

## REOI Evaluation Form

**Use Green tabs 1-5 to evaluate COST SAVING projects.**

**Use Blue tabs 6-10 for INCREASED DIVERSION projects.**

**Use Red tabs 11-12 for CENTRE of EXCELLENCE projects.**

## REOI Evaluation Form

**Use Green tabs 1-5 to evaluate COST SAVING projects.**

**Applicant:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Review Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**CIF Project #:** 999

Criterion	Overall Criteria Score	Criteria Weighting	Overall Weighted Score	Overall Percentage Score
1: Increased Cost Effectiveness	0	35	0	0%
2: Increased Blue Box Diversion	0	10	0	0%
3: Regionalization Benefits	0	10	0	0%
4: Payback Period and Return On Investment	0	30	0	0%
5: Project Implementation Measures/Aspects	0	15	0	0%
<b>Total: &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

Funding Recommendation	
<b>Project Payback</b> > Did the project have a payback period less than 8 years (Yes/Reject)?	<b>Reject</b>
<b>Minimum Acceptable Scoring Level</b> > Did the project have a Consensus Criterion Total score of at least 25	<b>Reject</b>
<b>Weighted Score Funding Factor</b> >	<b>110%</b>

Project Type	Project Budget	Funding Requested	%
Projects achieving cost savings	\$100	\$50	50%

Project Funding Range	Base Funding Level	Base Funding (x weighted score)	Additional Funding (Evaluator may recommend additional funding if appropriate)	Total Funding	Funding Percentage
Projects achieving cost savings (<50%)	50%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%

Reviewers	Deliverables / Comments / Recommendation
CIF Staff	<i>Insert the expected project deliverables, project comments and funding recommendation here:</i>
CIF Project Committee	
CIF Committee	

**COST SAVING - Project Application Evaluation**  
**Evaluation Criterion 1: Improved Cost Effectiveness**

Project #: 999  
 Evaluator: GE

Sub Criterion	General Considerations	Refinements/Preferences	Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
a) Improvement in Cost Effectiveness Compared to Current Situation	Use WDO Data Base or applicant supplied costs	Consider the savings relative to the size of municipality and impact on current performance. <b>Note: Cost saving projects proposing minimal savings may be evaluated under the Blue Diversion Tabs (6 to 10)</b>	<b>0:</b> if no savings <b>+5:</b> if significant savings	<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0</b>
b) Is Project Cost Reasonable Compared to Similar Projects/Other Municipalities	Review costs and deliverables for similar projects on file.	Is project budget significantly over or under similar projects? Are the project deliverables/goals realistic or unrealistic?	<b>0:</b> if budget is significantly over/under similar projects (unrealistic deliverables for the stated budget) <b>3:</b> if budget is moderately over/under similar projects <b>5:</b> if budget is comparable to similar projects (realistic deliverables for the stated budget)	<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0</b>

**COST SAVING - Project Application Evaluation**  
**Evaluation Criterion 2: Increased Blue Box Diversion**

Project #: 999

Evaluator: GE

Sub Criterion	General Considerations	Refinements/Preferences	Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
a) Improvement in Residential Blue Box Diversion Compared to Current Diversion	Audit data vs. pilot studies if available or WDO Datacall group averages.	Consider new capacity and/ or diversion improvements based on tonnage or volume, as applicable.	-5: if diversion/capacity is significantly reduced 0: if diversion/capacity is unaffected 5: if diversion/capacity is significantly increased	0	25	0
b) Improvement in residential Blue Box Residue Rate	Audit data vs. pilot studies if available or WDO Datacall group averages.	Will the project increase or decrease the current residue rate	-5: if residue rate is significantly increased 0: if residue rate is unaffected 5: if residue rate is significantly decreased	0	15	0
c) Improvement in residential Blue Box material revenue	SE Price Sheet or historical averages from WDO Datacall.	How does the project affect the sales or value of recyclable material?	-5: if material revenue/quality is significantly reduced 0: if material revenue/quality is unaffected 5: if material revenue/quality is significantly increased	0	15	0
d) Improvement in residential Blue Box Diversion Compared to Other Municipalities	WDO Datacall group.	Consider improvements based on tonnage or volume, as applicable. Is the project scoped correctly to achieve maximum benefits compared to peers.	-5: if diversion compared to other programs is significantly reduced 0: if diversion compared to other programs is unaffected 5: if diversion compared to other programs is significantly increased	0	20	0
e) Flexibility and Ability to Adapt to Changes in Material Mix	Seasonal changes to mix; Future changes in mix	Will the project become unusable or strand assets if the program or materials change? Does the project rely on specialized/dedicated equipment or processes?	-5: if equipment/process requires dedicated equipment unable to be reused 0: if equipment/process must be modified if circumstances/materials change 5: if equipment/process can be reused easily if circumstances/materials change	0	25	0

**COST SAVING - Project Application Evaluation**  
**Evaluation Criterion 3: Regionalization Benefits**

Project #: 999

Evaluator: GE

Sub Criterion	General Considerations	Refinements/Preferences	Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
a) Extent of Regionalization Proposed Relative to the Waste Shed	Consider MIPC defined waste sheds or project appropriate alternatives.	How large is the waste shed in tonnes or # of proposed participating municipalities?	-5: if > three municipalities will stop participating 0: if no additional municipalities will participate +5: if > three municipalities will begin participating or sufficient tonnage is available to support project economics. 1: additional point if waste shed proposed aligns with MIPC study. 1: additional point if significant tonnage is affected. (5 points max.)	0	25	0
b) Extent of Proven Collaboration to Consolidate Regionalized Tonnes	Past demonstrated intermunicipal cooperation.	Are there municipalities currently participating in regionalized activities?	1: point if a municipality is planning to work with others 2: points if two municipalities are currently negotiating to work together 3: points if multiple municipalities are currently negotiating to work together 3: points if two municipalities are currently working together in the area 4: points if three municipalities are currently working together in the area 5: points if > three municipalities are currently working together in the area	0	25	0
c) Project Opportunity Cost	Compare to similar projects implemented elsewhere	Will an alternative supplier, methodology or regional structure yield better diversion, capacity or more cost effective results?	-5: if another waste shed/regional structure or cost is clearly preferable 0: if another waste shed/regional structure or cost is neutral 5: if another waste shed/regional structure or cost is clearly not preferable	0	20	0
d) Transferability of Funded Project Features to Other Municipalities	Ease of transferability and applicability to other municipalities	How much effort/cost is required to apply the project features to other municipalities, waste sheds or regions?	0: points if project is very difficult or very expensive to transfer 1: point if project is not easily transferred, expensive or usable in 1 muni. only 2: points if project is not easily transferred or expensive but usable in 2 munis 3: points if more than two munis can use with some difficulty transferring 4: points if > three munis can use with little/no difficulty transferring 5: points if > three munis can use, project is easily transferred and inexpensive	0	30	0

**COST SAVING - Project Application Evaluation**

**Evaluation Criterion 4: Payback Period and Return On Investment**

Project #: 999

Evaluator: GE

Sub Criterion	General Considerations	Refinements/Preferences	Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
a) Payback Period (years) and/or Return on Investment	Consider project annualized implementation costs/savings and or increased revenue.	<b>NOTE: If the project has a payback of eight years or more the project will be rejected (If this criterion scores 0, enter 0 in all criterion scores below on this page)</b>	<b>0:</b> Eight years or greater <b>1:</b> Five to Eight years <b>2:</b> Four years <b>3:</b> Three years <b>4:</b> Two years <b>5:</b> One year or less	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>
b) Project Budget	Defined budget, reasonableness of costs, accuracy, completeness.	Costs seem appropriate, budget includes contingency, projected maintenance impacts, monitoring & measuring, P&E, etc.	<b>0:</b> if no budget was included with a cost savings application <b>1:</b> poorly defined budget <b>3:</b> well defined budget, few omissions, no errors <b>5:</b> costs seem appropriate, budget includes projected maintenance impacts, monitoring and measuring, etc.	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>
c) Risk of Not Achieving Proposed Payback	Consider project schedule, funding, contractors, negotiations, inclusion of other partners	Does the project have a well defined schedule, milestones, monitoring and measuring plan, reporting provisions? Has the project team completed projects before? Has the proponent failed to complete projects before. Has the proponent delivered poor results or incomplete/inferior reporting/monitoring and measurement before? Have previous projects gone over budget?	<b>0:</b> High Risk (little chance of success) <b>1:</b> Moderate Risk (serious concerns project will be unsuccessful or remain incomplete) <b>2:</b> Medium Risk (concerns project will be unsuccessful or remain incomplete) <b>3:</b> Low Risk (very few concerns project will be completed on time and on budget) <b>4:</b> Good Risk (project will likely be completed on time and on budget) <b>5:</b> No Risk (almost certain the project will be completed on time and on budget)	<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>0</b>
d) Early Adopter	Is the project novel? Is the proponent an early adopter of new technologies or processes?	Are there similar projects operating in the Province or elsewhere? Is this the first use? Does the project have the potential to affect many municipalities or large amounts of tonnage?	<b>0:</b> More than eight similar projects <b>1:</b> Seven similar projects <b>2:</b> Six similar projects <b>3:</b> Five similar projects <b>4:</b> Four similar projects <b>5:</b> Less than three similar projects	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>

**COST SAVING - Project Application Evaluation**

**Evaluation Criterion 5: Project Implementation Measures/Aspects**

Project #: 999

Evaluator: GE

Sub Criterion	General Considerations	Refinements/Preferences	Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
a) Extent of Project Readiness	Consider proposed timeline and project implementation details.	<b>Application will be rejected if the project was started before the application was submitted.</b> Score higher for budgeted and council approved but unstarted projects to permit CIF involvement in project scope and deliverables.	1: if no budget amount or Council approval 2: if budget included but no Council approval 3: if budget and Council approval (budget may not be adequate) 4: if adequate budget approved and project underway 5: if well defined budget approved but project not started	0	20	0
b) Management Team Experience	Consider Staff, Council and Supplier/Consultant and/or Contractor ability, experience and motivation.	Points may be deducted if the team has failed on prior projects or a previous project has been significantly over budget	-5: No team proposed -3: Unqualified team (failed/unfinished projects outstanding) 0: Inexperienced team 3: Qualified team 5: Experienced, qualified staff, consultants and contractor involvement	0	20	0
c) Project Risks	Consider past projects and municipal circumstances.	Consider Staff, Council, Supplier and/or Contractor ability, experience and motivation. Consider specifics of project, have similar projects failed elsewhere?	0: High Risk (little chance of success) 1: Moderate Risk (serious concerns project will be unsuccessful or remain incomplete) 2: Medium Risk (concerns project will be unsuccessful or remain incomplete) 3: Low Risk (very few concerns project will be completed on time and on budget) 4: Good Risk (project will likely be completed on time and on budget) 5: No Risk (almost certain the project will be completed on time and on budget)	0	10	0
d) Monitoring and Reporting		Monitoring and reporting are critical components of all CIF projects. Does the project contain detailed, quality M&M and reporting components? Has the proponent offered to speak about the completed project?	0: No Plan 1: Plan needs significant development 2: Plan needs development 3: Adequate plan but missing some detail, budget or other components 4: Adequate plan with only minor improvements needed 5: Complete plan identified with detailed provisions	0	10	0
e) Quality of Application		Consider clarity, completeness and accuracy of project submission. Has an effort been made to provide a superior submission with adequate details? Will excessive CIF staff time be required to develop the project?	-5: if project submission is clearly unready to proceed 0: if project submission needs major CIF staff assistance to proceed 5: if project submission is clearly ready to proceed	0	20	0
f) Project Schedule		Consider clarity of project schedule, reasonableness of timeline assumptions, realistic project timing, realistic supplier demands etc.	-5: if project schedule is clearly unrealistic 0: if project schedule needs major CIF staff assistance to proceed 5: if project schedule is clearly realistic and ready to proceed	0	20	0

## REOI Evaluation Form

Use Blue tabs 6-10 to evaluate INCREASED DIVERSION projects.

**Applicant:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Review Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**CIF Project #:** \_\_\_\_\_ 999

Criterion	Overall Criteria Score	Criteria Weighting	Overall Weighted Score	Overall Percentage Score
1: Cost Effectiveness	0	5	0	0%
2: Increased Blue Box Diversion	0	30	0	0%
3: Regionalization Benefits	0	25	0	0%
4: Payback Period and Return On Investment	0	5	0	0%
5: Project Implementation Measures/Aspects	0	35	0	0%
	<b>Total: &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

Funding Recommendation	
<b>Minimum Acceptable Scoring Level</b> >Did the project have a Consensus Criterion Total score of at least 25	<b>Reject</b>
<b>Weighted Score Funding Factor</b> >	<b>120%</b>

Project Type	Project Budget	%
Diversion	\$100	50%

Project Funding Range	Base Funding Level	Additional Funding (Evaluator may recommend additional funding if appropriate)	Total Funding	Funding Percentage
Diversion (<50%)	50%	\$0	\$0	0%

Reviewers	Comments / Recommendation
CIF Staff	<i>Insert the expected project deliverables, project comments and funding recommendation here:</i>
CIF Project Committee	
CIF Committee	



**INCREASED DIVERSION - Project Application Evaluation**  
**Evaluation Criterion 1: Cost Effectiveness**

Project #: 999  
 Evaluator: GE

Sub Criterion	General Considerations	Refinements/Preferences	Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
a) Cost Effectiveness Compared to Current Program	Use WDO Data Base or applicant supplied costs	Non capital/asset projects often can not be quantified on a dollar cost basis. The scoring summary weighting for these projects has been modified to compensate. <b>If significant cost savings are present, evaluate the project using the green "Cost Savings" tabs (1 to 5).</b>	-5: significant increased costs <b>0</b> : no increased costs +5: significant cost savings	<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0</b>
b) Is Project Cost reasonable Compared to Similar Projects/other municipalities	Review cost/benefit analysis.	Is project budget significantly over or under similar projects? Are the project deliverables/goals realistic or unrealistic?	<b>0</b> : if budget is significantly over/under similar projects (unrealistic deliverables for the stated budget) <b>3</b> : if budget is moderately over/under similar projects <b>5</b> : if budget is comparable to similar projects (realistic deliverables for the stated budget)	<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>
c) Cost Effectiveness Compared to Other BB Materials.	Use WDO Data Base or applicant supplied costs	Consider next least cost tonne if appropriate.	-5: if easier/cheaper alternatives are available <b>0</b> : if no better alternatives are available and minimal diversion or savings +5: if no better alternatives are available and maximum diversion or savings	<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>0</b>

**INCREASED DIVERSION - Project Application Evaluation**  
**Evaluation Criterion 2: Increased Blue Box Diversion**

Project #: 999

Evaluator: GE

Sub Criterion	General Considerations	Refinements/Preferences	Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
a) Improvement in residential Blue Box Diversion for multi- municipal or Province wide programs	Audit data vs. pilot studies if available or WDO Datacall group averages.	Consider new capacity and/or diversion improvements based on tonnage or volume, as applicable.	-5: if diversion/capacity is significantly reduced 0: if diversion/capacity is unaffected 5: if diversion/capacity is significantly increased	0	15	0
b) Improvement in residential Blue Box Residue Rate	Audit data vs. pilot studies if available or WDO Datacall group averages.	Will the project increase or decrease the current residue rate	-5 if residue rate is significantly increased 0 if residue rate is unaffected 5 if residue rate is significantly decreased	0	10	0
c) Improvement in residential Blue Box material revenue	SE Price Sheet or historical averages from WDO Datacall.	How does the project affect the quality, rejection rate, sales or value of recyclable material?	-5: if material revenue/quality is significantly reduced 0: if material revenue/quality is unaffected 5: if material revenue/quality is significantly increased	0	20	0
d) Improvement in residential Blue Box Diversion Compared to Other Municipalities	WDO Datacall group.	Consider improvements based on tonnage or volume, as applicable. Is the project scoped correctly to achieve maximum benefits compared to peers.	-5: if diversion compared to other programs is significantly reduced 0: if diversion compared to other programs is unaffected 5: if diversion compared to other programs is significantly increased	0	5	0
e) Flexibility and Ability to Adapt to Changes in Material Mix	Seasonal changes to mix; Future changes in mix	Will the project become unusable or strand assets if the program or materials change? Does the project rely on specialized/dedicated equipment or processes?	-5: if equipment/process requires dedicated equipment unable to be reused 0: if equipment/process must be modified if circumstances/materials change 5: if equipment/process can be reused easily after changes	0	25	0
f) Project Reach	Consider the reach and efficacy of the program	Consider percentage of population involved, the frequency, duration and quality of P&E materials. Is there a behavioural change involved and a compelling change campaign.	-5: if significantly fewer people will be reached by the project than currently -3: if fewer people will be reached or behaviour change is likely temporary 0: if reach and/or behaviour change is unaffected by project 3: if more people will be reached or behaviour change is likely to last longer 5: if significantly more people affected or behaviour change is likely permanent	0	25	0

**INCREASED DIVERSION - Project Application Evaluation**  
**Evaluation Criterion 3: Regionalization Benefits**

Project #: 999

Evaluator: GE

Sub Criterion	General Considerations	Refinements/Preferences	Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
a) Extent of Regionalization Proposed Relative to the Waste Shed	Consider MIPC defined waste sheds or project appropriate alternatives.	How large is the waste shed in tonnes or # of proposed participating municipalities?	-5: if > three municipalities will stop participating 0: if no additional municipalities will participate 5: if > three municipalities will begin participating or sufficient tonnage is available to support project economics. +1: additional point if waste shed proposed aligns with MIPC study. +1: additional point if significant tonnage is affected. (5 points max.)	0	25	0
b) Extent of Proven Collaboration to Consolidate Regionalized Tonnes	Past demonstrated intermunicipal cooperation.	Are there municipalities currently participating in regionalized activities?	1: if a municipality is planning to work with others 2: if two municipalities are currently negotiating to work together 3: if multiple municipalities are currently negotiating to work together 3: if two municipalities are currently working together in the area 4: if three municipalities are currently working together in the area 5: if > three municipalities are currently working together in the area	0	25	0
c) Project Opportunity Cost	Compare to similar projects implemented elsewhere	Will an alternative supplier, methodology or regional structure yield better diversion, capacity or more cost effective results?	-5: if another waste shed/regional structure or cost is clearly preferable 0: if another waste shed/regional structure or cost is neutral 5: if another waste shed/regional structure or cost is clearly not preferable	0	20	0
d) Transferability of Funded Project Features to Other Municipalities	Ease of transferability and applicability to other municipalities	How much effort/cost is required to apply the project features to other municipalities, waste sheds or regions?	0: if project is very difficult or very expensive to transfer 1: if project is not easily transferred, expensive or usable in 1 muni. only 2: if project is not easily transferred or expensive but usable in 2 munis 3: if more than two munis can use with some difficulty transferring 4: if > three munis can use with little/no difficulty transferring 5: if > three munis can use, project is easily transferred and inexpensive	0	30	0

**INCREASED DIVERSION - Project Application Evaluation**

**Evaluation Criterion 5: Project Implementation Measures/Aspects**

Project #: 999

Evaluator: GE

Sub Criterion	General Considerations	Refinements/Preferences	Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
a) Extent of Project Readiness	Consider proposed timeline and project implementation details.	<b>Application will be rejected if the project was started before the application was submitted.</b> Score higher for budgeted and council approved but unstarted projects to permit CIF involvement in project scope and deliverables.	1: if no budget amount or Council approval 2: if budget included but no Council approval 3: if budget and Council approval (budget may not be adequate) 4: if adequate budget approved and project underway 5: if well defined budget approved but project not started	0	10	0
b) Management Team Experience	Consider Staff, Council and Supplier/Consultant and/or Contractor ability, experience and motivation.	Points may be deducted if the team has failed on prior projects or a previous project has been significantly over budget	-5: No team proposed -3: Unqualified team (failed/unfinished projects outstanding) 0: Inexperienced team 3: Qualified team 5: Experienced, qualified staff, consultants and contractor involvement	0	15	0
c) Project Risks	Consider past projects and municipal circumstances.	Consider Staff, Council, Supplier and/or Contractor ability, experience and motivation. Consider specifics of project, have similar projects failed elsewhere?	0: High Risk (little chance of success) 1: Moderate Risk (serious concerns project will be unsuccessful or remain incomplete) 2: Medium Risk (concerns project will be unsuccessful or remain incomplete) 3: Low Risk (very few concerns project will be completed on time and on budget) 4: Good Risk (project will likely be completed on time and on budget) 5: No Risk (almost certain the project will be completed on time and on budget)	0	15	0
d) Monitoring and Reporting		Monitoring and reporting are critical components of all CIF projects. Does the project contain detailed, quality M&M and reporting components? Has the proponent offered to speak about the completed project?	0: No Plan 1: Plan needs significant development 2: Plan needs development 3: Adequate plan but missing some detail, budget or other components 4: Adequate plan with only minor improvements needed 5: Complete plan identified with detailed provisions	0	25	0
e) Quality of Application		Consider clarity, completeness and accuracy of project submission. Has an effort been made to provide a superior submission with adequate details? Will excessive CIF staff time be required to develop the project?	-5: if project submission is clearly unready to proceed 0: if project submission needs major CIF staff assistance to proceed 5: if project submission is clearly ready to proceed	0	20	0
f) Project Schedule		Consider clarity of project schedule, reasonableness of timeline assumptions, realistic project timing, realistic supplier demands etc.	-5: if project schedule is clearly unrealistic 0: if project schedule needs major CIF staff assistance to proceed 5: if project schedule is clearly realistic and ready to proceed	0	15	0

**INCREASED DIVERSION - Project Application Evaluation**  
**Evaluation Criterion 4: Payback Period and Return On Investment**

Project #: 999

Evaluator: GE

Sub Criterion	General Considerations	Refinements/Preferences	Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
a) Payback Period (years) and/or Return on Investment	Consider project annualized implementation costs/savings and or increased revenue.	<b>Minimum score of 1</b> in this criteria recognizes a payback calculation may be difficult for diversion projects and avoids project disqualification. <b>If there are significant cost savings, evaluate the project using the "Cost Saving" green tabs (1 to 5).</b>	<b>1:</b> > Five years or undetermined <b>2:</b> Four years <b>3:</b> Three years <b>4:</b> Two years <b>5:</b> One year or less	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
b) Project Budget	Defined budget, reasonableness of costs, accuracy, completeness.	Costs seem appropriate, budget includes contingency, projected maintenance impacts, monitoring & measuring, P&E, etc.	<b>0:</b> if no budget was included with a cost savings application <b>1:</b> poorly defined budget <b>3:</b> well defined budget, few omissions, no errors <b>5:</b> costs seem appropriate, budget includes projected maintenance impacts, monitoring and measuring, etc.	<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>
c) Risk of Not Achieving Proposed Project Goals	Consider project schedule, funding, contractors, negotiations, inclusion of other partners	Does the project have a well defined schedule, milestones, monitoring and measuring plan, reporting provisions? Has the project team completed projects before? Has the proponent failed to complete projects before. Has the proponent delivered poor results or incomplete/inferior reporting/monitoring and measurement before? Have previous projects gone over budget?	<b>0:</b> High Risk (little chance of success) <b>1:</b> Moderate Risk (serious concerns project will be unsuccessful or remain incomplete) <b>2:</b> Medium Risk (concerns project will be unsuccessful or remain incomplete) <b>3:</b> Low Risk (very few concerns project will be completed on time and on budget) <b>4:</b> Good Risk (project will likely be completed on time and on budget) <b>5:</b> No Risk (almost certain the project will be completed on time and on budget)	<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>
d) Early Adopter	Is the project novel? Is the proponent an early adopter of new technologies or processes?	Are there similar projects operating in the Province or elsewhere? Is this the first use? Does the project have the potential to affect many municipalities or large amounts of tonnage?	<b>0:</b> More than eight similar projects <b>1:</b> Seven similar projects <b>2:</b> Six similar projects <b>3:</b> Five similar projects <b>4:</b> Four similar projects <b>5:</b> Less than three similar projects	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>

**REOI Evaluation Form**

**Use Red tabs 11-12 to evaluate Centre of Excellence projects**

**Applicant:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Review Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**CIF Project #:** \_\_\_\_\_ 999

Criterion	Overall Criteria Score	Criteria Weighting	Overall Weighted Score	Overall Percentage Score
1: Applicability and Potential	0	60	0	0%
2: Project Implementation Measures/Aspects	0	40	0	0%
	<b>Total: &gt;&gt;&gt;&gt;</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

Funding Recommendation	
<b>Minimum Acceptable Scoring Level &gt;</b> Did the project have a Consensus Criterion Total score of at least 25 (Yes/Reject)?	<b>Reject</b>
<b>Weighted Score Funding Factor &gt;</b>	<b>140%</b>

Project Type	Project Budget	Funding Requested	%
Centre of Excellence	\$100	\$80	80%

Project Funding Range	Base Funding Level	Base Funding (x weighted score)	Additional Funding (Evaluator may recommend additional funding if appropriate)	Total Funding	Funding Percentage
Centre of Excellence (<100%)	80%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%

Reviewers	Comments / Recommendation
CIF Staff	<i>Insert the expected project deliverables, project comments and funding recommendation here:</i>
CIF Project Committee	
CIF Committee	

**Centre of Excellence - Project Application Evaluation**  
**Evaluation Criterion 1: Applicability and Potential**

Project #: 999

Evaluator: GE

Sub Criterion	General Considerations	Refinements/Preferences	Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
a) Improvement in Provincial diversion or revenue	Audit data vs. pilot studies if available or submitted diversion projections.	Consider new capacity and/or diversion improvements Province wide based on tonnage or volume, as applicable. Consider improvements to revenue.	-5: if diversion/capacity is significantly reduced 0: if diversion/capacity is unaffected 5: if diversion/capacity is significantly increased	0	15	0
b) Improvement in local diversion or revenue	Improvement in potential diversion/revenue relative to the proposed project scope	Consider new capacity and/or improvements locally based on tonnage or volume, as applicable. Consider increase in quality and/or value of materials.	-5: if diversion/capacity is significantly reduced 0: if diversion/capacity is unaffected 5: if diversion/capacity is significantly increased	0	10	0
c) Flexibility and Ability to Adapt to Changes in Material Mix	Seasonal changes to mix; Future changes in mix	Will the project become unusable or strand assets if the program or materials change? Does the project rely on specialized/dedicated equipment or processes?	-5: if equipment/process requires dedicated equipment unable to be reused 0: if equipment/process must be modified if circumstances/materials change 5: if equipment/process can be reused easily if circumstances/materials change	0	15	0
d) Project Reach	Consider the reach and efficacy of the program	Consider percentage of population involved, the frequency, duration and quality of P&E materials. Is there a behavioural change involved and a compelling change campaign.	-5: if significantly fewer people will be reached by the project than currently -3: if fewer people will be reached or behaviour change is likely temporary 0: if reach and/or behaviour change is unaffected by project 3: if more people will be reached or behaviour change is likely to last longer 5: if significantly more people affected or behaviour change is likely permanent	0	15	0
e) Extent of Regionalization Proposed Relative to a Waste Shed	Consider MIPC defined waste sheds or project appropriate alternatives.	How large is the waste shed in tonnes or # of proposed participating municipalities?	-5: if > three municipalities will stop participating 0: if no additional municipalities will participate 5: if > three municipalities will begin participating or sufficient tonnage is available to support project economics. +1: if waste shed proposed aligns with MIPC study. + 1: if significant tonnage is affected. (5 points max.)	0	5	0
f) Project Opportunity Cost	Compare to similar projects implemented elsewhere	Will an alternative supplier, methodology or regional structure yield better diversion, capacity or more cost effective results?	-5: if another waste shed/regional structure or cost is clearly preferable 0: if another waste shed/regional structure or cost is neutral 5: if another waste shed/regional structure or cost is clearly not preferable	0	25	0
g) Transferability of Funded Project Features to Other Municipalities	Ease of transferability and applicability to other municipalities	How much effort/cost is required to apply the project features to other municipalities, waste sheds or regions?	0: points if project is very difficult or very expensive to transfer 1: if project is not easily transferred, expensive or usable in 1 muni. only 2: if project is not easily transferred or expensive but usable in 2 munis 3: if more than two munis can use with some difficulty transferring 4: if > three munis can use with little/no difficulty transferring 5: if > three munis can use, project is easily transferred and inexpensive	0	15	0

**Centre of Excellence - Project Application Evaluation**  
**Evaluation Criterion 2: Project Implementation Measures/Aspects**

Project #: 999

Evaluator: GE

Sub Criterion	General Considerations	Refinements/Preferences	Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
a) Extent of Project Readiness	Consider proposed timeline and project implementation details.	<b>Application will be rejected if the project was started before the application was submitted.</b> Score higher for budgeted and council approved but unstarted projects to permit CIF involvement in project scope and deliverables.	1: if no budget amount or Council approval 2: if budget included but no Council approval 3: if budget and Council approval (budget may not be adequate) 4: if adequate budget approved and project underway 5: if well defined budget approved but project not started	0	5	0
b) Management Team Experience	Consider Staff, Council and Supplier/ Consultant and/or Contractor ability, experience and motivation.	Points may be deducted if the team has failed on prior projects or a previous project has been significantly over budget	-5: No team proposed -3: Unqualified team (failed/unfinished projects outstanding) 0: Inexperienced team 3: Qualified team 5: Experienced, qualified staff, consultants and contractor involvement	0	15	0
c) Project Risks	Consider past projects and municipal circumstances.	Consider Staff, Council, Supplier and/or Contractor ability, experience and motivation. Consider specifics of project, have similar projects failed elsewhere?	0: High Risk (little chance of success) 1: Moderate Risk (serious concerns project will be unsuccessful or remain incomplete) 2: Medium Risk (concerns project will be unsuccessful or remain incomplete) 3: Low Risk (very few concerns project will be completed on time and on budget) 4: Good Risk (project will likely be completed on time and on budget) 5: No Risk (almost certain the project will be completed on time and on budget)	0	15	0
d) Monitoring and Reporting		Monitoring and reporting are critical components of all CIF projects. Does the project contain detailed, quality M&M and reporting components? Has the proponent offered to speak about the completed project?	0: No Plan 1: Plan needs significant development 2: Plan needs development 3: Adequate plan but missing some detail, budget or other components 4: Adequate plan with only minor improvements needed 5: Complete plan identified with detailed provisions	0	20	0
e) Quality of Application		Consider clarity, completeness and accuracy of project submission. Has an effort been made to provide a superior submission with adequate details? Will excessive CIF staff time be required to develop the project?	5: if project submission is clearly unready to proceed 0: if project submission needs major CIF staff assistance to proceed 5: if project submission is clearly ready to proceed	0	15	0
f) Project Schedule		Consider clarity of project schedule, reasonableness of timeline assumptions, realistic project timing, realistic supplier demands etc.	-5: if project schedule is clearly unrealistic 0: if project schedule needs major CIF staff assistance to proceed 5: if project schedule is clearly realistic and ready to proceed	0	10	0
g) Project Budget	Defined budget, reasonableness of costs	C of E projects may be submitted without a budget if they are intended to be undertaken by CIF. Therefore min. score of 1.	1: poorly defined budget 3: well defined budget, few omissions, no errors 5: costs seem appropriate, budget includes projected maintenance impacts, monitoring and measuring, etc.	0	10	0
h) Early Adopter	Is the project novel? Is the proponent an early adopter of new technologies or processes?	Are there similar projects operating in the Province or elsewhere? Is this the first use? Does the project have the potential to affect many municipalities or large amounts of tonnage?	0: More than eight similar projects 1: Seven similar projects 2: Six similar projects 3: Five similar projects 4: Four similar projects 5: Less than three similar projects	0	10	0