Feedback Form

Medium Term 3 Request for Proposals (RFP) – October 16, 2026

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Ritesh Talati

Title: Sr. Analyst

Organization: Atura Power

Email: [redacted]

Date: November 2, 2026

To promote transparency, feedback submitted will be posted on the Medium-Term RFP engagement page unless otherwise requested by the sender.

☐ **There is confidential information, do not post**

☑ **Comfortable to publish to the IESO web page**

Following the Medium-Term 3 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 Medium-Term RFP engagement page.

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 October 30, 2026.**

Procurement Process and Timelines

Do you have any feedback on the procurement process and/or proposed timing for proposal submission?

No comments at this stage.

Flexible Contract Terms

Do you have any feedback on the IESO's proposal to allow proponents to select a contract term between 3 to 10 years at the time of proposal submission?

Atura supports the proposed flexibility in contract terms, as it enables proponents to align contract duration with the investment needed to extend asset life and with assets' remaining operating lives.

Atura encourages the IESO to clarify how the limit on contracts longer than 5 years will be applied fairly. This should include publishing the number of longer-term contracts available, the eligibility criteria and the ranking approach before proposals are submitted. Atura also agrees with allowing proponents to submit multiple proposals for the same facility with different contract terms, so viable resources aren't excluded solely because of the term elected.

Do you have any feedback on approaches on the mechanics for submitting proposals with flexible contract terms, or on the methodology for evaluating proposals with varying contract terms?

Net present value (NPV) can be used to compare cash flows across different contract terms. However, for shorter-term alternatives, the IESO would need to assume costs beyond the contract term. Atura encourages the IESO to publish these assumptions before proposals are submitted, so proponents understand how their elected term and price will be evaluated.

Enhancing Competition in Proposal Evaluation

Do you have any feedback on setting the MT3 procurement target as a percentage of the aggregate nameplate capacity of submitted proposals, as well as on potential mechanisms to limit the influence of any single proposal on procurement outcomes?

It is unclear how setting the procurement target as a percentage of aggregate submitted nameplate capacity will create meaningful competitive tension, particularly where a significant portion of the submitted capacity may be required to meet the procurement objective. The IESO should provide further clarity on how the percentage will be established and how the proposed approach is expected to influence procurement outcomes.

Separately, any mechanism intended to limit the influence of a single proposal should not disadvantage proposals solely based on their size. Proposal size should not, on its own, limit a proposal's ability to compete.

General Comments/Feedback

Do you have additional feedback to share with the IESO?

No comments at this stage.