

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

For Canadian Partnership Against Cancer's Approach to Evaluation Activities

RFP No. RP313-2016-01

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

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

1. Question:

How does CPAC intend to measure the “five (5) years of experience”, e.g. one project per year for the past five years, 60 person-months of consulting contracts, etc.?

Answer:

CPAC is looking for at least 5 years of consulting work on multiple projects of similar or relevant scale and type that target organization-wide evaluation capacity, business effectiveness and process improvement. This may include but is not limited to one or more project per year over the past five years, or 60 person-months of consulting contracts.

2. Question:

What does the bidder have to present as information to demonstrate “five (5) years of experience” in health sector and in performance measurement and evaluation?

Answer:

Information demonstrating experience may be presented in different ways. For example, this could be shown through the résumé section, and parts C, D and E of the submission package which outlines:

C) a description of the relevant qualifications and experience of the Proponent organization and each candidate proposed for each key role;

D) descriptions or case studies of three similar or relevant projects excluding the Partnership;

E) references for the three similar projects described in section d(excluding the Partnership) successfully completed by the Proponent organization within the last three years (Schedule D Form 1);

3. Question:

Do the examples with references for three similar or relevant projects completed within the last three (3) years have to have been done under contract with the bidder, or can they be projects completed by the proposed team member resources?

Answer:

Similar or relevant projects can be completed under contract by the bidder or by the proposed team member resources.

4. Question:

What are the practical implications of the statement “The Agreement shall require that the successful proponent provide all deliverables in accordance with AODA and its regulations”?

Answer:

This legislation is not applicable to the service noted in Schedule A. This language is standard in all Requests for Proposals.

5. Question:

Does this [1.6 No Guarantee of Volume of Work or Exclusivity of Agreement] mean that the Partnership could break the statement of work into pieces and contract different bidders to complete them?

Answer:

The Partnership reserves the right to accept Proposals from more than one Proponent.

6. Question:

Would a learning management system / eLearning solution be an acceptable means to track and allocate high quality evaluations to staff?

Answer:

CPAC is not looking to develop a management system to track and manage evaluations activities, including resourcing. Among other project deliverables outlined in the RFP, the successful proponent will provide:

- A framework to guide the management of program-run evaluations
- Recommendations to strengthen the Partnership's model for guiding, managing and supporting evaluation activities
- A phased action plan that prioritizes the recommendations and includes approaches, tools, and operational considerations to facilitate implementation and communication of these recommendations

Additional details can be found on page 21-23 of the RFP.

7. Question:

Do proponents have to follow the new policy that came into effect on July 1st from Treasury Board regarding Evaluations?

Answer:

Yes, the development of a performance measurement strategy and evaluation framework that conforms to Treasury Board of Canada guidelines and Policy on Evaluation is stipulated in CPAC's funding agreement. Any new policy or directive related to measurement and evaluation would be relevant inputs to the project. CPAC seeks a vendor that takes into account relevant inputs in providing analyses and recommendations to address the aims of the project.

8. Question:

Does the framework developed need to be flexible in considering the capacity of partners or should the framework be a way to help partners develop their capacity?

Answer:

The framework is not a way to help partners develop their evaluation capacity. The framework developed should allow for flexibility in how evaluations are planned and managed while ensuring a focus on outcomes and impact. This includes considering the capacity of partners to comply with performance measurement and evaluation requirements that may be part of funded work.

9. Question:

Do you have a description of the external partner's capacity at this stage of the process?

Answer:

No, CPAC does not have a description of our partners' evaluation capacity. CPAC works with a number of different partners across provinces and territories, including First Nations, Inuit and Métis partners, which have varying evaluation expertise and capacity.

10. Question:

Can you clarify the following roles: project team, champion, program team?

Answer:

This work is a project of CPAC's Strategy Team. The project team consists of members of the Strategy Team, including the Manager, Strategy and Evaluation Development, who will be the main contact for the successful proponent, and other CPAC staff with evaluation experience. The project team will provide input that represents a cross-section of the organization.

The project champion is the VP of Strategy who has ultimate responsibility for the project and will broker discussions with CPAC's executive team and senior management.

Program team refers to the various teams at CPAC accountable for planning and implementing collaborative initiatives and projects with partners.

11. Question:

Who are the external stakeholders?

Answer:

The external stakeholders are our project partners, both those who have conducted evaluations for CPAC as a part of their project requirement and those who have been involved in answering evaluation questions. The successful proponent would need to contact them to get further insight into their participation in evaluations. The various project teams at CPAC may also be consulted.

12. Question:

How many program teams currently exist at the Partnership?

Answer:

There are nine program teams overseeing 22 initiatives as part of CPAC's 2012-2017 program of work.

13. Question:

How many evaluations have been completed in the last 5 years?

Answer:

There has been one organization-level evaluation in the current mandate. There have been five large program evaluations and 10 smaller project or initiative evaluations completed to date in the current mandate.

14. Question:

How many of those evaluations completed will the successful proponent be required to look at?

Answer:

The successful proponent is expected to work with the project team to determine the appropriate sample of completed program-run evaluations to review as inputs to the project. The final number and kind of evaluations to review should represent the range of evaluation activities across the organization.

15. Question:

How do you define “similar projects”?

Answer:

Similar projects would include projects that looked at evolving components of an organization’s business model, process improvement or business effectiveness, with the ultimate aim of achieving outcomes and driving progress, value and impact. Projects would need to be of similar complexity and include analysis of and advice to organizations that have a national or pan-Canadian scope and work with partners across the country.

16. Question:

Does the projects have to be “completed” to be included as a similar project within the proponent’s submission?

Answer:

It is at the discretion of the proponent to reference projects in progress deemed relevant to the RFP to effectively showcase its experience and expertise.

17. Question:

Can focus groups be completed virtually?

Answer:

Yes. Many CPAC partners are located across the country, and communication with them would likely be virtual.

18. Question:

Why is this work required at this time? Why now?

Answer:

CPAC continues to evolve as an organization and as our emphasis on measurement and evaluation deepens, we want to strengthen our approach to assess the outcome and impact of the work to advance Canada's cancer strategy for the next phase of our work.