

ADDENDUM No. 1

December 15, 2020

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS - RFP No. RP350-2020-01

FOR First Nations, Inuit and Métis Initiative Evaluation

DELETE and REPLACE Schedule C - Pricing Sheet and Schedule E - Project Deliverables and Milestones, issued with this Addendum.

CLARIFICATION - QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Please see the answers below regarding any questions raised in relation to this RFP.

1. Question:

Would you be able to provide more information about the projects that you have funded as part of this initiative and which will need to be evaluated? Alternatively, could you direct us to sources of information where we could learn more about the funded projects?

Answer:

The list of all participating organizations can be found on our website under current work: <https://www.partnershipagainstcancer.ca/about-us/who-we-are/first-nations-inuit-metis/current-work/>

Further details related to the funded projects will be provided to the successful Proponent.

2. Question:

Could we confirm that the maximum budget allocated for this project is \$250,000? We were a little confused around the language of this amount being allocated for “all phases.” Does this mean that the maximum amount a proponent would be able to propose in its bid is \$250,000?

Answer:

Yes, this is accurate. The maximum budget is \$250,000 CAD (inclusive of all taxes and expenses) for all phases and it is to cover all work listed out in the RFP. The “all phases” language refers to Phases 1-3 as listed out in the Evaluation Management section of the RFP.

3. Question:

We expect to include resources from three partner firms, with the Proponent as acting as the lead. Form D1 states "Each Proponent should provide references from three (3) different clients (excluding the Partnership) who have obtained services similar to those required in this RFP from the Proponent within the last three (3) years." Does this mean that the "services" must have been contracted to the Proponent (as the lead firm) to be eligible as a reference? Or are the "services" contracted to a partner on the Proponent's team eligible as a reference?

Answer:

No, it does not mean that the services must be contracted to the lead firm. references from partner firms are acceptable.

4. Question:

Form D2 states "Each Proponent should provide references from two (2) different clients (excluding the Partnership) to whom each candidate proposed for a key role has provided services within the last three (3) years in a role similar to that set out for the candidate in the Proposal." Do the references for "each candidate" need to have been related to projects contracted directly with the Proponent? Or can the references for "each candidate" be related to projects contracted by other firms (such as our partners).

Answer:

References can be for "each candidate" related to projects contracted by other firms.

5. Question:

Can the Partnership provide an estimate of the volume of performance-related quantitative data? Is this data in an aggregated format or does the data require aggregation across time/ projects or in relation to specific indicators?

Answer:

There are 29 funded partners who will be informing the evaluation, each with varying capacity and levels of data. Each partner has identified, or are in the process of identifying, what type of data can be available for contribution to the initiative evaluation. The successful Proponent will work closely with the Partnership and our partners to identify how each partner will contribute and what other types of data need to be collected. The data will need to be aggregated across projects.

6. Question:

Can the Partnership provide an estimate of the number / volume of administrative data to be assessed?

Answer:

Similar to the question above, the volume of administrative data to be assessed will vary depending on partner capacity. The administrative data refers to the data that would be coming in from partners (aggregate by partner project), which would require synthesis, analysis, and interpretation.

7. Question:

Can the Partnership provide an estimate of the number of partners who are conducting their own project specific evaluations?

Answer:

28 of the funded projects are conducting their own project-specific evaluation as part of their funding agreement.

8. Question:

Schedule C - Pricing Sheet Table 1: Budget by Deliverable requires effort to be determined in weeks. Would the Partnership accept Effort to be determined in days i.e. 7.5 hours?

Answer:

The Partnership has Deleted and Replaced Schedule C - Pricing Sheet and Schedule E - Project and Deliverables and Milestones, issued with this Addendum.

Proponents are required to outline the level of effort required to complete each deliverable, without stating exact start and end dates (these will be determined in collaboration with the successful Proponent).

Yes, efforts determined in days is acceptable.

Please note: 1 day is equivalent to 7.5 hours. One week is equivalent to 37.5 hrs/5 days.

9. Question:

Is there a limitation on the scope in terms of previous number of years for input into Schedule G: List of FNIM organizations and / or governments that proponents have engaged” e.g. “in the last 5 years”?

Answer:

Engagement within the last 5-7 years is preferred.

10. Question:

What is your sense of the importance of physical site visits given COVID-19?

Answer:

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, physical site visits are not required. Proponents are encouraged to leverage virtual tools when engaging with partners.

11. Question:

Do you have expectations on the limitations of virtual connections with some of these organizations?

Answer:

The Partnership does not anticipate any limitations with virtual connections, as it is currently used by the Partnership when interacting with partners.

12. Question:

We have a list of your partners and sites - do you have any more info, including site locations and program descriptions you could provide us?

Answer:

Please see response to Question 1.

13. Question:

Do you have expectations around which platform you want us to use (i.e. Zoom vs Teams vs WebEx)?

Answer:

The Partnership currently uses Microsoft Teams to engage with partners. The Partnership is open to using other platforms if required. The successful Proponent may need to confirm each partner's preferred platform once the engagement process starts.

14. Question:

What kind of program data- qualitative/quantitative/financial are you currently collecting?

Answer:

The Partnership collects information from partners quarterly, outlining:

- i. Work progress to date based on planned deliverables and activities, any forecasted updates in anticipated progress
- ii. Quarterly actual expenditures, variances, and related commentary, updated quarterly financial forecasts
- iii. Progress towards project outcomes
- iv. Any raised risks or issues
- v. Other information related to metrics is also collected as needed.

15. Question:

Are you able to share the current evaluation plan with us?

Answer:

The draft Evaluation plan will be shared with the successful Proponent.

16. Question:

Does the 15 pages include bios for the team's members, or can that be in an appendix?

Answer:

No, bios for the team members can be included in an appendix.

17. Question:

We want to make sure we understand the number of references required. You are asking for 3 (different) references for our organization, and 2 (different) references for each consultant in a key role. So, a team of 6 consultants would require $3 + (6 \times 2) = 15$ references total. Is that correct? Can a reference for a consultant in a key role be the same as one of our 3 organization references? Similarly, if our consultants have worked on the same project, could two consultants in key roles use the same reference as each other?

Answer:

Each consultant must provide three (3) references. So, 6 consultants would provide 2 references each (12 references). A reference for a consultant can be the same as the reference for the organization and two (2) consultants can use the same references.

18. Question:

Is there a project advisory or steering committee, or will it be the CPAC Executive Committee? Since there are multiple levels involved, is there more information available about the mechanism available and the depth of the engagement required at the level of the project advisory committee, agreement holder, and at the service provider sites.

Answer:

Yes, there will be a project advisory committee that is separate from the CPAC Executive team. Day-to-day interactions with the successful Proponent will be managed by the Performance Measurement and Evaluation Analyst, who will work with the advisory committee, internal Partnership team and funded partners included in the project.

19. Question:

We know a document review is part of the data collection - what kind of documents would be made available reflecting project activities for example monthly reports, narrative reporting, statistics of project services and delivery type data. We are trying to get a sense of the nature and type of the documents.

Answer:

The successful Proponent will be provided with the draft evaluation plan. They will also have access to the following documents:

- i. Partner proposal and annual workplans
- ii. Signed contract agreement with each partner
- iii. Quarterly status report documents
- iv. Draft cancer strategies or plans for First Nations, Inuit and/or Métis at the jurisdictional level, which may be helpful contextual information for partner project work
- v. Any partner project information/data that they choose to share to contribute to the initiative evaluation, which will be used to inform the data collection plan

20. Question:

Is there an expectation of translation of documentation (and reporting etc.) from English to French? Will we be receiving documents in French and if so, what volume?

Answer:

As a national organization, the Partnership works with both English and French speaking partners. The Partnership's operating language is in English; however, some partners provide/or request documentation in French. At the moment, one partner provides/or requests documentation in French. The Partnership will manage translations (working with pre-qualified vendors) and will provide translated documents.

21. Question:

Can you please provide clarification around the use of surveys? Specifically:

- a) We understand from the RFP that standardized survey responses will be collected from partners across projects at 1 point in time (pg. 21) and that the survey tool must be created and validated with the Partnership and/or partners (pg. 21). However, we do not see survey development and validation listed in the Proponent's responsibilities in the Terms of Reference (pg. 18). Will the Proponent or the Partnership be responsible for developing and validating the survey?
- b) In the summary of evaluation inputs (pg. 21-22), we see that partner survey data (collected by vendor, where feasible and appropriate) are to include



measures specific to partners who have the ability to contribute. Does this mean that separate survey tools will be required for each funded project that participates in survey data collection (where feasible and appropriate)? If so, can you please provide more detail about the degree of individualization to the survey tool that is expected or likely to be required per project?

- c) In Schedule C (pg. 29-31), Phase 2 indicates that 2 qualitative and 2 quantitative methods will be used (to be determined). Can you please clarify which methods, if any, it is expected that the Proponent will include? Would other methods (i.e., beyond whichever 2 are chosen) be implemented by the Partnership, producing data that the Proponent would then incorporate in analysis/triangulation/reporting?
- d) In the summary of evaluation inputs (pg. 21-22), the RFP mentions stakeholder group survey data (collected by partners, where feasible and appropriate). Would the Proponent be involved in developing and validating the survey(s) used to collect this data?

Answer:

- a. Yes, the successful Proponent will be responsible for the creation and validation of the survey.
- b. The survey is not intended to be individualized, but to have standard questions that we will ask the partners to answer. Each partner has also completed a workbook which specifies what information each partner can contribute to the initiative evaluation. The latter is a distinct data source from the survey.
- c. The successful Proponent will have the flexibility to propose different methods of data collection as they deem appropriate and in collaboration with the Partnership and its funded partners. The data collection plan proposed will need to ensure that any quantitative and qualitative methods used will sufficiently fill any gaps in order to inform the indicators and outcomes for the evaluation. This may include but are not limited to analysis of currently available data, surveys (qualitative and quantitative), focus group discussions, and key informant interviews.
- d. No - this refers to possible survey data collected by the partners with their own community/stakeholder groups they engage. Some of this data may be available to share with the Partnership for the purpose of this evaluation. If so, the partners would develop their own surveys and we would kindly ask the partners to share the data in aggregate with the Partnership and successful Proponent for inclusion in this evaluation.

22. Question:

Of the 29 funded Initiatives, how many are related to each category of Objective #1 (Cancer Plans) and Objective #2 (Priorities)?

Answer:

Objectives	# of Partners
Develop Peoples-specific, First Nations, Inuit and Métis cancer plans	13
Implement the Peoples-specific, First Nations, Inuit and Métis self-determined priorities	14

NB - Of the 29 partners, two partners are not completing work related to both objectives.*

23. Question:

- a. There is reference to a "partner workbook feedback". What is generally covered by this workbook and is CPAC receiving the anticipated feedback as expected?
- b. Also, is there a high degree of variability with respect to how workbook feedback is provided by funded initiatives? Does each initiative have its own Data Collection Plan, and to what degree are these uniform across all projects?

Answer:

- a. The workbook refers to a document which each partner will complete in order to identify which existing data sources we are able to leverage. It outlines: whether the partner has access to data that could inform each of the proposed indicators, how feasible it would be to collect it, and what the relative burden would be to collect it.
- b. Yes, there is variability in the levels of data each partner can provide. Partners have varying capacity, data availability and level of interest with the initiative evaluation, which is reflected in their workbook responses. This may also be impacted by COVID-19.

With regards to each initiative's data collection plan: Each partner (initiative) is also responsible for developing their own project-specific evaluation plan, which would include their data collection plan. These are tailored to each of the partner's context and are therefore not uniform across all projects.

24. Question:

Related to the above (Question 23), what type and quantity of feedback (roughly) is received from funded partners? to what extent is this quantitative and qualitative?

Answer:

The feedback from the partners outlines:

- i. whether the partner has access to data that could inform each of the proposed indicators (Yes/no),
- ii. how feasible it would be to collect it, (Level of feasibility: 1 to 5) and

iii. what the relative burden would be to collect it (Low, medium, high).

25. Question:

Mention is made of administrative data sets, baseline data etc. that will be provided to the successful proponent and leveraged through the evaluation. In what format(s) are these existing datasets and in what format will they be received/provided to the proponent? Are they uniform with respect to formats?

Answer:

Funded partners provide information on a quarterly basis. This information is captured in excel templates and outlines progress made against deliverables, and expenses incurred. Additionally, the Partnership collects administrative data on an annual basis related to the implementation of the initiative to determine how projects are progressing towards their objectives over time.

Additionally, the Partnership collects administrative data related to how the Initiative is progressing toward its objectives year over year.

26. Question:

- a. The partnership has developed an evaluation plan and framework. How extensive is this i.e. what is the general content?
- b. There is reference to key indicators in the RFP. Has CPAC established what these are, and if so, are funded initiatives collecting data in relation to these specific indicators?

Answer:

- a. The general content is as follows:
 - i. The draft evaluation plan includes information such as: Background and context
 - ii. Initiative objective and alignment of outcomes
 - iii. Key evaluation questions
 - iv. Evaluation objectives: intended users and uses
 - v. Evaluation budget
 - vi. Evaluation approach and design
 - vii. Evaluation sub-questions and possible stories of impact
 - viii. Data collection plan
 - ix. Data management and privacy
 - x. Evaluation project timelines
 - xi. Roles and responsibilities matrix
 - xii. Interpreting, sense-making and communicating findings

- b. Yes, indicators have been validated by partners. Partners will submit workbooks that will communicate what data can be contributed to inform each indicator. This information will need to be synthesized across partner submissions and used to develop a comprehensive data collection plan (as part of the evaluation plan). Some partner-specific follow-up may be required to confirm what data they can and are willing to contribute to the Initiative evaluation.

27. Question:

We have noted that some Indigenous governments and organizations are not always comfortable with the term "evaluation". Does CPAC require that all references in Schedule D, Form D1 be for evaluation projects, or would you accept references for projects that involve evaluation-type activities and methods for Indigenous governments and organizations, but which may not be specifically labelled as "evaluations" (e.g. other types of reviews, involving data collection and analysis).

Answer:

The Partnership will accept references for projects that involved evaluation-type activities and methods, that are not necessarily labelled as "evaluations".

28. Question:

In terms of project expenses, is it reasonable to assume that there will be no travel for the duration of the project as a result of Covid-19 restrictions? Or would you like to see proposals anticipate/budget for some travel e.g. at later stages of the project?

Answer:

Please see response to Question #11.

29. Question:

We have noted the use of infographics throughout CPAC documentation related to this initiative. Is it CPAC's expectation that the use of visuals and graphics of this nature (i.e. that are used to communicate information in a public-friendly way) will be included in evaluation reports?

Answer:

The Partnership is looking to the proponent to suggest the best way to communicate information related to this evaluation. While graphics can be used, it is not mandatory.

30. Question:

Has CPAC engaged other national and provincial/territorial Indigenous organizations in this initiative as "other partners" or just the Metis National Council?

Answer:

The Métis National Council is the only National Indigenous Organization that is involved in the initiative. Other National Indigenous Organizations are involved in the work of the Partnership, but it not currently funded as a part of this initiative.

The list of all participating organizations can be found on our website under current work: <https://www.partnershipagainstcancer.ca/about-us/who-we-are/first-nations-inuit-metis/current-work/>

End of Addendum No. 1

SCHEDULE C - Pricing Sheet

Table 1: Budget by Deliverable.

Enter the budget and timelines against each milestone specified in Schedule E: Project Deliverables and Milestones. Specify any assumptions being considered as part of estimated effort and cost.

Please provide the following

- Hourly rate:

Deliverables	Effort (# or hours)	Rate (hourly rate)	Cost	Assumptions/ Constraints
Phase 1: Planning and Logistics (February - April 2021)				
Kick-off meeting (post contract signing) to set out project evaluation plan (e.g. deliverables, timelines and scope) and partner engagement plan (virtual and/or in-person)				
Regularly scheduled touchpoint meetings through project duration; develop meeting agenda and prepare materials as necessary				
Detailed workplan and engagement plan across phases 1-3, outlining key deliverable dates, analysis plan, and touchpoint meetings and review times				
Analysis of partner workbook feedback, including crafting the data collection plan				
Development of qualitative data collection tools (1 - focus group questions, 2 - semi-structured interview guides)				
Development of methods to integrate qualitative and quantitative data analysis and findings				
<i>Subtotal - Phase 1</i>				
Phase 2: Evaluation Implementation (May - December 2021)				

Qualitative data collection via two methods to be determined (e.g. interviews, focus groups, document review, surveys and/or administrative data collected by the Partnership)				
Quantitative data collection via two methods to be determined (e.g. partner's projects-specific data, survey data and/or administrative data collected by the Partnership)				
Preliminary data analysis and sharing of preliminary findings with the Partnership; includes engagement touchpoint with Partnership Executive team.				
<i>Subtotal- Phase 2</i>				
Phase 3: Evaluation Analysis and Synthesis (January - June 2022)				
Prepare preliminary analysis and draft product(s) for review and validation (by the Partnership and partners)				
Craft detailed evaluation report summarizing the methods, results and interpretation of the findings for the Initiative funded partners and the Partnership				
Summary deck highlighting key findings, stories of impact and recommendations for future work				
Presentation of findings back to the funded partners (virtual)				
Presentation of findings back to the Partnership				
Additional deliverables				
[Please add additional deliverables, if required]				
<i>Subtotal - Phase 3</i>				
HST				
Additional Expenses				
Grand Total				

Additional Expenses (by Phase)

Please provide a list of all additional expenses including but not limited to: administrative costs, out of pocket expenses, transportation, food etc.

Total Proposed Price (Agreement Ceiling Price for fees)

\$

SCHEDULE E - Project Deliverables and Milestones

The Proponent should provide a detailed work plan, including the deliverables, timelines and project team responsibilities for the performance of the Agreement.

Note: Please use weeks to outline when work will be completed. Deliverables 1 & 2 has been added below and examples to demonstrate what is required. Please remove these deliverables and add the relevant deliverables required to support your approach.

Deliverable/Milestone	Start	End	Responsibility
1. Kick off meeting with Program team	Week 1	Week 1	Proponent
2. Review program information	Week 1	Week 3	Proponent