RPRA
Resource Productivity & Recovery Authority

Industry Advisory Council
Meeting Minutes

Date: July 7, 2026	**Time:** 3:00 pm – 4:30 pm
IAC Co-Chairs: Carol Hochu, Jeffrey Steiner	**IAC Secretary:** Cameron Parrack

Attendees:

Industry Advisory Council Members:
Carol Hochu, Tire and Rubber Association of Canada (TRAC)
Yasmin Tarmohamed, Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association (CVMA)
Julie Kwiecinski, Canadian Federation of Independent Business (CFIB)
Meagan Hatch, Electronics Product Stewardship Canada (EPSC)
Michelle Saunders, Food, Health and Consumer Products of Canada (FHCP)
Lavindi Richards-Harvey, Electro Federation Canada (EFC)
Greg Wilson, Retail Council of Canada (RCC)
Shannon Coombs, Canadian Consumer Specialty Products Association (CCSPA)
Ayesha Shaikh, Canadian Consumer Specialty Products Association (CCSPA)
Mark Dekker, Canadian Beverage Association (CBA)

RPRA Staff:
Noah Gitterman, Chief Executive Officer
Wilson Lee, Chief of Programs and Public Affairs
Lorella Hayes, Chief Financial and Administrative Officer
Mary Cummins, Registrar
Cameron Parrack, Director of Programs and Stakeholder Relations
Nathan Aranha, Manager, Portfolio Management and Strategic Initiatives
Zoe Barlas, Policy Analyst
Tristian Nathanial, Stakeholder Relations Advisor

RPRA Board:
Robert Poirier, RPRA Board Chair
Mary Shenstone, RPRA Board Vice-Chair

MECP Staff:
John Fox, Resource Recovery Policy Branch
Sophia Giangioppo, Resource Recovery Policy Branch

Regrets:
Jeffrey Steiner, IAC Co-Chair, RPRA Board members
Don Fusco, Chemistry Industry Association of Canada (CIAC)
Gordon Cameron, Ontario Community Newspapers Association (OCNA)
Paul Deegan, NewsMedia Canada (NMC)

Recording Secretary: Tristan Nathaniel, Stakeholder Relations Advisor

1. Introductions and co-chairs' opening remarks

- During their introductory remarks, the IAC industry co-chair acknowledged RPRA's improved transparency and responsiveness to stakeholder feedback and requested RPRA continue to focus on measurable value, long-term fee stability, and fee predictability.
- RPRA staff encouraged advisory council members to continue sharing feedback on RPRA's proposed planned activities, budget, forecast and fees during the business planning period.

2. Review of feedback received from the IAC and RPRA's responses

- RPRA staff summarized feedback provided during previous engagements in February and May of 2026 and addressed outstanding questions, including collaboration with other EPR regulators, tracking costs related to implementing the Auditor General's recommendations, compliance and enforcement metrics, timing of fees consultation, proposed business plan activities, and the annual registrant survey.
    - An IAC council member suggested Ministry staff should be invited to meetings with other EPR regulators to support inter-jurisdictional alignment.
    - An IAC member asked Ministry staff to provide updates on progress implementing the Auditor General's recommendations directed at the Ministry.
    - Regarding the review of the delivery of RPRA's annual registrant survey, an IAC member volunteered to engage with RPRA's survey vendor to help inform the type of survey questions asked and the survey delivery methodology in support of increasing the survey response rate.

3. RPRA compliance activity metrics

- RPRA staff shared recently published compliance activity metrics for the past year, including new metrics and invited feedback from the advisory council.
- RPRA staff highlighted the increase in compliance and enforcement activity in 2025, specifically new inspection cases opened, new non-compliance cases opened and free rider cases closed. RPRA staff noted the highest frequency of compliance and enforcement activities related to the Blue Box and Tires programs.
    - An IAC member said they would like to see more outcomes-based metrics that producers can more easily connect RPRA's compliance and enforcement work to impacts or value to their business.
    - An IAC member asked for clarity on how RPRA identifies potential free riders.
    - RPRA staff shared several methods RPRA's compliance team uses to obtain free rider information, including through audit and verification, market intelligence, and whistleblower reports.
    - An IAC member requested RPRA provide a definition of a free rider, as industry may consider free riders to be only unregistered producers, while RPRA's interpretation may include occurrences of parallel importation and/or inaccuracy of reported data.
    - RPRA staff confirmed free riders include unregistered producers, registered producers without a PRO, and producers who report incorrectly/falsely.

4. **Draft 2027 business plan, budget and forecasts**

- RPRA staff reviewed the accelerated business planning process, highlighting the opportunity for stakeholders to consult earlier and simultaneously on the draft 2027 budget and proposed fees.
- RPRA staff provided a summary of the draft 2027 budget which sits at $31M or 4.4% or $1.3M above the 2026 budget, which will fulfill the phased investments in data verification committed to in the 2026 business plan and implement all the Auditor General's recommendations.
- RPRA reviewed the 2027 business planning assumptions including ongoing business readiness work to support proposed regulatory changes.
- RPRA staff reviewed the proposed 2027 business plan revisions reflecting feedback from the May council meetings.
- An IAC member requested RPRA staff continue to develop an education-first approach to compliance and enhance outreach efforts, including webinars, Q&A opportunities, and one-on-one support to help producers better understand their responsibilities.
    - RPRA staff highlighted the proposed 2027 Business Plan includes enhancing the accessibility and clarity of support materials and compliance documents, reflecting feedback from the May council meetings.
- RPRA staff shared the proposed key performance indicators (KPIs) for 2027 and the performance targets
- An IAC member asked why the service provider performance reporting KPI target is set lower than reporting targets for PROs and producers.
    - RPRA committed to follow up with a clarification.
- RPRA staff reviewed the proposed 2027 budget and forecasts for 2028-2029 including expense breakdown, operating reserve, debt financing and revenue requirements by program.
- An IAC member asked for more information about the proposed 10% increase in RPRA's salaries and benefits and if the proportion of RPRA's budget allocated to salaries and benefits was in line with other DAA budgets.
    - RPRA staff explained the increase is associated with investments in audit and verification resources first proposed in the 2026 business plan, and additional resources to support the implementation of the Auditor General's recommendations and that the proportion of RPRA's budget allocated to salaries and benefits is lower than most other Ontario DAAs.
- An IAC member requested clarification about the proposed contingency reserve contributions
    - RPRA staff explained that although the operating reserve is projected to increase from 38% to 40%, well below the 50% limit it will decline to 1% of RPRA's expenses by 2029 (compared to 3% in 2027).

5. **Proposed revenue requirement by 2027 program fees**

- RPRA staff reviewed the cost allocation methodology and the key drivers impacting proposed fee rates, including registrant numbers and reported volumes, application of program surplus (or deficit), and use of administrative penalty revenues.
- RPRA staff shared information about the 45-day consultation on fees and sought feedback on the proposed use of administrative penalties revenues, amount of surplus (or deficit) applied to offset each program's revenue requirement, and potential scenarios for setting multi-year fee rates in the future.
- An IAC member expressed support for RPRA proposing to hold the small producer fixed fee flat throughout the business planning period and noted that it demonstrates RPRA's understanding of the current small business climate.

6. Open Discussion

- An IAC member requested clarity on the implementation of legacy program wind-up plans, including the management of surplus funds.
    - RPRA staff shared that that each legacy program wind-up plan follows a unique ministerial direction and is subject to program-specific requirements.
    - RPRA staff noted that OES surplus funds were transferred to RPRA to offset ITT/AV registry fees in accordance with the approved wind-up plan, while the OTS wind up plan requires surplus funds to be disbursed to former stewards.

7. Co-Chair's Closing Remarks

- The CEO and IAC industry co-chair thanked the council members for their participation and feedback and closed the meeting.