



AUPRF 2026 Request for Proposals

**FAQS ROUND 1
Water Innovation & Well Decommissioning Research**

Rev. 01: Additional Clarification Posted

MAY 5, 2026

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

AUPRF 2026 RFPs Round 1 – FAQs

Water Innovation & Well Decommissioning Research

This FAQs document consolidates questions received during the AUPRF RFP – Round 1 (Water Innovation & Well Decommissioning Research) and PTAC’s responses so that all proponents have equal access to the same clarifications.

Category: IT / Hosting & Data Management

RFP ID: 26-WDRC-RFP-02 (Decision-Support Software Tool for Well Decommissioning in Alberta)

Q1: *Where is the database going to be stored and managed upon implementation of the software tool?*

A: The database will be hosted on a web server. PTAC maintains the engines and tools that may be needed to manage the database.

Category: IT / Programming Languages & Technical Compatibility

RFP ID: 26-WDRC-RFP-02 (Decision-Support Software Tool for Well Decommissioning in Alberta)

Q2: *Are there any limitations of the current infrastructure/system in terms of accepting a software tool that may use other programming languages (Python, for example)?*

A: There are no limitations on the current infrastructure in accepting different common programming languages.

Category: GIS / Licensing

RFP ID: 26-WDRC-RFP-02 (Decision-Support Software Tool for Well Decommissioning in Alberta)

Q3: *Do you currently have an Esri software licence? If so, which licence (ArcGIS Pro, ArcGIS Enterprise, etc.)?*

A: PTAC does not have an Esri software licence. PTAC will consider acquiring such a licence or other licences, depending on the successful proposal.

Category: Technology Constraints / Acceptable Tools

RFP ID: 26-WDRC-RFP-02 (Decision-Support Software Tool for Well Decommissioning in Alberta)

Q4: *Are there any particular guidelines regarding which tools or technologies we can use, or anything that is prohibited?*

A: There are no specific requirements for what is acceptable or unacceptable regarding the tools or

technologies employed. The tool or technology must be able to be used on standard office computers and mobile devices.

Category: Contracting / Deliverables Access (Free vs Fee)

Q5: *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?*

A: 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)

Q6: *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'.*

A: Same answer as above. (i.e., the Deliverables/Access response in Q5.)

Category: Schedule / Project Duration

RFP ID: 26-WIPC-RFP-03 (Produced water transport and storage assessment)

Q7: *Is it anticipated for this project to be completed by December 2026? Would it be acceptable for this project to progress into Q1 2027, should the proposed schedule and deliverables warrant it?*

A: Yes, projects can extend for upwards of 2 years, depending on the topic being considered.

Category: Deliverable Format / Equivalent Tools

RFP ID: 26-WIPC-RFP-03 (Produced water transport and storage assessment)

Q8: *The RFP identifies an Excel-based screening model (or equivalent) as a specific deliverable. Would a Power BI-based dashboard be considered an acceptable equivalent, provided it delivers the same screening logic, transparency, and usability objectives?*

A: Yes, a Power BI-based dashboard tool would be considered.

Alberta Upstream Petroleum

Research Fund

Category: Governance / Project Technical Champion

RFP ID: 26-WIPC-RFP-03 (Produced water transport and storage assessment)

Q9: *In previous work conducted with AUPRF funding, companies have had the opportunity to engage with an Industry Technical Champion during project execution. Could you please advise whether a similar engagement should be anticipated for this RFP?*

A: Yes, the AUPRF program maintains a Technical Champion for each project as a key technical resource and also representing the AUPRF technical committee.

RFP ID: 26-WDRC-RFP-02 to build a decision-support tool for Alberta well decommissioning.

Q10: *Can PTAC connect us with Alberta producers who would be willing to participate in usability testing and pilot validation for this tool?*

A: Yes, PTAC can make those introductions.

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

Q11: *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?*

A: 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.

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

Q12: The RFP allocates a budget of \$200,000. If we proposed a multi-year project as such developments have a significant degree of complexity, should we interpret this as a \$200k budget per year, i.e. assuming that an AUPRF budget is reallocated in subsequent years, or is that a total allocation that should/could be split over many years?

A: The current allocation for this project is \$200,000 for the 2026–27 funding year. If the proposed scope warrants a multi-year approach, we would certainly be open to exploring opportunities for continued funding in future cycles, subject to committee direction and budget availability.

Publication Date: April 24, 2026.

Additional Clarification Posted (May 5, 2026)

Q: With SCVF/GM detection, quantification, and remediation validation identified as a priority challenge for Alberta’s upstream oil and gas sector, is the focus of the “Integrated SCVF/GM Remediation Success and Verification” RFP limited to subsurface mitigation (e.g., cement or alternative barrier repairs), or does it also include surface-level solutions for managing or treating produced gas?

A: The requirement for SCVF/GM detection, quantification and remediation is based on well decommissioning. In order for a well to be closed, the venting issues must be resolved. That, primarily, relates to subsurface mitigation. However, if there are other means of mitigation aside from the subsurface, those solutions will be considered.

End of FAQs

Publication: May 5, 2026.