document.

10. Supply Chain Disclosure Plan and Related Incentives

10.1 Is there a minimum percentage requirement for the Supply Chain Disclosure Plan that Proponents must meet?

No, there is no minimum percentage requirement for the Supply Chain Disclosure Plan, which is for informational purposes only. Requirements related to the Supply Chain Disclosure Plan are further detailed in item 10.2 below and can be found in Section 2.1(e). of the LLT RFPs.

10.2 Is the Supply Chain Disclosure Plan a mandatory requirement for all Proposals?

Yes, at time of Proposal submission, each Proponent is required to submit a Supply Chain Disclosure Plan and an SCDP Summary:

- Supply Chain Disclosure Plan: A non-binding, indicative narrative description of the Proponent's expected Total Supply Chain Costs, including an explanation for why any goods and services are not expected to be sourced from Canada
- SCDP Summary: A line-item breakdown of the non-binding information provided as part of the Supply Chain Disclosure Plan

The Supply Chain Disclosure Plan and the SCDP Summary are for informational, planning and policy development purposes. They are based on information available as of the time of Proposal submission and do not form the basis of any binding requirements under the LLT Contract. The Supply Chain Disclosure Plan and SCDP Summary of any Selected Proponents may be shared, on a confidential basis, with the Ministry of Energy and Mines at time of LLT Contract award.

10.3 Can the list of goods and services submitted as part of the SCDP Summary group major components for the purposes of the line-item breakdown?

Yes, Proponents can group major components when providing the list of goods and services as part of the SCDP Summary; the list must reflect the Proponent's expected Total Project Supply Chain Costs based on the best available information at the time of Proposal submission.

10.4 Can a Proponent make changes to the Committed Canadian Content Percentage summary after Proposal submission?

Where an LLT Contract is awarded in respect of a Proposal that specified a Committed Canadian Content Percentage, the Committed Canadian Content Percentage set out in the Proposal will form part of the Selected Proponent's Contract. As a condition of achieving Commercial Operation, the Selected Proponent will be required to provide a certificate stating the Actual Canadian Content Percentage and, upon request from the IESO, provide supporting evidence substantiating the calculation of the Actual Canadian Content Percentage.

The Selected Proponent is not bound to the itemized list of goods and services and their respective percentages indicated in the CCCP Summary tab of the Proposal Workbook. However, if the Actual

Canadian Content Percentage is less than the Committed Canadian Content Percentage, the Selected Proponent may be subject to CCR Liquidated Damages up to a maximum of $5 million.

10.5 What is the difference between goods and services that can be included as part of the Supply Chain Disclosure Plan (SCDP) and Construction Materials and Construction Labour that are eligible to count towards the Committed Canadian Content Percentage (CCCP):

As specified in the Ministerial Directive, the category of goods and services that can be included as part of the SCDP is a broader category than the category of Construction Materials and Construction Labour that are eligible to count towards the CCCP.

Under the SCDP, Proponents are required to identify:

- Goods included in their Total Project Supply Chain Costs that are expected to be manufactured within Canada, including from components sourced from outside Canada
- Services included in their Total Supply Chain Costs that are expected to be Canadian Status Services **or** supplied by Canadian Status Supply Chain Participant.

In order for goods and services to contribute towards the CCCP, such goods and services must fall under the LLT Contract definitions of Canadian Construction Materials and Canadian Construction Labour Suppliers, as applicable:

- Canadian Construction Materials means those Construction Materials that:
    - in respect of steel, is steel that: (i) is Melted and Poured in Canada; **and** (ii) has undergone its fabrication within Canada by taking such basic steel forms and turning them into specific components; and
    - in respect of aluminum, is aluminum that: (i) is Smelted and Cast in Canada; **and** (ii) has undergone its fabrication within Canada by taking such basic aluminum forms and turning them into specific components.
- A Canadian Construction Labour Supplier is a Person that is a Canadian Status Supply-Chain Participant; **and** (ii) provides Construction Labour using **only** employees and/or contractors that are Ordinarily Resident in Canada.

10.6 How should Proponents distinguish between Canadian and Non-Canadian goods and services in the Supply Chain Disclosure Plan (SCDP) Summary and Committed Canadian Content Percentage (CCCP) Summary?

For the applicable goods and services listed under the SCDP and CCCP Summary, each individual component, or grouping of components, must be listed as an individual line item and be identified as to whether it is expected to meet the applicable requirement or not.

For example, in the case of the CCCP Summary, if 50% of steel beams used for the proposed LLT Energy Project or LLT Capacity Project are expected to meet the definition of Canadian Construction Materials, the cost of that portion of the beams that meets the definition of Canadian Construction

Materials can count towards the CCCP. However, where a steel beam undergoes its fabrication within Canada by taking such basic steel forms and turning them into specific components only but is not Melted and Poured in Canada, or where it is Melted and Poured in Canada but does not undergo its fabrication within Canada by taking such basic steel forms and turning them into specific components, this would not meet the definition of Canadian Construction Materials and would not count towards achieving the CCCP.

10.7 For the purposes of the Committed Canadian Content Percentage (CCCP) Summary, can Construction Labour be broken down by "Canadian" and "Non-Canadian" labour that is attributed to the same labour supplier?

No, as specified in the Ministerial Directive, the definition of Canadian Construction Labour Supplier includes the requirement for the Person to provide Construction Labour using only employees and/or contractors that are Ordinarily Resident in Canada. A Person that provides Construction Labour (which definition is limited to labour on the Project Site) using any employees and/or contractors that are not Ordinarily Resident in Canada does not meet the definition of Canadian Construction Labour Supplier, and the associated costs cannot contribute towards the CCCP.

11. Additional Questions and Feedback Received

11.1 Who can I contact with specific questions related (but not limited) to Project siting, Project approvals and Project permits.

Proponents are welcome and encouraged to reach out early to the appropriate Ministry with specific questions related to their Projects. Further information and contact details are provided below:

Parks Canada Agency can assist with questions related to siting Projects on federal Crown land or waterways managed by Parks Canada Agency at: forceshydrauliques-dirwaterpower@pc.gc.ca

The Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) can assist with questions about Projects that trigger Renewable Energy Approval requirements (O. Reg 359/09) at: REAprogramdelivery@ontario.ca. For questions about all other types of energy Projects that may trigger other MECP approvals/permissions under the EPA, EAA, OWRA, Proponents should contact MECP at: enviropermissions@ontario.ca.

The Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) can assist with questions about Project siting on provincial Crown lands managed by MNR at: MNRFRenewableEnergySupport@ontario.ca.

The Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Agri-Business (OMAFA) can assist with questions related to Agricultural Impact Assessments at: ag.info.omafa@ontario.ca.

The Local Municipality is best positioned to answer specific questions related to Project siting and local permits and approvals.

11.2 Is a Municipality eligible to submit a proposal for the LLT RFP?

A Municipality (or an entity owned by a municipality) can, subject to any limitations on authority under the Municipal Act, 2001 (Ontario) or other city-specific applicable legislation or regulation, submit a Proposal for the LLT RFPs if it can meet all other requirements under the applicable LLT RFP (e.g., Team Member Experience).

11.3 Does the IESO provide tax forms to non-Canadian based entities?

No, the IESO is not in a position to provide non-Canadian tax forms for purposes related to the LLT RFPs.

However, for non-Canadian entities to confirm the IESO's registered status with the Canada Revenue Agency, the IESO's GST/HST business number is as follows: 870513959RT0001.

11.4 Are Mid-Term Extended Outages applied on a unit basis or a Facility basis?

The 12-month period of Mid-Term Extended Outages apply at the Facility level over the Term and can be taken starting in Contract Year 11. Unit outages can be staggered, but the total outage allowance is shared across the Facility and intended for minor maintenance activities, rather than major overhauls. For clarity, Mid-Term Extended Outages are being offered in addition to Planned Outages.

11.5 Where can a Proponent find more information related to Land Claims?

The Ministry of Indigenous Affairs and First Nations maintains this webpage with current land claims. Proponents proposing to locate their Projects on Provincial Crown Land managed by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) should refer to resources identified in the Public Land Site Report (PLSR) form posted on the MNR webpage, including the Mining Lands Administration System for information regarding notices and withdrawals issued under the Mining Act in support of ongoing land claim negotiations with First Nations.

As part of MNR's review of the Public Land Site Report Form and issuance of the MNR Confirmation Letter, MNR will notify the Proponent in instances where their proposed Project Site overlaps with an area that has been withdrawn under the Mining Act in support of ongoing land claim negotiations with a First Nation community.

It is important to note that land claims may affect the province's decision(s) related to granting Crown land site access; the support of the First Nation pursuing the land claim may be required.

11.6 For a hydroelectric or Pumped Hydroelectric Storage project, does the Project Site include the existing/to be constructed reservoir that will be used for the purposes of generating Electricity? How should this be reflected in the Crown Land Shapefile submitted as part of the Proposal (if applicable)?

Per the LLT RFP, Project Site means all Properties on which the proposed LLT Energy Project or LLT Capacity Project is to be located, excluding any Connection Line. This means that the Project Site

includes all Properties on which the proposed LLT Energy Project or LLT Capacity Project related infrastructure will be located. For hydroelectricity and pumped hydroelectric storage projects, this may include the existing/to be constructed reservoir depending on system configuration and location of project related infrastructure.

For hydroelectric Electricity generating facilities, the Provincial Crown Land Shapefile or Federal Crown Land Shapefile required by the IESO should highlight the portions of the reservoir where the impoundment facility will be located. Where the reservoir is a lake or river system, the entire waterbody may not need to be included.

For Pumped Hydroelectric Storage, where the system is closed loop, any existing/ to be constructed reservoirs should be included in their entirety and in the case of open loop systems, only the portions of the lake or river system being used for the purposes of installed project infrastructure should be included.

11.7 Can I submit the same shapefile as part of the Public Land Site Report (PLSR) submitted to the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) and my Proposal to participate in the LLT RFP? Are there any notable differences between the shapefile requirements?

Provincial Crown Land Shapefile requirements are generally consistent across the LLT RFP and the PLSR, however some key differences include:

Requirement	PLSR	LLT RFP
Project Site boundary	Requires only one polygon mapping the project boundary which identifies the full extent of the project site, including specific elements outlined in the PLSR form.	The Provincial Crown Land Shapefile may include multiple polygons mapping the boundary of the Project Site (per the defined term in the LLT RFP) depending on whether the Proposal includes any PQ Alternates
Inclusion of details outside the boundary of the Project Site	The PLSR requires the shapefile to identify the proposed project site located on public lands, in relation to geographic features outside of the project site (e.g., adjacent roads, neighboring communities, transmission corridors, and water bodies)	No requirements related to what features should be included outside of the Project Site

In both cases, the shapefiles should define the boundary of the Project Site that is located within Provincial Crown Land. However, the shapefile submitted to MNR may include a larger area than a Proponent decides to include in their Proposal to the IESO.

As a reminder, Proponents must attest that the Project Site information contained in the Provincial Crown Land Shapefile is consistent in all material respects with the Project Site information included in the Proponent's PLSR.

Proponents are encouraged to review the Ministry of Natural Resource's Public Land Site Report for further details and contact the Ministry of Natural Resources (see 11.1) for further details and clarifications on shapefile requirements as part of the PLSR.

The IESO has published Crown Land Shapefile Guidelines to support Proponent's in preparing Crown Land Shapefiles for the purposes of the LLT RFP.

11.8 Is communication with the government for the purposes of seeking clarity on permitting requirements related to a long lead time project considered communication for a Permitted Purpose?

Per Section. 3.5 of the RFP, Permitted Purposes include communication for the purposes of project planning, development, operations, regulatory compliance, participation in the IESO-administered markets, compliance with the requirements of the LLT RFP, structuring or assembling a Proponent, participating in stakeholder engagement events administered by the IESO in respect of the LLT RFP, or responding to stakeholder solicitations or requests for comments from the IESO in respect of the LLT RFP.

Where the purpose of the meeting with government officials is to seek clarification regarding permitting requirements for the purposes of project planning and not for the purpose of influencing government officials or attempting to obtain an unfair advantage in respect of the LLT RFP, such communication would be considered a Permitted Purpose.

Stakeholders are encouraged to review Section 3.5 of the LLT RFP to ensure any discussions with government officials are scoped to Permitted Purposes, and not for Excluded Purposes.

11.9 If a Supplier's request for an Early Long-Lead COD under the LLT(e) Contract or LLT(c) Contract is not approved by the IESO, can the Facility still connect to the grid, register as a market participant, and operate on a merchant basis prior to its contractual Commercial Operation Date? If so, would this remain possible even if there is some congestion at the time of connection?

The LLT(e) and LLT(c) Contracts do not govern the Supplier's ability to connect to the grid, register as a market participant, complete commissioning activities, or operate the Facility under the Market Rules prior to the Commercial Operation Date. These activities remain subject to applicable connection requirements, market registration requirements, and power system reliability requirements. If a Supplier's request for an Early Long-Lead COD is not approved, a Supplier may still be able to connect,

register as a market participant, and operate the facility prior to its contractual COD, provided all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

Any operation prior to COD would remain subject to system reliability requirements and applicable operating limits. Where transmission congestion exists, the facility may be permitted to connect and operate, provided the System Operator and the applicable Transmitter determine that the IESO-Controlled Grid can accommodate the Facility's capacity and all reliability requirements are met. In such circumstances, operation may be subject to dispatch restrictions or curtailment by the System Operator. Notwithstanding the above, if the transmission upgrades or enhancements required to connect the Facility are not yet in service, the Facility would not be able to connect or operate until the required transmission infrastructure is available.

11.10 Can the connection point be changed after contract execution?

Following contract execution, changes to the Connection Point, as specified in Exhibit A of the LLT(e) or LLT(c) Contract, would be considered a Facility Amendment under the Contract. A Facility Amendment requires IESO consent, which will not be unreasonably withheld.

11.11 Can an individual whose experience is being relied upon to satisfy the Team Member Experience requirements for one proposal also be identified as a team member on another proposal submitted by a different organization and rely on the same experience to satisfy that proposal's Team Member Experience requirements?

Yes. An individual may be identified as a Designated Team Member for multiple Proposals and the same experience may be relied upon to satisfy the Team Member Experience requirements for those Proposals, provided that the individual satisfies the definition of a Designated Team Member for each applicable Proposal.

Per the LLT(e) RFP and the LLT(c) RFP, a Designated Team Member is defined as an individual who is either a director, officer, or employee of the Proponent, or a Control Group Member of the Proponent.

However, in any such scenario the applicable Proponents and individual Designated Team Member should use extra caution to avoid or limit such individual’s involvement in the preparation of the applicable Proposals to avoid violating the Non-Collusion Requirements defined in the LLT(e) RFP and LLT(c) RFP. Pursuant to Section 3.5(d) of the LLT(e) RFP and LLT(c) RFP, violation of the Non-Collusion Requirements may result in disqualification.