

## E&E Project Evaluation Form

\*\*\*\*Please be advised that completed evaluations are made available publicly and are posted on Stewardship Ontario's E&E Fund web site\*\*\*\*

**Project Name/Number/Priority area:** Peer Review Process and Guide, #265, Cost Containment

**Lead Sponsor/competed by/date:** City of London, February 2009

**Project Duration:** 18 months

**Total project value:** \$26,365

**E&E funding amount:** \$26,365

### **Section 1 –To be completed by Project Applicant**

**1) What were the Project Goals and Objectives (as per the E&E Application and/or Contract)?**

**Goal:** Provide guidance on how municipal RFP processes can be structured to attract the most innovative and cost efficient private sector proposals possible, in a manner that will take full advantage of public and private sector knowledge in the areas of recycling and waste management.

**Objective:** Determine how extensive a peer review should be in order for a municipality to obtain the greatest benefit, and how and when such a review (or possibly reviews) should be carried out. Seek specific suggestions for improvements to London's procurement process.

**2) Were the goals and objectives met? (and if not why not?)**

Overall, they were met.

**3) Summary of Project Accomplishments (i.e. what did the project do/achieve?):**

The interactive process used during this project allowed for the creation of a better RFP. The insight derived from staff from the Region of York, Stewardship Ontario and the consultant added value to the RFP created by Genivar (for the City of London). The additional time required to Peer Review the work is very consistent with other common processes such as value engineering.

**4) Summary of Project Limitations (e.g. is there anything that should have been done differently?)**

The final project report could have included more examples of peer review processes from other jurisdictions and samples of work (before and after) to add further credibility to the project. The current project relied solely on the London experience. This would have required further budget but would have made for a stronger project. This could have highlighted the pitfalls of not doing this kind of peer review.

**5) What do you consider to have been the key “lessons learned” from this project? Does your project/activity represent a “best practice”?**

The most important lesson learned was the need to create an environment for constructive dialogue, criticism and review. This was achieved and resulted in a better RFP. Yes, it does represent a best practice. We would do this process again.

**6) What specifically are municipal staff doing with the experiences and data from this project? Do you have plans to apply these lessons in your program? Please explain how.**

This project was implemented and the City of London RFP incorporated the majority of the suggested changes from the Peer Review team. It is hoped that the experience from London will be applied elsewhere.

**7) Has your municipal council been informed about the project and its results?**

Municipal Council is aware that the E&E Fund has been used as part of the City of London MRF project on a couple of occasions.

**8) Do you think there are opportunities to share/replicate the successful elements of this project with other Ontario programs? If yes, how and where?**

Yes. This project as designed to be implemented elsewhere. Any municipality or technical consultant could pick up this report and undertake a similar process.

**9) Did this project result in either reduced costs per tonne of Blue Box waste recycled and/or increased Blue Box tonnes diverted? (Please explain)**

When the new MRF is built, this answer will be yes for both items.

***Section 2 –To be completed by Stewardship Ontario (and reviewed by applicant)***

**10) Did this project do what it set out to do? If not, what were the reasons/ barriers?**

Goals and objectives included provision of guidance on how municipal RFP processes could incorporate a third-party peer review in order to increase the potential to attract the most innovative and cost efficient private sector proposals possible, in a manner that will take full advantage of public and private sector knowledge in the areas of recycling and waste management. In addition to this the project set out to determine how extensive a peer review should be in order for a municipality to obtain the greatest benefit, and how and when such a review (or possibly reviews) should be carried out. As part of the process it was intended that specific suggestions for improvements to London’s procurement process and RFP be offered and discussed, with the option to incorporate left with London representatives.

The project did generate a peer review guide and tested the process of peer review. In addition, London had the opportunity to consider suggestions and amend, if they deemed appropriate, their RFP document.

**11) What are the key learnings from this project? Are there any next steps? What is being done to share the results?**

The peer review guide will be posted on the SO website. There were several key learnings, the first being that a peer review process did result in meaningful suggestions to improve the RFP. The exchange was very positive and proponent (London) and their consultant (Genivar) engaged positively in the process.

The London RFP and award process are nearing completion, and some work remains to gauge whether the goals and objectives – innovation, cost efficiency – were realized. There may be other secondary benefits that will take additional time to measure, such as improved contractual language and contract enforcement.

Next steps and follow up may occur where procurement opportunities, especially for things like MRF development, present themselves. It would be prudent to include London as the “other” municipal panel member so that they can bring forward their experience and advice to the process.

**12) Was the project good value for the money (e.g. were there measureable program or system cost reduction benefits, cost effective tonnage increases, etc?)**

The project budget included \$25,000 for consulting time and \$5,000 for expenses. While the full scope of benefit will be determined, this process served to provide a point of review intended to hone a much larger and very significant RFP process that could impact on many aspects of London’s program, including cost efficiency, recovery, performance measurement, and regional optimization if that is the option selected by the City.

In general, the performance of the London program will be measured over time and the ability of London to process blue box tonnage in a cost-effective manner will continue to be measured against projections, against competing facilities and programs, and within the context of the WDO reporting requirements. It is felt that introducing a peer review at this point in the process was good value for the cost of the project; continued monitoring of the project will determine whether the value grows over time.

**13) Does this project represent “best practices”? If yes, explain.**

The private sector peer review concept was introduced in E&E #226, in an associated OWMA report called “Blue Box Residential Recycling Best Practices – A Private Sector Perspective”. London already has an effective procurement process (a best practice) that included technical peer review and was able to accommodate the OWMA proposal.

Among the best practices that may be enhanced by the peer review input and discussion are 1) the multi-municipal approach option of the London RFP, 2) MRF optimization, 3) continuous improvement, and 4) effective contract management.

*Total project cost - \$26,365*

*E&E contribution – \$26,365*

*Other Cash/in-kind contributions – Staff time from London, York and SO was contributed to attend 2 meetings and to review and comment on RFP documentation. Meeting times (before travel) amounted to about 7 hours, with review becoming a priority activity for a period of about two weeks.*

## **15 ) Other Comments?**

The final say on the effectiveness of the process lies with the City of London, as the City will determine over time whether the changes incorporated in the RFP document resulted in improvements to the process. Based on the interaction between the peer reviewers, the City and the City's consultant, however, the preliminary observation is that there was value in the process. There was also project output: a guidance document was generated and the basis for promoting this type of peer review does exist.