



26-WIPC-RFP-03

ASSESSMENT OF PRODUCED WATER  
TRANSPORT AND STORAGE OPTIONS  
FOR ALBERTA

BUDGET: \$100,000

PUBLICATION DATE: MARCH 19, 2026

**PROPOSAL SUBMISSION DEADLINE: MAY 8, 2026 BY 5:00 PM**

[www.ptac.org](http://www.ptac.org)  
Suite 1550,  
520 Fifth Avenue SW  
Calgary, AB. T2P 3R7

## 1. Background & Rationale

Produced water volumes are increasing in several Alberta plays, while producer objectives are shifting toward greater reuse (e.g., hydraulic fracturing supply) and reduced reliance on high-quality nonsaline sources. Achieving this at scale depends on practical, regulator-aligned transport and storage solutions that are safe, cost-effective, and implementable within drilling/completions schedules.

Alberta's regulatory framework places distinct requirements on storage systems, oilfield waste management and tracking, and pipeline-based conveyance. Project proponents must correctly determine how a produced-water stream is being managed (production fluid, oilfield waste, or alternative water for reuse) and then align the end-to-end system (transport + storage) to the applicable requirements and evidence expectations.

This project is intended to provide producers with a defensible, decision-ready comparison of options and an integrated screening framework to select fit-for-purpose configurations under Alberta conditions (distance, seasonality, land access, approvals timelines, and risk tolerance).

## 2. Benefits to Producers

Decision-ready option comparison: a structured evaluation of transport modes (truck, temporary surface pipelines, layflat hose, and other practicable alternatives) and storage/buffering options across cost, schedule, risk and regulatory approvability.

Regulatory pathway clarity: a scenario-based jurisdiction and requirements map (AER vs. AEPA/EPEA interfaces) to reduce rework and avoid misclassification of produced water streams.

Reduced water sourcing pressure: identification of configurations that enable greater reuse and reduce reliance on high-quality nonsaline water where feasible.

Implementation focus: pilot-ready recommendations, including candidate corridors/hubs, monitoring concepts, and data gaps needed to progress to detailed design and approvals.

Re-usable tools: a screening scorecard and simple cost/risk models that producers can apply across assets and development programs.

## 3. Research Objectives

- Develop a clear, Alberta-specific scenario framework for produced water management (production fluid vs. oilfield waste vs. alternative water for reuse), including a jurisdiction screen and regulatory requirements map for transport and storage choices.
- Assess produced-water transport options and associated integrity assurance/monitoring approaches under Alberta operating conditions, including cost, seasonality and routing constraints.

- Assess produced-water storage and buffering options at a screening/pre-feasibility level, including how storage duration and configuration influence approvals pathways and constraints (e.g., Water Act, dam-safety triggers).
- Develop an integrated decision-support toolkit to enable consistent selection of fit-for-purpose transport + storage configurations by scenario.
- Identify and prioritize a short list of pilot opportunities (3–5) with conceptual configurations and high-level implementation roadmaps.

#### 4. In Scope

- “Produced water” means water produced in association with oil and gas production activities and managed for reuse, transport, storage, or disposal pathways. Proponents must apply the RFP’s scenario framework (production fluid vs. oilfield waste vs. alternative water for reuse) when describing produced-water management assumptions.
- “Flowback” refers to fluids returned from hydraulic fracturing operations. Proponents must explicitly state whether flowback is included in their approach and, if included, how it is treated within the scenario framework and transport/storage comparisons.
- This RFP does not request the selection or design of produced-water treatment technology trains. Treatment may be referenced only to the extent needed to state water-quality assumptions that affect the transport and storage pathway comparison.
- Transport modes covered (minimum set). The comparative assessment must include, at a minimum:
  - Trucking/hauling
  - Temporary surface water pipelines (TSPW)
  - Layflat hose
- Storage / buffering types covered (screening level). “Storage/buffering” in this RFP is a screening / pre-feasibility evaluation of options, including, at a minimum:
  - Short-to-mid-term buffering at/near source
  - Hub storage concepts
  - Third-party storage
  - Storage device categories commonly used in Alberta
- Regulatory and jurisdiction mapping relevant to produced water transport/storage, including: storage requirements, oilfield waste management/tracking, pipelines and temporary surface water pipelines, Water Act approvals/licensing considerations, release reporting triggers, and AEPA/EPEA interfaces where applicable.
- Transport options assessment, including (at minimum): trucking/hauling; temporary surface water pipelines (TSPW); layflat hose; and any other feasible alternatives identified during

engagement. Assessment to cover cost, operational feasibility, integrity assurance options, monitoring concepts, and incident response considerations at a screening level.

- Storage/buffering options assessment at screening/pre-feasibility level, including (at minimum): short-to-mid-term buffering at/near source; hub storage concepts; third-party storage; and storage device categories commonly used in Alberta. The assessment will focus on applicability, constraints, relative risk, expected evidence burden (high-level), and schedule/approvals timing drivers.
- Integrated evaluation and decision support: develop a consistent scoring framework and workflow that links produced-water scenario classification to transport and storage choices, evidence needs, and implementation steps.

Cost and schedule screening: develop order-of-magnitude (OOM) cost and schedule models/sensitivity drivers (distance, volume, seasonality, monitoring intensity, approvals/land access) sufficient for comparative ranking.

## 5. Out of Scope

- Detailed engineering design or construction packages for storage facilities or pipelines (including detailed civil, structural, geotechnical, hydrotechnical, instrumentation, liner CQA, and commissioning specifications).
- Development of a submission-ready Directive 055 long-term AWSS evidence package, calculation templates, or detailed design criteria modules (covered by the Long-Term AWSS RFP).
- Detailed emergency response plan (ERP) development, insurance term sheets, or corporate governance frameworks for shared long-term storage facilities (covered by the Long-Term AWSS RFP).
- Selection/design of produced-water treatment technology trains or detailed water-quality characterization/testing programs, except where minimally required to define scenario classification assumptions for transport/storage selection.
- Regulatory reform proposals or advocacy positions.
- Detailed Directive 055 design calculations, hydrotechnical wave/freeboard modules, geotechnical investigation programs, liner CQA plans, integrity testing/commissioning specifications, or closure designs intended for long-term storage approvals.
- Develop liability/insurance term sheets or emergency preparedness program packages for long-term storage facilities.

## 6. Specific Deliverables

Proponents may propose refinements; however, proposals must include the deliverables below (or clearly justify alternatives that provide equivalent value).

- Regulatory & Jurisdiction Map (Report + Visual): scenario-based requirements crosswalk for produced water transport and storage, including a “do not assume oilfield waste” decision tree and an AER/AEPA interface screen.
- Transport Options Comparative Assessment: truck vs. TSPW vs. layflat hose (and any additional options), including integrity assurance/monitoring concepts, risk drivers and operational constraints.
- Storage/Buffering Options Comparative Assessment (Screening Level): applicability and constraints for buffering concepts and storage device categories, including approvals/timing considerations and potential dam-safety/Water Act triggers where relevant.
- Integrated Decision-Support Toolkit: (a) scoring rubric and workflow, (b) an Excel-based screening model (or equivalent), and (c) a short user guide.

## 7. Success Criteria

- Completeness and traceability: regulatory/jurisdiction mapping is accurate, current and clearly cited to primary sources; scenario decision tree is unambiguous.
- Decision usefulness: the toolkit enables consistent ranking/selection of transport + storage configurations and can be applied by producers with minimal additional interpretation.
- Implementation readiness: plans and output are sufficiently detailed to proceed to site-specific pre-FEED/detailed design and regulatory engagement.



# AUPRF 2026 Request for Proposals

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS**

MARCH 2026

[www.ptac.org](http://www.ptac.org)  
Suite 1550,  
520 Fifth Avenue SW  
Calgary, AB. T2P 3R7

# Instructions for Proposal Submissions

## AUPRF 2026 RFPs

### 1 Purpose & Scope

These instructions apply to all competitive solicitations funded by the Alberta Upstream Petroleum Research Fund (AUPRF) and administered by PTAC Petroleum Technology Alliance Canada. They define how Proponents must prepare and submit proposals, how proposals are evaluated, the timelines for decisions and notifications, and key commercial and legal terms applicable to AUPRF-funded projects.

### 2 Submission – Content Requirements

#### 2.1 Proponent & Company Information

- Legal name and address
- Primary contact name, title, email, and phone
- Brief company overview and relevant services

#### 2.2 Technical Proposal

- Understanding of the problem statement and scope
- Proposed methodology and approach
- Work plan, milestones, and schedule
- Team composition; max 2-page bios/CVs with roles and expertise

#### 2.3 Financial Proposal

- Itemized cost breakdown (e.g., labour categories and rates, materials, travel, subcontractors)
- Proposed milestone-based payment schedule (payments tied to deliverables)
- Leveraged funding

#### 2.4 Formatting and Page Limits

Unless otherwise specified in a particular RFP, no strict page limits apply; include the content necessary to enable a thorough assessment.

### 3 Submission — Method & Logistics

Submit by email to [info@ptac.org](mailto:info@ptac.org) with subject line: *AUPRF – RFP ID – Proponent Company Name*.

**Proposals submitted by other means will not be accepted.**

- **Deadline:** Proposals must be received on or before the RFP deadline indicated in each RFP document; late submissions will not be considered.

- File format: A single combined PDF is preferred, plus any required spreadsheets or forms specified in the RFP.
- Validity: Proposals must remain irrevocable and open for acceptance for 90 days from the submission deadline.
- Questions & FAQs: Refer to the AUPRF call for proposals landing page and any RFP-specific instructions for updates and clarifications.

#### 4 Eligibility, Legal & Commercial Terms

- PTAC reserves the right to accept or reject any Proposal, in whole or in part, and to cancel or amend an RFP without liability.
- Proponents are responsible for all costs associated with preparing and submitting their Proposals.
- Confidentiality applies to information provided by PTAC; Proponents may be required to sign a non-disclosure agreement. Proposals will be kept confidential and will be accessed only by evaluators.
- Intellectual property (IP) arising from AUPRF projects may be owned by AUPRF funders, or AUPRF funders receive a royalty-free operational use right. No other IP ownership or sharing options (if IP is being generated) are acceptable.
- Minimum insurance: Commercial General Liability (CGL) of \$5,000,000 and Professional Liability of \$2,000,000.
- Disclosure of intent to subcontract and any actual or potential conflicts of interest is required.
- Governing law: Province of Alberta, Canada.

#### 5 Evaluation Criteria & Process

##### 5.1 Scored Criteria and Weights

<i>Criterion</i>	<i>Weight</i>
Technical Approach	30%
Relevant Experience	30%
Cost	25%
Leveraged Funds from Other funders	5%
Team Qualifications	10%

##### 5.2 Screening & Completeness

Proposals are first screened for completeness and compliance (deadline, required sections, and required disclosures). Incomplete or non-compliant Proposals may be removed from further consideration at PTAC’s discretion.

### 5.3 Committee Review, Scoring & Deliberation

The relevant AUPRF technical committee reviews Eligible Proposals. Committee members score Proposals using the standardized scoring sheet before a deliberation meeting, where compiled results are discussed, and recommendations are confirmed.

PTAC may request clarifications, additional information, or presentations from Proponents to support evaluation before final ranking.

## 6 AUPRF Review & Communication Timelines<sup>1</sup>

The following service levels apply to all **AUPRF RFPs for Well Decommissioning Research Projects (WDRC) and Water Innovation Planning Committee (WIPC)** unless a specific RFP states a different schedule:

<i>Step</i>	<i>Date</i>
1. <b>RFP Release</b> - <b>Well Decommissioning Research (WDRC)</b> - <b>Water Innovation Planning (WIPC)</b>	March 19, 2026
2. <b>Submission of Questions</b>	April 10, 2026
3. <b>Answers to Questions Posted on PTAC Website</b>	April 24, 2026
4. <b>Proposal submission deadline</b>	<b>May 8, 2026</b> <b>5 pm Mountain Time</b>
5. <b>Acknowledgement of receipt</b>	May 22, 2026
6. <b>Decision ratification</b>	June 19, 2026 or sooner
7. <b>Award notifications</b>	June 26 – July 7, 2026
8. <b>Target project start</b>	Summer 2026 (unless otherwise specified)

## 7 Communication

- All communications by the proponent to PTAC should be directed to [info@ptac.org](mailto:info@ptac.org) and AUPRF2026 RFPs should be included in the subject line.
- PTAC will notify the Proposal's primary contact by email of the outcome (award or non-award).
- Unsuccessful Proponents may request high-level feedback on strengths and areas for improvement.
- Public Communications: PTAC/AUPRF may publish award highlights after contract execution.

---

<sup>1</sup> AUPRF 2026 RFPs for Ecological Research Planning Committee (ERPC), Air Research Planning Committee (ARPC), and Reclamation Remediation Research Committee (RRRC) will follow a different timeline and deadline.

## 8 Contracting, Payments & Reporting

- A standard AUPRF Funding Agreement will be issued to successful Proponents for review and execution.
- Payments are quarterly milestone-based and tied to accepted deliverables, as specified in the Funding Agreement.
- Executed agreements are retained in the AUPRF contracts repository managed by PTAC.

## 9 Compliance & Reserved Rights

PTAC may amend or cancel an AUPRF RFP at any time; any changes will be communicated to all prospective Proponents. Proponents must comply with all instructions, including confidentiality, insurance, subcontracting disclosures, and conflict-of-interest requirements.

## 10 Proponent Checklist

- Company information (legal name, address, contacts, overview)
- Technical proposal (approach, work plan, schedule, team bios/CVs)
- Financials (itemized costs; milestone-based payment plan, leveraged funding)
- Disclosures (subcontracting intent; conflicts of interest)
- Insurance confirmation (CGL \$5M; Professional Liability \$2M)
- Submission format (single PDF + required forms); deadline; 90-day validity

## 11 Legal Conditions

### 11.1 Non-Binding Solicitation; No Obligation to Award

This Request for Proposals (RFP) is not an offer to contract. No contractual, quasi-contractual, fiduciary, or other legal obligations of any kind are created by this RFP or by any submission, communication, or conduct of PTAC unless and until a written Funding Agreement is executed by duly authorized representatives of PTAC and the successful Proponent. PTAC may cancel, amend, or suspend this RFP at any time without liability.

### 11.2 PTAC's Reserved Rights

Without limiting any other rights, PTAC may, in its sole discretion and without liability: (a) accept or reject any or all Proposals; (b) accept a Proposal in whole or in part; (c) waive non-material irregularities; (d) seek clarifications; (e) negotiate changes to scope, schedule, and pricing with one or more Proponents; and (f) cancel this RFP at any time. The lowest-priced Proposal will not necessarily be selected.

### 11.3 No Claim for Compensation; Bid Costs

Each Proponent is solely responsible for all costs associated with preparing and submitting its Proposal, as well as any related activities. PTAC shall not be liable for any such costs or damages, whether or not the Proponent is selected for award.

#### 11.4 Limitation of Liability

To the maximum extent permitted by law, PTAC shall not be liable to any Proponent for indirect, incidental, consequential, special, punitive, or exemplary damages, loss of profit, loss of opportunity, or loss of reputation arising out of or related to this RFP, the evaluation process, or any decision to award or not award funding, even if advised of the possibility of such damages. Any direct liability of PTAC to a Proponent is strictly limited to the reasonable, proven out-of-pocket costs of preparing the Proposal, which the parties agree is disclaimed by Section 4.

#### 11.5 Verification and Clarifications

PTAC may request clarifications, additional information, or presentations from any Proponent and may verify any information contained in a Proposal through interviews, reference checks, third-party sources, or site visits. Failure to respond promptly may result in disqualification.

#### 11.6 Grounds for Disqualification

PTAC may, at any time, disqualify a Proposal or rescind a selection if: (a) the Proposal is late, incomplete, or non-compliant; (b) the Proponent fails to disclose or address an actual or potential conflict of interest; (c) the Proposal contains misrepresentations or misleading information; (d) the Proponent engages in collusion, unfair competition, improper influence, lobbying outside the authorized contact, or attempts to obtain confidential information not publicly available; or (e) adverse information materially affecting the Proponent's qualifications comes to PTAC's attention.

#### 11.7 Proponent Representations & Warranties

By submitting a Proposal, the Proponent represents and warrants that: (a) the Proposal is accurate, complete, and not misleading; (b) all proposed work product will not infringe intellectual property or other rights of third parties; (c) the Proponent and proposed subcontractors are duly qualified and in good standing; and (d) it will maintain the insurance required by the RFP and Funding Agreement.

#### 11.8 Confidentiality; Use and Disclosure

Information provided by PTAC in connection with this RFP is confidential and may be used solely for Proposal preparation and evaluation. Proponents must not disclose such information to any third party except their team members, advisors, or subcontractors who have a need to know and are bound by confidentiality obligations no less protective. PTAC may disclose Proposals to its funders, technical committees, advisors, and partners for evaluation and administration and may make disclosures as required by law or court/government order.

#### 11.9 Intellectual Property & License to Use

Subject to the Funding Agreement, IP arising from the Project may be owned by AUPRF funders, or funders will receive a perpetual, royalty-free right to use the IP in their operations without additional compensation. Proponents must ensure they have all the rights necessary to grant such

ownership or licenses. If IP is generated by the proposal/project, no other IP ownership or sharing options are acceptable. If IP is not generated by this project, this provision is unnecessary.

#### 11.10 Subcontracting

The Proponent must disclose its intent to subcontract any portion of the work. PTAC reserves the right to approve or reject proposed subcontractors. The Proponent remains fully responsible for all subcontracted work.

#### 11.11 Proposal Validity

Proposals must remain irrevocable and open for acceptance for 90 days after the submission deadline.

#### 11.12 Acceptance Not a Waiver

PTAC's acceptance of a Proposal, or its failure to identify deficiencies, does not waive any requirement of the RFP or Funding Agreement and does not relieve the Proponent from responsibility for compliance or performance.

#### 11.13 Order of Precedence; Entire Agreement

In case of conflict, the following order of precedence applies: (1) the executed Funding Agreement (including schedules), (2) the specific RFP (including addenda), (3) these Proponent Instructions, and (4) the Proposal. The executed Funding Agreement constitutes the entire agreement for project performance.

#### 11.14 Governing Law and Forum

This RFP and any related dispute are governed by the laws of the Province of Alberta and the federal laws of Canada applicable therein, without regard to conflict-of-laws rules. The parties attorn to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of Alberta, sitting in Calgary.

#### 11.15 Insurance & Indemnities

At a minimum, the Proponent shall maintain CGL of \$5,000,000 and Professional Liability of \$2,000,000, as well as any other insurance required by the Funding Agreement. Proponents will indemnify and hold harmless PTAC, its officers, directors, employees, and agents from third-party claims arising out of the Proponent's acts or omissions in connection with the Proposal or the Project, subject to the Funding Agreement.

#### 11.16 Addenda and Questions

Only written addenda issued by PTAC form part of the RFP. Proponents are responsible for monitoring the RFP communication channel (the PTAC website) and ensuring their Proposal reflects all addenda.