

Feedback Form

Long-Term 2 RFP – June 16, 2026

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Roberto Caputo

Title: Senior Director, Development

Organization: Compass Greenfield Development Inc.

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: July 3rd, 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 June 16th, Long-Term 2 RFP 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 July 3, 2026.

Domestic Content Requirements

Do you have feedback on the proposed requirements?

Stakeholders are encouraged to review and provide feedback on the domestic content provisions that were applied for the LLT RFP and can be found in the [LLT RFP Ministerial Directive](#)

Increased Proposal Fees

Do you have feedback on newly proposed fees?

E-PPA Design: DA to RT Adjustments

Do you have any comments to share with the IESO regarding the consideration of the IESO removing the DARTA mechanism for LT 2 Window 2?

Locational Rated Criteria

Do you have feedback on the proposed locational rated criteria?

Response: Compass Greenfield Development (CGD) supports continuing to offer rated criteria points as offered in LT2 Window 1 (e) to maintain competitive pricing for those site proposed in Northern ON.

Exclusion Criteria

Do you have feedback on the use of exclusion criteria to prohibit participation by any Proponent, including entities that Controlled the Proponent, deemed by the IESO not to be in good standing?

Response: CGD supports the use of this approach for future procurements. However, we do not believe it would be fair to apply it retroactively or on a pro-rated basis unless this requirement was clearly communicated to Proponents as part of previous procurement processes. Proponents should be evaluated based on the rules and expectations that were in place at the time they participated.

General Comments/Feedback

Do you have additional feedback to share with the IESO?

Response: CGD believes parcels that are partially designated as Prime Agricultural Areas should remain eligible for Agrivoltaics development within LT2 W2. We have encountered numerous parcels where the portions designated as Prime Agricultural consist of lower-quality soils (e.g., Canada Land Inventory Classes 4–7) and/or are proposed to be redesignated as Rural through Official Plan updates currently. This is particularly important where municipalities have already recognized that the existing designation is no longer appropriate. Excluding these parcels based solely on a partial Prime Agricultural designation could unnecessarily eliminate otherwise suitable development opportunities.