



# **Blue Box Program Wind-up Plan: Revised Fee Setting Methodology Addendum**

## **Consultation Report**

**March 2, 2022**

# Table of contents

<b>Introduction and context</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>About the Revised Fee Setting Methodology Addendum</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Stewardship Ontario Consultation</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>About RPRA</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Principles for public consultation</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Consultation</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Process</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>What we heard</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Appendix A: Stakeholders that submitted feedback</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Appendix B: Stewardship Ontario Consultation Report</b>	<b>8</b>

## Introduction and context

Between January 21 and February 4, 2022, the Resource Productivity and Recovery Authority (RPRA) consulted on Stewardship Ontario's proposal to simplify the fee-setting methodology for Blue Box Program stewards during the program's transition period between 2023-2025.

Prior to RPRA's consultation, Stewardship Ontario consulted stakeholders from December 1, 2021 to January 13, 2022 on the proposal. Based on the supportive feedback it received during its consultation, Stewardship Ontario submitted its recommendation to RPRA to amend the Blue Box Program Transition Plan in order to implement the revised fee-setting methodology.

All feedback received during both Stewardship Ontario and RPRA's consultation was considered by RPRA in reviewing and approving with conditions the proposed addendum. RPRA approved the Blue Box Program Transition Plan: Revised Fee Setting Methodology for 2023-2025 Addendum on February 17, 2022, and stakeholders were notified on March 2, 2022. In approving the addendum, RPRA assessed whether it was compliant with requirements in the *Waste Diversion Transition Act, 2016* (WDTA) and the Minister's directions and consistent with RPRA's Wind-Up Guide.

This report details RPRA's consultation process, the feedback received and how RPRA incorporated the feedback into approving with conditions the addendum. Questions about this report can be emailed to [consultations@rpra.ca](mailto:consultations@rpra.ca).

## About the Revised Fee Setting Methodology Addendum

On August 15, 2019, the Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks issued direction to Stewardship Ontario and RPRA to wind up the Blue Box Program and transition it to Ontario's new producer responsibility framework starting on July 1, 2023, through to December 31, 2025.

In December 2020, RPRA [approved](#) Stewardship Ontario's Blue Box Program Transition and Stewardship Ontario Wind-up Plan, with conditions, as well as the [Continuous Improvement Fund's \(CIF\) wind-up plan](#), which was included by reference in Stewardship Ontario's plan.

In October 2021, Stewardship Ontario initially advised the steward community of its intention to introduce a proposal to simplify its steward fee-setting methodology for the 2023 to 2025 Blue Box Program transition period. The revised fee-setting methodology would eliminate the need for stewards to report supply-to-market data to Stewardship Ontario starting this year with the 2022 reporting cycle (for 2023 invoices) through to the end of the Blue Box Program transition period on December 31, 2025.

From December 1, 2021, to January 13, 2022, Stewardship Ontario [consulted](#) stakeholders on the proposal. Following the consultation period, on January 19, 2022, Stewardship Ontario submitted its recommendation to RPRA to amend the Blue Box Program Transition Plan to include the revised the fee-setting methodology.

## Stewardship Ontario Consultation

Stewardship Ontario received feedback from stakeholders during a webinar presentation, through an online survey, and written comments. The stakeholders expressed broad support for the proposal. Examples of feedback include:

- One stakeholder representing a large percentage of stewards supported the proposal because of the proposal's benefit of not having to report commercially sensitive data to

Stewardship Ontario's service provider and the reduction in administrative burden by eliminating reporting requirements to Stewardship Ontario.

- A major industry association expressed strong support for the proposal noting the predictability and simplicity of calculating fees using the revised methodology, reducing duplication in reporting currently required under the old Blue Box Program and new Blue Box Program.
- A stakeholder representing a key material category in the Blue Box Program strongly supported the proposal and noted the burden reduction by eliminating supply reporting and risk reduction associated with not reporting commercially sensitive data to an external party providing services to Stewardship Ontario.
- Many stakeholders expressed strong support for the principle of reducing administrative burden. Concerns received by Stewardship Ontario included issues affecting individual stewards' operations, and recommendations to account for changes in individual steward fees due to divestment or acquisition of business.

For Stewardship Ontario's Consultation Report, please see [Appendix B](#).

## About RPRA

RPRA is the regulator created by the Ontario government to enforce the requirements of the *Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act, 2016* (RRCEA) and the *Waste Diversion Transition Act, 2016* (WTDA).

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

## Principles for public consultation

RPRA'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.

# Consultation

## Process

RPRA's consultation on Stewardship Ontario's revised fee-setting methodology began January 21, 2022. A [dedicated web page](#) was created on RPRA's website with background information on the consultation and how to provide feedback.

On January 21, RPRA emailed its general mailing list (approximately 1900 subscribers) announcing the consultation period and how to submit feedback. On January 24, RPRA notified Datacall participants (municipalities, First Nation communities and recycling associations) by email, and Stewardship Ontario notified their list of stewards on the same day. Additionally, a reminder was included in RPRA's February newsletter.

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

## What we heard

RPRA received twelve written submissions and conducted one virtual meeting with stakeholders during the consultation period. Based on the consultation undertaken by Stewardship Ontario and RPRA, the proposal received broad support. The primary concern raised during the consultation was related to the implication for program performance reporting due to the loss of steward supply-to-market data.

See below for a summary of comments received. For the list of stakeholders that submitted written feedback, please see [Appendix A](#).

- Support:
  - Five stakeholders that provided feedback were in full support. Reasons for supporting the revised methodology include greater predictability in fee setting, eliminating the duplication and complexity of reporting requirements for producers, and finding operational efficiencies for Stewardship Ontario throughout the transition period.
  - Stakeholders expressed support for removing the requirement to report commercially sensitive data to Stewardship Ontario's service provider.
  - One stakeholder supported the proposal and strongly supported the proposed approach to engage with municipalities and CIF to revitalize a waste characterization program to ensure accurate reporting of program performance data and to capture the changing material composition of the Blue Box Program. The stakeholder also encouraged Stewardship Ontario to continue calculating material-specific recovery rates as this information is used by stewards for planning and continuous improvement.
- Concerns:
  - Some stakeholders expressed concerns about the lack of details around the proposed waste characterization studies that would be required to continue performance reporting.
  - Several stakeholders do not support the proposal because it doesn't account for fluctuations in volumes year-over-year.
  - Several stakeholders commented on the lack of information and time for stewards to make an informed decision.

- Several stakeholders expressed doubts about Stewardship Ontario’s claim that the revised fee-setting methodology would reduce administrative burden due to other reporting requirements (e.g., reporting to Stewardship Ontario in other provinces, reporting to RPRA, etc.).
- Several stakeholders expressed concerns the methodology would advantage some stewards while disadvantaging others (e.g., lack of consideration for differing impacts of COVID-19 or other unforeseen circumstances on business, stewards experiencing growth will benefit more, etc.).
- Several stakeholders expressed concerns about the loss of precision in the calculation of fees (e.g., reporting errors from previous years won’t be caught).
- Several stakeholders noted that the revised methodology could have environmental implications by potentially disincentivizing stewards from making ‘good’ packaging decisions.
- One stakeholder raised concerns that Stewardship Ontario is basing its recommendation to RPRA to approve the proposal based on a small percentage of stewards who participated in Stewardship Ontario’s consultation.
- One stakeholder expressed concerns with the lost opportunity to evaluate costs of the old program with the new program during transition.
- One stakeholder noted their concern that the methodology is still based on waste characterization studies that aren’t publicly available. Stakeholder asked for more transparency in the fee-setting process, calling on RPRA to do so in their fee setting going forward as well.
- One stakeholder expressed their concern that municipalities of all sizes need to continue to be involved in the consultation and decision-making process.

## Conclusion

RPRA considered all stakeholder feedback obtained through both Stewardship Ontario’s and RPRA’s consultations as it reviewed Stewardship Ontario’s proposed addendum to implement a revised steward fee-setting methodology during the Blue Box Program transition period.

To address concerns about program performance evaluation due to the loss of steward supply-to-market reporting, which was the primary concern raised during the consultations, RPRA approved the Blue Box Program Transition Plan: Revised Fee Setting Methodology for 2023-2025 Addendum on February 17, 2022, with conditions.

Those conditions require Stewardship Ontario to provide a comprehensive plan for determining the recovery rate of the Blue Box Program through to the transition of the program in 2025. The plan must be provided to the Authority prior to the elimination of steward supply-to-market data reporting to Stewardship Ontario. For more details on the conditions, [view the approval letter](#).

## Appendix A: Stakeholders that submitted feedback

The twelve written submissions were submitted by the following stakeholders:

- Association of Municipalities of Ontario, City of Toronto, Regional Public Works Commissioners of Ontario and the Municipal Waste Association
- Best Buy Canada
- Carton Council Canada
- City of Hamilton
- Coty Canada
- Cycle Environment
- David McRobert, LL.B., MES, B.SC.
- Electronics Product Stewardship Canada
- Food and Health Consumer Products
- Loblaws
- Retail Council of Canada
- Wawanesa Insurance

# Appendix B: Stewardship Ontario Consultation Report

[See next page]



Stewardship Ontario

**Blue Box Transition Plan**  
**Proposal for Simplified Approach**  
**to Fee Setting**

**Consultation Report**

**January 2022**

## **Table of Contents**

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2. STAKEHOLDER COMMUNICATION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
2.1 Annual Steward Meeting .....	2
2.2 Email Notifications .....	2
2.3 Website .....	3
<b>3. CONSULTATION APPROACH .....</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1 Online Survey .....	3
3.2 Webinar .....	4
3.3 Email .....	5
<b>4. SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>5. NEXT STEPS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: LISTS OF STAKEHOLDERS THAT PARTICIPATED IN THE CONSULTATION .....</b>	<b>9</b>



## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Stewardship Ontario developed and proposed a Simplified Approach to Blue Box fee setting late in 2021 in recognition of the program’s scheduled wind up and the challenges faced by producers/stewards in moving to Ontario’s new regulatory framework for Blue Box recycling. The proposal sought to ease the administrative burden on businesses during the Blue Box transition period during which reports with slightly different information about supplied material would need to be submitted to Stewardship Ontario, the Resource Productivity & Recovery Authority (RPR) and likely to their Producer Responsibility Organizations (PROs).

This report details the activities and efforts undertaken by Stewardship Ontario to inform and engage stakeholders about the Simplified Approach proposal. Along with gauging their support or opposition, it gathers issues raised by stakeholders for eliminating the need to report detailed supply-to-market data to Stewardship Ontario beginning in 2022 and for the years 2023-2025 while the program continues to operate.

**2. STAKEHOLDER COMMUNICATION** As detailed below, Stewardship Ontario distributed information about the proposed Simplified Approach to stakeholders via various channels beginning in the fall of 2021. All communications advised of the availability of more information and encouraged submissions of questions and feedback. Updates and information were reviewed by RPR prior to posting or distribution.

### **2.1 Annual Steward Meeting**

Stewards were initially advised of the Simplified Approach proposal on October 19, 2021, with initial information and guidance that further details would be reviewed during the online Annual Steward Meeting (ASM) on October 27, 2021 (the initial ASM invite was distributed in September, followed by two email reminders). Information about the proposal was also included in the Report to Stewards distributed prior to the ASM.

The ASM had 362 attendees and the Stewardship Ontario section of the webinar was presented by Executive Director Lyle Clarke. The presentation discussed how a review of business processes with a view to reducing costs had revealed the potential to eliminate the need for stewards to report Blue Box supply-to-market data to Stewardship Ontario. Stakeholders were advised that the proposal would not impact fees for the coming year and that further details would be provided. A Discussion Paper and Q&A document were distributed December 1.

### **2.2 Email Notifications**

Email notifications were sent to stakeholders throughout the consultation. Email lists for “all” stakeholders included primary and secondary contacts for all organizations registered with the Blue Box program, as well as various trade and industry associations. RPR reviewed emails and contacts were included in a distribution list.

Note that the number of emails sent fluctuates based on autoreply bounce backs. Stewardship Ontario ensures its stakeholder lists are up to date. Emails pointed to the Stewardship Ontario website and encouraged questions and feedback submissions to [consultation@stewardshipontario.ca](mailto:consultation@stewardshipontario.ca)



Date sent	Stakeholder group	Subject and link	Number sent to	Open rate
October 22, 2021	All	<a href="#">2021 Annual Steward Meeting Reminder-Report to Stewards Now Available</a>	3148	28%
December 1, 2021	All	<a href="#">Proposed Amendment to the Blue Box Program Transition Plan -- Revised Fee Setting Methodology for 2023-2025</a>	2815	28%
December 7, 2021	All	<a href="#">Survey Available &amp; Webinar Registration: Proposed Simplified Fee Setting for 2023-2025</a>	2398	25%
December 21, 2021	All	<a href="#">Reminder Survey &amp; Webinar: Proposed Simplified Fee Setting for 2023-2025</a>	2409	23%
January 4, 2022	All	<a href="#">Reminder: Survey and Webinar -- Proposed Simplified Fee Setting</a>	2407	24%
January 7, 2022	All	<a href="#">Proposed Simplified Approach To Fee Setting – Webinar Materials and Survey Available</a>	2405	21%
January 11, 2022	All	<a href="#">Survey Reminder and Webinar Q&amp;A -- Proposed Simplified Approach to Fee Setting</a>	2405	18%

## 2.3 Website

The initial communication about the proposal was posted to the home page of the Stewardship Ontario website and continues to be available under Latest News:

- October 19, 2021: [Stewardship Ontario Proposes to Eliminate Need For Stewards to Report Supply-to-Market Data.](#)

All information, resources and updates about the Simplified Approach proposal were posted to the [Blue Box Program Transition](#) page on the Stewardship Ontario website, with some featured on the site's homepage. All emails pointed to the Blue Box page as a source for further information.

## 3. CONSULTATION APPROACH

Stakeholders were invited to provide their thoughts and questions about the Simplified Approach proposal via an online survey, through participation and questions during the January 6 webinar and through submissions to a dedicated email address.

### 3.1 Online Survey

The December 1 email advised stakeholders that a survey on the proposal was pending and the link to the online survey was provided in the December 7 email. The survey was hosted on the Alchemy platform (formerly SurveyGizmo) and provided respondents with a brief introduction and four questions:



*As part of the Blue Box transition, Stewardship Ontario is proposing to eliminate the need for stewards to report supply-to-market data to Stewardship Ontario, reducing the administrative burden on stewards and program management costs.*

- *Have you reviewed the proposal Discussion Paper and Q&A document? (yes/no)*
- *Do you support or oppose the proposal? (5-point scale: strongly support to strongly oppose)*
- *Please provide any comments about the proposal (open text field)*
- *Please provide your email (validated text field)*

Four survey reminders were sent, and webinar participants were advised that the survey was the easiest way to provide feedback on the proposal. The survey was closed on January 13, with responses from 105 fee-paying stewards. A list of survey respondent companies is included in Appendix A to this report.

The following summarizes survey responses from fee-paying stewards:

- 93% advised that they had reviewed the proposal Discussion Paper or Q&A document
- This table captures proposal support/opposition:

Strongly support	43.8%
Moderately support	23.8%
Neutral	14.3%
Moderately oppose	8.6%
Strongly oppose	9.5%

- 45 respondents provided comments about the proposal.

### **3.2 Webinar**

A total of 351 stakeholders registered for the webinar held on January 6, 2022, at 10 am ET. A total of 254 individuals attended the online event – the list of attendee organizations is included in Appendix A.

The one-hour webinar was hosted by Lyle Clark and the presentation included 27 slides with the following agenda:

1. Background and Context
2. Fee Simplification Explained
3. Next Steps.

The webinar presentation and recording were posted to the Stewardship Ontario website on January 7 and stakeholders were advised of their availability via email.

A total of 67 questions were submitted by attendees. Excluding queries for technical assistance and merging questions with similar themes, the final Q&A summary addressed 32 questions. The Q&A summary was posted on January 11 and stakeholders were advised of its availability via email. The Q&A summary grouped questions under the following categories:

- Calculating / Estimating The Fee
- Impact Of Covid On Fee Setting
- Entering / Exiting Stewards
- Divestitures / Acquisitions
- Ability To Opt Out



Stewardship Ontario

## SIMPLIFIED FEES: CONSULTATION REPORT

- Data Submissions
- Currently Exempt Stewards
- Free Riders
- Transition To Individual Producer Responsibility (Ipr)
- Expected Stewardship Ontario Cost Savings
- Packaging Reduction / Waste Reduction
- Recovery Rate Calculations / Waste Audits
- Miscellaneous
- Decision To Proceed
- Decision Timing

### 3.3 Email

A total of 23 stakeholders sent email to [consultation@stewardshipontario.ca](mailto:consultation@stewardshipontario.ca). The list of submitters is included in Appendix A.

Emails included seven formal submission letters from:

- Association of Municipalities of Ontario, City of Toronto, Regional Public Works Commissioners of Ontario and the Municipal Waste Association
- Region of Peel
- Carton Council Canada
- Cycle Environment
- Canadian Beverage Association
- Retail Council of Canada
- Food, Health and Consumer Products

The remaining emails primarily consisted of queries requesting further information about the proposal, consultation materials and specifics about how it would apply to their organization. Responses were sent to all stakeholder emails.

## 4. SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK

Stakeholders were advised to complete the online survey and/or submit written feedback on the proposal by January 13, 2022. The feedback received is summarized below, organized by topic with sample quotes included.

### **Major Trade Associations**

Formal responses were received from three major trade associations: Food, Health and Consumer Products of Canada (FHCP), the Retail Council of Canada (RCC) and the Canadian Beverage Association (CBA). These organizations represent stewards who collectively represent most of the annual fees paid to Stewardship Ontario. Each of the associations is strongly supportive of the proposal. A selection of quotes from their response letters appears below.

#### Food, Health & Consumer Products of Canada

- *FHSP is pleased to support the proposal to implement a simplified approach to fee setting which, if approved, would also substantially remove the need for annual reporting for the Shared Responsibility portion of the Blue Box program.*



Stewardship Ontario

## SIMPLIFIED FEES: CONSULTATION REPORT

- *This approach adds greater predictability of fees while eliminating duplication of reporting requirements for stewards while providing operational efficiencies for Stewardship Ontario throughout the remainder of transition to EPR*

### Retail Council of Canada

- *From a retail perspective, the difference between what needs to be reported between the previous legislation and the new regulation is material enough that members would have to calculate two completely different material handling fees per product in Ontario and remit different figures to SO and to the member's PRO for three years of transition.*
- *By moving to a simplified model, members have shared that SO's proposal greatly simplifies the transition years.*

### Canadian Beverage Association

- *The simplified approach would help to reduce the administrative burden on Ontario businesses as they take on the blue box transition and grapple with the pandemic and economic recovery.*
- *Eliminating reporting (to Stewardship Ontario), which will cease to exist in just a few years, is a prudent approach to take as producers manage the largest blue box transition Canadian history.*
- *Adopting the simplified approach partially addresses producers' concerns about protecting their commercially sensitive data by preventing the submission of any new data.*

The letters also made note of several relevant considerations that Stewardship Ontario would incorporate into its roll-out plan, should the proposal be approved.

### Individual Comments Received

Stewardship Ontario also received several comments from individual stewards. In reviewing these comments, it is important to note that only a small minority of stewards provided specific comments, reflecting the tendency of many stewards' agreement with and reliance on their trade association to represent their views.

### Acknowledgment of Option

A number of stakeholders acknowledged Stewardship Ontario's efforts for developing the proposal for their consideration:

- *Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on Stewardship Ontario's (SO) proposal to simplify the fee-setting methodology in the Blue Box Program Transition Plan.*
- *I think that it is great that SO is trying to assist the stewards by reducing effort required by them... overall it seems to be a sound option.*
- *Thank you for the wonderful presentation...*
- *It seems like a good plan. Won't really know until I see what kind of charges are being levied to us. Keep up the good work.*

### Proposal in Principle

Many survey comments and email submissions supported the proposal in principle, generally raising questions and issues similar to those who opposed the proposal:

- *The proposed solution seems to be simplest and most transparent solution.*
- *Although we strongly encourage Stewardship Ontario to adopt the Simplified Approach, we also ask that you and your team work with [us] to address questions and gaps in the proposal.*
- *We see some benefit as it may reduce our costs for preparing and submitting our to-market data*



- *In order to fully understand the impact of the proposed change... and determine our support (or lack thereof), it would be beneficial if an example or formula be provided to display how steward rates would be adjusted*
- *This would be a major reduction in our administrative burden... my initial reaction is a yes to the proposal.*
- *Although this sounds very nice, and would eliminate lots of work on our part, I'm still not very comfortable with the change especially not knowing what to expect fee wise*
- *Risks and benefits have been explained in concept, however without any ballpark as to the potential decrease on fees to producers, our votes are truly blind.*
- *We think the proposal makes sense, but it's too late for 2022... We would recommend for these changes to be in effect for the 2023 reports and after.*
- *We believe the changed methodology is premature and should be considered next year.*
- *Based on the aforementioned [issues], we do not support Stewardship Ontario's proposal to use a simplified approach to fee setting.*

### General Issues

The majority of feedback included issues and questions about different aspects of the proposal, with some requesting detailed information about how it might apply to a specific steward. Information to address the queries was included in the general Q&A document and the webinar Q&A summary. The first three issues noted below generated the majority of comments and feedback, with the final two issues included primarily in the formal submissions:

*Impact of Change:* A number of stewards wanted to understand how the proposal would manage entries and exits of stewards during the windup, how divestitures/acquisitions would be treated, the impact of notable changes to supplied quantities by a steward and the treatment of newspapers.

- *Stewards experiencing growth and increasing sales will benefit at the expense of Stewards with declining growth and decreasing sales.*
- *If setting fees from recent years (which would be nice to have a flat fee) - there does need to be some sort of "Adjustment" process if a business dramatically decreases the amount of product they are selling.*
- *In the simplified fee setting approach proposed, how would our business change be accounted for?*
- *Our packaging has changed too much the past year and we would not realize the benefit of moving from plastic to paper packaging.*
- *As the proposed methodology doesn't account for sales fluctuation over time, and complexity when we buy/sell brands, or account for discontinued brands, we don't support this new methodology.*
- *How will departing and emerging stewards be addressed?...How will prior-year adjustments be addressed?*
- *The implications of this change on in-kind funding... has not been defined.*
- *It is unclear how Stewardship Ontario would use this to establish the split between in-kind advertising space and cash funding for the Obligation with no data on non-newspaper stewards supply-to-market data.*

*Expected Cost Savings:* Stewards queried how much administrative savings would be realized by proceeding with the proposal and for the potential saving to be quantified.

- *If there are savings to be found by reducing the workload on SO staff, and if those savings are passed on to Stewards in the form of lower operating costs, then this proposal could make sense.*
- *It is effectively impossible for Stewards to make an informed decision on this matter during this consultation period since the anticipated cost savings were not disclosed.*



- *Without any ballpark as to the potential decrease on fees to producers, our votes are truly blind.*
- *We would like to know the actual SO total budget the calculation would be based on*
- *Would like to be informed of the expected financial savings of this proposal to fully support.*

*Impact of Covid:* Some respondents questioned the proposed formula to average the previous two years of data, noting that recent changes in material quantities driven by Covid did not provide a fair representation for the future.

- *Conceptually agree with simplification, however I don't think the years chosen are a good reflection of a businesses on-going obligation.*
- *This method is a fair assumption of the average and as long as the upcoming year budget does continue to decrease I see it as a fair determination of fees for all Stewards.*
- *The only draw back is data used for the calculation may not allow for fluctuations related to pandemic closures.*
- *The proposal will penalize stewards who did good during the COVID 19 spike (2019-2020).*
- *Including a Covid year would unfairly allocate the costs to restaurants*
- *Concerned how market factors (Covid) could impact the benchmark costs of some Stewards and thus skew the charges to individual Stewards.*

*Packaging Reduction/Waste Reduction:*

- *The simplified reporting methodology approach disincentivizes stewards from pursuing impactful packaging changes and responsible packaging choices.*
- *We have reduced 50% of our waste in paper from the previous year and in 2021 we believe that we have lowered another 30%. With your proposed Simplified Approach it will cost us more.*
- *There is zero accountability in this methodology. It's a free for all then we get fees based on a baseline. There is zero incentive to improve.*

*Recovery Rate Calculations/Waste Audits*

- *Should Stewardship Ontario decide to proceed with the simplified fee-setting methodology, it is critical that it continue to make the material-specific recovery performance available*
- *How does SO plan to go about financing the enhanced studies, given its progressively diminishing budget over the 2023-2025 timeframe*
- *Continuing the collection of recovery data is important for planning purposes. The discussion paper notes that in the absence of supply data, Stewardship Ontario will conduct "enhanced" waste characterization studies.*
- *The proposal introduces risk into the ability to properly determine the performance of the Blue Box program across the province.*

## 5. NEXT STEPS

Stewardship Ontario will reach out to all individual stewards and other stakeholders that submitted a comment or question to probe their response and provide any additional information they may require. Stewardship Ontario will also be mindful of all comments received and use them to inform future communications, and the roll-out of simplified fee setting, if approved.



## **APPENDIX A**

### **LISTS OF STAKEHOLDERS THAT PARTICIPATED IN THE CONSULTATION**

#### **List of Webinar Attendees**

3M Canada Company  
A. Lassonde Inc.  
Agropur Coopérative  
Air King Limited  
Alliance Agri-Turf Inc.  
Amazon Canada  
Amway Canada Corporation  
Anderson Watts Ltd.  
Apex policy  
Armstrong Milling Company  
ARRIS Canada  
Associated National Brokerage Inc.  
Aviva Canada Inc.  
Bag to Earth Inc.  
Basics Office Products  
Bath and Body Works (Canada)  
Bayer Inc.  
Bell Canada  
Best Buy Canada Ltd  
Bimbo Bakehouse Inc.  
Blistex Ltd  
Bonduelle Canada Inc  
Brock University  
BSH Home Appliances Ltd.  
Burnbrae Farms Ltd.  
Canadian Home Publishers  
Canadian Medical Association  
Canadian Tire Corporation  
CanPrev Natural Health Products  
Canus Goat's Milk Skin Care Products  
Carrier  
Carton Council  
CCL Industries, Inc.  
Certainteed Canada Inc.  
Chatters Limited Partnership  
Church and Dwight Canada Corp  
Cimpres Windsor Corporation  
Coca-Cola Canada Bottling Limited Company  
Colgate-Palmolive Canada Inc.  
Compass Minerals Canada Corp.  
Confederation College  
Costco Wholesale Canada Ltd  
Crate and Barrel Canada Inc.  
CTG Brands Inc.  
Custom Leather Canada Limited  
Cycle Environment - Consultant  
D&G Laboratories  
D&L Sales Ltd.  
Dell Canada Inc.  
Diva International Inc.  
Dixon Ticonderoga Inc.  
Dr. Oetker Canada Ltd  
Durham  
Duststop Air Filters Inc  
Empack  
Enbridge Gas Inc.  
Epson Canada Limited  
Farm Boy Company Inc.  
Ferring Inc.  
FHCP - Association  
Fix Auto Canada Inc.  
Formula Brand Inc.  
Gap Canada  
GE Lighting  
General Motors of Canada Company  
Giant Tiger Stores Limited  
Grace Foods Canada Inc.  
Royal Grp Technologies  
Gray Ridge Eggs Inc.  
Great Canadian Dollar Store (1993)  
Greater Sudbury Hydro Plus Inc.  
Green Shield Canada  
Groupe Jean Coutu  
Guy Perry - Consultant  
Hallmark Canada  
Helen of Troy  
Hexo Operations Inc.  
HFC Prestige International Canada Inc.  
Holt Renfrew & Co., Limited  
Home Hardware Stores Limited



Stewardship Ontario

## SIMPLIFIED FEES: CONSULTATION REPORT

HoMedics Group Canada Co  
Ice River Springs Water Co. Inc.  
International Cheese Company Ltd.  
Investors Group  
J.E. Russell Produce Ltd.  
Joylypso Inc  
JYSK Linen 'N' Furniture Inc.  
Kal Tire  
Kernels Pop Corn Limited  
Kleen Flo Tumbler Ind. Ltd.  
KriNos Foods Canada Ltd  
LAVO Kik Holdco Company Inc  
La-Z-Boy Inc.  
Leese Enterprises  
Lindt & Sprungli (Canada) Inc.  
Little Caesar of Canada Inc.  
Lixil Canada Inc  
Loblaws  
Lorax Compliance - Consultant  
Lovell Drugs Ltd  
Loyalist College  
Makita Canada Inc.  
Maple Dale Cheese Inc.  
Marble Slab Creamery  
Maroline Distributing  
Mary Browns Inc.  
McDonald's Restaurants of Canada  
McKesson Canada  
McMaster University  
Melitta Canada Inc.  
Meridian Credit Union  
Metagenics Canada Inc  
Methapharm Inc.  
METRO Ontario Inc  
Miravo Health  
Mitsubishi Motor Sales of Canada, Inc.  
Molson Coors  
MTD Products Limited  
Neat Freak Group Inc  
Nestle Canada  
Nestle Purina Pet Care  
Nestle Waters  
New Balance Canada  
Nike Canada  
Norrizon Sales and Marketing Group  
Northbridge Financial Corp  
Ocean Spray of Canada Ltd  
Old Dutch Foods Ltd  
Ontario Government  
Ontario Lottery & Gaming Corp  
Owens Corning Insulating Systems Canada LP  
Parmalat Dairy & Bakery Inc

Pascoe Canada  
Peavey Industries LP  
Philips Domestic Appliances Canada  
PPG Canada Inc.  
Primo Foods Inc, and Unico Inc.  
Primo Water  
Procter and Gamble  
Puresource Corporation  
Queen's University  
RBC Financial Group  
Reclay StewardEdge  
Retail Council  
Rev-Log  
Rogers Medica Inc (Shopping Channel)  
Rolex Canada Ltd.  
Rona  
Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc.  
Roxul Inc.  
RPRA  
Rust-Oleum Consumer Brands Canada  
RW consumer products  
RWDI Consultant  
S & F Food Importers  
S.H. Kirkorian & Co Ltd.  
Sage Environmental  
Sanofi-Aventis Inc, Sanofi Consumer Health  
Saputo Dairy Products Canada G.P.  
Shell Canada  
Sheridan Nurseries Ltd.  
Shurtape  
SIPKENS NURSERIES LTD  
Smucker Foods of Canada Co  
Sobeys  
Sony Electronics  
Spin Master Ltd.  
SPINRITE LP  
St. Joseph's Health Care London  
St. Lawrence College of Applied A  
STANDARD PRODUCTS INC.  
Staples Canada  
Stratford Festival of Canada  
Subaru Canada Inc.  
Sun Media a division of Postmedia Network Inc  
Sunny Crunch Foods Ltd.  
Tele-mobile Telus Mobility  
Tetrapak  
Thane Direct(Canada Inc)  
The Globe and Mail  
The Mentholatum Co of Canada Ltd.  
The Pepsi Bottling Group  
Thomas Large and Singer  
Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd.



Stewardship Ontario

Toyota Canada Inc.  
Toys 'R'Us Canada Ltd  
Tree of Life Canada Inc.  
University of Toronto  
University of Waterloo  
Usana Inc  
Van Rossem Consulting  
Volkswagen Group Canada Inc.

## SIMPLIFIED FEES: CONSULTATION REPORT

Wakefield Canada Inc  
Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company  
Wellbond Import Export Inc.  
Wing Hing Lung Limited  
Winners Merchants International L.P  
Yamaha Motor Canada Ltd.  
Zoetis Canada Inc.

### **List of Survey Respondents**

3M Canada  
A&W Food Services of Canada Inc  
A. LASSONDE INC.  
Agropur Coopérative  
Amazon Canada Fulfilment Services, ULC  
Amex Bank of Canada  
Amway Canada Corporation  
Anderson Watts Ltd.  
Arby's Restaurant Group Inc  
Aviva Canada Inc.  
Basics Office Products Ltd.  
Bayer Inc.  
Bell Canada/Bell Billing/Bell Mobility  
Best Buy Canada Ltd  
Brock University  
Bushnell Corporation  
Caleres Canada Inc.  
Campbell's Company of Canada  
Canada Dry Mott's Inc, A Keurig Dr Pepper Company  
CANADIAN HOME PUBLISHERS  
Canadian Tire Corporation  
Church and Dwight Canada Corp  
Coke Canada Bottling  
Colgate-Palmolive Canada Inc  
Costco Wholesale Canada Ltd.  
D&G Laboratories Inc.  
Dairy Queen Canada Inc.  
Dell Canada Inc.  
Dr. Oetker Canada Ltd  
Duststop Air Filters Inc  
Eska Inc  
Fairstone Financial Inc.  
Farm Boy Company Inc  
Ferrero Canada Ltd.  
Ferring Inc.  
GE Lighting  
General Mills Canada Corporation  
General Motors of Canada Company

GRACIOUS LIVING INC - Royal Grp TechNologies -  
Royal Alliance  
H. A. Kidd and Company Limited  
Hallmark Canada  
Hartz Canada, Inc.  
Helen of Troy Inc  
HFC Prestige International  
HoMedics Group Canada Co  
Home Hardware  
Ice River Springs  
John G. Hofland Ltd.  
Joylypso Inc  
Junvir Investments Limited  
Kasseler Food Products Inc.  
Kernels Popcorn Limited  
Keurig  
La-Z-Boy, Inc  
Lindt & Sprungli (Canada) Inc.  
Little Caesar of Canada Inc.  
Loblaws Inc.  
Magtar Sales Inc.  
Mary Brown's Inc  
McKesson Canada  
McMaster University  
Metagenics Canada Inc  
Microvite Investments Ltd. Disticor  
Ming Pao Newspaper Canada Limited  
Molson Coors Canada  
MTD Products Limited  
Nature's Path Food Inc.  
Nestle Canada  
Nike Canada  
Ocean Spray Int'l Services Inc.  
Old Dutch Foods Ltd  
Pan American Nursery Products Inc.  
Panago Pizza Inc.  
RC Purdy Chocolates Ltd  
Recipe Unlimited Corporation



Stewardship Ontario

## SIMPLIFIED FEES: CONSULTATION REPORT

Red Bull  
Regis Holdings (Canada) Ltd.  
RONA inc./Ace Canada  
Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc.  
Rust-Oleum Consumer Brands Canada  
Sanofi Consumer Health/ Sanofi-Aventis Inc  
Saputo Dairy Products Canada G.P.  
Sheridan College  
Sheridan Nurseries Ltd.  
Shurtape Technologies Co  
Smucker Foods of Canada Co  
Spin Master Ltd  
St. Joseph's Health Care London  
TATA Consumer Products Canada

Teva Canada Limited  
The Pepsi Bottling Group  
THE TORONTO-DOMINION BANK  
Toronto Star Newspapers Ltd.  
Toyota Canada Inc  
University of Toronto  
University of Waterloo  
Volkswagen Group Canada Inc.  
Wakefield Canada Inc  
Water Pik Inc  
Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company  
Wellness Natural Inc.  
Wismettac Asian Food Inc.

### **List of Email Submissions**

3M Canada  
Amazon  
Anderson Watts Ltd.  
Association of Municipalities of Ontario, City of Toronto, Regional Public Works Commissioners of Ontario and the  
Municipal Waste Association  
Canadian Beverage Association  
Carton Council Canada  
Cycle Environment  
Food, Health and Consumer Products of Canada  
HFC Prestige International Canada Inc.  
Krikorian and Co. Ltd.  
Lassonde Industries Inc.  
Lovell Drugs  
Nestlé Canada Inc.  
PI Fine Art  
Reclay StewardEdge  
Region of Peel  
Retail Council of Canada  
Rothmans, Benson & Hedges Inc.  
Thomas, Large & Singer Inc.  
University of Toronto  
VanRossem Consulting  
Venture Forward Strategies  
Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company