



Waste Reduction and Recycling Initiative

Evaluation Form

Mandatory Requirements

Failure to submit a complete application on time and with clear project costs, sources of financing, and funding request will result in a disqualification of the proponent's proposal for the current funding year. Applications received after the deadline will be filed for evaluation in the following year.

Rating

Qualified proposals will be rated by the review panel (see the WRRRI Funding Application Guidelines for information about this panel), using the rating criteria outlined in the form below. The highest total scores will determine the proposals that could provide the best value by best fulfilling the stated purpose of the Waste Reduction and Recycling Initiative (WRRRI).

The review panel reserves the right to deny any proposal if the total score is lower than 60 out of 100, or if one or more of the criteria are rated low enough to deem the proposed project deficient.

Proposal Selection

The review panel will select proposals primarily based on rating criteria scores and funding will be prioritized for higher scoring proposals.

In addition to scores, a few other areas will be considered in the proposal selection:

- An effort will be made to fund proposals from different communities and regions of the NWT. If an applicant submits a proposal for more than one project, the applicant's additional proposals may not receive funding, even if they scored higher than a proposal from a different applicant. Applicants who submit multiple proposals will be asked to prioritize their projects.
- All proposals must clearly address any legal requirements, such as required permits and licenses.
- Preference will be given to applicants who have not received WRRRI funding in previous years. For applicants who have received funding, the success of past WRRRI-funded projects will be considered (for example, was the project successfully completed and was reporting submitted as required?).

Evaluation Form – Waste Reduction and Recycling Initiative	Applicant Name:		Funding Requested:	Review Date:
Mandatory Requirements	Yes	No	Comments/notes <i>(attach sheet if necessary)</i>	
Received by the deadline set for the current year				
Clearly states the project costs, sources of financing, and funding request				
Rating Criteria <i>(see description of rating criteria below)</i>	Points Awarded		Comments or notes <i>(attach sheet if necessary)</i>	
Environmental (30 points total)				
1. Meets WRRRI objectives (10 points)				
2. Size of environmental impact (10 points)				
3. Clear environmental benefits (10 points)				
Community involvement and benefits (30 points total)				
4. Community involvement/support (10 points)				
5. Shared funding and/or minimization of costs (10 points)				
6. Clear community benefits (10 points)				
Likelihood of project success (30 points total)				
7. Detailed project implementation schedule (10 points)				
8. Detailed project costs and funding sources (10 points)				
9. Practicality / feasibility (10 points)				
Innovation (10 points total)				
10. Innovative solution (10 points)				
Total score (maximum 100 points)				

Other	Yes	No	Comments/notes <i>(attach sheet if necessary and identify any follow-up required)</i>	
Application is complete				
Applicants and/or project activities based in the NWT				
Proposal addresses applicable legal requirements (e.g., required permits or licenses)				
Has the applicant received funding in previous years?				
If the applicant has received funding in previous years, how successful was it? Was final report and accounting submitted in a timely and acceptable manner?				
Reviewers (Names and Signatures)			Recommendation <input type="checkbox"/> Approve funding for \$ _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Deny funding	
_____	_____	_____		_____
Name	Date	Name		Date
_____	_____	_____		_____
Name	Date	Name	Date	

Rating Guide				
0	1-3	4-6	7-8	9-10
Poor – the applicant failed to demonstrate requirements of the WRRRI and associated scoring criteria in a suitable and documented manner.	Inadequate – the applicant failed to meet the requirements of the WRRRI and associated scoring criteria in a suitable and documented manner.	Acceptable – the applicant somewhat met the requirements of the WRRRI and associated scoring criteria in a suitable and documented manner.	Good – the applicant reasonably demonstrated requirements of the WRRRI and associated scoring criteria were met in a documented and suitable manner.	Excellent – the applicant fully demonstrated requirements of the WRRRI and associated scoring criteria were met in a documented and suitable manner.
The response has little merit and failed to demonstrate that the work will be performed in an acceptable manner.	The response has some merit, but there are significant weaknesses that could result in unacceptable shortcomings in performance of the work.	The response has substance but there are weaknesses that could result in tolerable or reasonably correctable shortcomings in performance of the work.	The response is comprehensive but there are minor weaknesses that should not significantly impact performance of the work.	There are no apparent weaknesses.

Rating Criteria Description
Environmental (30 points)
<p>1. Meets WRRRI objectives (10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How <i>clearly</i> does the project meet WRRRI objectives? - How many objectives are met? - How <i>likely</i> is it that implementing the project will result in meeting these objectives?
<p>2. Size of the environmental impact (10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For each of the WRRRI objectives that the project will meet, to what <i>magnitude</i> will these be met? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o E.g., How much waste will the project reduce or divert through reuse or recycle? o E.g., How much will the project reduce risks of pollution from hazardous waste that will be recycled from the project? o E.g., How much awareness about waste reduction and stewardship will the project generate?
<p>3. Clear environmental benefits (10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Over and above the WRRRI objectives, what is the magnitude of the net environmental impacts and/or benefits from the project (e.g., greenhouse gas emissions)? - To what extent is the proposed solution local so that environmental impacts relating to transportation in and out of the community is reduced (e.g., will materials be reused/recycled in the community)?
Community Involvement and Benefits (30 points)
<p>4. Community involvement/support (10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What degree of demonstrated support is there from the community (e.g., municipality, community or Aboriginal government, local organizations) to do the work (e.g., joint application, letter of support)? - To what extent will the municipality, community government or Aboriginal government be involved in the project? - To what extent is the project local, and involving community members and community groups?
<p>5. Shared funding and/or minimization of costs (10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will the WRRRI funding be supplemented by other sources of funding and/or in-kind support over and above the minimum required in the WRRRI guidelines? - Have the minimization of costs been demonstrated (e.g., using volunteers rather than paying staff, using existing supplies in the community rather than buying new supplies)?
<p>6. Clear community benefits (10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regarding social and economic benefits to the community from the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o How <i>clear</i> are these? o How <i>likely</i> are these? o What is the <i>magnitude</i> of these? (e.g., How many members of the community will be reached through this project?)

Likelihood of Project Success (30 points)
7. Detailed project implementation schedule (10) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How detailed is the project implementation schedule? - Does the level of detail and information provide assurance that the project is achievable?
8. Detailed project costs and funding sources (10) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How detailed is the project budget and associated funding sources? - Does the level of detail and information about costs provide assurance that the project is achievable?
9. Practicality / feasibility (10) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the project seem feasible given the proposed budget? Are costs fair market value and essential to project success? - Does the project seem practical given the information provided in the application (e.g., have all aspects of the project been clearly thought out and have any potential challenges been identified with solutions)? - Are there considerations that have not been addressed in the application that could limit the practicality/feasibility of this project (e.g., a project proposed to be complete in the summer that will need winter roads)? - If the applicant has previously received WRRRI funding, did they demonstrate in the past project their ability to complete a project and meet the project objectives?
Innovation (10 points)
10. Innovative solution (10) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the project innovative? Is a unique approach used to meeting WRRRI objectives? - Could this approach, if successful, potentially be used in other NWT projects?