Feedback Form

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

Feedback Provided by:

Name: Paul Ernsting

Title: Project Manager

Organization: Peterborough Utilities Inc.

Email: [redacted]

Date: October 28, 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?

PUI supports an application period toward the end of Q2 2027.

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?

PUI supports the opportunity to select multiple terms with pricing.

The current requirement under the LT2 program is to have completed at least three years of an MT contract before being eligible for repowering. If a proponent was awarded an MT contract with a term greater than 5 years, will there be a new minimum duration of the MT contract before being eligible for repowering?

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?

The proposal could list the preferred alternative first followed by a second (possibly third) alternative. The IESO needs to clarify if a 5-year term must be submitted as part of the options (i.e. baseline pricing).

The IESO will consider flexibility for future optionality as part of its assessment for terms longer than five years. Will this be assessed by zone and developed through resource adequacy needs?

Would proposals with terms shorter than five years be given preference over proposals of five years?

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?

MT3 proposals should be evaluated on their own merit and not be subject to a comparison to other procurement programs.

The previous threshold of 80% of the aggregate nameplate capacity of submitted proposals in the MT2 program is appropriate to encourage competition. Given the IESO is aware of how many projects could be eligible for a MT contract, there should be a minimum target of energy and capacity that the IESO is looking to acquire.

General Comments/Feedback

Do you have additional feedback to share with the IESO?

PUI maintains support for the 85% DARTA threshold for variable energy technologies, both for the LT2 program and the MT3 program, understanding the IESO wants alignment with both procurements. Reducing this threshold transfers significant risk to the proponent.

PUI is supportive of the online submission platform to replace the current email-based process, especially if it will automatically detect errors/deficiencies in the submitted documents. Sufficient space allocation should be set up to accommodate larger attachments.