

Request for Proposal:

Inuvialuit Reindeer Herd

Initiative

Amendment #1

Issued by:

Inuvialuit Regional Corporation (IRC)

107 Mackenzie Road

Inuvik, NT X0E 0T0

Deadline for submissions: September 23, 2026 at 2pm MDT

This amendment is issued to answer questions from bidders.

Q1: Would IRC consider extending the proposal deadline by two weeks?

A1: IRC is not considering extending the proposal deadline.

Q2: What municipality would the processing plant be located in?

A2: Inuvik, Northwest Territories

Q3: What infrastructure exists for waste handling, processing and potable water?

A3: The new processing facility is at the pre-construction stage. Site servicing details for waste handling, processing and potable water are not finalized at this time. Information will be provided once finalized and after the contract is awarded.

Q4: How many animals are expected to be slaughtered on each processing day?

A4: Daily throughput has not yet been established, and defining it is one of the outcomes this assessment is expected to inform. For planning context: approximately 300 reindeer are currently harvested annually, and the long-term objective is an annual harvest of 2,500 to 3,000 animals. Bidders must use these values for bidding purposes. Final values are to be determined as part of this assessment.

Q5: Would the process be seasonal? If so, when?

A5: Harvesting occurs at defined points throughout the year rather than within a single season, with periods during which no harvesting takes place. Timing is driven by herd movement, weather and ice conditions and community requirements.

Q6: How are animals currently being processed and how are waste streams handled?

A6: Animals are harvested on the land and transported by boat or snowmobile to the processing facility in Inuvik. Field dressing takes place at the harvest site, with viscera remaining on the land.

Q7: What is the distribution network for getting product to market?

A7: There is no established distribution network at present. Developing one is an objective of the broader initiative and is addressed under subsequent project activities covering supply chain mapping and market analysis.

Q8: Would only primal cuts be prepared for distribution or will further portioning be required?

A8: Further portioning is anticipated. The intent is to produce a range of retail-ready formats, including steaks, ground meat and cubed meat in addition to primal cuts.

Q9: Is there a trained workforce capable of performing the work or is training required as part of the project?

A9: A trained workforce is currently in place. Staff are available for additional training and training components may be incorporated where the assessment identifies capacity gaps.

- Q10:** Are vital rates or population ratios available for the herd?
- A10:** Vital rates and population ratios are not currently available; work to compile this information is ongoing. The data currently held indicates herd growth from approximately 1,500 animals in 2021 to approximately 7,000 in 2025.
- Q11:** Is there information on the size or number of wolf packs overlapping the herd range?
- A11:** IRC does not hold current predator population data. Government of the Northwest Territories Environment and Climate Change (ECC) is the appropriate source for up-to-date wolf, grizzly and wolverine numbers. ECC has collared and tracked several wolf packs within the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (ISR). Predator management is currently addressed through herders remaining with the herd for nearly the entire year.
- Q12:** Is the intent a fixed slaughter facility or is a mobile slaughter plant meeting territorial and CFIA requirements an option?
- A12:** A mobile slaughter unit is the preferred model at this stage, with product transported to the processing facility in Inuvik. Preliminary discussions have taken place with CFIA regarding regulatory pathways suited to the operating constraints of reindeer harvesting in the ISR; no regulatory determination has been made. Proponents should treat both fixed and mobile configurations as within scope for assessment.
- Q13:** Is the intent for reindeer meat and other products to be used within Inuvik or the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (ISR) or is marketing outside the region to be explored?
- A13:** The primary intent is to supply reindeer meat to Inuvialuit beneficiaries. Beyond that, the intent is to sell meat and secondary reindeer products to other Inuit Nunangat nations and then south of 60, with international markets a potential longer-term consideration. Market development falls within the scope of subsequent project activities.
- Q14:** What is the budget or budget range for the deliverables as described in “3. Deliverables and timeline”?
- A14:** The budget or budget range is not for public information for the purposes of this bid.
- Q15:** What information or data will be provided or made available immediately at the beginning of the project by the IRC, Joint Secretariat, other Inuvialuit agencies, the Government of the Northwest Territories and the Government of Canada? This will be important to determine the balance between desktop work related to baseline data collection and whether fieldwork is required.
- A15:** Release of IRC-held data is subject to approval by the project’s governance committee, and proponents should allow for that step in their proposed schedule. Certain community knowledge held by IRC is subject to access restrictions and may not be available for release to a contractor.
IRC does not hold or control data belonging to the Joint Secretariat, other Inuvialuit organizations, the Government of the Northwest Territories or the Government of Canada and cannot commit those parties to provide information. IRC will facilitate introductions and support requests to those bodies where it is able to do so.

Baseline data of the type contemplated by this assignment does not currently exist in consolidated form. Fieldwork is therefore anticipated and proponents should scope and price accordingly.

Q16: What kind of support can be expected from the IRC for the research licence, if required, and the EISC?

A16: The successful proponent will be responsible for determining which authorizations its proposed methodology requires, and for preparing, submitting and holding any Northwest Territories research licence issued by the Aurora Research Institute. IRC will support that process by providing letters of support, facilitating community contacts and engagement and assisting the proponent in navigating the Environmental Impact Screening Committee (EISC) process where screening is required. Proponents should note that research licensing and screening timelines are set by the responsible bodies and cannot be compressed by IRC. Proposed schedules should reflect realistic lead times for these approvals. Where fieldwork is proposed on Inuvialuit private lands, separate authorization from the Inuvialuit Land Administration (ILA) may also be required.

Q17: Does the IRC have access to information on the amount of reindeer meat currently going to Inuvialuit households or how many animals are harvested?

A17: Yes. IRC holds records of the quantity of reindeer meat distributed to Inuvialuit beneficiaries and of the total number of animals harvested. Distribution information will be provided in aggregate form. Release is subject to the governance committee's approval and no household-level or personally identifying information will be made available. The approved information will be made available to the successful proponent.

Q18: Do you require broad community engagement for this project (e.g., household surveys, open houses, etc.)? Alternatively, could community engagement be undertaken with smaller focus groups (e.g., knowledge holders, elders, staff and governance committee members) who are directly involved in the stewardship of the herd?

A18: Broad community engagement is not required for this assignment. Engagement should be undertaken through targeted sessions with individuals directly involved in the stewardship of the herd, including knowledge holders, elders, herding staff, IRC staff and the governance committee members.

Q19: Is there a committee or team that we can work with on planning and coordinating community engagement activities if our proposal is successful (e.g., the Traditional and Local Knowledge Team)?

A19: The IRC project manager will be the successful proponent's day-to-day point of contact and will coordinate access to participants. Engagement planning is subject to review by the project governance committee.

- Q20:** Is there a copy of ICEDO's knowledge capture framework that we can reference while scoping engagement activities?
- A20:** There is no knowledge capture framework available at the moment.
- Q21:** Is there a standardized process or desired format for the community / governance committee review period (e.g., public posting and distribution of the report, a virtual workshop or other)?
- A21:** Draft deliverables will be submitted to IRC and then to the governance committee for review. The review format will be confirmed with the successful proponent. Proponents should note that any public posting or distribution of project materials is subject to IRC approval and to the communications requirements of the project's funding agreement and cannot be assumed.
- Q22:** Would there be interest in hosting an in-person knowledge transfer workshop with Sámi herders as part of this project, with a focus on key learnings, challenges, successes and opportunities? If this is of interest, we could seek additional funding opportunities to support this work concurrently.
- A22:** A knowledge exchange of this kind is of interest to IRC in principle, but it falls outside the scope of this Request for Proposal. It should not be included in proposals and will not form part of the evaluation. Any initiative of this nature would be pursued separately from this procurement.
- Q23:** Is there a new slaughter facility? If so, is the assessment of workforce competencies and operational challenges only for herd management up to the delivery of animals to the new slaughter facility?
- A23:** There is no facility for the purpose of slaughtering reindeer.
- Q24:** How does this scope relate to other recent RFPs? E.g., Inuvik Food Processing Plant Inuvik, NT – Feasibility Study and Functional Program; and Design of Permanent Food Processing Facility, Inuvik.
- A24:** The Inuvik Food Processing Plant is related to the Reindeer Herd Initiative as this is where the reindeer will be processed.
- Q25:** Project scale and level of effort
To help proponents develop an appropriately scaled approach and budget, could ICEDO provide any guidance on the anticipated scale for this work? For example, is ICEDO envisioning a relatively focused assessment based primarily on existing information and targeted engagement or a more comprehensive multidisciplinary assessment involving substantial travel, fieldwork and specialist input? If available, a general budget range or funding envelope would also be helpful for proponents in developing realistic work plans.
- A25:** ICEDO anticipates a focused assessment rather than a comprehensive multidisciplinary study. The work should draw primarily on existing information and targeted engagement with knowledge holders and herding staff, supported by a defined field component. Field work is expected and should be scoped and priced. The herd is semi-free-ranging over the area shown in Figure 1, which covers separated blocks of terrain with limited road

access. Field activity should be planned around that extent rather than around a single site.

Q26: Agribusiness and market analysis scope

Could ICEDO clarify the anticipated future market for the Reindeer Herd Initiative? For example, is the project primarily considering local and regional sales within the NWT, or should the assessment also consider interprovincial or broader Canadian markets? Should the assessment focus mainly on meat products and sales or also consider other potential products or revenue opportunities, such as hides, crafts, tourism or other revenue opportunities? This would help clarify the expected scope of the market analysis and the federal food-safety and regulatory assessment.

The RFP also asks the contractor to identify “priority investments.” Could ICEDO elaborate on what it expects this to include? For example, does this include infrastructure and equipment needs, workforce or training investments, ongoing research and monitoring, processing capacity expansion or other operational and business needs?

A26: A) The intended market progression is to supply Inuvialuit first, then the sale of meat and secondary product interprovincially, with international markets a potential longer-term consideration. Proponents should address local, regional and interprovincial markets, and may identify international considerations at a high level.

B) The assessment should consider meat production and sale as the primary stream and should address secondary products including hides and antlers. Crafts and tourism-based revenue concepts may be noted where they bear weight on the assessment, but detailed analysis of those streams is not required under this assessment.

C) ICEDO expects this to cover infrastructure and equipment needs, processing capacity, workforce and training investment and ongoing research and monitoring requirements. Recommendations should be prioritized and sequenced, with the basis for prioritization stated.

Q27: Existing information and data

What existing information will be made available to the successful contractor to support the baseline assessment? For example, does ICEDO currently hold herd health or population records, seasonal range or grazing information, operational records, infrastructure assessments including information on the ICEDO Country Foods Processing Plant, harvesting or distribution information (including the number of animals harvested and information on distribution needs for Inuvialuit beneficiaries), financial or production records, previous reports, GIS data or existing community knowledge/spatial datasets relevant to the herd and its range that may be available to the successful contractor, subject to permissions? We ask for clarification on this to inform the project workplan and timeline.

A27: ICEDO will make the following available to the successful contractor, subject to permissions:

- harvest records
- herd population figures held by IRC
- records of reindeer meat distribution to Inuvialuit

- relevant project documentation
- information for the Country Foods Processing Plant
- previous reports

- Q28:** Expected depth of the food-safety and regulatory assessment
The RFP identifies readiness to meet federal food-safety standards as part of Component A and familiarity with CFIA licensing and standards as relevant contractor experience. Could ICEDO clarify how detailed it expects this part of the assessment to be? Is the expectation primarily to identify key regulatory, infrastructure and operational needs and recommend next steps, or to develop a more detailed plan for meeting requirements related to CFIA licensing, processing facilities, inspection, transportation and other related requirements?
- A28:** The expectation is to identify the applicable regulatory, infrastructure and operational requirements and assess current readiness against them to then recommend a sequenced pathway and next steps.
- Q29:** Herd-health assessment expectations
Could ICEDO clarify what is intended by “baseline data collection on herd health”? Is the successful contractor expected to undertake new field-based herd-health data collection, such as animal examinations, biological sampling or other primary health data collection, or is the expectation to assess existing information, engage with herders and other knowledge holders, identify gaps and risks and develop recommendations for future herd-health monitoring and veterinary needs?
- A29:** The expectation is the second of the two approaches described in the question: assess existing information, engage herders and other knowledge holders, identify gaps and risks and develop recommendations for future herd-health monitoring and veterinary needs.
- Q30:** Feed supply, forage and range assessment
Component A identifies feed supply as an operational issue to assess, while Component B addresses environmental conditions that may affect grazing. Could ICEDO clarify what it expects this part of the assessment to include? Is the contractor expected to assess natural forage availability and habitat/range condition, the potential need for supplemental or imported feed and how it could be supplied or both?
Does ICEDO anticipate any new field-based forage or habitat/range assessment or is the expectation to rely primarily on existing information, available spatial or technical data and knowledge gathered through engagement with herders and other knowledge holders?
- A30:** The assessment should address natural forage availability and range condition and the potential need for supplemental feed together with how it could be realistically imported to the region.
ICEDO anticipates that there will be new field based forage and habitat/range assessment needed to address natural forage availability and range conditions.

Q31: Climate analysis expectations

For Component B, does ICEDO expect the contractor to undertake original climate modelling or projections or would the use of existing regional climate data and projections be sufficient?, For example, would an assessment of the implications for herd health, grazing conditions, infrastructure and operations meet the expected level of analysis? The RFP describes the assessment of shifting climate conditions and the identification of climate-related risks and adaptation considerations but does not appear to specify a modelling requirement.

Will relevant ICEDO/IRC staff, existing studies, datasets or other internal information be available to support this component? Can ICEDO/IRC also provide guidance on preferred climate datasets or facilitate access to relevant information that may not be publicly available?

A31: Original climate modelling is not required. Use of existing regional climate data and projections, interpreted for their implications for herd health, grazing conditions, infrastructure and operations meets the expected level of analysis. Proponents should identify the datasets and projection scenarios they propose to use and explain why those are appropriate, rather than ICEDO prescribing them. ICEDO and IRC staff will be available to support this component. Internal studies, datasets or other information will be made available where they exist and where release is approved.

Q32: Community engagement scope and associated costs

The RFP indicates that direct engagement with ICEDO's governance committee, elders, herders and other knowledge holders will be required and that contractors must be able to travel within the ISR, including Inuvik and Tuktoyaktuk. Could ICEDO clarify the anticipated geographic scope and level of community engagement? In particular, does ICEDO envision engagement in communities beyond Inuvik and Tuktoyaktuk? Is there an expected number of in-person community visits, interviews, governance committee meetings or on-the-land visits that proponents should use to plan and budget?

Could ICEDO also clarify whether proponents should budget for associated community engagement costs such as participant honoraria, community resource technicians or other Inuvialuit support, meeting space, etc. or whether any of these costs will be coordinated or covered directly by ICEDO?

A32: Broad community engagement is not required. Engagement should be undertaken through targeted sessions with individuals directly involved in the stewardship of the herd: knowledge holders, elders, herding staff, ICEDO and IRC staff, and governance committee members. Household surveys and open houses should not be scoped. Engagement will centre on Inuvik and Tuktoyaktuk, consistent with the travel requirement in the RFP.

Q33: Inuvialuit participation and knowledge transfer

Section 4 notes that preference may be given to proposals that include Inuvialuit personnel or subcontractors and a plan for meaningful knowledge transfer. Does ICEDO anticipate identifying Inuvialuit team members and/or community-based resource persons to participate in the work or should proponents identify and secure appropriate Inuvialuit personnel independently? Our team has established relationships in the region

and experience working with community resource technicians. We would be comfortable working with relevant Inuvialuit organizations (e.g. community corporations, Inuvialuit Game Council, Hunters and Trappers Committees) to identify potential Inuvialuit team members, if that is the preferred approach.

Does ICEDO have a vision for what knowledge transfer back to the community would entail? For example, are proponents expected to develop community-facing or other products in addition to the formal deliverables to ICEDO, such as community-specific maps, spatial data products, plain-language materials, presentations or other materials that communities can retain and use?

A33: Proponents are responsible for identifying and securing their own Inuvialuit personnel and subcontractors. ICEDO will not direct proponents to particular individuals. Knowledge transfer back to the community is outside of the scope for this requirement.

Q34: Knowledge capture framework

Section 2.3 states that interviews, on-the-land visits and other knowledge-gathering activities must follow informed-consent practices consistent with ICEDO's knowledge capture framework. Could ICEDO confirm whether this refers to IRC's Guidelines for Research in the Inuvialuit Settlement Region and associated traditional knowledge research agreements/processes, or whether ICEDO has a separate knowledge capture framework?

Does ICEDO expect a separate verification step with knowledge holders engaged in the project, such as review of transcripts and/or interview notes? If so, should proponents account for this as a separate engagement step in the workplan and budget?

A34: ICEDO has developed their own knowledge capture framework based on the IRC Guidelines for Research in the Inuvialuit Settlement Region. This framework will be shared with the successful proponent. ICEDO expects a verification step with participating knowledge holders, including review of transcripts or interview notes. Proponents should account for this as a distinct step in the workplan and budget.

Q35: GIS and spatial deliverables

The RFP notes that project data will belong to ICEDO. Does ICEDO anticipate GIS datasets or other spatial products as formal project deliverables in addition to maps incorporated into the reports? If so, are there preferred formats, data standards or existing spatial datasets that the successful contractor would be expected to use?

A35: ICEDO expects spatial datasets as formal deliverables in addition to maps incorporated into reports. At the moment there is no confirmed preferred format or standard.

Q36: Main point of contact with ICEDO

Will ICEDO have a primary point of contact with the successful contractor? If so, is there a role for them in the project that should be accounted for in the project workplan?

A36: The ICEDO project manager will be the successful contractor's primary point of contact and will coordinate data access, governance committee scheduling and introductions to participants and knowledge holders. Proponents should account for this role in the

workplan, including regular progress meetings. The project manager's involvement is an ICEDO contribution and should not be costed in the proposal.

All other information contained in this Request for Proposal remains unchanged.