# DOCKETED

| | |
|---|---|
| **Docket Number:** | 15-MISC-04 |
| **Project Title:** | Fuels and Transportation Merit Review |
| **TN #:** | 206283 |
| **Document Title:** | Sylvatex Inc. Comments: ARFVTP Technology Merit Review Biofuel and Biomethane Project Success |
| **Description:** | N/A |
| **Filer:** | System |
| **Organization:** | Sylvatex Inc./Virginia Klausmeier |
| **Submitter Role:** | Applicant Representative |
| **Submission Date:** | 10/5/2015 11:29:19 AM |
| **Docketed Date:** | 10/5/2015 |

*Comment Received From: Virginia Klausmeier*
*Submitted On: 10/5/2015*
*Docket Number: 15-MISC-04*

## ARFVTP Technology Merit Review Biofuel and Biomethane Project Success

*Additional submitted attachment is included below.*

CEC Technology Merit Review Biofuel and Biomethane Project Success, **15-MISC-04**

**Submitted by: Virginia Klausmeier, CEO, Sylvatex Inc.**

We would like to address the following points that we feel are important while CEC reviews prospective proposals.

1. We believe that some focus should be given to '**partnerships**' between business firms that apply for the CEC grants. The level of knowledge and expertise that can be gleaned from such fruitful partnerships can only lead to good innovation and creative thinking. We suggest the CEC should analyze the existing or prospective partnerships between firms as one entity and base its judgment of proposals on the results promised as a consequence of those partnerships provided they are within a specific timeframe and can prove their ability to deliver.
2. A lot of focus and attention was given to the fact that the prospective companies should be able to **match the funding** offered by the CEC to a certain percentage of the total cost. This line of thinking should be discouraged in our opinion as the entire point of requesting for funds or grants for small business firms or startups is to obtain capital to feed their R&D and business development sectors. It is however good to show that a company has viability and stands in good stead with the capital it already has but a lot of potentially good ideas may never see the light of the day if the funding clause becomes stringent in the CEC.
3. Another factor that the CEC might consider important while reviewing proposals would be the **functional scale-up model** for small business firms in a short amount of time. The fact that a company shows growth with its proposal and has a readily available solution that can be scaled in the short-term future should be highlighted and brought to the attention of the CEC.
4. In accordance with point number 3, companies that have **low capital expenditures** should be encouraged to apply as they offer an added advantage of low set-up costs for their consumers as well as are scalable in the near future which is a huge benefit along with the fact that it shows potential for the company.
5. Lastly, we would like to emphasize the overall importance of **flexibility in solutions** that a company offers such that it can grow and adapt technology to the industry trends; specifically catering to flexibility in feedstocks in the supply chain sector. In this ever-changing market, the ability to cater to various sectors or models through one product is a valuable advantage, which the CEC should keep in mind while reviewing proposals.