

2020 Funding Application Evaluation Scorecard

Applicant: _____ **Review Date:** _____

Project Name: _____ **CIF Project #:** _____

| Criteria | Overall Criteria Score | Criteria Weighting | Overall Weighted Score | Overall Percentage Score |
|--|------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1: Collective Benefits | 0 | 35 | 0 | 0% |
| 2: Cost Savings | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0% |
| 3: Knowledge and Better Practice Development | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0% |
| 4: Project Implementation Measures/Aspects | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0% |
| Total: >>>> | | 100 | 0 | |

Funding Recommendation

| | |
|--|---------------|
| Minimum Acceptable Collective Benefit Percentage Scoring Level > Did the project have a Consensus Criterion Total score of at least 65% (Yes/Reject)? | Reject |
| Minimum Acceptable Total Scoring Level > Did the project have a Consensus Criterion Total score of at least 35 (Yes/Reject)? | Reject |
| Project Payback> If a cost saving project payback period is less than 5 years (Yes/Reject)? | Yes |

| Project Budget | Funding Requested | % |
|----------------|-------------------|-----|
| \$200 | \$100 | 50% |

| Project Funding Range | Base Funding Level | | Additional Funding (Evaluator may recommend additional funding if appropriate) | Total Funding Recommended | Funding Percentage |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--|---|---------------------------|--------------------|
| Collective Benefit Projects | Reject | | \$0 | Reject | |

| Reviewers | Deliverables / Comments / Recommendation |
|-----------------------|---|
| CIF Staff | <p><i>Insert the expected project deliverables, project comments and funding recommendation here:</i></p> <p>1. Note: MRF valuation projects are subject to funding limits per CIF Committee (Sept. 13/17), MRF Business Valuation Funding Limit Policy.</p> <p>2. Note: Include in all cost savings & diversion 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 (including a sale, assignment, transfer, lease or license of funded equipment), the portion of funding that is not paid back by the project savings shall be reimbursed to the CIF or its successor(s).</p> <p>3. New 2020 GRANTCLAUSE(s) a) Include in all grants per CIF Committee (Feb 14, 2020): This project may be terminated early to align with the grant completion deadline stated in the approved CIF Windup Plan. The funding recipient will be provided written notice by the CIF of any such early termination of the grant within 30 days of the approval of the CIF Windup Plan. If the grant is terminated early, the CIF will pay grant funds for only the work performed up to the CIF grant completion deadline in accordance with schedule A and the terms and conditions of this grant, and provided the recipient submits an invoice along with all required supporting documentation to the CIF for the eligible work no later than 30 days after the CIF grant completion deadline. Any unutilized portion of the grant will automatically revert to the CIF, or its successors, and shall not be paid out to the grantee.</p> b) Include in all cost savings projects where the payback period exceeds the approved CIF completion deadline per CIF Committee (Feb 14, 2020): Recognizing that the allowable project payback period for this grant may extend beyond the approved CIF Project completion deadline, disbursement of that portion of the funds associated with the projected project payback will be prorated based on the documented payback achieved by that date. |
| CIF Project Committee | |
| CIF Committee | |

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

Evaluation Criteria 1: Collective Benefits

| Sub Criterion | Evaluation Considerations | | Scoring Basis and Rationale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score | Comments |
|---|---|--|--|-------|--------|----------------|----------|
| | 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) Transferability of Funded Project Features to Other Municipalities | Ease of transferability and applicability to other municipalities | Does the project demonstrate clear, replicable results? How much effort/cost is required to apply the project features to other municipalities, waste sheds or regions? Extent of transferable project features to other municipalities? | Score 0 to +5 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 2 munis can use with some difficulty transferring 4 if > 3 munis can use with little/low difficulty transferring 5 if > 3 munis can use, project is easily transferred and inexpensive and/or project has large collective benefit. | 0 | 20 | 0 | |
| b) Extent of Collective Benefit Proposed | Consider capacity to manage significant tonnage | What is the <u>volume of material</u> to be managed or # of proposed participating municipalities? | Score 0 to +5 <i>0 if no additional municipalities will participate or sufficient tonnage is not available support project economics</i> 5 if > 3 municipalities will begin participating or sufficient tonnage is available to support project economics. Add 1 additional if significant tonnage is affected. (5 points max.) | 0 | 20 | 0 | |
| c) Extent of Proven Collaboration to Manage Recyclables | | Does the project involve a collaborative effort amongst municipalities including the sharing of information? | Score 0 to +5 1 if 2 municipalities are negotiating to participate. 2 if multiple municipalities are currently negotiating to participate together. 3 if 2 municipalities are currently participating. 4 if 3 municipalities are currently participating. 5 if > 3 municipalities are currently participating. | 0 | 10 | 0 | |
| d) Project Opportunity Cost | Compare to similar projects implemented elsewhere. | Will an alternative supplier, methodology or structure yield better diversion, capacity or more cost effective results? | Score -5 to +5 -5 if another waste shed/co-operative or cost structure is clearly preferable 0 if another waste shed/co-operative or cost structure is neutral 5 if another waste shed/co-operative or cost structure is clearly not preferable | 0 | 5 | 0 | |

Evaluation Criteria 1: Collective Benefits

| Sub Criterion | Evaluation Considerations | | Scoring Basis and Rationale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score | Comments |
|---|---|--|---|-------|--------|----------------|----------|
| | 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 | | | | |
| e) Transitional Support | | Does the project advance or enhance the transition to IPR? | Score 0 to +5 0: No contribution to IPR Transition 1: Minimal contribution to IPR Transition 2: Slight contribution to IPR Transition 3: Moderate contribution to IPR Transition 4: Good contribution to IPR Transition 5: Significant contribution to IPR Transition | 0 | 20 | 0 | |
| f) Market Development and/or Research | | Does the project advance, sustain or enhance the Ontario materials market? | Score 0 to +5 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 | 0 | 10 | 0 | |
| g) Improvement in <u>Provincial</u> revenue or contamination or diversion | Audit data vs. pilot studies if available or submitted diversion projections. | Consider new capacity and/or diversion/contamination improvements Province wide based on tonnage or volume, as applicable. Consider improvements to Provincial revenue. | Score -5 to +5 -5 if diversion/capacity is significantly reduced or contamination is increased 0 if diversion/capacity/contamination is unaffected 5 if diversion/capacity is significantly increased or contamination is decreased | 0 | 5 | 0 | |
| h) Project Reach | Consider the reach and efficacy of the program | Consider <u>percentage of local population</u> involved, the frequency, duration, quality and transferrability of P&E materials, project results etc. Is there a behavioural change involved and a compelling change campaign. | Score -5 to +5 -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 | 10 | 0 | |

Total > 0 100 0

Cumulative weighted Score 0

Evaluation Criteria 2: Cost Savings

| Sub Criterion | Evaluation Considerations | | Scoring Basis and Rationale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score | Optional Evaluators Scoring Comments |
|---|---|--|--|-------|--------|----------------|---|
| | 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. | NOTE: If a cost saving project has a payback of more than five years score -1 it will be rejected. Score 0 if NOT a cost saving project. | 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 Score -1 to +5 -1 if cost saving project payback greater than 5 years 0: if this is NOT a cost saving project 1: Five years 2: Four years 3: Three years 4: Two years 5: One year or less | 0 | 30 | 0 | Place comments beside sub-criteria scores in this column for later consensus scoring discussions. |
| b) Project Budget | Defined budget, reasonableness of costs, accuracy, completeness. | Costs seem appropriate, budget includes contingency, projected maintenance impacts, monitoring & measuring, P&E, etc. | Score -5 to +5 -5: if no budget was included with a cost savings application -3: poorly defined budget 0: CIF staff will require significant time to improve budget 3: well defined budget, few omissions, no errors 5: costs seem appropriate, budget includes projected maintenance impacts, monitoring and measuring, etc. | 0 | 15 | 0 | |
| c) Improvement in <u>local</u> revenue or contamination or diversion | Improvement in potential revenue/diversion 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. | Score -5 to +5 Score -5 if diversion/capacity is significantly reduced or contamination is increased Score 0 if diversion/capacity/contamination is unaffected Score 5 if diversion/capacity is significantly increased or contamination is decreased | 0 | 20 | 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? | Score 0 to +5 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 | 15 | 0 | |
| e) 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? | Score -5 to +5 -5 if budget is significantly over/under similar projects (unrealistic deliverables for the stated budget) -3 if budget is moderately over/under similar projects 0 if costs can be adjusted to conform to similar projects & CIF staff time required 3 if costs can be adjusted to conform to similar projects without CIF staff time 5 if budget is comparable to similar projects (realistic deliverables for the budget submitted) | 0 | 20 | 0 | |

Total > 0 100 0

Cumulative weighted Score 0

Evaluation Criteria 3: Knowledge & Better Practice Development

| Sub Criterion | Evaluation Considerations | | Scoring Basis and Rationale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score | Comments |
|--|---|--|--|-------|--------|----------------|----------|
| | 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) Flexibility and Ability to Adapt to Change | Seasonal changes to mix; future changes in mix. | Will the project become unusable or strand assets if the program or materials change or IPR adopted? Does the project rely on specialized/dedicated equipment or processes? | Score -5 to +5 -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 easily reused if circumstances/materials change | 0 | 30 | 0 | |
| b) Improvement in Blue Box Program Performance | Audit data vs. pilot studies if available or submitted projections. | Consider new improvements based on costs, tonnage or volumes, as applicable. | Score -5 to +5 -5 if performance is significantly reduced 0 if performance is unaffected 5 if performance is significantly increased | 0 | 20 | 0 | |
| c) Knowledge Development | | Provide strategically important knowledge and/or tools to support programs in advance and after transition? | Score 0 to +5 0 if unaffected 5 if significantly improved | 0 | 20 | 0 | |
| d) Improvement in Blue Box Material Marketability | | How does the project affect the sales or value of recyclable material? Are revenue improvements transferrable to other municipalities? Consider increase in quality and/or value of materials. | Score -5 to +5 -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 | |
| e) Performance Analytics and Best Practices Research and Development | | Does the project advance or enhance program analytics, best practice research/development, data collection statistics, etc? | Score 0 to +5 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 | 0 | 10 | 0 | |

Total > 0 100 0

Cumulative weighted Score 0

Evaluation Criteria 4: Project Implementation Measures/Aspects

| Sub Criterion | Evaluation Considerations | | Scoring Basis and Rationale | Score | Weight | Weighted Score | Comments |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|-------|--------|----------------|----------|
| | 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 Project Readiness | Consider proposed timeline and project implementation details. | Application will be rejected if the project was started before the application was submitted. Score higher for budgeted and council approved but unstarted projects to permit CIF involvement in project scope and deliverables. | Score 0 to +5 0 if no budget amount or Council approval 1 if budget included but no Council approval 3 if budget and Council approval (concern 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) Project 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 | Score -5 to +5 -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 project schedule, funding, contractors, negotiations, inclusion of other partners | Does the project have a well defined schedule, milestones, monitoring and measuring plan, reporting provisions, (incl. how results will show collective benefits) ? 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? | Score -5 to +5 -5: High Risk (little chance of success) -3: Moderate Risk (serious concerns project will be unsuccessful or incomplete) 0: Medium Risk (concerns project will be unsuccessful or remain incomplete) 3: Low Risk (very few concerns project will be completed on time & 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 & budget) | 0 | 20 | 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? Does the plan contain an explanation of how collective benefits will be made available? | Score -5 to +5 -5: No Plan -3: Plan needs significant development 0: Plan needs minor development 3: Adequate plan but missing some detail, budget or other components 5: Complete plan identified with detailed provisions | 0 | 20 | 0 | |
| e) Quality of Final Application | | Consider clarity, completeness and accuracy of project final 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? | Score -5 to +5 -5 if final project submission is clearly unready to proceed 0 if final project submission needs major CIF staff assistance to proceed 5 if final 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. | Score -5 to +5 -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 | |

Total > 0 100 0

Cumulative weighted Score 0