



CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS

RFT: ClimSA_2024_005
File: AP_3/35
Date: 13 May 2024
To: Interested Service Providers
Contact: Wati Kanawale (watik@sprep.org)

Subject: Request for tenders (RFT): Review and Update of the Pacific Islands Meteorological Strategy (2017 – 2026)

Question 1:

Seeking clarity on deliverables and timelines.

- a) On page 8 (noting that the RFT document pages are not numbered), under the subheading 'Deliverables' there are eight (8) specified deliverables. On page 9 under the subheading 'Timelines and Deliverables', there are 6 Tasks lined up with the deliverables. In the case that this is a mere editing error (noting that the deliverables are still 8 but not in the way the table is set out) it would be helpful to correct this numbering and formatting. In summary, clarity is sought over the presentation of the deliverables as they do not line up.
- b) This brings me to the next part of this question, to have clarity please on the reconciliation of 'Contract Duration' (found in the table on top of page 9). The table at the top of the table states the contract duration as 30 days over 4 months, versus the second table on that same page with its third column 'Due Date (40 days over 3 months)'. The contract then would specify 30 days vs a 40-day count estimated for the delivery of the sum of the work, and then clarity needed on whether it is over a period of 3 months or 4 months. In summary, clarity is sought for whether the consultancy contract is for 30 days or 40 days, and if the work is to be conducted over 3 or 4 months.?

Response:

- a) The deliverables under the subheading 'Deliverables' and the deliverables under the subheading 'Timeline & Deliverables' are basically the same, more organized in the latter.
- b) We acknowledge the error in the Request for Tender document regarding the contract duration. The correct contract duration is 40 days in 3 months and the RFT has been revised to reflect this correction.

Question 2:

Expectations of the Consultant working with other consultants on related other reviews pertaining to the meteorological support services of SPREP.

This relates to the Working Arrangements paragraph found on the bottom section of page 8. There should be clearer instruction for the fair expectation of the Consultant in aligning this review work with other ongoing reviews. As the document reads currently from that paragraph:

- '...There are other critical areas of this strategy that are undertaken in parallel and that is the review of the Pacific Roadmap for Strengthened Climate Services (PRSCS), review of PMC and PMDP, review of the Pacific Climate Change Science and Services Research Roadmap (PCCSSRR). **The consultant is expected to work together with other consultants undertaking the above reviews.**'

The way this is written is a little vague and the Consultant could benefit from additional instruction to benefit the expectation and planning for the proposal development.

For instance.

- a) What arrangements will be provided by the Secretariat to facilitate the work of the Consultants across the related reviews?
- b) How will information be shared between reviews, and in which parts of the methodology should the engagement with the other Consultant parties be expected to occur?
- c) In what relation in terms of the reporting of the final works of the Consultant be made relative to the other works of the other Consultant parties?

Some clear guidelines reflected in the Methodology may benefit the expectations of both the Consultant of this review, SPREP, and the other Consultant parties, and may benefit from the proposal design standpoint.

Response:

SPREP is coordinating other review work that is related to the review and update of the Pacific Islands Meteorological Strategy (PIMS). In this case, SPREP as the secretariat can facilitate the following:

- a) Discussion across other related reviews with their respective consultants.
- b) Sharing of information amongst other related review work in which SPREP is coordinating.
- c) The reporting of the key deliverables and milestones (final works) are independent of other related review work.

Question 3:

This may be less of a question and more of a reflection for the consideration of the projected works and skills requirements in application to this RFT.

In total I think the tender is for a review that contains fairly significant pieces of work:

- a) **Evaluation expertise** - a thorough evaluative application and expertise on the strategy/plan in question. Nominally, an evaluation process for a fully considered performance assessment of the PIMS at mid-term requires an effort beyond just a desktop study involved. An evaluation of collated documentation is just one component that needs verification in the evaluative process, and inclusive of interviews with various partners and stakeholders (as is suggested by the suggested Methodology). A fully evaluated performance assessment will also help to produce the additional requested output in developing the lessons learnt components related to understanding barriers, challenges and gaps experienced in the implementation of a strategy/plan.
- b) **Strategic planning development and drafting expertise** – realigning a strategy midstream is without some potential complexities in arriving at agreed upon consensus on future outcomes, designing development pathways towards those outcomes, and adjusting the overall results framework of the PIMS strategy.
- c) **Implementation planning and programming design expertise** – the PIMS has both regional and national goals and objectives, and the coverage of the Members of SPREP. There are a potential multitude of plans at national level, the definite multitude of regional frameworks to analyze and assess, to find fit and alignment for the PIMS and its designed objectives and outcomes.

In reflection thus, the undertaking for the review is not an uncomplicated piece of work, and so the final question is whether the number of days calculation on page 9 of the RFT is sufficient for this piece of work and might be worth a reassessment by the Secretariat.

Response:

We understand the reflections above and suggest indicating your timeline based on your experience when bidding given that we are flexible to explore options of extending the number of days for task(s) if required.

Question 4:

Grateful if you would clarify if the duration was 30 days or 40 days as per the information provided under the RFT?

Response:

We acknowledge the error in the Request for Tender document regarding the contract duration. The correct contract duration is 40 days in 3 months and the RFT has been revised to reflect this correction.

Question 5:

Duration of the contract: Our initial understanding from the "Timeline and Deliverables" section is that the contract spans 40 days over three months. However, we noticed a discrepancy in the "Characteristics of the Consultancy" section, which mentions a 30-day duration over four months. Could you please clarify the expected duration and distribution of workdays for this contract?

Response:

We acknowledge the error in the Request for Tender document regarding the contract duration. The correct contract duration is 40 days in 3 months and the RFT has been revised to reflect this correction.

Question 6:

Mission expectations: Additionally, we would like to understand if there is an expectation from SPREP for the successful consultant to travel to Samoa for consultations as part of this project. If so, could you specify what the expectations and requirements would be for such a mission?

Response:

There is an expectation for the consultant to attend the PIMS Strategy Consultation scheduled for June 13th – 14th in Melbourne. The PICs NMHS Directors will be part of this consultation. It is recommended that the cost associated with this consultation be clearly provided in your financial proposal. Please identify this cost separately.

Furthermore, if the consultant finds it valuable to conduct other national level missions, including a mission to Samoa, please include this as an option in your financial proposal. This will help us to conduct the financial assessment properly and fairly, noting that individual consultants are providing options depending on their methodology and approach.

Question 7:

Community Engagement: What level of engagement with local communities is expected as part of this consultancy? Are there specific activities or outcomes that SPREP anticipates in relation to community interaction?

Response:

SPREP's focus of engagement is with the National Meteorological and Hydrological Services (Directors and staff), the sectors, and other relevant stakeholder organizations. However, if the consultant is recommending a need for the consultation to be taken to the community level, then ensure to identify this as part of your methodology and approach. Costs associated with this need to be included in the proposal and clearly identified under your financial proposal as itemized costs. Do not lump everything into just one consultancy fee. The financial proposal should be broken down to provide detailed costs.

Question 8:

Presentation at the PMC: Should we assume that the presentation at the Pacific Meteorological Council (PMC) will be conducted virtually, or is there a possibility that this will be an in-person event?

Response:



SPREP
Secretariat of the Pacific Regional
Environment Programme

At this stage, SPREP's preference is for the presentation to be delivered virtually. However, a change to present in person will mean that SPREP will bear the cost so there is no need to include this cost in your financial proposal.