

## Q&A from New Proposed Fee Methodology Consultation

	Question	Answer
1.	Does the new methodology reward recycled materials and penalize materials that are not recycled?	<p>The new methodology does have the effect of rewarding recyclable materials and ensuring that non-recyclable or difficult to recycle materials are not inadvertently rewarded in a number of ways. Examples of this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is no sharing of commodity revenue in the new methodology. Only materials that are collected in the recycling system and subsequently sold to recycling end markets will be allocated a share of the revenue to help offset the cost to manage their materials. This is unlike today's three-factor formula that works on a net cost basis thereby having the effect of transferring some commodity revenue to the low performing materials through factors 1 and 3.</li> <li>- All materials assume their relative share of 60% of the gross cost of the recycling system whether or not they are collected. Most importantly, this relative share is calculated using both the quantities of material sold and the material's cost per tonne to manage. As such all materials are assuming the 60% of gross costs <i>as though they were managed in the recycling system</i>. In this way, materials that are not collected and recycled are assuming a share of the gross costs and this necessarily reduces the share being attributed to those materials that are actually collected and recycled Step 4 of the methodology attributes cost only to those materials that require investment to improve their cost and performance effectiveness in the recycling system or are needing recycling end markets developed so they can move from a material that is only disposable, or one that is recyclable.</li> </ul>
2.	Why doesn't Ontario, Manitoba and Quebec programs have the same cost/tonne for the same materials? As a national business, the packaging and paper that we supply in each province is the same but the cost/tonne is so different across programs. Why?	<p>Many variables can affect each material's cost per tonne as calculated by conducting ABC studies. MMSM, SO and ÉEQ have heard from stewards that they would like to understand these differences better and in response, CSSA and ÉEQ have formed a technical committee to understand these differences. The committee's work is expected to take several months and then we will report back to stewards on their findings.</p>
3.	How is revenue treated in the old methodology versus the new methodology?	<p>In the new methodology commodity revenue earned when materials are sold to recycling end markets is only attributed to the materials that are actually sold to end markets and earn the revenue. In the current methodology, the net cost (cost minus revenue) is determined for each material and used when applying each of the three factors of the three-factor formula. This net cost approach has the effect of transferring some revenues earned by specific materials to other materials that did not contribute to the revenue earned.</p>

	Question	Answer
4.	I understand that development of the new fee methodology was based on principles, but I would still like to get some idea of what the new methodology will mean for my company. Can you provide us with a way of comparing it to last year's fees?	To assist stewards in their consideration of the new methodology, we have provided stewards with a calculator to compare the fees they pay using the current methodology to the fees they could pay with the new methodology. You will be able to input your material quantities and the tool will calculate the total fees by material for the current methodology and the new methodology using the 2016 fee rates. The tool will provide you with an order of magnitude variance in your total fees by material type. The tool is available <a href="#">here</a> .
5.	Why is ÉEQ's fee methodology different?	ÉEQ initiated a fee methodology review project prior to the CSSA project and is better positioned to discuss their methodology. However, the observation of the ÉEQ-CSSA Technical Committee is that there are strong similarities between the two outcomes. Both the SCC and ÉEQ determined that generated quantities should no longer be used and that supplied quantities, as reported by stewards, is a more appropriate basis for use in some component of the fee calculation.
6.	Why didn't the SCC make fee predictability one of its objectives?	Predictability was not added as an objective by the Steward Consultation Committee (SCC) because they understood that there are many inputs that inform the fee calculation (e.g., steward-supplied quantities, revenues achieved through sale of materials, and the myriad of impacts of system costs) change every year and therefore fee predictability is not a possibility unless an organization builds up a sizeable reserve.
7.	Will CSSA publish a Pay In Model for the programs?	<p>The individual program Boards determine what information is publishable based on their own circumstances. Both Ontario and Manitoba have historically published a PIM (Pay in Model) that summarizes the inputs to fees because these programs operate transfer payment programs where the municipal performance information is public. MMBC has not done this because the program is fully managed by MMBC and under the terms of confidential commercial contracts with municipal and private partners and this information is considered internal and confidential.</p> <p>That said, the consultation report will bring forward any comments and recommendations made by the steward community so please comment on your information needs so the Boards can consider these in their decisions.</p>
8.	It seems you are only allocating 40% of the cost to material that is actually managed in the system. Why?	No, that is not the case. 60% of the gross cost of the system is allocated to all materials based on the supplied quantities reported by stewards to ensure all materials are paying, whether they are collected or not. The remaining 40% is allocated to materials that are collected and managed. This means that those materials that are collected and managed pay a portion of the 60% based on supply and 40% based on their managed quantities. It is those materials that are not collected that will not be allocated the 40% portion nor will they be allocated any commodity revenue. Please review page 29 of the <a href="#">Modernized Fee Methodology Consultation</a>

	Question	Answer
		<a href="#">Document</a> for a good summary of this matter.
9.	Laminated plastics and laminated paper will be paying for their share of 60% of the fees based on quantities supplied into the marketplace. But they won't be paying on the 40% of the fees because there are not any tonnes in the recovered stream. Is that a correct interpretation?	<p>It is true that materials not collected are not allocated a portion of the 40% of the gross cost, as summarized in the diagram on page 29 of the pre-read. Also, please note that given these materials were not collected, they cannot have been marketed and therefore do not share in the revenue. That said, for a material such as laminated plastics, in addition to the 60% of gross costs, the material would also be allocated its share of program management costs (step 3 of the methodology) as well as P&amp;E and/or market development (step 4 of the methodology) – this last step ensures that the appropriate investment is made in materials that are not currently collected.</p> <p>That said, a material that is not targeted for collection, but actually is collected, even in small amounts, (plastic laminates sometimes fall into this category) will share in the 40% of gross costs. It could well be that even though plastic laminates are not targeted for collection, it is in some cases being collected, and if so it would be allocated its relative share of the 40%.</p>
10.	Who decides how much P&E cost is added to specific materials?	Cost and recycling performance by material is monitored and where a material's performance needs to be improved then the program makes that decision and those costs are included in the following year's fees.
11.	What is the difference between gross and net costs? I think net costs are currently used?	Gross cost is the total cost of collection and processing. Net cost is the final total once commodity revenue is subtracted from gross costs. With the current methodology, total program revenue is subtracted from total gross costs to calculate the total program net costs. Then the total net costs are allocated costs at each material category level. The new methodology allocates gross cost first in Step 1 and then allocates commodity revenue in Step 2.
12.	How will both reported and collected quantities be validated?	The quantities reported by stewards are reviewed annually during the steward reporting period at the end of May. The quantities that the municipalities and waste management partners report undergo review and validation by the individual stewardship programs. The validation approaches differ and reflect the nature of the business relationship between the stewardship program and the service providers. For example in BC, the contracts are with MMBC and validated by them. In Ontario, municipalities report annually to Waste Diversion Ontario using a process known as "Datacall." The WDO first validates the information and then provides to Stewardship Ontario.
13.	How does the methodology address unusual expenses such as program start-up costs?	Program start-up costs, which can typically include, program plan development, steward recruitment and registration, opening of local office etc., would all be factored into Step 3 of the new methodology. Step 3 allocates the program management costs of the stewardship program by first counting the number of stewards reporting in each material category and then factoring in the material's share of gross costs to manage the recycling system.

	Question	Answer
14.	MMBC has a Small Business Assessment Tool (SBAT) for low volume producers. Will MMBC continue to offer the SBAT? Will the proposed methodology result in changes to the SBAT?	MMBC will continue to offer the Small Business Assessment Tool for low volume producers, and the proposed methodology does not affect how it converts units to kilograms.
15.	Where can I find the fee methodology verbiage?	All of the presentation materials, as well as the pre-read that was sent out to stewards can be found <a href="#">here</a> .
16.	What is the source of "collected quantities"? My understanding was that for Ontario, the data that is available pertains to marketed tonnes (not collected). How does the new methodology account for those materials that may be collected but are not marketed?	<p>You are correct that today in Ontario only marketed tonnes are reported today.</p> <p>The new methodology may, in some programs, require data that is not currently available to be derived by applying business rules to the available data.</p>
17.	Are current material categories and levels of aggregation remaining the same under the new methodology or are they being revised? If revised, when will we get a sense of what the ones will be?	There has been no decision on whether or not fee rates will be aggregated for the 2017 fees. Each Board will consider aggregation during the fee setting cycle for 2017, as they do each year. Stewards will recall that one of the project's objectives was to evaluate the material categories that stewards use to report and this evaluation will consider aggregation of fees. With the new methodology, the SCC decided that cost and revenue differentiation is important and we will therefore need to review the reporting categories to determine if they adequately reflect the each material's cost and revenue differentiation.
18.	What is the timeline for CSSA or the SCC to report back on the review of the many inputs (bale and curb studies, ABC studies)?	The SCC has completed its work on the proposed new fee methodology. ABC, as well as bale and curbside audits are ongoing and inform today's methodology. CSSA project staff will continue its work on how to best improve these studies going forward to feed the new methodology if it is adopted for consideration by each of the programs' management. The implementation of the new methodology is not dependent upon completing this work as all studies that are conducted today were not changed by the new proposed fee methodology.
19.	What is/are the source(s) for the commodity prices you will be using?	Most programs access the regional commodity markets to inform the commodity prices uses in fee setting. Currently, Ontario uses the information reported in Data Call.

	Question	Answer
20.	I am confused by the answer that was given by Scott regarding fee material category aggregation. He indicated that aggregation is decided on by individual Boards on a yearly basis. That was not my understanding. Can you confirm this is the case?	See answer to question 7 above.
21.	Throughout the presentation, there was comment that all pay. Is this true? Is there not an exemption for "small" organizations that do not require them to be stewards?	The reference in the presentation is to businesses that are obligated under the various provincial pieces of legislation. Businesses that are exempted by regulation, i.e., a de minimis threshold has been imposed, are not considered to be obligated stewards.
22.	Reporting our 'supplied' materials by weight is pretty easy and straight forward, will weight continue to be the reporting mechanism under the new methodology?	Yes, stewards will continue to report their material by weight (i.e., kilograms).
23.	When will the new fee methodology come into effect? Will the 2016 report (2015 data) have the new fee rate applied?	The first opportunity to use the new methodology could be the 2017 fees, which we would calculate this year and bring to stewards at our October meeting this fall. However, each board needs to approve the fee methodology and in Ontario it also needs to receive Ministerial approval.
24.	How far down are the categories drilled for the Plastics category? Seems High Grade and Low Grade plastics seem to be affected similarly, rough feel is that they are looking at an 80% increase?	When you use the fee assessment tool found <a href="#">here</a> , you will see the variance for each reporting material.
25.	How likely is the new fee setting methodology to be subject to market volatility in terms of MRF output. In Essence, remembering the thoughts	The new fee methodology will be impacted by commodity markets because it uses the material's commodity price to allocate the revenue to the materials that have earned it.

	Question	Answer
	around the evolving tonne and changes in end markets. Will this significantly change costs year-on-year in categories?	
26.	Free Riders are an ongoing issue, equally so with this new fee setting methodology. Was any discussion given during this process to capture this as Plastics had the largest disparity of supplied v collected and is also the most expensive?	Free riders are always a priority for each stewardship program and work continues by the programs and provincial governments to enforce their regulations.
27.	Would be interested in understanding significantly differing costs of Commodity recycling costs	Thank you for your comment. Stewards have been polled to determine whether they would like to accept the invitation to have Activity Based Costing studies included in the annual fall information session.
28.	Bearing in mind the significant impact to certain categories on the cost to manage vs marketability what incentive/likelihood of CSSA or individual programs to look for economies on behalf of its stewards (to manage materials)? Or is this down to MRF's...?	Each program Board takes measures to ensure that the program is running as effectively and efficiently as possible within the confines of the regulatory framework – whether it is a transfer payment jurisdiction, such as Ontario or a fully producer-managed jurisdiction such as British Columbia.  Even in programs where municipalities manage the collection and MRF operations such as Ontario and Manitoba, stewardship programs have opportunity to work with their municipal partners on system improvements that yield cost performance improvements.
29.	Are Category Volumes above reported (i.e. STINO) smoothed across all categories or is one category (ie plastics) bearing all STINO with Plastics category? (Same question for all categories?) If no smoothing, why not?	The programs do incur cost to manage non-obligated materials and although all programs work actively to minimize this expense, all program budgets do have some element of this expense.  The new methodology recommends using supplied quantities to allocate 60% of the gross cost of the recycling system and in this way, avoids inadvertently attributing much of this cost to a particular material category simply because the non-obligated material 'looks like' obligated material.
30.	Does this mean that we can advise our teams we should see savings over previous years per your recent	Whether or not a steward will see savings or added cost will depend on their material mix. While we will not be able to provide 2017 fees until the fall, the calculator tool we have provided will give stewards an opportunity to determine the order of magnitude effect the new methodology may have compared to the current

	Question	Answer
	comments?	methodology, using the same inputs.
31.	Will this process be used on new provinces coming into the program?	Yes, the objective is to have a harmonized fee methodology for multiple packaging and printed paper programs.
32.	Will we receive a credit for 2016 fees paid?	No, the fee methodology used in previous years was the approved and appropriate method for calculating fees. The new methodology is a future looking change that will be applied if it is approved.
33.	If a limited ability to get good ABC data from facilities was a limiting factor in the old model, as you are basing future costs on ABC, how are you going to now get good ABC data?	<p>The ABC study methodology is under review to determine alternative approaches for executing the studies – for example, there may be aspects of the ABC that can be calculated using models versus Material Recycling Facility (MRF) visits. There may be aspects that can be calculated by conducting a study at one accessible MRF that can serve as a reasonable proxy for others. When the review is complete, recommendations will be put forward to the programs’ Boards of Directors.</p> <p>The stewardship programs understand that the decision by the SCC to continue to rely on ABC study data will renew the stewards’ interest in this element of the program operations. Please note that the ABC costs are used today and are available, and therefore the new proposed methodology can be used, if approved by Boards, whether or not the ABC study methodology changes in the future.</p>
34.	Will the excel tool be made available to stewards only; or will it also be made available to associations to help inform our members...we would suggest please include Associations.	The calculator tool is available to everyone <a href="#">here</a> .
35.	Will the fee changes be effective for 2015 data (2016 report/2017 invoice), or 2016 data or 2017 data?	The first opportunity to use the new methodology could be the 2017 fees, which we would calculate this year and bring to stewards at our October meeting this fall. However, each board needs to approve the fee methodology and in Ontario it also needs to receive Ministerial approval.
36.	Will this methodology also be considered for the Ontario Hazardous Waste program?	No. This methodology is designed to be used only for packaging and printed paper programs. The MHSW program and the method of calculating fees is governed by Ontario Regulation 11/12.
37.	If the new fee methodology does not receive approval in Ontario, will it still be implemented in the other provinces?	That decision will be made by each program’s Board of Directors.

	Question	Answer
38.	Based on Step 2 [of the new methodology], do I only calculate total paper tonnage on only the revenue pages of our phone book to determine the fees that we pay and exclude all informational type pages?	The fee methodology is not guidance on how stewards should report the materials that they supply into the residential marketplace. The proposed methodology is instead a way to fairly allocate the costs to manage the material and meet stewards' regulatory obligations.
39.	From what I'm hearing, the changes would affect the rates Stewards are charged but no change to how the quantities are calculated. It is still by weight. Rates are still charged by Kgs.	That is correct. The new methodology does not change the way that stewards report their materials each year on May 31 <sup>st</sup> .
40.	Why are recycling fees not applied at the limited number of manufacturers of the container and not the multitude of stewards who use those containers in the manufacturing of their product?	Governments direct extended producer responsibility (EPR) regulations to obligate the businesses that make the decision about what packaging to use, rather than the companies that manufacture the packaging.
41.	We have been able to report as a Low Volume Steward, and have submitted this year's report already - supplying Printed paper only- Is this new fee methodology going to affect us?	No, the new methodology will not affect the manner in which low volume stewards report.
42.	Will this new methodology eliminate materials that are currently collected curbside?	No materials are eliminated. The methodology applies to all obligated materials.
43.	Why is HST charged in some provinces? Ontario has been exempt for many years, why isn't this consistent across all provinces?	Taxable status of each program is determined on the basis of the legislation in each province. Stewardship Ontario is not considered to be providing a taxable service and therefore cannot charge HST on Blue Box fees and cannot claim input tax credits.

	Question	Answer
44.	Why was the principle to "Encourage reduction, redesign, and recyclability" removed from the guiding principles? Is there nothing that we as stewards can do to lower the total cost of the recycling program through our packaging and printed paper choices?	The Steward Consultation Committee considers the three R's to be a critical component of the stewardship programs, but they believe they should reside at the program level, not inside the fee calculation. Stewards can always help to lower the total cost of the system by selecting recyclable materials and reducing the total amount of packaging they sell into the marketplace.
45.	Under the new formula, how often would the fees per item class change?	The fees will be calculated annually. That will not change.
46.	How often will the ABCs be re-visited?	The review of the ABC methodology that is currently under way will provide guidance on the frequency of these studies.
47.	What is the proposal that will be submitted to WDO and for minister approval? It should be clear to the steward community before the proposal is put forward.	If the Stewardship Ontario Board approves the use of the proposed new methodology, then that methodology will be submitted to the WDO and Ontario Ministry of Environment and Climate Change for approval.
48.	Is the 40% portion of Gross Cost limited to obligated materials? Or does it include STINO?	It includes STINO, for example, that is collected that resembles obligated materials, e.g., pie plates that are sold as product or non-obligated magazines sold via mail order from outside the province.
49.	Will the new fee calculation method affect how the stewards report?	No. Stewards should continue reporting as they always have.
50.	How does STINO affect new fee calculation method?	<p>The programs do incur cost to manage non-obligated materials and although all programs work actively to minimize this expense, all program budgets do have some element of this expense.</p> <p>The new methodology recommends using supplied quantities to allocate 60% of the gross cost of the recycling system and in this way, avoids inadvertently attributing to much of this cost to a particular material category simply because the non-obligated material 'looks like' obligated material.</p>

	Question	Answer
51.	Should I use the calculator tool to budget for next year's fees?	<p>The actual 2017 fee rates will be published in October to allow stewards to budget in advance of the 2017 invoice year.</p> <p>That said, stewards wanting to prepare budgets for the 2017 fiscal year sooner can use the calculator tool to provide directional/illustrative information for their use when completing preliminary budgets.</p> <p>The actual fee rates to be charged in 2017 cannot be calculated at this time because the necessary inputs to fee setting are not yet available. For example, the quantities supplied by stewards will only be available upon completion of the annual filing, due by May 31, 2016.</p>
52.	When is the report due?	Your feedback on the proposed new fee methodology is due by email to <a href="mailto:jjames@cssalliance.ca">jjames@cssalliance.ca</a> by <b>May 20, 2016</b> . If you're referring to your steward report, it is due by May 31, 2016 and can be submitted using the <a href="#">WeRecycle Portal located here</a> .
53.	Does this new fee calculator now apply to the universities and colleges or are we still using the university calculator as we have in past years?	You will still use the university calculator to calculate the tonnage that you report, there is no change to that. The calculator tool referred to in yesterday's communication is just for illustration purposes to see what your fees for 2016 would have been if the new fee methodology was in place.
54.	<p>We sell 20 L pails, 4L jugs and one litre bottles all made of HDPE. We report the number of litres sold in each container size and in three different product categories, oil, solvent and antifreeze.</p> <p>Your spreadsheet shows HDPE fees are to increase by 59.3% (Proxy fees versus 2016 fees). This 59.3% increase is consistent no matter how many kg are input in column C. Can I assume that the fee for each product category should be raised by 59.3%?</p> <p>The majority of our quarterly SO</p>	<p>Please note that the fee methodology review project was targeted at the Packaging and Printed Paper programs, not the MHSW program. The fee calculation methodology for the MHSW program is outlined in O. Reg. 11/12 and amends O. Reg. 542/06 by requiring that fees charged to stewards are determined by the Steward Share Assessment (SSA) methodology.</p> <p>The fee comparison calculator tool recently published refers only to the packaging for your product - not the product itself. For example, the fees you pay for the Antifreeze you supply will continue to be calculated and invoiced via the MHSW program.</p> <p>The HDPE packaging is to be reported to the Stewardship Ontario Blue Box program as an Ontario steward. Based on the material's definition, you would report into the Other Plastics category. Using your 20L pail example, and assuming this pail weighs approximately 1 kg when empty and the lid weighs approximately 300 grams, the total weight of the packaging is 1.3kg.</p> <p>Using the SO version of the calculator tool you would note that the new Other Plastics fee rate could add approximately 6 cents to the 20L pail sold or a total of \$0.49.</p>

	Question	Answer
	<p>invoice covers sales of oil in 20L pails. We have been using a stewardship fee of \$3/pail in calculating a selling price to our customers. If I apply the 59.3% increase to this, we would see the stewardship fee increase to \$4.78 per pail.</p> <p>We buy brand new pails and lids for \$4.18 each. How can it cost more to dispose of a used pail than to buy a brand new one?</p> <p>Is my understanding of this correct?</p>	
55.	<p>I would like to get some clarification on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Definitions of “Supplied Quantities” vs. “Collected Quantities”, and the implications on the capture rates in reporting.</li> <li>2. Insight on the 50% industry obligation, and any potential changes that may arise from the new methodology or any other ongoing consultations.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Supplied quantities are those quantities of obligated materials reported by all stewards in their annual filing. Collected quantities are those quantities received by the municipal or private collectors of Blue Box materials - i.e. the materials collected at the residential location.</li> </ol> <p>For the 60% portion of the gross cost to be allocated to all materials based on the relative share of supplied quantities (as calculated by using both the quantities supplied and the material's specific ABC cost per tonne to manage), the capture rate is not relevant. All materials will assume their share of this portion of gross cost regardless of their capture performance. The remaining 40% of the gross cost are then allocated <i>only</i> to those materials collected by the system. It is these materials only who will bear their relative share of the 40% and only these materials who will be allocated their relative share of the commodity revenue earned by the recycling system.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Each of the four programs participating in the fee methodology review project has a different regulatory obligation at this time - 50% in Ontario; 80% in Manitoba, 75% in Saskatchewan and 100% in British Columbia. The fee methodology review project does not impact the industry obligation - or the size of the total pie to be funded by stewards. The fee methodology begins once the total program obligation/budget is known and is used to determine the size of the 'slice', or the component of the overall budget, to be funded by each material.</li> </ol>

	Question	Answer
56.	<p>What fee schedule am I supposed to use for the blue box calcs for our 2015 data? Ontario, Manitoba, Sask and BC.</p>	<p>You are currently preparing to submit your 2015 data which will inform the calculation of your 2017 fees. The 2017 fee schedule will be made available to stewards at our annual fall meeting in late October.</p>
57.	<p>I have a customer that has stores in Ontario and Manitoba, but only 1 DC in Ontario. I don't have data about their sales volume in Ontario and Manitoba. What is industry standard to break out produced quantity for this customer between the 2 provinces?</p>	<p>If your customer ships their products to a distribution centre and is unable to determine the quantity of products that end up in Ontario vs. Manitoba, they may estimate the quantities of PPP supplied to these two provinces by referencing Statistics Canada Population Percentage data as provided in <a href="#">Part 2.0.1</a> of the Guidebook.</p>
58.	<p>What is the projection of new province programs coming online?</p>	<p>The governments of Alberta and Nova Scotia have both drafted legislation aimed at implementing Extended Producer Responsibility programs for packaging and printed paper. However both governments have decided that they need more time to consider how to proceed with implementing these programs. At this time, no additional provincial EPR programs for PPP are expected to move forward in 2016. We will keep stewards posted of any developments in any of the provinces.</p>
59.	<p>What constitutes a low volume Steward?</p>	<p>Low volume stewards are defined slightly differently in the different provinces as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>In British Columbia</u>, the government has defined a low volume steward as a business that produces between one and 2.5 tonnes of packaging and printed paper and are obligated to pay a flat fee of \$550.00; and businesses that produce between 2.5 and 5 tonnes of packaging and printed paper and are required to pay an annual flat fee of \$1,200.00.</li> <li>- <u>In Saskatchewan</u>, the government has granted a two year exemption from reporting and paying fees to newspaper publishers with revenue over \$2M and all businesses with annual revenue between \$2M and \$5M.</li> <li>- <u>In Manitoba</u> there is no category of low volume stewards</li> </ul>

	Question	Answer
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>In Ontario</u>, businesses with gross sales over \$2M but total reported packaging and printed paper less than 15 tonnes are required to report their materials to Stewardship Ontario but are exempt from paying fees.</li> </ul>
60.	What are non-obligated stewards?	<p>Non-obligated stewards are business that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are not resident in a province where packaging and printed paper stewardship obligations exist and/or</li> <li>- Are not the brand-owner, first importer or franchisor supplying obligated packaging and printed paper to consumers in BC, SK, MB or ON or</li> <li>- Exempted due to a regulated de minimis threshold.</li> </ul> <p>For a full overview of how to determine if your organization is an obligated steward please see <a href="#">Part 1.6</a> of the National Guidebook.</p>
61.	We used to have a packaging calculator for Automotive sold. Will there be any calculator for MC or ATV units? Please advise.	<p>The sole purpose of the calculator tool we released following the April 21<sup>st</sup> meeting is to enable stewards to compare the proposed new methodology with the current methodology to provide an order of magnitude directional sense of what the new method could mean. We believe that the calculator you are referring to is used by automotive sector stewards to calculate your packaging and printed paper and therefore you can use these quantities as inputs to the fee methodology calculator tool.</p>
62.	In order to facilitate planning, please give an approximate time when the 2015 MMBC materials report will be required.	<p>Your steward report is due by May 31, 2016. You can submit your report by using the <a href="#">WeRecycle Portal located here</a>.</p>