

E&E Project Summary Report

Project Title/number: Peer Review Process and Guide, #265

Priority area: Cost Containment

Lead Sponsor/other partners: City of London, Stewardship Ontario, Guilford and Associates, the Region of York

Project Timing: June 2007 through end 2009

Project Summary:

i) Goals

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.

ii) Accomplishments

The main activities and documents for this project were executed and delivered, and City of London staff and their consultant did receive a peer review and act to clarify and accommodate where appropriate.

iii) Lessons Learned/Best Practice implications

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.

iv) Limitations

The London exercise worked because City officials and their consultant reacted positively to the opportunity and dedicated time to exploring the input from the review team. The process will be limited by weaknesses in any of the following cornerstone elements: a strong coordinator; a neutral senior private sector reviewer; "second opinion" senior municipal participants; a proponent who, like London, invites review and incorporates the process into their procurement process.

One limitation may be the ability to secure an impartial senior private sector reviewer who does not have an interest in the RFP itself. This may have to be acquired as paid, consulting help, if conflict or the appearance of conflict is evident.

v) Impacts (including tonnes diverted and cost impacts)

The process developed here is a supporting activity to the RFP process, and is more specifically aimed at municipal MRF development since this tends to be a higher-order technical exercise in terms of complexity, capital risk and contract management. The potential to impact tonnes and cost will depend on the condition of the RFP (rigidity, wording) and the scope of the project prior to submission to the peer review process. In the case of London, the RFP was professionally written and no major deficiencies were identified, so the impact of the process in this case was to fine tune a number of conditions in the RFP in order to clarify language and assist in attracting innovative proposals.

Financial Summary

Total project cost - \$26,365

E&E fund contribution - \$26,365

Additional information (list of resources & tools/ how/where to access additional information/ follow-up contacts):

The Peer Review Guide will be posted on the E&E Fund (SO) site, as is the foundation OWMA document.