

## ANSWERS TO CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS

File: AP\_6/5/8/4  
Date: 08 November 2019  
To: Interested suppliers  
Contact: Siniva Tuuau-Enosa  
  
Subject: Request for tenders: National Needs Assessment for 14 PICs and Timor-Leste for the PacWastePlus Project

---

1. Is there an indicative budget for the proposed scope of works?
  - **Not shareable at this point. We are seeking respondents to describe what they feel is the appropriate methodology to deliver the outcome and justify the associated budget.**
2. To what extent do you see the proposed national training framework as an extension of existing programs? Based on our experiences in the Pacific, the extent to which existing resources (training or best practice solid waste management guidance) are being utilised is mixed. Can you please indicate a preference for existing resources to be utilised for this project based on your knowledge of adoption and successful implementation of SPREP funded tools and initiatives? This has scoping implications so your assistance in indicating whether you see this as building upon existing resources or starting from scratch would help us in our project planning and fee estimation.
  - **This activity is not proposing a national training framework, rather that the successful consultant establishes (confirms) minimum standards for comparison purposes, and through the output report provide recommendations on what countries need in terms of capacity building in relation to waste management. The activity should be designed to clearly articulate (i) the desired capacity building of countries, (ii) the assessed need based on analysis against a standard.**
3. To be able to complete the task within your proposed timeframes, consultation and site visits would need to be efficient and with the aim of capturing a representative sample. Would a 'sampling approach' be considered acceptable? Would SPREP assist in advising on representative sites and stakeholders, and how would stakeholder fatigue be managed given there is a waste legislation review running in parallel (and some of the stakeholders will be the same)?
  - **A sampling approach would be considered acceptable, the expectation is that tenderers will describe their methodology and provide an explanation as to why they feel it is the best way to achieve the project outcomes.**
  - **SPREP will assist in advising on stakeholders that will assist with in-country coordination**
  - **SPREP will put successful consultant in contact with focal point as a way of introduction and to manage processes. It is acknowledged that resources in our member countries are limited, but it is hoped the various activities will draw on a wide and varied officer base in each country to reduce issues of fatigue. Regardless of this, the tasks are required to be delivered in the stated timeframes due to other project pressures.**

4. Where tenderers can demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of waste management in the 14 countries (and connections with the relevant stakeholders), would SPREP consider it acceptable if efforts were focused on countries with less capacity to provide data or communicate issues over the phone?
  - The expectation of this activity is that the same assessment of capacity needs and focus is for each of the 15 PacWaste Plus programme countries.
5. Please clarify what is meant by “assess the capacity of the country”? We would interpret this as the capacity of (national or provincial) government to regulate and local government to implement (or contract out)? Where does the private sector fit into this (eg. Total waste management in PNG) or the multi-national operating in these countries fit into it. (eg. Major mines that manage their own waste onsite)?
  - Interpretation is accurate and the expectation is for the capacity of the government to regulate and implement activities. The PacWaste Plus programme recognises the various players in this space such as the private sector, however that is out of scope for this activity, and focus is only on the National and local government’s capacity building needs.
6. Please elaborate upon the “minimum standards” (task 2). Given SPREP is undertaking a review of the adequacy of current environmental legislation for waste management in parallel to this job, are we able to really confirm minimum standards at this stage? We’re aware of the international standards, but we need further clarification on priorities and acceptable management standards that SPREP considers realistic.
  - The task is requesting the successful consultant to determine an appropriate minimum standard (are utilise an existing one) to provide a basis for any recommendations they make on capacity building needs for each country. SPREP is not setting this standard, as we are seeking a consultant to undertake the work that has knowledge and experience in this field and can provide this level of expertise.
7. The RFT notes a previous literature review. Is SPREP able to list what is included in the literature review or if possible make it available as part of this project?
  - Clause 4 in the TOR (Other Information) is standard wording for PacWaste Plus tenders, no previous literature review has taken place.
8. Can you confirm what the ultimate outcome of this work would be? If I understand correctly, you are seeking a report, as an input for a gap analysis, outlining what the countries feel they need in terms of waste education/knowledge capacity (and roughly for how many people and what is the real issue they need more support for?. Is this a fair assessment?
  - Yes, that is a fair assessment of the expected outcome of this activity.
9. What kind of data will be provided? Existing reports etc?
  - Clause 4 in the TOR (Other Information) is standard wording for PacWaste Plus tenders, no previous literature review has taken place.
10. Is there an infrastructure summary for the streams per country?
  - No, however, if you feel this needs to be factored into the assessment of countries, then you are most welcome to include as part of your methodology.

11. We propose to skype/call everyone. Travel would be option – do you think that works?
  - the expectation is interested bidders will articulate in their methodology on how they propose to deliver the required activity, in whatever modality they deem necessary be it skype/telephone calls or travel.
12. Criterion 1 says the consultant must have a law degree – is that indeed a requirement or a typo left from a different RFT?
  - Criteria 1 states the need for “Demonstrated experience in waste management industry and undertaking assessments of activity and capacity to implement legislation/policy”. A law degree is therefore not a prerequisite.
13. Task 3 states that an assessment will be undertaken via desktop review, email and telephone follow ups, and country visits where necessary. Given the spread of the target countries across the region, a cost to travel to each of the countries can be substantial. If the particular countries that may need to be visited during the assessment are unknown, then providing a cost for that aspect in the proposal will be challenging. Therefore, can we provide that cost as a variation to the proposal, should it be identified during the work that a country visit will be necessary? Or do we need to provide an indicative cost for each country as part of the proposal?
  - The expectation is interested bidders clearly articulate in their methodology how this activity is to be delivered (including modality). The financial proposal is to then be reflective of this methodology and any other relevant charges deemed necessary by bidder. We recommend that proposals contain separable portions which the panel may assess either as part of the proposal package or separated if not required. Assessment of the submissions will include an assessment of the costs to deliver and should therefore include all efforts to provide appropriate costings that support the proposed methodology.