

### **CIF Project #700 – Budget Priorities for WRPs and RFP Support**

#### **Background**

In 2012, WDO (now RPRA) directed the CIF to take action to improve municipal compliance with the identified best practices found in the WDO Datacall at the time. The CIF needed to develop a plan to allocate \$100,000 in support of municipal efforts to develop Waste Recycling Plans (WRP) and standardized Request for Proposals (RFP) for Blue Box services procurements. With limited funding available, it was important to identify an appropriate list of candidates and prioritize.

#### **Summary of Results**

The 2010 municipal datacall was reviewed to create an initial list of municipalities that would benefit from this type of work. It was revealed that 61 programs did not have, or were not developing, a WRP and a number of municipalities had contracts nearing expiration. The initial list of candidates was then narrowed by prioritizing programs with significant opportunity for improvement.

Five municipalities were identified as top priorities for the development of a WRP. These programs accounted for the majority of the tonnage and gross program costs of the non-compliant programs. It was also recommended that some of the funding be used to develop a set of generic WRPs that could be utilized by small municipalities. It was felt that this would make the most of the available funding and provide support to the maximum number of programs. Three programs were identified for the provision of RFP support based on program size, contract expiry date, program performance and cost per tonne.

Based on this evaluation, the CIF approached the municipalities that were identified to offer support in development of a WRP or RFP.

#### **Financials**

The final cost for this work was \$4,226.

#### **Learnings**

By taking some time to evaluate the data, the CIF was able to prioritize funding and allocate it based on need, the potential for improvement, and to maximize the number of municipalities that were supported. As noted in its annual reports and 2008-2013 program review, this initiative and others led to year over year improvements in the best practice scores of municipalities reporting into the datacall.