

Large Renewable Procurement Feedback Survey

Preamble

The IESO has initiated [stakeholder and community engagement](#) to invite feedback on the initial Large Renewable Procurement (LRP I) process that recently concluded, and to understand what improvements could be made prior to the second round of procurement (LRP II). The survey questions below are an opportunity for interested parties to offer feedback on the overall LRP I process. The IESO will use this feedback to inform potential process improvements going forward.

The [LRP I](#) was a two-staged competitive process for procuring large renewable energy projects generally larger than 500 kilowatts. The process included an initial Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to qualify applicants, followed by a Request for Proposals (RFP) to evaluate proposed projects. The LRP I process was underway from mid-2014 to April 2016. The LRP I process was informed by the broad engagement activities conducted by the former Ontario Power Authority in 2013 and 2014. Details of these activities are contained in the [interim](#) and [final](#) LRP recommendations reports provided to the Minister of Energy. LRP I also implemented government policy outlined in a series of directions from the Minister of Energy (available [here](#), under the heading “Minister of Energy’s Directions pertaining to the LRP”).

Scope of Survey

As outlined in the [draft Stakeholder and Community Engagement Plan](#), this survey is seeking feedback on the overall LRP I process as well as on the draft Engagement Plan, itself. Interested participants are encouraged to use this survey form, however, other written submissions will also be accepted.

For clarity, the IESO is not currently seeking feedback on LRP I policy areas that have been directed by the Minister of Energy or are otherwise unrelated to the mandate of the IESO. These include feedback on:

- The need or amount of renewable generation to be procured;
 - See April 5, 2016 [Minister’s directive](#)
- Potential environmental impacts of proposed renewable energy projects;
 - See Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change [website](#)
- Changes to laws and regulations related to renewable energy generation;
 - See Ministry of Energy [website](#)
- Challenges on the outcome of the LRP I RFP process (e.g. contract awards); and
 - See LRP I results on the LRP [web pages](#)

- The overall LRP II procurement timelines
 - See April 5, 2016 [Minister's directive](#)

Survey responses will be accepted between **April 12, 2016 and May 3, 2016** and may be submitted via:

- the online survey,
- by email to engagement@ieso.ca, or
- by mail to: Independent Electricity System Operator
120 Adelaide Street West, Suite 1600
Toronto, Ontario
M5H 1T1
'Attention: LRP survey feedback'

Participant Identification

Name: _____

Company (if applicable): _____

Community (if applicable): _____

Participation

1. Were you involved in or affected by the LRP I process (either the LRP I RFQ or LRP I RFP)? If yes, briefly describe your involvement.

RFQ

The first stage of the LRP I process was a Request for Qualifications, which was used to qualify applicants that were interested in developing large renewable energy projects. The RFQ set mandatory requirements for financial capability and past development experience (including planning, developing, financing, constructing and operating similar or comparable facilities and/or large complex infrastructure projects). Only applicants that were qualified through this process were eligible to participate in the subsequent Request for Proposals.

2. Using the LRP I RFQ as a baseline, do you have any suggestions to improve the requirements for the LRP II RFQ?

RFP

The second stage of the LRP process was a Request for Proposals, which was used to evaluate proposed projects submitted by Qualified Applicants. The RFP included a number of mandatory requirements related to community engagement, early site and environmental due diligence, resource availability, access rights, and connection parameters, among others. In addition to meeting all the mandatory requirements, proposals could gain a possible advantage in the competition by completing optional rated criteria activities, which would award points to proposals that demonstrated additional community support and/or Aboriginal participation. Finally, proposal prices and rated criteria points were evaluated and projects were run through connection availability testing, in order of evaluated proposal pricing, to determine whether there was space on the electricity grid to connect the proposed project.

Community Engagement

The LRP I RFP required mandatory engagement with the communities in which the Site and Connection Line were proposed (Project Communities). This included:

- developing a Community Engagement Plan (shared with each Project Community, and posted on the project website);
- best efforts to hold at least one meeting with local officials from each Project Community, and;

- holding at least one public community meeting in each Project Community (with notices published in local newspapers and sent to neighbours in advance).

The LRP I RFP also included optional rated criteria activities to provide an advantage to projects with additional community support, which was provided in the form of:

- a municipal or First Nation council support resolution;
- a municipal or First Nation agreement from each Project Community;
- support from 75% of abutting landowners; and/or
- At least 10% Aboriginal participation.

The IESO is seeking feedback on the effectiveness of these engagement activities.

3. Were the mandatory community engagement requirements and optional rated criteria community support activities clear? (*very clear/somewhat clear/ somewhat unclear/very unclear*)
4. Were the mandatory community engagement requirements successful in raising awareness of and sharing information about proposed projects with the Project Community? (*very successful/ somewhat successful / somewhat unsuccessful / very unsuccessful*)
5. Were the optional rated criteria activities appropriate and effective indicators of community support? (*very effective/ somewhat effective/ somewhat ineffective/ very ineffective*)
6. Are there other engagement or support activities that should be considered?
7. Municipalities/Aboriginal communities: was the volume of LRP engagement interaction manageable? What was the level of administrative support required? (*significant/ somewhat significant/ not significant*)
8. Are there steps, processes or activities that could be leveraged to further facilitate the LRP engagement?

Qualified Applicants from the LRP I RFQ were announced on November 4, 2014. The LRP I RFP opened on March 10, 2015 and closed on September 1, 2015. It was during this period that Qualified Applicants would have been engaging Project Communities and preparing their Proposals.

9. All communities: were you adequately informed about projects that were being proposed in your community?
(well informed/somewhat informed/not informed)
10. First Nation and Métis Communities: At what point in advance of the LRP I RFP closing (September 1, 2015) were you approached to partner on a project?
(1 month/2–4 months/5–6 months/6+ months)
11. Is there anything that could be improved to ensure communities are informed and have the opportunity to be engaged about a proposed project?

Site Considerations

The LRP I RFP also required Qualified Applicants to complete early environmental desktop studies for the site of their proposed facility and connection line, and share the results with the local community and on the project website. This Site Considerations information included early investigation into species at risk, significant wildlife habitat, heritage features, and nearby physical features, such as roads, railways and airports. Results of these early studies were required to be provided via detailed maps of the proposed project and connection line.

12. Was this early Site Considerations information useful to communities? If not, what additional information would be of use?
(Very useful/ somewhat useful/ not useful/ not aware of Site Considerations information)
13. Developers: was the Site Considerations work helpful to inform early project siting and/or project design? *(Very helpful/ somewhat helpful/ not helpful)*

Overall

14. Using the LRP I RFP as a baseline, do you have any suggestions to improve the requirements for the LRP II RFP?

General

15. Recognizing that many of the [LRP materials](#) (i.e., LRP I RFQ, LRP I RFP, LRP I Contract and prescribed forms) were legal and technical documents, were the materials understandable and clear? If not, what could be improved?
16. Do you have any feedback on the IESO's role during the LRP I process (e.g., was the IESO effective at responding to or clarifying questions)?

17. Please provide any other feedback related to the LRP I process and/or suggestions for improvement within the scope of this engagement.

LRP II draft Stakeholder and Community Engagement Plan

The IESO has posted a draft Engagement Plan for this initiative which includes objectives, scope, timelines and the ways in which participate and provide feedback.

18. Do you have any feedback related to the [draft Engagement Plan](#) for this initiative?

End of survey:

Thank you for your interest in the Large Renewable Procurement and for providing your feedback on the LRP I process. This feedback will be taken into consideration as the IESO moves forward with the development of LRP II.

Please note that LRP feedback can be provided at any time at engagement@ieso.ca. There will be separate opportunities to provide feedback on the draft LRP II RFQ when it is available in June 2016, and the draft LRP II RFP when it is available in early 2017.

We encourage interested parties to subscribe to LRP email updates, [here](#).