

Summary of Questions & Answers related to the MNO Request for Proposals

OARGP – Ontario Aboriginal Responsible Gambling Program

Q's & A's from / to prospective RFP proponents

Deadline for submission of written questions is Friday, June 14, 2013

1. QUESTION:

Does the total amount (75K) include travel costs for the consulting team to meet with the OARGP member organizations and presentations to the steering committee? Will MNO take on costs related to hosting the event i.e. event accommodation, travel for member organizations etc?

ANSWER:

Yes the 75K is inclusive for consultants travel costs, etc. MNO does have the budget for hosting the OARGP members meetings, including travel, etc.

2. QUESTION:

One of the proposal response guidelines includes a "data collection plan" with timelines. Can you please clarify what data you are referring to e.g. data collection that is part of the final evaluation framework, data collection that is related to project deliverables etc.

ANSWER:

Data collection in reference to the project deliverables.

3. QUESTION:

The RFP requires a literature review. We would like to clarify the scope of this review. Can you please specify if you are referring only to literature related to Aboriginal problem gambling prevention broadly or to Aboriginal problem gambling prevention evaluation frameworks, performance measure and evaluation tools. Does the MNO have a sense of the scope of this literature?

ANSWER:

We had in mind a broad overview that might spark discussions / generate new ideas about what is going on around the country in the area of Aboriginal Problem Gambling and as well, yes, also interested in evaluation frameworks, performance measures and evaluation tools. The MNO has a limited knowledge of what is out there.

4. QUESTION:

Can you share any of the previous evaluation plans or reports that have been developed for this? It would be very helpful to know how much has been done, how far things progressed and to really see what still needs to be done.

ANSWER:

Any previous studies referred to in an RFP are not provided for review for the purpose of preparing a submission of a proposal responding to the RFP.

5. QUESTION:

Can you tell me why the group is developing a framework at this time?

An evaluation framework is generally done at the beginning of a program cycle, so that organizations / departments / programs know how they are going to be evaluated. I'm just wondering if there is important information I should know about the timing of this RFP.

ANSWER:

Some aspects of previous evaluations that have been done have been implemented. As the program has evolved, there has been an identified need to develop an evaluation framework that is specific to aboriginal organizations, and other assessment tools as described in the RFP.

6. QUESTION:

I would like to get some clarity about section 3.4 regarding the final product. All of the bullets listed here are all of the pieces that we will gather and use to review, analyze and develop the Evaluation Framework. But the actual framework is not listed as an actual deliverable so I just want to clarify to make sure I understand.

ANSWER:

Yes, the evaluation framework is one of the deliverables.

7. QUESTION:

Is there any additional information you can tell me about this database at the University of Waterloo? In the RFP it is called COMAP. What is in the database? How is the MOHLTC involved with it? How is it used by the groups?

ANSWER:

COMAP stands for Centre for Community Mapping and you can find out more, general information about them / the concept on the web. In the last 2 years, the MOHLTC has contracted with COMAP to house and manage the reporting system database that the OARGP members must use to report back to the Ministry. For the most part a fairly standard reporting system - activity reporting, budget ask and reconciliation, user stats,

etcetera. The MOHLTC is the primary recipient of the reporting data but the OARGP members also use it to report up to their individual political / administrative structure. The initial system was not user friendly - Univ of Waterloo has made / is making improvements to the system.

8. QUESTION:

Is there an ideal date when the steering committee would like to have the "Final presentation to discuss finds and recommendations proposed for the written report"?

ANSWER:

Our funder for this RFP is of the opinion that the work should not take more than 3 months to complete, hence, late September / early October would be the timeline for presentation of the Final Report.

9. QUESTION:

Can you provide a list of key stakeholders and location from each of the 8 member organizations? For example I know Nishnawbe Aski Nation member represents 49 communities but only has 1 head office in Thunder Bay for consultation purposes. However, Ontario Federation of Indian Friendship Centres or MNO have several offices, so is it the head office of these organizations?

ANSWER:

Head office locations for the member organizations are as follows:

- NAN: Thunder Bay
- ONWA: Thunder Bay
- AIAI: London
- KC: Kenora
- MNO: Ottawa
- UOI: Curve Lake
- OFIFC: Toronto
- IFN: Noble

Given the broad geographic area we would expect the in person meetings to be held in Toronto. Waterloo also for the COMAP representative.

10. QUESTION:

Will you post or circulate all questions from interested proponents regarding this proposal?

ANSWER:

YES!