

Quantification Protocol for Wind Powered Electrical Energy Generation: Summary of Comments & Revisions*December 2007: First Technical Review*

Page Number	Comment	Resolution (Round 1 and Round 2)
Cover	Use of the term "electrical energy" in place of the terms power or electricity. In the case of this protocol, we need to differentiate between electrical energy services and other electricity services that supplement generation.	All references to "Wind Power Generation" have been corrected to "Wind-Powered Electrical Energy Generation" throughout the document.
Page 1	References made to points of connection needed clarification and consistency.	Suggested terms have been applied to the document.
Page 1	Requiring a project proponent to prove that their electricity is being consumed (previously point one of project requirements in section 1.1) does not provide any value.	If the facility is generating power then we should assume it is being consumed. This requirement, therefore has been removed
Page 1	Questions around the placement of meters to measure electricity net of any line losses.	The text has been revised to ensure clarity of where metering should be completed.
Page 1	Clarification was needed on requirements for eligibility of certification, particularly, to address the frequency of audits and verification to prove compliance with EcoLogo.	Text has been revised to reflect the conditions for certification, verification, and auditing.
Page 4	The protocol applicability needed to be expanded to include a statement on quantification and management of the environmental benefits associated with green power generation.	Suggested language for a brief description of the nature of RECs and Offsets, their relation to each other, and their quantification has been inserted.
Page 14	Equation for Projects Emissions incomplete in section 2.5.1	Equation updated to reflect all SS relevant and included in calculating Project Emissions.
Appendix A	An appendix outlining the emissions intensities for fuel extraction/production is required.	Intensities have been inserted into the document as table A4 in Appendix A.

January 24-25, 2008 Second Round of Review

#	Comment by	Type of Comment	Comment or Justification for Comment or Justification for Proposed Wording Change	Response/Proposed Wording Change
#	Comment by	(general, technical, editorial)	Comment or Justification for Proposed Wording Change	Response/Proposed Wording Change
1	Eric Schmadtke - PetroCanada	General	<p>Distinction between REC and GHG market –can you buy RECs and have them qualify as GHG?</p> <p>Can think of one example of a company that has RECs but not Offsets.</p>	<p>Not all RECS are created equal in terms of GHGs. You would still have to apply the GHG protocol. You can't just take a REC and apply a factor to turn into GHG – even more difficult for solar and hydro. RECs don't necessarily have 3rd party verification.</p> <p>A company would have to apply the Wind Protocol and the regulatory requirements therein in order to get offsets. RECs are a voluntary market ..</p>
2	Chris Joy - ENMAX	General	If you convert RECs to Offsets, you would need to propose a project and outline a quantification protocol, etc?	Yes - It is a data management overlay, meeting the demands of Alberta's compliance-based system for offsets.
3	Timo Makinen - Shell	General	Double counting	Helpful to have this in writing – clarify the conversion between RECs and Offsets clearer.
4	Rob Janzen – Climate Check	General	<p>Unsure about EcoLogo and it costs \$1500 to get, it is essentially a marketing tool and not a rigorous assessment – are we sure EcoLogo is rigorous enough to meet our compliance market? Is it the right message?</p>	<p>To clarify – \$1500 is to meet the requirements of EcoLogo and get a statement to that effect, not a certification. The signal that we are trying to send is that this is best practice. Not that this would be the verification standard. Does the potential benefit from linking back to a federal program outweigh any other effects.</p> <p>It came from CASA Renewable Energy Team but the assumption of that time was that it needed to meet the criteria but not that it was required. If push came to shove you needed to demonstrate that it would meet that criteria.</p>

		(general, technical, editorial)	Proposed Wording Change	
1	Eric Schmadtke - PetroCanada	General	Distinction between REC and GHG market –can you buy RECs and have them qualify as GHG? Can think of one example of a company that has RECs but not Offsets.	Not all RECS are created equal in terms of GHGs. You would still have to apply the GHG protocol. You can't just take a REC and apply a factor to turn into GHG – even more difficult for solar and hydro. RECs don't necessarily have 3 rd party verification. A company would have to apply the Wind Protocol and the regulatory requirements therein n order to get offsets. RECs are a voluntary market ..
2	Chris Joy - ENMAX	General	If you convert RECs to Offsets, you would need to propose a project and outline a quantification protocol, etc?	Yes - It is a data management overlay, meeting the demands of Alberta's compliance-based system for offsets.
3	Timo Makinen - Shell	General	Double counting	Helpful to have this in writing – clarify the conversion between RECs and Offsets clearer. To be clarified
4	Rob Janzen – Climate Check	General	Unsure about EcoLogo and it costs \$1500 to get, it is essentially a marketing tool and not a rigorous assessment – are we sure EcoLogo is rigorous enough to meet our compliance market? Is it the right message?	To clarify – \$1500 is to meet the requirements of EcoLogo and get a statement to that effect, not a certification. The signal that we are trying to send is that this is best practice. Not that this would be the verification standard. Does the potential benefit from linking back to a federal program outweigh any other effects. It came from CASA Renewable Energy Team but the assumption of that time was that it needed to meet the criteria but not that it was required. If push came to shove you needed to demonstrate that it would meet that criteria.
5	Chris Joy- ENMAX		EcoLogo might be a moot point because when you apply for approval of a large facility –you've already met the	

			<p>requirement of EcoLogo Unsure if you are getting anything additional to existing siting rules in AB.</p>	
6	Theresa Howland – BullFrog power		<p>Perhaps more applicable to other renewables, esp. hydro generation – you want to ensure you ID environmentally friendly generation. It is an easy process, don't have to actually go through the process, just meet the definition.</p>	<p>At least in Wind, there really is no added value to EcoLogo – just creates more work.</p> <p>During Technical Review, there was some discussion about EcoLogo but no one said to take it out.</p> <p>Chris Joy – Although involved with Tech Review, upon closer examination of documents needed to EcoLogo, there is nothing additional to achieve EcoLogo than is required to meet Provincial Requirements.</p>
7	Timo Makinen - Shell		<p>What happens to offsets that are generated from wind when Fed and provincial plans meet?</p>	<p>Crediting period of 8 + 5 so it shouldn't be a huge consideration.</p> <p>Concern that potential offsets might be affected when generated by Wind which is not viewed favorably by Fed.</p> <p>An active lobby is trying to get Feds to acknowledge wind.</p> <p>Chris Joy – understanding that there has been some movement on Renewables in Feds</p> <p>Concern over double subsidizing of the Renewables industry I.e. Eco Energy Program. Needs to be either or – not both programs.</p> <p>Issue to be flagged for Environment as it doesn't add value as EcoLogo requirements do not provide additional value.</p>