

1 **Q. Further to the response to PUB-NP-009:**

2 **a) Please explain why Quality Leading Indicators were added to the Corporate**  
3 **Performance Measures in 2023 and explain the criteria used to evaluate this**  
4 **measure.**

5 **b) Please explain why Cash Flow from Operating Activities was removed from the**  
6 **Corporate Performance measures in 2024.**

7  
8 **A. a) Managing and measuring safety performance at Newfoundland Power is done using a**  
9 **combination of lagging and leading indicators.**

10  
11 Lagging indicators reflect past performance and are useful for charting progress over  
12 time. All injury frequency rate (“AIFR”), a lagging indicator, has historically been the  
13 Company’s primary measure of safety performance. The use of AIFR, and similar  
14 metrics such as total recordable incident rate (“TRIR”), is common in the industry as  
15 these metrics are highly standardized and can be consistently applied across utilities.  
16 The Edison Electric Institute has recognized certain limitations with TRIR (and, by  
17 extension, AIFR), including that it focuses on safety as the absence of injuries,  
18 instead of the modern understanding of safety as the presence of safeguards.<sup>1</sup> In  
19 addition, lagging indicators are not predictive.

20  
21 In order to balance the limitations of lagging indicators, utility best practice has been  
22 moving toward the use of leading safety indicators. As defined by Electricity Canada,  
23 leading indicators are proactive, preventive, and predictive measures that provide  
24 information about the effective performance of a utility’s health and safety activities.<sup>2</sup>  
25 Leading indicators provide an opportunity to learn and build resilience in safety  
26 practices before someone gets injured.

27  
28 Prior to 2023, AIFR was the only safety-related corporate performance measure used  
29 in the Company’s short-term incentive (“STI”) plan. In 2023, the Company  
30 introduced quality leading indicators as a STI target, in addition to AIFR. The  
31 combination of leading and lagging safety indicators measures safety outcomes, as  
32 well as the existence of conditions that are likely to encourage future favorable  
33 outcomes. Electricity Canada has recognized the use of leading and lagging indicators  
34 together as providing a more complete picture of the factors affecting safety  
35 performance than they do separately.<sup>3</sup>

36  
37 The Company’s quality leading indicators performance measure is made up of two  
38 metrics, weighted equally: (i) quality of incident investigations; and (ii) quality of job  
39 safety planning.

40  
41 Quality of incident investigations is measured through an internal review of the  
42 Company’s incident investigations. The Company’s Senior Management Incident

---

<sup>1</sup> See Edison Electric Institute, *Severity-Based Lagging Indicator: Making the Best of Our Injury Data*, January 2023, pages 1-2.

<sup>2</sup> See Electricity Canada (n.d.). Leading Indicators. Retrieved March 20, 2024 from <https://www.electricity.ca/knowledge-centre/safety-security/occupational-health-safety/leading-indicators/>.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

1 Review Committee reviews investigation documentation and grades investigations  
2 against the Company’s established guidelines for incident investigations. Each  
3 investigation is given a score, the average of which is used to produce the annual  
4 incident investigation result for the year.

5  
6 Quality of job safety planning is measured through the review of a sample of the  
7 Company’s e-tailboards and written tailboards (“tailboards”). The Company’s Risk  
8 Management Job Safety Planning Committee (“RMJSPC”) reviews a sample of all  
9 pre-job safety planning activities each quarter, which includes all operating areas. The  
10 RMJSPC reviews each selected tailboard against the Company’s framework which  
11 outlines all required components of a tailboard. Each selected tailboard is scored  
12 against the framework and the scores are averaged over each quarter, and annually, to  
13 produce the annual job safety planning result for the year.

- 14  
15 b) In 2019, cash flow from operating activities was added as a corporate performance  
16 measure as part of the Company’s STI plan. Cash flow from operating activities,  
17 before working capital adjustments, is a key financial metric used by credit rating  
18 agencies in assessing the Company’s creditworthiness. This STI target measured  
19 actual cash flow results compared to the Company’s budget.

20  
21 From 2019 to 2023, cash flow from operating activities fluctuated, largely due to the  
22 operation of the Energy Supply Cost Variance Clause and the current wholesale rate  
23 structure.<sup>4</sup> These fluctuations were largely outside of management’s control. Targets  
24 that are largely outside the control of management are not effective in incenting  
25 performance. As a result, this corporate performance measure was removed in 2024.

---

<sup>4</sup> See the Company’s 2025/2026 General Rate Application, Volume 1, Application, Company Evidence and Exhibits, Section 3, page 3-44, footnote 113.