



Consultations on Improving Public Performance Reports in Alberta

What We Heard

July 2008

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Alberta's Project Objectives	2
Consultation Process	2
Four Key Consultation Themes	2
General Findings under the Four Key Consultation Themes	3
Credibility	3
Relevance	5
Clarity and Accessibility	7
Engaging Users	8
Participant Groups	10
Media	10
Business NGOs and Professional Associations	11
Social/advocacy NGOs	12
Legislators	13
Individual Interviews	14
List of Consultation Participants	16

What We Heard
Consultations on Improving Public Performance Reports in Alberta

Published by: CCAF-FCVI Inc.
291 Olmstead Street
Ottawa, Ontario CANADA
K1L 7J9

Phone: 613-241-6713
Fax: 613-241-6900
Email: info@ccaf-fcvi.com

Introduction

In 2007, the Ministry of Treasury Board of the Government of Alberta approached CCAF-FCVI, Inc. (CCAF) to undertake a direct dialogue with the users of the government's Public Performance Reports (PPRs). As part of its commitment to be accountable, the Government of Alberta annually produces a variety of public performance reports. For the purpose of this study, public performance reports include the Government of Alberta business plan, ministry business plans, the Government of Alberta's annual report *Measuring Up*, and ministry annual reports. The financial statements in these documents were excluded from review.

The purpose of this dialogue was to identify ways the government could improve its PPRs to better meet the needs of users. This was one of the first direct consultations of user groups of its kind in Canada. CCAF facilitated the consultations and interviews and will prepare the final report due to be released in September 2008. The final report will present the findings and provide recommendations based on those findings. This "What We heard" document is a summary of the consultation findings, the consultation survey results and summary findings of the individual interviews conducted.

The Alberta consultation project forms part of a larger, multi-jurisdictional research project that the CCAF is leading with funding from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation. The project aims to improve the quality and usage of public performance reporting. The multi-jurisdictional project will combine key findings from the Alberta project with results on recent developments in public performance reporting from other organizations and governments.

Alberta's Project Objectives

- * Strengthen government expertise and knowledge of user needs.
- * Strengthen Alberta's leadership role in government accountability.
- * Improve PPRs to better meet user needs.
- * Contribute to a larger national CCAF study on PPRs.

Consultation Process

Between October and November 2007, a series of consultations were conducted with media representatives, and with business and social/advocacy non-governmental organizations.

During the week of December 10, 2007, consultations were conducted with government and opposition Members of the Legislative Assembly (MLAs) of Alberta. Each consultation lasted between 45 and 90 minutes. During that week, separate individual interviews were held with cabinet ministers, a senior government official, members of the Provincial Audit Committee, and two members of the project's Advisory Committee.

During each of the consultations, participants engaged in a dialogue and responded to a written questionnaire. Consultation, interview and survey questions focused on the usefulness, and the purpose of the reports; the information to be included in the reports; the role that the legislature has or should have in the creation and review of these reports; and what information could be provided in these reports that would help MLAs in their work with constituents

All consultation participants organizations are listed at the end of this document.

Four Key Consultation Themes

The participants' ideas for enhancing PPRs can be summarized under **four principal themes**, which form the framework of this report. Flowing from these themes, the consultations yielded several **key findings** – that is, the most important messages delivered by users.

The four key consultation themes are:

1. Enhancing the Credibility of PPRs
2. Increasing the Relevance of PPRs
3. Improving the Clarity and Accessibility of PPRs
4. Engaging Users in PPRs

General Findings under the Four Key Consultation Themes

1. Credibility

Enhancing the Credibility of PPRs – For most participants, the credibility of performance reports was one of the most important factors in the degree to which they used or found value in the reports. Credibility is an attribute that users assign to a report based on their perceptions and, as such, can be subjective. What information is included, how it is presented and interpreted, and what information is missing influence a user’s perception of the report’s credibility and its usefulness.

Key Findings

Credibility: PPRs are more credible if they emphasize results and outcomes, and do not focus on the processes used to achieve the results. If targets are not met, PPRs should acknowledge this, and show what has been learned from the experience. Performance measures should be presented in a consistent manner over time so that performance results are evident; if changes are made, they should be explained. PPR language should be clear and simple so readers do not get the impression that the government is attempting to hide something.

In the written Consultation Survey, respondents indicated that their confidence in Alberta’s PPRs would increase if PPRs had independent review and input (21.3%), if the performance measures/indicators were seen as relevant (19.1%), and if there was consistency in reporting (14.9%). The survey found that the most important ranked factor that would increase the use of Alberta’s PPRs was if “results are presented in a straightforward and simple manner.” This factor was also ranked highest as “Most Important” and “Important”.

Participants suggested that credibility suffers if:

- * Government appears to claim credit for results beyond its control. Participants questioned how the government can attribute certain results exclusively to the government’s action and not to a broader mix of factors in which the government was not the determining force. Participants see government acting more and more as a facilitator and not as a direct deliverer of services.
- * Government is reticent to admit failure (and to signal that it can learn from failures). This creates a perception that governments are unable or unwilling to learn from their mistakes. Admissions in PPRs that the government does not meet certain performance measures are seen as “false humility.”
- * The recommendations of the Office of the Auditor General of Alberta (OAG) on performance measures are not addressed by government, and that the status of government’s implementation of the recommendations is not addressed.

- * The writing style and readability of PPRs is too technical. The authors should consider using a writing style aimed at the general public. Participants suggested that a lack of clarity in the writing creates an impression that government is “obscuring the information.” The media repeatedly asked that government experts be available to answer technical questions, not necessarily on an attribution basis.
- * Performance measures are not consistent over time; or if the wording of reports obscures meaning.

Participants wanted:

- * More self-evident connection between goals (what the government wants to achieve), strategies (how it plans to achieve the goals), and performance measures (how it will determine results). However, when reporting on performance measures, the reports would measure the end results, and is contributing to achieving these results?
- * Goals, strategies and performance measures to be presented in a consistent manner across ministries and from year-to-year, with explanations where there have been changes over time.
- * The performance measures data (such as from public opinion surveys) to be as consistent as possible from year-to-year, with five years of data on performance measures and three to five years of historical information on spending.
- * More consistency in the format of reports across ministries and from year to year. They asked for some description of when, why and how performance measures have changed from year-to-year.
- * Goals and performance measures to be directly relevant to the quality of life of citizens.
- * The inclusion of more financial data, linked to strategies and performance measures to add credibility by making it easier to determine if the government is obtaining value for money and is adequately funding key initiatives. To users, spending levels are implicit indicators of priority that help users determine if a program or policy is adequately funded. Participants valued consistency across reporting periods for survey data, and wanted to ensure third party surveys can be conducted as long as they are required.
- * Stronger linking between business plans and annual reports and budget documents so that program-level spending would be presented in a more transparent manner. They also believed this would help in more closely aligning strategies, goals and performance measures.

Participants questioned:

- * The use of “perception performance measures” with mixed opinions on the value of such measures.
- * The use of survey results. Participants demonstrated mixed levels of trust in numbers based on government surveys. Generally, trust levels increased for surveys commissioned by a third party instead of the GoA. Statistics Canada, for example, has a high level of credibility among media.
- * Where the government is measuring their departments’ success by high-level results like provincial student achievement scores, participants questioned how the government can attribute this [a higher score] to a ministry or an employee’s action.
- * The use of the 3-year government business planning cycle to measure longer term outcomes.

2. Relevance

Increasing the Relevance of PPRs – Relevant public performance reports help users to appreciate, on a timely basis, what is planned, what has happened and why it happened. Essentially, relevance is the degree to which a performance measure is pertinent, inclusive, timely, and understandable.

Key Findings

Relevance: Users want to “follow the money” through closer links between annual reports, business plans and relevant financial reports.

Different users have different needs for PPRs. They may use them for general information, to identify priorities, for their own strategic planning and policy development, to assess government’s performance, and/or to identify service and policy gaps. Some require much more detailed information to meet their specific needs.

The Consultation Survey found that **Measuring Up** is the report least read by respondents at 71% compared to the most read **Ministry Business Plans** (87.1% of respondents). However, while it is the least read it does indicate a relatively strong readership. When asked, in the survey, how frequently they currently use PPRs for certain purposes, 65.5% said they use them for general information, 49.1% use them to identify priorities, 46.3% for policy development, 37.5% to assess government’s performance, and 35.0% said they use them for the development of programs and services. Only 21.9% currently use them for resource allocation decisions.

Participants:

- * Indicated that the structure of PPRs – with goals, strategies, and performance measures – was useful. That being said, there was a wide consensus amongst all participants that the strategies and performance measures listed in the reports they examined could be more closely aligned to goals. PPRs are more relevant to users if users can clearly see how the strategies employed relate to the goals sought.
- * Want PPRs to place greater emphasis on results and outcomes instead of the processes used to achieve the results. They also agreed that performance measures should reflect the influence government actually has over the result or outcome.
- * Said that PPR goals and performance measures often lack information to assess why a target was set at the level given, even when backed by extensive stakeholder consultation. Participants wanted to know: “Why was the target set where it was? What was the methodology? Why was the target not met? What will be done to address the results?”
- * Felt that enabling users to seek out additional context and background is much easier with the online version of PPRs, where hyperlinks could direct readers to additional information.
- * Wanted to see a closer link between annual reports and business plans. Participants suggested that PPRs should state: a) “here is what we said we were going to do” and b) “here is what we did.” One participant, wanting PPRs to be more of a “living document,” proposed a “Fact – Assumption – Action” framework. Reports would (i) clearly and succinctly lay out what the existing goal, target or commitment was and whether it had been achieved; (ii) what assumptions were embodied by the goal; and (iii) what action would be taken going forward to achieve the new target.
- * When asked what external bodies or mechanisms might contribute to a review of the relevance of performance measures in the government and ministry business plans, consultees did not think the OAG should be the one to do this. Some participants felt that relevancy strayed into policy issues, which are the domain of the government, and that the relevance of performance measures should be discussed by legislative committees and in dialogue with the public (users).

3. Clarity and Accessibility

Improving the Clarity and Accessibility of PPRs – To improve the clarity and accessibility of PPRs, many participants proposed that government make greater use of the internet and of existing information technologies.

Key Findings
<p>Clarity and Accessibility: Many participants believe that greater use of information technology, combined with robust management systems, could enable more data to be presented, without interpretation, at different layers of detail. This would also make it easier to combine public performance reporting data with other data.</p> <p>Over time, making more program-level statistics (including disaggregated data) publicly available would lessen the demand on PPRs as the primary source for this type of program management information.</p>

The Consultation Survey found that participants ranked a “report card/aggregated indices report” as the most preferred content for Alberta’s PPRs. Participants ranked both a “detailed/descriptive report” and “technical/data oriented report” as less preferred. However, a “technical/data oriented report” was ranked as second “Most Important” to respondents. The survey also found that respondents ranked “graphs” as the presentation format they would most prefer to see in Alberta’s PPRs and “text” as the least preferred format.

Participants:

- * Prefer to access PPRs through the internet in most cases. Many participants proposed better harnessing of the internet and currently available technologies when considering the future form and format of PPRs.
- * Proposed creating a central website or portal for PPRs as is done with business plans. Many participants wanted both printed copies and an ability to easily access documents online.
- * Expressed a preference for a report card/aggregated indices format.
- * Thought a layered approach to reporting information would help to meet different user needs. The consultation participants said PPRs cannot be “all things to all people.” Relying on one report to meet the needs of multiple user groups makes the reports less useful to all and placed an unreasonable demand on the producers of the report.
- * Want the inclusion of program-level statistics and information. More operational details could illustrate results and provide the context that many felt was missing. As one participant put it, the lack of operational-level detail in PPRs prevents the reports from “tell[ing] the full story” and reflecting “on-the-ground experiences.”

- * Want government-wide standards for data to ensure that apples-to-apples comparisons could be made (e.g., how an “aging population” is defined).
- * Want to be able to disaggregate the data found in PPRs. Some participants want data broken out by geography (e.g., neighbourhood or constituency) while others think more demographic and socio economic data would be valuable. There was a realization that some data would lose its usefulness when disaggregated as the margin of error would increase significantly.
- * Reactions were mixed as to whether all PPRs should be released on the same day or if a more staggered release should be considered (i.e., annual release but with half of the reporting organizations disclosing on one day and the other half on another day).
- * Want greater access to government-held data (spending, demographics, take up/usage rates, etc.) in order to enhance their planning processes and program delivery. They believe government is not always willing or able to provide greater access. They believed this could be done via hyperlinks in the online versions of PPRs. This would enable users to “draw their own conclusions” on government performance and more easily combine government-sourced data with other information sources. Currently, the users find the data in PPRs generally interesting but not particularly useful for business purposes.

4. Engaging Users

Engaging Users in PPRs – The Government of Alberta often consults citizens on policy issues. However, such consultations do not usually include an explicit discussion of performance measures, targets, and reporting mechanisms. This current low level of engagement regarding these matters results in a low level of familiarity with ministry goals, strategies and performance measures. The users’ perceptions of PPRs are directly influenced by how much and how well users are able to engage in the formulation of the PPRs and in any dialogue that may occur after the publication of PPRs.

Key Findings

User Engagement: Participants from all user groups said the quality of the user engagement process directly affects the credibility, relevance, and general utility of PPRs. Participants valued the concept of “mainstreaming” public performance reporting, i.e., the idea that a ministry would explicitly review and discuss goals, performance measures, targets, and reporting mechanisms with PPR users while reviewing existing or proposing new policies and programs.

In the Consultation Survey one respondent wrote, “The criteria and performance measures need to be set in consultation with the public and key stakeholders who are affected by the policies. Once these performance measures are set they need to be produced by the departments in ways that shows how we are doing in each area.” Their reasoning is based on their experience that existing performance measures “are all quantitative measures, but there is no way to capture qualitative information. These numbers may not reflect the ‘on the ground’ experience.” Many said that determining relevance was more of a collaborative, government-led process than a community-based one.

Participants:

- * Agreed that there is a role for an “external party” to comment on the relevance of performance measures. There was little consensus, either within or across user groups, as to how that would be accomplished. Some participants believe that an external check might be more valuable as a management tool than as a way to engage users. Some participants wanted organizations “affected” by the performance measures in PPRs to be included in determining relevance.
- * Believe that the Legislative Assembly of Alberta and its elected members have an important role to play in public performance reporting and in holding the government to account for the effective spending of public monies.
- * Believed that all-party legislative committees should play a role in reviewing and commenting on PPRs. Most participants, except the legislators, were unaware that the Policy Field Committees (PFCs) are already mandated to review ministry annual reports.
- * Observed that the PFCs might be able to serve in an oversight/review role once a policy or program is implemented and the performance measures, targets, and reporting mechanism are already in place. Stakeholders could provide independent feedback via ministries, before Policy Field Committee review.
- * Generally felt disengaged from the public performance reporting process and made it clear that their perception of the credibility, relevance and usefulness of PPRs is directly influenced by the extent to which they are engaged in the formulation of PPRs and in any dialogue that may occur after the publication of PPRs. Legislators said they could be more engaged through Cabinet Policy Committees, the Agenda and Priorities Committee, Treasury Board and all-party committees such as the

newly formed Policy Field Committees.

- * Felt that PPRs do not adequately reflect the shift in government relying more than ever on outside organizations to deliver programs and services that were once delivered almost exclusively by government; i.e., such organizations are not given enough opportunities to influence the content of PPRs. This created the impression among many participants that public performance reporting is a standalone process, separate from and not involving these outside user groups.
- * Believe they could provide valuable input on performance measures, targets, and reporting mechanisms when programs are being developed instead of after the fact. They believed their involvement would enable a closer alignment of the goals, strategies and performance measures found in PPRs.
- * Expressed an interest in receiving an information briefing when the PPRs are tabled in the legislature and requested information sessions with ministry officials upon the tabling of PPRs to discuss the reports. Participants believed that an enhanced dialogue between users and producers could be the basis for a new longer-term relationship.

Participant Groups

The next section of this report provides additional detail on the comments made during the consultation by the individual user groups.

Media

Although not all the media participants use performance reports, those who do use them for similar purposes as the other participants. In the Consultation Survey, a higher percent of media participants reported having not read Ministry Business Plans or GoA Strategic Business Plan, when compared to the other user groups. Most stated that they used PPRs to “compare political rhetoric to what actually happened,” often referring to them well after they had been issued. The participants estimated that they refer to GoA business plans or annual reports, on average two to three times a year. Overall, they view PPRs as a “valuable piece of reference, even if rarely used.” They find PPRs often contain interesting information on the state of Alberta’s economy and society. That being said, they also want operational details included in the reports to make them more relevant. They also felt there was a need for more plain language in the way the reports are written.

Most find it difficult to digest “2000-plus pages worth of information,” and they said that PPRs make for “terrible” TV coverage. They suggest the government hold a technical briefing when ministry annual reports are released and include the name and contact information for senior officials that could provide technical background. Participants thought it would be worthwhile to have a portal where all reports could be accessed.

Most media participants indicated they are looking for trends, usually on a five-year timeline. They said it is important for data sets in PPRs to reflect this. They often use this information in graphical illustrations. Most indicated they want more consistency for year-to-year performance measures. If this was not possible, or if there were changes to performance measures, then they would like changes to be noted and an explanation provided. Otherwise, it could appear that officials changed performance measures so that lacklustre results could not be tracked.

Despite their perception that PPRs were of an overly “political nature,” media participants took this consultation seriously and hoped for incremental improvement. They acknowledged the difficulty in producing PPRs that completely met their needs.

Business NGOs and Professional Associations

Generally, these participants rely on ministry business plans more than on annual reports. Business plans are seen to be useful to track government planning and spending. The participants also find that budget documents are useful.

Business participants used the reports for a broader range of uses than media participants. They tend to focus on the ministry reports that directly affect their organizational interests. “We use reports from a ministry depending on whether it affects our members,” said one participant.

Another participant described how he uses the reports to determine points of commonality and to align his organization’s plans with the government’s plans. Another uses them to track spending levels in order to determine if a priority is adequately funded.

Other uses of PPRs by this group included:

- To determine policy trends in the government;
- To promote the interests of the organization’s members;
- For government relations activities;
- To anticipate legislative change;
- To research an organization’s field of activity;

- For teaching/educational purposes; and
- As background information for collective bargaining.

Most participants see PPRs as public relations documents for the government. Some believe the documents are not as detailed as they should be and require readers to consult other sources of information.

This group also said that in many cases they could not attribute the results to government action, so it makes it look like these are public relations document; that is, they felt PPRs deal with goals or performance measures that government has little control or influence over. They also wanted PPRs that are placed on a web site to have more explanatory information available regarding why a performance measure and a target were chosen, as well as drill down to more detailed data. A few participants said a mechanism for all-party review of PPRs would aid in establishing the credibility of the documents.

A number of participants referred to Employment, Immigration and Industry's publications, specifically this ministry's brochure listing its priorities and lead officials. They wanted a contact person to be able to call in the ministries for more information.

Some participants mentioned the GoA's Quarterly Fiscal Update format, where planned and actual spending is presented with an explanation for variances. They thought this format could be applied to the PPRs. They also wanted more integration of financial and non-financial information, where value for money information would be presented.

Social/advocacy NGOs

These participants rely on PPRs for a broad spectrum of uses. As with many participants across different user groups, these participants focus more on business plans and how funds are allocated than on annual reports. "Business plans are informative and are communicated well," said one participant. This was in line with the other user groups. The business plans are more useful for their planning purposes. Again, participants believe that the audience for PPRs, particularly annual reports, is not clearly defined. "In any document like this, you can't shoot for the middle – then it doesn't work for anyone. For example, if this is for the NGO sector, we understand this stuff and want more rigorous information, yet for the public, this information and these performance measures may be enough," said one participant.

Some use them (together with information exchanges with ministry contacts) to assess government direction. Others use them to refine the design of their organization's service plan, identify service gaps that may exist, to determine if their organization

could and should address those service gaps, and to better align their existing services with others in their “space.” Several rely on PPRs for internal strategic planning processes and contextual information. Many used them to assess government priorities and to match them against their own organizational priorities. PPRs are useful in determining the GoA’s level of understanding of “what goes on” in the non-profit sector and in educating the government about the sector, including underlying systemic or societal issues. Umbrella organizations placed the reports in their library for their members to use. Several of these uses were also captured in the Consultation Survey.

Participants from this group are very aware of how the policy process had become much more diffuse and how government and NGOs now work much more in collaboration in order to achieve results. They believe that the public performance reporting process had not changed in line with these other changes, and that this disconnect negatively influences their perceptions of and attitudes towards PPRs. One participant wondered, “How do we get a longer-term vision and goals and what or how programs and services can contribute to this?”

One respondent noted that the level of detail and specificity with which the government reports would be deemed inadequate for a funded grant organization. “Contracted agencies are told that they have to prove results, but government doesn’t have to do so,” said one participant. Another participant stated, “We look at them for what the reports are not saying. If you read the other ministry reports, there are so many things government says they want to do, but then the reports don’t measure these things.”

Another participant stated that although PPRs are tied to the budget, the individual believed there should be an identifiable link between priorities, programs, policies and their budgets and that financial data should be relative to population growth (e.g., per capita) or as a percentage of total gross domestic product as these benchmarks would allow users to compare Alberta with other provinces.

Legislators

MLAs generally made limited use of PPRs, unless they received questions from constituents or serve on a Cabinet Policy Committees. Government MLAs identified a number of places where government MLAs have an opportunity to be involved in reviewing and using PPRs. They listed the Cabinet Policy Committees, the Policy Field Committees, the Agenda and Priorities Committee and Treasury Board Committee, where PPRs could be reviewed before they are published, and through Public Accounts

Committee after PPRs are published. Some legislative committees, such as the Public Accounts Committee, do make use of PPRs, particularly annual reports.

MLAs are open to playing a greater role in public performance reporting through Policy Field Committees (PFCs) but this would need to be balanced against other priorities. MLAs reflected on their experience with the recently constituted PFCs, seeing them as a “work in progress.” They expect the committees will have a growing workload, centred on reviewing legislation. They agreed that PFCs will continue to evolve as will the culture of the committees. Opposition MLAs found the work to date of the PFCs to be more worthwhile than government MLAs.

MLAs want to see more outcome-based performance measures which measure a wider facet of subject areas. They believed more disaggregated data, particularly by riding, would be of use to them and their citizens who focus on local issues. For those who do legislative committee work, they need information presented by specific issues, which needs to be concise and tailored for short meetings. They want more timely information and suggested quarterly updates (but not more reports) might be more useful for some of their purposes than an annual cycle. Legislators spoke about the need for layered reports to meet specific purposes.

MLAs do not think it should be the role of the OAG to provide a relevance check for performance measures. They believe greater stakeholder input could address many of the issues related to relevance raised in this consultation process. The costs of recommended performance measures would have to be considered although some performance measures might be of value, obtaining the data might be cost-prohibitive.

Individual Interviews

One interviewee spoke of his need for comprehensive and timely information so he and his executive teams can make the most informed decisions possible. Generally, he and other interviewees do not use PPRs on a day-to-day basis. PPRs are the foundation of the annual policy planning cycle that starts with an annual policy retreat. The interviewees found that strong management practices need to underpin reporting practices so the right information can be captured and brought to bear on the issues of the day.

The interviewees consider the PFCs a “work in progress” and expect that Policy Field Committees (PFCs) will have a growing workload focused on reviewing legislation. Some interviewees don’t believe that reviewing PPRs would be the most effective use of the PFCs’ time at the outset. The PFCs would need to create a working culture where the public interest could be placed ahead of political ones and where a spirit of

constructive partisanship could emerge. These interviewees anticipate that if performance measures and reporting are addressed during the policy development stage, there would be less need for the PFCs to tackle that work. Several interviewees say stakeholders' expectations would need to be managed if the process were opened up, as the GoA would ultimately need to decide which targets to use in managing programs.

One interviewee noted the importance of government-wide data standards in public performance reporting, such as references to specific demographics (i.e., aging population) or how a calculation is completed (high-school completion rates). Such standards would assist in tracking and reporting across ministries. "One thing government can do is ensure government is reporting the same facts. I'm not sure that we're there today," said the interviewee.

Most interviewees want to see a greater link between business plans and annual reports. One interviewee with knowledge of Australia's PPR practices noted, "Australia did an overall, more strategic document, and there were more detailed, operational documents. These were linked." Most interviewees say this would enhance management practices and increase transparency. One interviewee proposed a Fact-Assumption-Action framework and suggested that PPRs become more of a "living document" where the report would (i) clearly and succinctly lay out what the existing goal, target or commitment is and whether it has been achieved; (ii) what assumptions are embodied in the goal; and (iii) what action will be taken going forward to achieve the new target. The clarity of the language used in the reports was also noted. "Ministry reporting needs clearer writing – the reports are difficult to read. The Australian report was also easier to read because of the language they used," noted the interviewee with knowledge of Australian PPR practices.

List of Consultation Participants

Media

1. CHED Radio
2. Edmonton Journal
3. CKUA
4. Alberta Political Scan
5. Insight Into Government
6. CBC Radio
7. CTV

Business NGOs/Professional Associations

1. Canadian Taxpayers Federation (Alberta)
2. Alberta Teachers Association
3. Canadian Federation of Independent Business
4. Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Councils
5. Certified General Accountants of Alberta
6. Canadian Home Builders Association (Alberta)
7. Alberta Union of Provincial Employees
8. Retail Council of Canada (Alberta)

Social/advocacy NGO

1. Public Interest Alberta
2. Alberta Council on Aging
3. Catholic Social Services
4. Muttart Foundation
5. Volunteer Alberta
6. Alberta Cancer Board and Foundation
7. Calgary Chamber of Voluntary Organizations
8. Prospect Human Services Society
9. United Way of Calgary and Area
10. Volunteer Calgary

Members of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta

1. Hon. Carol Haley, MLA for Airdrie-Chestermere
2. Hon. Gordon Graydon, MLA for Prairie-Wapiti
3. Hon. Victor Doerksem, MLA for Red Deer-South
4. Hon. Mo Elsalhy, MLA for Edmonton-McClung
5. Hon. Dan Backs, MLA for Edmonton-Manning
6. Hon. Hugh Macdonald, MLA for Edmonton-Gold Bar

Individual Interviews

1. Hon. Ron Stevens, Deputy Premier and Minister of Justice and Attorney General, MLA for Calgary-Glenmore
2. Hon. Lloyd Snelgrove, President of Treasury Board, Minister of Service Alberta, Minister Responsible for Corporate Human Resources, MLA for Vermilion-Lloydminster
3. Mr. Ron Hicks, Deputy Minister of Executive Council
4. Ms. Tracey Ball, Member of the Provincial Audit Committee, Member of the Public Performance Reporting Consultation Advisory Committee
5. Mr. John Watson, Member of the Provincial Audit Committee, Member of the Public Performance Reporting Consultation Advisory Committee
6. Mr. John Meston, Executive Director, Alberta Association of Services for Children and Families, Member of the Public Performance Reporting Consultation Advisory Committee