

CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS

RFT: 2026/012
 File: AP_2/18/18/1
 Date: 31 March 2026
 To: Interested Service Providers
 Contact: Procurement Unit (procurement@sprep.org)

Subject: Request for tenders (RFT): Technical Revision and Concept Development Consultancy – Adaptation Fund Regional Proposal and Innovation Grant

Question 1:

Consultancy Structure. Could you please advise whether SPREP envisages this assignment being undertaken by a single individual consultant, or whether SPREP is open to the work being delivered by a small, complementary team of consultants with different technical specialisations working together under a lead consultant? Given the breadth and technical diversity of the scope and the tight timeframe, this clarification would be very helpful.

Response:

We are open to the assignment being delivered by a small, complementary team of consultants however we ask that there be specified designated lead consultant

Question 2:

Adaptation Fund Secretariat Review Comments. If possible, would SPREP be able to share the Adaptation Fund Secretariat’s review comments on the existing Regional Concept Note? Access to these comments would greatly assist us in understanding the depth and focus of the required revisions and in estimating the level of effort needed to respond effectively.

Response:

Please note that the Adaptation Fund Secretariat’s detailed review comments will be shared with the successful bidder. In the interim, a brief summary of the review has been provided to give context on the depth and focus of the revisions required.

<p>I. Concrete adaptation action through regional approach</p>	<p>Reduce the document to 50 pages (including annexes), align outputs and outcomes across the Theory of Change and tables, include outputs, activities, risks and assumptions in the ToC, and consider structuring one component per objective.</p>
<p>II. Economic Social and Environmental Benefits and compliance with ES Policy of the Fund</p>	<p>Include a summary of the gender analysis, provide gender-disaggregated beneficiary data (including vulnerable groups and PWDs), identify any maladaptation risks, quantify project benefits with methodology or proxies, and justify the regional approach.</p>

<i>(An ESS completed by SPREP is available)</i>	
III. Cost effectiveness and regional approach to support cost effectiveness	Refine project scope, include a BAU comparison table with quantitative estimates and sustainability, strengthen cost-effectiveness, demonstrate compliance with technical standards, list applicable standards, and justify no duplication with related projects.
IV. Learning and knowledge management component	Clarify responsibility and approach for tracking lessons, resources for sustainability, details and budget for knowledge-sharing, post-project knowledge sustainability, and feedback mechanisms to improve training and capacity building.
V. Consultative process <i>(consultations completed)</i>	Using details in the Annex provided Document consultations (completed) concisely in Section I and include a table listing all stakeholder consultations by country.
VI. Project alignment with AF results framework ensure following information is included:	Revise the results framework to ensure all indicators are SMART, align outcomes/outputs and indicators with the updated AF Results Framework (Nov 2025), update the table to the required format, include grant amounts per component and objective, and ensure all figures are consistent.
VII. Overview of the environmental social impacts in compliance with Environmental and Social Policy and Gender Policy of the Fund <i>(an ESS Screening Report by SPREP is readily available)</i>	Complete the ESS checklist against all 15 ESP principles using the required table format (drawing on the SPREP ESS Report), ensure alignment with AF ESP rather than IE policy, and elaborate on the gender-specific cultural and legal context.
VIII. Projects contribution to new and innovative solutions .	Provide clear references showing where the approaches have been successfully applied and their outcomes, including clarification on examples such as community-based pig management.

Question 3:

Scope and Expectations within the Available Timeframe. The TOR includes both the revision of the existing Regional Concept Note and the development of three concept notes for submission under the Adaptation Fund Innovation Grant window. Any additional guidance on SPREP's expectations regarding the depth, maturity, and level of technical detail required for these deliverables within the available timeframe would be appreciated

Response:

We expect the consultant to deliver a final Regional Concept Note that has addressed all of the comments from the technical review and feedback from the SPREP Invasives Team and ready for submission to the Adaptation Fund.

The technical guidance and feedback from the review of the Regional Concept Note will also inform the expected depth and level of detail for the Innovation Grant concept notes. These concept notes should be prepared to a standard suitable for initial submission to the Adaptation Fund by the end of the contract period.

Relevant technical inputs are currently being developed by SPREP teams. The successful bidder will be responsible for consolidating these inputs and producing coherent, submission-ready concept notes

Question 4:

Can you clarify how advanced is the development of the three concept notes for the Adaptation Fund Innovation grant window?

Response:

The development of the three innovation concept notes is already underway, with technical teams currently populating the required templates with relevant technical inputs. These are expected to be completed by the time consultant contracting is completed.

The role of the consultant will therefore focus on consolidating, refining, and finalising the concept notes to a submission-ready standard, rather than initiating development from scratch.

In addition, the scope does not require extensive country or partner consultations for the Innovation Grant window. This has been completed. The facilitation of any required country endorsement processes will be undertaken by SPREP, not the consultant.

Question 7:

What level of strategic direction vs. independent technical leadership is SPREP expecting from the consultant?

Response:

SPREP will provide overall strategic direction, including alignment with PRISMSS priorities, regional context, and coordination with participating countries and partners, as well as provision of existing documentation and technical inputs.

The consultant is expected to exercise a high level of independent technical leadership. This includes applying their expertise in Adaptation Fund programming to advise on the alignment of project objectives, structure, and documentation with Adaptation Fund requirements and expectations. The consultant will be responsible for critically reviewing and strengthening the existing concept note and associated materials, and for ensuring that SPREP's proposed interventions are clearly articulated, strategically positioned, and fully responsive to Adaptation Fund technical review feedback.

The successful bidder will be expected to lead the technical design, refinement, and packaging of the proposal ensuring compliance, coherence, and quality while working in close collaboration with SPREP Invasive Species Team and PRISMSS partners.

Question 8:

Will SPREP co-ordinate engagement in country or is this expected to be led by the consultant? Similarly, is the consultant expected to engage directly with national focal points or only through SPREP-led channels?

Response:

SPREP will lead and coordinate all engagement with participating countries and relevant national focal points. The consultant will support this process by contributing to and participating in consultations as required, including preparing materials, providing technical inputs, and engaging in discussions facilitated by SPREP. Engagement with national focal points will be coordinated through SPREP according to its appropriate communication channels and country protocols (SPREP Focal Points)

Question 9:

Are the comments on the Adaptation Fund Regional Concept Note available to be shared ahead of proposal submission or will they be provided following contract award?

Response:

Please refer to response provided on question 2. The full review document will be provided to the successful bidder.

Question 10:

Does SPREP have an identified technical partner established?

Response:

Yes. Technical partners for the project have already been identified.

Question 11:

Is baseline data (ecological, biosecurity etc) available or is the consultant expected to generate assumptions?

Response:

Baseline data and supporting information are available through SPREP and its technical partners and will be shared with the consultant. However, there may be existing data gaps. The consultant is expected to review the available information, and where necessary, apply justified assumptions and/or address data gaps to ensure the robustness and completeness of the proposal in line with Adaptation Fund requirements.

Question 12:

How much turnaround time should be assumed for SPREP, government and any partner reviews?

Response:

The assignment is being delivered within a very tight timeframe. SPREP will endeavour to provide feedback on draft outputs within approximately 2–3 working days wherever possible.

However, the consultant should note that some inputs from participating countries and PRISMSS partners may require additional time and are outside of SPREP's control.

Question 13:

Who is responsible for approving the concept notes prior to submission to the Adaptation Fund?

Response:

SPREP and relevant countries involved in the projects. Formal endorsement of the concept notes will be required from the participating countries, and SPREP will facilitate this process in coordination with the relevant national focal points and authorities.

Question 14:

What is the location and duration of travel required?

Response:

No travel required.

Question 15:

Is the consultant expected to cover the costs of consultations with countries and technical partners e.g. travel, venue hire and associated expenses? Or is the consultant only expected to cover their own time and expenses to undertake the consultations?

Response:

No. The consultant is not expected to cover costs associated with country or partner consultations such as travel, venue hire, or related logistical expenses. Consultations are expected to be conducted virtually, and the financial proposal should therefore reflect the consultants' professional fees and any associated remote working costs only. Should any in-person engagement be required, this will be facilitated and agreed in advance with SPREP.

Question 16:

With respect to gathering inputs such as beneficiary numbers, national technical standards, and lists of related projects, we assume these inputs will be shared by SPREP / country focal points.

Response:

SPREP will provide available information on beneficiary numbers, applicable national technical standards, and relevant or aligned projects where such information is held or can reasonably be obtained through existing records or country focal points.

Question 17:

Please confirm the respective targeted countries for the technical concept notes on Natural Enemies Natural Solutions, Protect Our Marine Areas, and Predator Free Pacific.

Response:

The Innovation Grant concept notes are not country-specific. Rather, they are designed to complement programme-level interventions. SPREP is currently working closely with interested and supportive countries in the region that wish to be associated with and endorse these project submissions. The final country participation will be confirmed by SPREP

Question 18:

We kindly request confirmation on whether preliminary technical concept outlines or prior scoping notes exist for the three Innovation Grant themes and will be shared with the consultant.

Response:

Preliminary technical concept outlines and associated scoping information for the three Innovation Grant themes are currently being prepared. These materials will be shared with the successful bidder upon contract award to support refinement and finalisation of the concept notes.

Question 19:

Please clarify if any specific country-based team member is expected in the team composition.

Response:

No country-specific or country-based team members are required or expected as part of the consultant team composition.

Question 20:

May we confirm whether all communications with PRISMSS technical partners and countries will be coordinated by SPREP, with the consultant participating as needed, or whether the consultant is expected to independently convene consultations after initial contact.

Response:

SPREP will assist with convening meetings with PRISMSS technical partners and participating countries. The consultant may communicate directly with technical partners, as needed, to progress and finalise the concept notes, in coordination with SPREP.

Question 21:

Given the submission of proposal for this RFT is on 10th April and a total of minimum 9 weeks of review window is mentioned in the ToR, please confirm the anticipated timelines for the submission of draft and final concept notes.

Response:

Final drafts are expected to be submitted by 15 June 2026.

Question 22:

For the Technical Proposal, may we confirm whether SPREP has a preferred structure or page limit for the methodology and workplan section. Please confirm separate technical and financial proposals are expected to be submitted along with the application and honour forms.

Response:

It is entirely up to the bidder how they want to structure the technical proposal. Submissions of multiple attachments are acceptable. The technical and financial proposals can be submitted separately but within the due date.

Question 23:

The contract outlines obligations to safeguard Confidential Information but does not specify a survival period post-termination. Page 17

Query: Can SPREP confirm the duration for which confidentiality obligations will survive following the expiry or termination of the Contract?

Response:

Confidentiality obligations can survive the termination or expiration of the contract. This can be added by the legal team.

Question 24:

Clause 2.11 requires the Supplier to indemnify the Buyer against all claims, expressly including "consequential financial loss". Page 8 Furthermore, Clause 12.6 states that the IP indemnity is not subject to any limitation or cap on liability. Page 16.

Query: Will SPREP agree to a mutual waiver of indirect and consequential losses, and introduce an overall aggregate liability cap (e.g., 100% of the contract value) for the Supplier?

Response:

We can consider this at the evaluation stage as the legal team assesses this on a case-by-case basis.

Question 25:

The Charges are defined as the total maximum amount payable, with no provision for rate escalation. Page 9

Query: Given the project timeline extending to June 2026, Page 8 will SPREP consider including a rate escalation provision for any project delays that are beyond the Supplier's reasonable control?

Response:

The contract price is fixed. Rate escalation due to inflation and market changes is not considered. These should be factored into the costs.

Question 26:

The Terms of Reference focus on the technical revision of the Adaptation Fund Regional Concept Note and developing concept proposals. Page 7

Query: Can SPREP confirm that the scope of work is strictly technical and does not require the Supplier to provide formal legal opinions or legal drafting? Please note that the bidder is not authorized to do any legal work.

Response:

The consultant is not required to provide formal legal opinions or undertake any legal drafting as part of this work.

Question 27:

Clause 7.1 allows subcontracting with the Buyer's prior written approval. Page 11 The Declaration of Honour form also references joint ventures. Page 3

Query: Can SPREP confirm if bidding as a formal Joint Venture is permissible, and clarify the expected timeline for approving any proposed sub-contractors?

Response:

Yes, it is permissible, but it needs to be clearly outlined in the application form/ proposal. The suitability will be subject to determination by the evaluation committee. If awarded, subcontractors will be subject to discussions and inclusion in the contract.

Question 28:

Schedule 1 states that 2% is deductible from the final fee for every 7 days of delay from the End Date, but does not state a maximum cap. Page 3

Query: Will SPREP agree to cap the maximum deductible amount for delays at a standard market rate (e.g., 10% of the total fee)?

Response:

A cap can be discussed once the contract has been awarded.

Question 29:

It is stated that the available budget is USD 186,000 . Could you please clarify what this means? Is it a project budget or is it the limit for consultancy or available budget for overall activity including fee, travel and miscellaneous etc.

Response:

No travel required for this consultancy. USD 186,000 is the ceiling for the tenders, any tenders above this will not be considered.

Question 30:

In regards to GEDSI, does the organisation or the project proponent have a GEDSI plan?

Response:

A Gender Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion (GEDSI) analysis has been developed for the Regional Adaptation Fund Concept Note, along with a stakeholder engagement annex that incorporates GEDSI considerations.