

FINAL
REPORT

Pilot Emission Removals,
Reductions and Learnings (PERRL)
Initiative – Stakeholder Research

Prepared for:

Environment Canada – Audit and Evaluation

January 2006

pn 5789



336 MacLaren Street
Ottawa, ON K2P 0M6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Executive Summary	3
Résumé du rapport	5
General Orientation on Emissions Reductions and Removals/PERRL	8
Application Process	11
Bid Outcome	19
Reporting Process	23
Related Outcomes	30
Methodology	35

Appendix: Interview Protocol

INTRODUCTION

Pilot Emission Removals, Reductions and Learnings (PERRL) is an initiative launched under the federal government's Action Plan 2000 which seeks to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and set the stage for future measures. The PERRL initiative contributed to these goals as it was designed to provide Canadian companies, organizations and individuals with an economic incentive to take immediate action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. As a pilot project, it was also intended to provide new information about emission reduction in strategic areas (i.e. conceive, plan, implement and administer GHG emissions reductions/removals) and inform the analysis and development of future policies from the new information gained.

The federal government allocated \$15 million to fund and administer PERRL to the end of 2007, when the program will be phased out. Through PERRL, the federal government is buying verified greenhouse gas emission reductions from eligible projects on a fixed price per tonne basis.

Environment Canada is conducting an evaluation of the PERRL Initiative in the current fiscal year. This evaluation, along with two other evaluations of departmental Climate Change Programs (Opportunities Envelope and One-Tonne Challenge), are included in the 2005-06 Audit and Evaluation Plan approved by the Departmental Audit and Evaluation Committee in June 2005.

The summative evaluation of the PERRL Initiative will assess what has been learned from this early use of market-based purchasing mechanism, in terms of both the activity that it has and/or is inducing, and how it has led to improvements in Canadian expertise in identifying, achieving, quantifying and verifying removals and reductions in strategic areas. The evaluation will also examine the impact of this initiative on policy development. This evaluation is intended to guide decisions on the application of market-based instruments in environmental protection.

The evaluation uses multiple lines of evidence and complementary research methods. One part of this evaluation involves interviews with selected stakeholders – individuals, governments, non-profit organizations who have submitted bid applications/project proposals. This report covers results from the key informant interviews with selected stakeholders.

The results of the interviews are meant to feed into the PERRL evaluation and should not, in the absence of other evidence, be considered to represent a thorough evaluation of the initiative. All evaluations conducted by Environment Canada's Audit and Evaluation Branch are posted on their website (www.ec.gc.ca/ae-ve). The PERRL Evaluation will be posted in the summer of 2006.

The purpose of the key informant stakeholder interviews is to obtain their assessment of the degree to which the PERRL initiative effectively achieved its relevant stated outcomes and the extent to which stakeholders are satisfied with the initiative. The evaluation included questions about the stakeholders’ perceptions about the application process, the assessment and outcome of their bid, the reporting requirements and whether PERRL was a catalyst in their undertaking emissions reductions projects. The results of this research may be used to help inform the development of existing and future emission reduction policies.

The present research involved in-depth executive interviews conducted by telephone with the individuals responsible for submission of applications for PERRL contracts. Interviews were completed with 20 stakeholders out of the current population of 36 whose contact details were provided to Environics by Environment Canada. The stakeholders interviewed included a representation of those with successful and unsuccessful bids and from four main strategic areas. These interviews took place between November 8 and December 14, 2005.

The table below indicates the representation of the stakeholders by strategic area and success of bid.

Bid Outcome	Strategic Area				
	All areas	Landfill gas capture	Renewable energy	Biological carbon sequestration	C02 capture/Geological storage
Successful	15	8	4	3	-
Not successful	5	1	2	1	1
Total	20	9	6	4	1

The document begins with an executive summary outlining key findings, followed by a detailed analysis of findings. Appended to the report is a copy of the interview protocol used.

The detailed results are examined by strategic area and by success of bid. Analysis of one strategic area (Carbon dioxide capture/Geological storage) is not included, as there was only one participant from this area and the results cannot be analyzed by area as it would identify the participant.

In a few cases, some words have been removed from quotes to protect the confidentiality of the participants providing the information.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Application process

Most stakeholders (whether successful or unsuccessful in their bids and across all strategic areas) offered both positive and negative views about their overall experience with the application process. Most of the comments focused on the application documents. Some were positive about clarity and ease of understanding of the documents; these stakeholders seemed to know what they had to do. Other stakeholders were mostly negative, focusing on what they saw as the complexity, ambiguity and the difficulty in understanding these documents, and the need for them to be more tailored to specific strategic areas.

Unsuccessful bidders were more inclined than successful bidders to be critical of all aspects of the application process, including information requirements, the application materials and instructions, the ease of preparing the application, the timing of the application process and the actual bidding process used to evaluate the bids. It should be noted though that unsuccessful bidders were not as likely to have made contact with Environment Canada in putting their bid together, and this may have been a factor in the outcome of their bid.

Assessment and bid outcome

Among the 15 successful stakeholders, few felt surprised at being successful. A majority of successful stakeholders, across all strategic areas, felt comfortable with the bid price they submitted, and this was especially the case for those bidding in Round 3.

Of the five unsuccessful bidders, most were unhappy with the bid outcome and felt it was unfair. Notably, most felt they did not get enough feedback as to why their bid was unsuccessful.

Reporting process

Of the 15 successful stakeholders only three (all in Round 1) had finished preparing their report. Two out of three of these were critical of the overall process and found it quite onerous and time-consuming (i.e., a lot of follow-up with PERRL staff). Moreover, all three were critical of the information requirements and somewhat critical of the materials and instructions supplied by PERRL. Of the two who had contacted PERRL in the preparation of their report, both said that PERRL staff were helpful and did their best to answer their questions.

Of the remaining 12 stakeholders who have yet to prepare their verification report, only eight felt they were able to assess this aspect of the PERRL process. Among these stakeholders, opinion was mixed as to the clarity and reasonableness of the reporting requirements, with stakeholders in the area of renewable energy being more positive about the reasonableness of the reporting requirements. However, when it came to the materials and instructions from PERRL, most felt that the manual was not clear and straightforward.

Is PERRL a catalyst for emissions reductions activity?

Most unsuccessful bidders said their project was not contingent on PERRL and had other sources of funding to support their project going ahead. However, they added that either their project moved ahead at a slower pace or their emissions reductions were not as closely monitored as they would have been if they got the PERRL contract.

Almost all successful stakeholders in the areas of landfill gas capture and renewable energy said that their project would have moved ahead without PERRL, and mentioned municipal government in general or municipal associations (e.g., Canadian Federation of Municipalities), and federal government sources (e.g., Natural Resources), as well as a few who mentioned private sources. In contrast, almost all in the area of biological carbon sequestration said their project was contingent on winning the PERRL contract, mainly because they would not have had sufficient funds to carry out their project. Similar to the unsuccessful stakeholders, successful stakeholders who said that their project would have gone ahead anyway, added that although their project would have gone ahead anyway it would have moved forward at a slower pace.

RÉSUMÉ DU RAPPORT

Processus de présentation des propositions

La plupart des participants (qu'ils aient ou non vu leurs propositions acceptées et provenant de tous les secteurs d'importance stratégique) ont émis des opinions favorables et défavorables au sujet de l'ensemble de leur expérience du processus de présentation des propositions. La plupart des commentaires ont porté sur les documents de présentation des propositions. Certains se sont dits positifs au sujet de la clarté et de la facilité à comprendre les documents; ces participants semblaient savoir ce qu'ils devaient faire. D'autres participants se sont surtout montrés négatifs, leurs commentaires étant centrés sur ce qu'ils avaient perçu comme étant la complexité, l'ambiguïté et la difficulté à comprendre ces documents, ainsi que sur le besoin d'adapter davantage ces documents en fonction des caractéristiques propres aux secteurs d'importance stratégiques.

Ceux dont la proposition avait été rejetée ont eu plus tendance que ceux dont elle avait été acceptée à se montrer plus critiques à l'égard de tous les aspects du processus de présentation des propositions, y compris les exigences au titre des renseignements requis, des documents et des directives, de la facilité à préparer la proposition, des délais prévus dans le processus de présentation des propositions, ainsi que du processus d'enchères utilisé pour évaluer les propositions. Il est bon de noter que ceux dont la proposition avait été rejetée n'étaient pas aussi enclins à dire qu'ils avaient communiqué avec Environnement Canada lors de la préparation de leur proposition; ce qui a peut-être contribué au rejet de leur proposition.

Évaluation des propositions et résultat obtenu

Parmi les 15 participants dont la soumission a été acceptée, seuls quelques uns semblaient surpris du résultat obtenu. Une majorité de ces participants, dans tous les secteurs d'importance stratégique, étaient à l'aise avec le prix qu'ils avaient proposé, tout particulièrement, ceux qui participaient à la 3^e ronde d'enchères.

Parmi les cinq participants dont la soumission a été rejetée, la plupart ont trouvé ce résultat regrettable et injuste. Visiblement, la plupart étaient d'avis qu'on ne leur avait pas fourni suffisamment d'information au sujet des raisons justifiant le rejet de leur soumission.

Procédure de rapport

Parmi les 15 participants dont les efforts ont été fructueux, seulement trois (tous dans la 1^{re} ronde) avaient terminé de compléter leur rapport. Deux sur trois d'entre eux se sont montrés critiques à l'égard de l'ensemble du processus et l'ont trouvé lourd et accaparant (p.ex. énormément de suivi avec le personnel du PPEREA). De surcroît, tous les trois ont été critiques à l'égard des exigences en matière d'information et quelque peu critiques au sujet des manuels et des directives fournis par le PPEREA. Les deux participants qui avaient communiqué avec le PPEREA lors de la préparation de leur rapport ont tous affirmé que le personnel du PPEREA leur avait apporté son aide et s'était efforcé de répondre à leurs questions.

Parmi les 12 participant qui n'avaient toujours pas préparé leur rapport de vérification, huit seulement étaient d'avis qu'ils étaient en mesure d'évaluer cet aspect du processus du PPEREA. Parmi ces participants, les opinions variaient quant à la clarté et au caractère raisonnable des exigences relatives à la production de rapports, les participants provenant du domaine des sources d'énergie renouvelable étaient davantage positifs au sujet du caractère raisonnable des exigence en matière de production de rapports. Toutefois, en ce qui a trait aux documents et aux directives fournies par le PPEREA, la plupart étaient d'avis que le manuel n'était ni clair ni facile à utiliser.

Le PPEREA est-il un catalyseur pour les activités de réduction des émissions ?

La plupart des participant dont l'offre avait été refusée ont affirmé que leur projet ne dépendait pas du PPEREA et qu'ils avaient d'autres sources de financement pour soutenir la mise en œuvre de leur projet. Cependant, ils ont ajouté que soit la mise en œuvre de leur projet s'effectuait plus lentement ou que leurs réductions des émissions n'étaient pas surveillées aussi étroitement que s'ils avaient obtenu le contrat du PPEREA.

Presque tous les participants des secteurs de la capture et de la combustion des gaz d'enfouissement, ainsi que des sources d'énergie renouvelable, dont la soumission avait été acceptée, ont affirmé que leur projet aurait été de l'avant même sans le PPEREA, mentionnant les administrations municipales en général ou des associations municipales (Fédération canadienne des municipalités) et des sources provenant du gouvernement fédéral (p.ex. Ressources naturelles), de même que quelques uns qui ont mentionné des sources de financement privé. Inversement, presque tous les participants du secteur de la capture et du stockage géologique du dioxyde de carbone ont affirmé que la mise en œuvre était assujettie à l'obtention du contrat du PPEREA, surtout parce que leur financement aurait été insuffisant pour la réalisation de leur projet. De façon analogue aux participants dont l'offre avait été

rejetée, ceux qui ont remporté plus de succès et qui affirmaient que leur projet aurait été de l'avant de toutes façons, ont ajouté que même si leur projet avait démarré, sa mise en œuvre se serait effectuée plus lentement.

GENERAL ORIENTATION ON EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS AND REMOVALS/PERRL

Stakeholder information

To get a brief overview of the organization’s history or background on emissions reductions and removals projects, stakeholders were first asked about previous activity in this area, the impetus for this activity, the current priority placed on emissions reductions and removals, and the importance of PERRL in leading them in this direction.

A majority of stakeholders reported that they were involved in emissions reductions and removals activities prior to PERRL, and that PERRL was not the primary impetus for their organization developing initiatives in this area. The exceptions were, a few stakeholders involved in landfill gas capture projects, who said that PERRL influenced the direction of their strategy in the area of emissions reductions and removals activities.

“PERRL was not the impetus...It [PERRL] formed part of a strategy in actualizing our greenhouse gas emissions credits.”

“Been involved in climate change, carbon sequestration policy for a decade.”

“We are involved in various aspects of emissions reductions activities.”

Majorities of stakeholders in each of the strategic areas reported being involved in emissions reductions and removals activities prior to PERRL. Also, those who had successful bids were no more likely than those who had unsuccessful bids to have had previous experience with these activities.

The impetus for emissions reductions and removals activities was interest in reducing energy, becoming more sustainable, and that they saw a market for these kind of activities.

“We are always interested in finding ways to reduce the cost of energy.”

“Have a sustainable energy policy.”

“We do it because we know there is a market for it.”

Almost all stakeholders, across all strategic areas, reported that their organizations place a high or fairly high priority on emissions reductions and removals.

“Reducing greenhouse gas emissions is a big priority – our primary activity.”

“There is always pressure to do better and to reduce emissions.”

“At it for six years and will be there for many years.”

Some stakeholders reported being a member of an association or collective around emissions reductions. These included: the International Emissions Trading Association (IETA), Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (CAPP), the Canadian Wind Energy Association (CanWEA), the American Wind Energy Association (AWEA).

Most said that their organization or organizations like themselves have an interest in emissions reduction programs like PERRL. However, a few said that involvement will depend on the terms involved. A few said that stronger interest could be generated as awareness of these programs increase or by publishing case studies or examples.

“Yes, absolutely. It’s very high on their agenda.”

“I think there are individuals...who see the benefits and understand that they can offset the cost of an environmental system by going this route.”

“I think there’s interest, but it depends on the terms involved. How much money am I going to get paid? And What am I going to have to do to get the money?”

“A lot of people don’t know what it’s about.”

Impetus to apply for PERRL

The projects submitted to PERRL covered a range of applications including capturing of methane gas from landfill, wind farms, planting of trees, conversion of agricultural soils.

The vast majority of stakeholders said their bid was made on behalf of their own company. A handful put in a bid on behalf of some other organization.

The principal reason for applying to PERRL was financial - to offset the costs of an existing or planned emissions reductions or removals program or as an opportunity to create credits and a market for these credits. This was the main motivation across all strategic areas and among both those who were successful and unsuccessful with their bid. A few also saw it as a learning process for the post-Kyoto world. One stakeholder viewed it as good exposure for his company. Another stated that his company's decision to put in a bid was influenced by the uncertainty surrounding participation in systems that were parallel to the PERRL initiative (e.g., offset system).

“Without PERRL it would not have been cost-efficient to capture these gases.”

“Contributes to a reduction of the debt associated to the current capture and opens the door for future commercial developments of the project.”

“Obviously wind projects on a stand alone basis are kind of marginally economic...the opportunity to maybe get some credit for the carbon dioxide credits was interesting for us as well.”

“Thought it was an interesting program that we could learn a lot from.”

“We saw that having...name associated with that would be good for us and hopefully good for the PERRL program as well.”

Stakeholders indicated their organization learned about PERRL from a variety of sources, including the MERX website, provincial government sources, federal government news releases, from Environment Canada, the Canadian Wind Energy Association, or the Alberta Research Council.

APPLICATION PROCESS

In this section of the survey, stakeholders were asked questions about their perceptions of the PERRL application process. This included their perceptions on their overall experience, information requirements, the application materials and instructions, their contact with Environment Canada, the ease of preparing their PERRL application, the timing of the application process, and the bidding process used to evaluate their bids.

Overall experience with PERRL application process

Most stakeholders, across all strategic areas, offered both positive and negative views about their overall experience with the application process.

Two stakeholders, both of which were successful in their bid, offered only positive comments on their overall experience with the PERRL application process. Four stakeholders, three of which were unsuccessful, had only negative comments about their overall experience with the application process.

The **positive** aspects of the application process included: that the documents were clear, easy to understand, straightforward, and that they knew what they had to provide. A few said that whatever questions they had about the program were resolved by contacting PERRL staff. One stakeholder liked the MERX system.

“For the most part, I thought the bid document was fairly clear and straightforward to go through.”

“The explanations on the bidding document were clear.”

“Not difficult to complete the application – very straightforward process.”

“It was a structured application process. Provides a good reference scheme.”

“The instruments were very detailed and they did provide a template or worksheet for us to complete and that was very nice.”

“I respond to a lot of RFPs in my office, and I thought the PERRL process was one of the better ones.”

“Knew what I had to provide.”

The **negative** aspects identified by stakeholders included: that the documents (forms and templates) were too complex and onerous, too detailed and hard to understand, ambiguous, too prescriptive and that the documents were too general and were not specifically tailored for their strategic area. A few said it was hard to figure out how to do the market pricing and about the use of MERX. One Quebec stakeholder complained about the inadequacy of the French documentation.

“Some of the actual paperwork, that you had to submit, in terms of the claim forms and the templates...they weren’t very easy.”

“I thought a lot of it was somewhat ambiguous, in terms of what specifically was being required.”

“The process was very prescriptive in terms of you must use all these factors, and you must do this and you must tell us that.”

“The form is being designed for all kinds of programs. How do I take my project and make it fit this form.”

“MERX was not that good a platform. We would have preferred that PERRL post changes and updates on their website.”

“When it comes to submitting a bid price submission...we were almost guessing at what the values were. It was hard, in terms of the market pricing.”

“I had to put aside the French documentation and work with the English one. Often seemed obvious that the translation had been done by an Anglophone. This is not particular to PERRL, but because the document is technical, it would be useful to make sure that the translation is appropriate and done by specialists and specific to the Quebec culture.”

Reasonableness of information requirements

Stakeholders expressed mixed opinions about the reasonableness of the information requirements. About half thought the information requirements were reasonable, but in a few cases this was only because these stakeholders were already well-informed in this area.

“I think it’s reasonable.”

“They were quite reasonable. We were quite knowledgeable and had up to date info because we had already looked at ways of measuring emissions reductions in the past.”

“Quite simple if we followed what was written. However, on an operational basis, we knew it would involve a lot of work on the field to validate our ER. For certain people, this could really be a problem, if they are not familiar with this validation process.”

Half felt that the information was not reasonable, largely because they found the application process required far too much information, and that they did not understand why this level of detail was needed, especially since it was a pilot project.

“Some of the information that they were asking for was just over-the-top, in terms of what it would take to put it together.”

“The information seemed to be quite a bit...for what was a pilot project that everybody wanted to learn something from.”

Most stakeholders involved in the area of landfill gas capture felt that the information requirements were not reasonable, while those in the area of renewable energy felt the information requirements were reasonable. Those involved in biological carbon sequestration projects offered mixed reviews.

Nearly all unsuccessful stakeholders felt that the information requirements were unreasonable, while a majority of successful stakeholders felt that they were reasonable.

Perceptions of application materials and instructions

Most stakeholders felt that the application materials and instructions supplied by PERRL (i.e., the manual and other materials) were at least somewhat useful. Of these, a few found them very helpful and straightforward.

“Very useful. They just mapped out everything that I had to know to complete the application.”

“The manual itself was thorough and it was fine.”

Some were critical of the materials supplied by PERRL. Among these the reasons identified were: the materials were too complex and long, did not provide them with all the information they needed,

was not clear and needed some clarification. A few also felt that although the materials were helpful, they were not specific to their area or that the manual was too precisely written (i.e., easy to understand for those who have the same knowledge as the writer of the manual, but not for others).

“It was very complex. The application manual was something like 70 pages...and again given the timeframe just seemed unreasonable.”

“There’s a lot of numbers in there and a lot of different things in there, and the explanations in the application manual weren’t necessarily all that helpful.”

“Quite complex, but mainly not adapted to our field of activity.”

“Those writing the document know exactly what they want, and those reading it, if they’re not of the same mindset as the person writing it tend to sit there going – what are these guys after.”

Most stakeholders, across all strategic areas, found the application materials and instructions at least somewhat useful, but this positive view was most pronounced among those involved in the area of biological carbon sequestration projects with all of them reporting that the materials were at least somewhat useful. However, most stakeholders involved in landfill gas and renewable energy projects also found these materials useful.

Most unsuccessful stakeholders were critical of the PERRL application materials and instructions, while most successful stakeholders found these materials at least somewhat useful.

Contact with Environment Canada

Most stakeholders contacted Environment Canada in preparing their application, primarily to clarify some requirements. On the whole most of those who made contact had a positive experience, and felt that the staff at Environment Canada were responsive, helpful and timely in getting information to them.

“I believe we requested some clarification maybe once. It was timely and helpful.”

“I think the people that we dealt with at PERRL, itself, were definitely a positive. They were responsive to us. They couldn’t help us with everything, but they did their best and we appreciated their efforts.”

“Good support from the PERRL staff to help us through the application process. Always very helpful. Always provided clear guidance.”

However, a few felt that there was too large a time lag in getting responses to their questions, as questions went to one central source and then were fielded by someone else. One stakeholder also felt that the communication process with PERRL was difficult.

“If you didn’t get all your questions resolved a week ahead of time, there were basically things you just had to go on, you wouldn’t be able to use that process.”

“We were contacting them and feeling we were going around in circles.”

Almost all stakeholders in the areas of landfill gas capture, renewable energy and biological carbon sequestration felt positive about their contact with Environment Canada.

Most unsuccessful stakeholders did not make contact with Environment Canada (which may have been a factor in the outcome of their bid), and of the few who made contact, opinions were mixed.

Ease in preparation of PERRL application

Stakeholders offered mixed opinions on how easy or difficult they found it to prepare their PERRL application. Overall, those who found it easy felt that it was straightforward and did not involve a lot of time, while those who found it difficult felt it was too detailed or technical and required a lot of effort on their part to put it together. However, even a few of those who found it easy, complained about some aspects of the application process.

Among the stakeholders who found the application process easy, the reasons given included: they felt it was straightforward and was not an onerous process. However, a few among this group did experience specific problems with filling in the templates and determining the emissions reductions.

“I think generally we found it was not overly onerous.”

“Not too difficult; straightforward.”

“It wasn’t easy, but is not very difficult. I think the problem is that they have one template. They use the same template for different projects and it makes data presentation more difficult.”

Among those who found the application process difficult, the reasons offered included: it was very technical and detailed and that they had to put in a lot of time and effort to complete it.

“Very labour intensive to put together.”

“It took a fair amount of effort. I would say more than other renewable energy certification programs. We had to obtain extensive permit history and details on expenditure, etc. With other similar programs, the requisite information requirements are much less onerous.”

“We found it was fairly onerous and very technical, and we put a fair bit of work into it.”

Stakeholders in the areas of landfill gas capture and biological carbon sequestration had mixed opinions on the ease or difficulty of preparing their PERRL application, while most stakeholders in the area of renewable energy found the application process quite difficult.

Almost all unsuccessful stakeholders felt that the preparation of their application was quite difficult, while successful stakeholders were mixed in their opinions, with some reporting that it was easy and some saying it was difficult.

Timing of application process

When it came to the timing of the application process, opinion was divided as to whether the process was reasonable or too short.

“The time for the application was fine. Did not see any problem there.”

“It was a very tight timeline for us.”

“I wouldn’t say it was too tight, it definitely wasn’t too long. It was probably in that band of acceptable time, it was on the short end of that.”

Among those who felt the application process was too short, a number of reasons were offered for this opinion, including:

- They heard about the PERRL process after it had actually started and, therefore, had less time to get their proposal in within the set timeframe;

- They felt that those who were undertaking new initiatives or using new technology would require more time to put together their proposal.

“Too tight because it was late in the process when we heard of this project. We would have liked to benefit from a more “human” approach to deadlines.”

“From Environment Canada’s point-of-view, if they want to encourage this kind of initiative and new technology, they absolutely need to leave that window open for a lot longer time period.”

Stakeholders in the area of renewable energy were the most positive about the timing of the application/bid process, with all reporting that it was fine or okay. In contrast, most stakeholders in the area of biological carbon sequestration felt the timing was too short, while those in the area of landfill gas capture were divided between those who felt it was okay and those who felt it was too short.

Most unsuccessful stakeholders felt the timing of the application/bid process was too short, while most successful stakeholders felt it was reasonable.

Evaluation of bidding process (Reverse Auction)

When it came to the actual bidding process used to evaluate the bids (reverse auction process), a majority of stakeholders said the process was fine and fair, and they understood why the government used such a process.

“Yes, I think that would be a fair way of doing it.”

“From the government’s perspective, it was appropriate. It makes sense in trying to keep the costs down.”

However, a few of these stakeholders did say they hoped that it was not all based on the lowest cost and that there would have been other qualitative factors involved in the assessment of each of the proposals submitted to PERRL. They felt that if the assessment was mostly based on price, some good projects that can reduce emissions will be excluded.

“I can understand why that process is in place, but it’s going to exclude projects from being implemented...I don’t think it necessarily makes sense to exclude projects that are proposed that can reduce greenhouse gases, given Canada’s requirements.”

“I don’t have a problem with that. The caveat I have is that in that process there has to be an effective qualitative way of assessing whether a project is ever going to get built or not.”

Some were critical of the bid process and said:

- The bid process did not make sense to them.
- They did not understand why this process was used, and felt that Environment Canada should have used another method of assessing the bids, such as market pricing.

“I don’t think the bid strategy makes a lot of sense. It just seemed ridiculous.”

“We did not understand why they were using this method. Why not go with the “price of the market”. We were limited to a closed market and had to bid at a lower cost than the current market...”

Most stakeholders in the area of renewable energy felt that the reverse auction bidding process was generally fine. In contrast, the majority of those in the area of landfill gas capture were not happy with this process, while those in the area of biological carbon sequestration expressed mixed opinions.

Most successful stakeholders were comfortable with the reverse auction bidding process, while most unsuccessful stakeholders were critical of this process.

BID OUTCOME

In this section of the report, stakeholders were asked questions about their reaction and assessment of the bid outcome. This section first looks at the responses of unsuccessful bidders and then that of successful bidders.

Unsuccessful Bidders

These questions were asked to the five unsuccessful stakeholders.

GENERAL REACTION TO BID OUTCOME

Of the five stakeholders who had an unsuccessful bid (N=5), two were very upset about the outcome. One said that they were surprised that their bid was not accepted and another said they were not surprised, but disappointed with the outcome. One other did not respond to this question.

“I don’t know if I was surprised. Obviously disappointed, put a lot of time and effort into it...”

FAIRNESS OF BID OUTCOME

Three out of five unsuccessful stakeholders felt that the decision on their bid was unfair. The reasons identified were:

- impressions that everything was decided in advance
- they were discriminated against because of the region in which they resided
- PERRL was too legalistic in making its decision

“In the end, they decided to rely strictly on the legal definitions in the bid document.”

“It seemed that we were excluded being in...as compared to being close to Ottawa.”

One unsuccessful stakeholder said the fairness of the decision would depend on the intention - to select the lowest bid or to incite people to develop methods and technologies for the future. If it was to select the lowest bid, then they felt this was not a fair decision.

Another did not comment on the fairness of the bid outcome.

FEEDBACK PROVIDED BY PERRL

Three out of five unsuccessful stakeholders (one in each of rounds 1, 2 and 3) felt that they did not get sufficient detail from PERRL about why their bid was rejected. One (round 1) mentioned receiving a letter from Environment Canada, but did not feel that this response was sufficient. Two others (one in round 2 and the other in round 3) said they were still waiting to hear what caused them to lose the bid, and they had been waiting a long time to get this feedback. Of these, one felt that if PERRL wanted to get more people involved in such projects, feedback was necessary.

“We weren’t told why we weren’t successful...Did we miss it on the evaluation or the price.”

“It was a long process.”

“If they’re trying to develop projects and get people involved, and more people bidding and better projects coming through, there has to be some feedback.”

Two of the unsuccessful stakeholders (both in round 1) mentioned receiving a letter from Environment Canada. One felt they understood why their bid was not successful, while the other (as mentioned above) felt that the letter was not a sufficient response and that there should have been contact from Environment Canada before the rejection letter was sent out.

“The letter was pretty straightforward.”

“There was no contact whatsoever until they sent us a letter that they were not accepting our bid.”

FOLLOW-UP WITH PERRL STAFF FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

Three of the five unsuccessful stakeholders did follow up with PERRL staff for further information or explanation. One was told that they could not get feedback, because contracts with successful bidders were still being negotiated, another said they had sent requests for information but never got an answer, and another said they were not satisfied with the feedback they got from contacting PERRL but saw no point in pursuing it further.

“Yes, and they said they couldn’t say much because they were still negotiating the contracts with the successful bidders. But they haven’t announced those contracts as yet.”

Successful Bidders

These questions were asked to the 15 successful bidders.

GENERAL REACTION TO BID OUTCOME

Nearly all successful stakeholders reported that they were not surprised at the outcome. Most felt they had some chance of having their bid accepted. In fact, two stakeholders felt that they were sure they would be accepted.

“Not a surprise. We thought we had a good chance, not for sure, but a good chance.”

“We were not overly surprised and we were not taking a ho-hum attitude to it either.”

“It was sort of a coin toss - 50-50 chance. We bid a price that we thought was reasonable.”

“We really expected it to be accepted.”

However, one stakeholder reported great surprise at the positive bid outcome.

“We were very surprised; we expected there would be a lot more bids presented.”

Interestingly, only some stakeholders said they were happy at their bid being accepted. All of these stakeholders were in the areas of landfill gas capture or renewable energy. Most of these were in round three.

“We were happy. Hey, great we got it.”

FAIRNESS OF BID PRICE ACCEPTED

A majority of successful stakeholders felt comfortable with the bid price submitted and felt it was sufficient to undertake the project they were doing.

“Absolutely, because at the moment there is no possibility to sell greenhouse emission reductions, and at least it will bridge the time until a system is in place. Because there was no option, any money you can get is welcome.”

“The price we bid...was what was necessary...”

“Had we felt kind of railroaded into a low price we just wouldn’t have put a bid in.”

However, a few felt that the price they put in was not sufficient. A few others said that they put in a lower bid to be accepted, but later discovered that others who had put in a much higher bid had also been accepted, which made them have second-thoughts about the bid they submitted.

“It wasn’t sufficient.”

“Felt comfortable at first, but later on when we found out that others got a higher price, we did feel that we could have asked for more.”

The majority of successful stakeholders in the areas of landfill gas capture, renewable energy and biological carbon sequestration felt comfortable with the price that they submitted. Among the few stakeholders who were dissatisfied with their bid price, there was no clear pattern as to strategic area.

Almost all of the successful stakeholders who felt comfortable with their bid price were in round three. Among the few stakeholders who were dissatisfied with their bid price, there was no clear pattern as to bidding round.

AGREEMENT NOT YET SIGNED

Of the eight stakeholders who did not have signed agreements at the time of the survey, only a few were able to comment on the anticipated timing of the signing of the agreement. Two said the process of getting a signed agreement was moving rapidly and imminent, and one said the delay was not PERRL’s fault but their own. Another stakeholder said that although they were told that they were going to receive a contract soon, they still have not received anything. One stakeholder indicated that they were still thinking about whether or not they should sign the agreement, as there are concerns about the reporting process and the time it will involve, particularly if they have to go back and forth with PERRL staff in completing their report.

REPORTING PROCESS

In the interview, stakeholders were also asked questions about their perceptions of the PERRL reporting process. This included their perceptions on their overall experience, information requirements, the reporting materials and instructions, their contact with Environment Canada, the ease of preparing their report, and their satisfaction with the way their report was received.

This section first looks at the responses of stakeholders who have finished preparing their verification report and then at responses of stakeholders who have yet to prepare their report.

Stakeholders finished preparing verification report

Of the 15 successful stakeholders only three, all in round one of PERRL and all in the area of landfill gas capture, said they have finished preparing their verification report.

OVERALL EXPERIENCE PREPARING VERIFICATION REPORT

Of the stakeholders that finished preparing their verification report, two were critical of the process, saying that the requirements were not clearly articulated and required a lot of follow-up with PERRL staff or that the process was fairly onerous.

“If you’re not sure what you’re being asked, I think it requires more effort to complete the requirements. Cause there is necessarily more follow-up. There’s a lot of back and forth.”

“I felt it was a somewhat onerous process.”

One stakeholder felt that it was clear for the most part, but added that they used a consultant to help put the report together.

“Overall, it was fine. Used a consultant to help us out with it.”

REASONABLENESS OF THE INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS

All stakeholders who had finished preparing their verification report were critical of the information requirements. The criticisms included that the requirements did not match their industry standards, that the requirements were not straightforward and that they required a lot of follow-up with PERRL staff.

“Some of the suggested technical requirements for data validation didn’t really...reflect sort of what would be the industry standard for how we would measure those emission reductions.”

“I would have liked a more straightforward form that was a bit more compact, definitely shorter, and just not as indirect, just maybe more clear.”

USEFULNESS/HELPFULNESS OF REPORTING MATERIALS/INSTRUCTIONS SUPPLIED BY PERRL

All stakeholders who had finished preparing their verification report, were somewhat critical of the reporting materials and instructions. The criticisms included:

- the manual didn’t provide all the information they required;
- the instructions were vague and hard to understand; and
- the method suggested for data verification didn’t match the technology they were using.

“The manual was helpful in some ways, but it didn’t cover off every question we had certainly.”

“Some of the templates I think I would say are okay, but some of them have information in them that I don’t understand what it really is, and I still don’t.”

“When it came to the data verification side of it, we felt that the recommended method that they had just didn’t match the technology we were using.”

CONTACT WITH PERRL STAFF IN PREPARING REPORT

Of the few stakeholders who had finished preparing their report two said they contacted PERRL staff in the process of writing their report. They said PERRL staff were helpful and answered their questions. However, one pointed out that the staff could not answer all their questions to the level required, which he did not blame on the staff itself but on the system that was in the place.

“The staff was very helpful.”

“I think it was helpful. We had our questions answered. Again, though there were some questions that didn’t get answered to the level that we wanted, but I think that was just sort of a relic of the system that was in place.”

EASE FOR ORGANIZATION TO PREPARE REPORT

Of the few stakeholders who finished preparing their report, two felt that the report preparation was not easy, because it was seen as not being straightforward or clear and requiring a lot of follow-up with PERRL staff.

“It wasn’t the easiest report to organize given the requirements. We did a lot of back and forth, in terms of organization as to how things should be organized in the report.”

However, one felt that the preparation was on par with what they have done for other government agencies.

“Compared to other things that we have to do for any other kind of government agency – it was on par with that.”

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS ON REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Stakeholders were asked for suggested improvements on the reporting requirements. Among the few who have finished preparing their verification report, some suggested improvements on the reporting requirements included:

- providing an example of a verification report;
- reducing the size of the report by getting rid of most of the templates would make it a quicker process and reduce the cost of completing the verification form;
- the claim form once accepted becoming the invoice; and
- a clearer explanation of the kind of technical data expected.

“Something along the lines of example verification reports, example calculation summaries, etc. would be very useful in ensuring that proponents are supplying what the PERRL office wants to see (e.g., the Emissions Summary Dispersion Model Report specified by the MOE in their guidance document).”

“I think in terms of improvements, I would definitely discard most of these templates and just come up with a final claim. I think it will be more easy to understand for people, plus it will reduce the cost of actually putting together these claim reports.”

“I would streamline the entire template process and end up with two or three pages maximum that could be submitted.”

“Some way that it can be structured that the claim form, once it is accepted, then becomes your invoice.”

“Better information regarding precisely the kinds of technical data expected as support for the verification audits would have been useful.”

Stakeholders yet to finish verification report

Twelve of the 15 successful stakeholders said they have yet to prepare their verification report. Of these stakeholders, five were in the area of landfill gas capture, four in renewable energy and three in biological carbon sequestration. Ten were in round three of the PERRL process and two were in round two.

This section looks at the responses of the eight stakeholders (6 in round 3 and 2 in round 2) who were able to answer questions on the reporting process.

OVERALL EXPERIENCE PREPARING VERIFICATION REPORT

Among those who have yet to prepare their verification report (and answered these questions), opinion was mixed as to whether the reporting requirements articulated by PERRL were clear. This mixed pattern was found across strategic area and bidding round.

Some felt that they were clear.

“I think it’s clear overall.”

“Yeah, they’re clear. They’re fine.”

Others thought it was not so clear and straightforward.

“To us it seems really convoluted.”

“Will be a challenge.”

THE REASONABLENESS OF THE INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS

Among those who have yet to prepare their report (and answered these questions), opinion was mixed as to whether the reporting requirements were reasonable.

Some thought the requirements are reasonable.

“For our type of project, the requirements are fairly, I think fairly straightforward.”

“Yeah, they’re clear. They’re fine.”

Others thought it was not so clear or straightforward and one worried that it would entail a lot of going back and forth with PERRL, and some expressed concern about the uncertainty of the money they will end up receiving from PERRL.

“Too cumbersome...Too complicated.”

“It’s that potential loop back and the uncertainty associated with exactly how many dollars are we going to get that’s the real problem for us.”

Most stakeholders in the area of renewable energy felt the information requirements were reasonable, while those in the areas of landfill gas capture and biological carbon sequestration offered mixed opinions.

Both stakeholders in round two found the information requirements reasonable, while stakeholders in round three were divided in their assessments.

USEFULNESS/HELPFULNESS OF REPORTING MATERIALS/INSTRUCTIONS SUPPLIED BY PERRL

Among those who have yet to prepare their report (and answered these questions), most thought the manual was not clear or straightforward or was written for someone with a lot of expertise in this activity rather than for someone who is a novice in this field.

“It’s written okay by someone who’s in that business and knows that business very well from a government regulatory standpoint...For the poor farmer who’s doing a project one time, this must just be a nightmare for those guys.”

“Some of the basic reporting tables are fairly straightforward...I think there is one area that is less clear – the requirements for the verification and what is required in the verifier’s report.”

A few thought the instructions (i.e., manual) were helpful and straightforward, and provided them with the information on what they should use in putting their report together and the details that needed to be provided in the report. Both of these stakeholders were in the area of biological carbon sequestration.

“It answers a lot of questions that we have. What kind of reference materials we should use and the level of detail that we need to provide.”

CONTACT WITH PERRL STAFF IN PREPARING REPORT

Among those who have yet to prepare their report (and answered these questions), a few have contacted PERRL. All of whom rated their contact with PERRL positively.

“They were helpful. They got back to us pretty quickly. They were able to answer our questions, if not, they would ask staff from other departments.”

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS ON REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Stakeholders were asked for suggestions on improving the reporting requirements. Those who have yet to prepare their report (and answered these questions), also suggested improvements. These suggestions differed from those suggested by stakeholders who had prepared their verification report.

Those who have yet to finish their report were more interested in learning from earlier rounds, while those who have completed the report offered suggestions that were centred around simplification or reduction of forms. This is not surprising given that all those who completed the report were in round one and would not have been able to look back at previous rounds, and would have actually gone through the process and have a better basis for assessing the documentation and the process itself.

The suggestions made by those who have yet to prepare their report included: feedback on verification reports from previous rounds, and not paying consultants to verify reductions in cases where there are already existing standard practices within their own area.

“You have experience from rounds one and two and it’s a learning initiative. There isn’t any sharing of the results, so we can say...PERRL advises us that previous participants have found the following issues with relation to verification.”

“I do not see the necessity to have all these consultants being paid a lot of money to attest how much renewable energy or clean air that is being produced, when there is already a mechanism in place which are not questionable.”

RELATED OUTCOMES

In this section of the report, stakeholders were asked about the outcome of the project, whether they have or will look for other programs or funding, and what they learned from applying for PERRL, and the future of their project.

This section first looks at the responses of unsuccessful stakeholders and then those of successful stakeholders.

Unsuccessful Bids

As stated earlier in the report, five stakeholders had unsuccessful bids, but only three of them responded to these questions.

PROJECT OUTCOME

All three unsuccessful stakeholders (who responded to these questions) said that the project was not contingent on receiving a PERRL contract and that they went ahead with the project. However, they added that the project moved ahead at a slower pace or that emissions reductions were not as closely monitored as they would have been if they got the PERRL contract. Two others did not respond to this question.

“We proceeded, but not at the same level. We would have done it quicker...if we got the PERRL, but we sort of scaled it back, just because of the cost.”

All three unsuccessful stakeholders who said their project went ahead without a PERRL contract did look for other sources of funding, such as provincial government sources and private companies.

“Yes, we’ve gone ahead and looked for other funding mechanisms.”

“We have looked at private sales. We are in discussion with companies interested in purchasing greenhouse gas emissions.”

LESSONS LEARNED FROM PERRL

All three unsuccessful stakeholders (who responded to these questions) identified a few things that they learned from applying for a PERRL contract. These included: that it provides them with

something they can use for future projects, and that it taught them how to go through the paperwork and put in a bid.

“In developing the framework we sort of got something we can use for future projects, in terms of defining the baseline concepts and defining what the project is and what are the incremental emissions reductions credits.”

“We’ve learned how to go through their paperwork and put the tender in.”

One unsuccessful stakeholder added that they have not learned why their bid was not accepted, and that once they know why they lost they will know what to do the next time.

Successful Bids

These questions were asked to the 15 successful stakeholders

IMPACT OF PERRL CONTRACT ON PROJECT?

Overall, successful stakeholders were divided as to whether their project going ahead was contingent on PERRL.

Successful stakeholders (who responded to these questions) were divided as to whether their project would have gone ahead without the PERRL contract. Some stakeholders said that their project was contingent on a PERRL contract, as they would not have had the financial means to implement the project.

“The financing from PERRL is required in order to meet return objectives. If PERRL falls through, then some other alternative would have to replace PERRL’s funding. So, yes, it is critical.”

“No, I don’t think so. I think we would wait for the money from PERRL before we proceed with the project.”

Some reported that the project would have moved ahead without the PERRL contract, but the implementation of the project would have moved at a slower pace.

“Our project did not require PERRL.”

“It probably would have, but it would have been a slower process.”

Almost all successful stakeholders in the areas of landfill gas capture and renewable energy said that the project would have moved ahead without the PERRL contract, while almost all of those in the area of biological carbon sequestration said that the project was contingent on winning the PERRL contract.

OTHER PROGRAMS/FUNDING AVAILABLE TO SUPPORT THEIR PROJECT?

When asked about other programs or funding available to support their project, most successful stakeholders within the same strategic area named similar sources of funding. All successful stakeholders in the area of renewable energy mentioned the Wind Power Production Incentive offered by Natural Resources Canada, while some stakeholders in the area of landfill gas capture cited municipal government sources in general or specifically the Federation of Canadian Municipalities.

There were no differences between those with and without signed agreements with respect to other sources of funding available to support their project.

LESSONS LEARNED FROM APPLYING FOR PERRL

All successful stakeholders felt that they learned something from their experience in applying for a PERRL contract. These included:

- helping them for the future (i.e., international projects, offset system);
- understanding the information that is required to put together such a bid;
- understanding the time it takes to put a bid together;
- the problems that can arise in such a process;
- pricing information;
- the fact that their industry does not use the same terminology as PERRL;
- a better understanding of concepts used in the area of greenhouse emissions trading; and
- that it would be more difficult for them to recommend that their clients undergo such a process.

“Helps us for the future to anticipate the kind of information that is needed and helps us to foresee some of the problems.”

“A good school to open the door for international projects.”

“My understanding is that some of the lessons learned out of the PERRL program is going to be imbued in the offset system. So obviously that will give us a leg up on the offset system.”

“The process is very lengthy, we would have expected it to be quicker.”

“We’ve got some pricing information now and we know what some levels at which these things have sold.”

“We sort of don’t speak the same lingo as the folks that are designing the program. It’s not really the lingo we are going to use day-to-day.”

“By attending conferences or sessions and reading it, a better understanding of greenhouse gas emissions trading concepts.”

“Demystified emissions trading.”

“I think we are more knowledgeable about what exactly is required now. It certainly wasn’t what we anticipated. I think we basically have a little bit of a harder time suggesting or recommending to clients that we go ahead with the application.”

There were no patterns seen across strategic area or round in the things that stakeholders learned from going through the PERRL application process.

FUTURE OF THE PROJECT

Successful stakeholders offered mixed opinions as to whether their project will continue once the PERRL contract or program ends in 2007.

Some said they will continue with their project in the future.

“Yes, absolutely – that’s what we do.”

“Yes, it will continue.”

A few (both those with and without signed agreements) were unsure and reported that they are still considering the future of the project or are uncertain about the success of continuing with the project.

“Still considering this.”

“We would try, but the success would be reduced.”

Some successful stakeholders were considering looking at or have already looked at the offset system to support their project in the future. In one case, the stakeholder was not sure if they would go ahead and sign the PERRL contract, as there were some concerns about the reporting requirements

“Yes, it’s [offsets] a big consideration for us.”

“We will be looking to sell them through offsets, either that or use them internally for our own programs.”

“We’re just trying to come to grips with the reporting requirements...we don’t know if we should sign this...There’s a large reporting requirement and it just lingers beyond what should be the end of the program.”

One stakeholder worried about the uncertainty around the issue that their company may not be eligible for the offset system because of their involvement in the PERRL program.

“..The impact of PERRL participants’ eligibility in the Government of Canada’s offset program is still unresolved.”

Successful stakeholders (both those with and without signed agreements) in the areas of renewable energy and biological carbon sequestration were the most inclined to report having looked into or considering looking into offsets.

METHODOLOGY

The stakeholder interviews were conducted by telephone with 20 stakeholders out of the current population of 35 who were identified by PERRL staff as eligible for inclusion in the evaluation. The methodology consisted of in-depth qualitative “elite” interviews conducted by telephone with key representatives responsible for stakeholder bids and/or contracts.

The stakeholders interviewed included a representation of those with successful and unsuccessful bids and from four main strategic areas.

	Strategic Area				
Bid Outcome	All areas	Landfill gas capture	Renewable energy	Biological carbon sequestration	C02 capture/Geological storage
Successful	15	8	4	3	-
Not successful	5	1	2	1	1
Total	20	9	6	4	1

Interview Protocol

Environics developed an interview protocol to guide the interviews, in consultation with the client. Once approved by the client, the protocol was translated into French. A copy of the interview protocol can be found in the Appendix to this report.

Recruitment

Environment Canada contacted all clients in advance to notify them of the purpose of the interviews and request their participation. This was carried out by e-mail. Environics then contacted stakeholders by telephone to schedule an interview session. Once an interview had been scheduled, Environics sent the client an abbreviated version of the interview protocol to provide an overview of what would be covered and time to prepare for the interview, as well as a confirmation of the date and time of the scheduled interview.

Conducting the Interviews

The interviews were conducted by experienced Environics researchers by telephone. The interviewees were assured of the confidentiality of their comments, that is, all information collected

through the interviews would be treated as strictly confidential, and would not be identified by client or location.

All stakeholders were contacted multiple times (up to 12 in some cases), in order to schedule an interview. All interviews were conducted between November 8 and December 14, 2005.

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

**Environment Canada
2005 PERRL Stakeholder Research**

Final Interview Protocol

Client Information

Contact Name:

Title/Position:

Organization:

City/Province:

Phone:

Language: English French

PERRL bid status Accepted Round 1 2 3 Signed Agreement: Yes No

Not Accepted Round 1 2 3

Strategic Area Landfill gas capture
 Renewable energy
 Biological carbon sequestration
 CO2 capture/Geological storage

Introduction

- Introduce self and company
- Confirm speaking to correct individual
- Reference prior contact (advance letter, scheduled session, faxed list of questions)
- Did you receive an advance letter from Environment Canada informing you that Environics would be contacting you?
- Were you scheduled for an appointment for _____?
- Were you faxed a list of the topic areas to be covered in this interview?
- Cover housekeeping (interview format, length, assurance of confidentiality, taping if this is intended)

The interview will last about 30 minutes.

Your answers will be confidential. Your individual responses will not be available to Environment Canada. Your responses will be grouped with the responses of others and cannot be traced back to you.

I would like to tape our discussion, so I can concentrate on your responses and not be scrambling to take down notes. The tape will not be going to Environment Canada, and will only be used for internal analysis uses. Is this alright with you?

Are there any questions that you have for me?

A. General Orientation on Emission Reductions and Removals/PERRL

1. Provide a brief overview of your organization's history/background on emission reductions or removals projects: (previous activity if any, impetus for activity, current priority currently placed on these projects)

Was your organization involved in emission reductions or removals activity prior to PERRL?

What was the impetus for this activity?

Did PERRL lead your organization in this direction?

What is the current priority placed on emission reductions or removals in your organization?

2. Briefly describe your current project (one involved in PERRL bid)

Are you doing this on behalf of your own company or for someone else?

3. What was the impetus to apply for PERRL?
4. How did you/your organization hear about PERRL (e.g., association, news release)?

B. Application Process

1. Confirm timing and round of PERRL bids submitted (**Which round 1, 2 or 3?**)
2. What was your organization's overall experience with the PERRL application process ?

Positive: What, if any, were the positive aspects of your experience with the PERRL application process? What worked?

Negative: What, if any, were the negative aspects of your experience with the PERRL application process? What didn't work?

3. How reasonable were the information requirements for submitting a bid?

What issues, if any did you have with these requirements?

4. How useful/helpful was the bid information/instructions supplied by PERRL (Manual, other materials)

5. Did you contact Environment Canada in preparing your bid (e.g. to get further information, clarify requirements)?

If so, how helpful was the response you received?

6. How easy or difficult was it for your organization to prepare your bid under PERRL?

What in particular made this difficult?

7. How did you find the timing of the application/bid process?

Was it too tight or too extended?

8. What is your view on the reverse auction process used to evaluate PERRL bids?

Is it the most appropriate method for this type of program?

Why not?

What would be better?

9. Other general comments on the application process. Any suggested improvements?

IF BID ACCEPTED – SKIP TO SECTION E

IF BID NOT ACCEPTED

C. Bid Outcome

1. Confirm outcome of bid(s)
2. General reaction to bid outcome: Surprised or not?
3. Fairness of bid decision?
4. How adequate was the feedback provided by PERRL? Was it sufficiently clear, detailed, accurate, timely?
5. Did you follow up with PERRL staff for further information/explanation? If so, how satisfactory was this contact?

D. Related Outcomes

1. What happened with this project – did it proceed without a PERRL contract? Was this project contingent on PERRL contract?
2. Was/is there other programs/funding available or used to support this particular project? Is there potential future support that is anticipated or planned on?
3. What, if anything, has your organization learned from your experience in applying for a PERRL contract?

SKIP TO SECTION H

IF BID ACCEPTED

E. Bid Outcome

1. Confirm successful bid(s) and agreement(s) signed
2. What was your general reaction to your bid being successful?

Were you surprised or not?

3. Fairness of bid price accepted?

Did you feel comfortable with the price that you submitted?

Was it sufficient to undertake the project that you were doing?

Did you feel you had to put in that price to be accepted?

4. IF AGREEMENT NOT YET SIGNED:

Anticipated timing of signed agreement?

Anything in particular holding up the process?

F. Reporting Process

(IF ROUND 1)

1. Confirm have submitted one full round of verification report
2. What was your overall experience in preparing the required verification report on your project on emission reductions?
3. Were the reporting requirements clearly articulated by PERRL? If not, in what way?
4. How reasonable were the information requirements for submitting reports? What issues, if any did you have with these requirements?
5. How useful/helpful was the reporting information/instructions supplied by PERRL (Manual, other materials)
6. Did you have any contact with PERRL staff in preparing your report? If so, how helpful were the PERRL staff you had contact with?
7. How easy or difficult was it for your organization to prepare your report? What in particular made this difficult?
8. Were you satisfied with the way in which your report was received by PERRL? If not, why not?
9. Other general comments on the reporting requirements. Any suggested improvements?

SKIP TO SECTION H

(IF ROUNDS 2-3)

1. Confirm status/timing of upcoming verification reports *[have they begun to address the reporting – if not then some of the following questions may not be relevant]*
2. Are the reporting requirements clearly articulated by PERRL? If not, why?
3. How reasonable are the information requirements for verification reports? What issues, if any, do you have with these requirements?
4. How useful/helpful are the reporting information/instructions supplied by PERRL (Manual, other materials)
5. Have you had any contact with PERRL staff in preparing your report?

IF YES:

How helpful were the PERRL staff you had contact with?

6. How easy or difficult is your organization finding it to prepare your report? What in particular made this difficult?
7. Other general comments on the reporting requirements. Any suggested improvements?

G. Related Outcomes [questions may not be relevant for stakeholders in Rounds 2-3]

1. What impact has your PERRL contract had on this project? Did it prove to be key to this project moving ahead/being successful? Would the project have moved ahead without this contract?
2. Was/is there other programs/funding available or used to support this particular project? Is there potential future support that is anticipated or planned on?
3. What, if anything, has your organization learned from your experience in applying for a PERRL contract?
4. What about the future of this project once the PERRL contract/program ends in 2007? Are you looking at other programs/supports for this project (e.g. offsets)

H. Conclusion

A couple of final questions to finish up . . .

1. Does your organization belong to an association or organized collective around emission reductions or removals? If yes: What is it called? Approximately how many members are there?
2. How much interest or demand do you think there is among organizations like yours and others, for this type of emission reductions and removals programs? IF NOT A LOT OF INTEREST:What if anything do you think it would take to generate stronger interest?
3. This concludes the interview. Before we end do you have any final comments about the PERRL program?

-
- Thank for participation
 - Briefly indicate how information collected will be used (analysis and report to EC as part of broader evaluation of PERRL)
 - Reiterate confidentiality
 - Provide contact name at EC if requested (Marie-Christine Tremblay: 819-953-0842)

Environnement Canada
Étude auprès des représentants d'entreprises
PPEREA 2005

Protocole d'entrevue

Information Client

Nom du contact:

Titre/Occupation:

Organisme:

Ville/Province:

Téléphone:

Langue: Anglais Français

Statut de la Soumission Acceptée Ronde 1 2 3 Accord signé: Oui Non
 non-acceptée Ronde 1 2 3

Secteurs stratégiques Capture des gaz d'enfouissement
 Énergie renouvelable
 Séquestration du carbone biologique
 Capture et stockage géologique de CO2

Introduction

- Identification personnelle et de la compagnie :
- Vérifier que l'on s'adresse au bon individu
- Faire référence aux contacts précédents (lettre préalable, prise de rendez-vous pour l'entrevue, liste des questions télécopiées)
- Avez-vous reçu la lettre d'Environnement Canada vous informant que nous appellerions ?
- Votre rendez-vous a-t-il été fixé pour le ___ novembre ?
- Avez-vous reçu l'information sur les sujets que nous allons couvrir en entrevue ?
- Décrire les procédures habituelles (format d'entrevue, durée, assurance de confidentialité, enregistrement audio si telle est l'intention)

L'entrevue va durer une trentaine de minutes.

Vos réponses vont être traitées de manière strictement confidentielle. Vos réponses individuelles ne seront pas transmises à Environnement Canada. Vos réponses vont être regroupées avec celles des autres personnes qui vont participer à cette évaluation.

Je désirerais enregistrer sur bande audio notre entretien pour me permettre de me concentrer et ne pas avoir à prendre de notes. Cet enregistrement ne sera pas transmis à Environnement Canada et ne servira qu'à des fins internes. Est-ce correct ? Merci.

Avez-vous des questions ?

A. Orientation générale relative à l'élimination et la réduction des émissions / PPEREA

1. Veuillez présenter une brève description de l'historique de votre organisation et de ses antécédants en regard des projets d'élimination ou de réduction d'émissions (RE) (activités précédentes, s'il y a lieu, motif de cette activité, priorité actuelle mise sur de tels projets)

Votre organisation était-elle impliquée dans des activités d'élimination ou de réduction des émissions avant le PPEREA ?

Qu'est-ce qui vous a incité à vous impliquer dans ce type d'activité ?

Le PPEREA a-t-il contribué à faire que votre organisation aille dans cette direction ?

Quel est le niveau de priorité accordé à l'élimination ou la réduction des émissions au sein de votre organisme ?

2. Décrivez brièvement votre projet (celui présenté dans le cadre de la soumission PPEREA)

Faites-vous cela pour votre propre organisation ou pour quelqu'un d'autre ?

3. Qu'est-ce qui vous a incité à faire application pour le PPEREA ?

4. Comment votre organisation/vous-même avez-vous entendu parler du PPEREA (cf. association, communiqué)?

B. Processus de présentation des propositions

1. Confirmer le moment et la ronde au cours desquelles les soumissions PPEREA ont été présentées.

2. Quelle a été votre expérience d'ensemble en regard du processus d'application du PPEREA ? (positive-négative et raisons).

POSITIF : Quels ont été les aspects positifs de votre soumission au PPEREA ? Qu'est-ce qui a bien fonctionné ?

NÉGATIF : Quels ont été les aspects négatifs de votre soumission au PPEREA ? Qu'est-ce qui n'a pas bien fonctionné ?

3. À quel point les exigences d'information requises pour soumettre votre proposition étaient-elles raisonnables ?

Quels problèmes, s'il y a lieu. Avez-vous eus avec ces exigences ?

4. À quel point les informations/ instructions fournies par le PPEREA (guides, manuels, autre matériel) vous ont-elles été utiles ou vous ont-elles aidé ?
5. Avez-vous pris contact avec Environnement Canada en cours de préparation de votre soumission (cf. pour obtenir plus d'information, clarifier certaines exigences) ?

Si tel est le cas, dans quelle mesure les réponses que vous avez obtenues vous ont-elles été utiles ?

6. À quel point a-t-il été facile ou difficile pour votre organisation de préparer votre soumission au PPEREA ?

Qu'y a-t-il en particulier qui a fait que cela a été difficile ?

7. Que dire de l'échéancier pour la procédure de soumission de votre proposition ?

Était-il trop long ou trop serré ?

8. Quel est votre point de vue concernant le processus d'enchères inversées utilisé pour évaluer les soumissions PPEREA ?

Était-ce la méthode la plus appropriée pour ce type de programme ?

Si non, pourquoi pas ?

Qu'est-ce qui aurait été préférable ?

9. Avez-vous d'autres commentaires généraux à formuler concernant le processus d'application ? des suggestions d'amélioration ?

SI LA SOUMISSION A ÉTÉ ACCEPTÉE – PASSER À LA SECTION E

SI LA SOUMISSION N'A PAS ÉTÉ ACCEPTÉE

C. Résultat de votre soumission

1. Confirmer le résultat de votre (vos) soumission(s).
2. Votre réaction d'ensemble face au résultat de votre soumission: surpris ou pas ?
3. La décision était-elle juste?
4. À quel point le feedback fourni par le PPEREA ? A t-il été suffisamment clair, détaillé, pertinent, rapide ou au moment voulu ?
5. Avez-vous fait un suivi auprès du personnel du PPEREA pour obtenir plus d'information/d'explications ? Si oui, dans quelle mesure ce contact a t-il été satisfaisant ?

D. Résultats associés

1. Qu'est-il arrivé avec ce projet – A t-il été réalisé sans le contrat PPEREA ? Ce projet était-il dépendant du contrat PPEREA ?
2. Y avait-il ou y at-il d'autres programmes/ sources de financement disponibles ou utilisées en support de ce projet particulier ? Y a t-il un support potentiel possible que vous anticipez pour l'avenir ou sur lequel vous comptez dans votre planification ?
3. S'il y a lieu, qu'est-ce que votre organisation a retenu de son expérience d'application du contrat PPEREA ?

PASSER À LA SECTION H

SI LA SOUMISSION A ÉTÉ ACCEPTÉE

E. RÉSULTAT DE LA SOUMISSION

1. Confirmer le résultat de votre (vos) soumission(s) et la signature de l'entente
2. Votre réaction d'ensemble face au résultat de votre soumission ?

Surpris ou pas ?

3. La décision était-elle juste en regard du prix de votre soumission?

Étiez-vous à l'aise avec le montant pour lequel vous avez soumissionné ?

Était-il suffisant pour vous permettre d'amorcer votre projet ?

Étiez-vous sous l'impression de devoir avoir à soumettre un tel prix pour être accepté ?

4. (SI L'ENTENTE N'A PAS ENCORE ÉTÉ SIGNÉE) –

Moment anticipé pour la signature de l'entente ?

Y a-t-il quelque chose qui retarde le processus ?

F. Procédure de rapport

(Si Ronde 1 réalisée)

1. Confirmer qu'une ronde complète de vérification a été effectuée.
2. Décrivez comment s'est déroulée votre préparation pour le rapport de vérification sur votre projet de réduction des émissions.
3. Est-ce que les conditions et pré-requis du rapport ont été clairement expliqués par le PPEREA? Si non, de quelle manière ne l'étaient-ils pas?
4. Est-ce que les informations requises pour le rapport étaient raisonnables ou exagérées? Quels problèmes avez-vous rencontrés par rapport à ces informations requises ?
5. Jusqu'à quel point les informations et directives fournies par le PPEREA (manuels et autre matériel) ont été utiles ou vous ont aidés?
6. Avez-vous eu des contacts avec du personnel du PPEREA lors de la préparation du rapport? Si oui, comment le personnel du PPEREA avec qui vous avez été en contact vous a-t-il aidés ?
7. Jusqu'à quel point cela a-t-il été facile ou difficile pour votre organisme de préparer le rapport? Y a-t-il quelque chose en particulier qui a rendu cette procédure difficile ?
8. Êtes-vous satisfait de la façon que votre rapport a été reçu par le PPEREA? Si non, pourquoi ?
9. Autres commentaires sur les pré-requis pour le rapport. Des idées pour améliorer la procédure ?

PASSER À LA SECTION H

(SI RONDES 2-3)

1. Confirmer si le répondant a commencé à travailler sur le rapport; si non, certaines questions ci-bas ne s'appliquent pas.
2. Est-ce que les pré-requis pour le rapport sont clairement expliqués par le PPREREA? Si non, pourquoi ?
3. Est-ce que les informations requises pour le rapport étaient raisonnables ou exagérées? Quels problèmes avez-vous rencontré par rapport à ces information requise ?
4. Jusqu'à quel point les informations et directives fournies par le PPEREA (manuels et autre matériel) ont été utiles ou vous ont aidé?
5. Avez-vous eu des contacts avec du personnel du PPEREA lors de la préparation du rapport?

SI OUI :

Comment le personnel du PPEREA avec qui vous avez été en contact vous a-t-il aidé ?

6. Jusqu'à quel point cela a-t-il été facile ou difficile pour votre organisme de préparer le rapport? Y a-t-il quelque chose en particulier qui a rendu cette procédure difficile ?
7. Autres commentaires sur les pré-requis pour le rapport. Des idées pour améliorer la procédure ?

G. Résultats [les questions ne sont pas pertinentes pour les actionnaires dans les rondes 2-3]

1. Quels ont été les impacts de votre contrat de PPEREA sur ce projet ? S'est-il avéré essentiel pour permettre à votre projet d'évoluer et d'être un succès ? Est-ce que ce projet aurait avancés sans ce contrat ?
2. Y a, ou y avait-il d'autres programmes ou subventions possibles et/ou utilisées pour supporter votre projet? Y a-t-il d'autres formes de support potentiel que vous envisagez ou avez planifié ?
3. Qu'est-ce que votre organisme a appris de ce processus d'application pour un contrat de PPEREA?
4. Qu'en est-il du futur de votre projet lorsque le contrat/programme de PPEREA arrivera à échéance en 2007? Regardez-vous présentement pour d'autres programmes ou subventions pour votre projet? (ex: crédits d'impôt)

H. Conclusion

Voici quelques questions avant de terminer l'entrevue...

1. Est-ce que votre organisme appartient à une association ou un collectif qui s'occupe d'élimination ou de réduction d'émissions? Si oui, quel est le nom de l'association/organisme et combien y a-t-il de membres ?
2. Selon vous, quel est le niveau d'intérêt ou de demande parmi les organismes comme le vôtre pour ce type de programme d'élimination ou de réduction d'émissions? Si peu d'intérêt: qu'est-ce qui pourrait être fait pour générer davantage d'intérêt ?
3. Ceci met fin à notre entretien. Avant de terminer, puis-je recueillir un commentaire final concernant le PPEREA ?

-
- Remercier le répondant pour sa participation
 - Indiquer brièvement comment l'information recueillie va être utilisée (analyse et rapport à EC comme intrant à une analyse plus large du PPEREA)
 - Réitérer la garantie de confidentialité
 - Transmettre le nom de la personne-contact à EC si demandé (Marie-Christine Tremblay: 819-953-0842)