

CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS

RFT: POLP - 2023/002
File: AP_6/19/4
Date: 18 August 2023
To: Interested Service Providers
Contact: Ngaire Ah Ching (ngairec@sprep.org)

Subject: Request for tenders (RFT): Consultancy – Development of a Regional Wide Compendium and Assessment of current research into and practical application of alternatives to single-use plastics, including barriers and solutions for upscaling artisan and commercial products to replace single-use plastics.

Question 1:

Could you please advise us of the expected budgetary ceiling, and the number of days you envisage the activities to require during the three-month contracting period.

Response:

As per clause 6.2 of the tender document, scores will be awarded accordingly to the financial proposal submitted. The financial proposal is therefore competitive, and every bidder is to propose costs as applicable to the scope of work in the Terms of Reference. Financial Proposals above USD 50,000 will only be considered if there is clear justification provided as to why costs above this limit are necessary.

The Project Schedule is indicated at 4 months. There is no particular expectation of a number of days to be undertaken within the timeframe.

Question 2:

Does the PMU have a specific list and contact details of stakeholders to be engaged or is the consultant expected to determine relevant stakeholders and independently make contact?

Response:

The PMU will provide a list of stakeholders (incl contact details) to be engaged. The consultant is also expected to determine and suggest relevant stakeholders and make direct contact. The lists may be discussed further during Activity 1 – Inception Meeting.

Question 3:

Considering the diversity of stakeholders to be engaged, does the PMU have capacity to assist with interpretation/translation services if required or should the consultant allow for the provision of interpretation services (if required)?

Response:

Where it may be required, the PMU through its National Focal Points can assist with interpretation/translation.

Question 4:

Does POLP/PMU have a style guideline for the report and compendium or is style up to the consultant?

Response:

The Consultant will work with the PMU (Communications and Stakeholder Engagement Officer) in developing and finalizing the design and layout of the report and compendium.

Question 5:

Can you please clarify if the study intends to focus on “plastics substitutes” or “plastics alternatives” as this will define the exact scope of the study. We assume the TOR is referring to substitutes not alternatives. Please see the UNCTAD definitions of substitutes and alternatives below.

The UNCTAD report titled *Plastic Pollution. The pressing case for natural and environmentally friendly substitutes to plastics* describes plastic substitutes and alternatives as follows:

Plastics substitutes: natural materials from mineral, plant, animal, marine or forestry origin that have similar properties to plastics. They do not include fossil fuel-based or synthetic polymers, bioplastics, and biodegradable plastics. Plastic substitutes should have a lower environmental impact along their life cycle (e.g., natural fibres, agricultural wastes, and other forms of biomass). Depending on the case, they should be biodegradable/compostable or erodable, and should be suitable for reuse, recycling, or sound waste disposal as defined by national, regional regulations or in internationally agreed definitions. They can include by-products. Plastic substitutes should not be hazardous for human, animal, or plant life.

Plastic alternatives: They can include bioplastics or biodegradable plastics. Bioplastics means bio-based polymers materials (e.g., by using vegetable fats and oils, corn starch, straw, woodchips, sawdust, and recycled food waste) and should be subject to material recycling. Biodegradable plastics refers to the end of life of plastics, indicating that they biodegrade in the natural environment, or that they can be composted. They can include their by-products. Plastic alternatives should have lower GHG lifecycle emissions when compared to plastics and not be hazardous for human, animal, or plant life.

Response:

The focus is on plastics substitutes. While substitutes can include bioplastics or biodegradable plastics, these should not be the primary focus of the study.

Question 6:

Does the study include looking at reuse-refill options? These are important when there isn't sufficient scale for locally sourced substitutes (some discussion on reuse here <https://www.lifecycleinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/UNEP-D010-Food-Packaging-Report.pdf>– this will include reuse and refill models that can be implemented locally with and without the need to return to the manufacturer where the manufacturer is overseas. However, this may not be included in the current time and budget restrictions. Clarification around this would be useful.

Response:

Reuse and refill models that can be implemented locally with and without the need to return to the manufacturer where the manufacturer is overseas could be addressed as a case study where such practices are being adopted in SIDS that can be replicated in the Pacific context but for time and budgetary reasons this should not be the focus of the study.

Question 7:

Can we please get further information on the timeline listed in the scope of works as a draft report is expected one week after the consultations end and the presentation happens in the same week?

Review and Consultations addressing the TOR Scope of Works (Section 3).

No later than twelve (12) weeks from the date of approved Workplan.

Review and Consultations addressing the TOR Scope of Works (Section 3).

No later than twelve (12) weeks from the date of approved Workplan.

3 Draft Report to SPREP and its stakeholders.

No later than thirteen (13) weeks from the date of approved Workplan.

4 Presentation of findings to SPREP and its stakeholders.

No later than thirteen (13) weeks from the date of approved Workplan.

5 Submission of Final Report.

No later than two (2) weeks from receiving final feedback from SPREP and relevant stakeholders.

Response:

Timeline is indicative and could be adjusted after discussion with successful consultant/s.

Question 8:

Does the study intend to focus on substitutes that are available or being used worldwide and might be suitable to the Pacific context or would it focus on the materials that are currently being used/available in the Pacific region?

Response:

Study is expected to address substitutes that are available or being used worldwide and might be suitable to the Pacific context and materials that are currently being used/available in the Pacific region.

POLP focus is on Takeaway food and beverage containers, single-use plastics employed in tourism enterprises, and single-use plastics found in general household refuse (including plastic bags, polyethylene terephthalate (PET) bottles, polystyrene containers, plastic straws).

Question 9:

Given primary data is not supposed to be collected from the 12 countries of interest, does POLP already have a list of alternatives/substitutes that are being used in the countries? Or is this information supposed to be collected as part of the project? This will impact on the timeline for the project.

Response:

Information is to be collected as part of the project.

Question 10:

Is the compendium strictly limited to a collection of best practice and research or would it feature focus snippets on case studies relevant to the Pacific?

Response:

The compendium could feature collection of alternatives being used, research into alternatives as well as case studies relevant to the Pacific.

A resilient Pacific environment sustaining our livelihoods and natural heritage in harmony with our cultures.