

Stakeholder Feedback and IESO Response

Long-Term 2 RFP – Window 2 [LT2 (window 2) RFP] – August 14th, 2026

Following the June 16, 2026, LT2 RFP stakeholder engagement webinar, the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO) invited stakeholders to provide feedback on Domestic Content Requirements, Increased Proposal Fees, E-PPA: DA to RT Adjustments, and Locational Rated Criteria. The IESO is currently in the design stage of the LT2 RFP. Feedback is posted on the Long-Term RFP [engagement webpage](#). Please reference the feedback forms for specific feedback as the information below is provided in summary.

Note on Feedback Summary and IESO Response

The IESO appreciates the feedback received from stakeholders and communities. The tables set out below respond to the feedback received and are organized by topic.

Disclaimer

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

A) Domestic Content Requirements

Stakeholders broadly support the policy objective of strengthening Canadian and Ontario supply chains, provided implementation does not increase costs for ratepayers, undermine competition, or jeopardize project deliverability. Stakeholders generally preferred a voluntary incentive-based approach over mandatory requirements. Specific feedback is summarized below.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
Stakeholders generally expressed support for the proposed requirement that Proponents submit a non-binding Supply Chain Disclosure Plan for informational, planning and policy development purposes only. - Stakeholders note that uniform domestic content expectations across technologies could distort competition and increase bid prices as Proponents will price limited domestic availability and potential damages into their Proposals. - Stakeholders suggested that the IESO engage with suppliers and developers to get a better understanding of supply chains for different technologies, and what commitments/information manufacturers could supply the Proponent at time of bid submission, while also noting that supply chains can shift significantly during the time that projects are being developed. - Stakeholders further suggested that the IESO provide a consistent format for Proponents to submit a Supply Chain Disclosure Plan so that bids are comparable and it's clear what level of detail the IESO is looking for. - One stakeholder suggested that providing supply chain costs in the Supply Chain Disclosure Plan rather than just a percentage conflicts with closed-book procurement.	The IESO appreciates this feedback. The LT2 procurement is intended to support reliable and cost-effective resource acquisition through a competitive process. In evaluating any domestic content framework, the IESO will work with government and consider the differing supply chain characteristics among eligible technologies and the potential impacts on competition, timelines and ratepayers. Under the Long-Lead Time Request for Proposals (LLT RFP) the Supply Chain Disclosure Plan requirement is intended to support broader policy objectives related to supply chain awareness. LLT RFP Proponents are expected, as part of completing the Supply Chain Disclosure Plan, to provide the best available information based on their current project plans and market understanding. As part of evaluation, the IESO will only verify that the plan has provided the required information; the Supply Chain Disclosure Plan will not be evaluated further. The IESO will ensure that any requirements related to domestic content are clearly specified in the RFPs and Contracts, as applicable.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
One stakeholder asked whether the IESO would be open to relief mechanisms if Canadian sourcing ceases to be available during the project development but was available at the time of bid and Supply Chain Disclosure Plan development.	The IESO will be engaging with government in the coming months to determine the domestic content approach for the LT2 W2. However, the IESO anticipates the approach to be similar to what was introduced under the Long Lead-Time (LLT) RFP. Under the LLT RFP the Supply Chain Disclosure Plan requirement is non-binding and intended for informational purposes only. Therefore, the IESO does not anticipate requiring any relief mechanisms if Canadian sourcing ceases to be available during project development. Additionally, under the LLT RFP the Committed Canadian Content Percentage incentive is voluntary, and Proponents are not obligated to seek this incentive. Should a Proponent seek this incentive and receive an evaluated proposal price reduction and then be unable to demonstrate that they met their committed minimum percentage at time of Commercial Operation, the application of Canadian Content Requirement (CCR) Liquidated Damages would apply. The IESO introduced the CCR Liquidated Damages to recognize that projects will be prioritized based on this incentive and there is the potential for more expensive projects to be selected compared to less expensive projects not seeking this incentive.
One stakeholder requested more information regarding the \$5 million dollars liquidated damages and whether it is a flat rate applied to all projects or scaled to project size.	Under the LLT Contracts the Canadian Content Requirement (CCR) Liquidated Damages applies to a maximum of \$5 million dollars. The amount of CCR Liquidated Damages is calculated based on the minimum sourcing percentage commitment shortfall and the contract capacity of the facility. Please refer to Section 2.17 of the LLT(c) Contract or Section 2.15 of the LLT(e) Contract for further detail. The LLT Contracts can be found on the Long Lead-Time RFP webpage.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
One stakeholder requested clarification on what the IESO classifies as “Canadian Material” and “Construction Material”.	As set out in the ministerial directive in respect of the LLT RFPs, the IESO has defined: Canadian Construction Materials to mean 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. Construction Materials to mean any permanently installed structural materials used on the Project Site that are comprised of steel or aluminum that are not part of any manufactured component of major equipment identified in Exhibit A (facility description). In the coming months the IESO will be engaging with government to determine the domestic content approach, including any related definitions, that would be used for LT2 W2.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
Stakeholders generally expressed support for the proposed voluntary Committed Canadian Content Percentage incentive: • Two stakeholders recommend that the IESO and government consider setting a lower minimum percentage threshold than the LLT RFP to appropriately reflect: (i) near-term procurement timeline needs, (ii) current supply chain realities of the technology types participating in the LT2 procurements. • One stakeholder suggested that including a Canadian content incentive in LT2 W2 is premature given the supply chain realities of the competing technology types and instead should be considered for future LT2 RFP windows. • One stakeholder suggested that the Evaluated Proposal Price reduction is not sufficient to offset the premiums associated with procuring domestic content. • One stakeholder suggested that the IESO establish lower and technology specific thresholds and that the IESO should recognize majority-owned and controlled Ontario-based First Nations rights-holder-owned business as eligible Canadian suppliers.	The IESO appreciates this feedback and will be engaging with government in the coming months on a domestic content approach that is appropriate for the LT2 RFP.

B) Increased Proposal Fees

Stakeholders were divided on the proposed increase to proposal fees. While several stakeholders support cost recovery and the principle that evaluation costs should be borne by Proponents rather than ratepayers, there is expressed concern regarding impacts on procurement participation. Specific feedback is summarized below.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
Many stakeholders supported the proposed proposal fee increase, noting: • Proposal fees should reflect the growing complexity of administering procurements, such as administering evaluations, deliverability assessments, and technical reviews. • Evaluation costs should be borne by proponents rather than ratepayers. • Cost reflective fees may help discourage speculative or non-serious proposals. • The current fee has remained unchanged for many years.	The IESO appreciates this feedback. The current non-refundable proposal fee of \$10,000 (excluding HST) was approved by the Ontario Energy Board (OEB) in 2006 and has remained unchanged. In order to support the growing complexity in administering Proposal evaluation due to options to submit alternative capacities, alternate connection points, requirements to perform geospatial analysis, diverse resource types and expanded RFP requirements and rated criteria, the IESO has submitted a proposal to the OEB to increase the maximum Proposal Fee up to \$25,000 (excluding HST).
Many stakeholders cautioned that the proposed increase to proposal fees could be a barrier to participation: • Increasing proposal fees may disproportionately affect smaller developers, Indigenous partners, and community-based Proponents advancing storage projects. These Proponents often operate with lean development budgets and may face additional costs associated with municipal engagement, land agreements, and interconnection studies. • Some stakeholders expressed concern that a significant increase in a non-refundable proposal fees could discourage participation. • One stakeholder opposed applying the fee to facilities seeking to recontract.	The IESO appreciates stakeholder feedback regarding the proposed increase to proposal fees and recognizes concerns about potential impacts on participation, particularly for smaller developers, Indigenous partners, community-based proponents, and proponents pursuing re-contracting opportunities. Proposal fees are intended to help recover a portion of the administrative costs associated with the procurement and to encourage serious proposals from proponents that are committed to advancing projects through the procurement process. The IESO notes that proposal fees represent only one component of the overall development costs associated with participating in the LT2 RFP. The IESO will consider stakeholder feedback regarding the potential impact of increased Proposal Fees on competition and participation. At this time, the IESO believes the proposed fee increase appropriately balances the cost

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
	recovery objectives of an increasingly complex procurement with maintaining a competitive procurement process and intends to apply the Proposal Fee requirements consistently across all Proposals submitted under the LT2 RFP including Repowering Proposals in respect of Eligible Existing Facilities (i.e., repowering proposals).
Some stakeholders suggested alternative approaches including: • Graduated fees proportionate to project size. • Reduced fees for Indigenous-led projects or projects with significant Indigenous equity participation. • Partial refunds.	The IESO acknowledges and appreciates this feedback.
Stakeholders sought greater transparency regarding the use of fee revenues and requested clarity regarding implementation timing, particularly if Ontario Energy Board approval is received after final procurement documents are issued.	The IESO has proposed a Proposal Fee increase, of up to a maximum \$25,000 (excluding HST), as part of its revenue requirement submission to the Ontario Energy Board (OEB). The revenue requirement submission is under review by the OEB and intervenors at this time. The IESO expects a decision on this submission well before final procurement documents are issued for the LT2 RFP. If approved, the new Proposal Fee would be applicable starting with window 2 of the LT2 RFP. The Proposal Fee serves as a cost recovery mechanism aligned with the principle of cost causation, to greater ensuring that Proposal evaluation costs are borne by Proponents rather than passed on to ratepayers. The IESO will determine the Proposal Fee based on procurement complexity (e.g., Long-Term RFPs warrant a higher fee relative to Medium-Term RFPs). This approach will ensure fees remain proportionate to the IESO's costs

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
	incurred, while maintaining flexibility across different procurement types.

C) E-PPA: DA to RT Adjustments

The majority of stakeholders were opposed to the proposed removal of the DARTA mechanism and recommended it be retained for LT2 W2. Specific feedback is summarized below.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
The majority of stakeholders opposed the removal of DARTA, noting that the fundamental source of risk remains unchanged and that the removal of this protection would transfer significant uncontrollable risk onto Proponents: - Stakeholders generally suggest that while additional market history may improve a Proponent's ability to quantify the exposure, it does not improve their ability to manage or control underlying weather-driven production variability. - Stakeholders further suggest that variable generation resources, storage resources and certain run-of-river hydro facilities remain exposed to risks that cannot be materially mitigated through operational decisions; the fundamental risk is due to inherently variable weather patterns which no Proponent controls and cannot hedge at the project level in Ontario today. - Stakeholders generally suggested that lenders and investors generally require predictable revenue profiles and that this risk would ultimately be reflected in Proposal pricing through increased risk premiums, resulting in higher costs to ratepayers. - One stakeholder suggested that in the absence of DARTA, the operator would bear 100% of the IESO's forecast accuracy. For example, if the IESO centralized forecast over-estimates a wind/solar asset's day-ahead capability, the operator is credited with "deemed revenue" they could not physically achieve in real-time. Without DARTA, the operator's Deemed Market Revenue will be penalized for a variance caused	The IESO appreciates and acknowledges this feedback. After considering feedback received, the IESO is proposing to reduce DARTA protection for LT2 W2 from 85% to 60%. This change has been reflected in the LT2 draft documents posted to the Long-Term 2 RFP webpage on August 14th, 2026. The IESO will continue this conversation in future engagements as we work to design the LT2 W2 procurement. The DARTA mechanism was introduced to the E-PPA style contract in response to stakeholder feedback received during the development of the LT2 Window 1 RFPs. It was intended as an interim measure to address uncertainties surrounding the renewed market and the lack of data around day-ahead to real-time operations expressed by prospective Proponents and their financiers. The IESO had proposed the removal of the DARTA mechanism in recognition that by the time of LT2 W2 Proposal Submission Deadline, Proponents will have had more than 2-years of experience participating in the renewed markets. Furthermore, stakeholders are reminded that imputed production risk is a separate issue that the Proponent must manage via how they choose to bid their Monthly Imputed Production Factors. The more conservatively a Supplier bids their Monthly Imputed Production Factors relative to their actual estimated capability, the less production risk they will be exposed to. The onus is on the Proponent to strike a balance between setting reasonable Monthly Imputed Production Factors that mitigate production risk while setting a Proposal price that is competitive. For clarity, the E-PPA form of contract applies only to the energy stream, storage resources

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
entirely by the IESO's own forecasting algorithms.	more appropriately fall under the capacity stream where the capacity-style contract applies.
A number of stakeholders emphasized that Ontario's day-ahead market remains relatively new and that additional operating experience would be beneficial before significant changes are made to risk allocation mechanisms: • Some stakeholders suggested a phased reduction of DARTA protection. • One stakeholder suggests that if DARTA is phased out the IESO publish the trajectory (e.g., narrowing protection band) so Proponents can price the transition. • The same stakeholder also suggests allowing Proponents the option to either: a) Opt into DARTA and forgo the upside, - or b) Opt out of DARTA and retain the upside.	The IESO appreciates feedback for a phased approach and as indicated above, is proposing to reduce DARTA protection from 85% to 60% for Window 2 of the LT2 RFP. At this time, the IESO is not considering an approach that would allow Proponents to elect whether to opt in to DARTA. The IESO is still considering further reducing the DARTA protection, or removing it entirely, for facilities contracted under future windows (i.e. beyond Window 2) of the LT2 RFP. If such an action is taken, the IESO will inform prospective Proponents at the earliest possible opportunity to allow them to develop their Proposals accordingly.
One stakeholder asked the IESO to clarify if DARTA is modified or removed, how the IESO will treat the cap on real-time upside, so Proponents can price the full risk-reward profile.	The IESO is not considering any further changes to the contract settlement formula described in Exhibit J of the draft LT2(e-2) Contract at this time.
One stakeholder supported removing DARTA, citing that market participants are best positioned to manage production uncertainty and that risks associated with weather hydrology, fuel availability, and operational performance should be borne by Proponents rather than ratepayers.	The IESO appreciates this feedback and as indicated above, is considering the removal of the DARTA protection for facilities contracted in future windows beyond Window 2 of the LT2 RFP.

D) Locational Rated Criteria

Stakeholders support the continued use of locational rated criteria and agreed that it can assist in aligning procurement outcomes with available transmission, regional needs, and overall system planning objectives. Specific feedback is summarized below.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
Many stakeholders emphasized the importance of early publication and transparency regarding locational rated criteria: - Stakeholders requested that eligible circuits, zones, methodologies, and the incentive point allocations, be published as early as possible. - Several stakeholders note that locational criteria has a significant influence on project siting decisions, land acquisition activities, community engagement and project financing. - Stakeholders cautioned that delayed guidance or late changes to locational rated criteria could reduce competition, increase development costs, and strand development efforts. - One stakeholder requested that the IESO make the basis for these criteria transparent, so that ratepayers and communities can see where siting is being steered and why. - Several stakeholders indicated that locational incentives should be closely coordinated with deliverability guidance and should be based on realistic opportunities for project connection. - Many stakeholders recommended publishing clear information regarding how locational criteria relates to available transmission capacity, future system needs, and regional planning outcomes.	The IESO appreciates stakeholder feedback regarding the importance of early publication and transparency of locational rated criteria. The IESO recognizes that locational incentives can significantly influence project siting decisions, land acquisition, community engagement, financing activities, and overall project development timelines. Accordingly, if locational rated criteria are included in LT2, the IESO intends to provide information on the criteria, methodology, and associated point allocations and weightings as early as reasonably practicable. The IESO agrees that locational criteria should be informed by transmission system considerations, including deliverability, available transmission capacity, regional planning outcomes, and future system needs. Any locational rated criteria would be based on the IESO's transmission planning assessments and would be designed to support efficient resource development in areas that best align with system availability and requirements. To support project development activities, draft LT2 Window 2 deliverability guidance is expected to be published in September 2026. Any changes to locational rated criteria would require direction from the Government of Ontario. The IESO is currently engaging with government on this topic and will communicate any approved changes through future procurement documentation and stakeholder engagement activities.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
Stakeholders expressed differing views regarding regional prioritization and northern Ontario capacity: • Several stakeholders supported the continuation of incentives that encourage development in the north and recommended that additional northern connection capacity be made available where feasible. • Some stakeholders requested greater visibility into the amount and timing of future northern transmission. • Some stakeholders suggested that locational criteria focus more directly on grid readiness, transmission availability, and measurable system value rather than broad geographic classifications. • One stakeholder recommended that incentives for siting in the north and incentives for siting in southern Ontario not be applied simultaneously within the same procurement.	The IESO appreciates stakeholder feedback regarding regional prioritization, northern Ontario development opportunities, and the design of potential locational incentives. The IESO recognizes the importance of providing transparency regarding transmission availability and ensuring that any locational criteria support the efficient development of resources that address identified system needs. Any locational rated criteria would be informed by the IESO's transmission planning assessments and would be designed to reflect factors such as transmission availability, deliverability, and broader system value. The IESO acknowledges stakeholder interest in greater transparency regarding future transmission capability and intends to provide relevant information, including draft LT2 Window 2 deliverability guidance, which is expected to be published in September 2026. Any changes to locational rated criteria would require direction from the Government of Ontario. The IESO is currently engaging with government on this topic and will consider stakeholder feedback regarding the design of any future locational incentives, including how they are applied across different regions of the province.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
Several stakeholders recommended that locational criteria recognize projects that provide measurable local system benefits: - Stakeholders highlighted potential benefits including transmission investment deferrals, congestion management, voltage support, improved utilization of existing infrastructure, support for regional planning needs, non-wires alternatives, and the development of multi-use assets capable of providing multiple grid services. - Some stakeholders also noted the value of distribution- connected generation and projects located near major load centers. - One stakeholder suggested that the IESO develop incentives to site projects where current transmission capacity is limited, but future upgrades will free up space based on IESOs internal system planning view.	The IESO appreciates these suggestions. Any changes to the locational rating criteria would require direction from the Government of Ontario. The IESO is currently engaging with government on this topic and considering potential approaches to better reflect transmission system needs in future procurements. A key consideration would be the expected timing and level of certainty associated with planned transmission upgrades relative to the LT2 project COD, as well as the potential impacts of upgrade delays and the risk of congestion during any interim period where a project's COD precedes the availability of the transmission capacity needed to deliver its output.
One stakeholder requested that the Northern Ontario Connection Study test non-wires alternatives on an equal footing with transmission and generation.	The Northern Ontario Connection Study was initiated to develop options for connecting remote First Nation communities to the provincial grid, improving reliability for existing grid-connected communities, supporting critical minerals development, and enabling new generation resources in Northern Ontario. Given these objectives, the study evaluated transmission options against NWAs to meet the long-term demand forecast of the region. Please see the public engagement deck which comments on draft results of the study.

E) General Comments

Stakeholders provided a range of additional feedback, including feedback on deliverability guidance, withdrawal-capacity assumptions, transparency and information disclosure, municipal support requirements, siting restrictions in Prime Agricultural Areas, capacity stream structure, reporting obligations, and eligibility requirements. Specific feedback is summarized below.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
Stakeholders emphasized the importance of timely and detailed deliverability guidance to support proposal development and siting decisions and offered suggestions: • One stakeholder recommends that to support consistent and accurate pre-bid signals the LDC's be required to apply the IESO's charging assumptions when assessing withdrawal capacity and enabling conditional deliverability outcomes where reasonable operating limits can be incorporated into connection agreements; this would help ensure distribution-connected storage remains a viable participant in LT2 • One stakeholder encourages the IESO and Hydro One to revisit transmission line capacity assumptions that were applied in LT2 W1 on the basis that they believe existing limits are overly conservative and do not accurately reflect the capability of the transmission system or the opportunity to safely and reliably accommodate additional generation	• LDCs are responsible for assessing whether projects connecting to a distribution system are deliverable to the point of connection with transmitter-owned equipment. Deliverability determinations and any associated operating restrictions are made at the discretion of the connecting LDC. Projects that are deemed deliverable may proceed through the Connection Impact Assessment (CIA) process, where any feasible operating limits required to maintain system reliability can be further assessed and established. • The IESO is continually reviewing and refining the transmission line capacity assessment methodologies and assumptions to ensure that available transmission capacity is maximized while maintaining system reliability and keeping congestion risks within acceptable levels. The IESO welcomes more specific feedback on the assumptions and would be pleased to discuss any concerns or alternative approaches stakeholders believe should be considered.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
Stakeholders supported IESO's proposal to improved transparency around non-price procurement outcomes: • Several stakeholders support the publication of additional information on successful and unsuccessful proposals including technology mix, project sizes, geographic distribution, participation levels, and high-level reasons for non-selection noting that this transparency would improve market understanding, support future proposal development and provide greater confidence in procurement outcomes. • Stakeholders generally emphasized the need to balance transparency with the protection of commercially sensitive information.	The IESO appreciates stakeholder feedback supporting improved transparency around non-price procurement outcomes and recognizes the potential value of such information in improving market understanding, supporting future proposal development and providing greater confidence in market outcomes. As indicated in the June 16, 2026 Stakeholder Engagement, the IESO is considering releasing information related to technology mix, project sizes, geographic distribution, submission volumes and high-level reasons for non-selection. The IESO also recognizes the need to protect commercially sensitive information and therefore as indicated in the June 16, 2026 Stakeholder Engagement is not considering releasing information related to project locations or other project details that could impact future competition dynamics. Further details on scope and implementation will continue to be shared through future engagements.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
Stakeholders expressed mixed views regarding municipal support requirements: - Some stakeholders raised concerns around the timing of the municipal elections and the challenges this may create for obtaining Municipal Support Confirmations in advance of Proposal submission and suggested either removing the requirements, allowing for alternative forms of municipal engagements or adopting a phased approach whereby the IESO prescribes engagement requirements post Contract award - Some stakeholders emphasized that municipal support requirements should be applied consistently across project types, including repowered facilities, to ensure fairness - One stakeholder suggested clearer expectations for municipal support, particularly for storage projects, which differ materially from generation facilities, would further streamline development timelines	The IESO appreciates stakeholder perspectives regarding municipal support requirements. Municipal support remains an important policy component of the LT2 procurement design and reflects the value of local engagement and support in project development. The IESO recognizes that the municipal election cycle can create practical challenges for Proponents. The requirement to obtain a Municipal Support Confirmation at the time of Proposal submission is a policy requirement outlined in the Directive. The IESO will continue to engage with government and assess stakeholder feedback regarding the municipal support requirements. Any resulting changes would be reflected in a revised or further government directive. The IESO acknowledges stakeholder feedback suggesting clear expectations for obtaining municipal support. Beginning under the LT2 RFP W1, the IESO determined through community engagement that Municipalities and Indigenous Communities are in the best position to determine appropriate community engagement activities for a Proposal. Proponents are required to fulfill engagement requirements set forth by the municipality(ies) or Indigenous Community(ies) in which the Project Site is located. To demonstrate the coordination of such engagement with local authorities, the IESO requires that Proponents submit evidence confirming that the Pre-Engagement Confirmation Notice was delivered to the applicable Local Body Administrator(s). This approach enables the local community to establish what constitutes appropriate engagement and enables the IESO to rely on support confirmations as evidence that engagement has been satisfactorily completed by the Proponent and that the community supports the submission of the Proposal to the IESO.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
Some stakeholders recommended the IESO reconsider restricting solar development in Prime Agricultural Areas (PAA) suggesting that the current restrictions may unnecessarily limit viable project opportunities: • Stakeholders noted that dual-use agrivoltaics can support both agricultural production and electricity generation citing benefits such as continued agricultural activity, farmer revenues, crop protection, and land-use efficiency • One stakeholder suggested that the IESO update the prescribed form to allow landowners and local municipalities to make their own decision as to whether joint PAA and non-PAA land parcels can still be supported for a proposed solar project in such unique joint-purpose parcels of land • One stakeholder noted that they have encountered numerous parcels where the portions designated as Prime Agricultural consist of lower-quality soils and/or are proposed to be redesignated as Rural through Official Plan updates. 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	The IESO appreciates stakeholder feedback regarding current restrictions for siting Non-Rooftop Solar Projects on lands located in areas designated as Prime Agricultural Areas. These restrictions reflect current Government policy direction as outlined in the Directive. The IESO will continue to evaluate this issue and welcomes further supporting data on this topic for future consideration.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
Stakeholders recommended establishing separate capacity procurement targets for storage and non-storage resources, citing the importance of maintaining resource diversity and ensuring firm, dispatchable capacity continue to support long-term system reliability: - One stakeholder suggested that batteries are energy-limited and depend on the system to recharge. Natural gas generation continues to provide firm, flexible capacity that supports reliability and enables more intermittent resources to connect. Window 2 should fairly value duration, firmness, dispatchability, and flexibility, not lowest energy price alone. - Stakeholders note that based on IESO's own analysis of effective load carrying capacity, batteries will have a diminishing impact on providing capacity.	The IESO appreciates stakeholder feedback regarding separate capacity procurement targets for storage and non-storage resources. Procurement requirements are established based on identified resource adequacy needs and the IESO's planning assessments, including the Integrated Needs Assessment from the Annual Planning Outlook. As system needs evolve, procurement requirements are adjusted accordingly. For example, the minimum duration requirement for capacity resources was increased from four hours in LT1 to eight hours in LT2 to better align with long-term reliability needs. The IESO recognizes that different resource types provide different reliability attributes and that the capacity contribution of storage resources may evolve as deployment increases. The IESO will consider this capacity contribution when establishing the procurement evaluation framework. At this time, the IESO does not intend to establish separate procurement targets by technology type within either the LT2(e-2) RFP or the LT2(c-2) RFP.
One stakeholder suggests that the reporting requirement be designed to avoid creating approval requirements for communications, avoid creating additional administrative burden, respect Indigenous governments' independent communications authority, and be limited to major announcements rather than routine engagement activities.	Under the LT2 W1 Contracts, Suppliers are required to provide the IESO with Quarterly Progress Reports from the Contract Date until the Commercial Operation Date, indicating project status and the progress of on-going design and construction work. The IESO is proposing that under the LT2 W2 Contracts the Quarterly Progress Report requirement be expanded to include requiring Suppliers to report on planned media events (e.g., groundbreaking ceremony, commissioning milestones, ribbon cutting or similar) regarding the Facility and clarify that the Quarterly Progress Report may be disclosed to the Government of Ontario.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
Stakeholders suggested that the LT2 W2 should be designed to expand, not narrow, the pool of viable projects and investment partners: - One stakeholder suggested that there does not seem to be a procurement path for re-contracting or new high efficiency natural gas cogeneration projects. These resources continue to be excluded due to the physical behind-the-meter connection despite operating successfully with an 18-year old IESO contract. - One stakeholder expressed concern that some facilities may not qualify under the proposed MT or 23-year in-service requirements.	As indicated in the June 12, 2026 IESO Response to Stakeholder Feedback, the IESO is not considering an amendment to its connection requirements under the LT2 RFP. Currently, embedded facilities connected to a distribution system are eligible to participate provided they meet all applicable connection requirements as described in the LT2 RFP and Contract (i.e. adherence to the Distribution System Code and <i>market rules</i>). As indicated in the June 12, 2026 IESO Response to Stakeholder Feedback, the IESO intends to maintain the requirement that, by May 1, 2032, facilities with a Medium Term (MT) Contract must have completed at least three years of operations under that contract and facilities without an MT Contract must have been in-service for at least 23-years. In instances where these requirements are not satisfied, potential Proponents should plan to participate in subsequent procurement windows that may arise, such as the LT2 W3.
One stakeholder suggested that the IESO include the requirement for wind projects to have at least 1-year of on-site collected wind data. This requirement will ensure that only materially derisked projects are able to submit proposals and will result in more competitive pricing and a reduced likelihood of projects not achieving commercial operations or underperforming during the contract term.	While site-specific wind data can support project development and generation forecasting, the IESO seeks to balance project maturity requirements with maintaining a competitive procurement process. The LT2 framework includes Proposal and performance security requirements, as well as contractual performance obligations, to help ensure that successful projects achieve commercial operation and perform in accordance with the specifications of their Proposals. Ultimately, Proponents are responsible for conducting the necessary due diligence to support their project assumptions and delivery commitments.

Feedback / Common Themes	IESO Response
One stakeholder recommended that the IESO increase their procurement targets for the remaining LT2 windows noting that this would contribute to filling the energy gap starting in the 2030s identified in the Annual Planning Outlook, and mitigate the risks of delays to nuclear refurbishment/buildout.	Procurement targets for the remaining LT2 windows are informed by the latest planning assessments, including forecast system needs, reliability requirements, and cost considerations. The IESO will continue to monitor evolving system needs and uncertainties, including the timing of nuclear refurbishments and new nuclear resources, and will assess whether additional procurements or adjustments to future targets are warranted through ongoing planning activities. The IESO notes that there are multiple mechanisms that can be used to meet identified system needs beyond just the LT2 RFP.