



Addendum #1
RFP IRGR01-23
Inclusive Regional Governance
Alberni-Clayoquot Regional District

Please review the following information before submitting your response to IRGR01-23.

1. How many First Nation partners are referred to in the RFP? Which Nations?

a. There is a total of 10 First Nation in the Region.

Non-Treaty

- Hupacasath FN
- Tseshaht FN
- Tla-o-qui-aht FN
- Ahousaht FN
- Hesquiaht FN
- Ditidaht FN

Treaty

- Huu-ay-aht FN
 - Uchucklesaht Tribe
 - Yuułuʔiłʔatḥ Government
 - Toquaht FN
-
- The 4 Treaty Nations above have a representative that sit as voting members of on the Alberni-Clayoquot Regional District (ACRD) Board.
 - The Hupacasath, Tseshaht and Tla-o-qui-aht First Nation are interested in exploring having a seat on the Board.
 - Discussions with the Ahousaht, Hesquiaht and Ditidaht First Nations are still needed.

2. Does the ACRD currently have a project team and does it include First Nations partners already.

- a. Currently there is a team with the Province and other Region Districts.
- b. The Alberni-Clayoquot Regional District team consists of the Chief Administrative Officer, ACRD Board Chair, ACRD Vice Chair, some ACRD Directors, and representatives from Hupacasath and Tseshaht Nations.



3. What are the desired outcomes for this project, based on the relatively short timelines? (Not so much in terms of the deliverables, but the anticipated or desired outcome).
 - a. This is listed in Schedule B of the RFP: The intent of the work is to enable regional discussions that will reveal the key themes, interest, and questions to be pursued in the consultation and development of legislation to meet the varied needs of First Nations and the ACRD.
In summary, the ACRD hopes to identify and discuss the interests, values, barriers, and mitigative measures that could exist around the application of new legislation, (still undrafted), that would facilitate having non-treaty Nations sit as voting members of the ACRD Board.
As this potentially impacts existing members of the ACRD, we would also hope to identify the key aspects of a plan for conducting future discussions, (community or other), regarding this possible change.
4. Does the funding for this project support honouring people's wisdom and labour through honoraria as well as funding for reducing barriers (e.g., transportation, childcare, etc.)? If so, is this included in the anticipated consultant fees or external to our proposed budget?
 - a. Yes. The ACRD does have an identified budget for these important elements. This budget is separate from the budget for anticipated consultant fees.
5. Is funding for venue rentals, catering, A/V for accessibility, etc. anticipated to be included in consultant fees or external to the proposed budget.
 - a. The ACRD has a venue to host meetings. If there are alternative sites identified, these site costs would likely come from the same budget as for the anticipated consultant fees. Elements, such as catering, or A/V could come from a separate budget, but this would need to be discussed and established in advance with the consultant.
6. What is the current relationship with host First Nations?
 - a. The ACRD Board and Staff have very good relationships with many of the First Nations (FN) in the region. There are 4 Treaty First Nations that have representatives on the ACRD Board. Three of the non-treaty first nations, Tla-o-qui-aht FN, Hupacasath FN, and Tseshaht FN are interested in exploring having a representative on the ACRD Board. Discussions with the Ahousaht, Hesquiaht and Ditidaht First Nations are still needed.



7. What is the capacity for each Nation to come to the conversation and how many members do you anticipate might be involved from each Nation?
 - a. We have held one meeting with July which included representatives from the ACRD Board and Staff and two non-treaty first nations. The Chief Councillors from the Tseshaht FN and the Hupacasath FN were in attendance. Currently, there appears to be a capacity for each Nation to attend or, in some cases, host others rather than travel. This capacity is an ongoing consideration depending on when the meetings take place and who expresses a desire to attend.
8. Who do you anticipate would be representing host Nations (i.e., elected and/or hereditary leaders, other members)?
 - a. To date, each Nation that has expressed a desire to participate, has identified and appointed who they would like to represent them at this discussion table. These representatives have included some staff and some elected officials, including Chief Councillors and representative from Council.
9. Can the ACRD clarify which of the objectives in the scope of work they would like to see achieved within the \$45k funding allowance? And within the March 31, 2024, interim report? These would assist in prioritizing the work.
 - a. The ACRD is aiming to achieve all elements identified within the RFP. It is challenging to prioritize which should be advanced before others. This stated, we would prefer to see a sound process rather than to advance any particular aspect. We also acknowledge there may be a number of ways to structuring this and encourage proponents to submit approaches based on their experience and knowledge.
10. Is the ACRD open to focusing this scope of work (i.e. excluding optional work) on the summary, primarily desktop analysis and relationship building for future phases?
 - a. Given that we already have an established working group, the ACRD would prefer to advance all three areas with those Nations that are currently choosing to engage in the process. It may necessary to plan on having subsequent discussion with other Nations if and when they choose. This noted, we also acknowledge there may be a better way of structuring this and encourage proponents to submit approaches based on their experience and knowledge.
11. Is it the intent of ACRD to complete all the objectives by June 30, 2024 (approx. 6 month), 18 months (the maximum term of contract), or neither/undefined?



November 16, 2023

- a. We do not expect to complete all objectives by June 30, 2024. It is the intent of the ACRD to have significantly advanced the discussions but understand that it may be that we have simply had sufficient dialogue to identify the high-level elements that the group believes would benefit from more comprehensive exchange. If this were to be the case, then we would like to be able to identify a process through which these comprehensive discussions could be achieved.
12. Meaningful engagement would require that the First Nation communities within the region be consulted on both the subject (inclusive regional governance) and the process. Has ACRD done work on this? Please provide direction on how proponents should make allowance for this engagement, likely within their optional phases of the work, without this prior relationship building?
- a. We have held one meeting in July which included representatives from the ACRD Board and Staff and two non-treaty first nations. The Chief Councillors from the Tseshaht FN and the Hupacasath FN were in attendance. At this meeting we discussed details regarding the subject and the process. We believe there is a benefit to having a similar meeting again once we have a successful proponent to work with. The meeting would likely be in-person, with a hybrid option that allows those who cannot travel the opportunity to attend virtually. As we may not see all 10 Nations actively participating, it will be important to ensure that we plan for how we will maintain effective sharing of information. Part of the complexity of this work, will be to advance discussions while acknowledging that it will not be fully representative of all the Nations. We hope that by keeping an open venue for participation, as well as consistent methods for sharing the details of our ongoing dialogue, that some will have a greater ability to provide input when and if they choose. Should a Nation express a desire for more detailed engagement with their elected body and/or community, we would work with them to develop a plan, a budget and identify possible mechanisms for funding.
13. Travel is likely required to each the First Nation communities as part of this project. The travel costs and engagement time alone likely exceed the project budget. Can the ACRD provide direction on how proponents should budget for this, specifically with regards to timing?
- a. Although not ideal, we believe that it is reasonable to plan for more detailed meetings with the three non-treaty first nations, Tla-o qui-aht FN, Hupacasath FN, and Tseshaht FN, that have expressed interest at this time. There will likely be some benefit to including further direct discussion with the 4 Treaty Nations as a later phase. It would also be beneficial to roughly consider costs for discussions with the Ahousaht, Hesquiaht and Ditidaht First Nations, as this would facilitate securing possible grant funds that we could apply for if and when needed.



14. Is the ACRD open to having the consultant support them with securing further funding?
 - a. Yes. Although the ACRD is already planning on advancing with provincial community to community grant applications, we do not believe that these are the only grant options available to us. We would appreciate the ability to work with the successful proponent to secure additional sources of funding.

15. Has the ACRD explored securing funding contributions from First Nation partners on this initiative? These would likely come through grant funding only available to First Nations (e.g., NRT DAEF).
 - a. No. We have not explored this option yet. The ACRD would however, be open to exploring these options with First Nations partners provided this does not remove other priorities/opportunities the Nations may have for the possible funding.

16. Will the evaluation of price be based on this scope of work (\$45k) or the overall budget (including optional phases)?
 - a. The evaluation will consider both. The ACRD is seeking to find the best partner to help achieve all phases of the work. The contract is based on value and thus includes all elements identified in the RFP. Although we hope the outcome helps generate positive change to provincial legislation, it is the quality of the dialogue and strength of the continuing relationship we share that is most valued in this initiative.

17. Does the ACRD have an anticipated overall budget for this project (i.e., all phases, including those not funded)?
 - a. We currently do not have a specified budget. However, our experience would suggest that all phases would likely require a doubling of the existing grant funds. This depends on many factors not limited to meeting format, and degree of interest and availability from the Nations who are choosing to participate.

18. Does the budget include ACRD staff time, and if not, what does ACRD staff participation look like? I am thinking about communications and CAO time primarily, but possibly Development Services, or even the Fire Chief.
 - a. ACRD Staff Time will be the responsibility of the ACRD not the successful proponent. We will work with the successful proponent to ensure that staff time is planned and budgeted appropriated. This initiative is an overt strategic priority of the ACRD and staff time allocations will be made in accordance with this priority.



-
-
19. Has each of the 6 non-treaty Nations explicitly expressed a desire to participate in this process?
- a. Not currently. Some Nations are already participating, some have simply expressed a desire to be kept informed, while others have not yet replied. Part of the complexity of this work, will be to advance discussions while acknowledging that it will not be fully representative of all the Nations. We hope that by keeping an open venue for participation and sharing details of our progress, that some will have a greater ability to provide input when and if they choose.
20. Can the ACRD Clarify whether Treaty or Non-Treaty First Nations are referenced in the following:
- i. from page 18 of the proposal, “Determine and evaluate points of interaction with local First Nations in relation to specific structure, service profile, and approach to regional decision-making.”
 - a. The ACRD is prioritizing the work with the Non-Treaty Nations as provincial legislation currently prevents them from participating at a Board level with the ACRD. This noted, we also understand that any changes to legislation to include Non-Treaty First Nations will also likely have impacts on regional service structures, voting and financial structures. As such (assuming we come up with proposed legislative changes), future phases will need to contemplate engagement of the current member communities and Treaty Nations of the Regional Board.