
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION 2011- 2014

September 2014

The Clean Air Strategic Alliance

Prepared by Norman MacLeod

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
History	2
1. 2014 Performance Evaluation Approach and Methodology.	3
2. Expectations from the 2011 Performance Evaluation	4
3. Strategic Plan Performance	6
Goal 1	6
Goal 2	8
Goal 3	9
Goal 4	11
4. Functional Performance.....	13
4.1 Improving Consensus-seeking Skills and Approach	13
4.2 Dealing with Impasse	14
4.3 A Non-Consensus Stream	15
4.4 A Broader Toolkit	16
5. Institutional Performance	18
5.1 Board Performance.....	18
5.2 Board Membership and Participation	19
5.3 Secretariat Performance.....	23
6. CASA's Contribution to IRM Planning	24
7. Key Associated Risks	29
7.1 Funding	29
7.2 Stakeholder Satisfaction	30
Appendix A: Terms of Reference.....	32
Appendix B: Performance Measures.....	35
Appendix C: Letter Template For Sectors With No Umbrella Association	38

INTRODUCTION

Article 16 of the Clean Air Strategic Alliance (CASA) by-laws contains the following requirement;

The performance of the Society will be evaluated upon the expiration of three years from, the date of its incorporation, or the date of its last performance evaluation, by the Members of the Society.

Three years having passed since CASA last conducted a performance evaluation, the Executive Committee has initiated a process to engage all Board members in evaluating CASA's relevance, effectiveness and value to Alberta's air quality management system and engaged stakeholders. Norman MacLeod, former Executive Director at CASA, was asked by the Executive Committee to prepare a discussion document, drawing on CASA records and experiences from 2011 through 2014. The Terms of Reference (Appendix A) for this document include a requirement to provide background, analysis and, where appropriate, recommendations with respect to key strategic challenges. The document is intended to provide a base of information that stakeholders can use to assess CASA's performance and discuss future commitments.

Traditionally, performance measurement at CASA is meant to track the overall performance of the organization as well as progress made towards CASA's vision, mission and goals as described in the Strategic Plan. This document distinguishes between the various dimensions of CASA performance, while focusing on specific concerns and priorities identified by Board members over the past three years, viz.:

Strategic Plan Performance: evaluation of the work done by CASA related to each of the plans four goals and associated objectives.

Functional Performance: evaluation of the extent to which CASA actually uses, or should use, a collaborative, consensus-based approach in developing policy advice.

Institutional Performance: evaluation of the performance of CASA bodies (note – evaluation of Project Team work is reflected in Strategic Plan delivery, functional performance and stakeholder satisfaction).

CASA's Contribution to Integrated Resource Management: evaluation of the utility and "fit" of CASA's work within Alberta's IRM system, and CASA's relationships with the AWC, AAC and Airshed Zones.

Key Associated Risks: evaluation of the two principal risks given a high rating in CASA's recently produced Risk Management Plan (i.e. funding, stakeholder satisfaction).

Wherever possible the document provides a summary of the Board expectations that were expressed in 2011 and that were subsequently reflected in the 2012 – 2016 Strategic Plan. This is followed by an analysis of performance during the last three years. In some instances observations are offered (shown in a shaded box) and, as requested, recommendations (numbered) are made where there are opportunities to improve on performance.

HISTORY

CASA has conducted five previous performance evaluations and each was done differently. In some instances a CASA committee conducted the review and reported back to the Board. In other instances, external consultants were used to develop background information that informed Board and/or caucus discussions. Each review seems to have posed different key questions for the Board's consideration, but in each instance, CASA members agreed to a renewed set of expectations that formed the basis for their recommitment to the Alliance.

- CASA's first formal performance evaluation occurred in 1997. There were three stages in the process: one, board members consulted with their stakeholder group to confirm support for CASA's decision-making approach and its priorities; two, board members held a workshop to present the results of their stakeholder meetings; and three, an action plan was developed that addressed communications planning, board roles and processes, and ways to improve the effectiveness of project teams.
- In 2001, a committee of four board members conducted a more limited review. They considered the question: "Does CASA have the necessary elements in place to support its work?" The committee recommended that the Board renew the CASA mandate for an additional three year period and made some suggestions regarding funding.
- In 2004, a steering committee, consisting of one representative from each sector, oversaw the performance evaluation. It was conducted by an independent evaluator, PAGE Management Counsel Ltd. The steering committee followed up on five areas for improvement recommended in the report.
- In 2007, the CASA Board created a Performance Evaluation Committee to answer the question, "How effective is CASA in supporting the Government of Alberta in strategic air quality planning?" Three committee members contributed the equivalent of 20 full working days each – to preparation, interviews, meetings and report writing. The Board accepted the committee members' report and forwarded their recommendations for consideration in the development of a new strategic plan.
- In 2010, CASA completed the performance evaluation as part of a comprehensive eight month strategic review. The review included: an E-scan done by the University of Alberta; the engagement of Foresight Canada to lead a Board strategic planning exercise; preparation of a mission review discussion document; and caucus workshops to review CASA performance. All of these elements culminated in a two-day strategic retreat that resulted in a renewed member commitment to the Alliance and a new Strategic Plan.

1. 2014 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

In conducting previous performance evaluations, CASA members and staff have invested a great deal of

time in the renewal process. While performance evaluation is a bylaw requirement, and revision of the strategic plan is an important undertaking at CASA, the Executive Committee suggested that CASA should look for efficiencies in the roll-out of the 2014 review.

These efficiencies can be found by:

- Drawing on the work of previous reviews. The 2010 review, in particular, contains many observations that are still very relevant and may be revisited and updated in light of developments over the last three years.
- Incorporating elements of the recently approved risk management plan. The plan provides useful strategic guidance for specific CASA priorities (i.e. funding and stakeholder support).
- Integrating CASA's performance evaluation with the findings of the current Government of Alberta review of the Integrated Resource Management system and the role of partners.

This report drew on many sources that together provide a quantitative and qualitative picture of CASA performance. Sources of information included:

- 2013 CASA Performance Measurement Strategy
- CASA Performance Evaluation 2013
- 2013 Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey
- Project Team Exit Surveys
- 2013 Strategic Plan Evaluation
- Board meeting evaluations
- Board minutes
- Anecdotal information from Board members during annual interviews

Finally, with the development of the Performance Measurement Strategy in 2013 and the resulting data generation, CASA can use this information for the first time as part of this three- year evaluation. Given the purposeful approach that went into its design, the strategy provides a useful approximation of key aspects of CASA performance.

The 2012-2016 Strategic Plan, which was approved by the CASA Board in March 2012, states that,

"...there is a need to regularly assess CASA's effectiveness across a range of performance measures and to facilitate periodic evaluation of CASA's performance by members and stakeholders. These measures and assessments will contribute to plan revisions".

There is an expectation that the results of the 2014 evaluation will be reflected in an amended Strategic Plan.

2. EXPECTATIONS FROM THE 2011 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

In conducting the 2011 Performance Evaluation and Mission Review and developing the 2012 – 2016 Strategic Plan, CASA members described the broad expectations they had of the organization and its work for the following three years. Some expectations were specific to individual caucuses, but many were shared expectations captured in the subsequent Strategic Plan for 2012 – 2016 and in related Board records. These expectations focused on CASA’s role, deliverables, function and effectiveness.

Key Insights from the Strategic Foresight Committee

1. **Building upon Success:** Air quality management in Alberta has advanced over the past 15 years, in large part attributable to the ongoing dialogue and collaboration through CASA. The high level of engagement and synergy has led to sound and durable solutions to air quality issues.
2. **Defining the S in CASA:** CASA has focused primarily on generating solutions to air quality challenges, but the opportunity exists for CASA to demonstrate strategic leadership and to play a more proactive role in addressing emerging issues and shaping our collective path forward.
3. **Expanding CASA’s Reach and Broadening its Focus:** Opportunity exists to think more holistically about air quality management, to consider tackling issues beyond its current scope, to expand to national, inter-provincial, regional and sub-regional scales, and to engage a broader range of stakeholders.
4. **Building Capacity:** Broadening CASA’s focus and engaging a wider range of stakeholders will require enhanced capacity to facilitate “interest-based” discussions and to contemplate air quality management issues beyond those associated with regulated emissions.

The CASA 2012 – 2016 Strategic Plan noted that:

The new federal Air Quality Management System (AQMS) is directed at providing a comprehensive approach to the reduction of air pollution in Canada. It is the product of collaboration between the federal, provincial and territorial governments and stakeholders. The AQMS will require sector by sector regulation of industrial emissions and the importance of addressing non-point source emissions has been underlined. These requirements will impact CASA air quality management frameworks that were developed in the past and are currently being implemented, as well as the ability of existing CASA project teams to make progress in ongoing discussions.

At least three major Government of Alberta initiatives could shape CASA’s future – the Land Use Framework for Alberta (LUF), the Cumulative Effects Management System (CEMS) and Alberta’s Clean Air Strategy.

The Land Use Framework provides a blueprint for land use management and resource decision-making aimed at achieving Alberta’s long term environmental, social and economic

goals. A Land Use Secretariat is responsible for overseeing the preparation of Regional Plans by Regional Advisory Councils, consisting of individuals representing the range of interests within each region, and who are able to appreciate the broad interests of the region.

Dovetailed with the LUF is Alberta Environment's new Cumulative Effects Management System (CEMS). This system is intended to be outcome and risk-based, and to consider health, economic and social values. It is to be implemented using a place-based approach, a broad set of tools and collaboration with many parties. It is to be adaptive and flexible in assuring the achievement of outcomes. The CEMS represents a shift in scale from managing air quality on a provincial basis to managing air quality on a regional basis, and a change in focus from managing air quality on its own to managing air, land, water, and biodiversity together.

Alberta Environment anticipates finalization of a new Clean Air Strategy for Alberta in the last quarter of 2011 or first quarter of 2012. It is anticipated that it will provide an enabling framework within which CASA multi-stakeholder discussions could proceed.

Future roles for CASA or for Alberta airshed groups have yet to be prescribed within the Air Quality Management System, the Land Use Framework, or the Cumulative Effects Management System.

Board Direction

At the June 2011 strategic planning retreat, CASA Board members had the opportunity to affirm CASA's strategic foundation and to clarify and prioritize goals and objectives. Members also considered the implications of CASA's 'new job' for the Board, Executive Committee, Secretariat, and project teams. Some highlights of the discussion included:

- CASA should focus on being a platform for consensus in Alberta, but should also articulate a broader collaborative toolkit that would improve stakeholders' ability to understand and contribute to air quality issues.
- Joint information gathering and more energy invested in the front end of the Comprehensive Air Quality Management System (CAMS) could lead to more effective project teams.
- CASA's ability to improve performance will require that the roles and capacity of the Board, the Executive Committee, the Secretariat, and project teams be reviewed.
- The emphasis that the Board placed on goals 1 and 2 clarifies CASA's job and requires that CASA be strategic in selecting candidates for projects.
- Through "strategic intervention" CASA can model sound multi-stakeholder engagement in other processes. It is more effective to demonstrate how CASA does business than to simply tell others.

Each of these elements provided a slightly different quality of information for CASA's Board. Together, these elements describe a set of expectations that were considered carefully during the development of CASA's 2012 – 2016 Strategic Plan.

3. STRATEGIC PLAN PERFORMANCE

Strategic Plan performance is measured and evaluated twice yearly against prescribed targets, as required by CASA's 2013 Performance Measurement Strategy. The strategy requires the Secretariat to measure the percentage of strategic plan objectives that are listed as in-progress or complete.

For calendar year 2013, 81% of strategic plan objectives were listed as in-progress or complete. The remaining objectives, listed as, "not initiated or suspended or postponed" fell within Goals 3 & 4 of the Strategic Plan, which focus on Communications.

Reviewing strategic plan performance by goal, provides a framework for more detailed evaluation and suggests specific opportunities for improvement.

Goal 1: To provide strategic advice on air quality issues and the impacts of major policy initiatives on air quality.

- 1.1 Facilitate the discussion and evaluation of major policy initiatives on air quality and the determinants of air quality.
- 1.2 Inform Board discussions on the best ways/means to address air quality issues in Alberta through comprehensive problem analysis. Determine, assess, and prioritize existing and emerging air quality issues and provide advice to CASA/other organizations on addressing these issues.

The Expectation:

In 2011 the Board suggested expanding the screen and scope activity associated with developing a Statement of Opportunity to include explicit identification and exploration of the best ways and means to address a particular air quality issue. This could include:

- Commissioning reviews by outside experts
- Producing independent research reports and developing discussion papers for use by others
- Facilitating interaction among scientists and other experts to create background information and viable broad policy alternatives
- Assessing the immediacy of the issue
- Identifying if CASA's consensus-based approach is well-suited to address all aspects of the issue, some aspects, or none

Performance and Analysis:

Through the introduction of a new Managing Collaborative Processes (MCP) guide in 2012 project managers and participants can now draw on a comprehensive reference guide to help them improve their performance with multi-stakeholder teams. For project managers the guide describes specific activities and techniques that can be used to encourage an interest-based (vs. positional) dialogue. These are presented within a step-wise decision-making process that moves teams from the convening stage through to ratification of a completed agreement. Similarly, participants can draw on suggestions that will help them effectively present their interests, work with other stakeholder groups and develop solutions that meet their needs.

The new MCP guide provides for the development of a Project Charter which is the collection of all information relevant to informing the project's parameters and outcomes. The charter describes the scope, deliverables, outcomes, projected resources and costs, timelines, stakeholder analysis and plan for engagement, a high level communication plan and draft ground rules for the project team. The Project Charter:

- Is used to obtain project support from CASA's Board;
- Defines the scope of the project and provides an advanced starting point for Project Team discussions
- Sets common expectations for project scope among stakeholders

While stopping short of commissioning external research and using outside experts to inform a Project Charter Working Group, the MCP Guide has significantly improved CASA's vetting of air quality issue candidates. This may delay the convening of a project team, but in the past many of these requirements would have emerged once a project team was convened, requiring stakeholders to change direction and seek Board approval.

Candidate issues normally emerge through annual Executive Director Interviews with CASA Directors and are then discussed by the full Board before preparation of a Statement of Opportunity. These annual meetings are directed at ensuring that CASA activities are aligned with member priorities, considering the different circumstances and needs of each member organization. While members seem generally satisfied with CASA's agenda, the need to reach consensus on which issues are addressed, means that some issues that are important to only one or a few stakeholders fall short of that test. Members also offer a general caution that CASA's reach should not exceed its capacity. There is a limit to the range and number of issues CASA can address at any given time.

Taken together, the scoping provisions introduced since the last three-year evaluation seem to have addressed the Board expectations from 2011.

Goal 2: To contribute to the continued development and implementation of effective and efficient air quality management in Alberta.

- 2.1 Through targeted and strategic interventions, model effective collaborative decision-making processes in the delivery of integrated air quality management. (Linked to 4.1)
- 2.2 Develop policy advice and frameworks to guide air quality management planning in Alberta.
- 2.3 Provide a forum for the discussion of air quality issues among various stakeholder groups.
- 2.4 Provide multi-stakeholder strategic advice on aspects of air quality program delivery. (Link to 3.2)

The Expectation:

In 2011, the Board recognized that the rollout of the national AQMS would have a major influence on the nature of air quality management in Alberta. Pending further clarification of the way in which the AQMS would unfold, the Board noted that CASA's experience in developing and implementing frameworks could contribute to the rationalization of the emerging direction at the national, provincial and regional scales.

As is reflected in objective 2.1 above, it was felt that CASA should identify opportunities for strategic intervention at a regional scale; opportunities that would provide a chance to model effective collaborative dialogue, satisfying several of CASA's goals in the process. The way in which these strategic opportunities would be identified was not resolved at the time, nor was any specific mechanism suggested.

Finally, in discussing CASA's role in providing a forum to discuss air quality issues among stakeholders, the Board highlighted the need to improve the level and quality of CASA's engagement with aboriginal communities. No specific actions were suggested, but the Board charged the Secretariat with exploring how this might be done.

Performance and Analysis:

To an extent CASA's new project work (i.e. Odour Management, Non-Point Source Emissions) is the result of a need to address regional issues that are of interest province-wide. CASA's work on these projects was not planned to meet a specific regional planning need, but both the Odour Management Team and the NPS Working Group are aware that their work will support the development and/or implementation of regional air quality management objectives (see CASA's contribution to IRM).

Since 2010 CASA Project Teams have completed several policy-related reports that have contributed to the management of air quality in Alberta. These include:

- Vehicle Emissions Team Final Report 2010

- Flaring and Venting Project Team Final Report 2010
- Confined Feeding Operations Final Report 2012
- Electricity Working Group Report (Implementation of BLIERS) 2012
- Human and Animal Health Implementation Team Final Report 2013
- PM and Ozone Implementation Team Final Report 2013
- Non-Point Source Emissions Workshop Proceedings 2013
- 5-Year Electricity Framework Review Interim Report 2014

Numerous other research reports were commissioned during this period to provide information for ongoing project work, as were several process related reports, including the MCP Guide.

CASA continues to provide meaningful, targeted policy advice that will contribute to the effective management of air quality in Alberta. This advice will continue to influence policy development at the provincial and national scale and will have application in the development and implementation of air quality management objectives in regional planning.

CASA has not identified opportunities for “strategic intervention” at the regional scale, nor is it clear that there is continued support for that objective.

There has been no appreciable improvement in the level or quality of CASA’s interactions with aboriginal communities (see Board Membership and Participation).

Goal 3: To contribute to the development of a reliable, comprehensive, objective knowledge system with respect to air quality (E.g. information on emissions, ambient air quality, health, and environmental impacts, and management and mitigation mechanisms.

- 3.1 Oversee a systematic process by which knowledge needed for successful air quality management is created, captured, shared and leveraged.
- 3.2 Provide strategic advice on the knowledge and information required for air management.
- 3.3 Assemble and share cross-jurisdictional information on air monitoring, mitigation measures and best management practices that could be effective in Alberta.

The Expectation:

In approving the 2012 – 2016 Strategic Plan the Board observed that, “the sum total of actions suggested under Goal 3 exceed CASA’s capacity and resources, and CASA will need to be strategic in identifying its most appropriate and relevant function.”

More specifically, the Board felt that the CASA Data Warehouse (CDW) had real value, but questioned whether CASA should act as a manager or should instead simply provide periodic advice regarding the preferred attributes of the CDW. The advice would focus on the functionality, quality, accessibility, transparency, knowledge gaps and relevance of the CDW, in relation to its ability to inform the resolution of air quality issues in Alberta. The Board observed that there will be an ongoing need for the CDW, or its successor, to be viewed as a credible source of information and to maintain the confidence of stakeholders.

In addition, the Board felt that providing oversight of an air quality “knowledge system” should be one of CASA’s highest priorities (author’s note – this was not ultimately reflected in the Board’s ranking of goals). They noted that this function – determining what information is available and what is needed – is very different from the collection and management of databases. They identified a need for CASA to inventory the considerable information and the many reports developed by CASA over the preceding 16 years, to enable gap analyses and to facilitate the resolution of emerging issues in the years ahead. The end state would be an awareness of what information is in the system, an awareness of the gaps, and an ability to take steps to fill the gaps.

Performance and Analysis:

The CASA Data Warehouse continues to be funded by AESRD through an annual agreement with CASA that sees AESRD provide management direction and funding, while CASA provides financial oversight. CASA is currently working with AESRD to clarify CDW assets, their location and use.

For at least the last two years CASA has had no involvement in the management of the CDW. On two occasions during that window it has acted as a facilitator between members of the OSC (only a few members remain) and the AESRD to arrange for the release of annual budget information. The future of the CDW is tied to AESRD and AEMERA plans for the monitoring and evaluation of air quality information in Alberta.

3.3.1 Given CASA’s limited role in the management of the CASA Data Warehouse, the database should be renamed and management responsibility should be clarified and documented. The Operations Steering Committee should be repurposed, or a new group created, to provide meaningful stakeholder advice regarding the CDW to the accountable managing agency. The advice would focus on the functionality, quality, accessibility, transparency, knowledge gaps and relevance of the database, in relation to its ability to inform the resolution of air quality issues in Alberta.

The CASA Secretariat has over 20 years of data, reports, research and meeting products. They provide valuable context, information and lessons that can be applied to address emerging issues. In paper form, much of this information had been inaccessible and had resulted in a loss of institutional memory.

The Secretariat has completed its project to create a searchable database that can be used to: inform stakeholder inquiries; report to the Board; and conduct periodic performance measurement. “Back-end” searchable tables and “front-end” query forms have been prepared and system testing is complete. The Secretariat anticipates that this searchable database will significantly improve CASA’s ability to generate information about the work of past project teams, bring forward outstanding implementation requirements and provide context for current stakeholder discussions. Prior to the development of this capability all such information had to be generated manually. Some work remains to populate the back end tables.

Individual project teams will continue to commission research that is designed to meet issue- specific information requirements, including the gathering of some cross-jurisdictional information, in effect conducting their own gap analyses.

CASA’s development of a searchable database will contribute to the provision of the “knowledge system” described by the CASA Board in 2011. However, barring further resourcing and focus, directed at meeting the intent of the objective, this tool will not realize its full potential or result in the required inventory of needed air quality information.

Goal 4: To communicate information that builds awareness, understanding, and commitment to air quality management in Alberta.

- 4.1 Establish CASA as a model that exemplifies the application of collaborative multi-party processes.
- 4.2 Increase awareness of air quality information and specific CASA activities and projects through targeted outreach to all interested sectors.
- 4.3 Build air quality partnerships and working relationships and facilitate the exchange of air quality information among practitioners and decision- makers.
(Link to 4.1)

The Expectation:

In 2011 the Board described CASA’s familiarity with the collaborative process and consensus- based dialogue as its greatest strength and said that CASA should place a high priority on transferring that knowledge and expertise to other parties (author’s note – again, this was not reflected in the Board’s subsequent ranking of goals). The transfer of this information to non-air focused organizations was considered to be a lesser priority, but one which would interest other parties in CASA’s work.

There was limited agreement on the extent to which CASA should be involved in public education and outreach. Some members felt that positioning CASA as a media resource would increase its visibility. Some advocated for an increased focus on education. Still others cautioned that this goal and the associated objectives had the potential to draw heavily on CASA's limited resources, and that these functions should be left to other organizations that are better equipped.

It was agreed that CASA would continue to educate and provide information, when warranted by specific project team discussions.

Performance and Analysis:

CASA performance with respect to both Goals 3 & 4 is perhaps a reflection of the priority placed by CASA members on Goals 1 & 2 during strategic plan development in 2011 and the limited resources available to CASA for external communications activities.

Still, since 2011 CASA has sponsored or initiated several communications activities that were designed to improve general awareness of CASA and its consensus-based work:

1. In 2012 the Government of Alberta announced cabinet approval of a renewed Clean Air Strategy (CAS) for Alberta. The renewed CAS was accompanied by a more specific action plan. For three days following the launch of the CAS, the GoA, CASA and its stakeholders used social media (e.g. Twitter, Facebook, YouTube), linked webpages, pre-recorded video, e-mail and other platforms to raise awareness of the new strategy and air-related issues. CASA provided backgrounders that focused on:

- i) the considerable work done by CASA stakeholders to develop recommendations;
- ii) CASA's consensus-based approach to developing policy advice; and
- iii) the implications of a renewed policy for CASA's work.

The release of the strategy allowed the Secretariat and CASA partners to gain experience using social media as a means to distribute information.

2. In 2012 CASA sponsored a two-day workshop in Red Deer to share information about CASA-related initiatives and to learn more about consensus-building approaches and tools. Day 1 of the workshop provided the most current information about government priorities and the related implications for stakeholders. Day 2 of the workshop provided an opportunity for stakeholders with extensive collaborative experience to discuss the strengths and challenges of multi-stakeholder negotiations.

3. CASA's 2013 Emerald Awards submission focused on CASA's 20 year "body of work" and emphasized the number and impact of CASA agreements reached, across a broad range of topics. CASA highlighted the 225,000+ stakeholder hours that have been committed since 1994. In the NGO category CASA was one of five finalists selected from 24 submissions.

4. In 2014 CASA's 20th Anniversary provided an opportunity to host a conference for CASA stakeholders that focused on the art and science of building collaborative agreements. Speakers were selected based on their experience working within collaborative decision-making processes in different walks of life. CASA will continue to follow up on the

conference, using conference materials (e.g. video clips) to promote further interest in multi-stakeholder processes and CASA's work.

In addition to these events, CASA staff regularly attend and present at forums sponsored by CASA partners and other Alberta organizations with an interest in collaborative approaches to policy development.

CASA has also sponsored three training sessions for project team participants and other parties with an interest in collaborative processes. CASA's training curriculum makes frequent reference to the MCP Guide and promotes an interest-based approach to multi-stakeholder negotiation.

4. FUNCTIONAL PERFORMANCE

4.1 Improving Consensus-seeking Skills and Approach

The Expectation:

CASA members and stakeholders are committed to the continuous improvement of their ability to produce consensus agreements. In some respects that ability defines CASA and is clearly a point of pride for CASA members. In 2011 CASA stakeholders identified a number of improvements that could be made to current practice.

- Providing more training, and more effective training, in the principles and practice of consensus-building. Both new and existing stakeholders should have access to experiential training and mentors who can provide practical advice to help overcome common challenges.
- Providing clear procedures that apply when stakeholders choose to "block" a particular outcome, or a project team is unable to agree on key elements of an issue or how it should be addressed.

Performance and Analysis:

The development and rollout of CASA's Managing Collaborative Processes (MCP) Guide and its focus on interest-based negotiation provided a platform to integrate several initiatives, each directed at improving CASA stakeholders' ability to build consensus.

First, the guide brought together separate problem-solving streams in a single guide for practitioners; strategic decision-making; project management and planning; and the collaborative process. Second, it provided a foundation for the application of interest-based negotiation in CASA projects. Third, it provided a framework and content for training CASA stakeholders. The guide was developed in 2012 and was made available to stakeholders soon afterwards.

Training has since been provided to a range of CASA stakeholders and new project team participants. Stakeholders have expressed their appreciation for the training's focus on interest-

based negotiation and believe it has had a positive influence on the orientation of project participants and their application of collaborative process to the start-up of new teams.

CASA has made no formal provision for mentoring new entrants to the Board or existing project teams, beyond the orientation offered at the outset of their engagement. For these players learning is necessarily experiential, acquired through observing other table members. Often, stakeholders seek information and advice from Secretariat staff when and as needed. Typically requests focus on the way in which an issue is addressed or how an individual's unique interests should be presented to the team.

4.1.1 Expand the use of the MCP Guide and increase stakeholder familiarity with interest-based negotiation by placing a high priority on training delivery 1) for new and existing stakeholders within the CASA family, and then 2) to other key decision-makers with an interest in CASA's work.

4.2 Dealing with Impasse

The Expectation:

In 2011, The Board directed all stakeholders to “press harder” to reach agreement when confronted with an apparent impasse. They also noted that there should be more accountability, transparency and procedural clarity when stakeholders elect to block an emerging agreement.

Currently, the Board has the authority to make a decision when project teams can't reach consensus. When there is a lack of consensus at the Board, the matter can be referred to the Ministers of Energy, Environment and Sustainable Resource Development, and Health for decision.

Performance and Analysis:

Concerns regarding how the Board and project teams deal with impasse are not new to CASA, or for that matter, any organization seeking multi-stakeholder agreement. There are many references in CASA records dating back to the 90's that refer to the challenges associated with overcoming impasse. CASA has an obligation to more effectively equip project team participants to deal with impasse in a manner that is consistent with CASA principles and maintains the integrity and credibility of the organization. It is not when parties are in agreement that the adequacy of consensus-based procedures should be measured, but rather when they are in fundamental disagreement. What can CASA offer as an organization when discussions are the most challenging and the path forward is the least clear?

In 2010 the Flaring and Venting Team reached an impasse regarding the need for further measures to reduce emissions. More recently the 2013 Electricity Framework Review Team found itself at an impasse when it was unable to reach agreement on the need for the Framework to be subject to a comprehensive structural review. In both instances participants sought guidance from the Secretariat with respect to CASA procedures to address impasse.

Both the Flaring and Venting Team and Electricity Framework Review Teams were ultimately able to prepare non-consensus reports that effectively framed the issues in play and captured the views of the

affected parties. While the quality and content of these reports met CASA needs at the time, the associated procedural debate was unhelpful and difficult.

4.2.1 Improving CASA’s approach to dealing with impasse is most easily accomplished through an organization-wide commitment to understanding and practicing interest-based negotiation in all CASA forums. This single requirement, coupled with a requirement for all CASA stakeholders to receive training in interest-based negotiation would establish the required foundation to manage impasse more effectively.

4.2.2 The Secretariat should be charged with preparing detailed, CASA-focused procedures for dealing with impasse, as an appendix to the MCP. In the interests of meeting Board expectations for transparency and accountability in project team discussions, dissenting parties should be required to document how a proposed solution or course of action would negatively affect their interests, and be required to propose alternatives that would meet all parties’ interests.

4.3 A Non-Consensus Stream

The Expectation:

In early 2010, the Board directed the Secretariat to scope the possibility of building a “parallel service stream” to provide policy advice for projects not well-suited to a consensus-based approach. In some instances, the expectation that CASA *must* produce a consensus agreement can detract from the collaborative approach that CASA members value. The view that anything short of consensus is failure may limit the scope of CASA’s work. In 2011, the Strategic Foresight group observed that CASA members participate in a *strategic* alliance that should be addressing “big policy issues”. Such issues are often not candidates for quick resolution, but they may be the very issues that benefit from transparent discussion, engaging a broad range of stakeholders.

Performance and Analysis:

If CASA is to address only those issues that are good candidates for consensus, it may minimize the value of a non-consensus, yet collaborative approach that would still allow stakeholders to:

- Gather early perspectives on an issue
- Engage in joint fact finding
- Foster a better understanding of the dimensions of an issue
- Understand both unique and common interests of affected parties
- Test for areas of agreement and disagreement

Not only is this information of real value to policy-makers; it begins to build a more positive dialogue between competing interests. A more incremental approach to collaboration, that focuses on the above listed elements first, need not preclude setting an expectation that the parties may produce a consensus agreement on some or all aspects of an issue in time. CASA’s mission is to use a “collaborative consensus approach”, but that should not limit CASA’s contribution to Alberta’s most challenging issues.

At the Board's direction, new CASA teams are guided by detailed Project Charters, and a more inclusive approach to the preparation of Statements of Opportunity. This has required project managers and stakeholders to have an early look at the dimensions of an emerging air quality issue and to consider if all, or parts of an issue, are good candidates for consensus agreement (see Strategic Plan Performance – Goal 1). This change suggests that CASA is already moving to a more incremental, streamed approach to addressing new issues.

- 4.3.1 During revision of CASA's Strategic Plan, the Board should make a provision under Goal 1 for CASA to convene multi-stakeholder discussions that are *not* directed at reaching a consensus agreement, but rather at providing comprehensive policy analysis and advice within a multi-stakeholder framework.**
- 4.3.2 Amend the MCP Guide, and change CASA practice, to enable non-consensus, collaborative approaches to the development of policy advice.**
- 4.3.3 The Government of Alberta should identify an early opportunity to pilot this approach, requiring CASA to undertake this type of multi-stakeholder policy analysis on an emerging air quality issue.**

4.4 A Broader Toolkit

The Expectation:

There is an ongoing interest in CASA finding ways to work smarter while still producing collaborative outcomes and building relationships between members. Members feel that CASA is reasonably efficient in completing its work, but would also like to address some issues without necessarily convening a standing project team and associated subgroups. This idea of CASA using a "broader toolkit" has been discussed by the board on many occasions, but it has yet to be tested. Any new approach could be determined on an issue-specific basis, and perhaps piloted for subsequent board review. There is some speculation that alternative approaches may reduce the cost of addressing air quality issues, but that has not been demonstrated.

At the 2011 retreat the Board discussed ways in which CASA could introduce *new collaborative methods* to make a more significant contribution to the formulation of policy in Alberta, within the limits prescribed by CASA's mission and resources.

Performance and Analysis:

There is a general appreciation among stakeholders that multiple and interrelated problems require multiple and interrelated solutions. There is a global shift away from a top-down approach, towards an emphasis on building institutional bridges between governmental leaders and other stakeholders. This is a result of international trends in governance; the availability of improved communications technologies; the need to share responsibility for resolving complex issues; and the political need to manage cross-cutting social, economic and environmental projects.

In mature organization, there is a tendency to employ the same approach to every new issue. This is not just a function of habit. The approach and methods CASA uses to engage stakeholders is a product of Board direction, the earlier CAMS process, the more recent MCP Guide and the legacy of a successful

track record. There is little appetite to try new forms of engagement when the existing approach seems to work. But how should CASA respond when an emerging issue is not a good candidate for a consensus-driven project team? Can CASA still make a useful contribution to policy development?

In some instances CASA may serve as a catalyst to engage parties with an interest in an issue without presuming there will be a particular type of outcome or that it will lead to the development of a particular kind of document. CASA could promote a climate of “learning as we go” on some policy initiatives. Stakeholders want to know that their investment of time will have some payoff, but they also appreciate well-designed and professionally executed opportunities to discuss important issues. Many stakeholders are not wedded to the use of a CASA-like project team. If and when necessary, CASA has the capability to convene more focused and highly-managed teams, but this need not be a first response.

Other jurisdictions are experimenting with a broad range of engagement vehicles to inform policy development. The examples described below offer a few alternatives to CASA’s current practice. They are not stand alone possibilities and could be used in any combination, or in sequence, to provide a comprehensive and inclusive approach to involving stakeholders in policy development.

Stakeholder Search Conferences

A participative planning method that requires a representative group of stakeholders to come together over several days to describe a preferred future path, based on an exploration and understanding of a common history and the existing policy landscape. More than a simple visioning process, it is intended to produce agreement on the most promising courses of action to address an agreed set of issues (CASA’s one-day NPS workshop could be viewed as a kind of abbreviated Search Conference).

Evidence-based Panels

A structured method for involving stakeholders and recognized experts in the development of evidence-based policy. Building agreement on the interpretation, relevance and feasibility of research/literature can lead to higher confidence in the quality of policy outcomes and a shared interest in implementation.

Web based Approaches

Online collaborative policy development uses interactive software to build a sense of preferred direction among a community of users. Accessible to as broad or narrow an audience as is desirable, policy developers can provide background information, float policy options, pose focused questions, promote interaction between interested parties, and frame emerging areas of agreement. Moderators or planners can use the platform to describe how past contributions are being used and can integrate platforms, linking to other related sites. Standing online Communities of Practice can be linked to specific policy development initiatives.

The possibilities to bring parties together in new ways are limitless. While CASA should not be seeking new ways to engage stakeholders simply for the sake of change, neither should it limit its toolkit to only those described in the MCP Guide. A more responsive approach to process design may use stakeholder resources more efficiently, while generating valued products.

5. INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE

5.1 Board Performance

The Expectation:

In 2011 CASA members focused on five aspects of the Board's function. They said that:

- the Board should be used to provide strategic direction and to expedite the CAMS process
- the role and function of the Executive Committee should be enhanced, providing for more effective liaison between the Board, the Secretariat and project teams
- Board members and their counterparts on project teams should interact more frequently so that emerging project issues can be addressed before positions become entrenched and so that Board guidance can be offered when necessary
- Board membership could be tiered, based on the extent of engagement required. More thought should be given to the range of ways that parties can participate, rather than focusing only on Board membership
- Increase the size of the Executive Committee or add alternates so that the group can meet as required

Performance and Analysis:

In 2013 and 2014, the years in which active project team members have been asked about their interaction with Board members, an average of 84% of respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the support they received from Board counterparts.

The current size of the Executive Committee and the availability of its members doesn't allow for the kind of proactive liaison imagined by the Board. The Secretariat is often unable to get timely responses from all caucuses or schedule meetings for a more focused exchange between

committee members. The Board correctly recognized the important role the committee plays in expediting and focusing CASA's business, but it is unlikely that the committee will be able to realize its potential without structural change. A somewhat larger committee would allow for more frequent engagement between the three caucuses and more opportunity for the committee to guide CASA's work.

5.1.1 Add one alternate to each of the existing Executive Committee member positions. Encourage the alternates to actively participate in all Executive Committee meetings.

5.2 Board Membership and Participation

When CASA was established, it represented a new way of finding solutions to current and emerging air quality issues. As an incorporated, not-for-profit society, CASA was conceived to be an independent organization providing consensus-based advice to the Government of Alberta and others, with industry, government and non-government organizations at the table. To be effective, CASA needed to have diverse representation, yet remain manageable in size.

The 1994 bylaws allowed for up to 20 members to join CASA. This was subsequently amended in 2005 to increase the number of members to 22, with the addition of First Nations and Metis members.

Article III of the bylaws describe the conditions for membership in the Association. Any organization can apply to join CASA provided that the application meets the requirements of Article III:

- The applicant must meet the bylaw criteria to be designated as representing industry, government or non-government organizations
- The application must be approved by the Board
- Application approval can't result in an increased number of Board members without an amendment to increase the number of members (or without an existing member resigning)
- Application approval can't result in any Stakeholder Group (industry, government or NGOs) exceeding 49% of total Board membership

Board membership is given to a designated organization, not individuals. Board directors and alternates are appointed by the member. Member "self-selection" is an important part of the consensus process. Because there is no appointment term for directors or alternates, appointed individuals can continue in their position as long as they have the support of the member (the organization) that selected them.

At least once every year CASA members are asked, in session, to confirm Board membership. This is a requirement of the Annual General Meeting, and it provides an opportunity to raise and discuss membership questions. More frequently, the Executive Committee discusses membership issues and receives applications for membership on the Board's behalf. The Executive, in turn, may recommend that an application be approved or rejected by the Board. The Executive is bound by bylaw requirements, but often the Executive's recommendation is shaped by CASA's operating principles and the need for inclusivity, access, balance and transparency.

Each year CASA sees a modest turnover in Board representation. Membership has remained static for the past ten years with the exception of the withdrawal of the Oil and Gas – Small Producers. Since 2010, there have been three requests for membership on the CASA Board. In each case the application was either withdrawn, rejected or remains unresolved within the respective caucus.

Performance and Analysis:

It would be reasonable to assume that parties who feel excluded from the decision making process would make that known to the Board and/or the Secretariat. Concerns regarding Board or Project Team representation are rare and they are usually remedied once the concerned party develops a better understanding of the ways in which they can participate and influence the development of CASA recommendations. Project teams typically ensure that all parties with an interest in an air quality issue actively participate in the development of recommendations.

They do this, in part, to build broad support for the implementation of their recommendations. Still, there are instances where interested parties feel that only direct Board representation will allow them to advocate for specific recommendations that are critical to their interests.

The range of air quality issues that are proposed to the CASA Board for discussion is constantly changing. The continued credibility of the organization and its work requires that the membership regularly review the makeup of the Board, ensuring that potentially affected organizations are adequately represented. Some members or directors may decline to withdraw from the Board if they believe it would be difficult to gain re-entry at some point in the future, or if they perceive that withdrawal would reduce their influence in future air quality discussions.

The current review of Board membership at the Annual General Meeting is viewed as a pro- forma bylaw requirement, rather than an informed discussion about the makeup of the Board relative to its current and planned agenda. In instances where membership has been discussed at the AGM, it is only to recommend that membership be revisited after development of a new strategic plan. The procedure for the submission, review and approval of membership applications was documented and reaffirmed by the Board in December of 2008, and it is applied as required. However, the procedure does not provide for an annual, dedicated discussion focused on Board membership.

5.2.1 Introduce staggered three-year term limits for all CASA Board members, together with a requirement that each member prepare a very brief account of its interest in current or emerging air quality issues at the time of renewal. All parties requesting CASA membership should also be required to provide an Interest Statement together with their application.

5.2.2 Apart from the requirements of the AGM, schedule an annual Board agenda item to discuss the Board's makeup and capacity to address emerging air quality issues. This discussion would immediately follow an annual review of CASA's operational plan and strategic plan.

- 5.2.3 Delete the Oil and Gas – Small Producers membership on the Board.** (When the Small Explorers and Producers Assoc. of Canada resigned, they confirmed that they would continue to access information about CASA through the Canadian Assoc. of Petroleum Producers.)
- 5.2.4 Request an application for Board membership from AEMERA, in recognition of its significant role in the development and administration of Alberta’s air quality monitoring system.**

Electricity Sector Representation

Industry participants involved in electricity-related discussions at CASA represent a broad range of interests, reflecting the diverse nature of Alberta’s system for the generation, purchase and distribution of electricity. The broad range of electricity interests challenges all CASA participants to find effective approaches to facilitate intra-sector dialogue, arrive at consensus outcomes and to represent individual views and business interests. This requirement is particularly important when fundamental regulatory issues are being discussed that may have a significant impact on individual companies. In these circumstances CASA is obliged to: 1) help parties fully understand and apply an interest-based approach to accommodating diverse interests; and 2) ensure that all parties have sufficient access to all discussions that may affect an individual party’s interests.

These requirements are not unique to the electricity sector, but they are made more challenging when there is no single umbrella organization able to coordinate, consolidate and present a sector’s interests. CASA recognized this challenge when the membership procedural guidelines were rewritten and prepared a draft Template for Sectors with No Umbrella Organization (Appendix C). The template was endorsed by the Board for referral to sectors with this need.

Currently there are two members representing electricity interests on the CASA Board, a total of four potential seats, only three of which are filled. (In 2008 the CASA Board reconfirmed that it supports having both directors and alternates engaged in table discussions.) Given the latitude to use existing seats more effectively, perhaps through a redefinition/renaming of the Utilities and/or Alternate Energy memberships, it is likely that a broader range of electricity interests could be represented on the Board. This was most recently done by members associated with the Alberta Environmental Network and was supported by the Board. While an increase in electricity membership is possible, this should only be considered if a solution isn’t available using existing seats.

- 5.2.5 Consistent with the guidance provided by the Procedural Guidelines Committee in December of 2008, and agreed to by the Board, the Electricity Sector should reach agreement on a protocol for representation of all electricity- related interests engaged in CASA discussions. The Memorandum of Understanding Template, provided to the Board in 2009 for the use of sectors with no umbrella organization should serve as a first draft (Appendix C).**

5.2.6 The Board should task the Electricity Sector with reconfiguring/renaming their existing membership, filling the four seats available and providing for a broader representation of electricity interests.

Aboriginal Participation

The CASA Board and Project Teams have had a longstanding interest in encouraging aboriginal participation in CASA policy discussions. In 2010 the CASA Board again raised this issue and suggested that the Secretariat increase its efforts to attract representation from First Nations and Metis communities. The CASA Board currently has two director positions set aside for aboriginal participation, one directed at First Nations, the other at Metis communities.

Aboriginal participation in CASA Board meetings and on project teams has been very limited. While there have been periodic meetings between the Executive Director and aboriginal representatives to encourage participation, these meetings have not resulted in sustained attendance at Board meetings, as evidenced by our recent Board attendance survey. Project teams continue to show a keen interest in aboriginal participation. Most recently, the Odour Management Team and Electricity Framework Review Team have both considered how they might effectively canvas aboriginal interests regarding draft project work.

Of all CASA members, aboriginal representatives have perhaps the most limited institutional capacity to participate in multi-stakeholder discussions and the development of natural resource management policies. Further, current and past aboriginal representatives have repeatedly expressed their discomfort with being seen to represent a broad range of aboriginal opinion on provincial air quality issues, when they are only practically able to represent a much narrower range of views; those of their own community or organization. This concern is compounded when CASA documents imply that there is aboriginal agreement, when that characterization is unwarranted (e.g. in minutes, etc.). Given the persistent and chronic inability of the Alliance to develop and sustain meaningful aboriginal participation in CASA policy discussions, it may be advisable to try a very different approach that focuses on aboriginal inclusion vs. trying to find an aboriginal “fit” within CASA’s governance model.

There is, of course, a provincial government obligation to consult aboriginal communities and organizations in the development of policies related to the protection and management of natural resources, but this does not supplant the need for CASA to find a more effective approach to aboriginal participation.

5.2.7 Rather than continuing to seek CASA members from First Nations and Metis communities, CASA should hold periodic workshops, directed specifically at providing information and eliciting a common aboriginal view, or range of views, with respect to air quality policy. These periodic workshops could: cover a single, or several, air quality issue(s); be designed to align with geographic or cultural interests; and could extend beyond air quality, to include other media (e.g. if there was a shared interest with the AWC, or others).

5.3 Secretariat Performance

The Expectation:

Board direction from 2011 focused on three areas:

- The need for the Secretariat to assess emerging issues, do the needed homework, and bring thoughtful documents to the Board for discussion, resulting in more focused team discussions that have greater clarity of purpose. This was characterized as an expansion of the old Screen and Scope process in CAMS
- Encouraging Project Managers to play a greater role in supporting project teams: acting as brokers; building relationships; encouraging team members to focus on their interests; and fostering productive discussions between meetings
- Providing more support at the caucus level, ensuring that communications with caucuses are timely and that stakeholders are well-briefed

Performance and Analysis:

With the introduction of the Managing Collaborative Processes Guide, the required Project Charter and a more inclusive approach to Statement of Opportunity preparation, CASA and the Secretariat have effectively addressed the need for a more thoughtful approach to project screening and project definition.

Project Managers are now regularly encouraged to take a much greater role in the management of project teams. There is an expectation that managers will “own” the design and execution of project work plans, build stakeholder relationships between meetings and use a more directed style of facilitation. Training for managers presumes that CASA will use an interest-based approach to negotiation; reflected in CASA’s approach to meeting management and between-meeting strategy discussions. The Secretariat remains committed to an outcome/product orientation, tempered by the importance CASA places on *how* outcomes are developed.

Effective project management and facilitation skills take many years to develop. The productive management of multi-stakeholder teams requires years of experience, gained through observation and in-session practice. CASA’s success will continue to be a product of competent project leadership and the commitment of its stakeholders. Enabling and growing a high performance culture among Project Managers must be aggressively supported if CASA is to continue on its current path.

- 5.3.1 The Executive Director and Executive Committee should maximize the exposure of Project Managers to a broad range of multi-stakeholder processes and policy development initiatives, both inside and outside of CASA’s current mandate and specific areas of interest. CASA members should actively support the development of a formal or informal Community of Practice, fostering the facilitation and project management skills required to lead multi-stakeholder teams.**

Secretariat support for individual caucuses and caucus meetings has been limited. When asked CASA has distributed information, arranged meeting space and, very infrequently, attended and contributed to caucus discussions. Caucuses rarely request assistance, perhaps because there is a need for caucuses to discuss some issues in confidence. The Secretariat could increase its support to caucuses, if requested, with consideration for the availability of Secretariat staff and the need to balance caucus support with project team work.

6. CASA'S CONTRIBUTION TO IRM PLANNING

The Expectation:

One of five key outcomes from the 2011 Board retreat described the opportunity for CASA to “model effective multi-stakeholder engagement by providing key interventions in other multi-stakeholder processes.”

Beyond its current contribution to policy development and the development of provincial air quality management frameworks, the 2011 Mission Review document suggested that CASA outcomes could be applied to components of Regional Land Use Plans under the LUF. Experience gained in one region would be made available to other regions. Greater consistency could be achieved and adverse consequences for neighbouring regions minimized. It was suggested that CASA stakeholders work with the Government of Alberta to define an appropriate role.

There is an ongoing need to clarify and document the link between provincial policy-oriented organizations and the development and implementation of regional plans. A review of Board minutes from 2009 through 2014 confirms that this issue has been raised frequently by CASA members, but the nature of CASA's contribution to regional plans remains unclear. Clarification of CASA's role in IRM planning, and specifically, the relationship of CASA products to regional plans would provide a useful filter for CASA members in reviewing candidate Statements of Opportunity.

Performance and Analysis:

From a systems planning perspective there is little evidence that there is significant duplication or gaps between CASA's policy development discussions and the content of individual regional plans. The different products generated by provincial and regional processes seem well understood by stakeholders and they are familiar with their purpose and content. Many of the same players or organizations participate in different forums at different scales. Where that is not the case, information sharing across multi-stakeholder discussions and planning levels ensures that discussions at all levels are focused and meet an identified need.

Perhaps the most effective check on unfocused or redundant engagement initiatives are the stakeholders themselves. Virtually all those engaged in multi-stakeholder discussions “vote with their feet”. If a particular table or organization fails to produce products that have a clear application to current needs (i.e. contributes to IRM), meeting attendance will decline or there will be a change in the seniority of representatives assigned to the discussion.

The most effective way to ensure that CASA, or any similar organization, maintains its focus on work that is valued by its members and integrated with other parts of the Integrated Resource Management System, is to schedule regular, forthright table discussions about CASA's agenda (at least annually). Further, any proposed CASA project should be subject to considerable scrutiny with respect to its alignment with CASA's mission and its specific contribution to IRM. Of course, there is always the possibility that discussion of some air quality issues may be of interest to Alberta stakeholders, but not yet enabled within the existing IRM framework.

Since 2010 CASA has disbanded five project teams:

- the Particulate Matter and Ozone Implementation Team
- the Confined Feeding Operations Implementation Review Team
- the Human and Animal Health Implementation Team
- the Vehicle Emissions Team
- the Flaring and Venting Team

Subject to Board direction and further guidance from the Government of Alberta and AEMERA, the CASA Operations Steering Committee may also be repurposed or disbanded in the coming months. This is a total of 6 project teams, several of which were focused on the implementation of recommendations. Over the same period the Odour Management Team was convened and it seems likely that CASA will soon be addressing Non-Point Source Emissions.

In practice, the renewal and alignment of CASA projects has been self-correcting, driven by Government of Alberta planning requirements, stakeholder interest and the landscape of emerging air quality issues in Alberta.

- 6.1 In support of building an improved understanding of IRM requirements and the contribution of existing multi-stakeholder organizations, the Government of Alberta should develop a stakeholder friendly, annotated roadmap that clarifies roles, responsibilities, outputs, linkages and other information that will help clarify system requirements and stakeholder opportunities.**

CASA and the AWC

After the Alberta Water Council (AWC) was incorporated as a not-for-profit organization in 2007, the CASA board expressed interest in the potential to collaborate with the Council on matters of mutual interest. The two organizations have a number of similarities, and stakeholders wondered if efficiencies could be gained by combining Secretariat activities and, at the strategic level, if consensus recommendations could be integrated. In March 2007, the CASA board established a committee to explore opportunities for collaboration with the AWC.

In September 2009 the committee prepared recommendations under each of the three goals described in its terms of reference. The terms of reference suggested that collaboration opportunities between CASA and the AWC could be enhanced by:

1. Identifying opportunities for leveraging resources, increasing efficiency, avoiding duplicate efforts, and building on their respective successes;
2. Educating and raising awareness regarding the activities and processes of both the Water Council and CASA; and
3. Demonstrating a commitment to, and helping build on, the important linkages between air, land and water at the strategic level.

Of the recommendations endorsed by the CASA Board, seven addressed the need for improved communications between the two organizations. They included recommendations for improved liaison, linked websites, jointly sponsored events, annual Board updates and joint communications about the value of a multi-stakeholder approach.

Only one recommendation addressed CASA and AWC contributions to IRM. The recommendation noted the significance of the new LUF and read:

“CASA and the AWC, in consultation with the Land Use Secretariat, hold discussions on a role for each organization in the implementation of the Land Use Framework, including regional planning and cumulative effects management.”

CASA’s Board further directed that:

“In scoping new projects, the secretariat will consider whether there should be collaboration with the Alberta Water Council or the Land-use Secretariat.

The secretariat will coordinate discussion with the Land-use Secretariat after the board meets with Alberta Environment to discuss cumulative effects management.”

Performance and Analysis:

Implementation of the committee’s recommendations has been limited. The Executive Directors of the organizations have shared information on a regular basis (e.g. with respect to recruitment, job descriptions, budgeting, financial administration, liaison with the Government of Alberta, and other topics). There has also been some collaboration on training opportunities and workshops of common interest.

CASA and the AWC share a common governance structure and a similar provincial relationship with place-based multi-stakeholder teams (e.g. WPACs and Airshed Zones). The organizations draw on the same funding sources and work within a similar business model. Still, it is not surprising that the organizations have had little in the way of a day-to-day exchange. The content of project work at CASA and the AWC has been distinct and has not usually resulted in substantive exchange or inquiry across project teams, where the great majority of work is done. There are exceptions. For example, AWC work on Non-Point Source pollution may contribute to CASA discussions. The search for efficiencies between CASA and the AWC (beyond administrative efficiencies) is normally left to participating stakeholders who have a keen interest in spending their time wisely.

In 2011 CASA's Board observed that,

“The trend toward more integration of media at the regional level will almost certainly require a similar integrated approach at broader policy levels. Similar integration challenges exist even within air quality discussions. Companies find themselves having to manage and provide input to GHG and AQMS discussions as though they were not related. In an era of limited available sweat equity, stakeholders will demand more integrated approaches.”

Clearly, CASA members expect that there should be a periodic assessment of the way in which provincial policy is integrated, including the way in multi-stakeholder organizations such as CASA and the AWC work together.

6.2 Convene a small Working Group drawn from the Boards of the AWC and CASA (including the Executive Directors), and designated senior Government of Alberta staff with responsibility for implementation of the Integrated Resource Management System. Task them with developing recommendations to the two Boards and the responsible Deputy Ministers with respect to:

- **the current and potential CASA and AWC projects that are contributing to, or will contribute to IRM requirements (e.g. regional plan development and implementation, regulatory frameworks, and new GoA policy requirements); and**
- **the advisability of fully integrating the work and governance structures of the AWC and CASA, including policy development directed at managing other natural resource values as appropriate.**

CASA, the Alberta Airshed Council (AAC) and Airshed Zones (AZ)

CASA and the Airshed Zones (AZ) have had a good relationship that has evolved in response to a changing air quality management landscape, changing needs and the addition of new players. In the past, CASA has, on request, assisted new zones with their start-up activities, providing some initial staff support and modest financial support to identify stakeholders and bring them together. The CASA board was also asked to endorse a new AZ if the board of the AZ so desired. AZ representatives have actively participated on many CASA project teams over the years, as the zones are often affected by CASA recommendations.

CASA and Airshed Zones have both played key roles in Alberta's air quality management system and their work is interconnected. Many CASA project teams have used air quality monitoring data that is collected by the AZs to assess the current state of air quality trends.

There is a reciprocal relationship between CASA and the AZs in that airshed monitoring supports policy development and planning at CASA and CASA project teams have made recommendations for the monitoring and assessment of air quality by AZs. With Alberta's growing emphasis on place-based environmental management, CASA, AZs and the AAC have a common interest in addressing strategic

issues and challenges.

At its March 24, 2010 meeting, the CASA Board accepted the final report from the CASA Airshed Zones Board Committee. A key recommendation provided for the creation of a new committee, to be called the CASA and AAC Joint Standing Committee (JSC). Among other things, this Joint Standing Committee would work to strengthen the relationship between CASA, the AAC and the individual Airshed Zones, and would provide a forum for discussing and addressing strategic issues related to effective air quality management in Alberta. The need for CASA to provide start-up support to individual airsheds has been supplanted by a collaborative approach, focused on issues of common interest.

The JSC Terms of Reference require the parties to, “clarify the roles, interests and relationships of the AAC, CASA and Airshed Zones”. Accordingly, the committee commissioned a report in 2012 that examined:

- functional components of Alberta’s Air Quality Management System;
- roles and responsibilities of the organizations delivering aspects of the system;
- relationships among organizations;
- government initiatives with implications for delivery of air quality management; and
- issues or inconsistencies that the JSC may wish to address.

The report posed a number of important questions regarding the planned roll-out of air quality monitoring in Alberta, the answers to which will significantly influence the role of all players involved in air quality monitoring and related policy development in Alberta. The report was subsequently forwarded to the newly created Alberta Environmental Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting Agency (AEMERA) and AESRD. In March of 2013, Ernie Hui, CEO, AEMERA attended a JSC meeting and noted that, “AEMERA will be seeking input on system design and planning from relevant organizations (e.g. CASA, AZs). We will also be engaging with organizations currently involved in monitoring and partnering with them on operational monitoring activities.”

Until further guidance is received from AEMERA and the AESRD with respect to the questions posed in the JSC 2012 report, it will be difficult for the Joint Standing Committee to make further progress on its Terms of Reference.

Beyond the immediate requirement to clarify the roles and responsibilities of CASA, the AAC and Airshed Zones, the JSC Terms of Reference provide for the sharing of information between the principal players. This will be an ongoing requirement and there is much that could be done to improve cross-organization communications.

7. KEY ASSOCIATED RISKS

CASA’s performance is closely linked to the risks identified in CASA’s recently developed Risk Management Plan. Of the four risks given a high rating in the plan, two address CASA’s need for sufficient and sustainable funding and two address CASA’s relevance to stakeholders and their satisfaction with the organization. If CASA fails to meet performance expectations, one would expect the shortfall to be reflected in decreased funding and a loss of stakeholder support.

7.1 Funding

The Expectation:

There was no specific Board guidance offered with respect to CASA’s funding following the 2011 Performance Evaluation. However, the Board has regularly discussed the funding issue, often in the context of CASA’s requirement for an annual core funding grant to maintain all Secretariat operations and support project teams. Perhaps the most significant Board discussion regarding CASA’s core funding occurred in 2011, in response to a Secretariat discussion document that proposed a range of alternative funding sources for CASA, including non-GoA grant applications, contract opportunities and industry levies. In each case, these alternative sources were found to be inappropriate or unreliable.

Performance and Analysis:

There have been two developments in the last four years that have significantly improved CASA’s sustainability. First, the Government of Alberta moved to sole source funding for CASA, initially through AESRD and then through Alberta Energy. This removed the need for annual last minute cross agency fundraising. Second, Alberta Energy has provided CASA with sufficient funding to remain in operation through the following fiscal year, allowing CASA to plan Secretariat support for the full life of projects (i.e. most projects last for 2 or more years). Still, CASA remains wholly dependent on the Government of Alberta for its core funding and should ensure that the risk management strategies prescribed in the Risk Management Plan are followed.

1. Consider timing and requirements of both the Government of Alberta and industry partners’ budget cycles and budget preparation processes when planning CASA’s budget (i.e. timing of funding requests, etc.).	Executive Director
2. Explore harmonizing CASA’s fiscal year with the Government of Alberta’s fiscal year (i.e. April 1 to March 31 vs. January 1 to December 31).	Executive Director
3. Consider the recommendations arising from the Government of Alberta’s evaluation of Integrated Resource Management and the role of partners.	Executive Director to liaise with CASA President
4. Liaise with the Government of Alberta to gain a better understanding of the Results Based Budgeting initiative and consider aligning CASA’s work with these expectations (i.e. Linking CASA’s work more directly to budgetary provisions).	Executive Director to liaise with CASA President

5. Ensure that funding is discussed quarterly with the Board of Directors.	Executive Director
6. Review the CASA Wind-down Fund and adjust annually to ensure it is sufficient.	Executive Committee

More recent Board discussions have focused on the need for financial support for individual projects, some of which is supplied by the Government of Alberta and some from participating industries. The requirement for project funding has been difficult to resolve because these funding requests are typically submitted outside of normal budgetary cycles. CASA Project Charters include an estimate of project funding requirements, but there is no evidence that this requirement alone will address project funding shortfalls. Again, in the interim, the approved strategies in the Risk Management Plan should be followed.

1. Meet with Board Members annually to review their priorities and seek alignment with CASA’s agenda.	Executive Director
2. Consider timing and requirements of both the Government of Alberta and industry partners’ budget cycles and budget preparation processes when planning CASA’s budget (i.e. timing of funding requests, etc.).	Executive Director
3. Ensure that project charters include specific budget projections and that Board approval of the Project Charter includes a discussion of the budget.	Working Group Executive Committee
4. Explore alternatives for providing sustainable, predictable funding for CASA project teams.	Industry Caucus Government Caucus

7.2 Stakeholder Satisfaction

Since CASA’s inception, its members have placed a high priority on assessing the extent to which its work satisfies stakeholder needs. The level of satisfaction may be measured through regular surveys, anecdotal information, evidence of chronic or recent disaffection by participants or a decline or increase in related indicators (e.g. a decline/increase in attendance or the seniority of engaged participants). The Performance Measurement Strategy provides at least 4 measures that are directly associated with stakeholder satisfaction:

The 3-year stakeholder satisfaction survey is listed in the PMC strategy as a measure of “providing support to stakeholders”. This survey is a composite of several survey questions, all ostensibly directed at providing a reasonable measure of stakeholder satisfaction. This year, the survey measured stakeholder satisfaction at 50%, up from the 47% measured three years ago. While having met the target (i.e. an increase over the previous survey) it is still considered to be too low.

Three other measures of stakeholder support provide a different view. Under the same objective, project teams’ satisfaction with support provided by the Secretariat is measured at 86%. In response to 2013 bi-annual project team surveys, team members’ degree of satisfaction with the support provided by their respective Board members was measured at 84%. Project team satisfaction with the project work done and with their ability to participate in a collaborative manner was measured at an average of 84%.

A closer look at the methodology used to calculate responses to the 3-year survey is warranted to explain the significant difference in these numbers and to arrive at a more consistent measure. For example, in 2013, of 36 respondents answering a question about their satisfaction with CASA support to Airshed Zones, 11 answered that they “didn’t know”. These 11 responses were subsequently included in the total universe of respondents, effectively placing them with those who were then presumed to be not satisfied for reporting purposes.

7.2.1 The 3-year stakeholder satisfaction survey should be revisited to bring the survey design and calculation methodology in line with the Performance Measures Committee’s more recent work.

In any case, stakeholder satisfaction is and will remain the most important measure CASA uses to assess its performance and value. Again, the Risk Management Plan provides useful strategies to improve performance.

1. The strategic plan is evergreen and is renewed every 3 years.	Executive Director
2. Meet with Board Members annually to review their priorities and seek alignment with CASA’s agenda.	Executive Director
3. Review the annual results of Performance Measures & Indicators and discuss implications for CASA priorities. (This includes the Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey, every 3 years.)	Executive Committee & Board Members
4. Initiate the Performance Evaluation with all 3 caucuses, every 3 years.	Executive Committee
5. Consider the recommendations arising from the Government of Alberta’s evaluation of Integrated Resource Management and the role of partners.	Executive Director to liaise with CASA President
6. Ensure that CASA’s priorities align with the implementation of the Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development “Renewed Clean Air Strategy” and “Action Plan”.	Executive Committee & Board Members

In order to ensure that stakeholders recognize CASA’s value as a forum for multi-stakeholder dialogue and to ensure that consensus outcomes are not the sole measure of success, the following strategies are provided in the Risk Management Plan.

1. Ensure that Project Charters include an explicit description of about the decision-making model to be used by the project team, including which decisions will require consensus of the parties.	Working Group
2. Meet with Board Members annually to review their priorities and seek alignment with CASA’s agenda.	Executive Director
3. Consider shifting the CASA brand to focus on the broader collaborative toolkit, with less focus on the consensus model.	Communications Committee
4. Develop a best practices guide for managing and documenting non-consensus outcomes – a companion piece to the Guide to Managing Collaborative Processes.	Executive Director Secretariat

APPENDIX A: CASA PERFORMANCE EVALUATION 2014 TERMS OF REFERENCE

Revised – August 2, 2014

Background

Article 16 of the Clean Air Strategic Alliance bylaws is sometimes described as the “sunset clause”, intended to evaluate and reaffirm support for the organization. The clause reads:

The performance of the Society will be evaluated upon the expiration of three years from, the date of its incorporation, or the date of its last performance evaluation by the Members of the Society.

CASA’s first formal performance evaluation occurred in 1997. There were three stages in the process: one, board members consulted with their stakeholder group to confirm support for CASA’s decision-making approach and its priorities; two, board members held a workshop to present the results of their stakeholder meetings; and three, an action plan was developed that addressed communications planning, board roles and processes, and ways to improve the effectiveness of project teams.

In 2001, a committee of four board members conducted a more limited review. They considered the question: *Does CASA have the necessary elements in place to support its work?* The committee recommended that the board renew the CASA mandate for an additional three year period and made some suggestions regarding funding.

In 2004, a steering committee consisting of one representative from each sector oversaw the performance evaluation. It was conducted by an independent evaluator, PAGE Management Counsel Ltd. The steering committee followed up on five areas for improvement recommended in the report.

In 2007, the CASA Board created a Performance Evaluation Committee to answer the question, “How effective is CASA in supporting the Government of Alberta in strategic air quality planning?” Three committee members contributed the equivalent of 20 full working days each - to preparation, interviews, meetings and report writing. The Board accepted the committee members’ report and forwarded their recommendations for consideration in the development of a new strategic plan.

In 2010, CASA completed the performance evaluation as part of a comprehensive 8 month strategic review. The review included: an E-scan done by the University of Alberta; the engagement of Foresight Canada to lead a Board strategic planning exercise; preparation of a mission review discussion document; and caucus workshops to review CASA performance. All of these elements culminated in a 2-day strategic retreat that resulted in a renewed member commitment to the Alliance and a new Strategic Plan.

Observations

In conducting 5 previous performance evaluations, CASA members and staff have invested a great deal of time in the renewal process. While performance evaluation is a bylaw requirement, and revision of the strategic plan is an important undertaking at CASA, the Executive has suggested that CASA should be looking for efficiencies in the roll-out of the 2014 review.

These efficiencies could be found by:

- Drawing on the work of previous reviews. The 2010 review, in particular, contains many observations that are still very relevant and may simply need to be revisited and updated in light of developments over the last 3 years.
- Incorporating elements of the recently approved risk management plan. The plan provides useful guidance with respect to CASA governance and specific vulnerabilities.
- **Preparing a discussion document that includes background, analysis and “SMART” recommendations with respect to key strategic challenges, for review by caucuses and for subsequent board discussion and decision.**
- **Presenting the discussion document at the September, 2014 Board meeting, then setting an expectation that the evaluation will conclude at the following meeting in December**
- Spending caucus time on this file wisely, so that discussions are focused on the discussion document and so that an informed member consensus emerges between September and December.

Terms of Reference and Deliverables

At the request of the Executive Committee, Norm MacLeod will prepare the referenced discussion document, under the committee’s direction. In preparing the document he will consult with CASA Board members, so that the most current stakeholder concerns are considered. While it is acknowledged that this review is directed at meeting CASA bylaw and planning requirements, it may also inform and draw on the current Alberta ESRD initiative – Working with Others in IRMS, Multi-stakeholder Organizations Review.

1. The discussion document will address, at a minimum, the following elements:
 - An evaluation of CASA performance against the 2010 renewed member commitment to the Alliance, as expressed in the 2010 Strategic Plan (and in related documents)
 - CASA’s role and mission within the current landscape of stakeholder engagement in Alberta and in comparison with other engagement opportunities (e.g. the Alberta Water Council, Air shed groups, RAC’s, etc.)?
 - CASA’s effectiveness (including record of implementation) and CASA’s contribution to natural resource management planning and policy development in Alberta.
 - CASA’s potential agenda over the next strategic cycle (i.e. 2015 – 2017)
 - Consensus vs. Non-consensus outcomes (including value, implications and mechanisms)
 - The organization and function of the Secretariat, Executive, Board and Project Teams

- Board membership and related representation
 - Stakeholder/member capacity
 - Funding for both 1) core functions and 2) project team work
 - Key challenges (i.e. risks and opportunities)
2. Where appropriate the document will offer recommendations for the Board's consideration. In other instances, key questions may be posed to promote discussion.
 3. Previous iterations of the Performance Evaluation would have benefitted from recommendations to establish ongoing mechanisms to implement findings. This requirement will be addressed in the document.
 4. As per the wording used in the 2010 review, the document will explicitly pose the question to members, "Is there still value in CASA and its approach?"
 5. The final discussion document will be available for Board distribution by September 10, 2014. A draft for Executive Committee review will be provided by September 2, 2014.
 6. Norm MacLeod will provide a presentation, outlining key elements of the document at the September 18, 2014 Board meeting, and will remain available for follow-up with the Executive and Board members through to Sept. 30, 2014.

The discussion document and the Sept. 18 Board presentation should "set the table" for individual caucus meetings in the Fall, and a subsequent Board meeting in December to determine if all members are committed to CASA renewal, and on what basis.

APPENDIX B: PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Table 1 outlines the 2013 performance measures results. Additional information can be found in Appendix A.

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	
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%	81%	The Board designated the objectives under Goal 1 and 2 as the top priorities for CASA. The % of objectives under these two goals listed as in progress or complete is 100%. Most of the objectives not being acted upon are related to communications.
Monitor the implementation of CASA recommendations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Percentage of low-rated recommendations being monitored. 	100%	100%	
Provide support to CASA stakeholders.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degree of CASA members, partners and stakeholders' satisfaction with CASA. 	Maintain or increase	50%	Satisfaction increased by 3% from 47% in 2010.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Project teams' degree of satisfaction with support provided by Secretariat. 	Maintain or increase	86%	This is the first year this measure has been calculated.

Objective	Performance Measure	Target	Actual		Notes
Board					
Encourage Board member participation in CASA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of Board attendance at Board meetings by sector. 	75%	Government – 53% Industry – 83% NGO – 95%		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 – 86% Industry – 90% NGO – 75%		This is the first year this measure has been calculated.
Strategic Plan Goal 1: To provide strategic advice on air quality issues and the impacts of major policy initiatives on air quality.					
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 seven documents that engaged stakeholders, shaped CASA's policy agenda and focus, and influenced air quality in Alberta. See Additional Information in Appendix 1.
Strategic Plan Goal 2: To contribute to the continued development and implementation of effective and efficient air quality management in Alberta.					
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%	PMOIT	HAHT	PMOIT – Particulate Matter and Ozone Implementation Team HAHT – Human and Animal Health Team The HAHT did not meet the target for completing work in a timely manner or that the team developed SMART recommendations.
			100%	86%	
			100%	29%	
			100%	86%	
			100%	71%	

Performance Evaluation 2011 – 2014

Objective	Performance Measure	Target	Actual	Notes
<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>				
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	No data available	Data collection was unsuccessful. ¹
<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	90%	This is the first year this measure has been calculated.
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. ¹
	• Number of return and unique visitors to website.	Maintain or increase	Return – 2928 Unique – 4597	Return visits decreased from 3480 in 2012. This is the first year that unique visitors has been calculated.
	• Number of news stories about CASA.	Maintain or increase	16	This is an increase from 8 in 2012.

Recommendation 1: Approve performance measures results.

The Performance Measures Committee recommends that the Board approve the results of the 2013 performance measures and the inclusion of the appropriate performance measures in the 2013 CASA Annual Report.

¹The Secretariat is responsible for data collection for these two measures. The method used to collect the data was unsuccessful. The PMC has offered the Secretariat several suggestions to improve data collection for the 2014 reporting period.

APPENDIX C: LETTER TEMPLATE FOR SECTORS WITH NO UMBRELLA ASSOCIATION

From December 9, 2009 Board Meeting, Item 1.5 – Attachment I

Purpose

The following parties enter into this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU): X

Company
Y Association
Z Group

hereafter referred to as the _____ (e.g., X Sector Collective).

The purpose of this MOU is to establish a process for the selection and appointment of an individual representative from the collective to be the X Sector Collective representative and alternate representative on the Clean Air Strategic Alliance (CASA).

The parties agree as follows:

- A. Each party shall be a member of the Collective and shall have one vote.
- B. The Collective shall be a member of and represent the interests of the power generation sector in the Clean Air Strategic Alliance Association.
- C. In addition to meeting and voting in person, voting may take place using telecommunications, the Internet or other electronic means.
- D. Any vote or motion made by the collective shall be carried by a majority and, in the case of a tie, the Chair shall have a casting vote.
- E. The parties shall, from time to time, elect a Chair who will be entitled to call a meeting. A request to hold a meeting may be made to the Chair by a majority of the members in which case the Chair must call a meeting within 30 days of the receipt of such notice. It is agreed that until determined otherwise in accordance with paragraph "C" above, the first Chair shall be _____.
- F. At any duly called meeting, which shall be at least every twelve months, the group shall elect a representative and alternate representative to CASA. It is understood that the first representative shall be _____ and the first alternate shall be _____ and their appointments shall be for a term expiring _____. In the event an election to appoint new representatives has not taken place prior to the expiry of their term, their appointments shall continue beyond that date until such time as an election has taken place.
- G. It shall be the responsibility of the chosen representative and the alternate representative to use their best efforts to ascertain and present the collective interests of the members of the Collective to CASA and to provide the members of the Collective with regular communications with respect to items under discussion by CASA and the outcomes of those discussions.

Performance Evaluation 2011 – 2014

- H. The members of the Collective shall regularly communicate the activities of CASA to their respective memberships.
- I. The Chair may respond to any request by CASA for confirmation as to the appointed representatives.
- J. This agreement may be amended or cancelled, including the addition or removal of members to the collective by motion as provided in paragraph “C” above.
- K. Any member of the collective may resign by providing 30 days’ notice to the Chair.

This MOU shall commence on the date it is fully executed by all parties and remain in effect until cancelled or amended.

By signatures affixed below, the parties acknowledge their agreement:

X Company Per:	Date
Y Association Per:	Date
Z Group Per:	Date