

June 2, 2004

SUBJECT: April 29, 2004 Alberta Energy Information Exchange

Sponsored by the Department of Energy, Canadian Association of Petroleum Landmen and Canadian Association of Petroleum Land Administration

Dear Information Gathering Session Participants:

Thank you to those who participated in the April 29, 2004 Information Exchange. We sincerely appreciate your attendance and your frank and honest feedback. About 400 individuals attended the session and about half of the attendees (178) made the effort to complete the feedback form.

Below is a summary of some of the key points we made in our presentations what we heard in your responses, and of our new proposed directions. You can review all the comments attached.

We welcome any further comments you may have after you have had a chance to review the feedback.

e-Transfers

What we said

- e-Transfers was successfully implemented on March 31, 2004.
- Anticipate the new process will speed up the turn-around times by as much as 75 percent.
- e-Transfers will be made mandatory for P&NG and Oil Sands agreements by the end of 2004.

What we heard

- 29 per cent of respondents are using the e-Transfer system.
- 91 per cent of those who responded said they agreed or strongly agreed that e-Transfers has simplified administration and processes.
- A large number of respondents indicated they had not yet signed up, that their partners had not yet signed up or that they had not yet processed a transfer on the new system.

Department of Energy (DOE) response

- Please make sure you and your partners sign up and use the system!

- DOE will continue to accommodate manual transfers for partial transfers, non-P&NG agreements and under special circumstances.

e-Postings

What we said

Should the DOE reduce the current seven-week review process to five weeks?

What we heard

- 69 per cent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the proposal to reduce the review period.
- Some respondents were concerned that the change would reduce the amount of time that industry has to review parcels before a sale.
- There is no compelling reason to change the review period.

DOE Response

- The DOE will keep the current seven-week review period.

Suspension of Third Party Requests to Review Non-Productive Rights

What we said

The DOE proposed a temporary suspension of third party requests in favour of more area reviews.

What we heard

68 per cent of the comments received showed strong support to keep third party requests.

- There was strong support to charge a fee to help reduce frivolous requests.
- There was concurrence that area reviews are the preferred long-term solution.
- Industry would like to have input into determining where area reviews are conducted and have advance notice of when and where these reviews will occur.

DOE response

- The DOE will retain third party requests to review non-productive rights.
- As a compromise, the DOE will limit the number of requests, on an agreement and hectare basis, and require written confirmation that a land search has been completed. The DOE will outline these criteria in an Information Letter.
- The DOE will consider the pros and cons of charging a fee for third party requests. No action will be taken at this time.
- The DOE will review its current Section 18 process, in its entirety.

Addressing wells on cancelled/reverted rights

What we said

- The DOE will no longer be addressing wells specifically as to what action to take on each well. A list of wells will be included in the final letter of continuation to the designated representative (copy to applicant if different) identifying which wells are linked to the agreement being cancelled or amended. It will now be the client's responsibility to determine whether they:
 - Need to abandon a well. Note: the EUB will automatically send out an abandonment package to the well licensee within four days of being notified by the DOE.
 - Still retain a complete (gas or oil) spacing unit.
 - Need to cancel an undrilled well licence with the Alberta Energy and Utilities Board.
 - Can still produce above/below the base of the cancelled/reverted rights.
- Ultimately it is industry's responsibility to maintain communication between their land department and field offices to avoid occurrences of trespass.

What we heard

- Although industry appreciates the detail that the DOE provides on each well, they understand that it's not DOE's responsibility to review their wells and understand the severity of trespass.

DOE response

- This process will be implemented upon completion of internal systems testing. If testing proceeds successfully, this process will be in place by August 2004.

Tenure Regulation Changes

What we said

- Regulation changes will go into effect on July 1 2004.
- Fees and penalties are now correctly defined in the regulation.
- Instances of trespass will be subject to a \$50,000 penalty.

What we heard

- Some respondents support the proposed \$50,000 trespass penalty while others said that the fee is excessive.
- The majority of respondents asked for more information on what constitutes trespass.

DOE response

- Effective date for all three regulations is now proposed to be September 1, 2004. The DOE has updated the trespass information on the web site. See "frequently asked questions".
- The DOE is preparing an Information Letter that will clarify the definition of trespass and outline those specific instances when the penalty will be applied.

Natural Gas in Coal (NGC)

What we said

- There are four working groups reporting to the NGC Multi-Stakeholder Committee: Water, Surface/Air, Royalty, and Mineral Land Tenure.
- The NGC Multi-Stakeholder Committee will make recommendations to government in November 2004.
- The Tenure Working Group is proposing to: use existing P&NG agreements for NGC, implement zone specific posting and zone specific

retention on a go-forward basis and allow an additional year under a Section 17 potentially productive continuation with an increased fee.

What we heard

75 per cent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the direction taken regarding the tenure aspects of NGC development.

- There is no consensus on zone specific retention.
- Ownership issues need to be resolved in the courts.

DOE response

- The Tenure Working Group will work with the Surface/Air Working Group on overlapping issues.
- The Tenure Working Group will finalize their recommendations and forward to the NGC Multi-Stakeholder Advisory Committee (MAC) in the fall.
- If the MAC approves the Tenure NGC working group's recommendations, the DOE will undertake further analysis and consultation to determine the impact on conventional oil and gas activity.

Information Letter Tracking Project

What we said

- An automated Information Letter process will be implemented on June 1, 2004.
- Industry will be able to query all active and inactive Information Letters by the Fall 2004.

What we heard

- 91 per cent of respondents said the search capabilities for DOE Information Letters will be a useful tool.

DOE response

- The DOE has issued an Information Bulletin explaining the system. See Mineral Rights Information Bulletin 2004-01 on Tenure's web site.
- You can subscribe to receive DOE Information Letters

I would like to personally thank our co-hosts at the Canadian Association of Petroleum Landmen (represented by Guy Anderson and Karin Steers) and at the Canadian Association of Petroleum Land Administration (represented by Lynn Gregory and Linda Westbury) for helping make this a successful event. The DOE staff look forward to seeing you at our next Information Exchange.

Sincerely,

Rhonda Wehrhahn

Business Unit Leader, Tenure

Mineral Development and Strategic Resources.

Please see the DOE web site for more information.

Alberta Energy Tenure Information Exchange April 29, 2004

There were 178 respondents

e-Transfers – Audrey Murray Are you using the e-Transfer system that was introduced on March 31, 2004?

Yes = 51 (28.65%)

No = 108 (60.67%)

N/A = 19 (10.67%)

Do you agree that e-Transfers has simplified administration and processes?

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Some what Disagree	Some what Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6
3		1	7	64	49

Comments from respondents:

- We have internal road blocks that are going to be resolved soon, we hope.
- I believe it will. xxxx does have it; however, I have not used it as yet.
- We haven't signed up yet. We haven't decided how to manage the create/review & concur process and who has authority to review and concur. That's why we are all here today.

- Not yet, but once everyone is on I think it will.
- xxxx is presently set up for e-transfers although I haven't used it yet. I do agree though that processing the forms electronically will be much more efficient and quicker.
- The only reason we haven't used it is because we haven't had any transfers to do.
- Will be using the process on future transfers.
- xxxx is in the process of signing up for the e-transfer system.
- Haven't had any transfers to do yet.
- Looking forward to the decrease in turn around time on having transfers registered. Also looking forward on being able to better track the status of execution and not deal with the paper trail.
- I'm just in the process of signing us up. I was having trouble finding the site on the ADOE website but was able to contact ADOE and have it clarified (hopefully).
- I have not had a chance to use the system and it sounds great on paper. I like the idea of mandating the system for P&NG leases – the system is only as good as the actions/efforts of the users.
- Haven't yet used e-transfer but have signed up to do so with anticipation that it will be simplified.
- Just received internal approval yesterday and will be signing up within the next couple of days and processing an e-transfer. I attended the-transfer session in March and found it very informative.
- Haven't actually used it yet but xxxx is set to utilize. My role will only be as approver.

- Xxxx has signed up for the e-transfer system but has yet to process any transfers this way. I attended the recent CAPLA course on e-transfers and strongly believe this will simplify the whole transfer process.
- Partial transfer of lands within a lease – e.g. lease covers 5 sections only want one section transferred. Can you still do it? Can you do it electronically and will a fee still be charged for the new agreement issued?
- Must have some flexibility. Some companies may be defunct or not have email access. Some provisions must be made for extremely unusual circumstances. Other than that, I really like this initiative.
- My concern is how you are going to get companies to get ETS accounts. Both times I've tried to do an e-transfer I was unable to because not all of the parties had ETS accounts.
- Cannot comment on simplified process, as I have not used it at this time.
- Haven't used it yet, but will be.
- Roles within the company still have to be identified and then implemented.
- Once we have process in place, I believe it will be great. Having difficulty determining how transfers will come in to company who reviews and who concurs. Presently setting up accts for 30 – 40 people on the website, but having difficulty determining how this will work in company.
- Looking forward to using e-transfers. Based on the presentation it appears to be very efficient and forward thinking.
- Not previously aware of it. If I don't have a computer am I prevented from mailing or receiving transfer of lease?
- In the process of going on to e-transfers.
- Bright lights behind speaker – distracting and unable to see speaker.
- I will start using e-transfers shortly.
- We are not using yet, but it should certainly simplify process and be quicker and much more efficient.
- This process is handled mostly through our A&D department.
- I can definitely see the benefits of this process, however, with so many viruses, can the data be corrupted, or destroyed putting the whole process at a halt?
- Still in the process of setting up and converting our EN numbers.
- Intend to start using e-transfer system ASAP. I am confident that this will simplify administration and processes.
- Looks like a very good system – very cost effective and efficient system to address transfers. Call me old fashion but I'm still nervous about e-bidding.
- Have not tried a transfer yet, but did attend a training/information session.
- This will help keep co-op structures in better shape where partnerships are concerned. Allows for beneficial ownership and registered ownership to be better aligned.
- My clients intend to use this but are not set up yet.
- Would like to utilize this new process more however finding most brokers do not have an ETS client number. Good to hear this is being addressed currently.
- My clients are not using e-transfer and if one of the partners is, we still use the manual system.
- We intend to but it hasn't yet moved to the top of the list.
- No transfers required so far.

- Haven't used yet, but working in the A.D. end of the business, it will greatly save time and paper.
- I think it will be great – once everyone is using it, could be bedlam until then.
- Good overview to encourage more use especially in small shops where time is restricted as are staff for all roles.
- Unfortunately all the transfers we have attempted have been with transferees who are not yet registered. Looking forward to completing our first on-line transfer.
- I believe we will be setting this in place in our company soon.
- We have not had to transfer anything yet, but will try it when I have to transfer ownership.
- I believe it will when everything is in order.
- E-transfers is a great idea. I like all the benefits save time, less paper, you only print off what you need.
- I think this new process is a great addition if we can add more things to this method we could streamline administration processes even further. We look forward to seeing these.
- Haven't had the opportunity to use it yet but look forward to using it. We are set up to make use of it.
- What if one of the parties isn't registered. Can you still submit it the old fashion way?
- Have not used this system yet so cannot advise whether this has simplified administration.
- I look forward to trying it.
- I don't personally use this, however, I know that we (xxxx) use it.
- Just registered – haven't done anything yet.
- Will be tremendous to have this in place for land sales.
- Sounds like it will really speed up processing documentation - excellent!
- It will be very important to get all companies registered, so it will be easier to utilize. For smaller companies the DOE may have to contact to encourage participation.
- Very excited about and looking forward to using it!
- Audrey provided great training for e-transfers. Congratulations – job well done.
- There is still quite a few companies that are not yet set up on this system but it should improve with time.
- No – too small at this time.
- We have set up our ETS account and at the present time, are assessing how to assign roles. It would be nice to see how industry is managing this process.
- I can see major problems for leases taken under brokers. I hope their fees do not get out of hand because they can no longer prepare documents when leases are granted.
- With ETS account number for xxxx, it should be a workable system.
- It will simplify process once it is mandatory.
- Manual transfers – if there is a slight mistake, I think it should still be allowed that if the land admin was to speak to the above the ADOE could correct the mistake due to the verbal agreement of land admin and allowing the DOE to input the transfer onto the auto system w/o rejection.
- Have not done any at present time.
- xxxx is in process of establishing its business roles and signing authorities for this process. We agree this will reduce cycle time for all parties.
- Not currently using system but see potential to simplify the process.

- Our company is using but I personally haven't gone in. I can't imagine why this system wouldn't be a great enhancement.
- I am hoping you will have more sessions on how to use the process.
- Intend to use in the future.
- In a province so strong as ours you should be hiring additional experienced staff to compliment your e-business initiatives.
- Need to get brokers to brainstorm new process for transfers on mineral agreements held in trust. Once that works and all other companies have bought in – strongly agree. Love the turn around time with this new system.
Haven't actually used the system yet.
Haven't had the opportunity to actually use the system.
- Very well done – user friendly.
- I have not yet used the system but believe it will be beneficial to all
- Haven't heard feedback on this yet.
- xxxx is set up to use it; however, I have not used the system yet.
- It looks like it will be simplified; I cannot say for sure until we are actually working live on the system.
- 4 types are a bit confusing as to which.
- How long will the transfers stay on the system- waiting for next company to sign off on the transfer (i.e.) 3 months, 5 months? Will an e-mail be sent out stating – need to resubmit the transfer?

e-Postings – Brenda Allbright

Do you agree with reducing the seven-week internal review process to fiveweeks?

Stro ngly Disa gree	Disa gree	Som e what Disa gree	Some what Agree	Agree	Stro ngly Agree
--	----------------------	---	--------------------------------	--------------	--------------------------------

Comments from respondents:

- Do not process these
- As long as the DOE can complete the review in that 5 week time period
- Would like to understand exactly how it could be simplified within the DOE. If done with fairly little confusion then could see industry supporting the decision provided the only impact to industry be a decrease in time frame (i.e. purely an internal change with the DOE.)
- If the reduced timing has no impact on publish dates or sale dates, I don't think it will make a difference to the company posting the land. I don't feel a change is necessary.
- I am not familiar enough with the process to really offer comments other than I am always a proponent of streamlining processes, increasing efficiencies and maintaining/improving effectiveness.
- Great idea.
- Doesn't really matter, either way is fine.

- Security of information is the utmost of importance. What guarantee will be put in place to ensure this?
- It's working well – gives government and companies time to further evaluate lands.
- I do not work in this area.
- In most situations, 2 weeks difference is not likely to be significant for operations.
- N/A to my job.
- Suggest shortening internal review is positive, however, given access issues and time required to contract equipment and obtain other regulatory (i.e. AEUB) approvals for activity (such as drilling an adjacent well) to evaluate a parcel, the current total time of 7 weeks should be retained. This, potentially, would add 2 weeks to the time between publication of notice and the sale date.
- Not familiar with the process but will have to get back to you after asking internally.
- I would not recommend reducing the time period below 5 weeks. For the party who is being proactive by posting rights – they may need this time period to plan operations (i.e. shoot 3D seismic) prior to the publication of the sale.
- Cannot answer as not involved in this aspect of the business
- It should speed up the business cycle/sale cycle.
- Why change something that is working?
- Not involved in the current process so I cannot comment intelligently on proposed or potential changes.
I am not involved in this process so it would not be appropriate to comment.
I don't do land sale, but it sounds much better then the old days.
- Good process to automate.
- Industry is used to the timing and how it works as is.
- I cannot answer this question, as I don't handle postings in my job.
- Don't have a great reason for this but anything that speeds up processes is positive.
- I do not use e-postings so therefore can provide no comments.
- Agree if the agencies involved can respond consistently.
- Sounds good, but don't have enough expertise in this area, and the implications of this to the posting party.
- Everything works well today. Lets keep a successful process in place.
- It is beneficial to reduce this internal review process if it results in industry having access to lands being posted earlier so that we have more time to review the lands and determine whether or not we would like to bid on the parcel.
- I do not see any industry issues to reduce the internal process time.
- E-bidding – how secure is your bid letter as compared with dropping off envelope.
- Allow for quicker cycle time.
- I don't work in this area.
- Need to compensate for activities that go to a sale i.e. - review drilling into sale, seismic into sale, advanced posting will need to be assessed to allow certain new activities.
- Unsure – I don't worry/work with postings – would have to ask the people who do handle this.
- Not sure what the repercussions would be on our geologists.
- Unsure what this impact will be for us. So long as process is clear, change okay.
- May impact seasonal drilling?
- Cannot comment at this time without consultation with our exploration group.

- I will defer comment to our land negotiators.
- Current electronic data available should allow companies to reduce their review time.
- As long as government processes aren't jeopardized or short cuts made.
- When drilling into a sale this becomes a bit of an issue especially when dealing in spring break up, that extra 2 week window sometimes is a blessing.

Suspension of Third Party Requests to Review Non-Productive Rights – Grace Matias

Comments from respondents:

- Disagree to the suspension.
- I think third party requests are necessary; however, a fee would not be an unreasonable solution to frivolous requests.
- Disagree with suspension. As a company, I don't believe we mis-use the review system. Usually we request review in more extreme cases because of the length of time before lands/rights actually become available.

I do understand the concerns of industry with regard to industry not having access to Third Party Requests. I would think that industry would pay a fee should they be serious about.

I believe that the third party requests have been a valuable tool used by the industry in developing Alberta's oil & gas resources. I would think that the increased revenues of lands which have been Sec 18 and brought back through Crown Sales and/or new production brought on would pay for the increased costs incurred by the Department to administer this program.

- Would ask that consideration be given for either a fee based request or application be limited to companies with established area/holdings, and minimum acreage to prevent section by section requests. Will "forced farm-ins" be brought into action? How will this be affected by shallow rights reversion once instituted?
- I agree there is more benefit in doing a larger area.
- Agree a fee would be a great way to at least decrease the amount of requests received while still having the ability to submit them instead of suspending all together.
- If area reviews are increased significantly, then this is acceptable. Otherwise, non-productive rights can be held almost indefinitely with no recourse for third parties. Farm-ins are very often not available if the company holding the land has no motivation, i.e. their land is HBP. They're much more willing to deal when they have a Sec 18 Notice. Alternatively, the department could drop the area reviews and rely on third party requests. This would focus attention on the lands that are of interest to industry.
- Charge a fee for third party requests as long as sufficiently researched, by applicant – issue is legislating due diligence to requesting parties (applicants) – lower priority item
- I think that should a company want to request a review that they should also be required to post and bid on the parcel should they be successful.
- Think this process should be kept; however, perhaps by instituting fees it would eliminate a percentage of the requests that are not intent on pursuing the rights.
- Agree with Alberta Energy's position – should focus efforts on area reviews.
- Is there an on-line map that industry could have access to see what areas have been reviewed and when they were last reviewed and what areas are upcoming?

- Did not address when the suspension would become effective. Also, how long will the temporary suspension be in force?
- Don't like this. If the objective is to minimize administration, perhaps a charge to the party requesting the review could help fund the cost of additional administration. This is important to industry!
- Can you post a schedule of which areas are currently under department review? Is it possible to develop a form that would guide industry through a review process that would then save the department time in reviewing?
- A lot of land is essentially "sterilized" until DOE happens to do an area review. Perhaps these should be some kind of an obligation to post and bid on lands, therefore, the DOE time to review would be justified.
- Maybe if you charge for third party requests you won't get as many or only people really serious about it will send in a request.
- A review is certainly needed here.
- Are the criteria listed somewhere as to what would grant you acceptance?
- Would rather see a fee implemented for third party reviews rather than a full suspension/discontinuation unless area reviews are conducted on a more regular basis and not only every 10 – 15 years.
- Strongly disagree with this! Industry should have input into where review occurs. Don't mind fee for application.
- While I understand your reason to suspend third party requests, a suggestion for streamlining would be for a template of questions that industry needs to answer to qualify for a review by DOE. This way you know that a company has completed a comprehensive review themselves first.
- Really feel that we should have the ability to request review (department) to look into why a specific lease is continued (Sec 15) when it is not producing. Request a review is important.
- I can't really comment on this as I have never been part of this process
- 3rd party reviews a fee for these are a good idea and it should be substantial or based on amount of work required by the department. Perhaps break it down and charge accordingly.
- In favour – if this is to be a temporary suspension – will we be informed if this changes to a permanent suspension or that we may again submit requests?
- Refreshing to see that the Crown is suspending – the Sec 18 notice provisions address the reversion of non-productive rights. If the Crown brings this back, there should be a price tag to the third party making the request to address the Crown's costs associated with these requests.
- If the DOE charged a fee to process a third party request (e.g. \$1,000) it might reduce "nuisance" requests and fund the cost for department review of the request. I would prefer paying a new fee rather than see right suspended.
- Could e-business, by grouping requests in an area together, resulting in an area review.
- Do not think this is appropriate. Feel the DOE should review activity on 3rd party notices since expiry. Believe such a review would reveal substantial activity and bonus amounts. While farm-in is an option – it often isn't possible with larger companies that refuse to do deals and sterilize lands.

- xxxx made the suggestion of a fee for 3rd party requests previously in a committee meeting. A fee of around \$5,000 would likely reduce frivolous requests and would ensure that the right areas are being reviewed. Perhaps the 900 sq. mile area review could be then based on 3rd party requests.
- Fees are a good idea! I think it would be a benefit. Fees would detour companies from false requests – make them do their homework.
- Seems to make sense if they generate a small % of review. Rather than suspend totally, perhaps some criteria needs to be established before a request review is undertaken.
- Great presentation – clarification was required to industry.
- I think this is a good idea given the statistics presented. For a small oil & gas company this may not be the best in the competitive environment we are currently in.
- Somewhat in favour of dropping this.
- It appears to be a good initiative to better use department resources and eliminate frivolous applications.
- Am strongly in favour of this proposal.
- Should look at “who” is initiating 3rd party reviews. My experience is the small companies (0-1000) may not be able to get the attention of the medium to large companies and therefore use this process more frequently. This suspension could hurt a portion of industry that because of size is already disadvantaged.
- Agree to suspension temporarily.
- 28% is still a very large number. Having the ability to trigger a review is still very important. A fee charge may be a consideration. I don’t feel this review should ever be taken away.
- Should be allowed for a fee.
- Is there an opportunity for industry to know what areas are being reviewed or when they will be? A public disclosure of the department’s plan for area reviews would be in order.
- If it takes 15 years to complete the 900 sq mile area by area, we may not be accurately targeting the areas that need to be reviewed. If DOE receives 3rd party requests for a certain area, this is the area that should be reviewed.
- I think charging a fee would eliminate some of the 3rd party requests.
- Agree as long as the area review process is ongoing in a timely fashion.
- Disagree – but in the sense that parties requesting review should be in the extreme case, i.e. farm-in not possible. Maybe Crown could post the areas under review?
- Provide industry with opportunity to recommend priority of area reviews. Allow industry to pay for a specific review.
- As the province is so large and it does take an immense amount of time to review all areas, removal of this will reduce industries ability to have incorrect situations resolved within a timely manner. I do recognize the time and cost to industry, but still believe this is an important right for industry.
- I like the idea of implementing a fee for 3rd party requests. I think the amount should be about \$1,000 - \$5,000. This won’t discourage companies to do 3rd party requests, but enough so that companies will be willing to do their part before considering it.
- The suspension of small 3rd party requests is fine; however, there should be a mechanism through which industry can provide guidance as to where “area reviews” should be conducted. Also, the department should let industry know where it is planning an area review. That way, industry can be more pro-active rather than re-active.

- Informative – was not aware that other companies requested review of an area.
- Should consider industry requests as a guide to new area reviews.
- Don't agree with this. Just as with postings, industry input/interest should initiate the area review. Suspending the requests given more communication to those parties holding continued rights and not willing to deal. Will e-mail Grace with comments.
- Would like to see procedure retained to free up unproductive land.
- Notwithstanding that 3rd party requests result in 28% of issued Sec 18 notices and that 302 requests don't result in a notice, 70% of the requests do result in Sec 18 notices. While this benefits the province and the applicant. Consider a fee (\$5K) if you make a request and no notice results.
- Companies I work with utilize the Section 18 requests and believe still want to be able to do this. Things change so waiting for the DOE to go back to review an area will be frustrating. In all cases where I have made application for review, we had contacted the company to farm out unsuccessfully.
- I agree with the suspension of 3rd party requests and applaud any efforts to improve the turn around time on continuation applications.
- Your method of handling this situation seems fair.
- DOE should recognize that requests for small areas for review are integral to our business vs. waiting for a large area review that may never happen in the appropriate area, or trying to deal with an intractable or unreasonable lessee.
- Will industry know which “area review” is being carried out at any one time? A suggestion would be to post the area review on the Crown's website. This way we can see where the Crown is reviewing and how the review may impact our company.
I disagree with this suspension.
- I believe there should be a fee set up for 3rd party requests rather than eliminate them all together.
- Please keep in place.
- Don't agree, would be okay with the introduction of a fee, which would help ensure proper applications.
- Suggest DOE post where reviews are occurring for Area Reviews. Perhaps “fee for review” is the route to go for specific cases.
- If the Crown does not revisit an area for review and 3rd party reviews are suspended, then right that may be able to produce will be unavailable.
- As a small company player the 3rd party review process allows us to shake the tree to get specific lands to be dealt with by larger companies. The suspension of this process is a large disappointment to me. A charge for a 3rd party review would be a fair alternative (\$2,500 per section).
- Agree – speed up continuation and stay out of industry deals.
- I'd rather see the Crown charge for a review. If farm-outs were as easy to obtain, as you seem to think, then 3rd party reviews would not be required. If the 70% of 3rd party reviews requested by industry that are successful and when lands expire and are reacquired, how much money did the Province receive? Surely the bonus hugely outweighs the cost to your department?
- There seems to be an assumption by the department that farm-ins are an alternate solution to this problem. However, it has always been very difficult to farm-in on land that enjoys a Section 15 Continuation, as there is little motivation for the tenure holder to farm-out.

If industry input is to be eliminated the department's review process should be less random. Perhaps a map should be created that identifies the portions of the province that have infrastructures/or oil/gas production and the reviews should focus on wells in these areas that have been shut-in or suspended for extended periods.

- Please don't. Charge a fee. Require data to support the application. Although farm-ins are an option, many of the majors who hold these leases don't make it a priority to deal with the small movers and shakers (operators). Getting even phone calls returned from some is a huge step. Back in the day, deal making was a lot easier than it is today. Negotiators comment all the time how tough it is now, especially with the majors or companies on the sale block who no longer care to even return your calls, let alone begin talks to deal. Sec 18 becomes a last option.

- Has there been notification to industry of this suspension?

- I agree with this temporary suspension but would request a periodic update to industry regarding future plans including industry feedback. I also agree with looking at feasibility of a fee for a 3rd party request.

- What is the estimated time frame for the suspension period?

- Temporary suspend – stick to area reviews only but charge money for 3rd party requests.

- Allow 3rd party requests but charge a fee - say \$10,000?

- Some industry input should be received towards which areas get reviewed.

I appreciate how much work this must be; however, I think it is important to have a mechanism in place to allow companies to advise the department where Section 18 notices need to be served.

I agree to charge a fee to those companies who request review of non-productive rights.

- We do understand that area reviews do take time and that the province is of a large nature; however the ultimate outcome is that issuing notices would benefit the department and requesting party – more money earned at land sale bids and more wells being drilled, royalty revenue/rental revenue. A fee may be a good idea, which could be allocated to hiring a team of individuals to review these requests vs. area reviews.

- Disagree. Perhaps impose a penalty to those requests made by companies who did not do their "homework".

Addressing wells on cancelled/reverted rights – Grace Matias

Comments from respondents:

- I hate to see the old system changed but I understand that it is not your responsibility to review our wells.

- Mineral Admins understand the severity of trespass. It has and will be an ongoing struggle to make the geology engineering and prod. Departments understand and take responsibility for any penalties.

- Can see a continuing problem with accuracy of information regarding well bores – will this also flag wells where well owner is not identified as a ??? interest owner.

- Appreciate the details on what option/requirements we have for wells on expired lands/rights.

- Sounds like a good proposal. Thank you for the valuable information i.e. Sec 16.

- Please add means to trespass on DOE website. Because of penalty industry wants a defined definition of trespass.

- Agree that onus should be on industry to submit continuation applications in timely manner or also to ensure that are not trespassing.
- Changes will be helpful.
- When will the new process take effect?
- Might the generic paragraph lead to some confusion? If a company sees the well on the list it might think the entire well should be abandoned when in fact you only can't produce beneath a specific zone. Sec 16 reg & compl. On the spacing unit only – good information to know.
- EUB and ADOE should communicate better. It appears to me that one party should have the ability to make appropriate decisions for both departments that ensure equity. The role should be something like an Ombudsman.
- Good update and suggested changes.
- Must very clearly define trespass - too grey of an area. There are a number of trespass conditions that go beyond simply stating, "if it doesn't fall in the confines/definition of your lease agreement".
- Important information.
- The trespass issue is a concern and so clear and concise information will help ensure the reduction of trespass issues.
- Good reminder about the cessation of operations of wells at the end of the primary term (excepting Sec 16) to avoid trespass issues.
- Process currently has not been a problem.
- Grace – just an observation there still is some confusion out there about being able to continue operations in the time frame of expiry and continuation review. I'm not sure how the government can communicate their policy any clearer – good luck!
- Would prefer to keep existing process.
- Is this just a shift in cost from those with the best information to those with something less and therefore a shift that will potentially increase trespass situations?
- Companies take more care evaluating their rights after reversion – trespassing issue to watch out.
- Agree with the standard blurb.
- Good idea that wells listed on letter.
- Agree – should be the responsibility of industry – will help cut back the timing for continuation turn around.
- Further information regarding trespass and Sec 16 exclusion would be helpful.
- The letter/advice is a very useful tool.
- Good to reinforce the message.
- Good compromise.
- I would like to see a well status on the letter along with UWI so that you can quickly look to see if it is oil or gas. This would allow us as administrators to flag things for our geologists.
- Excellent – reduce orphaned wells program.
- Trespass needs to be specifically outlined. Comment regarding producing over expiry was extremely contradictory and when the fine becomes so extreme that it may be at the cost of ones employment – makes the issue personal.
- Question – does the EUB anticipate a change in their process or will all wells flow through compliance issues.

- Could we get a CAPLA course dealing with re-entries? Or maybe a CAPL course? Difference between declaration and re-entry authorization? xxxx's gas ops are less than 50% re-entries and we are still learning as we go (we reacquire the minerals take over the well from previous owner). WISH: amend re-entry authorization from 2 months to 3 months aligns better with non-routine licencing with EUB.
- Agree with your approach, as we should be well aware of what activity is or has occurred on our rights. Industry has a great duty to review their internal processes, stakeholders and what data they have available and how that can be delivered to make better decisions.
- May increase telephone calls to ADOE seeking clarification of responsibilities.
- This is a great heads-up for people who may not take care of their wells in a timely manner.

Consultation process for streamlining Freehold Mineral Tax – Richard Dmytryshyn

Comments from respondents:

- Great changes.
- Good to hear this as we have had many problems with F.H. taxes in the past.
- Any changes for streamlining this process would be welcomed.
- Need to have major clarification on exactly who is to be invoiced by Alberta Energy, too much confusion when lessor and multiple lessees being invoiced.
- Agree this is an area, which could use review, and simplifying or streamlining will be welcomed.
- Only one lessee should receive invoice (lessee copy) of the FMT to prevent duplicate payments.
- Interesting
- Excellent initiative – can't wait to start working on this.
- What about possibly invoicing the well licensee only rather than the title owner(s) and/or lessees?
- Good updates.
- Tax well operator.
- Not involved with this.
- Since a system is already in place for providing division of interests for Crown wells/perhaps the same process for freehold ownership could be provided and thus the government could bill only the owners of the wells. I think this would reduce a huge amount of 3rd party billings.
- Didn't say anything we already knew.
- A very good initiative that should benefit both industry and government. I look forward to see progress updates.
- Very informative presentation. Should land send a letter to Lessor at tax time clarifying who pays what (thus avoiding duplicate/triplicate payments and refunds)?
- Looking forward to consultation to streamline this process.
- Any initiative that can potentially decrease the amount of confusion as to who pays would be most welcome. The number of owner queries is significant. I will be looking for an opportunity to get involved in this one.
- Lessee's companies should only be sent out to one Lessee (payor of lease). There should be some requirement for the current payors/operator of the lease to ensure that the title is

linked to that company – should be mandated. I also feel that interest shouldn't be charged when a re-assessment is done in July and more tax is payable.

- More information sessions on how FMT works would be appreciated.
- Look forward to hearing more on this.
- Very good initiative.
- Good idea to try to get greater clarity in this area. From the land side in a partner scenario, it seems unclear what WI owner handles, particularly where operator is not the lessee (although persons paying portion of royalty directly to lessor for its WI) – easier if 1 WT payor who ?? out to other WI owners.
- I will contact CAPLA to join this committee for FMT.
- If we are to eliminate the duplicate billing it may be beneficial to set up a designated rep for FMT and that party bills the proper parties.
- Very good – need to touch on linking/delinking.
- The time frame from issuing tax statement (Feb) to having them due March 25 would be nice to have this time frame extended.
- Didn't really tell you a whole lot other than a lengthily description of the massive complications with it (due to large volumes, etc).
- xxxx would like to provide input and meet with government reps.
- Excellent objective – process greatly requires streamlining.
- Would like to have a payor of the FMT made to avoid confusion of multiple payment being made.
- Lessee copies should identify in large lettering – lessee copy only – do not pay, as well a standard form should be created by the department for change of lessee notification and make it a standardized procedure.

Tenure regulation changes – Paul Batke

Comments from respondents:

- Happy about simplification of table in schedule 2.
 - Strongly agree with the idea put forward of having openness and clarity as to what constitutes trespass subject to the \$50,000 penalty.
 - Add trespass info to web site.
 - Industry needs a “definition” of trespass.
 - Agree with changes to offsets.
 - Looking forward to seeing a “what constitutes a trespass” article!
 - Trespass penalty is a major concern and industry needs to fully understand what constitutes trespass.
 - Add trespass information to web site.
 - Think it is great that some fees have now been changed to reflect that they are penalties.
 - Need clarification on exact regulations pertaining to trespassing.
 - Trespass clarification, please.
 - Update DOE website to include various ways trespass happens – define/clarification.
- Update website to include an area that defines some common terminology and applicable (related) regulations – identify related areas and regs.

- Please post to website what you consider constitutes trespass. As was discussed at the presentation, with a \$50,000 penalty being instituted, the industry needs to have clear direction as to what you constitute a trespass.
- Interesting and informative.
- Measures be put in place establishing what constitutes a trespass.
- Companies don't trespass on purpose. \$50,000 penalty too high. Information letter 2003-05 needs to be rewritten for clarification.
- Department should outline what they consider trespassing.
- Clearly define what constitutes trespass. Given the high penalties involved, industry should have absolute clarity on this issue.
- More information is needed on trespass on ADOE website and to raise awareness that a huge penalty exists effective July 1, 2004. Punishment should fit the crime – it seems totally unfair that someone is hit with a \$50,000 fine for failing to acquire a 2 ha parcel under a stream when the rest of the section is owned by a Freehold owner.
- All Tenure Reg changes are well conceived except the trespass fee. I believe the increase incidence of trespass has little to do with lax operations by oil companies, but by increased interpretation of what constitutes trespass i.e. road allowance. If you own Crown P&NG on both sides, what difference does it really make? Please see previous Ombudsman comment. (see addressing wells section).
- Request that you provide an information letter strictly dedicated to trespass issue. What is deemed as trespass?
- Thanks for doing this process.
- Really feel \$50,000 is excessive. Need clarification on what is trespassing.
- \$50,000 is a reasonable trespass fee. A lot of these trespass issues can be avoided by reading the regulations and improving communications externally.
- More information about trespass is required.
- Paul, might be a good idea to send a letter outlining what is trespass.
- Need a clear list/examples of what constitutes “trespass.” With \$50,000 penalties, people will lose their jobs and maybe their careers!
- Trespass – *M&M Act* more info need.
- Have concerns about new trespass penalty – i.e. no provision for credit for self-disclosure.
- Agree that we need better information about what constitutes a trespass situation.
- Trespassing guidelines needed.
- Trespass – provide examples in frequently asked questions. List those situations where companies have trespassed.
- Offset changes will e a good idea.
- Put trespass situations on website. For \$50,000 penalty we should know what comprises a trespass situation.
- Trespass situations should be available FAQ – Crown Equity.
- Further clarification of what constitutes a trespass would be appreciated.
- July 1, 2004 is a good time to implement.
- \$50,000 for trespass is excessive penalty. Crown could use a ladder for penalty – depending on the number of incidents of trespass the company has. Could also base penalty on type of trespass extent of trespass and if company notifies Crown of trespass.
- Want clarification as to trespass.

- I think it is important to have a guideline as to what a company should or should not do to avoid trespass.
- Please advise what involves a trespass charge of \$50,000. Guidelines in black and white will result in lower trespass charges against companies.
- Definitely need “trespass” information and examples to be made available. \$50,000 is an excessive amount that may cause loss of employment trying to do a good job – in the field.

- Good message about the dialogue process with industry.
- I am glad to hear that the regulations support re-entry wells as grouping wells as quite often these re-entries cost a lot of money and they do usually treat the re-entry as uncovering new information regarding the play.
- Comment on trespass – I think it is industry’s responsibility to ensure they are not in trespass – you don’t have the mineral rights – you don’t produce.
- Trespass requires some definition/clarification – especially for a \$50,000 fine!!!
- I agree trespass needs to be detailed to all of industry.
- \$50,000 - need full detail on trespassing. Would there be an appeal process?
- Penalty of \$50,000 is extremely harsh. Would be appreciated if as much information as possible be made available on potential trespass situations i.e. heads-up for industry.
- Agree and feel the department is moving forward.
- My comment is that \$50,000 per trespass is too much of a penalty. I do not believe that one would knowingly set out to trespass when the rules are in place, but only would trespass unknowingly. Please consider lowering this penalty.
- Very informative – I was not aware of most of these changes, nor the timelines.
- Procedures required on re-entries by new mineral owner on acquired well bores. Declaration. Re-entry Authorization. We don’t even want to be deemed in trespass. How do we know when we may be in danger of trespass? We’ve asked before, but answers have been unclear.
- Clarification of what may constitute a trespass.
- Would like to see a clearer outline of what constitutes trespass as brought up in session.
- Agree with the request for clarification on what constitutes “trespass.” Also would like ADOE to consider reduction of penalty for companies that come forward to ADOE on trespass situations.
- Need definitions for trespass. Should be an appeal process as \$50,000 is a lot of money for a minor trespass.
- Trespass penalty of \$50,000 validates the seriousness of the offence and is justified. Outlines of what trespass entails should be provided but I agree extensive details should not be provided, as it will generate ideas of how to bend the rules.
- Need more information on trespass and new penalties.
- Please make available information of trespass either on website, letter, especially with the \$50,000 fee.
- Add trespasses to website – I would agree that with a fee of \$50,000 a bit more of a guideline should be available to the operators (or an information letter).

Update – Natural Gas in Coal (NGC/CBM) – Sharla Rauschning, Audrey Murray

Are you satisfied with the direction taken regarding the tenure aspect of Natural Gas in Coal (CBM) development?

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Some what Disagree	Some what Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
--------------------------	-----------------	---------------------------	------------------------	--------------	-----------------------

Comments from respondents:

- Zone specific retention sounds like an admin nightmare for both industry and ADOE – more leases, rentals, continuations, and expiries for the same piece of land.
- Lets produce and get richer!
- I like the idea of zone specific leasing. I would be in favour of a shallow rights reversion on existing agreements.
- Like the go forward basis for zone specific leasing, but would like to know impact in possibility of shallow rights reversion.
- Agree that NGC should be included in the current lease and that the DOE is looking at trying to make bidding process better for acquiring leases for NGC.
- Continue updating industry and update and maintain as current information on the website.
- Very informative and well presented. I believe that sessions like this are so important to the industry to advise on any changes updates, i.e. coal bed methane, are to the exploration of coal bed methane.
- Don't like specific zone retention – we do a lot of uphole completions. We would rather favour reversion of those zones that might have CBM in certain areas – e.g. revert P&NG to base Edmonton as well as deeper zones.
- I don't like the zone specific retention concept. I would like a lot more information on what is being discussed on this front prior to giving it my blessing.
- Thank you for the update on this new focus within industry. I found your well statistics interesting in comparison to total wells drilled.
- DOE has no control, but it would be wiser to have courts determine ownership sooner rather than later.
- Are the royalty regimes going to change for CBM wells as they are more expensive to drill, etc. Incentive program (are they being considered)?
- At least DOE is attempting to provide better clarification of NGC rights but must go further to allow non-convention producers to break through. It is understandable the DOE does not want to significantly fracture zones; however, where NGC is development can be clearly demonstrated there should be a process in place to revert those zones back into the leasing pool.
- Disagree with zone specific would be an administration nightmare.
- Can we make an effort to use only one CBM or NGC for this substance.
- I'm against zone specific retention. For the party who takes the risk to drill down to the deeper targets, why should they be forced to surrender the shallow rights if they cannot dually produce shallow/deep zones and/or the economics do not support drilling stand

alone shallow wells which could more effectively be produced out of the deeper well bore? A party may not be willing to potentially do much too deeply producing zone(s) in order to conduct an uphole test to obtain the uphole rights. Some deeper targets are also drilled based on stacked uphole targets. By removing the opportunity to exploit these uphole targets may result with fewer deeper and riskier wells being drilled.

- CAPL input into direction was brilliant, thanks xxxx.
- Until some development scenarios are better understood, continuations i.e. spacing units used currently to continue lands may not be appropriate.
- Highly informative presentation. I eagerly anticipate the information session.
- Can you please give me some information on CSUG. Thank you (xxxx).
- Crown has provided direction as to their interpretation, i.e. CBM in natural gas in coal but it may exist in the coal seam or the adjacent sands. We will not regulate CBM & NGC separately. Now industry needs to reach some agreement. I am seeing references to exclusion of CBM in party to party agreements but no understanding or agreement about what is excluded.
- Glad to see that a lot of groups are involved and that the issues are being looked at earlier on in the process.
- It would be nice to see agreement for this.
- Need more info – much interest
- We have seen the negative implications of splitting out rights in bitumen. Still believe Crown/Freehold ownership needs to be dealt with directly.
- Zone specific posting/continuation may be appropriate in NGC areas; however, I don't believe that this is the best approach. Industry costs will go up, stakeholder complaints will escalate and larger companies may leave the province.
- Don't distinguish CBM unless absolutely essential. Rather than writing new policies and regs, provide discretion within existing policies/regs to deal with CBM where this would be appropriate.
- Need definitive ownership on freehold.
- Think as a taxpayer that the shallow rights issue should be looked at openly, particularly now that prices are high (extend beyond NGC context), otherwise comfortable with the direction.
- Need to have more access to rights that contain NGC, maybe should look at revision on rights that are in areas where NGC is being developed. What should be the standard reference - NGC or CBM?
- NGC will soon be "conventional" so it should not be split out or treated differently. It will become a viable "bail out" and should be treated the same as conventional NG – look past the curve.
- If CBM rights are split on agreement could be an administrative nightmare.
- Not really familiar with process.
Do not go down the road of zone specific leasing. Impacts land use, environment, disputes (see oil sands), and orderly development. Also there are not enough staff at DOE or in industry to administer this.
Do you need both the coal rights and natural gas rights to produce CBM?
- I'm not very familiar (yet) with the whole issue of CBM.

Information Letter Tracking Project – Susan Carlisle

Will the search capabilities for the Department Information Letters be a useful tool for you?

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	-------------------	----------------	-------	----------------

Comments from respondents:

- Wonderful idea – w/o keyword search capability.
- The easier it is to find information the better, thanks!
- Want to try it out.
- Will save time knowing where to go and having it organized and easy to find.
- No comments – need to explore website to find out what information is accessible.
- Looking forward to new information on website.
- Very much so. Department website needs reorganization – can't find things now.
- We receive a copy but it is rarely circulated and notification by e-mail would be very helpful in triggering me to go on web and read it.
- Excellent – another impressive initiative by DOE – congratulations.
- Especially useful if you can keyword search.
- Good changes, greater ease in finding an IL.
- How do we sign up as a company or just as individuals?
- Awesome.
- It seems they have addressed many of the issues around ILs.
- A good initiative.
- Makes you want to look at the ILs more often.
- Keyword searching & consolidation with bulletins will be welcome.
- Search range is too big! Prefer hard copies (conventional method).
- As an independent, these are some of the tools that I can stay current with changes to regs, etc.
- Would use it more if easier access – would like to be notified of new IL by e-mail.
- Looks good.
- Excellent
- How do we get on e-mail distribution list?
- The search capability will be useful but still need to be able to drill deeper in the “topic” categories. For example the keyword initiative need to follow up for sure.
- Key word search s/b accelerated. Policies are very well thought out.
- Would like to subscribe to individual types of info letter (e.g. get IL on Royalty Pricing separate from everything else).
- The information letters are extremely useful as clarification of the current regulations. I would like to continue to see new information letters coming out. The ability to search on line information letters using key words would be helpful.
- Yes, it is sometimes difficult to find certain subjects, so I will look forward to the implementation of key work search.

- Perhaps tree menu option (e.g. continuations/Sec 15 (listing all info corresponding)).
- It has been very cumbersome in the past.

-This would be a beneficial resource for land administration. General

Comments

What topics interested you most at this year’s Information Exchange?

e-Transfer & e-Postings	159
Suspension of 3rd Party Requests	104
Addressing of wells rights	12

What other processes would you like to see converted to e-Tenure and in what priority?

Continuations applications (Basic)	150
Encumbrances	110
Offset Notices	132

Comments from respondents:

- Love the forward thinking of DOE.
- Continuations- expedite the process and response time on expired leases and/or approvals on continuations. Reduce waiting time; follow up on expiries to include quick return on notification of cancellation of agreement.
- Overall excellent information session by department. Impressed by calibre of all speakers.
- Replace agreement docs with pdf, xml, tif, one page that substantiates our acquisition – s/b implemented with e-bidding initiative.
- How would the DOE handle any technical data to be submitted in conjunction with a continuation application, offset notice response, etc?
- Due to trespass issues, speeding up continuation application reviews is critical.
- Direct Crown purchases, groupings, licence validation.
- In the winter drilling area, if you have submitted a validation application 3 months prior to expiry, sometimes you still have a period where you cannot do anything until the validation letter has been received and in some cases you have then missed the winter drilling window. I believe the validation process would benefit from being available on e-Tenure.
- This was tough to rank by priority - they are all great things to convert.
- Good session to update me on changes – speakers were very well spoken – information was precise. Good handouts.
- When not sending packages, e-mail would be great.

- Session was very informative and conducted in a very efficient manner.
- A very good session.
- Think that licence grouping tracking would be of great benefit, as tracking seems to be a complex process that could be prone to error, particularly when ?? groupings in place.
- None of the above.
- I feel that licence validation and groupings should be the next process to be reviewed for e-business as these processes are quite straight forward.
- Validated licences s/b automatic with a lag time for “continuation offer.”

Do you have enough access to information regarding e-Tenure?

Yes = 121 (67.98%)

No = 09 (5.06%)

N/A = 48 (26.97%)

How do you get information for e-Tenure? (Nexus, Negotiator, articles, speeches, web page). *All of these areas plus the following comments:*

- CAPLA
- CAPL
- Seminars
- Information Exchange
- E-mails
- Member of Tenure e-design committee and e-transfers group
- Add to Q&A section “how to” section showing examples of how to (for example) complete a posting request or how to complete a re-entry authorization form.
- Information Letters
- More information sessions
- The web page is a great way to communicate as long as there is a place to ask questions and see questions/answers that others ask.
- Subscribe to many e-mail subscription list
- Attend Industry meetings
- Would like to see DOE do more articles in Nexus and Negotiator.
- Good communication to date.
- CAPLA meetings, regular (annual) or sooner if needed regarding big changes, or a meeting such as this.
- The AB website is a great tool. You do a great job in making information available. Thank you for maintaining it.
- Would like to be informed via e-mail
- These sessions are the most beneficial – there is nothing like hearing it from those most directly involved and it allows for questions and explanations.
- As a consultant you don’t always have access. I don’t find Nexus/Negotiator always tell you of specific changes. I also need to work on finding ways to access system.
- E-Tenure should not be the sole channel for information. We seem to be spending too much time on the computer already.
- The Crown’s web page is where I go to obtain information and if I still have questions, I can contact the Crown if necessary.

- Industry association publications, e-mail through Petroleum Registry are slid distribution systems.
- Is there such a medium as an “e-Tenure Newsletter”?
- This system sounds simple and straight forward. Will it be better then the EUB system for access and finding information and submitting forms? The EUB registry is very difficult to access and handle. It is also very different to get problems solved – very long response time.
- Is it possible to send out e-mails to companies that have an e-mail address set up for the e-transfer process?
- This session reiterated to me that I should become a subscriber to the information letters and bulletins to stay on top of issues.
I prefer attending sessions such as this one simply for the reason that you get an update off all news/changes in all the areas, plus the opportunity to address questions/scenarios.
I think it would be helpful to send information/manual packages to industry to ensure we are all updated on information and changes.
- Update website – more current information, more definitions and clarification of common terms, more FAQs – more specifics and examples.

Do you have access to provide concerns to team members or government?

Yes = 101 (56.74)
 No = 05 (2.81%)
 N/A = 72 (40.45%)

Do you have any suggested topics for future Information Exchanges?

- Groupings what can & can't be grouped.
- Trespass – types of trespass
- Session on trespass
- Shallow rights reversion would be good for smaller operators.
- I think at each exchange the government needs to review the “Areas of Review” (3rd party review/requests) they will be reviewing during the following year.
- Areas that are causing the department the most questions and comments – would provide a good basis for an annual or semi-annual session such as today.
- An introduction to NGC
- I signed up for this session because of “horizontal wells/production allocation agreements” and was disappointed that these were not addressed.
- Continuation application process and sample examples of what is approvable and what is not approvable.
- Interactive session on dealing with split ownership of rights, such as continuation issues; posting requests; offset issues; trespass implications; vertical pooling. This may be better handled as a joint CAPL/CAPLA course.
- Understanding the interfaces between agencies and departments i.e. AEUB (zone definitions/designations, re-entries), Surface Rights Board (surface issues vis a vis. continuations, etc), Sustainable Development (approvals for postings, surface issues).
- Need to have trespass information exchange.
- Trespass

- Wells, linking transferring from expired leases
- Abandonment regs and definitions
- Unit agreements
- More in depth resolutions on Freehold Mineral Tax issues.
- Alberta Energy and CAPLA/CAPL are very good about arranging information sessions.
- Shallow rights reversion
- Provide a look back session on decisions made particularly those involving unilateral change on part of DOE (ie: section 18 suspension) to see if deemed successful. How will “success” be defined?
- More on the upcoming Land Sale e-Tenure. Should start to be distributed to make everyone well aware of the guidelines and setups required.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

- Congratulations to all. Has this taken off since the first couple at 100 – 120! I believe this is largely a function of the evolution of the ADOE – Industry relationship to the point where there is a much greater recognition of the commonality of interests than has been the case before the Tenure Review process began. I believe that this is something both ADOE and CAPLA can be very proud of. ADOE has raised the bar for all regulators. I hope this is appreciated fully at senior levels in the Dep’t. Gold for e-tenure.
- Very good presentations today.
- Excellent session overall. Time management was excellent.
- Overlapping issues – sec 18s and freeing up NGC prone areas. Zone specific retention is the best solution. Reference to farm-out is often unrealistic. Many companies will sit on the uphole rights for decades – let other companies prove up lands – then pursue.
- Information session was very informative and set up very well. Speakers were on topic, well informed and the overall session was worth the time I invested to attend.
- Best info session so far. The DOE is always so well prepared to answer all questions and concerns that the Oil & Gas Industry has. Thanks, again.