

## 2017 Revised REOI Evaluation Form: Frequently Asked Questions and Instructions for Use

1. **Introduction:** In accordance with CIF Board directives, this evaluation form separates and identifies Cost Saving, Diversion and Centre of Excellence projects. Criteria have been modified to recognize and evaluate the specific attributes of each project type within these divisions.
  
2. **Tabs:**

<b>Use Green tabs 1-5 to evaluate COST SAVINGS projects.</b>
<b>Use Blue tabs 6-10 to evaluate INCREASED DIVERSION projects.</b>
<b>Use Red tabs 11-12 to evaluate CENTRE of EXCELLENCE projects.</b>
  
3. **Weighted Scores:** Each project type has specific evaluation criteria. Similar criteria may appear in more than one category, however, the weighted score for the criteria may be different in order to better recognize and evaluate different priorities between the project types.
  
4. **Project Payback:** The Spreadsheet tracks the minimum requirement of 5 yrs. or less for project payback and if the period is exceeded, a recommendation to reject the project will be recorded. Similarly a minimum project score is tracked and if the project scores less than 25, a recommendation to reject is recorded.
  
5. **Weighted Score Funding Factor:** The higher the weighted score funding factor, the more funding is automatically recommended for a higher scoring project. E.g. a 100% funding factor means an application requires a perfect score (100) to receive full base rate funding. 110% means a 90 score receives full funding etc. In the "Cost Savings" project category, with a 110% weighted score funding factor, a project scoring 86 would obtain a recommendation of 47% of the baseline funding so a good project gets almost full (50%) funding. A 65 score (average project) would obtain 36% funding. A 35 score (weak but passable project) gets a 19% funding recommendation. The funding factors are different for each project category to adjust for typically lower scoring of Diversion and Centre of Excellence projects.
  
6. **Project Budget:** Insert the project budget and funding amount requested into the yellow highlighted boxes. The spreadsheet will calculate the percentage of funding requested. This percentage may be compared to the recommended base level of funding calculated by the spreadsheet below.
  
7. **Discretionary Funding Recommendation:** The spreadsheet automatically calculates the recommended project funding amount by multiplying the weighted project score and the base funding level set for each project type. (e.g. cost saving projects are normally funded to a base level of 50% of the project budget). A column appears beside the calculated base level funding amount to provide for a discretionary funding recommendation if the evaluator deems the project merits it. This can be used to incentivise politically desirable or novel projects etc. or deduct amounts from the calculated base funding (e.g. to deduct non BB portion of project or decrease amounts to the pre-established base level funding).

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

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

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

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Review Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_ CIF Project #: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria	Overall Criteria Score	Criteria Weighting	Overall Weighted Score	Overall Percentage Score
1: Increased Cost Effectiveness	0	37	0	0%
2: Increased Blue Box Diversion	0	10	0	0%
3: Regionalization Benefits	0	5	0	0%
4: Payback Period and Return On Investment	0	33	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**

Project Payback > Did the project have a payback period less than 5 years (Yes/Reject)?	<b>Reject</b>
Minimum Acceptable Scoring Level > Did the project have a Consensus Criterion Total score of at least 25 (Yes/Reject)?	<b>Reject</b>
Weighted Score Funding Factor >	<b>110%</b>

Project Type	Project Budget	Funding Requested	%
Projects achieving cost savings	<b>\$200</b>	<b>\$100</b>	50%

Project Funding Range	Base Funding Level	Base Funding (x weighted score)	Additional Funding (Evaluator may recommend additional funding if appropriate)	Total Funding Recommended	Funding Percentage
Projects achieving cost savings (<50%)	<b>Reject</b>		<b>-\$1</b>	<b>Reject</b>	

Reviewers	Deliverables / Comments / Recommendation
CIF Staff	<p><i>Insert the expected project deliverables, project comments and funding recommendation here:</i></p> <p>Include in all grants per CIF Committee (aug 25/16) - During the term of the projected payback period, if the grantee opts to cease providing the related Blue Box service, the portion of funding that is not paid back by the project savings shall be reimbursed to the CIF or its successor(s).</p>
CIF Project Committee	
CIF Committee	

Note: Only the consensus evaluation summary is retained for official records.

# COST SAVING - Project Application Evaluation

## Evaluation Criterion 1: Improved Cost Effectiveness

Project #: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Sub Criterion	Evaluation Considerations		Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
	General	Refinements/Preferences Based on Project Specifics (Refine / add new evaluation considerations based on project specifics)				
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>Score 0 to +5</b> Score 0 if no savings Score +5 if significant savings	0	50	0
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>Score 0 to +5</b> Score 0 if budget is significantly over/under similar projects (unrealistic deliverables for the stated budget) Score 3 if budget is moderately over/under similar projects Score 5 if budget is comparable to similar projects (realistic deliverables for the stated budget)	0	50	0

Total >      0                  100                  0

**COST SAVING - Project Application Evaluation**

Project #: \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluation Criterion 2: Increased Blue Box Diversion**

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Sub Criterion	Evaluation Considerations		Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
	General	Refinements/Preferences Based on Project Specifics <i>(Refine / add new evaluation considerations based on project specifics)</i>				
			Scoring Basis: 0: Sub-criterion not addressed; 1: Minimal (<5%) impact/improvement 2: Slight (5-10%) impact/improvement 3: Moderate (10-15%) impact/improvement 4: Good (15-20%) impact/improvement 5: Significant (>20%) impact/improvement			
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.	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if diversion/capacity is significantly reduced Score 0 if diversion/capacity is unaffected Score 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	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if residue rate is significantly increased Score 0 if residue rate is unaffected Score 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?	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if material revenue/quality is significantly reduced Score 0 if material revenue/quality is unaffected Score 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.	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if diversion compared to other programs is significantly reduced Score 0 if diversion compared to other programs is unaffected Score 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?	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if equipment/process requires dedicated equipment unable to be reused Score 0 if equipment/process must be modified if circumstances/materials change Score 5 if equipment/process easily reused if circumstances/materials change	0	25	0

**COST SAVING - Project Application Evaluation**

Project #: \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluation Criterion 3: Regionalization Benefits**

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Sub Criterion	Evaluation Considerations		Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
	General	Refinements/Preferences Based on Project Specifics <i>(Refine / add new evaluation considerations based on project specifics)</i>	Scoring Basis: 0: Sub-criterion not addressed; 1: Minimal (<5%) impact/improvement 2: Slight (5-10%) impact/improvement 3: Moderate (10-15%) impact/improvement 4: Good (15-20%) impact/improvement 5: Significant (>20%) impact/improvement			
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?	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if > 3 municipalities will stop participating Score 0 if no additional municipalities will participate Score +5 if > 3 municipalities will begin participating or sufficient tonnage is available to support project economics. Add 1 additional point if waste shed proposed aligns with MIPC study. Add 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?	<b>Score 0 to +5</b> Score 1 point if a municipality is planning to work with others. Score 2 points if 2 municipalities are currently negotiating to work together. Score 3 points if multiple municipalities are currently negotiating to work together. Score 3 points if 2 municipalities are currently working together in the area. Score 4 points if 3 municipalities are currently working together in the area. Score 5 points if > 3 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?	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if another waste shed/regional structure or cost is clearly preferable Score 0 if another waste shed/regional structure or cost is neutral Score 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?	<b>Score 0 to +5</b> Score 0 points if project is very difficult or very expensive to transfer Score 1 point if project is not easily transferred, expensive or usable in 1 muni. only Score 2 points if project is not easily transferred or expensive but usable in 2 munis Score 3 points if more than 2 munis can use with some difficulty transferring Score 4 points if > 3 munis can use with little/no difficulty transferring Score 5 points if > 3 munis can use, project is easily transferred and inexpensive	0	30	0

## COST SAVING - Project Application Evaluation

Project #: \_\_\_\_\_

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

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Sub Criterion	Evaluation Considerations		Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
	General	Refinements/Preferences Based on Project Specifics (Refine / add new evaluation considerations based on project specifics)				
a) Payback Period (years) and/or Return on Investment	Consider project annualized implementation costs/savings and or increased revenue.	<b>NOTE:</b>  <b>If the project has a payback of more than five years it will be rejected</b>	<b>Score 0 to +5</b> <b>0: Five years or greater</b> 1: Five years 2: Four years 3: Three years 4: Two years 5: 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>Score 0 to +5</b> 0: if no budget was included with a cost savings application 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.	<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>Score 0 to +5</b> 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)	<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>Score 0 to +5</b> 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	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>

**COST SAVING - Project Application Evaluation**

Project #: \_\_\_\_\_

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

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Sub Criterion	Evaluation Considerations		Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
	General	Refinements/Preferences Based on Project Specifics <i>(Refine / add new evaluation considerations based on project specifics)</i>				
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.	<b>Score 0 to +5</b> Score 1 if no budget amount or Council approval Score 2 if budget included but no Council approval Score 3 if budget and Council approval (budget may not be adequate) Score 4 if adequate budget approved and project underway Score 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	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5: No team proposed Score -3: Unqualified team (failed/unfinished projects outstanding) Score 0: Inexperienced team Score 3: Qualified team Score 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?	<b>Score 0 to +5</b> 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?	<b>Score 0 to +5</b> 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?	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if project submission is clearly unready to proceed Score 0 if project submission needs major CIF staff assistance to proceed Score 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.	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if project schedule is clearly unrealistic Score 0 if project schedule needs major CIF staff assistance to proceed Score 5 if project schedule is clearly realistic and ready to proceed	0	20	0

**Total >**      0      100      0



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

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

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

## 2017 REOI Increased Diversion Project Evaluation Form:

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Review Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_ CIF Project #: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria	Overall Criteria Score	Criteria Weighting	Overall Weighted Score	Overall Percentage Score
1: Cost Effectiveness	0	5	0	0%
2: Increased Blue Box Diversion	0	35	0	0%
3: Regionalization Benefits	0	15	0	0%
4: Payback Period and Return On Investment	0	10	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

Minimum Acceptable Scoring Level > **Reject**

Did the project have a Consensus Criterion Total score of at least 25 (Yes/Reject)?

Weighted Score Funding Factor > **120%**

Project Type	Project Budget	Funding Requested	%
Diversion	<b>\$100</b>	<b>\$50</b>	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
Diversion (<50%)	50%	\$0	-\$50	Reject	-50%

Reviewers	Comments / Recommendation
CIF Staff	<i>Insert the expected project deliverables, project comments and funding recommendation here:</i>  Include in all grants per CIF Committee (aug 25/16) - During the term of the projected payback period, if the grantee opts to cease providing the related Blue Box service, the portion of funding that is not paid back by the project savings shall be reimbursed to the CIF or its successor(s).
CIF Project Committee	
CIF Committee	

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

Project #: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Sub Criterion	Evaluation Considerations		Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
	General	Refinements/Preferences Based on Project Specifics <i>(Refine / add new evaluation considerations based on project specifics)</i>				
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>	<b>Scoring Basis:</b> 0: Sub-criterion not addressed; 1: Minimal (<5%) impact/improvement 2: Slight (5-10%) impact/improvement 3: Moderate (10-15%) impact/improvement 4: Good (15-20%) impact/improvement 5: Significant (>20%) impact/improvement  <b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5: significant increased costs Score 0: no increased costs Score +5: significant cost savings	0	50	0
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>Score 0 to +5</b> Score 0 if budget is significantly over/under similar projects (unrealistic deliverables for the stated budget) Score 3 if budget is moderately over/under similar projects Score 5 if budget is comparable to similar projects (realistic deliverables for the stated budget)	0	25	0
c) Cost Effectiveness Compared to Other BB Materials.	Use WDO Data Base or applicant supplied costs	Consider next least cost tonne if appropriate.	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if easier/cheaper alternatives are available Score 0 if no better alternatives are available and minimal diversion or savings Score +5 if no better alternatives are available and maximum diversion or savings	0	25	0
<b>Total &gt;</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>

**INCREASED DIVERSION - Project Application Evaluation**

Project #: \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluation Criterion 2: Increased Blue Box Diversion**

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Sub Criterion	Evaluation Considerations		Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
	General	Refinements/Preferences Based on Project Specifics <i>(Refine / add new evaluation considerations based on project specifics)</i>				
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.	<b>Scoring Basis:</b> 0: Sub-criterion not addressed; 1: Minimal (<5%) impact/improvement 2: Slight (5-10%) impact/improvement 3: Moderate (10-15%) impact/improvement 4: Good (15-20%) impact/improvement 5: Significant (>20%) impact/improvement	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	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if residue rate is significantly increased Score 0 if residue rate is unaffected Score 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?	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if material revenue/quality is significantly reduced Score 0 if material revenue/quality is unaffected Score 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.	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if diversion compared to other programs is significantly reduced Score 0 if diversion compared to other programs is unaffected Score 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?	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if equipment/process requires dedicated equipment unable to be reused Score 0 if equipment/process must be modified if circumstances/materials change Score 5 if equipment/process can be reused easily after changes	0	25	0

## INCREASED DIVERSION - Project Application Evaluation

Project #: \_\_\_\_\_

### Evaluation Criterion 3: Regionalization Benefits

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Sub Criterion	Evaluation Considerations		Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
	General	Refinements/Preferences Based on Project Specifics (Refine / add new evaluation considerations based on project specifics)				
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?	<b>Scoring Basis:</b> 0: Sub-criterion not addressed; 1: Minimal (<5%) impact/improvement 2: Slight (5-10%) impact/improvement 3: Moderate (10-15%) impact/improvement 4: Good (15-20%) impact/improvement 5: Significant (>20%) impact/improvement	0	25	0
b) Extent of Proven Collaboration to Consolidate Regionalized Tonnes	Past demonstrated intermunicipal cooperation.	Are there municipalities currently participating in regionalized activities?	<b>Score 0 to +5</b> Score 1 point if a municipality is planning to work with others. Score 2 points if 2 municipalities are currently negotiating to work together. Score 3 points if multiple municipalities are currently negotiating to work together. Score 3 points if 2 municipalities are currently working together in the area. Score 4 points if 3 municipalities are currently working together in the area. Score 5 points if > 3 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?	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if another waste shed/regional structure or cost is clearly preferable Score 0 if another waste shed/regional structure or cost is neutral Score 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?	<b>Score 0 to +5</b> Score 0 points if project is very difficult or very expensive to transfer Score 1 point if project is not easily transferred, expensive or usable in 1 muni. only Score 2 points if project is not easily transferred or expensive but usable in 2 munis Score 3 points if more than 2 munis can use with some difficulty transferring Score 4 points if > 3 munis can use with little/no difficulty transferring Score 5 points if > 3 munis can use, project is easily transferred and inexpensive	0	30	0

## INCREASED DIVERSION - Project Application Evaluation

Project #: \_\_\_\_\_

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

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Sub Criterion	Evaluation Considerations		Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
	General	Refinements/Preferences Based on Project Specifics <i>(Refine / add new evaluation considerations based on project specifics)</i>				
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>Score +1 to +5</b> 1: > Five years or undetermined 2: Four years 3: Three years 4: Two years 5: One year or less	0	10	0
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>Score 0 to +5</b> 0: if no budget was included with a cost savings application 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	35	0
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>Score 0 to +5</b> 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	35	0
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>Score 0 to +5</b> 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	20	0

**INCREASED DIVERSION - Project Application Evaluation**

Project #: \_\_\_\_\_

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

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Sub Criterion	Evaluation Considerations		Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
	General	Refinements/Preferences Based on Project Specifics <i>(Refine / add new evaluation considerations based on project specifics)</i>				
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.	<b>Score 0 to +5</b> Score 1 if no budget amount or Council approval Score 2 if budget included but no Council approval Score 3 if budget and Council approval (budget may not be adequate) Score 4 if adequate budget approved and project underway Score 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	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5: No team proposed Score -3: Unqualified team (failed/unfinished projects outstanding) Score 0: Inexperienced team Score 3: Qualified team Score 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?	<b>Score 0 to +5</b> 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?	<b>Score 0 to +5</b> 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?	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if project submission is clearly unready to proceed Score 0 if project submission needs major CIF staff assistance to proceed Score 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.	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if project schedule is clearly unrealistic Score 0 if project schedule needs major CIF staff assistance to proceed Score 5 if project schedule is clearly realistic and ready to proceed	0	15	0

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

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

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



## 2017 REOI Centre of Excellence Project Evaluation Form:

Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ Review Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_ CIF Project #: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria	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

Minimum Acceptable Scoring Level > **Reject**

Did the project have a Consensus Criterion Total score of at least 25 (Yes/Reject)?

Weighted Score Funding Factor > **140%**

Project Type	Project Budget	Funding Requested	%
Centre of Excellence	\$200	\$100	50%

Project Funding Range	Base Funding Level	Base Funding (x weighted score)	Additional Funding (Evaluator may recommend additional funding if appropriate)	Total Funding Recommended	Funding Percentage
Centre of Excellence (<100%)	80%	\$0	-\$1	Reject	-1%

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 #: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Sub Criterion	Evaluation Considerations		Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
	General	Refinements/Preferences Based on Project Specifics <i>(Refine / add new evaluation considerations based on project specifics)</i>				
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.	<b>Scoring Basis:</b> 0: Sub-criterion not addressed; 1: Minimal impact/improvement 2: Slight impact/improvement 3: Moderate impact/improvement 4: Good impact/improvement 5: Significant impact/improvement	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>
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.	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if diversion/capacity is significantly reduced Score 0 if diversion/capacity is unaffected Score 5 if diversion/capacity is significantly increased	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
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?	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if equipment/process requires dedicated equipment unable to be reused Score 0 if equipment/process must be modified if circumstances/materials change Score 5 if equipment/process can be reused easily if circumstances/materials change	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0</b>

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

Project #: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Sub Criterion	Evaluation Considerations		Scoring Basis and Rationale	Score	Weight	Weighted Score
	General	Refinements/Preferences Based on Project Specifics <i>(Refine / add new evaluation considerations based on project specifics)</i>				
			Scoring Basis: 0: Sub-criterion not addressed 1: Minimal 2: Slight 3: Moderate 4: Good 5: Significant			
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.	<b>Score 0 to +5</b> Score 1 if no budget amount or Council approval Score 2 if budget included but no Council approval Score 3 if budget and Council approval (budget may not be adequate) Score 4 if adequate budget approved and project underway Score 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	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5: No team proposed Score -3: Unqualified team (failed/unfinished projects outstanding) Score 0: Inexperienced team Score 3: Qualified team Score 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?	<b>Score 0 to +5</b> 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?	<b>Score 0 to +5</b> 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?	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if project submission is clearly unready to proceed Score 0 if project submission needs major CIF staff assistance to proceed Score 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.	<b>Score -5 to +5</b> Score -5 if project schedule is clearly unrealistic Score 0 if project schedule needs major CIF staff assistance to proceed Score 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.	<b>Score 1 to +5</b> 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?	<b>Score 0 to +5</b> 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