

CIF Project # 825 – RFP Template Review and Effectiveness Study of P&E Tools

Background

In 2013, Quinte Waste Solutions (QWS) released an RFP for recyclables collection and processing using the CIF RFP templates but encountered several issues that necessitated the release of addenda to correct. As part of the CIF project funding process for 2013-2014, QWS secured funding under the CIF Centre of Excellence to provide constructive feedback on the CIF RFP templates.

Summary of Results

The RFP was written using the CIF templates and the QWS RFP template. Nine firms received the RFP, seven attended the mandatory site review at the MRF, and three submitted competitive bids. Several addenda were released to address questions about the RFP and QWS provided CIF a summary of the issues and recommendations on how to improve the CIF templates based on their experiences using the templates.

Financials

The work was completed at a cost of \$5,000 including taxes.

Learnings

In 2013, Quinte Waste Solutions developed a Request for Proposals for recyclables collection and processing for its service area. The Financial Administrator was directed by the General Manager to make use of the CIF RFP template in conjunction with QWS' own template in the development of this document. This was done by means of substantial cross-referencing between the two templates to ensure that there was no duplication and no accidental omissions in terms of individual clauses.

At the beginning of the RFP process, QWS staff attempted to use the CIF template itself and overwrite with QWS's own name, terminology and specific wording. This proved cumbersome in terms of the simple mechanics of cut-and-paste, changes in page numbering, etc. As well, staff's aim was to develop a single RFP combining collection and processing. This meant that staff were constantly referring to three sections (collection, processing, general information) of the QWS template to make sure clauses in the CIF template paralleled clauses

in the QWS template, although possibly in different sections. In the end staff abandoned the use of the CIF template as a base and simply used it as a reference while returning to the QWS template.

In many respects, use of the CIF template was redundant for QWS as it had been originally developed by the author of QWS' original and subsequent RFPs and a great many clauses were identical to QWS' template. In addition, the CIF template appeared to have been developed for the use of larger municipal departments with access to staff whose primary responsibility was purchasing and QWS staff felt that some of the CIF wording was 'over-kill' for a smaller organization. Therefore, the finished RFP that QWS issued was an amalgam of both CIF and QWS' templates, and much time was spent to make sure no duplications were copied into the QWS RFP. An example would be for operating insurance, which staff compiled into one section rather than separate categories of insurance coverage for the collection and the processing sides.

The efficacy of the CIF template would be greater for large municipal recycling operations than for those of smaller municipalities or stand-alone service Boards such as QWS'. On the other hand, in some cases the CIF template was useful in providing QWS staff with valuable suggestions in the "Best Practice" and "Constructive Comment" notations. The ability to switch from the index to a particular clause, too, was helpful.