

HAMILTON BURLINGTON SPCA

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

"Who Needs Care"

An Annual Assessment of Barriers to Accessible Animal Care

Delivered under The Bond Project

RFP Reference No. HBSPCA-2026-BOND-01

Issued: Monday, September 14, 2026

Proposals Due: Friday, November 13, 2026 at 2:00 p.m. Eastern Time

Issued by the Hamilton Burlington SPCA

245 Dartnall Road, Hamilton, Ontario

Approved for release by John Gerrard, President and Chief Executive Officer

Table of Contents

Page references below match the layout of this document as issued.

RFP at a Glance	4
1. Invitation to Submit a Proposal.....	5
1.1 Invitation	5
1.2 About the Hamilton Burlington SPCA	5
1.3 Purpose of this RFP	5
1.4 Terminology.....	6
2. Background and Context.....	7
2.1 The vision.....	7
2.2 The need.....	7
2.3 Why animals belong in the poverty conversation	7
2.4 What HBSPCA brings to the work.....	8
3. Scope of Work.....	9
3.1 Primary objective.....	9
3.2 Secondary objectives.....	9
3.3 Geographic scope	9
3.4 Key research areas.....	9
3.5 Methodology expectations.....	10
3.6 Deliverables	11
3.7 Report structure	12
3.8 Key Metrics Dashboard.....	12
3.9 Policy recommendations framework	12
3.10 Optional priced modules	12
4. Timeline	13
4.1 Procurement timeline.....	13
4.2 Project timeline	13
4.3 Multi year intent.....	14
5. Proposal Requirements.....	15
5.1 Format	15
5.2 Required components	15
5.3 Cost Proposal requirements	18
5.4 Mandatory requirements	18
6. Response Process.....	20
6.1 Sole point of contact.....	20
6.2 Intent to respond.....	20
6.3 Proponents information session.....	20
6.4 Questions and addenda.....	20
6.5 Submission instructions.....	20
6.6 Late submissions.....	21
6.7 Blackout period and lobbying	21
6.8 Conflict of interest.....	21
6.9 Confidentiality	21
6.10 Costs of responding	21
6.11 Rights of HBSPCA	21
6.12 Debriefs and disputes	22
7. Evaluation Process	23
7.1 Evaluation committee	23
7.2 Five stage process.....	23
7.3 Technical evaluation criteria.....	23

7.4 Scoring method	24
7.5 Shortlist presentations	25
7.6 Award and negotiation	25
8. Contract and Commercial Terms	26
8.1 Contract structure	26
8.2 Payment.....	26
8.3 Intellectual property.....	26
8.4 Subcontracting.....	27
8.5 Key personnel.....	27
8.6 Insurance and compliance.....	27
8.7 Governance and reporting	27
8.8 Termination	27
9. Impact, Utilization and Success	28
9.1 Primary audiences	28
9.2 Annual release strategy	28
9.3 Success measures for this engagement.....	28
9.4 Ethical commitments.....	28
9.5 Closing	29
Appendix A. Form 1, Proponent Declaration and Submission Checklist	30
Part 1. Proponent information	30
Part 2. Declarations	30
Part 3. Submission checklist	31
Appendix B. Form 6, Cost Summary Template	32
Part 1. Cost by phase.....	32
Part 2. Optional priced modules.....	33
Part 3. Rate table.....	33
Part 4. Pricing assumptions	33
Appendix C. Form 2, Team Composition Table.....	34
Substitution commitment	34
Appendix D. Form 3, Client Reference	35
Reference questions HBSPCA will ask	35
Appendix E. Comparator and Sector Scan	36
Recurring annual reports of the kind we are commissioning.....	36
Research bodies working on access to animal care.....	36
Social policy research capability in Canada	37
Appendix F. Form 4, Conflict of Interest Declaration.....	38
Appendix G. Form 5, Confidentiality Acknowledgement.....	39

RFP at a Glance

This page is a summary only. Proponents are responsible for reading the full document. Where this summary and the body of the RFP differ, the body of the RFP governs.

Item	Detail
Issuing organization	Hamilton Burlington SPCA (HBSPCA), 245 Dartnall Road, Hamilton, Ontario
Assignment	Design, execution and production of "Who Needs Care", an annual research report documenting barriers to affordable veterinary care, pet food security and essential animal services among low income households
Term	Year 1 baseline study, with two optional annual renewal years at the sole discretion of HBSPCA
Contract type	Fixed price by deliverable, with priced options
Proposal deadline	Friday, November 13, 2026 at 2:00 p.m. Eastern Time
Submission method	Electronic submission to the RFP mailbox, in two separate files (Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal)
Questions deadline	Friday, October 9, 2026 at 4:00 p.m. Eastern Time
Anticipated award	Friday, December 18, 2026
Campaign kick off	Monday, March 1, 2027
Inaugural report release	Tuesday, November 2, 2027
Evaluation approach	Two envelope. Technical proposals scored first. Cost envelopes opened only for proposals that meet the technical threshold
Primary weightings	Research philosophy 20, team make up 20, methodology and work plan 20, cost and value 15, experience 10, ethics and community engagement 10, communications 5

A note on why this matters

The Hamilton Burlington SPCA is not government funded. Every program we run is paid for by donors and by fees, and every year we are asked to prove that the need is real. We can tell you what we see at our door. What we cannot yet do is measure it, benchmark it, and put it in front of a policymaker in a form that is hard to argue with. That is the work we are commissioning here.

1. Invitation to Submit a Proposal

1.1 Invitation

The Hamilton Burlington SPCA invites qualified research organizations, academic institutions, consultancies and multi disciplinary teams to submit proposals to design, execute and produce "Who Needs Care", an annual research report on barriers to accessible animal care. The inaugural report will establish the baseline. The intent is that it becomes a recurring annual publication and the reference document on this subject in Canada.

We are open to a wide range of proponent types. We will consider a single firm, a firm leading a subcontracted team, an academic research centre, or a formal consortium of partners. What we care about is the strength of the thinking, the credibility of the people doing the work, and a clear eyed plan to get it done on time and on budget.

1.2 About the Hamilton Burlington SPCA

The Hamilton Burlington SPCA is one of Canada's oldest animal welfare organizations and one of its most active community service providers. We are a registered charity. We receive no government funding. Our work is funded by donations and by fees for service.

Over the past four years our programs have grown from roughly \$2 million to roughly \$9 million annually, and our care capacity has grown by about 400 percent. More than \$3 million has been invested in programs that support low income and struggling individuals and the animals who live with them. Programs currently include:

- Pet Health Outreach clinics offered at \$30, serving approximately 4,000 people across Hamilton and Burlington
- Low cost spay and neuter, and a newly launched low cost dental program
- The Pet Pantry emergency food program, now operating on a community distribution model, serving approximately 6,500 families and supplying more than 20 partner community food banks
- Counselling and end of life supports for families facing impossible decisions
- Encampment outreach and a Tiny Homes partnership supporting people experiencing homelessness in Hamilton
- Northern and remote community outreach where there is no local access to animal health care
- Adoption, foster care, protection and community cat programs

We are also building the Animal Wellness Hub through the Unleash Love capital campaign, with more than \$15 million raised to date. The organization operates from 245 Dartnall Road in Hamilton, with additional leased and modular space added to meet demand.

1.3 Purpose of this RFP

HBSPCA is seeking a research partner to build "Who Needs Care" from the ground up. The selected proponent will be responsible for research design, data collection, analysis, writing and production of the annual report, and for supporting the public release with sound, defensible evidence.

Three things will decide this competition more than any others. We say so plainly so that proponents can put their effort in the right place:

1. **Research philosophy.** How you think about researching poverty, hardship and the human animal bond, and how the people we serve are treated inside your method.
2. **Team make up.** Who is actually doing the work, what they have done before, and how much of their time we get.
3. **Cost.** What it costs, what drives the cost, and what we get for it over three years.

1.4 Terminology

Term	Meaning in this RFP
HBSPCA, we, us	The Hamilton Burlington SPCA, the organization issuing this RFP
Proponent	An organization or team submitting a proposal in response to this RFP
Successful Proponent	The proponent selected for award and contract negotiation
The Report	"Who Needs Care", the annual research report to be produced under this assignment
The Bond Project	The umbrella research and advocacy initiative under which the Report is produced
Must, shall, mandatory	A requirement. Failure to meet it will result in the proposal being found non compliant
Should, is encouraged	A desirable element that will be considered in scoring but is not a pass or fail requirement

2. Background and Context

2.1 The vision

Daily Bread Food Bank's "Who's Hungry" report has done something remarkable. It turned a set of lived experiences into an annual, comparable, quotable body of evidence that policymakers cannot ignore. It is now cited in council chambers, in provincial budget submissions and in national coverage, and it has an audience waiting for it every year.

"Who Needs Care" is intended to do the same for animal care access. It should combine rigorous quantitative analysis with the human and animal stories that show what economic barriers actually cost a family. It should be published annually, use consistent measures so that year over year change is real and defensible, and end with recommendations that a decision maker can act on.

Comparable models proponents may wish to reference in their approach include Daily Bread Food Bank and North York Harvest's "Who's Hungry" (Toronto), the PDSA Animal Wellbeing Report produced annually with YouGov (United Kingdom), the Access to Veterinary Care Coalition studies (United States), and Faunalytics' work on companion animal access and welfare. Appendix E provides a fuller comparator scan. Proponents are not expected to replicate any of these. They are expected to know the landscape they are entering.

2.2 The need

Families across our region face economic hardship that directly affects their ability to care for the animals in their homes. In our own service data this shows up every day, and it is getting worse rather than better. The crisis presents in five recognizable ways:

- Delayed or forgone veterinary care, leading to preventable suffering and to conditions that become emergencies
- Pet food insecurity, forcing households to choose between feeding themselves and feeding their animals
- Surrender of deeply loved animals purely because of the cost of care
- Limited access to preventive services, which converts manageable problems into expensive ones
- Barriers to training and behavioural support that could have prevented an abandonment

What we do not have is the evidence base. We can describe the need. We cannot yet size it, map it, or track it. Nor can the sector as a whole. That gap is why this work is being commissioned.

2.3 Why animals belong in the poverty conversation

For many households an animal is not a luxury. It is a medical aid, a mental health support, a reason to get up, and a family member. When a family loses an animal because of cost, the loss is not only the animal. It is stability, routine and dignity. Our position, and the frame we expect the research to test rather than assume, is that animal welfare and human poverty are the same conversation viewed from two different chairs.

Proponents should note that we are the secondary food partner behind many human food banks in this region. When human food insecurity rises, animal food need follows it, and the animal side is usually the part that goes unfunded.

2.4 What HBSPCA brings to the work

The successful proponent will not be starting from a blank page. Subject to privacy review, consent and a data sharing agreement, HBSPCA expects to make the following available:

Asset	Description
Shelter intake and surrender data	Multi year intake, surrender, reason for surrender and outcome data
Pet Health Outreach clinic data	Utilization, service mix and demand data from our \$30 clinic program
Pet Pantry registration and distribution data	Household level registration and Community Day distribution data covering approximately 6,500 families
Community food bank partner network	Access to more than 20 partner food banks for recruitment and distribution of survey instruments
Program and outreach staff	Access to front line staff for context interviews, instrument testing and field logistics
Community and clinical partners	Introductions to veterinary partners, foster network, housing and encampment outreach partners
Communications capacity	In house communications team for launch, design input and media relations
Executive sponsorship	Direct access to the President and CEO and to the senior leadership team throughout the project

Proponents should build their approach on the assumption that this access is real and usable, and should say clearly in their proposal what additional data they would want, from whom, and what they would do if it cannot be obtained.

3. Scope of Work

3.1 Primary objective

Document the scope, scale and human impact of barriers to affordable animal care, in order to drive policy change and community action that keeps families and animals together.

3.2 Secondary objectives

1. **Quantify the crisis.** Establish baseline metrics on animal care accessibility that can be tracked annually.
2. **Identify vulnerable populations.** Determine which communities face the greatest barriers and why.
3. **Map service gaps.** Document geographic and demographic gaps in affordable animal care.
4. **Track progress.** Create annual benchmarks that measure whether things are improving.
5. **Inform solutions.** Provide evidence based recommendations for systemic change at the municipal, provincial and federal levels.

3.3 Geographic scope

The core study area is the City of Hamilton and the City of Burlington. Proponents should propose a design that produces statistically defensible findings for the core study area and that is structured so it can be extended in later years to a broader Ontario or national sample without breaking comparability. Proponents may propose an optional priced module covering northern and remote communities served by HBSPCA outreach. Rural, urban and suburban differences within the core study area must be addressed in the design.

3.4 Key research areas

The five research areas below are the required scope. Proponents may propose refinements, additions or a phased sequencing, and should say clearly what they would drop or defer if the budget requires it.

Area 1. Access to affordable veterinary care

- Average costs of basic veterinary services measured against household income levels
- Geographic disparities in veterinary care cost and availability
- Pet insurance coverage rates, uptake barriers and effectiveness for low income households
- Delayed and forgone care rates, and the health outcomes that follow
- Cost differentials between emergency and preventive care, and the cost of waiting
- Barriers to routine wellness visits, including cost, transportation, hours, language and trust

Area 2. Pet food security and basic resources

- Households choosing between human food and animal food, and how often
- Geographic food deserts for animal supplies and food
- Seasonal variation in animal food security
- The effect of economic shocks such as job loss, rent increases and medical bills on animal care decisions
- Access to basic supplies including bedding, carriers, leashes, litter and seasonal items
- Access to prescription and special diet foods, which are frequently the largest single line for a sick animal

Area 3. Program access and service availability

- Geographic distribution of affordable and subsidized veterinary clinics
- Mobile clinic accessibility, scheduling and reach
- Wait times for subsidized services and the consequences of those waits
- Eligibility requirements, documentation burden and application barriers
- Spay and neuter availability and affordability
- Dental care access and cost, chronic disease management, and end of life care options

Area 4. Training and behavioural support

- Availability and affordability of training classes and behavioural intervention
- Language, cultural and literacy barriers to accessing behavioural support
- Virtual and remote training accessibility
- Programs that support retention and prevent surrender
- Crisis intervention services including temporary care and emergency boarding
- Support during housing instability, and programs for survivors of domestic violence and their animals

Area 5. Systemic barriers and demographics

- Low income households with animals, and seniors on fixed incomes
- Households that include a person with a disability, including service and support animals
- Rural and remote communities, newcomer and immigrant families, youth and young adults
- Indigenous communities and partners, engaged on terms set with those communities
- Transportation barriers and their measurable effect on service utilization
- Housing restrictions, pet deposits, breed and size restrictions, and their effect on retention and surrender

3.5 Methodology expectations

HBSPCA is not prescribing a methodology. We are prescribing a standard of evidence. Proposals must set out a mixed methods design that a reasonable critic would accept, and must explain the trade offs the proponent has chosen and why.

Quantitative components

- An annual survey of animal owners accessing low cost or subsidized services, with a defined sampling frame, target sample size, confidence interval and weighting approach
- A community wide survey of animal owners in the study area, structured for comparability against the service accessing sample
- A service provider survey covering demand, capacity, wait times and unmet need
- Administrative data analysis drawing on shelter intake and surrender data, clinic utilization, food distribution data and emergency assistance uptake
- Geographic and economic analysis, including mapping of service availability against need, cost comparison across areas, and demographic correlation

Qualitative components

- In depth interviews with families facing animal care decisions, recent surrenders driven by cost, successful program participants, and front line providers and volunteers
- Focus groups with community stakeholders, affected populations, service providers and policymakers
- Case studies covering successful community intervention models, policy change impacts and innovation in service delivery
- A clear position on how lived experience voices are compensated, protected and represented

3.6 Deliverables

#	Deliverable	Description	Due
1	Inception report and work plan	Confirmed scope, refined research questions, detailed work plan, risk register, governance and reporting cadence	Jan 30, 2027
2	Research design and instruments	Full methodology, sampling plan, survey instruments, interview and focus group guides, analysis plan	Feb 20, 2027
3	Ethics and privacy package	Ethics clearance or equivalent, consent materials, privacy impact assessment, data handling protocol	Feb 27, 2027
4	Campaign kick off support	Research explainer materials, participant facing collateral, spokesperson briefing note and media backgrounder	Feb 26, 2027
5	Fieldwork progress reports	Monthly written status covering response rates, fieldwork issues, budget to date and risk	Monthly, Mar to Jun 2027
6	Preliminary findings memo	Early quantitative signal and emerging qualitative themes, for internal use only	Jul 23, 2027
7	Draft report	Complete draft of the seven part report, with all figures and full source notes	Sep 3, 2027
8	Final report	Print and digital ready final report, plain language summary, and accessible (AODA compliant) digital version	Oct 8, 2027
9	Key Metrics Dashboard	Baseline dashboard with defined indicators, calculation notes and an update protocol for future years	Oct 8, 2027
10	Data files and codebook	De identified datasets, codebook, weighting documentation and reproducible analysis scripts	Oct 8, 2027
11	Launch and briefing support	Presentation deck, media availability support, and up to three policy briefings to government or stakeholder audiences	Nov 2027
12	Methods handover package	Documentation sufficient for the study to be repeated annually with comparability preserved	Nov 30, 2027

3.7 Report structure

The Report will follow a seven part structure, adapted from the "Who's Hungry" model:

1. **Executive Summary.** Key findings and urgent calls to action.
2. **The State of Animal Care Access.** Comprehensive data analysis.
3. **Portrait of Families in Need.** Demographic analysis and personal stories.
4. **The Care Gap.** Service availability measured against need.
5. **Geographic Disparities.** Regional and neighbourhood level access analysis.
6. **Policy Solutions.** Evidence based recommendations by level of government.
7. **Call to Action.** Specific asks for each stakeholder group.

3.8 Key Metrics Dashboard

The Report must be anchored by a small set of headline indicators that will be repeated annually. At minimum:

- Number of animals at risk due to economic barriers
- Number and rate of families surrendering an animal for reasons of cost
- Average wait time for affordable and subsidized services
- Geographic service deserts identified, and change year over year
- Rate of delayed or forgone veterinary care in the past twelve months
- Rate of households reducing their own food or medication spending to feed an animal
- Policy recommendations from prior reports that have been implemented

3.9 Policy recommendations framework

Recommendations must be organized by level of government and must be specific enough to be acted on. Illustrative areas include:

- **Federal.** Tax treatment of veterinary care, veterinary education loan forgiveness, funding for rural and remote veterinary services.
- **Provincial.** Veterinary care assistance programs, mobile clinic funding, scope of practice and licensing reform that increases access, and the treatment of animals in social assistance calculations.
- **Municipal.** Zoning for veterinary services in underserved areas, pet friendly housing and tenancy policy, licensing fee structures, and emergency assistance programs.

3.10 Optional priced modules

Proponents are invited, but not required, to price the following as separate options. Options will be scored for value but will not disadvantage a proposal that does not include them.

- Northern and remote community module covering communities served by HBSPCA outreach
- Provincial extension module scaling the sample to represent Ontario
- Veterinary profession module surveying practitioners on spectrum of care, unpaid care and burnout
- Interactive public data portal or online dashboard
- Economic modelling of the public cost of inaction, including shelter, municipal and health system costs

4. Timeline

4.1 Procurement timeline

Milestone	Date
RFP issued	Monday, September 14, 2026
Optional virtual proponents information session	Thursday, October 1, 2026, 1:00 p.m. ET
Deadline for written questions	Friday, October 9, 2026, 4:00 p.m. ET
Written responses and addenda issued to all proponents	Friday, October 16, 2026
Proposal submission deadline	Friday, November 13, 2026, 2:00 p.m. ET
Compliance review and technical evaluation	November 16 to 27, 2026
Shortlist notified	Monday, November 30, 2026
Shortlist presentations and interviews	Week of December 7, 2026
Reference checks	December 7 to 11, 2026
Cost envelopes opened for qualified proposals	Monday, December 14, 2026
Notice of award and unsuccessful proponent notifications	Friday, December 18, 2026
Contract execution	On or before Friday, January 8, 2027
Debriefs available on request	January 2027

4.2 Project timeline

Phase	Period	Key outputs
Inception and design	January to February 2027	Inception report, research design, instruments, ethics and privacy package
Campaign kick off	March 1, 2027	Public launch of The Bond Project research campaign, recruitment begins, fieldwork opens
Fieldwork	March to June 2027	Surveys, interviews, focus groups, administrative data collection
Analysis	July to August 2027	Preliminary findings memo, quantitative analysis, qualitative coding, mapping

Phase	Period	Key outputs
Drafting and review	September 2027	Draft report, HBSPCA and advisory review, revisions
Production	October 2027	Final report, dashboard, data files, accessible digital version
Release and advocacy	November 2027	Launch day, media, policy briefings, community presentations
Handover and Year 2 planning	December 2027	Methods handover package, lessons learned, Year 2 scope and pricing confirmation

On the March 2027 kick off

March 1, 2027 is the public kick off of the research campaign and the opening of fieldwork. It is not the report release date. It is a fixed date. Our communications, community partners and funders are being organized around it, and a proposal that cannot reach a field ready instrument and ethics clearance by the end of February 2027 will not be competitive. Proponents who believe the date is unachievable for a defensible design should say so directly in their proposal and propose an alternative, with reasons. We would rather hear that in November than in February.

4.3 Multi year intent

This RFP covers the Year 1 baseline study. HBSPCA intends, but does not commit, to extend the engagement for two further annual cycles on the same methodology, subject to satisfactory performance, available funding and board approval. Proponents must price Year 1 in full and provide indicative pricing for Year 2 and Year 3 so that we can evaluate the true cost of the three year program. Option years, if exercised, will be confirmed in writing no later than 90 days before the start of the applicable cycle.

5. Proposal Requirements

5.1 Format

- **Two files.** Submit a Technical Proposal and a Cost Proposal as two separate PDF files. No pricing of any kind may appear in the Technical Proposal. Pricing found in the Technical Proposal will result in disqualification.
- **Length.** Technical Proposal body of no more than 30 pages, single sided, minimum 11 point type. Curricula vitae, references, sample work and required forms are excluded from the page count. Cost Proposal has no page limit.
- **File naming.** [Proponent Name] - HBSPCA-2026-BOND-01 - Technical.pdf and [Proponent Name] - HBSPCA-2026-BOND-01 - Cost.pdf
- **Order.** Follow the section order in 5.2 below. Evaluators score against that order, and a proposal that scatters the required content across an unrelated structure makes itself hard to score well.
- **Accessibility.** Submissions should be provided as accessible, text searchable PDFs.

5.2 Required components

The Technical Proposal must contain the following sections, clearly labelled.

A. Cover letter and proponent profile (maximum 2 pages)

- Legal name, structure, head office and any Canadian office locations
- Name, title, telephone and email of the individual authorized to bind the proponent
- A brief statement of why this assignment matters to your organization
- Confirmation that the proposal is valid for 120 days from the submission deadline
- Signed Form 1 (Proponent Declaration, Appendix A)

B. Research philosophy statement (maximum 3 pages)

This is a scored section and it carries the heaviest weight in the evaluation alongside team make up. Tell us how you think, not only what you do. At minimum address:

- Your stance on researching poverty and hardship, and what obligations that places on the researcher
- How people with lived experience participate in the work, and at what stage. Are they subjects, advisors, co designers, or something else
- How you handle the tension between advocacy and objectivity when the client is an advocacy organization. We want findings we can defend, including findings we will not like
- Your position on the human animal bond as a research subject, and how you avoid both sentimentality and dismissiveness
- How equity, cultural safety and language access shape your design rather than being appended to it
- Your approach to Indigenous data sovereignty and to research with Indigenous communities, if applicable to your design
- What you consider to be the most likely way this study could produce a misleading result, and how your design guards against it

C. Technical approach and methodology (maximum 10 pages)

- Proposed overall design and why it is the right one for these questions
- Sampling frame, target sample sizes, expected confidence intervals and weighting approach for each survey component
- Recruitment strategy, including hard to reach populations, and realistic response rate assumptions
- Qualitative approach, including participant selection, compensation, consent and analysis method
- Administrative data strategy, including what you would request from HBSPCA and from third parties
- Geographic and spatial analysis approach, including data sources and mapping outputs
- Analysis plan, including how the Key Metrics Dashboard indicators will be constructed and kept comparable year over year
- Quality control, validation and peer review arrangements
- Known limitations of the proposed design, stated plainly

D. Team make up (maximum 6 pages plus CVs)

This is a scored section carrying equal weight to research philosophy. We are buying people, not a brand. Provide:

- An organization chart for the project team showing reporting lines and decision authority
- A team table using the Appendix C template, listing for every named individual: role, credentials, years of relevant experience, **committed hours and percentage of total project effort**, and location.
- Curricula vitae of no more than two pages per person for all key personnel
- Identification of the Principal Investigator and confirmation of their minimum committed time
- Named subcontractors and consortium partners, with the same detail, and a description of how the partnership is governed
- Coverage plan if a key person becomes unavailable, and your commitment on substitution
- Evidence of capacity to deliver alongside your current workload, including current committed engagements over the project period

The core team is expected to cover the following functions. One person may hold more than one function where they are genuinely qualified to do so, and proponents should say so rather than padding the team.

Function	Expectation
Principal Investigator	Senior researcher with demonstrated experience leading applied social policy research to publication
Quantitative lead and data analysts	Survey design, sampling, weighting and statistical analysis
Qualitative lead	Interview and focus group design and facilitation, trauma informed practice
GIS and spatial analyst	Mapping, spatial statistics and service gap analysis
Community engagement coordinator	Recruitment, partner and participant liaison, field logistics

Function	Expectation
Communications and knowledge translation lead	Report writing for a public audience, data visualization and design coordination
Project manager	Schedule, budget, risk and single point of contact for HBSPCA
Subject matter advisor	Veterinary, animal welfare or human animal bond expertise, whether internal or advisory

E. Relevant experience and references (maximum 4 pages plus samples)

- Three to five comparable assignments completed in the last seven years, with client, dates, budget range, your role, and outcome
- Particular weight is given to recurring or longitudinal studies, research with low income or marginalized populations, work that reached a public or policy audience, and work in animal welfare, veterinary access or the human animal bond
- Two examples of published work you authored or led. Public links are acceptable
- Three client references using Form 3 (Appendix D). References will be contacted only for shortlisted proponents

F. Work plan, schedule and risk (maximum 4 pages)

- A Gantt style schedule aligned to the milestones in section 4.2, showing critical path
- Resource loading by phase, tied to the committed hours in your team table
- Explicit confirmation of the March 1, 2027 campaign kick off, or a reasoned alternative
- A risk register with at least eight risks, their likelihood, impact and mitigation, including low response rates, ethics delay, data access delay and key person loss
- Your assumptions and your dependencies on HBSPCA, stated as specifically as possible

G. Ethics, privacy and data governance (maximum 3 pages)

- Ethics review pathway, including the reviewing body and expected timing. TCPS 2 alignment is expected
- Informed consent approach for surveys, interviews and stories used in the published Report
- Compliance with PIPEDA and applicable Ontario privacy law, and your proposed privacy impact assessment
- Data storage, residency, encryption, retention and destruction. Canadian data residency is required
- De identification approach and small cell suppression rules
- Trauma informed practice, participant safeguarding, and referral protocols where a participant discloses distress or hardship
- Participant compensation policy and how it is budgeted

H. Communications and knowledge translation (maximum 2 pages)

- How the Report will be written and designed to be read by a councillor, a journalist and a donor, not only by a researcher
- Data visualization approach and how you will work with the HBSPCA communications team

- Support you will provide at launch, and your availability for media and policy briefings
- Plain language summary and accessibility approach, including AODA compliance for digital outputs

I. Value add and community benefit (maximum 1 page, optional)

- Capacity building for HBSPCA staff, student or emerging researcher placements, in kind contributions, sector contribution such as peer reviewed publication, or other benefits you would bring

5.3 Cost Proposal requirements

The Cost Proposal is submitted as a separate file and must include:

1. A completed Cost Summary using the Appendix B template, in Canadian dollars, exclusive of HST, showing Year 1 in full and indicative pricing for Year 2 and Year 3.
2. A detailed breakdown by deliverable and by phase.
3. A rate table listing every named team member, their hourly or daily rate, and their budgeted hours.
4. Disbursements and expenses itemized, including participant compensation, translation, travel, incentives, printing and software or licence costs.
5. Optional priced modules from section 3.10, each priced separately and clearly identified as optional.
6. Payment schedule proposal tied to the deliverables in section 3.6.
7. Any assumptions that materially affect price, and what would cause the price to change.

HBSPCA has not published a fixed budget ceiling. We are asking proponents to tell us what a defensible study of this kind actually costs, and to help us understand what drives that cost. A proposal that is cheap because it is thin will not win. A proposal that is expensive without explaining what the money buys will not win either. Proponents are encouraged to present a base scope plus clearly priced options so that we can adjust scope to budget rather than adjust quality to budget.

5.4 Mandatory requirements

The following are pass or fail. A proposal that does not meet all of them will be found non compliant and will not be evaluated further.

#	Mandatory requirement
M1	Proposal received in full by the submission deadline, in the two required files
M2	Signed Form 1, Proponent Declaration, including the authority to bind the proponent
M3	No pricing information of any kind contained in the Technical Proposal
M4	A named Principal Investigator with a minimum of seven years of relevant research experience
M5	Completed team table (Form 2) with committed hours for every named individual
M6	A stated ethics review pathway aligned to TCPS 2 or an equivalent recognized standard
M7	Confirmed Canadian data residency for all participant data

#	Mandatory requirement
M8	Three client references provided using Form 3
M9	Confirmation of ability to carry the insurance in section 8.6, or to obtain it before contract execution
M10	Signed confidentiality acknowledgement (Form 5), covering this RFP and any HBSPCA data disclosed
M11	Written confirmation that the proposal is valid for 120 days

6. Response Process

6.1 Sole point of contact

All communication regarding this RFP must be directed in writing to the RFP Contact named below. From the date this RFP is issued until the notice of award, proponents must not contact any other HBSPCA director, employee, board member, volunteer or agent about this procurement. Contact outside this channel may result in disqualification.

Role	Detail
RFP Contact	[Name, Title]
Email	[rfp@hbspca.com]
Subject line format	HBSPCA-2026-BOND-01 - [Proponent Name] - [Question or Submission]
Mailing address	Hamilton Burlington SPCA, 245 Dartnall Road, Hamilton, Ontario

6.2 Intent to respond

Proponents are asked, though not required, to email a short notice of intent to respond by Friday, September 25, 2026. This lets us circulate addenda and clarifications directly to you rather than relying on you to check for postings.

6.3 Proponents information session

An optional virtual information session will be held on Thursday, October 1, 2026 at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Time. Attendance is not mandatory and does not affect scoring. The session will include a walk through of the scope, an overview of the HBSPCA data assets described in section 2.4, and an open question period. Questions asked at the session and the answers given will be summarized and issued in writing to all registered proponents. Only the written record is binding.

6.4 Questions and addenda

- Written questions must be received by Friday, October 9, 2026 at 4:00 p.m. Eastern Time
- Questions will be anonymized and answered in writing, and both the questions and the answers will be issued to all registered proponents by Friday, October 16, 2026
- Only written answers issued as an addendum form part of this RFP. Verbal statements by any person do not amend this RFP
- Proponents must acknowledge all addenda in Form 1
- If an addendum materially changes the requirements, HBSPCA may extend the submission deadline

6.5 Submission instructions

1. Submit both files by email to the RFP Contact address by Friday, November 13, 2026 at 2:00 p.m. Eastern Time.

2. Total attachment size must not exceed 25 MB. If your submission is larger, email the RFP Contact at least three business days before the deadline to arrange a secure upload link.
3. Proponents are responsible for confirming receipt. HBSPCA will acknowledge every submission by email within one business day. If you have not received an acknowledgement, contact the RFP Contact immediately.
4. The time of receipt recorded by the HBSPCA email server governs.
5. Proposals may be amended or withdrawn in writing before the deadline. Amendments received after the deadline will not be accepted.

6.6 Late submissions

Proposals received after the deadline will not be accepted or evaluated, and will be deleted unopened. This applies regardless of the reason for the delay, including technical failure at either end. Proponents are strongly encouraged to submit at least 24 hours early.

6.7 Blackout period and lobbying

From the issue date until the notice of award, proponents and anyone acting on their behalf must not lobby, solicit or attempt to influence any HBSPCA board member, employee, volunteer, donor or evaluator in relation to this procurement. A breach will result in disqualification. Ordinary business between a proponent and HBSPCA that is unrelated to this RFP is not affected, but it must not touch on this procurement.

6.8 Conflict of interest

Proponents must disclose in Form 4 any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest, including any current or former relationship with HBSPCA, any board or committee member, any named partner organization, or any competing proponent. Disclosure does not automatically disqualify a proponent. Non disclosure will.

6.9 Confidentiality

This RFP and any material provided during the process, including the underlying briefing note for The Bond Project, are confidential and proprietary. They are provided solely for the purpose of preparing a proposal and must not be distributed, reproduced or disclosed to any third party without prior written consent. Proponents must sign Form 5 and must ensure that every subcontractor and team member is bound by equivalent obligations.

Proposals submitted become the property of HBSPCA and will not be returned. HBSPCA will treat proposals as confidential and will disclose them only to evaluators, advisors and those with a need to know, subject to any legal obligation to disclose.

6.10 Costs of responding

Proponents are responsible for all costs of preparing and submitting a proposal, attending interviews and participating in this process. HBSPCA will not reimburse any such costs under any circumstances.

6.11 Rights of HBSPCA

HBSPCA reserves the right, at its sole discretion and without liability, to:

- Accept or reject any or all proposals, including the lowest priced proposal
- Cancel or reissue this RFP at any time, in whole or in part
- Amend the scope, budget, timeline or evaluation approach by written addendum before the deadline
- Waive a minor irregularity that does not affect fairness
- Request clarification from any proponent without giving the same opportunity to all, where the clarification does not change the substance of the proposal
- Shortlist, interview and negotiate with one or more proponents
- Award in whole or in part, and award separate components to different proponents
- Verify any information provided, including through sources not identified by the proponent
- Decline to award at all if no proposal represents value for money

This RFP is not a tender or an offer. No contractual or legal obligation of any kind arises between HBSPCA and any proponent until a written agreement is signed by both parties.

6.12 Debriefs and disputes

Unsuccessful proponents may request a debrief within 15 business days of the notice of award. Debriefs are held virtually, last approximately 30 minutes, and cover the proponent's own proposal only. Comparative scores of other proponents will not be shared. Concerns about the fairness of the process should be raised in writing to the RFP Contact within the same 15 business day period and will be reviewed by a senior leader who did not participate in the evaluation.

7. Evaluation Process

7.1 Evaluation committee

Proposals will be evaluated by a committee that includes HBSPCA senior leadership, program leadership from the affected service areas, communications leadership, and at least one external advisor with research methods expertise who has no interest in any proposal. Every evaluator will sign a confidentiality and conflict of interest declaration before receiving proposals. The President and CEO approves the final recommendation, and the award is subject to board approval where required by our procurement policy.

7.2 Five stage process

Stage	What happens	Result
1. Compliance review	Each proposal is checked against the mandatory requirements M1 to M11 in section 5.4	Pass or fail. Non compliant proposals are not evaluated further
2. Technical evaluation	Compliant Technical Proposals are scored independently by each evaluator against the criteria in 7.3, then consensus scored at a committee meeting	Technical score out of 85. A minimum of 60 of 85, being roughly 70 percent, is required to advance
3. Shortlist presentation	Proponents scoring at or above the threshold are invited to a 90 minute session: 30 minute presentation, 45 minute question period, 15 minute close. The named Principal Investigator must attend	Technical scores may be adjusted up or down by up to 10 points based on the session
4. References	Three references contacted for each shortlisted proponent using a consistent question set	Confirms or qualifies the experience score. Serious adverse findings may remove a proponent
5. Cost evaluation and award	Cost envelopes opened only for shortlisted proponents. Cost scored per the formula in 7.4 and added to the technical score	Highest total score recommended for award, subject to negotiation and approval

7.3 Technical evaluation criteria

Technical criteria total 85 points. Cost is worth 15 points and is scored separately at stage 5, for a maximum total of 100 points.

Criterion	What we are looking for	Points
A. Research philosophy	Clarity and depth of the stated philosophy. Treatment of people with lived experience. Handling of the advocacy and objectivity tension. Equity, cultural safety and language access built into the design. Honest account of how the study could go wrong	20

Criterion	What we are looking for	Points
B. Team make up and capacity	Strength and relevance of named individuals. Coverage of all required functions. Committed hours and seniority of effort, not just seniority of names. Depth of bench and substitution protection. Demonstrated capacity to deliver on schedule alongside existing commitments	20
C. Methodology and work plan	Technical soundness of the design. Sampling, weighting and response rate realism. Quality of the qualitative approach. Analysis plan and dashboard construction. Credibility of the schedule against the March 2027 kick off. Quality of the risk register	20
D. Relevant experience and references	Comparable assignments, particularly recurring or longitudinal studies, work with low income populations, and work that reached a public or policy audience. Quality of the submitted published work	10
E. Ethics, privacy and community engagement	Ethics pathway and timing. Consent and safeguarding. Privacy, data residency and de identification. Participant compensation. Depth of genuine community engagement rather than consultation as a formality	10
F. Communications and knowledge translation	Ability to write and design for a public and policy audience. Data visualization. Launch and briefing support. Accessibility	5
Technical subtotal		85
G. Cost and value	Total three year cost, transparency of the build up, reasonableness of the rate and hour mix, and value delivered for the price. Scored per section 7.4	15
Total		100

7.4 Scoring method

Technical scoring scale

Each criterion is scored on the following scale and then weighted to its point value.

Rating	Definition
0 - Not addressed	The requirement is not addressed, or the response is so limited that it cannot be assessed
1 - Poor	Addressed but with significant gaps, errors or unsupported assertions. Meaningful risk to the project
2 - Adequate	Meets the requirement at a basic level. Nothing distinguishing. Some risk remains
3 - Good	Meets the requirement fully with a credible, well supported response and low residual risk
4 - Strong	Exceeds the requirement. Demonstrates insight and directly relevant experience. Adds confidence

Rating	Definition
5 - Outstanding	Materially better than the requirement. Improves the project beyond what was asked, and is fully substantiated

Cost scoring

Cost is scored using the lowest compliant price method, applied to the total three year price for the base scope, excluding optional modules:

$$\text{Cost score} = (\text{lowest compliant total three year price} / \text{proponent total three year price}) \times 15$$

Optional modules are not included in the cost score. They are assessed qualitatively for value and may inform the final scope decision at negotiation. Where a proposal contains a price that appears unsustainably low relative to the proposed hours, HBSPCA may seek written clarification and may decline to award where the price is judged to put delivery at risk.

7.5 Shortlist presentations

Shortlisted proponents will be invited to a 90 minute virtual or in person session during the week of December 7, 2026. Sessions follow a consistent format and question set. The named Principal Investigator must attend and must lead the discussion. We are using the session to test three things: whether the people on the page are the people we will get, whether the team can defend its methodological choices under questioning, and whether we can work with them for three years. Sales presentations by business development staff who will not touch the project are actively unhelpful.

7.6 Award and negotiation

- The highest scoring proponent will be recommended for award and invited to negotiate a written agreement
- Negotiation may address scope adjustment, optional modules, schedule, payment milestones and contract terms, but will not change the evaluated basis of award
- If a written agreement cannot be concluded within 20 business days, HBSPCA may end negotiations and proceed to the next ranked proponent
- All proponents will be notified in writing of the outcome

What will actually distinguish a winning proposal

Specific named people with real committed hours, not a roster of senior names attached to a junior delivery team.

A philosophy section that reads like a position rather than a policy statement.

A sampling and recruitment plan that shows the proponent has thought about how hard it is to reach the households we serve.

Honesty about limitations, and a risk register that names the things that genuinely go wrong on projects like this.

A price we can understand line by line, with options that let us match scope to the funding we can raise.

8. Contract and Commercial Terms

8.1 Contract structure

The successful proponent will enter into a written services agreement with HBSPCA covering the Year 1 baseline study, with two optional renewal years exercisable at the sole discretion of HBSPCA. The agreement will incorporate this RFP, all addenda, and the successful proposal. Where there is a conflict, the signed agreement governs, followed by this RFP and addenda, followed by the proposal.

8.2 Payment

Payment will be made against accepted deliverables rather than on a time elapsed basis. The following schedule is the HBSPCA starting position and may be adjusted at negotiation:

Milestone	Share of Year 1 fee
Contract execution and inception report accepted	15%
Research design, instruments and ethics package accepted	20%
Fieldwork closed and preliminary findings memo accepted	25%
Draft report accepted	20%
Final report, dashboard and data files accepted	15%
Launch support complete and methods handover package accepted	5%

Invoices are payable within 30 days of acceptance of the associated deliverable. Disbursements are reimbursed at cost with receipts, within the approved budget. Any expenditure that would exceed the approved budget requires written approval in advance and will not be paid without it.

8.3 Intellectual property

- HBSPCA will own the Report, the datasets, the codebook, the analysis outputs and all deliverables produced under the contract
- The successful proponent retains ownership of its pre existing intellectual property, proprietary methods, tools and panels, and grants HBSPCA a perpetual licence to use them to the extent embedded in the deliverables
- The successful proponent will be publicly and prominently credited as the research partner in the Report and at launch
- Academic publication of findings by the proponent is welcomed and requires prior written approval from HBSPCA, which will not be unreasonably withheld, and must not precede the public release of the Report
- De identified data may be made available by HBSPCA to other researchers under a data sharing protocol developed with the successful proponent

8.4 Subcontracting

Subcontractors and consortium partners named in the proposal are approved on award. Adding, removing or replacing a subcontractor after award requires HBSPCA written approval. The prime proponent remains fully responsible for all work.

8.5 Key personnel

Named key personnel may not be substituted without HBSPCA written approval. Any substitute must be of equal or greater qualification. Unapproved substitution of the Principal Investigator is a material breach.

8.6 Insurance and compliance

- Commercial general liability of not less than \$2,000,000 per occurrence
- Professional liability, errors and omissions, of not less than \$2,000,000
- Workplace safety insurance coverage as applicable in the jurisdiction of the proponent
- HBSPCA named as an additional insured on the commercial general liability policy
- Compliance with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act for all public facing outputs
- Compliance with PIPEDA and applicable Ontario privacy legislation
- Police record checks for any personnel with direct, unsupervised contact with vulnerable participants

8.7 Governance and reporting

- A single named project manager on each side, with a standing biweekly working meeting
- Monthly written progress reports covering schedule, budget to date, response rates, risks and decisions required
- A project steering group including HBSPCA senior leadership, meeting at each phase gate
- A research advisory group including community, veterinary and academic representatives, convened by HBSPCA with input from the successful proponent
- Escalation to the President and CEO for any matter affecting scope, budget or the launch date

8.8 Termination

HBSPCA may terminate for convenience on 30 days written notice, paying for work satisfactorily completed and for reasonable, unavoidable commitments made to that point. Either party may terminate for material breach that is not cured within 15 business days of written notice. On termination for any reason, all data, work in progress and deliverables prepared to that date become the property of HBSPCA and must be transferred within 10 business days.

9. Impact, Utilization and Success

9.1 Primary audiences

The Report is being commissioned to be used, not filed. Proponents should design with these audiences in view:

1. **Policymakers.** Federal, provincial and municipal elected officials and their staff.
2. **Community leaders.** Mayors, city councils, community and social service organizations.
3. **Funders and philanthropists.** Private foundations, corporate sponsors and major donors.
4. **The veterinary profession.** Professional associations, practitioners and educational institutions.
5. **Animal welfare organizations.** Shelters, rescues and advocacy groups, including the many small organizations operating in this region.
6. **Media and the public.** Journalists, social platforms and community advocates.

9.2 Annual release strategy

- **Launch day.** Coordinated media release with the headline findings and a spokesperson available.
- **Policy briefings.** Targeted presentations to municipal, provincial and federal officials.
- **Community presentations.** Sessions with local organizations, partners and stakeholders.
- **Digital campaign.** Social, website and email outreach built around the dashboard indicators.
- **Follow up advocacy.** Sustained use of the findings through the year, and tracking of what changed.

9.3 Success measures for this engagement

Measure	Year 1 target
Deliverables accepted on schedule	All twelve deliverables accepted within five business days of the due date
Sample achieved	Target sample achieved for each survey component, at the confidence interval proposed
Media reach	Coverage in regional and at least one national outlet at launch
Policy engagement	A minimum of three policy briefings delivered to government audiences
Sector uptake	Citation or use of the Report by other animal welfare or social service organizations
Repeatability	Methods handover package sufficient for Year 2 to run with full comparability
Participant experience	No substantiated complaint regarding participant treatment, consent or privacy

9.4 Ethical commitments

These commitments are not negotiable and apply to every person working on this assignment.

- Protection of participant privacy and confidentiality at every stage
- Informed, freely given consent for all interviews, surveys and published stories
- Sensitive, non extractive handling of financial hardship and of grief
- Cultural competency and language access built into the design and the field team
- Participants benefit from the study, including through resource information provided at the point of contact
- Community feedback sessions on findings and recommendations before publication
- Transparent reporting of limitations and methodology, including anything that did not work

We are asking people to describe the worst financial moments of their lives, and to talk about animals they may have lost. They are doing us a favour. The research must treat them accordingly.

9.5 Closing

"Who Needs Care" will fill a real gap. Following the model established by "Who's Hungry", this research will give us the evidence base needed to drive meaningful policy change and community action. The goal is straightforward. No family should be forced to choose between their own financial survival and the animal who shares their home.

We are looking for a research partner who wants to build something that lasts, and who is prepared to tell us the truth about what they find. If that is you, we look forward to reading your proposal.

John Gerrard

President and Chief Executive Officer

Hamilton Burlington SPCA

Appendix A. Form 1, Proponent Declaration and Submission Checklist

Part 1. Proponent information

Legal name of proponent	
Operating name, if different	
Business or charitable registration number	
Head office address	
Canadian office address, if applicable	
Type of organization	
Named Principal Investigator	
Project manager and single point of contact	
Telephone	
Email	
Website	

Part 2. Declarations

By signing below, the proponent confirms that:

1. The information in this proposal is accurate and complete.
2. The signatory is authorized to bind the proponent.
3. The proposal is valid and open for acceptance for 120 days from the submission deadline.
4. The proponent has read this RFP in full, including all addenda, and accepts its terms and process.
5. No pricing information of any kind appears in the Technical Proposal.
6. The proponent can carry the insurance required in section 8.6, or will obtain it before contract execution.
7. All named personnel have consented to being named and are available as committed.
8. The proponent has disclosed all conflicts of interest in Form 4.
9. The proponent has not engaged in any lobbying prohibited by section 6.7.

Addenda received and acknowledged (list numbers)	
Name of authorized signatory	

Title	
Signature	
Date	

Part 3. Submission checklist

Tick each item. This checklist does not replace the mandatory requirements in section 5.4, but a proposal that fails this checklist will usually fail those requirements too.

Included	Item
	Technical Proposal, separate PDF, 30 page maximum for the body
	Cover letter and proponent profile (5.2 A)
	Research philosophy statement (5.2 B)
	Technical approach and methodology (5.2 C)
	Team make up narrative, organization chart and CVs (5.2 D)
	Relevant experience and two work samples (5.2 E)
	Work plan, schedule and risk register (5.2 F)
	Ethics, privacy and data governance (5.2 G)
	Communications and knowledge translation (5.2 H)
	Value add and community benefit (5.2 I, optional)
	Form 1, Proponent Declaration, signed
	Form 2, Team Composition Table (Appendix C)
	Form 3, References, three completed (Appendix D)
	Form 4, Conflict of Interest Declaration (Appendix F)
	Form 5, Confidentiality Acknowledgement (Appendix G)
	Cost Proposal, separate PDF, using Form 6 (Appendix B)

Appendix B. Form 6, Cost Summary Template

All amounts in Canadian dollars, exclusive of HST. Complete every row. Add rows as needed. This summary must be supported by the detailed breakdown and rate table described in section 5.3.

Part 1. Cost by phase

Phase	Year 1 (2027)	Year 2 indicative	Year 3 indicative
Inception and research design			
Ethics, privacy and instrument development			
Quantitative fieldwork			
Qualitative fieldwork			
Administrative and spatial data analysis			
Analysis and reporting			
Design, production and accessibility			
Launch, briefings and knowledge translation			
Project management and governance			
Professional fees subtotal			
Participant compensation and incentives			
Translation and interpretation			
Travel and field costs			
Printing and production			
Software, licences and panel costs			
Other disbursements (specify)			
Disbursements subtotal			
TOTAL, base scope			

Total three year base scope price (used for cost scoring): \$ _____

Part 2. Optional priced modules

Optional module (section 3.10)	Price	Included in base?
Northern and remote community module		
Provincial extension module		
Veterinary profession module		
Interactive public data portal		
Economic modelling of the cost of inaction		
Other proposed option (specify)		

Part 3. Rate table

Name	Role	Rate (\$/hr or \$/day)	Year 1 hours	Year 1 cost
Total				

Part 4. Pricing assumptions

State every assumption that materially affects your price, and identify what would cause the price to change.

Appendix C. Form 2, Team Composition Table

Complete one row per named individual, including subcontractors and consortium partners. Committed hours must reconcile to the rate table in Form 6 and to the resource loading in your work plan. This form is a mandatory requirement (M5).

Name	Role and function	Credentials	Years relevant experience	Committed hours, Year 1	Percent of total project effort	Employer and location
	Principal Investigator					
	Project manager					
	Quantitative lead					
	Data analyst					
	Qualitative lead					
	GIS and spatial analyst					
	Community engagement coordinator					
	Communications and knowledge translation lead					
	Subject matter advisor					
	Additional team member					
Total					100%	

Substitution commitment

Describe your commitment on key person substitution, including notice, approval and the bench available to replace each key role.

Appendix D. Form 3, Client Reference

Complete one form for each of three references. References must be for assignments the named team members worked on, and should be as close as possible to the nature of this assignment. References will be contacted only for shortlisted proponents.

Reference number (1, 2 or 3)	
Client organization	
Reference name and title	
Telephone and email	
Assignment title	
Dates of assignment	
Approximate contract value	
Proponent role (prime, subcontractor, consortium partner)	
Named team members from this proposal who worked on it	
Brief description and outcome	
Was the assignment delivered on time and on budget? If not, what happened?	

Reference questions HBSPCA will ask

1. Was the work delivered on schedule and on budget? If not, how was it handled?
2. Were the people named in the proposal the people who did the work?
3. How did the team handle a finding the client did not want to hear?
4. How did participants and community partners experience the research team?
5. Was the final product usable by a non technical audience?
6. Would you engage this team again for a multi year commitment?

Appendix E. Comparator and Sector Scan

The following organizations and publications are provided for orientation only. Inclusion is not an endorsement, a pre qualification, or an indication that any of these organizations has been approached. Proponents are neither required to reference them nor advantaged by doing so. They are listed because they represent the standard of work HBSPCA is aiming at, and because a proponent who does not know this landscape will struggle with this assignment.

Recurring annual reports of the kind we are commissioning

Publication and producer	Why it is relevant
Who's Hungry, Daily Bread Food Bank with North York Harvest Food Bank, Toronto	The direct model for this assignment. An annual profile of poverty and food insecurity based on a large survey of food bank clients, supported by a research committee and volunteer survey administration, used consistently for policy advocacy
PDSA Animal Wellbeing (PAW) Report, produced annually with YouGov, United Kingdom	The closest animal welfare analogue internationally. Running since 2011, nationally representative samples of dog, cat and rabbit owners, used to set an evidence base and impact measure across the UK veterinary and welfare sector
HungerCount, Food Banks Canada	National annual data collection across a distributed network of agencies. Relevant for anyone proposing a partner network based data collection design
State of the sector reporting, Humane Canada	National animal welfare data collection and the natural route to comparability with other Canadian jurisdictions

Research bodies working on access to animal care

Organization	Focus
Faunalytics	Independent research on companion animals and animal advocacy, including work on defining and measuring access to veterinary care
Access to Veterinary Care Coalition, University of Tennessee	Foundational United States research quantifying barriers to veterinary care among pet owning households
AlignCare, University of Tennessee One Health	A subsidized, incremental care model aligning social services, welfare organizations and veterinary providers. Relevant to the policy solutions section
ASPCA research and the ASPCApro access to care library	Applied research on spectrum of care, low cost clinic utilization and shelter outcomes
Pets for Life, Humane Society of the United States	Long running community based data on underserved communities and animals who have never seen a veterinarian

Organization	Focus
Institute for Human-Animal Connection, University of Denver Graduate School of Social Work	Community based participatory research at the intersection of animal welfare and social justice
Human Animal Bond Research Institute	Research funding and evidence synthesis on the human animal bond
Ontario Veterinary College, University of Guelph	Canadian companion animal welfare research capacity, including Canadian access to care survey work
Waltham Petcare Science Institute, Mars Petcare	Large scale companion animal science and population level research capability

Social policy research capability in Canada

Organization	Focus
Social Research and Demonstration Corporation	Non profit, non partisan Canadian social policy research and program evaluation with a poverty and vulnerable population focus
Environics Institute for Survey Research and Environics Research	Canadian public opinion and social research, including material deprivation measurement
Canadian university research centres in social work, public health and geography	Spatial analysis, poverty measurement and community based participatory methods
National survey firms with Canadian panels	Panel capacity for the community wide survey component, typically as a subcontractor rather than as prime

Appendix F. Form 4, Conflict of Interest Declaration

Complete and sign. Disclosure does not disqualify a proponent. Failure to disclose does.

Question	Yes or No	If yes, provide details
Does the proponent, or any named individual, have a current or former employment, contractual, governance, donor or volunteer relationship with HBSPCA?		
Does any named individual have a family or close personal relationship with an HBSPCA board member, officer or employee?		
Does the proponent have a relationship with any other proponent responding to this RFP?		
Does the proponent have any interest that could be perceived to compromise the objectivity of the research, including a commercial relationship with a veterinary, pet food, pet insurance or pet retail business?		
Has the proponent had access to information about this procurement not available to other proponents?		
Is there any other actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest?		

Name of authorized signatory	
Title	
Signature	
Date	

Appendix G. Form 5, Confidentiality Acknowledgement

This RFP, the underlying briefing note for The Bond Project, and any HBSPCA data, documents or information disclosed during this procurement are confidential and proprietary. By signing below, the proponent agrees that:

1. All information received in connection with this RFP will be used solely for the purpose of preparing and submitting a proposal.
2. No such information will be distributed, reproduced or disclosed to any third party without the prior written consent of HBSPCA.
3. The proponent will ensure that every employee, subcontractor, consortium partner and advisor with access to the information is bound by obligations at least as protective as these.
4. On request, or if the proponent withdraws from the process, all confidential material will be returned or securely destroyed, with written confirmation provided.
5. These obligations survive the conclusion of this procurement, whether or not the proponent is successful, and continue for a period of five years.
6. If the proponent is successful, these obligations are superseded by the confidentiality provisions of the signed services agreement, which will also govern participant data.

Legal name of proponent	
Name of authorized signatory	
Title	
Signature	
Date	