



AUPRF 2026 Request for Proposals

FAQS
Water Innovation Research

Rev. 02

JULY 3, 2026

www.ptac.org
Suite 1550,
520 Fifth Avenue SW
Calgary, AB. T2P 3R7

AUPRF 2026 RFPs Round WIPC – FAQs

Water Innovation Research

This FAQs document consolidates questions received during the AUPRF RFP Process and PTAC’s responses so that all proponents have equal access to the same clarifications.

RFP ID: 26-WIPC-RFP-05 EVIDENCE-BASED ASSESSMENT OF FREEBOARD REQUIREMENTS FOR WIND-WAVE EFFECTS IN IN-GROUND WATER STORAGE

Q1: Should the required freeboard calculator be delivered primarily as an Excel workbook, or would PTAC also accept a MATLAB-backed workflow with Excel/CSV export?

A1: PTAC is expecting a workbook-based, reviewer-friendly final calculator—because the RFP explicitly calls for an “Excel/CSV calculator” in scope and names an “In-Ground Freeboard Calculator (Workbook)” as a specific deliverable. The backend development/validation may use MATLAB or another engineering tool, but the final user-facing deliverable should be a workbook/Excel-CSV calculator, or a clearly justified equivalent that is transparent, easy for reviewers to run, and usable on standard office computers.

Q2: Are there preferred Alberta wind datasets or regulator-accepted sources that proponents should use for the wind statistics and 10 m over-water wind adjustment?

A2: There is no instruction naming one mandatory wind dataset, but the work will require representative Alberta wind statistics converted to 10 m over-water conditions. The strongest public baseline is Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) hourly station data—because ECCC’s historical climate portal provides hourly wind speed and direction, along with bulk download options—and the most relevant Alberta-specific technical information, which compiles Environment Canada hourly wind data across Alberta into design-value maps and station summaries.

Q3: For the higher-fidelity method comparison, does PTAC expect full third-generation spectral wave modelling, or would selected fit-for-purpose comparison cases be acceptable?

A3: The RFP asks for selected fit-for-purpose spectral comparison cases, not an all-encompassing requirement for full-domain third-generation modelling. The objectives ask proponents to evaluate improved methods/models against baseline fetch-limited methods, and the in-scope method-testing language narrows the spectral work to “spectral wave modelling (fit-for-purpose mini-grids) for complex shapes; comparison and uncertainty quantification.” Full third-generation spectral modelling is not required

Q4: Will PTAC/AUPRF provide representative producer case-study geometries, or should proponents develop representative Alberta in-ground storage pond geometries for validation and demonstration?

A4: Proponents should develop representative Alberta in-ground pond geometries for validation/demonstration, and may also describe how real producer case studies could be incorporated if PTAC later facilitates introductions or data sharing.

Q5: What level of GIS deliverable is expected: scripts only, GIS layers/maps, or a reusable GIS workflow package for effective/restricted fetch analysis?

A5: The RFP requires a submission-ready toolkit that includes a calculator workbook + GIS scripts + documentation, and the specific deliverables go further by calling for an Alberta Wind & Fetch Data Pack with effective fetch GIS layers and scripts, depth/geometry libraries, submission templates, optional benchmark charts/maps, a training package, and a final report. That is the profile of a reusable GIS workflow package plus supporting datasets/maps, not a scripts-only handoff. In other words, the expected GIS deliverable is a reusable workflow package/data pack rather than standalone code files only.

Q6: Should the operational trigger guidance align with any specific Alberta emergency preparedness, storage, or dam-safety frameworks?

A6: Yes. The operational-trigger guidance should be aligned first with AER Directive 055, because it now expressly covers the Alberta storage-system categories most relevant here—lined earthen excavations, engineered containment ponds, and aboveground synthetically lined walled storage systems—along with storage notifications/authorizations, environmental protection and safety practices, spill prevention, siting, monitoring, and record keeping. Where a facility meets the thresholds for dam/canal review, the Alberta Water Act Dam and Canal Safety Guidelines are also directly relevant; those guidelines require additional information, such as flood inundation maps, flood action plans, and emergency preparedness plans, and they explicitly state that the approval holder is responsible for keeping the structure stable and safe.

Q7: Are letters of support from technical subcontractors or producer partners encouraged as part of the proposal package?

A7: Letters of support are optional but potentially useful—especially where they prove something the committee would otherwise have to take on trust, such as producer site/data access, pilot participation, subcontractor commitment, or real leveraged funding/in-kind support.

Category: Contracting / Deliverables Access (Free vs Fee)

Q8: *We are unclear as to whether the contracts are intended to produce a deliverable that will be made available to industry at no cost, or if the contracts are intended to produce a deliverable that will be provided to industry for a fee paid to the entity awarded the contract. Can you confirm the method by which the deliverables from these contracts will be made available to industry?*

A8: Under the contracts for the AUPRF program, industry funders have free access to the use of IP generated from the project for their own internal purposes. This does not include any IP developed before this engagement. If the deliverable is a tool or study for industry stakeholders, any services from the proponent to the producer would be a normal fee-based commercial services agreement. If it is just a standalone use of the tool or a research report developed through funding under this program, the tool or report is available for producer use for free.

Category: Intellectual Property (IP) / “May be owned” Clarification

RFP ID: AUPRF 2026 – All RFPs (general contracting clarification)

Q9: *Can you please confirm or expand on the IP clause - it states "IP arising from the project may be owned by AUPRF funders." Can you clarify what conditions would trigger AUPRF funders to retain or release ownership of the IP arising from the project? Please clarify the word 'maybe'.*

A9: *Same answer as above. (i.e., the Deliverables/Access response in Q8.)*

RFP ID: AUPRF 2026 – All RFPs (general scope and timeline clarification)

Q10: *Do proposals need to address all challenges and elements listed in the “In Scope” section, or can they focus on only a subset? Are multi-year proposals acceptable?*

A10: Proponents are expected to address the elements outlined in the “In Scope” section as comprehensively as possible, as completeness is a key factor in the evaluation process.

If certain elements are considered less relevant or better suited to a later phase, proponents are encouraged to clearly justify this and provide recommendations for the Committee’s consideration. While proposals should aim to cover the full scope, the Committee recognizes that some approaches may be phased. In such cases, a multi-year approach may be appropriate, with potential for continued funding in future cycles, subject to Committee direction and budget availability. However, there is a preference for delivering results within a reasonable timeframe.

End of FAQs

Publication: July 3, 2026.