

Minutes



Performance Measures Committee meeting #68

Date: 14 January 2015

Time: 9:00 am – 2:30 pm

Place: CASA office, 10035 108 Street, Edmonton

In attendance:

Name

Martina Krieger

Ruth Yanor

Michelle Riopel

Stakeholder group

Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development

Mewassin Community Council

CASA

Action Items:

Action Items	Who	Due
68.1 – Create a summary of the decisions made that require quorum and send them to Keith for approval.	Michelle	ASAP
68.2 – Complete Appendix A to indicate whether he accepts the decisions made during meeting #68.	Keith	February 5 before noon
68.3: Prepare the draft 2014 annual report and send it to the Committee for review.	Michelle	February 5
68.4 – Prepare the draft Board presentation and send it to the Committee for review.	Michelle	February 5
68.5 – Choose a presenter for the March 12 th Board meeting.	All	March 4th

1) Administrative Items

The meeting began at 9:10 pm. There was no industry representative so quorum was not achieved. The committee agreed to proceed, with the provision that any decisions made during the meeting (See Appendix A of these minutes) will be shared with Keith Murray. Keith will be asked to provide approval of these decisions in writing, which will then be considered agreed to by consensus.

Action item 68.1 – Michelle will create a summary of the decisions made that require quorum and send them to Keith for approval.

Action item 68.2 – Keith will complete Appendix A to indicate whether he can accept the decisions made during meeting #68

The Committee expressed a desire to organize a farewell lunch for Celeste and PMC members since there wasn't an opportunity to do so prior to her departure. Ruth and Martina agreed to contact Celeste as well as current and former PMC members, select a date and arrange for food. Michelle agreed to confirm availability of a board room for a group of about 10 people to attend.

The agenda and meeting objectives were approved.

The minutes from meeting #67 were approved. Action items from meeting #67 were reviewed as follows:

Action Items	Who	Status
67.1: Administer the 'Recommendation Implementation Assessment Questionnaire' for the ten recommendations that were identified as substantive from 2009, and the one recommendation that was identified as substantive from 2010.	Michelle	Complete
67.2: Gather the performance measures and indicators results for the final report.	Michelle	Complete
67.3: Confirm availability for meeting on January 14th.	Martina	Complete

2) Performance Measures and Indicators Results

Michelle reviewed the results of the performance measures indicators for 2014 with the Committee. The group discussed them in relation to the upcoming report to the Board, with highlights as follows:

Performance Measures:

- The results of the CASA audit will not be available until February 2015. The acting Project Manager will share these results with the PMC once they are available.
- At 58%, the percentage of Strategic Plan objectives rated as “in progress” or “complete” is significantly lower than the target (100%). It was noted that:
 - 19% of the shortfall is attributed to lack of Communications Advisor. This point was also raised in the 2013 review.
 - The Board has prioritized Goals 1 and 2 from the CASA Strategic Plan. It was noted that under these two Goals, 71% of the objectives were “in progress” or “complete” in 2014.
 - The PMC has been previously acknowledged that 100% is a target to strive for but likely won't ever actually be met.

The group felt that for this measure, the objectives should be prioritized and the percentages calculated by priority group. This would be more useful in terms how to interpret and address low achievement.

- The target for board attendance has not been met by government for the second year in a row. This is due to vacancies on the CASA Board for First Nations, Metis, and – for the majority of 2014 – federal government. Meanwhile, the provincial government board members have a very high attendance rate. The committee suggested that this measure should be parsed into two:
 - Percentage of Board member attendance at Board meetings by sector *currently represented on the Board.*
 - *Percentage of Board member positions filled, by sector.*
- When targets aren't met for measures that relate to satisfaction (with the Secretariat, Board support, and capacity to participate in collaborative processes), the percentage provided in Table one does not provide enough information to help to parties in question improve. The committee suggested that in these cases, the Project Manager could create a non-attributed summary of all the relevant collected information associated with that measure in addition to the percentage satisfaction. This would be a good resource for continuous improvement.

- It was noted that the majority of inquiries for information come to CASA through email, rather than phone calls. The committee suggested adjusting this measure to track all recordable inquiries (ie. Phone, email, social media, etc.), rather than just by phone.
- The method to collect data on 3rd party requests for CASA assistance was unsuccessful in 2014 and 2013. The group noted that it is the responsibility of the Executive Director, and this may have been missed as a result of the transition between E.D.s in 2014. The group agreed to keep the measure as-is, but revisit in the 2015 review to see if results improve.
- The group commented that the increase in number of website visits might be related to the 20th Anniversary, and that a drop in numbers in 2015 could be anticipated.

Performance Indicators:

- One recommendation from the 2010 Flaring and Venting Project Team (#1) was assessed as complete. The committee recommends closing it.
- As they are low-rated, recommendations 18 and 26 from the 2009 AMSP Team are recommended to be added to the low-rated recommendations matrix for continued followed-up. It was noted that in the coming years it will probably be appropriate to follow up with AEMERA regarding recommendation 18. It was also noted that recommendation 26 may be addressed through implementation of some pending actions in the Clean Air Strategy.

3) Board Feedback on Measures and Indicators

Michelle provided the following a recap of discussions the Board had in 2014 regarding Performance Measures:

At the March 2014 Board meeting, the Performance Measures Committee presented the 2013 Performance Measures Committee Report, which included the results from 2013 performance measures and indicators. The Board commented that the report provided useful information that can help the Board to evaluate CASA as an organization (performance measures) and to have a conversation about CASA's agenda (performance indicators). In June, the Board had an in-depth conversation about the performance measure and indicator results and discussed their strategic implications for CASA.

The Board identified a number of measures that require further consideration by the PMC. The Committee discussed them as follows:

Measure/Indicator	
Degree of CASA members, partners and stakeholders' satisfaction with CASA.	<p>Board Discussion Highlights and Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CASA Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey is delivered every 3 years. Overall satisfaction is calculated using an average of 7 survey questions. These questions have been used since 1995. • The Board felt that overall satisfaction was low (50%), since satisfaction of stakeholders is a critical measure for CASA. • It was noted that teams are surveyed annually and satisfaction from those members is much higher overall. <p>Next Steps: This measure should be <u>revisited by the PMC</u> in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the 7 questions asked providing useful information?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In calculating overall satisfaction, should all 7 questions be given equal weighting? • Should the survey be delivered more frequently (i.e. annually)? • Is the target providing useful results (i.e. would a trend analysis be more useful)? • The 7 questions should be analyzed individually to determine if there are specific issues that CASA can focus on to improve the satisfaction of its stakeholders. <p>PMC Discussion: The Committee agreed that the seven questions need to be reviewed, but noted that it is not urgent given the 3-year cycle of the Satisfaction Survey, which was last run in 2013. The Committee felt that in order to effectively revise this measure, it would be useful to bring in someone with expertise in survey design. The group also felt that the CASA Communications Committee should be included in the discussion, because they can provide perspective on the original intent of the seven questions.</p>
<p>The change in flaring and venting associated with solution gas, well test and coalbed methane.</p>	<p>Board Discussion Highlights and Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The increase in flaring and venting is of increasing concern for the NGO sector. NGOs are following up with the GoA and the Alberta Energy Regulator. • CASA could explore the opportunity for further work in this area. <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board should consider this information during strategic planning as they discuss CASA’s ongoing agenda. • <u>The PMC should review</u> this indicator to ensure it is providing the most useful results. They should consider if it may be more appropriate to use conservation efficiency rather than the change in flaring and venting as an indicator. <p>PMC Discussion: The Committee noted that it is not urgent given the 3-year cycle of this measure, which was last calculated in 2013. The Committee noted that if the Board would like this measure reviewed, there would be a need to seek expertise beyond the PMC membership.</p>
<p>Objective: Improve air quality in Alberta. -There are six indicators under this Objective.</p>	<p>Board Discussion Highlights and Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 6 indicators under this objective look at various air quality aspects for the province. • The data needs to be explored in greater detail to determine if it is indicative of a problem. The data could be used to answer particular questions such as “Is there any issue with NOx and O3 in urban areas?”.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In continuing to explore the data, the Board will likely not reach consensus on all the issues, but all would benefit from such a conversation. This type of data analysis could be used to shape CASA’s future agenda. • A backgrounder about the current regulatory landscape and gaps would significantly add to this conversation. <p>Next Steps: It would be useful to have additional analysis of the data.</p> <p>A review and gap analysis of current regulatory frameworks in Alberta is needed, although the Secretariat does not currently have the capacity to produce such a document. This document would contribute to CASA’s ongoing strategic discussion and identify where CASA has a role to play in filling gaps.</p> <p><u>The PMC should review</u> the wording of the objective for clarity.</p> <p>PMC Discussion: There was not an understanding of what the Board is requesting. The Committee would like more specific direction on what the Board is looking for in terms of “clarity” on this measure, and what is expected of the Committee.</p>
<p>The percentage of monitoring stations and/or parameters implemented from the 2009 Ambient Monitoring Strategic Plan (AMSP).</p>	<p>Board Discussion Highlights and Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CASA spent a significant amount of time developing the AMSP. • The province needs reliable, credible data. • The JSC developed a document outlining roles and responsibilities as well as a gap analysis of the current air quality management system which has been shared with AEMERA. (The JSC is coordinating a meeting with AEMERA.) • This could be an opportunity for CASA to support the work of AEMERA as well as to help address local airshed concerns. <p>Next Steps: AEMERA provided an update at the September CASA Board meeting. At this time, the Board was to make it clear that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is expected that the AMSP will be incorporated by AEMERA as it implements the provincial monitoring program. • If this is not AEMERA’s intention, they should provide sufficient justification to the Board. <p><u>The PMC should review</u> if the way this data is presented is the most appropriate and useful.</p> <p>PMC Discussion: The Committee felt that evaluation of this measure may need to wait until the role of AEMERA becomes clearer. The Committee should</p>

contact AEMERA to revisit this issue in the 2015 PMC review.
--

A summary of the above PMC responses will be included in the 2014 PMC annual report to the CASA Board.

4) Low-rated Recommendations

The Committee reviewed the status updates for each of the items in the low-rated recommendations matrix. The Committee made recommendations to the Board on the low-rated recommendations as described in the tables below. These recommendations will be included in the 2014 PMC annual report to the CASA Board.

The Committee recommends that the following two low-rated recommendations be closed:

Recommendation	Original Rating	Recommendation from PMC
2002		
<i>Acidifying Emissions Project Team</i>		
3. Alberta Environment should lead an evaluation of the acidifying emissions management system every two to three years based on the evaluation process that has been established by AEMIT. Evaluation results should be reported to the CASA Board and the next evaluation should be done in 2003. This task would require Alberta Environment to complete the forms that AEMIT has developed and used to conduct its evaluation; these are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the goals, objectives and performance measures table, and the evaluation protocols table. 	0	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Close.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Complete</p> <p>The Acid Deposition Framework was created and has a 5-year review process. The Framework appendices contain two forms related to the bullets in the recommendation. In April 2013 the PMC sent a letter to ESRD requesting that each review include completion of the forms in the appendices, and that the results be shared with the CASA board.</p> <p>In February 2014, ESRD responded to the letter with copies of the completed forms from the appendices.</p>
2009		
<i>2008 Electricity Framework Review Team</i>		
8. The initiative on Credit for Early Action on Mercury Capture be implemented as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Credit for Early Action on Mercury initiative will enable operators to gain recognition for past and upcoming Mercury capture before the regulation deadline. 	0	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Close.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> AESRD has established a process for Mercury credit as per the recommendation. The use and need for these credit provisions is being reviewed as part of the current EFR. The results of this review will be expected to be included in the EFR final</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operators will earn credits for kilograms of Mercury captured (as a result of Mercury control activity demonstration, early installation of Mercury control equipment and other combustion process modifications). • Credits can only be used on a site-basis (no trading) and only when plants experience upset conditions impacting their ability to achieve target removal requirements. • The credits for early action recognition cannot be used to delay installation of Mercury control equipment. • January 1, 2011 is the compliance date. Companies will earn credits for Mercury capture rates greater than 75% before January 1, 2011. • Between January 1, 2011 and January 1, 2013, companies will earn credits for Mercury capture rates greater than 80%. • All credits will be earned at a discount value of 50%. • All credits will expire on December 31, 2015. 		report.
--	--	---------

The Committee found that they require further guidance and information from the Board in order to make a recommendation on the following low-rated recommendation:

2009	
<i>2008 Electricity Framework Review Team</i>	
<p>7. The following deemed credit thresholds for the 2011 BATEA standards be applied to new coal-fired and gas-fired units:</p> <p>A. NO_x (coal-fired) – 0.38 kg/MWh net</p> <p>B. SO₂ – 0.55 kg/MWh net</p> <p>C. NO_x (gas-fired) – “A” factor = 0.07 kg/MWh net and “B” factor =</p>	<p>The Committee is requesting further direction from the Board on next steps for this recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Currently, there appears to be disagreement on the status of this recommendation, and whether it is still relevant. This is being reviewed as part of the current EFR and the results will be expected to be included in the EFR final report.</p>

0.008 kg/GJ Non-Peaking Standard Formula: NO _x (kg/h) = [Net Power Output (MW net) x A] + [Heat Output (GJ/h) x B]	
---	--

The Committee found that the following low-rated recommendation requires continued tracking as implementation progresses:

2007	
<i>Renewable and Alternative Project Team</i>	
1. The Renewable and Alternative Energy Project Team recommends that the Government of Alberta develop and implement a policy framework to increase the supply of and demand for renewable and alternative electrical energy in Alberta. This policy framework should be developed and implemented in a timely manner, and the Government should consider including in the policy framework the elements and policy options described in this report.	<u>Reason to keep in the low-rated matrix/ continue to monitor:</u> The Framework has been developed but is not officially considered complete, and related policy decisions have been delayed. This is because it is felt that the renewed Climate Change Strategy (which should be finished soon) may affect parts of the Framework. Once the Strategy is complete, the Framework will be revisited to see if any changes need to be made before finalizing it.

5) Preparations for March Board Meeting

The Committee discussed the schedule to prepare the 2014 PMC annual report. Michelle will prepare a first draft of the 2014 annual report and send it to the Committee for review. The Committee will review and provide feedback on the document electronically for the acting PM to incorporate. The acting PM will submit the final report for inclusion in the March CASA Board Book (deadline February 19th).

Action Item 68.3: Michelle will prepare the draft 2014 annual report and send it to the Committee for review.

It was noted that a volunteer from the Committee would be need to present at the March Board meeting. A presentation will also need to be prepared. Once the presentation is complete, presenters will need to meet in-person to prepare.

Action Item 68.4 – Michelle will prepare the draft Board presentation and send it to the Committee for review.

Action item 68.5 – PMC members need to choose a presenter for the March 12th Board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:15pm.

Minutes



Appendix A: PMC decisions for approval by Keith Murray

Decision	Approved? (Y/N)	Comments
PMC Meeting #67 Minutes approved	Y	
Recommendation to the Board that recommendation #1 from the 2010 Flaring and Venting Project Team should be considered complete, and be closed.	Y	
Recommend to the Board that recommendations #18 and #26 from the 2009 AMSP Team be added to the low-rated recommendations matrix for continued followed-up.	Y	
Request more specific direction from the Board regarding their request that the PMC “review wording for clarity” of the strategic objective to “Improve Air Quality in Alberta”.	Y	
Recommend to the Board that the low-rated recommendation #3 from the Acidifying Emissions Project Team be closed.	Y	
Recommend to the Board that the low-rated recommendation #8 from the 2008 Electricity Framework Review Team be closed.	Y	
Request further guidance from the Board on the low-rated recommendation #7 from the 2008 Electricity Framework Review Team.	Y	
Keep recommendation #7 from the Renewable and Alternative Project Team in the low-rated recommendation matrix for continued monitoring of implementation.	Y	