

# Minutes



## *ELECTRICITY PROJECT TEAM – Meeting #10*

**December 2, 2002**  
**CASA Offices, Edmonton**

10035 108 ST NW FLR 10  
EDMONTON AB T5J 3E1  
CANADA

Ph (780) 427-9793  
Fax (780) 422-3127  
Email [casa@casahome.org](mailto:casa@casahome.org)  
Web [www.casahome.org](http://www.casahome.org)

### **In attendance:**

Keri Barringer	Environmental Law Centre
Peter Blackall	Environment Canada
Barry Breau	Alberta Environmental Network (guest)
Claude Chamberland	CPPI
Kerra Chomlak	CASA
Matthew Dance	CASA
Joseph Doucet	University of Alberta (presenter)
Susan Dowse	Calpine Canada
Linda Duncan	Lake Wabamun Enhancement and Protection Association
Ed Gibbons	AUMA
Les Johnston	EPCOR
Joe Kostler	ATCO Power
Martha Kostuch	Bert Riggall Environmental Foundation & Prairie Acid Rain Coalition (co-chair)
Bevan Laing	Alberta Energy
Tim Lambert	Canadian Public Health Association
Dermot Lane	Coal Association of Canada
Chow-Seng Liu	Alberta Environment (Management Options Subgroup)
Satwant Lota	EUB
Don Macdonald	Alberta Environment
Tom Marr-Laing	Pembina Institute
Ian Peace	Residents for Accountability in Power Industry Development (Public Consultation Subgroup)
Ansar Qureshi	Alberta Health and Wellness
Kim Sanderson	Recorder
Al Schulz	CCPA
Herman Schwenk	Alberta Beef Producers
Nashina Shariff	Toxics Watch Society
David Spink	Alberta Environment (co-chair)
John Squarek	CAPP/upstream
Harry Tyrrell	Mewassin Community Action Council
Sarah Waddington	Alberta Environment (Public Consultation Subgroup)

### **Regrets:**

Sandra Barnett	TransCanada Power
Paul Hunt	Climate Change Central
Bart Guyon	AAMD&C
Mike Kelly	TransAlta Corporation (co-chair)
Ted Ostrowski	CAPP/Oilsands
Dennis Paul	Paul Band
Justin Thompson	Vision Quest
Evelyn Walker	PPA Buyers

## Action Items:

Task	Who	When
2.1 Keep the Electricity Project Team apprised of the status of the national discussion on a Canada wide standard for mercury.	David Spink	ongoing
10.1 Ensure that the agenda for each EPT meeting contains time for updates from the provincial and federal representatives on activities that could affect the team's work.	Kerra Chomlak	ongoing
10.2 Ensure that a timeline chart from each subgroup is distributed to the team for discussion at the January meeting.	Kerra Chomlak	Jan. 6, 2003
10.3 Describe existing provincial systems for monitoring, reporting and compliance for the five priority substances and offer the department's thinking on plans for substances that do not now have all three components in place (greenhouse gases and mercury).	Alberta Environment	Jan 6, 2003
10.4 Form a pre-subgroup to begin thinking about compliance requirements for selected management options and undertake preliminary research to identify other jurisdictions that are setting up similar systems. Select a meeting date and advise Kerra so she can inform the rest of the team.	Linda Duncan, Keri Barringer, David Spink and Chow-Seng Liu Kerra Chomlak	Dec. 10, 2002
10.5 Provide comments on draft tables 1 and 2 according to instructions from the Prioritization subgroup when the tables are distributed by email.	EPT members	as per email
10.6 Email the list of dates and locations for public meetings to the EPT and ask members to indicate their availability for one or more sessions.	Matthew Dance	Dec. 6, 2002
10.7 Restructure the budget so the numbers are presented in the same format as they were originally, with internal and external accounts.	Kerra Chomlak	Jan. 6, 2003
10.8 Provide details on general cash flow and why the projection for secretariat expenses has gone up.	Kerra Chomlak	Jan. 6, 2003
10.9 Give Kerra some guidance regarding the anticipated level of activity for the team for the next six months.	EPT co-chairs	Dec. 20, 2002
10.10 Inquire about hosting the December 16 meeting of the Management Options Subgroup.	Susan Dowse	Dec. 6, 2002

Joe Kostler convened the meeting at 9:40 am, stepping in for Mike Kelly as industry co-chair. Those present introduced themselves. New members Susan Dowse and Don Macdonald are replacing Rob McManus and Brent Lakeman respectively.

### 1. Administration

- a) **Approval of the Agenda.** Three items were added to the agenda: media request to attend the January EPT meeting, the role of the team in a possible review of the Electric Utilities Act and Bill 32. The amended agenda was approved. The team was reminded that Professor Joseph Doucet would be making his presentation over lunch.
- b) **Minutes of the November 5, 2002 meeting** were adopted by consensus.
- c) **Report on action items from November 5 meeting**
  - 2.1 Ongoing. David Spink advised that Deputy Ministers of Environment are meeting in early December and mercury is on their agenda, so there is likely to be new information on the status of the national discussions on a Canada wide standard for mercury to report at the January EPT meeting.

9.1 Done. Timelines have been developed for the management options work and will be discussed later on the agenda.

9.2 Done. Various members provided comments on the draft slide presentation to Kerra and revisions are ongoing through the Public Consultation subgroup.

9.3 Done. The Optimum Energy report has been distributed to all EPT members.

9.4 Done. A slide presentation was prepared and Mike Kelly delivered it to the CASA board at the November 28 meeting.

9.5 Done. Hon. Lorne Taylor attended the CASA board meeting to discuss the government's climate change plan and CASA's role with respect to the electricity sector.

9.6 Done. The team's key task area #8 on monitoring, reporting and compliance is on the agenda for this meeting.

9.7 Done. Kerra is working with Les Johnston of EPCOR and with Calpine to set up tours of their facilities for the EPT.

**d) Feedback from the CASA Board Meeting**

David Spink summarized the discussion from the November 28<sup>th</sup> CASA board meeting as it pertained to the EPT's work. Hon. Lorne Taylor reviewed the government's climate change plan and where he hopes discussions will go between the federal and provincial governments. Of importance to the team: he summarized his expectations for CASA's work on emissions from the electricity sector, mentioning target reductions for greenhouse gases, with specific reference to coal-fired plants; he also mentioned that he was looking for recommendations on renewables, energy efficiency and energy conservation that could feed into a sectoral agreement. He stressed that these agreements are very important, and they would contain penalties and backstops to ensure that hard targets are met. He mentioned that he would like some guidance on penalties. He noted that CASA would not be negotiating the sectoral agreements, but would be providing a lot of substantive input. When asked if the EPT was bound to work with the government's intensity target, he said the team could look at whatever it wanted, but that members know what the government has put forward, and if the EPT wants its work to be relevant, it would keep that in mind.

With respect to the team's presentation to the board, questions were raised about the Electric Utilities Act (EUA) and whether the team would have input to the current review of the act, and how Bill 32 might influence the team's work. These items will be discussed later in this meeting. When the issue of funding was raised, the board's advice was that the EPT should decide if it needs additional funding and if we can not reach agreement on how to fill funding gaps, the CASA executive could be consulted, as there will not be another board meeting until March. Other related items that came up in the board meeting and that were regarded as important for the EPT to be aware of included:

- how to allow new entrants to the marketplace under any emissions management schemes
- ongoing federal-provincial discussions regarding carbon sinks
- the impact of various provincial approaches to climate change and other emissions on businesses that operate in more than one province
- the issue of mercury

- need for consistency among regulations and rules for addressing greenhouse gases; the minister indicated there may be two parallel tracks on climate change in the short term. The EPT needs to be realistic and to take action at other levels into account in developing its recommendations. The form of many of these actions is unknown but the team should keep track of them and consider the implications for its stakeholders (e.g., how provincial sectoral agreements might mesh with federal covenants). Bill 32, which is enabling legislation, is expected to be law by June and the regulations will be prepared after that.

**Action: Kerra will ensure that the agenda for each EPT meeting contains time for updates from the provincial and federal representatives on activities that could affect the team's work.**

## 2. Management Options Subgroup

### a) Status Update

David Spink reported that the Management Options subgroup (MOS) focused its most recent meeting (November 21) on renewables, energy efficiency and energy conservation. At that meeting the MOS formed two groups to do further work on these topics. These groups are being assisted by Keith Denman of the CASA secretariat; the renewables group meets December 3 and the energy efficiency and conservation group meets December 6. Both will report back to the MOS on December 16.

The MOS also discussed Alberta Environment's Emissions Trading project and opportunities for synergy between this project and the work of the EPT. The CABREE work to model various scenarios proposed by the subgroup is continuing and will be ready for the MOS to discuss at its December meeting. The final report should be ready for the full team by the January 13 meeting.

The team briefly discussed the positioning of renewables and energy efficiency and conservation in its work. While the minister indicated that nothing is "off the table" with respect to these topics, including a public benefits charge, the government's climate change plan does provide some direction and items such as renewable portfolio standards may be "near the edge of the table."

### b) Timelines

Tom Marr-Laing reviewed the timelines for the MOS's work, which will be the rate-determining step for the team as a whole. The crux of the team's work must be completed by March 31, 2003 to allow sufficient time for stakeholder consultation and fine-tuning of recommendations. This is a very ambitious timeline and the team should assess its progress in February to decide if the CASA board should consider requesting an extension of the deadline at its March meeting. Team members acknowledged that the Alberta government is keen to move on sectoral agreements, while at the same time, many things are happening outside CASA that could affect the team's final product. The other subgroups are developing timelines for completing their work and the team agreed to have a longer discussion on the overall workplan and timelines at its January meeting.

**Action: Kerra will ensure that a timeline chart from each subgroup is distributed to the team for discussion at the January meeting.**

### 3. Key Task Area #8 – Monitoring, Reporting and Compliance

The team discussed how it wished to approach this aspect of its terms of reference. Bill 32 makes a number of references to monitoring, reporting and compliance, but this is enabling legislation, and therefore it does not contain specifics on operational components. For example, we are starting from “ground zero” on GHG reporting and compliance, and the details around this need to be fleshed out to operationalize emissions trading. For the five priority substances, it was noted there are three main “chunks”: NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, and primary particulate matter; greenhouse gases; and mercury, and monitoring and reporting requirements are different for each chunk.

Utilities representatives gave a short update on current practice with respect to monitoring, reporting and compliance. Most utility emitters have operating approvals that require monthly and annual reporting for NO<sub>x</sub> and/or SO<sub>x</sub>. Mechanisms for compliance with emissions standards are in place and are well understood. Most utilities in Alberta have been monitoring and reporting their greenhouse gas emissions through the Voluntary Challenge and Registry (VCR). Processes and procedures are in place for reporting based on fuel consumption, applying various emissions factors depending on the fuel source. Reporting generally has been based on CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents, and there are also factors to determine N<sub>2</sub>O and methane, so these can be reported as well. Emissions factors in the VCR process are consistent with the national greenhouse gas inventories prepared by Environment Canada. Greenhouse gas data is important for sectoral agreements and emissions trading, among other things. Some mercury monitoring has been done in the last few years, but not on a continuous basis. The utilities have an agreement with Alberta Environment to monitor mercury for 36 cycles to get a statistically valid number of samples in coal, bottom ash, fly ash and some stack surveys. The first set of results is expected by the end of the first quarter of 2003. Opacity monitoring is required for coal-fired plants and this data can be converted to total PM emissions. Data are subjected to a comprehensive QA/QC process and are thus quite reliable.

Various points were raised during the discussion of this topic:

- The team needs to clarify if it is talking about source or ambient monitoring. The focus should be on source monitoring, but other systems such as NPRI already exist to do this.
- It is important that we consider other processes, and CASA teams that may already be obtaining information; e.g. the PM and Ozone team has discussed monitoring, compliance and reporting, which will address PM, Ozone, NO<sub>x</sub> and SO<sub>x</sub>.
- Some members thought this team should be looking at approvals and standards to see if they are adequate rather than assessing compliance. Other members thought the team needs to look at all three components and that management options should not be developed without considering accountability and compliance mechanisms to give the instrument some substance.
- It may be premature to look at compliance before the team has narrowed down the range of options it wants to consider.
- Concern was expressed about moving to instruments with which Alberta has no experience, which could lead to a range of issues, including liability. Bill 32 raises some flags on this matter. Compliance strategies should be discussed and explored now as part of the discussion of other work.
- It may be possible to do some work in parallel with the emissions trading project.

The team agreed that it would be valuable to assemble information on existing monitoring, reporting and compliance mechanisms in Alberta. Members also agreed that a small group of interested stakeholders should start to look at compliance issues for things that the team knows are “on the table,” such as emissions trading and sectoral agreements, as well as scope out other options that should be examined in detail. This information will be discussed at the January 13 EPT meeting.

**Action: Alberta Environment will describe existing provincial systems for monitoring, reporting and compliance for the five priority substances and offer the department’s thinking on plans for substances that do not now have all three components in place (greenhouse gases and mercury).**

**Action: Linda Duncan, Keri Barringer, David Spink and Chow-Seng Liu will form a pre-subgroup to begin thinking about compliance requirements for selected management options and will also undertake preliminary research to identify other jurisdictions that are setting up similar systems. They will select a meeting date and advise Kerra so she can inform the rest of the team.**

#### Lunch Presentation by Joseph Doucet

Professor Joseph Doucet, an economist with the University of Alberta, was engaged by the Information subgroup to prepare a report entitled “Power Purchase Arrangements, Wholesale Market Organization and Air Emission Management Options.” The subgroup selected an economist to do this work rather than a lawyer because it felt that economic analysis would provide more insight into the impacts on emissions trading or a command and control system. Prof. Doucet was asked to seek legal input while preparing his report.

Professor Doucet’s report to the team was distributed prior to this meeting, and copies of his presentation were also handed out. He stressed that electricity systems and markets are complex and that a wide range of emissions management options exist. He reviewed the six questions he had been asked to address, and concluded by saying that emissions reductions programs are challenging to design and implement, PPA contracts make it more difficult, and a better understanding of cost implications is needed to understand market impacts.

Team members posed a number of questions during the discussion, to which Professor Doucet (JD) responded.

*Q: With respect to the relationship between the owner and the PPA buyer, would an emissions trading system mean that all agreements would have to be renegotiated?*

JD: Emissions trading really means that in a market, entities are responsible for emissions so there has to be a certain number of permits that they can trade among themselves. PPA buyers could be responsible or owners could be. With incentives, if responsibility rests with owners, then they have to do their utmost to reduce the costs they pass onto PPA buyers. PPAs may have to be renegotiated, but it seems that this would be messy and protracted.

*Q: If sectoral agreements are voluntary, what incentives would plant owners have to participate?*

JD: If they participate in a lot of markets, they have an incentive to be viewed as good corporate citizens, and may see benefits they could use in other markets.

AENV: Bill 32 does not suggest that sectoral agreements will be voluntary.

*Q: Are there any potential public policy issues with trying to overlay (a) emissions trading on PPAs and (b) incentives on what is supposed to be a deregulated system? Was this sufficiently thought through before Alberta deregulated its electricity system?*

JD: I would need to have a better sense of the team's objectives to answer that. It is important to recognize that the question of cost allocation is not separate from the efficiency of the system. If government decides PPA buyers should bear a portion of cost, this could affect the efficiency of the system, which in 10-15 years could affect the price residential consumers pay for power. I was not part of the analysis and discussion that preceded the decision to deregulate, but they probably didn't think of everything.

*Q: If a plant goes down, does the PPA holder have to make up the power and, if so, how?*

JD: The PPA buyer owns the energy, so if a plant goes down, there is no energy to sell. The buyer could purchase power on the open market or through a bilateral agreement, but would need to find out why the plant went down and determine who is responsible. All these aspects are spelled out in the contract.

*Q: What other jurisdictions have dealt with these issues and do you have any ideas as to how the EPT could move its work ahead?*

JD: I am not aware of any other jurisdictions that have PPAs and are trying to juggle this approach.

*Q: Have other deregulated systems figured out a different approach?*

JD: Most places are using systems benefit charges. Other places that have restructured faced the problem of stranded costs, while Alberta had the problem of stranded benefits. Most other places had a big envelope of costs that they had to recover and the easiest way was to piggyback charges on wires, etc. This provided an incentive for alternatives.

*Q: With emissions trading, allocations could be made to PPA holders or to generators. The problem with allocations to PPA holders is that they are not supposed to be seen to be in collaboration with each other. How could they work together if they did get the allocations to achieve the required reductions?*

JD: Players in a deregulated market structure are not to be in discussion, but when there is a broader societal reason – such as emissions reductions – that is a different situation. There really is no obvious answer to this one.

*Q: Does the size of the sector influence this analysis? And given the knowledge of the Alberta situation, is there any sense of the size required to keep us below the step where we would lose a PPA holder?*

JD: To take the second question first, there really is no answer yet; we need a better sense of cost first. Regarding the size of the sector, emissions trading clearly works better with a large number of players,

all of whom are small relative to the overall market. With the existing electricity sector, more players would improve the chance of a successful emissions trading program.

*Q: How can this work cleanly when so much generation is done by one company?*

JD: PPA arrangements are novel and they work well, but this was a second best solution; the best would have been divestiture, which would have achieved the market concentration objective.

AENV: It's probable that in 20 years, Alberta will not have PPA buyers as plants turn over.

*Q: Hidden behind the PPAs is a series of private contracts at fixed prices. So the market we see is not the real market. If we affect the interface with PPAs, what is the knock-on effect on those below? Fixed costs matter as these determine health of the market and what consumers pay, and they affect profitability.*

JD: We can't see the price in the private contracts, which makes it more complicated for government.

#### 4. Prioritization Subgroup

The proposed timelines for this subgroup to complete the first part of its task were distributed by email to the team prior to the meeting. Tim Lambert reviewed the timelines for completion of tables 1 and 2 with footnotes. Table 1 describes the criteria used to select the five priority substances and will be 5-10 pages long with the descriptive footnotes. Table 2 looks at the co-benefits for list 2 substances of addressing the five priority substances. The subgroup will be sending these drafts out to the EPT for review and comment in the next week or so. The material will be revised pending those comments and sent out again to the team for discussion at the January EPT meeting. Additional work is needed on list 2 substances, and this will be the focus of the subgroup's activity in the new year, when others with an interest in these substances may wish to join the subgroup.

**Action: EPT members will provide comments on draft tables 1 and 2 according to instructions from the Prioritization subgroup when the tables are distributed by email.**

#### 5. Public Consultation Subgroup

##### **a) Progress Update**

Ian Peace provided the update from the Public Consultation subgroup. The subgroup has been focused on the objectives and format for the public meetings, and how to receive feedback from them. Sari Shernofsky has developed a MS Powerpoint presentation for use at the public meetings, and this was circulated to the team for comment. Feedback focused mainly on the way in which the five priority substances were characterized, and the subgroup would like some guidance on how to deal with this aspect. It was suggested that this subgroup should incorporate content developed by the prioritization subgroup and the management options subgroup into the public presentation and not try to write new material.

It has now been decided that two meetings will be held in the Wabamun area, for a total of nine locations. The Calgary-area meeting will be held in Chestermere. The following dates and locations have been confirmed for public meetings:

Edmonton, Jan. 20  
Keephills, Jan. 21  
Grand Cache, Jan. 22  
Stony Plain, Jan. 23  
Chestermere, Jan. 26  
Brooks, Jan. 28  
Hanna, Jan. 29  
Forestburg, Jan. 30  
Pincher Creek, Feb. 4

Team members previously agreed that they would participate in the public meetings, depending on the dates and locations.

**Action: Matthew Dance will email the list of dates and locations for public meetings to the EPT and ask members to indicate their availability for one or more sessions.**

During discussion, EPT members noted the following points:

- The EPT should be cautious about putting too much material out to the public in a format they will not be able to understand.
- Some members thought the presentation should focus on the process, who's at the table, and what the team is doing, while others felt that the team needs to share more of the substance of its work in order to get meaningful input from the public, including stating clearly why the team was asked to undertake this task.
- Additional detail could be provided in handouts so people can see what has been done and can take something away to digest and comment on; handouts could include evaluation criteria and management options among other things.

The team agreed that the Public Consultation subgroup should manage and coordinate preparation of the content to be presented at the public meetings, including any handouts. They will use materials developed by the Management Options subgroup and the Prioritization subgroup as the basis for the presentation materials. Because there will be a lot of activity in these two subgroups over the next month, it will not be possible to finalize the materials until January. If the Public Consultation subgroup requires help making a decision on content, they can seek guidance from the co-chairs.

**b) Feedback stakeholders have received**

Ed Gibbons and David Spink made a presentation to the AUMA's utility committee and had a very good discussion with them. Joe Kostler will be presenting to the Hanna advisory committee on December 10 and Les Johnston will be doing a presentation to the Genesee advisory committee on December 12. A folder has been set up to store comments and input from stakeholder meetings, so it can be reviewed by the team when developing its recommendations.

6. Information Subgroup

David Spink reported that this subgroup has not met since the last EPT meeting. They arranged for the report and presentation from Joseph Doucet and have requested a one-page item on MS from Larry Svenson at Alberta Health and Wellness; this item is expected to be completed

shortly. The matrix with priorities and gaps noted was sent out to the team and any comments should be forwarded to the co-chairs of the subgroup.

## 7. Workplan and Budget

**a) Workplan and Timelines.** The team agreed to discuss the workplan and timelines in more detail at the January 13 meeting.

**b) Budget.** Kerra reviewed the budget and distributed an updated copy, noting the following changes: the industry contribution is \$73,000 not \$70,000, and the CASA core has agreed to provide \$59,000 to the team (\$17,000 for 2002, and \$42,000 for 2003). The Public Consultation subgroup will come back to the team in January with an estimate for a possible second round of public meetings.

The team discussed the budget, raising the following points:

- The team feels it is getting good support from the secretariat but needs more details on secretariat expenses to understand why costs have increased as much as they have. Kerra noted that the activity of the team and its subgroups has been much greater in the last few months than at the beginning of the project.
- The budget numbers are arranged differently than they were before, which makes it more confusing to understand changes; it would be useful to revert to the earlier format with internal and external accounts.
- The team needs to get an understanding of how long the rate of present activity will continue, as that will affect the budget.
- The Management Options subgroup predicted expenses of \$75,000, but still doesn't know what the options will look like. If the subgroup can narrow the options at the December 16 based on the CABREE scenario work, it would like to have more detailed analysis done between mid December and mid January. The subgroup expects that \$20,000 would be sufficient to have this work done and requested approval from the team to expend these funds if a consultant is available to do the analysis. Some concern was expressed that the team's work to date is biased in favour of technical and economic analysis rather than issues of liability, enforceability and transparency. It was noted that about 2/3 of the EPT is on the Management Options subgroup, so there can be an active discussion regarding the proposed analysis within the subgroup.

The team agreed to authorize the Management Options subgroup to spend up to \$20,000 if they feel some work can be done during December and January to advance the assessment of potential management options. The subgroup will inform the team by email once they have identified at the December 16 meeting how they plan to spend these funds. Members are asked to respond by email if there are significant concerns, and efforts will be made to quickly address them.

**Action: Kerra will restructure the budget so the numbers are presented in the same format as they were originally, with internal and external accounts.**

**Action: Kerra will provide details on general cash flow and why the projection for secretariat expenses has gone up.**

**Action: The EPT co-chairs will give Kerra some guidance regarding the anticipated level of activity for the team for the next six months.**

8. Other Business

**a) AENV Emissions Trading Meeting.** The next meeting is being held on December 13; CASA is covering ENGO expenses to attend this meeting. Erik Haites, a world expert on emissions trading schemes will be in attendance.

**b) Facility Visits.** Les Johnston has offered to host a Genesee tour for February 13, the day before the EPT meeting. He will confirm this date with Kerra.

**c) Media Request to Attend January Meeting.** CBC television requested permission from CASA to film part of the EPT's next meeting in Calgary to obtain footage that could be used in eventual coverage of the team's report and recommendations. They would also like to interview some members of the team outside the meeting. They are interested in highlighting the fact that the three sectors are working together on this issue. As is CASA practice, the co-chairs will speak for the team; any member who is interviewed can speak on behalf of their stakeholder organization, but they need to make this clear to the journalist. Members who do not want to be available to the media should so indicate to Geoff Williams, CASA's communications adviser.

**d) Review of the Electric Utilities Act.** Bevan Laing advised that this Act has been under review for the last two years and new legislation is now being drafted. Stakeholder consultations have been undertaken through the electric utilities advisory committee, which meets regularly and communicates policy changes back to their organizations. Draft three is now out for comment to this committee and comments are expected back by December 10. The Act is expected to come forward in the spring session and be proclaimed in June. Bevan does not see any issues for the EPT, nor anything in the draft legislation that would influence what the team is doing or restricts the team's potential recommendations in any way. It is not likely that the EPT will have input to the revisions to the Act, even if the team did identify changes that should be made, that would require the Act to be re-opened, which is unlikely.

It was suggested that perhaps there should be some dialogue at the CASA board level with government departments so that CASA could be apprised of legislative reviews that are planned for the next few years and make an appropriate contribution.

**e) Bill 32.** David Spink advised that Bill 32 (Climate Change and Emissions Management Act) has completed second reading. The bill will go out for public consultation between December and February before it is re-introduced. The bill is expected to be law by June 2003. The public consultation process has not been fully designed yet, but the website has been used very successfully and web communications are likely to play an important role. It is likely that those stakeholder groups who were consulted on the climate change plan will also be consulted on Bill 32. Some work will probably be done on sectoral agreements before the regulations are drafted and these agreements may then influence the regulations. At the CASA board meeting, the minister indicated he would consider establishing an advisory group on the regulations, in response to a request from an EPT member.

The team discussed whether it was appropriate for it to review the draft bill and provide comments, since it does have implications for the EPT's work. It was agreed that the team *per se* would not review the bill, but stakeholders are free to do so on their own; if they saw specific barriers or other potential issues for the team's work, they should bring those forward to the team. Anyone who does review the act was encouraged to share their comments with the team.

## 9. Next Meetings

The next EPT meetings will be as follows:

- January 13 in Calgary
- February 14 in Edmonton
- March 5 in Edmonton
- March 19 in Calgary if needed
- April 10 in Edmonton

**Action: Susan Dowse will inquire about hosting the December 16 meeting of the Management Options Subgroup.**

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm.