

Stakeholder Review Comments

#	Comment by	Clause/ Section Number	Type of Comment (general, technical, editorial)	Comment or Justification for Proposed Wording Change	Proposed Wording Change or Response to Question	Finalized Protocol
Non Incineration Thermal Waste Management Protocol – sponsored by Plasco						
1	Rob Kemp, Levelton Consultants LTD		General	Why are there some limitations in the protocol: -Is it prescriptive to specific technologies? -Is there any reason to limit to municipal solid waste (MSW) – eg. why not road side slash from forestry operations	-Should cover most technologies. -Limitation to MSW based on fuel grade/emissions profile. With the forestry slash example, it would be better to use the biofuels protocol as it is pure biological waste. That protocol was developed with forestry and 2 nd generation gasifiers at the table hence it should sufficient take into account these processes.	
2	Robert Janzen, Climate Check		Editorial	There is potential for non-use of materials and GHGs emitted while material is stored on site. Has this been factored in? A lot of grey area on how the project can be run. There needs to be a policy on how to deal with infrequency of operation.	Will make changes to the protocol.	
3	Roger Ord, Golder Associates		General	How does adjusted baseline for composting feed into this protocol?	There should be no impact on the 17.5% discount for the composting protocol adjustment to other waste management protocols	
4	Kate Page, Direct Energy		General	For baseline 6 (pg 16), don't need to prove the specific landfill that it is being diverted to. Why?	Diverting from a landfill that doesn't already have a lot of capture as there is not a lot in landfill gas capture in Alberta, elsewhere the protocol may have to require the landfill from which the material is diverted.	
Solar Thermal – sponsored by the Alberta Government						
5	Kelly Kishiuchi, Atco Gas		General	Small projects do not have to meter but what about a project developer with numerous small solar thermal technologies all aggregated?	Default value for an individual home. - the limiting factor is still monitoring. Decision-point monitoring of small scale is cost prohibitive when Retscreen and those tools are generally acceptable).	
6	Pierre Boileau, Canadian Standards Association		General	Is it a good assumption that natural gas is the alternative fuel source? What about electricity?	Remote sites there would be some fuels. NG is most conservative (as it is less emissions than electricity in Alberta) but is there enough flexibility.	
Commercial/Institutional Green Building – sponsored by the Alberta Government						
7	Pierre Boileau, Canadian Standards Association		Technical	Do energy audits adjust for heating degree days?	Yes	
8	Robert Janzen,		Technical	Going to compare to IPMVP (International Performance	That protocol is about the internal operations of building	

	Climate Check			Measurement & Verification Protocol) approach.?	not the structure like this protocol (commercial green building).	
9	Roger Ord, Golder Associates		Technical	Why was the ASHRAE model chosen?	Everyone is very familiar with ASHRAE 90.1. Thus, as an effort to accommodate the industry this model was chosen.	
10	Robert Janzen, Climate Check		General	Why require a building to use both the energy efficiency and the green building protocol (ie the commercial green building protocol only looks at the building shell so other energy efficiency aspects would have to be addressed with the energy efficiency protocol)?	Under Alberta's system, we use the ISO 14064 approach, hence have to create project barriers. Whether one or two protocols are used, you end up with the same end result. Energy efficiency should not just be tied to buildings but to numerous industrial processes, hence it is addressed in a broader energy efficiency protocol.	