

CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS

RFT: 2026-019
File: AP_3/42
Date: 6 May 2026
To: Interested Service Providers
Contact: Procurement Unit (procurement@sprep.org)

Subject: Request for tenders (RFT): Development of a Pacific Loss and Damage Communication and Engagement Toolkit

Question 1:

The RFT notes Pacific Islanders as the audience for the toolkit, but does SPREP anticipate further segmentation (e.g. community, government/ policy officials), or should the toolkit be designed as a broadly accessible, general-audience resource?

Response:

For Part A we would like this toolkit to be designed as a broadly accessible, general-audience resource with a lens on Pacific Islanders.

Question 2:

Is the toolkit primarily intended for individual self-learning, facilitated workshops or community discussions, or advocacy / communication by community representatives - Or should the toolkit explicitly support multiple use contexts?

Response:

Individual self-learning to grow Pacific empowerment which will eventually lead to a broad range of uses. We would like this toolkit to be the reference resource for Pacific Islanders who wish to know more about Loss and Damage and all it encompasses. The aim is to build personal capacity/knowledge on this issue for deeper recognition and understanding as to the impact of climate change upon self as a Pacific Islander in their natural environment but also for the individual to apply this information when and where needed ie to on share information and teach others when needed, to share personal experiences under loss and damage, to exchange information with others in knowledge exchange etc.

The second part of the toolkit is to support researchers, and those that seek input and feedback from Pacific Islanders to outline the best way to engage with Pacific Island communities when undertaking research on Loss and Damage across the different parts of a Pacific Island community/society.

Question 3:

What level of technical depth is expected when explaining Loss and Damage concepts (e.g. high-level explainer vs. moderately policy-literate audience)?

Response:

As this would be the first resource of its kind on this issue for Pacific Islanders, we seek a bit of both with the primary being this toolkit bringing about a moderately literate understanding of people on this issue. Some areas within may require further details. An advisory group will be able to provide further clarification upon confirmation.

Question 4:

Beyond factsheets, PowerPoint presentations, and activity plans mentioned in the scope, are there preferred or discouraged formats (e.g. e-learning modules, short videos, infographics, storytelling case studies, social-media-ready content)?

Response:

For the first part, short videos and PowerPoint presentations are not necessary – storytelling case studies or experiences and activity plans can pepper the toolkit where needed to support understanding of Loss and Damage, as with infographics.

Should you believe e-learning modules and social-media ready content through this resource be some of the best ways to approach this, then please outline in your technical proposal.

Question 5:

Is there a relationship between the two components of the toolkit (with need for cross-referencing) or should these function as largely standalone products?

Response:

These can be packaged as largely standalone products, or as two different parts within the single publication. We will be advised by your perspective on the best way forward.

Question 6:

To ensure that the level of effort and proposed methodology are realistic and aligned with SPREP's expectations, could you please advise on the indicative budget range or ceiling for this consultancy?

Response:

Please cost out how much you think it would cost to deliver the scope of work set out in the Terms of Reference.

Question 7:

Firstly, the Terms of Reference indicate that the work is to be completed within 60 days of contract signing. Could you please confirm whether this timeline is fixed, or whether there is any flexibility (for example, to accommodate stakeholder engagement processes or unforeseen delays)?

Response:

There is flexibility to this timeline, should this be needed due to unexpected delays and unforeseen circumstances.

Question 8:

In relation to stakeholder engagement, I anticipate that the development of both the communication resources (Component A) and the Engagement & Communication Guidelines (Component B) would benefit from consultation with end-users both prior to development and following draft completion. Could you please clarify, whether SPREP expects consultations to be conducted in person, or if online engagement is acceptable; and

Response:

Online engagement is acceptable should this be recommended and explained in your technical proposal.

Question 9:

Could you please clarify whether engagement is expected across all Pacific Island countries, or if a representative sample (e.g. 2–3 countries) would be sufficient?

Response:

A representative sample of Pacific Island countries would be sufficient – please do outline in your technical proposal.