

Wrap's Response to my Grant Application

Gerry,

Further to our conversation on Thursday, I am writing to confirm that the Technical Advisory Committee has not shortlisted the Reusacan proposal. We appreciate that this will be very disappointing news, particularly after the time and effort of developing and submitting a proposal.

The Innovation Fund received a large number of proposals in this round, with a combined value much in excess of the available budget to support projects. It has therefore been necessary to identify which proposals provided the greatest likelihood of delivering WRAP's targets to reduce household waste by March 2008.

I have set out below the issues raised during assessment relating to the Reusacan proposal:

Applicant: Reusa-Can Project Title: Reusa-can feasibility study, development, testing & trials

- The risk of the project failing to deliver substantial reductions in household waste by March 2008 make the project poor value for money (in terms of WRAP investment per tonne of waste reduction). **This is the primary measure of value for money that all projects are judged against**, as indicated in the Tender Invitation Document.
- At the point of application there are too many risks of failure for WRAP to support the project (e.g. technical and commercial feasibility, lack of collection, reprocessing and filling partners)
- Is it realistic for the project to spend £700k by November '06, with the current level of uncertainty? The timescale lacks credibility. This is a higher value than any other project supported to date, whilst the level of uncertainty of tonnage reductions being achieved remains high. The initial funding sought for the feasibility stages (1-4) is £227,950. This is far too great a cost for the Innovation Fund to support when the risk of project failure during the feasibility phase would still be high.
- There is a lack of project partners within the proposal to bring the innovation to market.
- The project application does not identify a broad project team (almost all activities in the feasibility phase appear to be undertaken by one or two individuals – with the applicant indicating sole responsibility for design, prototype production, selling), representing a risk of project failure. Time does not appear to have been allocated to developing the broad project partnership to take this idea to trial. This is likely to be a time intensive activity and engaging and securing detailed commitment from necessary project partners would be crucial to success.
- **The idea appears impractical, requiring food cans to be opened without removing the top of the can body** – contrary to the opening style of some can openers on the market; requiring no denting of cans in use or in recovery for reprocessing and requiring high transportation costs for delivering empty cans. These appear to be significant barriers to take-up of the innovation.

The finished Reusa-Can is proof enough. I am convinced the judges were either from the steel or canning industry and saw Reusa-Can as a threat.