
Q&A: Mental Health Flex Funding Review – RFQ (PAC133)

1. Question

Could you please clarify this requirement:

- a) Provide CHN with a clear understanding of the changing needs and value for money and evidence-based recommendations identifying priority need to guide future investment
- b) What data will be available to determine **changing** needs and what is the reference period (dates)? Or is this more about whether the changing service mix still meets the originally determined needs from one need analysis?
- c) What data will be made available to analyse value for money? Or is this more about using existing literature about the types of (stepped) mental health services that provide better value for money than others?

Answer

- (a) The aim of this activity is to build a strong understanding of the mental health landscape in the ACT and provide clear, evidence-based advice to inform CHN commissioning towards better outcomes for individuals and the community.
- (b) The Mental Health and Suicide Prevention team will work closely with the selected provider and share insights as required. Please refer to the links provided in the RFQ
- (c) Please refer to the response (b)

2. Question

Are the findings from this project expected to be published or otherwise publicly released? If so, Ethics approvals will need to be factored into the project proposal and this may have implications for project timelines.

Answer

We do not anticipate ethics approval will be required for this project. The result of this funding is to inform future commissioning.

3. Question

To what extent are the proposed delivery timelines fixed? Is there flexibility should additional time be required, for example in relation to stakeholder engagement or approvals?

Answer

CHN will work closely with the selected provider to scope of work to align with and expected deliverables within the agreed timeframe.

4. Question

Is there a minimum number of stakeholders that must be included as part of the consultation process?

Answer

Stakeholder engagement would be proportionate to scope of project and there will be opportunity to draw on consultations conducted during the development of [The Framework](#).

5. Question

Can stakeholder consultation be undertaken fully through digital methods, such as online interviews or surveys, or is there an expectation for in-person engagement for part of the process?

Answer

This will vary based on the proposal. Please respond via the response form on what methods will be used to conduct the stakeholder engagements noting response above.

6. Question

In the problem statement section, the following sentence is incomplete – “ This review must ensure alignment with ACT MHSP Regional Plan, CHNs Mental Health Outcomes Framework and the, ... “. Is there a third key document this review needs to align to?

Answer

No there is no other third key document to this review. This review must ensure alignment with ACT MHSP Regional Plan, CHNs Mental Health Outcomes Framework, while addressing gaps, duplication and inefficiencies across the system. The purpose of this review is to guide an evidence-informed approach to CHNs future procurement decisions and to better ensure CHN can respond to changing needs, changes in funding models and national reforms.

7. Question

The RFQ notes that extensive consultation is out of scope, however there is a deliverable relating to Stakeholder interviews and input. Can you provide further clarity on the expectations relating to stakeholder involvement? For example, how many stakeholders should be involved or the number of interviews to be undertaken?

Answer

Please refer to the response to Q4.

8. Question

We understand the CHN would like a value for money assessment and recommendations made. Which perspective would the CHN like this value for money assessment to take – 1. System or commissioner’s perspective, Lived experience or consumers perspective or 3. Equity/ societal perspective?

Answer

Please refer to the response to Q1 (a)

9. Question

Is there an indicative budget range allocated

Answer

The estimated funding available for this project is between \$50-\$80,000. This figure is provided to assist suppliers in understanding the intended scale and scope of the work. Respondents are requested to submit their most competitive and accurate pricing based on the requirements outlined, independent of this indicative amount.

10. Question

Would CHN be open to suppliers identifying and applying delivery efficiencies across both tenders (PAC133 and PAC134)?

Answer

Both tenders (PAC133 and PAC144) have set objectives, and key deliverables. All applicants are welcome to apply for both tenders and highlight delivery efficiencies separately for each tender in their respective application.

11. Question

In addition to the Tender Response Word Document for these RFQ's, are we able to submit attachments to the submission (Such as a PDF), to support our response?

Answer

One attachment (Word/PDF) limited to 5 pages can be attached to support your response (if required).

12. Question

In reviewing both RFQs (PAC133 and PAC134), we note that they are scheduled to be delivered concurrently. To support an appropriate approach, could you please clarify your expectations regarding how the outputs of these two streams of work should align or inform one another?

Answer

See Question 10