

# Feedback Form

## Long-Term 2 RFP – June 16, 2026

### Feedback Provided by:

Name: David Pickup

Title: Director, Electricity Program

Organization: Pembina Institute

Email: [REDACTED]

Date: July 2, 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 16<sup>th</sup>, 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](mailto:engagement@ieso.ca) by July 3, 2026.**

## Domestic Content Requirements

### Do you have feedback on the proposed requirements?

We support the intent of domestic content requirements to help strengthen the supply chain and support local workforce. However, it is critical that the requirements don't overly restrict development, as rigid domestic content mandates can inadvertently create supply chain bottlenecks, delay clean energy project deployment, and drive up capital costs ultimately impacting affordability for ratepayers.

As opposed to applying strict mandatory minimums, we support an incentive-based approach. Building on the provisions applied in the LLT RFP Ministerial Directive, procurements could award "rated criteria points" during the evaluation phase for projects that demonstrate higher levels of domestic content, encouraging developers to source locally where feasible while maintaining the flexibility needed to secure the most cost-effective and timely components.

The primary objective must be to deliver affordable, reliable, and clean energy that protects ratepayers.

## Locational Rated Criteria

### Do you have feedback on the proposed locational rated criteria?

We support the inclusion of rated criteria that prioritizes a project's proximity to existing transmission infrastructure to help minimize costly transmission system upgrades and accelerate connection timelines. However, critically, locational criteria should not lead to inefficient siting. Moreover, weighting projects based on broad geographic locations such as the "North" can inadvertently increase system costs and delay clean energy deployment. We broadly support removing the "North" criteria and focusing locational criteria points primarily on grid readiness and system value.

## General Comments/Feedback

### Do you have additional feedback to share with the IESO?

We congratulate the IESO on the successful completion of Window 1 and the continued progress in securing new resources. We also support the recent measures considered to improve transparency, specifically with the intent to post the list of all successful and unsuccessful projects going forward. This visibility is a positive step that will help developers and stakeholders better understand market dynamics and improve future rounds.

We recommend the IESO increase their procurement targets for the remaining LT2 windows. This would contribute to filling the energy gap starting in the early 2030s identified in the Annual Planning Outlook, and mitigate the risks of delays to nuclear refurbishment/buildout. The results of window 1

show that there is significant interest from industry in developing energy projects in Ontario: The applications received in the energy auction represented 4x more energy than the target of 3 TWh, and in the capacity auction, the applications represented 12x the target.