



RPRA
Resource Productivity
& Recovery Authority

CIF
CONTINUOUS
IMPROVEMENT FUND

Continuous Improvement Fund (CIF) Windup Plan Amendment Proposal

Consultation Report

December 7, 2022

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction and Context	3
1.1	About the CIF	3
1.2	About the Authority	4
1.3	Principles for public consultation	4
2.0	What We Heard	5
2.1	About the consultation process	5
2.2	Consultation participants	6
	Webinar attendance	6
	Survey	6
	One-to-one	7
	Written submissions	7
	Question & Answers	7
2.3	Overview of feedback received	7
	Variations in support required	7
	Expansion beyond the Blue Box	8
	Communications	8
	Concerns with the CIF WUP Amendment Proposal	9
	Services and supports that should be continued	9
	Potential opt-out provision	10
	Comments Received in Writing	11
3.	Conclusion	11
	Appendix 1: Part 1 & 2 Webinar Feedback	12
	Appendix 2: Online Survey Results	22
	Appendix 3: Stakeholders that Submitted Written Responses	29
	Appendix 4: Questions Posted by Webinar Participants — Q&A Summary	31

1.0 Introduction and Context

The Continuous Improvement Fund (CIF) submitted a Windup Plan (WUP) Amendment Proposal to the Resource Productivity and Recovery Authority (RPRA or the Authority) in August 2022.

The proposal outlines details for an early windup of CIF at the end of 2022 instead of 2023 and the transfer of its resources and assets, including approximately \$9.64M in surplus funds currently designated for disbursement to individual municipalities, recycling associations and First Nations communities, to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO).

AMO is proposing to use CIF surplus funds to continue some of the current activities undertaken by CIF and otherwise use the funds to continue supporting municipalities, recycling associations, and First Nations communities in the transition to Ontario's extended producer responsibility framework, as well as post-transition support.

As the CIF currently operates as a committee of RPRA, which has assumed oversight of the CIF, the RPRA Board permitted CIF and RPRA to jointly consult on the proposal between October 4 and November 4, 2022. The consultation was used to obtain stakeholder perspectives on the proposed amendment, specifically whether there was support for:

1. The early windup of CIF and the transfer of resources and assets to AMO and Local Authority Services (LAS, a subsidiary of AMO), in lieu of disbursements of surplus funds to designated program operators, and
2. The proposed multi-year strategic priorities and objectives outlined to meet anticipated transition and post transition needs.

All comments received during the consultation process were considered when reviewing the proposed plan. In approving the WUP Amendment, with a condition, RPRA assessed whether the proposed amendment was compliant with the Minister's direction issued under the *Waste Diversion Transition Act, 2016 (WDTA)* and consistent with RPRA's Wind Up Guide.

This report details the joint CIF and RPRA consultation process, the feedback received, and how the Authority incorporated the feedback into its decision. Questions about this report can be emailed to consultations@rpra.ca.

1.1 About the CIF

The CIF was first constituted by a Memorandum of Agreement between AMO, the City of Toronto, Stewardship Ontario (SO), and RPRA's predecessor, Waste Diversion Ontario (WDO). The CIF currently operates as a committee of RPRA, which has assumed oversight of the CIF.

The CIF began in late 2008 and its original mandate was to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of Ontario's Blue Box (BB) programs. CIF fulfills its mandate through the provision of technical support and training for municipalities and First Nations communities. As of 2021, the CIF has focused its efforts on supporting the transition of the Blue Box Program from the WDTA to the new producer responsibility regulatory framework outlined in the *Resource Recovery and*

Circular Economy Act, 2016 (RRCEA) and the associated Blue Box Regulation through collective initiatives that are of broad benefit to all programs across the province.

1.2 About the Authority

The Authority is the regulator created by the Ontario government to enforce the requirements of the RRCEA and the WDTA and their associated regulations.

The RRCEA establishes a new resource management regime where producers are individually accountable and financially responsible for their products and packaging, recovering resources and reducing waste. The WDTA allows for the continuation of Ontario's legacy waste diversion programs and sets out provisions to wind up those programs and the industry funding organizations responsible for operating them as directed by the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks.

RPRA is also mandated to build and operate digital reporting services on behalf of the Government of Ontario for programs beyond producer responsibility.

1.3 Principles for public consultation

The Authority's consultations are guided by the following best-practice principles developed by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development:

Inclusiveness and openness: Engage broadly with a wide variety of stakeholders, provide clear and understandable information, and make the consultation process accessible, comprehensible, and responsive.

Timeliness: Engage stakeholders early before decisions are made and provide regular opportunities for engagement on key program and policy matters.

Accessible and cost effective: Consider a variety of tools and methods to gather feedback that promote efficient and cost-effective consultations.

Balance: Provide opportunities for diverse perspectives and opinions to be heard and considered.

Transparent: Record feedback, report back a summary to stakeholders, and synthesize feedback into programs and policies as appropriate.

Evaluation: Demonstrate the impact of public consultations on program delivery and policy development.

2.0 What We Heard

2.1 About the consultation process

CIF and the Authority launched the public consultation on CIF's WUP Amendment Proposal on October 4, 2022. Dedicated web pages were created on both [CIF's](#) and the [Authority's](#) websites with background information on the consultation, registration links for the various sessions, and presentation materials.

On October 4, 2022, CIF sent email alerts and follow-up emails to its distribution list, which includes all 250 municipalities, recycling associations and First Nations communities that reported into the 2020 Datacall. Follow-up calls were also made by CIF Staff to local communities with a focus on all First Nation's communities that reported into the 2020 Datacall. CIF contacted approximately 65 communities by phone. In total, approximately 440 local community staff, representing 263 individual local communities were notified of the consultation. CIF also requested that email alerts be shared through membership groups including AMO, the Municipal Resource Recovery and Research Collaborative (M3RC), the Solid Waste Subcommittee of the Regional Public Works Commissioners of Ontario (RPWCO), and the Municipal Waste Association (MWA).

On October 4, the Authority announced the consultation to its list of Datacall participants — approximately 479 contacts, which includes municipalities, First Nation communities and recycling associations. The Authority also announced the consultation to its general mailing list (approximately 1440 subscribers) on October 7 via the Authority's October newsletter. A reminder email was sent to Datacall participants on October 31, 2022.

The consultation was delivered in two parts. Part 1 provided an overview of the proposal and Part 2 focused on the proposed multi-year priorities and objectives that would be funded with the transfer of surplus funds to AMO/LAS. The objective was to solicit input and feedback from participants and to assess the degree of alignment with the proposed amendment to the CIF Windup Plan.

Stakeholders were invited to submit feedback through:

- attendance at one of three Part 1 online webinars
- attendance at one of two Part 2 online webinars
- a one-to-one Zoom call (upon request)
- an online survey
- in writing via email

Stakeholders were invited to submit written feedback by email until November 4, 2022, which marked the end of the consultation period.

2.2 Consultation participants

Webinar presentations and recordings as well as the Q&As from all sessions can be found on the Windup Plan Amendment Proposal page on CIF's [website](#).

A breakdown of the participation in each part of the consultation follows.

Webinar attendance

Attendee Info by Category					
Date	Consultation Session	# of local community staff in attendance	# of local communities represented	# 2020 Datacall reporting programs represented	# of non-municipal/non-First Nation participants
Wed, Oct 5	Part 1: CIF Windup Plan Amendment Proposal, Overview	83	65	62	2
Thu, Oct 6		65	57	56	2
Tue, Oct 18		25	24	23	5
Wed, Oct 26	Part 2: Multi-Year Strategic Priorities & Objectives	27	23	20	1
Fri, Oct 28		27	25	23	0
Total Participants:		227	194	184	10

In some cases, multiple representatives from a single community attended. Analysis of the attendance records, accounting only for individual communities represented, shows that out of the 250 communities that reported into the 2020 Datacall, 137 communities in total were represented at the sessions, or 55%. This represents over 91% of the funds currently approved for disbursement. Of those 137 communities represented, 12 were First Nations communities, accounting for 50% of First Nations communities that reported into the 2020 Datacall.

Part 1 & 2 webinar feedback has been documented in Appendix 1.

Survey

Online surveys were distributed following each webinar session. Thirty-eight surveys were completed.

Feedback from survey respondents on the quality and accessibility of the consultation process and format was positive. 35 of the 38 survey respondents indicated that their overall experience with the meeting format was good or excellent. Communication of key content was generally successful: 37 of the 38 respondents indicated that they fully or somewhat understood the WUP Amendment Proposal.

The Survey also generated individual responses related to key take-aways and the importance of specific transition supports. The primary themes addressed in these responses are reflected below in Section 2.3, and a complete listing of all responses is included in Appendix 2.

One-to-one

Seven communities requested one-to-one calls: Enniskillen, Haldimand, Hamilton, Peel Region, Toronto, York Region, and the Chippewas of Nawash First Nation.

Written submissions

A total of 12 written responses were received. Ten responses were from municipalities or recycling associations that would be entitled to a disbursement of funds under the current CIF Windup Plan. Two were from groups/organizations representing stakeholders in Blue Box recycling. A summary of written responses is included in Section 2.3. Additional information, including a list of the municipalities and organizations submitting responses is provided in Appendix 3.

Question & Answers

Outstanding questions of clarification received throughout the consultation process have been addressed through the Q & A documentation presented in Appendix 4.

2.3 Overview of feedback received

The majority of participants that provided feedback in Part 1 of the consultation process indicated that continued support from CIF and M3RC during the Blue Box transition is important or very important.

The importance of extending support to municipalities and First Nations communities beyond 2023 when CIF is slated to wind up was mentioned frequently. Many communities expressed the need for support that includes other waste streams in addition to Blue Box materials and extends beyond the end of the Blue Box transition period in 2025 when many of the changes prompted by the transition will continue to impact local waste streams.

Variations in support required

The expressed need for support varied by community size, resources available, and program type (e.g., depot). The need for transition support was mentioned most frequently by representatives of small and medium-sized municipalities and First Nations communities. Small

communities may have limited or no specialized waste management resources and indicated a need for extensive support. Communities with depot-only collection systems expressed a need for support to address specific concerns related to anticipated reductions or losses of services post-transition.

Some participants representing smaller communities assessed the need for transition support as modest or minimal. Some participants representing larger municipalities have established in-house capacity to help manage the transition and see direct support from CIF to their operations as of moderate or no importance. However, some of these participants also expressed a desire to continue to receive information on how transition is progressing across Ontario and/or to see support extend beyond the transition to include other waste diversion programs.

The stated need for support also varied depending on when a particular municipality is transitioning and how the transition is unfolding. Municipalities transitioning early expressed a need for more support. Municipalities transitioning in the latter years noted that lessons learned, best practices, and other tools and resources developed during the first year of transition could be used to help them in their transitions.

Expansion beyond the Blue Box

Many of the comments regarding the importance of transition support reflect the fact that municipalities and First Nations communities will retain broad waste management responsibilities during and after the transition. Changes in one part of the solid waste stream will have an impact on others, and participants are concerned about overall waste diversion, and the possibility of increased contamination rates or other waste stream impacts, with potential resource and financial implications.

Participants expressed a need for support to help manage the addition of new materials targeted for collection in Blue Box systems, other materials under Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) regulations such as hazardous and special products, unregulated diversion programs for materials such as textiles, issues such as organics bans, and the circular economy. Participants also expressed a desire for additional support to help manage perceived deficiencies with other producer responsibility programs for materials such as electronics and tires.

Additionally, participants expressed concerns about ineligible sources under the RRCEA Blue Box framework (e.g., small IC&I businesses) and noted that support is required to understand how other communities are managing these sources, and to explore opportunities for inclusion in Blue Box systems.

Communications

Many participants indicated that they rely on CIF to explain the Blue Box transition and to serve as a centralized, streamlined, and reliable information source, given the complexity of the transition process.

Participants noted that they are anticipating changes to service levels and uncertainties in the transition process that may result in complaints from residents that come back to municipalities.

Participants also noted that resources such as bulletins, templates and other supports that help ensure consistent and accurate communications to residents will be valuable.

Concerns with the CIF WUP Amendment Proposal

Many of the comments reflected an understanding and acceptance of the logic of moving services currently provided by CIF to AMO and LAS. However, concerns were raised about whether LAS can ensure the same level of specialized waste management expertise and experience currently provided by CIF. Other non-AMO represented communities requested amendments to the organizational structure to ensure transparency of LAS board decisions.

Some participants see the proposed organizational structure as overly complex, with excessive layers of oversight, and requirements for multiple approvals.

Some participants questioned how individual communities' needs will be incorporated into work planning under the proposed LAS structure.

Many First Nations participants had no previous relationship with CIF or AMO, making it difficult to comment on the value of CIF-like services under AMO and LAS. Some of these participants expressed a strong need for transition support, especially once the First Nations transition schedule is announced.

Services and supports that should be continued

Participants in the Part 1 consultations identified several services and supports currently provided by CIF that should be continued during the Blue Box transition. These include:

- *CIF workshops and webinars:* These programs were seen by participants as valuable for explaining the Blue Box transition and sharing information and best practices.
- *Transition Working Groups:* Participants commented on the usefulness of the working groups for information sharing and addressing topics such as the management of depot systems and issues specific to First Nations communities.
- *Waste composition audits:* Waste audits were seen by participants as important for monitoring the performance of PROs and understanding how changes to the Blue Box system may impact other waste streams.
- *Research:* Participants viewed data collection as necessary to monitor system performance and inform policy development. They commented that jurisdictional scans and baselines indicating how other communities are proceeding in their transitions assist in reporting to senior management (SM) and Councils by identifying when issues or practices are being addressed provincially. They noted that local and multi-jurisdictional scans contribute to the determination of best practices. They also noted that participation studies are needed because Blue Box materials may migrate into solid waste if participation rates drop. Participants indicated that access to all research resources compiled by CIF to date should be available.

- *Templates and standard operating procedures:* Participants noted that these tools are needed to ensure that all municipalities have a common understanding of best practices. Participants also commented that sharing lessons learned by municipalities transitioning early could benefit communities transitioning later.
- *Promotion and education support:* Participants expressed a need for support in explaining the transition to residents. They commented that even as responsibility for P&E shifts to producers, municipalities will see new needs arise.
- *Communicating with SM and Council:* Participants indicated that communication support, including more visuals and definitions of terms/concepts that can be inserted into reports to SM or Councils, would be helpful.
- *Support for working with PROs:* Participants commented that resources and information on how to negotiate and work with PROs, including decision-making regarding potential roles as a contractor, would be valuable. Some communities noted that they would be uncomfortable negotiating with PROs without support.
- *Representation:* The role of CIF and M3RC in representing municipal interests in the transition process and other initiatives was seen by participants as important.

A persistent theme in Part 1 of the consultation process was the need for more information on the services and deliverables that will be available in 2023 and for the longer timeline associated with the CIF Windup Plan Amendment Proposal. In response, Part 2 of the consultations focused on the *CIF Windup Plan Amendment Proposal Part 2: Multi-Year Strategic Priorities & Objectives*.

Comments received in Part 2 of the consultations emphasized the importance of ensuring that the interests of municipal waste management operations are fully represented in the development of best practices and other tools/resources.

Potential opt-out provision

The consultation sessions raised the potential of an opt-out mechanism to be provided to individual communities as a possible condition of RPRA's approval of CIF's proposed WUP Amendment.

Several participants expressed concerns about a potential opt-out provision. Specific concerns mentioned include the possibility of larger municipalities opting out, leaving only small municipalities to fund services, and "free riders" that would benefit from services without contributing. Several participants commented on the value and importance of collective resources and a united voice during and after transition.

Some participants indicated that a report to their senior management and possibly to their Council will be required or expected if an opt-out option is provided. Participants noted it will be very difficult to report to Councils before the end of 2022 given the municipal elections on October 24. Other participants indicated that there will be no need for review/approval by senior management or Council in their municipalities.

Participants expressed a need for more information on the potential opt-out process.

Comments Received in Writing

Written submissions were received throughout the process. Ten of the 12 written responses were from 2020 Datacall participants. Seven of these respondents expressed unconditional support for the CIF WUP Amendment Proposal. One respondent expressed conditional support, and two respondents indicated that they do not support the proposed plan as currently drafted.

Two additional expressions of general support were received from stakeholder organizations.

- A written response from an association, representing 18 Datacall reporting municipalities, expressed general support for the CIF WUP Amendment Proposal. Sixteen of the 18 endorsed the proposal, with one of the 16 expressing conditional support. Two of the 18 do not support the proposed Option 3.
- A written response expressing support for the proposed amendment was also received from a stakeholder organization representing producer interests. This organization plays a role in transition, diversion programming, and overall waste management but is not a Datacall participant and is not entitled to a disbursement of funds under the current CIF Windup Plan.

Additional detail on the written submissions is provided in Appendix 4.

3. Conclusion

The CIF considered all stakeholder feedback gathered throughout the consultation process and made revisions to the initial CIF Windup Plan Amendment Proposal submitted to RPRA in October 2022. An updated proposal was prepared to better detail priorities, objectives and projects that would be available through AMO and LAS starting in 2023. CIF and M3RC staff will make ongoing efforts to work closely with all local programs year over year to ensure that the services, deliverables, timelines, and budgets meet with their approval. This annual review process will address the request put forward by communities in written submission.

RPRA has considered all stakeholder feedback and participation throughout the consultation process. To ensure that the decision to transfer the CIF surplus funds to AMO is made by each municipality, recycling association, and First Nations community that would otherwise benefit from a disbursement, RPRA approved the CIF Windup Plan Amendment, with a condition.

The condition requires CIF to continue to follow the CIF Windup Plan approved by RPRA in December 2020, until such time that an opt-out process is implemented which allows each participating community the opportunity to opt out and receive a disbursement from the CIF reserve funds instead. For more details on the condition, [view the approval letter](#).

Appendix 1: Part 1 & 2 Webinar Feedback

Appendix 1a: Part 1 Consultations

Appendix 1a provides a summary of responses to a series of questions posed by CIF to participants at the consultation sessions held on October 5, 6 and 18, 2022. Questions addressed three areas:

- Concerns with the CIF Windup Plan Amendment Proposal
- Benefits of the CIF Windup Plan Amendment Proposal
- Importance of Blue Box transition support

Questions were presented during breakout sessions led by municipal and First Nations volunteers on October 5 and October 6. Questions were presented by the consultation session facilitator to the entire group on October 18, as there were not enough participants registered to merit breakout rooms. In all cases, those leading this part of the consultation were tasked with asking the questions and moderating the discussions. They were not tasked with seeking context or clarifying any misinterpretations.

1. Concerns with the CIF Windup Plan Amendment Proposal

Participants were asked to identify and comment on any concerns they see with the CIF WUP Amendment Proposal (Option 3). The following questions were posed:

- **What are your main concerns?**
- **Do you have any concerns that should be raised at the Senior Management (SM) and leadership level?**

Participant's responses are summarized below and organized by topic. Comments that are not relevant to the proposal are not included.

Complexity of the WUP Amendment Proposal

- Some participants see the bureaucracy as excessive, with many layers added to the oversight of the organization. There is a concern that the voice of municipalities, particularly smaller municipalities with limited or no waste management staff, would be lost with all of the different players involved.
- A concern was also expressed that many approvals will be required to move the proposal forward, and that the transition to the new organization should be made as smooth as possible.

The need for additional information/clarity

- There were requests for more information on the municipal role, including more details on governance, services provided, whether/how accounting methodologies will be changed, and how municipalities will continue to be involved and have a voice.
- There was some confusion expressed regarding the Blue Box transition process vs. the CIF Windup Plan Amendment Proposal (i.e., proposed transition of CIF-like services to AMO/LAS).

Opt-out provision

- More information/clarity was requested on the possibility of an opt-out provision, including what the processes to opt-in or opt-out might look like.
- It was noted that a potential reason for SM to object to Option 3 would be a preference to have funds distributed vs. continue to receive support.
- Participants expressed concerns that if large municipalities opt-out of the proposed plan, only small municipalities will be left to fund services, and about “free riders” benefitting from the program without contributing. They noted that the more municipalities that are involved, the better it will be for everyone.
- It was also noted that First Nations communities may want to opt-out as they are not part of AMO.

Review and approval by SM and municipal Councils, if the opt-out option is provided to all programs reporting into the Datacall

- Several participants indicated that it will be important to bring the proposal back to leadership in their organizations. In many municipalities, several staff are working on transition but not all were present at consultation meetings.
- Several participants indicated that a report to their municipal Council would be required or expected. Given municipal elections on October 24, participants noted that it will be very difficult to get anything in front of Council before the end of 2022.
- A summary presentation that could be inserted into a report to Council or more easily viewed by SM and other municipal departments was requested. This could include more visuals and definitions of terms/concepts that will help staff inform new Councillors after the municipal elections.
- Other participants indicated that in their municipalities there will be no need for review/approval by SM or Council.

Knowledge and experience of staff in the proposed new structure

- LAS is seen by some participants as more of an administrative organization that hires outside resources for content and does not have any current staff that would bring any value to the proposed new organizational structure. Concerns were raised about whether current CIF staff will be retained within the new structure, and how municipalities can ensure that LAS will hire the right people to provide the necessary support for transition.

Management of non-Blue Box materials and ineligible sources

- Concerns were raised about what will happen with non-Blue Box materials in the rest of the waste stream. Participants raised as an example the management of hazardous and special product wastes under EPR, which they perceived as full of surprises and disappointments for many communities. Participants expressed a need for help beyond the Blue Box program.
- Feedback included concerns related to ineligible sources under the new Blue Box regulation. Participants expressed the view that small businesses are examples of sources that should remain eligible. There is a concern that important information is being overlooked in the design and roll-out of the changes, not only in the CIF transition, but also for all other programs transitioning to RRCEA framework.

Impact of the transition on waste management services

- Some participants are concerned about a potential drop in service levels after 2025. One concern was that the Blue Box system will become collection systems for tires and batteries, which were noted to have had service problems. Another concern raised was that fewer depots will be considered sufficient by PROs in depot collection systems. There are concerns that municipal staff may not know what needs will arise and what services they will be required to provide.
- Participants expressed the view that communities may see a spike in garbage volumes as a result of reduced services. It was noted that reduced services and/or increased waste may have a financial impact on municipal waste management budgets.

Residents' complaints

- Concerns were raised that if there are significant issues regarding the new Blue Box program, these issues will come back to municipal staff from residents. There are concerns that staff will have to deal with residents' complaints. Participants noted that the new structure could look complicated from residents' point of view (e.g., if the municipality becomes a subcontractor of CMO).

Concerns raised by smaller municipalities

- CIF is seen as the "go-to" organization for smaller municipalities, and if it no longer exists these municipalities would be in a very difficult place during and after transition.
- Communities that rely on depot systems are concerned about what happens if support for depots is reduced or removed.
- Some municipalities in Northwestern Ontario anticipate logistical challenges due to remote locations and limited resources.

Concerns raised by First Nations communities

- First Nations communities indicated that they are at a disadvantage because their transition schedule has not been released. Also, specialized waste management resources are limited. There is no solid waste coordinator at some Tribal Councils.
- Concerns were raised about how First Nations communities will be consulted about the proposed WUP amendment.
- There are questions about what future support from CIF will look like in First Nations communities that have not received support in the past.
- Some participants indicated that they are very nervous about transition and will need support to get through the transition process. One area of concern is the lack of resources to negotiate with PROs. Another is the need for communication tools such as bulletins to communicate with residents about the changes.
- Some participants see the benefit of CIF support during but not necessarily after the transition.

2. Benefits of the CIF Windup Plan Amendment Proposal

Participants were asked to comment on specific elements of the CIF Windup Plan Amendment Proposal that they view as beneficial, prompted by the following questions:

- **What do you like/want to make sure remains in the proposal?**
- **What services/supports would be useful to you?**

Responses are summarized below and organized by topic. Comments that are not relevant to the proposal are not included.

General comments

- Support to municipalities for the Blue Box transition is seen as important or very important by a majority of participants. Municipalities expressed a need for the resources from CIF to deal with transition issues.
- Some participants view CIF and M3RC (AMO) as the only organizations that have been clarifying transition issues. CIF has played a critical role in providing tools and knowledge and connecting municipal partners.
- Participants expressed a need for post-transition support. They noted that new questions will arise, and decision-making will be ongoing (e.g., whether and how to submit a response to a tender for local recycling services).

Information sharing

- The coordination function that CIF performs is seen as very beneficial. Participants indicated that it is very important to have someone to reach out to, and better to have connections between communities and collective resources vs. having to go it alone. Services that support information sharing about issues, concerns and best practices are essential supports that should be continued.
- Participants commented that information sharing with other municipalities provides confirmation that issues are larger than local. This is significant when reporting to SM or Council, which then see that the issue is being addressed on a province-wide basis.
- Specific information sharing services mentioned as important include:
 - CIF workshops, which have been helpful in the past. Continuing to provide support through workshops (specifically around best practices) is seen as useful.
 - CIF Transition Working Group subcommittee meetings, which have been a great tool to support the transition planning process. Participants noted that these meetings have been very useful in providing an understanding of what other communities are doing with Blue Box programs, and that this support will be needed on an ongoing basis.
 - Webinars, which have been very helpful for staying on top of the issues and providing knowledge and tools. It was noted that CIF has helped municipalities understand the impacts of the non-eligible sources that currently receive Blue Box collection from the municipality.
- Participants commented that all communities should have access to the same information resources, and that they all need a full, honest understanding of the changes rather than piecemeal information.

Expanding beyond the Blue Box

- Participants expressed the importance of expanding support beyond the Blue Box to waste management in general, including solid waste and other stewardship programs. They see a need for research, support and knowledge sharing to help manage new non-Blue Box materials coming on stream, unregulated diversion programs (e.g., textiles, C&D waste), issues such as organics bans, and the circular economy. They noted that there will be a

need for research, better protocols, and new models, and that the potential for many more EPR programs will create an ongoing need for a CIF-like service.

- It was noted that more support is needed for problematic materials, particularly in smaller municipalities. Tires were mentioned as an example. Some municipalities have waited years for pick-ups from depots.
- Participants identified a need for assistance in dealing with ineligible sources as the transition rolls out.
- The involvement of CIF in notifications to communities from PROs about new materials coming on stream was identified as potentially helpful.
- Some municipalities have contracts aligned with their transition date. They are interested in keeping up to date with changes to designated materials that will come later so they can monitor the impact of these changes on solid waste that will remain under municipal management.

Ensuring staff experience and expertise in the new structure

- Participants frequently mentioned the need to retain current CIF staff, and a desire for assurance that LAS will hire the right people. The current CIF staff are seen as bringing important value to municipalities because of their knowledge, experience, and networks of contacts.

Communications regarding the regulatory transition

- Some participants commented that municipalities are currently speaking to too many organizations, and that it is difficult to keep up. They feel that communication from the various organizations involved should be streamlined, and noted that many municipalities are relying on CIF to explain the transition in plain language that is easy to understand.
- Several participants commented on the need for support for communications regarding transition, given limited or no specialized waste management staff in smaller communities.

Waste composition audits

- Many participants indicated that waste composition audits will continue to be essential. They commented that municipalities need to know what is in the waste stream, have a vested interest in solid waste management, and cannot untangle the various parts of the service. Changes in one area of the waste management system are likely to impact other areas.
- Participants noted that waste audits will continue to be valuable for monitoring the local performance of PROs. Issues such as low capture rates and the migration of Blue Box materials into the solid waste stream will be of concern to municipalities. Some see waste audits as potentially even more important after transition than they are currently.
- Representatives of small municipalities see waste composition audits as particularly helpful because they need data and benchmarks but cannot afford to do the audits themselves.
- It was also noted that funding for waste audits is hard to find.

Promotion and education (P&E)

- There is interest in CIF continuing to support P&E during the transition. Participants commented that municipalities will need support to make sure they are providing the correct information to make a successful transition, to make sure that the changes are correctly

communicated to all parties, and to be able to explain what the system is going to look like after transition.

- It was noted that responsibility for P&E will shift to producers, but municipalities will see new P&E needs arise. An example cited was the need to address contamination in green bins and the solid waste stream due to confusion during the Blue Box transition.

The CIF Price Sheet

- A range of opinions were expressed about how useful the CIF Price Sheet would be after transition. Some municipalities expect to continue offering recycling services to the IC&I sector and other ineligible sources, and will continue to use the Price Sheet. Other municipalities do not see the Price Sheet as being valuable going forward since they will no longer be involved in processing Blue Box materials, and would not want to see resources used for this purpose.
- It was noted that some contractors are moving away from using the Price Sheet as a benchmark. Small communities relying on depot collection do not always have much competition for contractors and negotiations do not really happen in practice.

Research

- Participants commented that data collection is required to inform policy development, and that M3RC has an established relationship with the Minister's office, which will assist in achieving the true intent of transition – a broader range of materials, higher capture rates, and more successful diversion programs overall.
- It was noted that participation studies are needed because municipalities should know whether participation changes after transition. There is a concern that Blue Box material may migrate into solid waste if participation drops.
- Participants noted that reports from different projects that document best practices are very helpful, and that jurisdictional scans and contacts are important to support reporting to municipal leadership.
- Several participants indicated that the CIF Windup Plan Amendment Proposal should provide for continued access to all of the research resources compiled by CIF to date.

Templates and standard operating procedures

- Participants commented that templates and standard operating procedures will be helpful in ensuring that every municipality has a common understanding of what needs to be done for the transition, and that the experience of those municipalities transitioning early can be shared with those municipalities transitioning later.

Support for working with PROs

- Comments referred to how CIF has been instrumental in helping municipalities work with CMO. CIF's overview of CMO materials (SOWs and contracts) and highlighting what may be municipal concerns was also noted as being of great value. Participants also noted work by CIF to address CMO agreements and summarize CMO meetings with communities or municipal responses to CMO agreements has been useful for preparing Council reports/correspondence and developing CMO plans.
- Some participants sought support in developing templates and standard operating procedures for dealing with CMO. Participants also noted that tools and resources to

support decision-making re: whether to become a service provider to PROs will also be of value.

- Some participants do not feel comfortable negotiating with CMO without support.
- It was noted that there is a need to understand what “teeth” CIF will have going forward to help municipalities deal with CMO.

Support for smaller municipalities

- Representatives of small municipalities indicated that they are looking for support from CIF during and after transition, and that the support so far is appreciated.
- Comments focused on several important services and supports provided by CIF to smaller municipalities with limited resources. Specific areas of support mentioned were:
 - Data collection. Participants noted that it is difficult to aggregate data as a small community. Participants also noted a need for benchmarks and a “big picture” to enable comparisons with similar municipalities.
 - Participants also noted that information and templates to assist in procurement and service contracting would be beneficial as small municipalities do not have these resources and need these services to be continued.
- Several participants commented on how the Depot Working Group has provided important support for small municipalities with depot-only collection systems and should be continued. These communities said they rely on CIF for support and information and need to know what kind of support will be available going forward.

Supports specific to First Nations communities

- Representatives of First Nations communities commented that support from CIF is needed because there are so many unknowns about what is happening, when it is happening, what the impact will be, and what is needed. They noted that the needs of FN communities and the levels at which they are operating vary widely, and that the information on the transition can be confusing.
- First Nations representatives said they would like to have one streamlined system to support their communities. They also said they would like a single source of information with visuals and clear steps outlining what the transition should look like, answering questions, and providing a more “nitty-gritty” understanding of the changes underway. They expressed a desire for the transition process to be seamless.
- Participants indicated that the First Nations Working Group will be beneficial to First Nations communities going forward, depending on which way these communities go. First Nations participants noted that their communities need assistance to get through the transition.
- Other areas of support identified as important by FN participants include assistance with P&E materials (e.g., bulletins) to help educate residents about the changes, and support for negotiations with PROs.

Process to review the proposed windup plan

- It was suggested that a mechanism should be in place to review the new AMO/LAS entity every two years so that municipalities can assess the value of the organization and determine whether it should be continued. Participants noted that if the value is no longer there the remaining funds could be disbursed. Participants suggested that terms for the new organization could be set and hiring could be done on a contractual basis. Participants commented that municipalities could have shared decision-making to either be all in (keep

going) or all out (end the organization), but the representation municipalities would need to share decision-making about the organization's direction would have to be determined.

Representation and advocacy on behalf of municipalities

- Participants identified a need for representation of municipal interests and alignment of peers. They suggested that CIF could use its relationship with municipalities to collect information and help municipalities establish a bigger presence with RPRA and MECP when advocating for help or support.
- They also suggested that it may be useful to have CIF rally together all of the information from municipalities about the transition and other waste management developments such as ECA amendments and issues at landfills, and present this to MECP when advocating on behalf of municipalities. This may help with transition and other concerns such as the collection of tires.

3. Importance of Blue Box Transition Support

Participants were asked to provide summary comments in response to the following question:

- **How important is Blue Box transition support to your community?**

Responses are summarized below:

General comments about transition support

- A strong majority of participants indicated that continued support will be either important or very important. The need for continued support was mentioned most frequently by representatives of small and medium-sized municipalities and First Nations communities.
- Some participants indicated that continued support will not be important to their communities.
- Services and information provided by CIF and AMO are appreciated by many participants and seen as unique, valuable and something that municipalities cannot afford to lose.
- AMO, like CIF, is seen as a good fit, and an allied organization supporting municipalities.
- The speed of responses by CIF is important to some participants.
- A minority of participants, most often representing larger municipalities, are anticipating the windup of support and will be evaluating whether to opt out of the proposed plan, if given the option to do so.

Comments specific to support during transition

- There is strong support among participants for maintaining CIF support during the transition process. Specific reasons cited were:
 - CIF has been good at pointing out the risks to municipalities related to the transition process.
 - The collaborative environment supported by CIF is needed during the transition to share best practices, to provide scans of how other municipalities are proceeding, and to get a baseline of where other municipalities are at in their transition process.
 - Support for how to communicate with residents during transition is needed.

- Some participants are expecting “bumps” as transition rolls out. An example is the need to inform a new Council that may not have background in this area. There are lots of unknowns.
- Support is needed because the Blue Box transition can be an overwhelming process.
- In small municipalities with limited resources there are fears that support will not be readily available and that there will be no place to have questions answered during the transition.
- Many municipalities are unable to devote staff resources to manage the transition. Many are hiring consultants to alleviate the workload and assist in transition plans. There is a need for resources from CIF to deal with future transition issues.
- Comments indicated that the support needed will vary depending on when a particular municipality is transitioning and how the transition is unfolding. Municipalities transitioning early will need more support. Lessons learned, best practices, standard operating procedures, protocols, etc. can be developed during the first year of transition and used to help other municipalities transitioning later.

Comments specific to support after transition

- The importance of extending support to municipalities beyond 2025 was mentioned frequently.
- Participants indicated that municipalities need the support to be broad-based (i.e., an expanded mandate beyond the Blue Box) and ongoing (i.e., extending well beyond the end of the transition period when many of the changes will continue to impact all municipalities regardless of their transition date).
- Participants anticipate an ongoing need for the municipal voice during and after transition on other waste issues. They noted that municipalities have faced many surprises in the past and do not feel that the surprises are over; future work requirements are still unknown. They also noted that municipalities will not get the value that CIF provides from elsewhere and will lose the voice that it gives municipalities at the table if CIF does not exist. These participants see a one-time disbursement of funds as short-sighted.
- It was noted that the content expertise and municipal knowledge that CIF brings is essential, regardless of organizational structure.

4. Informal poll on awareness of Local Authority Services (LAS)

- In all three consultation sessions, participants were asked whether they are aware of LAS. A total of 46 participants responded: 20 indicated that they were not aware of LAS; 14 indicated some awareness; 12 indicated that they have worked with LAS.

Appendix 1b: Part 2 Consultations

Appendix 1b provides a summary of comments received during the Part 2 Consultation Sessions held on October 26 and 28, 2022. The focus of these sessions was on Multi-Year Strategic Priorities and Objectives. Participants in these sessions were invited to contribute questions and comments in open discussions following the presentations.

Comments received in Part 2 of the consultation process addressed the importance of ensuring that the interests of municipal waste management operations are fully represented in the development of best practices and other tools/resources.

There was also a recommendation to consider the development of quality management systems that would enable all municipalities, large and small, to operate within the same general framework. This would promote greater standardization.

Appendix 2: Online Survey Results

1) Please rate the meeting format:

	Excellent	Good	Average	Fair	Poor
Overall experience	22	13	3	0	0
Logging in	23	12	2	0	1
Sound quality	24	13	1	0	0
Visuals	21	16	1	0	0
Using the Q&A or chat features	21	14	2	1	0

Comments

- Too many words. Needs to be more simplified and to the point.
- Maybe less time in breakout and more time addressing questions after breakout.
- Vast majority of slides were excellent. The visual of the flow chart was a bit confusing but that's understandable as it is somewhat convoluted.
- I was also dealing with a water line break so was in and out of the presentation.
- Some presenters tended to speak very quickly which made it a little difficult to follow.
- Disappointed as the scope of this presentation was beyond our Unorganized Townships understanding
- I am new to the landfill position so it helped a lot.
- It was seamless, met my every need
- Felt a little time crunched.
- I have seen others use pop up polls which may have worked better for some of your questions so that you could receive more feedback. Sometimes people do not like to speak up in a crowd, even if it just in text form.

2) Please rate where you stand on the meeting objectives:

	Totally	Somewhat	Not at all
I understand the proposal	21	16	1
My questions were addressed	26	9	3
Clarifications were provided, if needed	23	13	2

Comments

- A question that was raised at the end got my attention as something that should maybe be addressed from the get-go. Do we need council's approval for this recommendation? I pre-emptively answered Yes to the question of whether or not we want CIF services to continue during transition because I can see the value from the staff perspective but if it is not my decision to make (but rather Council's), than perhaps we need to be advised of this so we may make a recommendation to our councils after elections and get back to you with an official answer. If the latter, I second the idea that it would be helpful to have a summary report prepared by CIF with some of the same graphics to ease the transfer of information during such a recommendation to council.
- I'm still confused ...mind you I left before the Q&A but.....need to have a more in depth talk with CIF to get what is happening in their world!
- Well explained and presented.
- I had asked how the LAS model would be funded after the surplus was expended. This was not answered.
- I wish RPRRA would just tell us once and for all what is happening with the Datacall.
- My lack of understanding was being distracted during the meeting. Clarified with slide deck provided through email
- Sorry, only using the "not at all" feature because I am just trying to understand it all. I find it extremely complicated but learning a little everytime there is an info page/webinar...
- It was easy to understand, straight to the point and had the key info
- I did not ask questions, but found the explanations given to others were good.

3a) What was the single most important takeaway from this presentation?

What was the single most important takeaway from this presentation?
1. What will the service provided by the PROs be/look like after 2026?
2. We have an opportunity to finally get control of our contribution while maintaining our pooled resources to support our unified voice.
3. that there is a proposal to continue to support municipalities through and after transition of the blue box programmes
4. Knowing how the change will look from a municipality's perspective
5. Looking to ensure support for municipalities
6. That CIF is here to help with Transition.
7. Looking at the 3 options
8. That RPRRA seems to be leaning towards the dissolution of CIF given that even were the WUP amendment to be accepted, they are considering offering an opt-out. IMO, it should either be a yes or a no because the opt-out could lead to significant service complications if too many opt out.
9. there is still money in the kitty
10. That municipalities will still be supported throughout the Blue Box transition if option 3 is selected.
11. The need for continued support
12. rationale for the direction

What was the single **most** important takeaway from this presentation?

- 13. That there was a potential for a specialized group available to provide assistance in municipal waste and recycling policy and programs in the future.
- 14. No matter the option chosen, there will be support for municipalities past 2022
- 15. AMO and LAS is proposing taking over some of the CIF responsibilities and the transfer of funds.
- 16. CIF wants to stay around to help municipalities with the transition
- 17. Learning there is a transition period coming and moving forward in 2026.
- 18. Unfortunately, I did not attend the entire session. I assumed incorrectly the purpose of the session.
- 19. Options of the next steps taken. As a First Nation community are we being well addressed.
- 20. an understanding of the recommended proposal
- 21. CIF is coming to an end, there is 3 options 1) to let CIF end 2022, 2) extend to 2023, or 3) merge CIF with LAS to continue to 2027 with possible more
- 22. CIF would still be working for municipalities
- 23. n/a
- 24. CIF is proposing an excellent plan for winding up the existing entity and moving into another body in order to continue supporting municipalities
- 25. need for ongoing support for those municipalities that transition later
- 26. the objective of the wind up proposal amendment
- 27. That CIF plays a huge role in helping staff like myself figure out what is happening and keeping us on top of it.
- 28. Concerns that level of service will change (from current depot and curbside to only one service). Will result in a reduction of working hours for current staff. What will happen to municipal assets that have been purchased to store blue box materials until processing?
- 29. where i can get help
- 30. There's a chance CIF might still be in play after 2023
- 31. What support CIF could provide moving forward in a new capacity with a new home.
- 32. importance of CIF to stay involved in the process to ensure FN communities are supported
- 33. The importance of CIF
- 34. CIF would like to continue their services via moving "homes" while making use of the funds that would be otherwise disbursed
- 35. three options all have varying impact to municipality
- 36. n/a
- 37. Appreciate that we are being provided options moving forward
- 38. Considering we are 6-7 months from transition, there are still a ton of unknowns for a municipality to deal with.

3b) What was the single least important takeaway from this presentation?

What was the single least important takeaway from this presentation?
1. N/A
2. overview of RPRA
3. budget information
4. all the background information
5. Discussion of the other bodies considered as potential "hosts" of the services currently offered by CIF. I think minimizing the amount of acronyms discussed would be best and since CIF's proposal (option 3) revolves around LAS and AMO, I think more time should be dedicated to explaining why that's the recommendation. Especially the LAS aspect. I was personally immediately on board with the idea that AMO absorb this new branch.
6. N/A
7. comments/questions rehashing the transition that have already been determined and are out of our hands
8. Uncertain what would be least important.
9. Not sure why LAS is joining forces
10. How it benefits or helps municipalities.
11. How to divide up surplus being a small user
12. nothing that I can pinpoint
13. the funds paid back to municipalities - better to use for the greater good as was intended so long as all stay in (except FN understanding the issues there)
14. n/a
15. reminded that M3RC is supported through CIF funds
16. None
17. Communication to residents regarding service change.
18. the finances
19. n/a. All good stuff
20. Who the new "house" would be
21. timing
22. n/a
23. It felt long and drawn out
24. NA

4) If the proposal is accepted, are there particular resources would you like the CIF to develop to help support your transition planning needs?

If the proposal is accepted, are there particular resources would you like the CIF to develop to help support your transition planning needs?
1. unknown at this time
2. Continue current approach to advise as issues arise.
3. how to operate collection systems such as depots and collection non-eligible locations - how to work with CMO to address uncollected materials/bins once transitioned
4. Continue in supporting municipalities in other waste diversion/reduction/circular economy areas especially those with policy changes coming - organics, mixed waste processing, thermal, materials bans, landfill bans, etc.
5. immediately post our municipal transition date (after July 2023) and after the transition period
6. Commercial recycling on route. How to manage.
7. I don't know what's required yet in the transition, so I don't know what resources I need.
8. I'm not sure if you would since we are OPTING out of the recycling business!
9. Having an organization to help guide and support municipalities through this process is beneficial. It is new to all municipalities and First Nations in Ontario, so any form of guidance through transition is appreciated.
10. Definitely streamlined communications between all the groups involved and the municipalities. There are just too many emails from different groups and different people. In rural Northern Ontario there are usually only a couple people in an office and they are overwhelmed with their many hats already and important items are slipping because of the jig-saw puzzle of communications.
11. Perhaps it would be beneficial for some sort of checklist to be developed to ensure that municipal staff are aware, planning for and communicating with CMO all of the different aspects that will be encountered. Also, as indicated during the presentation, some guidelines for communicating to residents and transferring their calls to CMO. It would be good if this was fairly consistent amongst municipalities so that the same message is expressed to all residents as they will likely be very confused as to why municipalities are no longer their point of contact / responsible.
12. unknown at this time
13. Continue with all the services currently provided. Post 2025 it will be important to have waste audit supports for garbage in order to determine the success of the EPR system.
14. Continue the working groups between municipalities. Consider setting up groups based on transition date i.e. 2023 group, 2024 group etc. provide information from municipalities regarding their experiences during transition.
15. Waste Audits Container Procurement Program
16. N/A at this time.

If the proposal is accepted, are there particular resources would you like the CIF to develop to help support your transition planning needs?

17. I didn't realize the purpose of the session was to justify the relevance of CIF in the new model to have CIF act as an AMO lobby group on behalf of Municipalities.
18. Yes. As a First Nation Community in a fairly remote area, support would be very beneficial in the transitional planning.
19. nothing specific
20. I support option 3 of the proposal and would like to see assistance with preparing for negotiations with PROs, continued training opportunities, providing funding and waste management improvement opportunities.
21. Ineligible source work for depots & curbside - approach - fee for service vs levy; municipalities as producers will still be an issue, additions to curbside & depot programs - CIF liaise with RPRA/CMO to make sure municipalities actually have the information they think they have and not create more work
22. Maybe a further study of the Unorganized Townships Local Services Boards Mandate to supply Recycling
23. Continue to develop plans and templates to assist municipalities
24. support the transition to AMO / LAS
25. N/A - consultant.
26. I am not sure how many other small municipalities there are, but it is difficult when we don't have the staffing for someone to take this on which is why I am struggling as I am not very versed in all of this and when I call CIF for assistance, they are able to provide me with the clarification so that I understand.
27. Not sure at this point, until other details have been determined.
28. individual support for small municipalities
29. P&E. Would be GREAT if Ontario as a whole had a standardized P&E template, that way it's easier for residents to understand and also for munis/communities who don't have the time and/or manpower
30. Resources to assist in coordinating the start-up of new developments with PROs and the City.
31. support for the negotiations with PRO's (background information, stats, strategic options etc.) and materials to share with the public on the transition (newsletter, FAQ's etc.)
32. All that can be provided
33. Information sessions - one on one
34. not sure at this time
35. I had mentioned this in the meeting, but I will elaborate here. Because we are a small municipality and we do not have a dedicated person to manage this waste portion of our services, we would really appreciate assistance with ensuring that we are providing accurate information for transition (especially as we are in the first group for transition) - maybe some helpful informational documentation to help bring the new Council up to speed on changes and also any information we can share with all staff and the residents to ensure everyone is informed with accurate

If the proposal is accepted, are there particular resources would you like the CIF to develop to help support your transition planning needs?

information with regard to any changes. Information regarding the stoppage of services to small business IC&I is helpful as well to distribute to all parties.

36. I believe the support is delayed, especially for municipalities transitioning in July 2023 as we are currently having to make vital decisions now.

37. yes, any support is greatly appreciated. This transition is exceptionally cumbersome and a large burden to small municipalities who do not have a person specifically in charge of the file with no other priorities. Even more so for the northwest region since the plans and proposals drafted for Toronto often lose their relevance here.

Appendix 3: Stakeholders that Submitted Written Responses

Written Responses

The following municipalities and recycling associations as well as stakeholder organizations submitted written responses to the CIF Windup Plan Proposal.

Municipalities and Recycling Associations

- Bluewater Recycling Association
- Greater Sudbury, City of
- Hamilton, City of
- London, City of
- Magnetawan, Municipality of
- Muskoka, District Municipality of
- Peel, Region of
- Simcoe, County of
- Toronto, City of
- York, Regional Municipality of

Stakeholder Organizations

- Carton Council of Canada
- RPWCO Waste Subcommittee

Analysis of Written Responses

A high-level analysis of the twelve written responses follows.

Datacall Participant Feedback for Preferred Option 3

2020 Datacall participants are the only respondents that would be entitled to a disbursement under the current CIF Windup Plan.

Supportive of Option 3

Eight of the 10 submissions from 2020 Datacall participants expressed support for the preferred plan, Option 3.

- Seven of the eight expressions of support for Option 3 contained no conditions.
- One of the eight responses in support of Option 3, from the City of Toronto, was conditional on the following:
 - An opportunity to make an annual determination regarding its disbursements from the CIF surplus funds, starting at the end of 2023, as a condition of continued involvement. This would be a refinement to the City's option as a non-AMO member to opt out of the proposed plan entirely.
 - Regular and formalized opportunities to review the work plans and budgets of the new Waste and Recycling Advisory Committee.

- Obtaining approval from Council to support the proposal.

Two additional expressions of support were received from stakeholder organizations.

- A written response from an association, representing 18 Datacall reporting municipalities, expressed general support for the CIF WUP Amendment Proposal. Sixteen of the 18 endorsed the proposal, with one (Toronto) of the 16 expressing conditional support. Two of the 18 do not support the proposed Option 3.
- A written response expressing support for the CIF WUP Amendment Proposal was also received from another stakeholder organization – this one representing producer interests. While not associated with the Datacall reporting programs, this organization plays a role in transition, diversion programming, and overall waste management, but is not entitled to a disbursement of funds under the current CIF Windup Plan.

Non-Supportive of Option 3

Two of the 10 submissions from 2020 Datacall participants did not support proceeding with Option 3.

- One of the submissions supported Option 2, extending CIF by one year.
 - The municipality suggested that this will ensure that municipalities undergoing transition in 2024 and 2025 will have access to CIF support and may also provide the time necessary for AMO and the CIF to provide additional detailed information needed to support a longer-term engagement.
 - The municipality indicated that it seeks more detail with respect to the goals and objectives of the new group, details on specific tasks and associated budgets and resources that are proposed to complete the activities, and a monitoring program to ensure activities are carried out as planned.
- One of the two submissions supported Option 1, the currently approved CIF WUP.
 - This response indicated a preference for the disbursement of funds at the scheduled end date to allow greater autonomy over spending to ensure monies spent address local priorities.

Appendix 4: Questions Posted by Webinar Participants – Q&A Summary

Participants at the consultation sessions held on October 5, 6, and 18, 2022, were invited to ask questions about the CIF Windup Plan Amendment Proposal.

Questions received and responses from representatives of CIF and RPRA are listed below and have been edited for clarity.

Questions	Responses
<p>There seems to be confusion over transition of recycling programs vs. the CIF transition plan. Can this be clarified?</p>	<p>Transition</p> <p>On June 3, 2021, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks filed a new regulation (O. Reg. 391/21: Blue Box) under the <i>Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act, 2016</i> (RRCEA). This made producers of Blue Box materials fully financially and operationally responsible for managing their designated products and packaging by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitioning existing municipal, local services board, and First Nations Blue Box services to the RRCEA producer responsibility framework between July 1, 2023, and December 31, 2025. • Making producers responsible for a consistent set of Blue Box materials and eligible sources, beginning on January 1, 2026. <p>CIF Windup Plan (WUP) Amendment Proposal</p> <p>Given that CIF is part of the old regulatory framework under the <i>Waste Diversion Transition Act, 2016</i> (WDTA), it prepared a plan to windup its operations according to the Minister’s direction to end the CIF as soon as practical prior to December 31, 2025. This plan was approved by RPRA in December 2020.</p> <p>The current WUP would see CIF end its support services at the end of 2023, surplus funds returned directly to municipalities and First Nations, and complete its administrative wrap up in early 2024. Any significant change to the current WUP requires the approval of the RPRA Board. CIF submitted a proposal to RPRA in August to amend its WUP to allow for the wind up of CIF operations early, at the end of 2023, and the transfer of its resources and assets to an aligned organization (AMO/LAS). The proposal would enable the continued delivery of support services to communities under the new organization beyond December 31, 2025. Feedback and commentary on CIF’s proposed plan are being invited through the consultation sessions.</p>
<p>There is some confusion about the</p>	<p>RPRA is the regulator responsible for approving and overseeing the implementation of the CIF WUP, as well as the wind up of the legacy Blue</p>

<p>support from RPRA and the support provided by CIF. If RPRA is monitoring and enforcing the program, why are we asking CIF to do this as well?</p>	<p>Box Program. RPRA is also responsible for overseeing the implementation of the new Blue Box Regulation under the RRCEA, including enforcing the requirements of the new regulation. As part of this function, RPRA provides support to registrants under the new Blue Box Regulation in understanding and complying with the new regulatory requirements. In this role, RPRA does not provide the support services currently provided by CIF or the support services contemplated under the amended WUP proposal.</p> <p>CIF is currently mandated to work with municipalities and First Nations communities in funding collective work that supports the transition of their Blue Box Programs. And, as per the proposal, AMO/LAS is proposing to continue playing a role in supporting municipalities in adapting to the new regulatory framework outlined under the RRCEA and the Blue Box Regulation.</p> <p>RPRA provides interpretation of the regulation, collects municipal data, and provides guidance on the new Blue Box system during and post-transition. CIF can provide the technical and communication support to enable communities to make decisions on how to proceed.</p> <p>As the regulator, RPRA oversees compliance and enforcement of the Blue Box regulation. Under the proposed new structure and priorities, CIF is proposing that its independent collection of audit and performance data continue past transition and be shared with RPRA and others as an additional measure of system performance.</p>
<p>What will our municipal role be when the Blue Box Program goes to producers?</p>	<p>Local communities play a critical part in transitioning the system. During transition local communities will either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Become a service provider (contractor) through agreement to commercial terms with a producer responsibility organization, or • Divest any assets related to Blue Box

	<p style="text-align: right;">service delivery.</p> <p>In both options local communities will experience periods of change between their transition date and December 31, 2025, and they will require plans to ensure the shift from municipal oversight to producer oversight is seamless for residents. In 2026, there will be another set of changes as producers must accept an expanded list of materials province-wide and bring on new eligible sources (i.e., schools, publicly funded long-term care facilities, etc. that are not currently being collected by the community).</p> <p>The CIF WUP Amendment Proposal provides for support to all communities during these periods of change.</p>
<p>Who makes the decision on the transition?</p>	<p>The decision to transition the legacy Blue Box Program operated by Stewardship Ontario under the WDTA to the new producer responsibility framework under the RRCEA was made by the Government of Ontario. It was initiated by a legislative change, Bill 151, the Waste-Free Ontario Act, which came into force November 2016.</p> <p>Regarding the approval of the CIF WUP Amendment Proposal: CIF must finish the consultations and obtain sign-off from CIF's Governance Committees on any changes to the proposed WUP Amendment Proposal. The proposal would then go to the RPRA Board for approval. If approved by RPRA, possibly with conditions imposed by RPRA, the requirements would then be considered by AMO and LAS to determine if it is something they could implement. The decision rests with the AMO and LAS Boards of Directors to decide if they want to go forward.</p>
<p>If funding is removed from M3RC does this mean that M3RC would cease to exist?</p>	<p>Funding for M3RC has been provided through a transfer from CIF. This funding would stop with the termination of CIF. It would then be up to M3RC and AMO to determine if an alternative source of funding for M3RC can be found. If not, M3RC would also be terminated.</p>
<p>What happens to the \$9.6 million (2022 year-end fund balance)? Will it be exhausted? Would Option 3 as proposed be a "permanent" arrangement?</p>	<p>If Option 3 is approved and a decision to proceed is made, the fund balance at that time would be transferred to AMO/LAS to support the new structure. An annual drawdown of approximately \$1.5 million per year is forecasted. Based on this forecast, the 2022 CIF reserve year-end forecast of \$9.6 million would last until approximately 2027. If no alternative funding source is available at that time, Option 3 as proposed would be terminated. A new funding mechanism would have to be found for something more permanent to be established.</p>

<p>Will the Datacall no longer be required?</p>	<p>The Datacall will end with the winding up of the legacy Blue Box Program.</p> <p>The year of the last Datacall report depends on which year a municipality or First Nations community is transitioning.</p> <p>Details regarding reporting and payments during transition can be found in Stewardship Ontario's Proposed Blue Box Program Wind-Up Plan Consultation Report. Please refer to slides 26 through 28. For example, if a municipality transitions to the new producer responsibility framework in June 2024, it will be eligible for funding for the partial year 2024. 2024 funding is determined based on the 2022 Datacall, which will be submitted in the Spring of 2023.</p> <p>Note that unlike municipal programs, First Nations communities have the option of transitioning later than their specified transition date. In the event a First Nation community takes the option to delay transition, funding for a given year can only be provided if the community has completed the necessary Datacall.</p> <p>Municipalities and First Nation communities can reach out to the RPRA Datacall Team via email: datacall@rpra.ca.</p>
<p>It looks like stakeholder money will no longer be required when we transition. Given this, will CIF funding no longer be available?</p>	<p>Over the last two years, the work of CIF has moved from funding individual projects to funding collective work that supports the transition. CIF has not received additional funding from communities with Blue Box programs since 2016. CIF has been using the existing reserve to fund grants, projects, and operations. CIF funding for initiatives and supports that are deemed to be a priority by members and support the broader sector would continue while CIF is operational. This funding would no longer be available once CIF terminates, as in Option 1 or Option 2.</p>
<p>Will the accounting methods stay the same or move toward LAS accounting methods?</p>	<p>CIF currently uses the same accounting methods that are primarily used by AMO and LAS. No changes are anticipated.</p>
<p>Is there a wind-up date associated with Option 3?</p>	<p>The RPRA Board is slated to consider the CIF WUP Amendment Proposal in November 2022. If approved, the objective would be to undertake the transition to the new structure as quickly as possible in 2023. With an annual drawdown of approximately \$1.5 million per year for CIF and M3RC</p>

	operations, it is forecasted that funding will be available until 2027. CIF proposes that a review of the ongoing needs of participating communities take place following the transition period (end of 2025), at which time the participating communities will have an opportunity to assess whether their ongoing objectives are best addressed by the structure set up under Option 3.
Is there an opportunity to delay transition from the chosen transition date? Would another option be to ask for an amendment to delay the wind-up of CIF to 2026?	The Minister's direction is to end the CIF as soon as practical prior to December 31, 2025. The current WUP requires CIF to terminate operations at the end of 2023. Option 2 was referenced in the approved WUP and allows for extension of operations to the end of 2024. Extension to the end of 2025 would, like Option 3, require an amendment of the existing WUP and RPRA approval. CIF considered an extension to the end of 2025, but Option 3 was selected instead as it provides both continued support through 2025 and post-transition support.
In Option 3, why wind up early? Why not simply transfer to the new organization (LAS) at the end of 2023?	A consideration in setting up the proposed timeline is to allow sufficient time to go through the approval processes and complete the administrative shut-down of CIF. Considerable work is required to close-down projects and transfer books, etc. to another organization. This work would ideally be completed in early 2023 before all programs begin transitioning to the new regulatory framework in mid-2023. This minimizes the chance of disruption while establishing the opportunity for ongoing benefits over a longer duration. If the consultations indicate that support is needed only during transition this will be reflected in recommendations to RPRA.
Is there enough time to proceed with Option 3, given that it involves windup by the end of this year?	The plan is to proceed as proposed. The transition of assets and services would not be immediate. If Option 3 is approved as proposed, CIF would initiate the transition in December 2022 and the assets and services would be moved during 2023. Existing relationships with AMO makes the migration easier and implementation delays can be accommodated.
Under Option 3, would municipalities and First Nations expect an experience similar to what is now available when accessing support? How would the "customer experience" differ, if at all?	<p>The experience would be very similar. CIF is currently positioned as a committee of RPRA. When CIF is no longer part of the regulatory framework, its support services will need to be delivered through another organizational framework – AMO and LAS in the CIF WUP Amendment Proposal. These services would include continuing to draw from the Transition Working Groups to get an understanding of experiences at the local level and use this to direct policies and programs.</p> <p>In addition, Option 3 provides an opportunity for the new organization to expand support services beyond the current Blue Box Program over time (e.g., other stewardship programs such as electronics and other waste diversion initiatives such as organics).</p>
Will existing CIF staff transition into	CIF will be closed and all employment with CIF will be terminated under any of the three windup Options. Under Option 3, LAS would independently hire

<p>roles at LAS? Will the knowledgeable and experienced CIF staff be part of the agreement? How can municipalities ensure that LAS will hire the right people to provide ongoing support?</p>	<p>staff as they see appropriate. No determination has been made at this point regarding the future of CIF staff.</p>
<p>Is there an opportunity for CIF under LAS to have more “teeth” to better deal with CMO?</p>	<p>CIF would continue to support members with information and data to strive for fair and reasonable approaches and solutions with PROs.</p>
<p>Why is it okay that support is provided to LAS (a procurement organization), but CIF (the experts) has to dissolve? Can the role of LAS be clarified?</p>	<p>The Minister provided direction requiring the entire structure for the current Blue Box Program to wind up so that the new full producer responsibility framework for resource recovery can be in place by end of 2025. The Minister directed that the windup of CIF be completed as quickly as practical. RPRA’s oversight over CIF would cease once CIF is wound up.</p> <p>Under the current WUP, the windup of CIF must be completed by the end of 2023. This is now being re-evaluated as part of the WUP Amendment process. Under Option 3, AMO/LAS would be the organizational home for CIF services to enable post-windup continuation of support services for communities.</p> <p>Unlike CIF, AMO/LAS is a distinct legal entity that will continue to operate despite the windup of the legacy Blue Box Program.</p>
<p>What will the focus of CIF be? What will the deliverables be? When will we know what the focus for projects will be?</p>	<p>Staff are developing multi-year strategic priorities and objectives for review and input by members. The plan will be presented for feedback at consultation sessions on Oct 26 and 28 and will inform revisions to the proposal.</p>
<p>Will there be P&E support during transition? Will CIF provide posters/bulletins to First Nations communities to explain the changes that may occur?</p>	<p>On each community’s transition date, the responsibility for promotion & education for residents moves to the producers.</p> <p>The work to be undertaken under CIF’s WUP Amendment Proposal includes communications supports (e.g., template reports & PowerPoints) for local</p>

	<p>communities that will focus on bringing interdepartmental staff and Councils up to date on what needs to happen to ensure a successful transition.</p> <p>Communication support will also be offered for messaging to non-eligible sources (e.g., small businesses) who will no longer be eligible for collection services starting in 2026. Specific requests or suggestions for P&E support to FN communities should be forwarded to CIF staff.</p>
<p>Will the CIF Price Sheet continue to be a valuable resource or are there resources attached to this that could be better utilized elsewhere?</p>	<p>Some of CIF's current services may be discontinued. Some may no longer be needed, such as the Blue Box Cooperative Container Procurement Program, as producers will assume responsibility for the provision of containers. Some resources, such as the Price Sheet, may no longer be viable. Many municipalities are planning to divest from processing and marketing services, and without their data to populate this resource, continuation of the Price Sheet will not be feasible. Advice on Price Sheet alternatives may be developed if a need is expressed by communities.</p>
<p>Will we be able to access the final reports from old, funded projects?</p>	<p>Yes. Under the CIF WUP Amendment Proposal, CIF would transfer its resources and assets to an aligned organization (i.e., AMO/LAS), as well as RPRA. Plans will be put in place to ensure continued access to all resources developed by CIF.</p>
<p>Will CIF become a longer-term facilitator of direction and policy post transition under LAS?</p>	<p>Under the CIF WUP Amendment Proposal, CIF-like services will continue and will be expanded under LAS. This will involve data collection that will inform government relations and policy work that will be carried out under M3RC.</p>
<p>Do municipal councils need to review and approve the proposed plan if it is going to AMO?</p>	<p>CIF and RPRA are seeking feedback on the proposed CIF Windup Plan Amendment from all stakeholders, which includes individual municipalities and First Nations communities. All feedback received in the course of this public consultation will be considered. It is up to each municipality to determine the level of authority required to provide feedback on the proposal.</p> <p>AMO, on behalf of all AMO-represented municipalities, along with the City of Toronto and First Nations communities, would have the prerogative to provide a recommendation to CIF to support, reject, or modify the proposed Amendment before submission to RPRA for final consideration. However, it would be the CIF's Governance Committees that would make the final recommendation.</p>

	<p>The decision to implement the proposal, if approved, possibly with conditions, by RPRA, rests with AMO and LAS.</p>
<p>What happens in those municipalities that rely on depots if support for depots is removed or reduced post-transition?</p>	<p>Under the regulation, producers must maintain depot service in communities that do not provide curbside service.</p> <p>Under the CIF WUP Amendment Proposal there would continue to be support for depot-only programs.</p>
<p>If there is an opt-out provision and large municipalities decide to opt out, will there be enough support for continuation of the proposed program? What happens to smaller municipalities that have less money at stake (i.e., potential refunds) but lots to gain from collaborative work? Will municipalities be able to opt in or out at a later date? What would an opt out process look like?</p>	<p>If the RPRA Board approves the proposed plan with an opt-out provision, the AMO and LAS Boards would have to consider the implications of the opt-out provision through two lenses. First, what is the financial impact and are there sufficient resources to continue? Second, from a principled point of view, is it appropriate to continue services that benefit everyone, but are supported financially only by some members? Ultimately the AMO and LAS Boards will determine whether the Option 3 proposal will be implemented.</p> <p>If the RPRA board introduces an opt-out provision, it may include specific process requirements. The AMO and LAS Boards would then decide whether to proceed and could possibly consider additional processes to implement the opt out provisions required by RPRA, which would be determined at that time.</p>
<p>Would there be a mechanism for municipalities to review and collectively decide to continue the proposed new organization or to close it down?</p>	<p>Feedback and input on the CIF WUP Amendment Proposal is being solicited through the consultation sessions. CIF must finish the consultations and obtain sign-off from CIF's Governance Committees, which include representation from AMO, on any changes to the WUP Amendment Proposal. The proposal would then go to the RPRA Board for approval. If approved by RPRA, the plan would then be considered by AMO and LAS to determine if it is something they could implement. The decision rests with AMO and LAS to decide to implement the proposal, potentially based on any conditions of approval imposed by RPRA.</p>
<p>Are there any details available about</p>	<p>The governance arrangement for Option 3 is shown on slides 22 to 24 in the presentation deck. Input from municipalities and First Nations communities</p>

<p>governance under Option 3? How will municipalities continue to be involved and have a voice?</p>	<p>will continue to be sought to help set work objectives and workplans through the Transition Working Group subcommittee structure as well as through additional outreach sessions.</p>
<p>Would municipalities have any increased exposure to risk under the WUP Amendment Proposal? Is legal review required before municipalities can comment on the proposal?</p>	<p>CIF is not requiring municipal legal review to understand whether there is support for the WUP Amendment Proposal. This may be something that a municipality wants to discuss internally, but it is not required as part of the process.</p>
<p>What will support for First Nations communities from AMO and LAS look like when there has been no association with AMO/LAS in the past? How does the role of the Ontario First Nations Technical Services Corporation play into this?</p>	<p>Support for First Nations Communities</p> <p>Support may take the form of meeting facilitation, research & analysis, information & data collection, and as needed resource development (e.g., Council report templates), and training.</p> <p>Engagement</p> <p>CIF has established a First Nations Transition Working Group, which will be part of the overall consultation process, and will continue under Option 3. As part of the consultation process, multi-year strategic priorities and objectives will be presented for feedback on Oct 26 and Oct 28. Annual work plans will be derived from these strategic priorities and objects and will set out the parameters for each year’s support services. Support services detailed in the annual plans are arrived at through engagement with all Working Group members and through one-to-one calls with participating communities.</p> <p>CIF is interested receiving ongoing input from groups like OFNTSC on how best to serve the First Nations communities. CIF staff connected with OFNTSC on October 20 to discuss transition and CIF supports available.</p> <p>Opting out Opportunity</p> <p>Each First Nation community that participated in the 2020 Datacall is individually eligible to receive a disbursement of their share of the CIF reserve</p>

	surplus and, thereby, terminating their involvement with CIF (and its successor).
Would CIF assist in negotiating with producers should a First Nations community want to continue curbside collection?	It is not appropriate for CIF to be directly involved in one-on-one negotiations between PROs and First Nations communities or municipalities. CIF would provide support to members through the provision of information and data to strive for fair and reasonable approaches and solutions with a Blue Box PRO.
Under Option 3, could support be provided for producer responsibility models being considered for non-Blue Box materials? Will there be research support and knowledge-sharing for these materials?	The primary focus of the new Waste and Recycling Services Group will be on the Blue Box system during the initial transition period. However, by terminating CIF and the relationship with Stewardship Ontario, breaking the link with the Blue Box Program Plan (BBPP), and forming this new structure, there would be much more flexibility in the future to evolve into other areas where members express needs (e.g., organics).
Will there be research and funding for ongoing waste composition audits?	Waste audits would be one of the main deliverables to be continued under Option 3 and funding would be earmarked for this purpose.
Will the same accessibility to supports be available to every participating municipality and First Nation?	Yes.
Does proceeding with Option 3 change anything regarding the current round of waste audits (2022-2023) and the MOU that CIF has with stakeholders?	Waste audits would be one of the main deliverables to be continued under Option 3 and funding would be earmarked for this purpose in our 2023 Operating Budget under any of the three scenarios.
What is the likelihood of continuing	As stated above, waste audits would be recommended under Option 3 as one of the main deliverables going forward through 2027. However, continued

<p>collaboration with stakeholders on Blue Box waste audits in years 2023/24 and 2024/25 if Option 3 is approved?</p>	<p>collaboration with organizations would need to be re-visited at a later date as would our co-funding agreement with Stewardship Ontario.</p>
<p>One of the examples of activities that the Recycling Unit would focus on, as presented in slide 22, are Post Collection Audits. Can you elaborate on what this refers to? Does it pertain to Blue Box materials or another stream?</p>	<p>This was simply used as an example of possible activity going forward and would need to be considered by the new governance structure. However, we do see expanding the scope of audits in future beyond the current Blue Box materials, most likely to include other RRCEA stewardship materials initially.</p>
<p>What is the role of M3RC?</p>	<p>Municipal Resource Recovery and Research Collaborative (M3RC) is comprised of representatives from AMO, RPWCO, MWA and the City of Toronto. M3RC activities are focused around waste and inform government relations/policy work on behalf of municipalities in Ontario.</p>
<p>What is the funding breakdown that CIF provides to M3RC?</p>	<p>CIF provides AMO with an annual Municipal Collective Transfer Fund (MCTF) payment of \$500,000. AMO uses this to fund M3RC activities.</p> <p>If CIF winds up per its existing Windup Plan, its services will end in 2023, and its administrative wrap up will occur in 2024. The MCTF payments will end when CIF is terminated in 2024. At that time, it would be up to M3RC and AMO to determine if an alternative source of funding for M3RC can be found.</p> <p>If the CIF's assets and resources are transferred to AMO/LAS per Option 3 (the CIF WUP Amendment Proposal), the annual MCTF payments to operate M3RC will continue until the CIF legacy funds are exhausted. The legacy funds are forecasted to last until 2027 under this scenario.</p>