General comments:
First, we would like to complement the work that has been done in this document. The feedback from our energy staff is that this type of information, in some kind of formal structured format that defined flows and products, would be an asset . Furthermore, such a document would help to improve STC questionnaires, clarify definitions and update survey respondent reporting guides.

We do also support the suggestion put forward by G. Brown of Australia that:

> "*a classifications expert and an energy expert (perhaps Mr Simmons?) be engaged to ensure that the revised definitions are developed into a classification suitable for statistical purposes (requiring a classifications expert), while retaining the technical accuracy of the energy definitions (requiring an energy expert).*"

This is a key element and essential to further developments. As mentioned at the last UN-Oslo conference, Statistics Canada is willing to work on this issue of classifications.

Specific Comments: They are provided in the page order of the document (Revised definitions of 'Flows'):

Page 5: The Free Trade Zone and custom controlled areas are not applicable to the Canadian context but do understand why they are needed.

Page 5 : In item (i), really do not understand what is meant by "...simply for statistical convenience"

Page 7:
Flared gas: In Canada we show flared gases as a category under production. Lets us keep in mind its importance in terms of GHG.
Conversion Losses: We need to keep in mind the IPCC guidelines.

Page 9:
the writer seems to change the name of "electricity plants" to "thermal electricity plants" to remove the confusion as to what types of generators are included in this category which made sense to us. However, on page 22 when given the definition of "electricity plants" the writer did not include the word "thermal" in the name even though the definition clearly indicated that they were referring to thermal plants only.

We would have liked to see a clearer definition of "distribution losses" since STC has that item on its Supply & Distribution questionnaire, but it is used more like a mean to balance the supply with the demand than actually measuring losses.

We would like to take a closer look at the "final consumption" categories since they are also on our Supply & Distribution questionnaire with the idea of lining them up with the categories in this report, however we did not have enough time.

Page 10: In Canada , Orimulsion is converted to Heavy Fuel Oil equivalent and part of the refinery statistics. It is a small amount.

Page 12: Because of the difficulties in obtaining the data relating to nuclear energy , we agree to the practical strategy outlined in the document.

Page 16: The issue we have faced in Canada relating to imports and exports of energy commodities has not been keep track of the movement of commodities but keep track of and balancing the related financial transactions.

Page 17: Excellent suggestion to have a new definition for aviation bunkers.

Page 26 and 27: Petroleum refineries and petrochemical plants are perfect examples of areas where "....revised definitions are developed into a classification suitable for statistical system " is necessary.

Page 36: This is an interesting attempt to identify the energy sector. However, as discussed at the last Oslo meeting, what is scope of 'energy industries' and what is the scope of 'energy sector' must be fully discussed and in the context /framework of a classification system. This again is in reference to the comments made by Australia.

If you have any questions relating to our comments, please feel to contact me.

Best regards

Justin