Feedback Form

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

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Julien Wu

Title: Senior Director, Regulatory Affairs

Organization: Brookfield Renewable N.A.

Email: [redacted]

Date: Oct 30, 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**
- x **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?

Brookfield Renewable N.A. appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback.

All Medium Term RFPs should remain simple, consistent, and predictable, to allow proponents and the IESO to focus on more complex RFPs and market issues. We generally support the proposed process and timing for MT3 RFP, and offer the comments below.

MT3 RFP should generally follow the successful MT2 RFP's design, and focus on price competition as the main selection criteria. Eligible projects in MT3 RFPs are existing assets that have received all necessary permits, requirements, and community consent to construct and operate. As such, MT3 RFP's design should not include municipal resolution or other rated criteria that would increase financial and administrative costs.

In addition, MT3 RFP should take place before LT2W2 RFP. This sequencing would allow proponents to consider extending the life of their assets first, prior to investing in repowering.

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?

We support this mechanism.

Proponents are best placed to determine the useful life of their existing facilities, each with their unique conditions and operating history. This approach would complement the IESO's proposal to allow MT contracts to be terminated early without penalty if a LT contract were obtained. Together, they grant the necessary flexibility for proponents to manage the transition from life-extension to repowering.

Separately, we ask that the IESO allow physically adjacent facilities—with the same owner and same technology type but different contracts—to be combined into a single RFP offer. For example, two adjacent wind facilities were built via two separate RFPs, with a three-year contract gap between them. It would be economical and efficient if both facilities can be repowered at the same time via the same LT RFP. Combining these two facilities in the same MT RFP bundle to align their contract end-dates would help planning and reduce procurement and construction costs. As a result, outages would be minimized and coordinated, and offer prices would be lower.

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?

We generally support a mechanism that is consistent with MT2 RFP's design.

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?

MT2 RFP allowed facilities with different contract end dates to participate. This mechanism enhanced competition by increasing supply. It also allowed proponents to reflect their business preferences: e.g., those who wanted to secure an early contract can do so, while others can choose to wait for subsequent MT RFPs.

We recommend that MT3 RFP take a similar approach, and allow contracts ending in 2032-2035, for example, to participate.

General Comments/Feedback

Do you have additional feedback to share with the IESO?