

August 21, 2018

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS - RFP No. RP801-2018-03

FOR Evaluation of Current State of Cancer Clinical Trials in Canada

CLARIFICATION - QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

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

1. Question:

Proposal Details

Is the expectation that the duration of this engagement will begin early to mid-October 2018 and end June 30th, 2019 or that the work for this project must be delivered within that time frame?

a. What milestones does this timing reflect?

Answer:

High-level timelines for the project are listed below:

1. Develop and submit a draft report on February 28, 2019
2. Present the report findings and recommendations to CCRA and Partnership stakeholders on March 18th, 2019.
3. Submit a final report on March 31, 2019.

The agreement end date of June 30th 2019 was included to incorporate 3 months of contingency in order to minimize the need of any agreement extensions.

2. Question:

Can the physical copies of the proposal be hand-delivered by us or must it be mailed/couriered?

Answer:

Yes, Proponents can hand deliver the physical copies.

3. Question:

CPAC/CCRA Organization

What would be the core project team structure on the CPAC side – would we be working with both CPAC and CCRA Executive Office team members?

a. Would there also be a broader project team, for example, comprising CCRA members?

Answer:

The CCRA Executive office comprises the core project team. The successful Proponent will work most closely with the CCRA Executive Director and other team members if required. The successful Proponent will also work with members of the Partnership's Digital Strategy and IT teams for the evaluation of CancerClinicalTrials.ca. Working groups of CCRA members will be established as necessary. The CCRA Board will also be a source of information for the successful Proponent.

4. Question:

What degree of involvement will the CPAC and/or CCRA team have with the Proponent over the course of this project?

a. How will core and extended team participation differ?

Answer:

The CCRA team will have regular meetings with the successful Proponent, will provide feedback on drafts, make connections to key players and provide advice and guidance on the the work. It is expected that the successful Proponent carry out work and complete tasks.

a. The core team will be more closely involved in the ongoing operations of the project, whereas the extended team would work more in an advisory capacity.

5. Question:

What groups does CPAC envision as the audiences of the project outcome - the final report on the future state of clinical trials in Canada?

Answer:

There are several different audiences for the final report including, the CCRA board and members, the Partnership's Board and relevant partners, other partners in the clinical trials environment (i.e, 3CTN, CTG etc). Recommendations from the report will also be shared with the Partnership's Strategy team to help inform the refresh of the Canadian Strategy for Cancer Control, and might be shared with relevant decision makers and Health Canada.

6. Question:

What metrics or measurements of success are currently in place against CPAC's funding allocation?

Answer:

You can refer to the Annual report which will be published on the 3CTN website <https://3ctn.ca/> in September. The successful Proponent will also receive the Scientific Advisory Board 36 month review.

7. **Question:**

Research Approach

What kinds of assessments with researchers, patients, and other groups has CPAC undertaken in the past to evaluate of the impact and influence of the Canadian Cancer Clinical Trials Network (3CTN) or Canadian Cancer Trials Group (CTG)?

Answer:

The Partnership has not undertaken any evaluations of the impact and influences of these groups. CTG is independent and might have undergone internal and/or external review but the Partnership was not involved in any such activities. 3CTN was reviewed by a Scientific Advisory Board at months 18 and 36 of their first 4-year mandate. The successful Proponent will be provided with all that information. 3CTN's Portfolio committee meets every six months, a current objective is to develop a set of rigorous criteria that will help to determine how high impact trials are identified.

8. **Question:**

How does 3CTN monitor and measure its progress in each of the three areas of concern (i.e. trial recruitment, quality and efficiency; communication across sites about trial opportunities; and patient and public involvement) identified in the 2011 Report on the State of Cancer Clinical Trials in Canada?

Answer:

3CTN anticipates release of their annual report that addresses each of the areas of concern in September 2018. 3CTN also produces reports for their governance structure, centres and funders. These reports and others will be shared with the successful Proponent.

9. **Question:**

What methods did the Partnership use for its internal evaluation of the Canadian Clinical Trials website in 2017 (i.e. what research methods were used)?

- a. What demographics of users has 3CTN conducted previous assessments of the Canadian Cancer Trials Website with (e.g. patients, clinicians, nurses, etc.)?

Answer:

The internal evaluation conducted interviews with appropriate Partnership staff who have familiarity with the Canadian Cancer Trials website. Additionally, the internal evaluators provided their own working knowledge of the site, based on years of administrative maintenance. Web statistics were collected from Google Analytics.

10. Question:

We have an individual we would like to bring on as part of our team to provide additional subject matter expertise. This person is currently a member of the Audit and Monitoring Committee for the Canadian Cancer Trials Group (CTG). Their role as part of our team on this project for the Partnership would involve providing advice and input to our team based on their knowledge of the cancer trial landscape in Canada - the individual would not be involved directly in data collection or analysis and we would of course declare their role with CTG in any written reports. We wanted to ensure this would not be perceived as a conflict of interest, can you please confirm if this is ok?

Answer:

CTG has no formal connection with the Partnership. We are in agreement that engaging with this individual would be not be an issue.

11. Question:

The RFP on page 6 requests "Proponents should also submit 4 electronic copy in Microsoft Word format or portable document format (PDF), sent by e-mail to the e-mail address shown below before the Proposal Submission Deadline." - I assume the number 4 is a typo that should read 1?

Answer:

Thank you for advising of this error, as it should read "an", instead of the number 4. Single electronic copy required for each part.

12. Question:

Regarding required references (under 1.8 Submission Requirements, page 7). Based on items d) and h) it sounds as though we need three references for the company as a whole, as well as two references for each individual that will be part of our team, is that correct? If so, can the references be the same for the company and the individuals or would you like separate references for each? For example, if we have two consultants as part of our team that have worked on all the same projects, can the three company references also double as the two references for each consultant? Or do we need to provide 7 different references (3 overall and two each for the two consultants)?

Answer:

It is correct that you need three references for the company as a whole, as well as two references for each individual that will be part of our team. The references can be the same for both the company and the individuals.

13. Question:

For the sample evaluation report, would you like that appended to the technical proposal or provided as a separate document?

Answer:

Please appended to the technical proposal.

14. Question:

Other than what is publicly available online, are there any documents related to program planning or evaluation for canadiancancertrials.ca or 3CTN that can be provided to proponents to help inform our development of the evaluation approach in the proposal (e.g., objectives/anticipated outcomes, logic models, evaluation plans/frameworks, detailed findings of the Partnership's 2017 evaluation of canadiancancertrials.ca, etc.)?

Answer:

The successful Proponent will be provided with any additional internal documents.

15. Question:

Is there an existing list or database of end users of canadiancancertrials.ca? If so, what type of contact information do you have for these end users and approximately how many individuals are in the database/list? If there is no existing list, can you provide insight into how end users could be identified and contacted?

Answer:

The existing database (as of March31/18) has a subscriber list of 2528. We collect name, email address and cancer trial criteria, such as disease site, province, city, and trial centre.

16. Question:

The RFP describes other engagement work the Partnership is undertaking with some of the same stakeholders that may also be included in this evaluation (i.e., the work to create a Pan-Canadian Vision for Cancer Research, and the refresh of the Canadian Strategy for Cancer Control (CSCC)). The RFP indicates that information will be shared with the proponent for this work, but will it be possible to have any input at the development phase into the questions or information collected through these other engagement processes? Additionally, will it be possible to organize shared events (e.g., stakeholders could participate in one session to provide input into both the vision for cancer research and the evaluation in this RFP)?

Answer:

The overall approach to engagement efforts for the evaluation would need to be coordinated with the work to create the Vision and the refresh of the Canadian Strategy for Cancer Control, including exploring options on the approach to the questions and feedback.

17. Question:

What is the expectation around providing materials and/or reaching out to key informants in French (e.g., especially those in Quebec or New Brunswick)? Is the Partnership able to provide translation of materials (e.g., surveys, interview guides, other required documents) for French stakeholders, or is this the responsibility of the proponent? Does the final report need to be translated into French and is this the proponent's responsibility?

Answer:

The Partnership is responsible for translation costs.

18. Question:

The RFP documents state that the Evaluation of Current State of Cancer Clinical Trials in Canada will become a key input into the development of the Pan-Canadian Vision for Cancer Research. While this RFP is underway, the Partnership is also leading the procurement of a consultancy to lead the development of the Pan-Canadian Vision. As these two related projects are out for competitive tender at the same time, does CPAC (and/or CCRA) have an opinion or view with respect to the prospect of both projects going to the same consultancy/team?

Answer:

We are open to receiving applications from the same consultancy/team for both open calls. Separate proposals are required for each, and each will be reviewed independently.

19. Question:

Are stakeholders aware of the evaluation? If yes, what has been communicated to stakeholder groups about their involvement with the evaluation?

Answer:

The Canadian Cancer Clinical Trials Network (3CTN) and its host organization Ontario Institute for Cancer Research are aware of the evaluation and are supportive and willing partners. As a result of overlap in leadership the Canadian Cancer Trials Group is also aware of the evaluation.

20. Question:

What level of support can be expected from CPAC/CCRA in the evaluation (eg. encourage stakeholder participation in the evaluation)?

Answer:

The CCRA intends to be involved throughout the lifecycle of the project and will play roles necessary to support the success of the project.

21. Question:

Page 23 of the RFP indicates engagements conducted by the Partnership will provide an additional stream of information as an input to the evaluation. Has the work on this begun and what is the timing to receive this data? Also, will the successful proponent be able to see the scope of the questions asked by the Partnership in advance of the Planning and Definition phase of the evaluation, to avoid gaps or duplication?

Answer:

Work for the additional stream of information is in the planning phase now and will be fully implemented in September. The **successful** Proponent will be provided with the scope of questions and will work with the CCRA Executive Office to align, leverage and avoid duplication with other ongoing informative work.

22. Question:

The RFP indicates there was an internal review done on the canadiancancertrials.ca website in 2017. In addition to the results provided in the RFP, will the full report be shared with the successful Proponent?

Answer:

The successful Proponent will receive the report and all other relevant materials.

23. Question:

Is CPAC/CCRA expecting that current or former researchers that have received funding for cancer clinical trials in Canada be part of the consulting team (as a subject matter expert), or would this be considered a conflict of interest?

Answer:

CPAC/CCRA recognizes the importance of engaging with subject matter experts. All potential conflicts would need to be declared. Experts who are currently engaged with the Partnership would be in conflict. Experts who were not eligible to be a member of the team could be considered for key informant interviews.