

2014 Performance Measures Committee Report



Prepared by the
Performance Measures Committee
for the
Clean Air Strategic Alliance
Board of Directors

13 February 2015

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	IV
INTRODUCTION.....	5
PERFORMANCE MEASURES	6
PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	10
REVIEW OF LOW-RATED RECOMMENDATIONS	12
RESPONSE TO FEEDBACK FROM THE BOARD.....	15
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	18
APPENDIX 1: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR TABLE 1 (PERFORMANCE MEASURES).....	19
APPENDIX 2: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR TABLE 2 (PERFORMANCE INDICATORS).....	21
APPENDIX 3: DECISION TREE FOR LOW-RATED RECOMMENDATIONS	24

Acknowledgements

The Committee would like to thank various CASA team members and implementers for their assistance reviewing the implementation of past CASA project team recommendations. The Committee would also like to thank Bob Myrick of the Alberta Environmental Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting Agency, Richard Melick of Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development, and Gerald Palanca of Alberta Energy Regulator for their help preparing this year's performance indicators.

The members of the Committee are: Martina Krieger (Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development); Keith Murray (Alberta Forest Products Association); Ruth Yanor (Mewassin Community Council); and Celeste Dempster and Michelle Riopel (CASA Secretariat).

Executive Summary

In December 2012, the CASA Board approved the new CASA Performance Measurement Strategy. The Strategy adopts new definitions of performance measure and performance indicator which differentiate between areas where CASA has a high degree of control over results (measure) and areas where CASA has a lower degree of control over results (indicator). The Strategy contains new performance measures and indicators for the Secretariat, the Board, the goals from CASA's Strategic Plan as well as project teams. These new measures and indicators were incorporated with CASA's pre-existing metrics and reorganized according to the new definitions of performance measure and indicator. 2014 will be the second year reporting on the new Strategy.

In 2014, the Performance Measures Committee was charged with three tasks:

1. To calculate CASA's performance measures and indicators,
2. To follow-up on low-rated recommendations from previous years, and
3. To review and respond to outcomes of the Board's discussions regarding performance measures from the March and June 2014 Board meetings.

The Committee calculated the results of CASA's performance measures and indicators which are outlined in Table 1 and Table 2 respectively. Performance indicators are not compared to a target, but rather provide context for the bigger picture in which CASA works.

The Committee collected updates on the low-rated recommendations from previous years which are tracked in a living document called the low-rated recommendations matrix. In light of this information, the Committee recommends that: 1) one recommendation be closed because it is complete; the forms in the appendices associated with the 2002 Acid Deposition Framework were completed in February 2014, and 2) one recommendation be closed because it is complete, and its continued use and need are under review as a part of the 2013 Electricity Framework Review. The Committee also requests direction from the Board on one recommendation.

The Committee reviewed highlights of the Board's 2014 discussions, and provided responses as requested.

Introduction

In December 2012, the CASA Board approved the new CASA Performance Measurement Strategy. The development of the Strategy involved investigating new trends and developments in the field of performance measurement, reviewing the relationship between performance measurement and CASA's audience, mission, vision, Strategic Plan, Strategic Plan goals, Principles and Criteria, as well as conducting consultations with current CASA project team co-chairs, the CASA Communications Committee, the CASA Board and a performance measurement professional from Alberta Energy.

The Strategy adopts new definitions of performance measure and performance indicator which differentiate between areas where CASA has a high degree of control over results (measure) and areas where CASA has a lower degree of control over results (indicator). This provides a resolution to a longstanding Board concern that these two levels of performance assessment had been treated similarly.

The Strategy contains new performance measures and indicators for the Secretariat, the Board, the goals from CASA's Strategic Plan, and project teams. These new measures and indicators were incorporated with CASA's pre-existing metrics and reorganized according to the new definitions of performance measure and indicator. This combination of performance measures and performance indicators provides a well-rounded description of CASA as an organization and provides meaningful information that supports continuous improvement at CASA.

Some of CASA's performance measures and indicators are calculated annually and some are calculated every three years. The three-year metrics were last calculated and reported on, as scheduled, in the 2013 report. 2014 is the second year reporting on the new Strategy.

In 2014, the Performance Measures Committee was charged with three tasks:

1. To calculate CASA's performance measures and indicators,
2. To follow-up on low-rated recommendations from previous years, and
3. To review and respond to outcomes of the Board's discussions regarding performance measures from the March and June 2014 Board meetings.

Performance Measures

Table 1 outlines the 2014 performance measures results.

Table 1: Performance Measures (* indicates that the measure will be included only in the PMC Annual Report and NOT in the CASA Annual Report. These measures are for internal consideration only. All other measures will be included in the PMC and CASA Annual Report)

Objective	Performance Measure	Target	Actual	Notes
<i>Secretariat</i>				
Ensure that CASA is financially efficient and accountable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual operations and cash flows are in accordance with Canadian generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). 	In compliance	In compliance	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Sufficient operating funds are available to bridge CASA's and GoA's fiscal years. 	3 months of operating funds	3 months	Based on estimated operating expenses for January through March.
Implement the CASA Strategic Plan.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Percentage of objectives from the Strategic Plan listed as in progress or complete (according to the Secretariat's colour coded rating system). 	100%	58%	The Board designated Goal 1 and 2 as the top priorities for CASA. The % of objectives being acted upon under these two goals listed as in progress or complete is 71%. The objectives that are rated red and relate to communications account for 19% of the total red rated objectives.
Monitor the implementation of CASA recommendations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Percentage of low-rated recommendations being monitored. 	100%	100%	There are 4 low-rated recommendations being monitored.
Provide support to CASA stakeholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Project teams' degree of satisfaction with support provided by Secretariat. 	Maintain or increase	74%	This is the second year this measure has been calculated. Was 86% in 2013.
<i>Board</i>				

Objective	Performance Measure	Target	Actual	Notes
Encourage Board member participation in CASA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of Board attendance at Board meetings by sector. 	75%	Government – 53.1% Industry – 83.3% NGO – 85%	The target for government was not met. The government caucus consists of federal, provincial, municipal, First Nations, and Métis representatives.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Project teams’ degree of satisfaction with support provided by Board member counterparts, by sector. 	Maintain or increase	Government – 57% Industry – 100% NGO – 100%	This is the second year this measure has been calculated. 2013 results: Government – 86% Industry – 90% NGO – 75%
<i>Strategic Plan Goal 1: To provide strategic advice on air quality issues and the impacts of major policy initiatives on air quality.</i>				
Influence and inform AQ policy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents produced to inform GoA & other stakeholders which includes a summary of the document and a qualifying description of the anticipated influence on air quality. 	Demonstrate influence	Demonstrated influence	CASA produced six documents that engaged stakeholders, shaped CASA’s policy agenda and focus, and influenced air quality in Alberta. See “Appendix 1: Additional Information for Table 1”.
<i>Strategic Plan Goal 2: To contribute to the continued development and implementation of effective and efficient air quality management in Alberta.</i>				
Develop reports and recommendations using the CDM process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of satisfaction with project team work by team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project Charter was completed. The work was completed in a timely manner. The process was collaborative. The team developed SMART (Specific, Measurable, Actionable, Realistic, Time-bound) recommendations. 	75%		N/A - No project teams completed their work in 2014.
		75%		
		75%		
		75%		
<i>Strategic Plan Goal 3: To contribute to the development of a reliable, comprehensive, objective knowledge system with respect to air quality, health, and environmental impacts, and management and mitigation mechanisms.</i>				

Objective	Performance Measure	Target	Actual	Notes
Provide available AQ information.	• Number of visits to CASA's Information Portal webpage.	Maintain or increase	No data available	The Information Portal webpage is still in development.
	• Number of phone inquiries for information.	Maintain or increase	5 phone inquiries	The Secretariat noted that there were numerous inquiries for information via email, but did not have a method in place to track these. The Committee agreed to recommend that the Board to expand this measure to include all recordable inquiries (i.e. Phone, email, social media, etc.)
<i>Strategic Plan Goal 4: To communicate information that builds awareness, understanding, and commitment to air quality management in Alberta.</i>				
Improve project team knowledge of the CDM process.	• *Project teams' degree of satisfaction with capacity to participate in collaborative processes.	Maintain or increase	74%	This is the second year this measure has been calculated. Was 90% in 2013.
Increase awareness of CASA, CASA projects and CDM.	• Number of 3 rd party requests for CASA assistance.	Maintain or increase	No data available	Data collection was unsuccessful for the second year this measure is in use. The Committee noted that this measure has been the responsibility of the Executive Director, and that this result may be the due to the transition that occurred in 2014. It was agreed that the use of this measure should be reviewed after 2015 if results do not improve.
	• Number of return and unique visitors to website.	Maintain or increase	Return – 3,572 Unique – 5,126	2013 Results: Return – 2,928 Unique – 4,597
	• Number of news stories about CASA.	Maintain or increase	22	2013 Result: 16

Recommendation 1: Approve performance measures results.

The Performance Measures Committee recommends that the Board approve the 2014 performance measures results for inclusion in the 2014 CASA Annual Report.

Recommendation 2: Revision of measure under Strategic Plan Goal 3.

The Performance Measures Committee recommends that under Strategic Plan Goal 3, the measure that reads “Number of phone inquiries for information” be revised to also include inquiries by email and social media

Performance Indicators

Table 2 provides a summary of the 2014 performance indicator results. Additional information can be found in Appendix 2.

Table 2: Performance Indicators Summary (all indicators will be included in CASA’s Annual Report)

Objective	Performance Indicator	Actual	Notes
Implement CASA recommendations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of substantive recommendations from 4 years prior (2010) that have been implemented. 	100%	See “Additional Information in Appendix 2 - Section 1”. Note that this % is based on 1 recommendations that was classified as substantive (out of a total of 6 recommendations from 2010). ¹
Measure impact of completed project team work.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each completed project team comes up with one specific metric to measure success of team 5 years in the future. 	N/A	No team metrics were scheduled for reporting in 2014.
Improve capacity to monitor AQ in Alberta.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Geographic percentage of province covered by airshed zone organizations. 	46%	Under the Air Quality Management System (adopted in October 2012), the entire province of Alberta has been divided into air zones (divisions fall along the Land-use Framework boundaries with the north and south Peace areas being combined).

Recommendation 3: Approve performance indicators results.

The Performance Measures Committee recommends that the Board approve the results of the 2014 performance indicators for inclusion in the 2014 CASA Annual Report.

Recommendation 4: Revise 2013 Performance Measures Committee Report

The Performance Measures Committee recommends that the 2013 Performance Measures Committee Report be updated with the corrected data on implementation of substantive recommendations.

¹ Note: It was brought to the attention of the Committee that 26 recommendations from the 2009 Ambient Monitoring and Strategic Planning Project Team were not included in the calculation of this indicator during the 2013 Performance Measures Review. The Committee added the collection of this information to their work for the 2014 review. Section 2 of Appendix 2 provides a summary of the revised 2009 performance indicator results. There may be a need to update the 2013 Performance Measures Committee Report based on results. Of the 26 recommendations, two were assessed as low-rated (recommendations 18 and 26).

Recommendation 5:

The Performance Measures Committee recommends adding recommendations 18 and 26 from the 2009 Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Project Team to the low-rated recommendation matrix for continuous monitoring.

Review of Low-rated Recommendations

In June 2008 the CASA Board identified the need to follow-up on low-rated recommendations on a longer term basis, rather than just the one year snapshot provided in the related performance indicator. The Committee developed a matrix of all low-rated recommendations since 1997 as well as a Decision Tree for assessing low-rated recommendations which was approved by the Board in 2009 (see Appendix 3). The matrix is intended to be a living document that will be updated as the Committee gathers information from implementers. The Committee will then use this information to advise the CASA Board on appropriate follow-up for the low-rated recommendations.

The Performance Measures Committee would like to submit four (4) low-rated recommendations to the Board for follow-up. The Committee recommends that one (1) recommendation be closed because it is complete; and one (1) recommendation be closed because it complete, and its continued use and need are under review as a part of the 2013 Electricity Framework Review. The Committee also requests direction from the Board on one (1) recommendation because there does not appear to be consensus on its status.

The CASA Board has the final decision whether to consider a recommendation closed (i.e. CASA no longer pursues information on its implementation). There are three criteria to weigh in the decision that were approved by the Board in September 2009:

1. Priority level: Is the current importance of the issues and/or recommendation high, medium or low?
2. Need for the recommendation: Given legal, technological, societal and economic changes since the recommendation was made, is the action prescribed still needed?
3. Practical challenges: Given the current work of the implementing body, are the necessary resources and capacity available to implement the recommendations?

The Committee recommends that the CASA Board deem the following two (2) 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:	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>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the goals, objectives and performance measures table, and the evaluation protocols table. 		<p>In February 2014, ESRD responded to the letter with copies of the completed forms from the appendices.</p>
2009		
2008 Electricity Framework Review Team		
<p>8. The initiative on Credit for Early Action on Mercury Capture be implemented as follows:</p> <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. 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. 	0	<p><u>Recommendation:</u> Close.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Complete.</p> <p>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 report.</p>

Recommendation 6: Close two (2) low-rated recommendations as they are complete.

The Performance Measures Committee recommends that the Board deem the following two (2) low-rated recommendations closed as they are complete:

- Recommendation 3 from the Acidifying Emissions Project Team.
- Recommendation 8 from the 2008 Electricity Framework Review Team.

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 coalfired and gas-fired units:</p> <p>A. NOx (coal-fired) – 0.38 kg/MWh net</p> <p>B. SO2 – 0.55 kg/MWh net</p> <p>C. NOx (gas-fired) – “A” factor = 0.07 kg/MWh net and “B” factor = 0.008 kg/GJ</p> <p>Non-Peaking Standard Formula: NOx (kg/h) = [Net Power Output (MW net) x A] + [Heat Output (GJ/h) x B]</p>	<p>The Committee is requesting further direction from the Board on next steps for this recommendation.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> The 2013 EFR Team agreed that this recommendation has not been implemented. The consensus recommendations are being used informally by ESRD but have not been formally incorporated into standards, in part because no new plants have been approved since January 1, 2011.</p>

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

2007	
<i>Renewable and Alternative Energy Project Team</i>	
<p>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.</p>	<p><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.</p>

Response to Feedback from the Board

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 Committee. The Committee discussed them as follows:

Measure/Indicator	
<p>Degree of CASA members, partners and stakeholders' satisfaction with CASA.</p>	<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 considered low (at 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? • 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 Response:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 Response: 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?”. • 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 Response: 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.

Next Steps:

AEMERA provided an update at the September CASA Board meeting. At this time, the Board was to make it clear that:

- 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.

The PMC should review if the way this data is presented is the most appropriate and useful.

PMC Response:

The Committee felt that evaluation of this measure may need to wait until the role of AEMERA becomes clearer. The Committee should contact AEMERA to revisit this issue in the 2015 PMC review.

Summary of Recommendations

Recommendation 1:

The Performance Measures Committee recommends that the Board approve the 2014 performance measures results for inclusion in the 2014 CASA Annual Report.

Recommendation 2: Revision of measure under Strategic Plan Goal 3.

The Performance Measures Committee recommends that under Strategic Plan Goal 3, the measure that reads “Number of phone inquiries for information” be revised to also include inquiries by email and social media.

Recommendation 3: Approve performance indicators results.

The Performance Measures Committee recommends that the Board approve the results of the 2014 performance indicators for inclusion in the 2014 CASA Annual Report.

Recommendation 4: Revise 2013 Performance Measures Committee Report.

The Performance Measures Committee recommends that the 2013 Performance Measures Committee Report be updated with the corrected data on implementation of substantive recommendations.

Recommendation 5:

The Performance Measures Committee recommends adding recommendations 18 and 26 from the 2009 Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Project Team to the low-rated recommendation matrix for continuous monitoring.

Recommendation 6:

The Performance Measures Committee recommends that the Board deem the following two (2) low-rated recommendations closed as they are complete:

- Recommendation 3 from the Acidifying Emissions Project Team.
- Recommendation 8 from the 2008 Electricity Framework Review Team.

Appendix 1: Additional Information for Table 1 (Performance Measures)

Documents produced to inform GoA & other stakeholders which includes a summary of the document and a qualifying description of the anticipated influence on air quality:

Document Title	Document Description	Anticipated Influence on Air Quality
2013 Performance Measures Report	This report was presented at the March Board meeting. It presents the calculated performance measures and indicators, and a review of the CASA Performance Measures Strategy, including recommended adjustments.	The report prompted a large discussion about the results, and the impact that it has on air quality.
2014 CASA Risk Management Framework	This framework was presented at the June Board meeting. It provides a uniform process to identify, measure, respond to, and report on risks as part of measuring CASA's performance (the how-to manual). The Board approved the framework.	This document will ensure that the Board continues to pay attention to relevant risks and maintain CASA as a viable organization.
2014 CASA Risk Management Plan	This plan was presented at the June Board meeting. It describes the scope of the risks to be managed, as well as the risk assessment, and strategies for managing risks. The Board approved the plan and agreed to append it to CASA's Strategic Plan.	This document will ensure that the Board continues to pay attention to relevant risks and maintain CASA as a viable organization.
EFR Interim Report	This report was presented at the June Board meeting. The EFR Project Charter for the second Five-Year Review included all the information relevant to the project's parameters and outcomes, including a description of an initial assessment.	This document provides the necessary information to inform the Government of Alberta as they consider if adjustments to the Framework are warranted, the nature of those adjustments, and a path forward as appropriate.

	<p>As the team explored the tasks in the initial assessment, interested parties reached an impasse on some key issues. The team prepared this report to clearly document key issues and identify points where the team agreed to disagree. In addition, a more detailed account of the various perspectives is appended to the report in the individual submissions from potentially impacted parties.</p>	
<p>Non-Point Source Project Charter</p>	<p>This Project Charter was presented at the September Board. It outlines the scope and goal for a potential NPS project team. It also breaks down the work into four objectives and corresponding strategies, and provides additional guidance on sequencing, stakeholder engagement, risk management, resourcing, and deliverables.</p>	<p>This document provides a path forward for helping to address non-point source air emissions contributing to primary PM2.5 and O3 standard non-achievement in Alberta.</p>
<p>CASA Guide to Managing Collaborative Processes</p>	<p>This Guide was finalized by the Secretariat in November and sent to be professionally printed.</p>	<p>This document is a comprehensive guide to collaborative decision making developed by CASA to better support its multi-stakeholder teams in developing sustainable solutions for air quality. It outlines the project management process, including screen and scope, the steps needed to build agreement on a recommended solution, as well as project close-out.</p>

Appendix 2: Additional Information for Table 2 (Performance Indicators)

Section 1: Percentage of substantive recommendations from 4 years prior (2010) that have been implemented.

For 2014, the Performance Measures Committee considered the recommendations approved by the CASA Board in 2010. In this year, the CASA Board approved one recommendation from the Indoor Air Quality Project Team, three recommendations from the Martha Kostuch Legacy Workshop Team and two recommendations from the Flaring and Venting Project Team. Of these, one recommendation from the Flaring and Venting Project Team was deemed substantive by the Committee. The remaining recommendations were deemed either administrative or operational and so are not subject to further evaluation.

Overall, the degree of implementation of CASA recommendations approved in 2010 is 100%. Table 1 shows the rating of the substantive recommendation and subsequent calculation of overall implementation of recommendations and Table 2 summarizes the results since 1997.

Note: Table 2 contains the updated degree of implementation for 2009 (42%), as described in Section 2 of Appendix 2.

Table 1: Rating of Substantive Recommendations

Project Team (No. of substantive recommendations)	Rating of Recommendations (Original recommendation numbers placed in appropriate rating column)										
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Flaring and Venting Project Team (1)											1
Total number (1)											1
Mean Calculation: $10 \times 1 = 10$											
Overall (average rating) = $10/1 = 10$ or 100%											
<u>Reviewer:</u> Flaring and Venting Project Team: Gerald Palanka (AER)											

Table 2: Summary of Results for Recommendation Implementation

Year Approved by CASA Board	Number of Substantive Recommendations	Degree of Implementation of Substantive Recommendations (%)
1997	25	77
1998	54	76
1999	30	62
2000	0	n/a
2001	5	94

2002	53	74
2003	79	73
2004	47	91
2005	18	77.2
2006	1	100
2007	1	30
2008	2	90
2009	3	42
2010	1	100

Section 2: Percentage of substantive recommendations from 2009 that have been implemented.
Note: The information below includes the 26 recommendations from the 2009 Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Team, which were missed in the 2013 Performance Measures Review.

For 2013, the Performance Measures Committee considered the recommendations approved by the CASA Board in 2009. In this year, the CASA Board approved ten recommendations from the Electricity Framework Review Team, fourteen recommendations from the Clean Air Strategy Project Team, twenty-six recommendations from the Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Project Team and eight recommendations from the Enhanced Collaboration with the Water Council Committee. Of these, three recommendations from the Electricity Framework Review Team, and recommendations 5, 11, 13 (1st bullet only), 14, 16 (bullets a, b, and d only), 17 (2nd bullet only), 18, 19 (bullets b and c only), 23, and 26 from the Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Project Team were deemed substantive by the Committee. The remaining recommendations were deemed either administrative or operational and so are not subject to further evaluation.

Overall, the degree of implementation of CASA recommendations approved in 2009 has been revised to 42% (from 17% originally calculated in 2013) through the recent inclusion of the abovementioned recommendations from the Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Project Team. Table 1 shows the rating of the three substantive recommendations and subsequent calculation of overall implementation of recommendations.

Table 1: Rating of Substantive Recommendations

Project Team (No. of substantive recommendations)	Rating of Recommendations (Original recommendation numbers placed in appropriate rating column)										
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Electricity Framework Review Team (3)	7, 8					6					
Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Project Team (10)			26	18	11, 19	14, 16	5	13, 17, 23			

Total number (13)	2					1					
Mean Calculation: $0x2 + 2x1 + 3x1 + 4x2 + 5x3 + 6x1 + 7x3 = 55$											
Overall (average rating) = $55 / 13 = 4.23$ or 42%											
<u>Reviewer(s):</u> Electricity Framework Review Team: Randy Dobko (ESRD) Ambient Monitoring Strategic Planning Project Team: Bob Myrick (AEMERA)											

Appendix 3: Decision Tree for Low-rated Recommendations

After three years of implementation, CASA assesses the implementation of recommendations by engaging stakeholders involved in the original team and/or the implementing agency. Assessors are asked to rate the degree of implementation on a scale of 0-10. Low rated recommendations are defined as recommendations receiving a 0-3 rating.

The Decision Tree, as illustrated on the next page, is intended to provide guidance on how to follow-up on low-rated recommendations. The Decision Tree will only be used for low-rated recommendations. The Committee will first follow-up with the implementer for information why a recommendation was not implemented. If no implementer is discernable, the Committee approaches a CASA team (if available) for information. Should neither be available, the Committee can make a recommendation to the CASA Board. Recommendations, whether from the implementer, CASA team or Committee, could include:

- Close the recommendation, and document the explanation
- More work that could be required, such as an implementation team, new work for an existing team, Board involvement, etc
- More information the Board would require to make its decision regarding follow-up or closure of the recommendation.

CASA Board Decision

The Performance Measures Committee will use the information to advise to the CASA Board on appropriate follow-up for the low-rated recommendation. The CASA Board has decision-making power whether to follow-up or to close the recommendation (i.e. render the recommendation no longer required).

There are three criteria to inform the board's decision to close a recommendation:

1. Priority level: Is the current importance of the issue and/or recommendation high, medium or low?
2. Need for the recommendation: Given legal, technological, societal, and economic changes since the recommendation was made, is the action prescribed still needed?
3. Practical challenges: Given the current work of the implementing body, are the necessary resources and capacity available to implement the recommendation?

