

CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS

RFT: 2026/029
File: AP_2/49
Date: 28 July 2026
To: Interested Service Providers
Contact: Procurement Unit (procurement@sprep.org)

Subject: Request for tenders (RFT): National Climate Data Strategy and Action Plan Development for Cook Islands, Niue and the Republic of the Marshall Islands

Question 1:

Can you please provide us with an indicative the budget for this project?

Response:

This is a competitive process, and we are open to all offers which will be assessed based on merit and best value for money.

Question 2:

Should the financial proposal exclude travel and DSA costs, given these are stated to be funded separately in line with the SPREP Travel Policy?

Response:

Yes, please exclude the travel costs from your financial proposal.

Question 3:

Can a firm apply for this consultancy?

Response:

Yes.

Question 4:

Output 8 in the Deliverables table states: "Final Strategic Action Plans for all four countries, incorporating stakeholder feedback." We note that the Background section references the wider UNEP CIS-Pac5 project, which covers five countries (Cook Islands, Niue, Palau, RMI, and Tuvalu).

Could SPREP please confirm whether the intended scope of this consultancy (and Output 8 specifically) is limited to the three countries stated elsewhere in the ToR, or whether a fourth country (e.g. Palau) is intended to be included, and if so what additional scope of work would apply.

Response:

No, the scope of work will only be for the three mentioned countries (Cook Islands, Niue, RMI)

Question 5:

Relatedly, Output 3–6 in the Deliverables table is described as "Draft national Climate Data Strategy and Action Plan for each country (Cook Islands, Niue, RMI)" — four output numbers (3, 4, 5, 6) for what appears to be three countries. Could SPREP clarify what the fourth output number refers to, or confirm this is a numbering error?

Response:

This is a numbering error and should be Output 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 as the final output.

Question 6:

Is this opportunity written for a sole individual consultant or can it be delivered by a team?

Response:

It can be delivered by a team

Question 7:

In the Duration section of the RFT states the consultancy duration is six months, while the phase table runs only to Week 16 (approximately four months). Could you please confirm the correct overall contract duration?

Response:

The overall contract duration will be 6 months. The timing windows are the proposed implementation phases but this will need to be developed further on award of contract as part of the development of the workplan.

Question 8:

Please confirm, whether in-country consultation visits are a firm requirement for each country, or whether a virtual-first approach with in-country visits only where justified may be proposed?

Response:

In-country consultation visits are considered important to achieving a comprehensive and meaningful consultation with national stakeholders in each country. It will be very difficult to achieve the depth of engagement required through a virtual-only approach, and bidders proposing a virtual-first methodology should clearly justify how equivalent consultation outcomes would be achieved. In-country visits, where proposed, will be facilitated separately in line with SPREP's Travel Policy (see Question 2).

Question 9:

Please confirm whether costs should be presented as a single consolidated total against the milestones, or broken down by country and milestone.

Response:

The budget is expected to be broadly similar across the three countries, broken down by milestone rather than by country. However, bidders may propose variations where justified by country-specific factors (e.g. logistics, stakeholder numbers, or scope differences) that could reasonably affect cost.

Question 10:

Could you please clarify what coordination, if any, is expected between this consultancy and other consultants or regional technical partners working concurrently under the UNEP CISPac5 programme in the same three countries?

Response:

Coordination with other regional technical partners working under the CISPac5 programme in the same three countries may be required where relevant, to ensure consistency and avoid duplication of stakeholder engagement. Consultants should remain available for such coordination as needed during implementation