

Questions and Answers (Q&A)

Posting #3 – April 13, 2018

Question 1.

We have reviewed the RFP Guidelines and Forms and do not see a limit regarding level of funding per project or per proposal. Is there a funding limit?

Answer: While total available funding for distribution across all successful proposals is approximately \$3.5 M, MET has not indicated a funding limit per project or per proposal. As outlined on **page 20-21** in the RFP **Guidelines**, costs must be reasonable, realistic, and representative of the project(s).

See also:

- Funding Principles (p. 12)
 - Awarding of Points (p. 31)
 - Negotiation of Agreement (p. 33)
-

Question 2.

With regard to project costs, is there a defined limit for administrative costs as per a portion of total project costs? If yes, does this same limit apply to proposals involving or partnership?

Answer: MET has not defined a range or limit for administrative costs as per a portion of total project costs. As outlined above, costs must be reasonable, realistic, and representative of the project(s). When preparing the Proposed Project Budget (Form B), all costs must be itemized. “Administrative costs” cannot be entered into the budget as one item with one cost.

Question 3.

Stream 2 (MNYF) defines newcomer youth as 11-24 years of age. Is there the opportunity to include programming for children from ages 6-11 in our proposal?

Answer: While Stream 2 addresses newcomer youth (11-24 years), Stream 1 sets no age limit on eligible beneficiaries/clients and therefore provides the opportunity to propose programming for any eligible beneficiaries/clients, regardless of age.

Manitoba Education and Training Integration Supports for Newcomers RFP# MET-ISN-001-2018

Q&A Posting #3 – April 13, 2018 . . . cont'd.

Question 4.

Are there any restrictions on the *type* of activity included in a proposal?

Answer: MET has not set any restrictions on *type* of activity included in a proposal. We have however set guidelines for each stream outlined in Part One of the RFP **Guidelines (pages 10-17)**. When considering an activity for your proposal, please review:

- Funding Principles
- Purpose and Priorities
- Activities of Interest
- Outcomes

Also see Part Two: Project Content (pages 18-19).

Question 5.

Page 11 in the RFP **Guidelines** indicates that international students (i.e. temporary resident with a valid study permit) are eligible clients. Does the *type* of learning institution the international student is attending affect the student's eligibility under the RFP?

Answer: No. Client eligibility is based on the individual holding a valid study permit, not the type of learning institution he/she is attending.

Question 6.

Regarding the Organizational Chart referred to in the list of Supporting Documents on **page 22** of the RFP **Guidelines**, could you please clarify what you require? Our organization has not yet developed an organizational chart.

Answer: We require a standard organizational chart that illustrates your organization's structure and relationship between areas/departments, management/staff, number of staff and their roles. It should be simple and clear. Example organizational charts can be found by searching online.

Question 7.

a. Regarding the list of Supporting Documents on **page 22** in the RFP **Guidelines**, we are a school division with a *Board of Trustees* not a *Board of Directors*. May we provide a list of our *Board of Trustees* instead?

Answer: Yes.

Manitoba Education and Training Integration Supports for Newcomers RFP# MET-ISN-001-2018

Q&A Posting #3 – April 13, 2018 . . . cont'd.

b. As a school division, should we provide an organizational chart of our community program, or school division, or both?

Answer: Assuming the responding organization is the community program, an organizational chart reflecting the community program would be appropriate.

Question 8.

We are considering a partnership with another organization. Should we submit separate proposals or a single proposal?

Answer: Where a proposal involves a partnership, only one organization is the Respondent (whichever organization is agreed upon). The Respondent submits one complete proposal. The completed Form A – Part 2 represents the **entire project content**; the completed Form B represents the **total project costs**. The partnering (secondary) organization prepares a signed **Statement from Partner Organization** (a supporting document) indicating its role in the project. The *role* described in the Statement does not need to repeat the detail provided on Form A – Part 2. If the proposal receives funding, and if there are costs to be paid to the secondary organization, the Respondent would be responsible for arranging payment to the secondary organization.

If each organization prefers to be a Respondent and submit separate proposals, you would need to 'divide' your project and its budget between organizations. That might get rather complicated on several levels – particularly around proposal preparation and proposal evaluation.

Question 9.

If a proposed project included short-term (5-6 week) wage subsidies for participants, would this be considered an eligible expense?

Answer: If wage subsidies are an integral component of a proposal, respondents can include this expense in their funding request, recognizing that it may or may not be approved for inclusion in the final negotiated Agreements. There are many factors to consider including availability of funding, the total amount of funding negotiated across all agreements, the strength of the proposal, the significance of the wage subsidy to the proposal, etc. Wage subsidies must also lead to long-term sustainable jobs (part-time or full-time); wage subsidies would not be considered if intended as a work experience only component of a program. When preparing the Proposed Project Budget (Form B), wage subsidies should be included under "Other Costs" or if preferred, you may prepare a separate Form B representing wage subsidies only.

Manitoba Education and Training Integration Supports for Newcomers RFP# MET-ISN-001-2018

Q&A Posting #3 – April 13, 2018 . . . cont'd.

Question 10.

a. On page 11 in the RFP Guidelines, Indigenous people are not listed as Eligible Beneficiaries/Clients. Does this mean that Indigenous people can only participate in this RFP as Respondents or as partner organizations?

Answer: The list of Eligible Beneficiaries/Clients includes “Communities”. Several of the outcomes stated in Stream 1 and Stream 2 focus on the engagement of newcomers by a broader community, or the connection between newcomers and members of a community. Within the context of the defined beneficiaries/clients and the targeted outcomes provided, there are many opportunities to include Indigenous individuals, groups, or communities in a proposal.

b. In the same list, you refer to *Temporary residents (and dependents) with a valid work or study permit*. To clarify, does this refer to Temporary Foreign Workers (TFWs)?

Answer: Yes. It includes TFWs and their dependents.

Question 11.

To whom should our Letters of Reference be addressed?

Answer: MET apologizes for overlooking this detail in the RFP Guidelines. Letters of Reference can be addressed to the attention of: **MET-Proposal Evaluation Committee**. This matches the label information provided for Envelope 3 on **page 27** in the RFP **Guidelines**. However, if your Letters of Reference are complete, we will accept them as prepared.

Question 12.

Is the province able to provide landings data/newcomer arrivals for Winnipeg by area (sub-division/ neighbourhood/Ward, etc.)?

Answer: Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada (IRRC) has publicly available immigration data on the [IRCC Open Data Portal](#). Please visit the portal on a consistent basis for monthly, quarterly, annual and ad hoc updates. MET has created two tables (see next page) using data available on the Portal. Statistics on landings broken down to specific areas of Winnipeg are not available. The uptake of services in neighbourhoods/areas of Winnipeg could indicate settlement trends but the province does not currently have statistics formally compiled or analyzed for public release.

Manitoba Education and Training Integration Supports for Newcomers RFP# MET-ISN-001-2018

Q&A Posting #3 – April 13, 2018 . . . cont'd.

Permanent Residents to Manitoba by Census Metropolitan Area				
	2015	2016	2017	2018 (Jan-Feb)
Winnipeg	12,390	14,070	11,835	1,570
Brandon	700	635	645	85
Steinbach	190	215	255	20
Thompson	135	150	255	25
Portage la Prairie	95	105	100	15
Other	1,390	1,650	1,605	310
Manitoba Total	14,900	16,820	14,700	2,020

Source: *Canada - Admissions of Permanent Residents by Province/Territory and Census Metropolitan Area of Intended Destination (2017 ranking), January 2015 - February 2018*, located on the Open Data Portal at <https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/f7e5498e-0ad8-4417-85c9-9b8aff9b9eda>.

Values are rounded to the closest multiple of 5. As a result of rounding, data may not sum to the totals indicated.
Data are preliminary and subject to change.

Permanent Resident Admissions to Manitoba by Immigration Category, 2016 - February 2018				
Immigration Category	2015	2016	2017	2018 (Jan-Feb)
Economic	11,250	10,690	10,055	1,460
<i>PNP</i>	10,260	9,960	9,425	1,255
Sponsored Family	1,845	2,380	2,475	340
Resettled Refugee & Protected Person in Canada	1,770	3,730	2,130	205
All Other Immigration	35	25	30	15
Manitoba Total	14,900	16,820	14,700	2,020

Source: *Canada - Admissions of Permanent Residents by Province/Territory of Intended Destination and Immigration Category, January 2015 - February 2018*, located on the Open Data Portal at <https://open.canada.ca/data/en/dataset/f7e5498e-0ad8-4417-85c9-9b8aff9b9eda>.

Values are rounded to the closest multiple of 5. As a result of rounding, data may not sum to the totals indicated.
Data are preliminary and subject to change.

End of Q&A Posting #3 – April 13, 2018

This is the FINAL Q&A Posting for RFP# MET-ISN-001-2018