



SPREP

Secretariat of the Pacific Regional
Environment Programme

REQUEST FOR TENDERS

RFT: 2022/026
File: AP_6/15
Date: 24 May, 2022
To: Interested consultants
From: Julie PILLET, Technical Waste Project Coordinator, SWAP

Subject: Request for tenders (RFT): Mid-Term Review of the ‘Committing to Sustainable Waste Actions in the Pacific’ (SWAP) Project

1. Background

- 1.1. The Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) is an intergovernmental organization charged with promoting cooperation among Pacific islands countries and territories to protect and improve their environment and ensure sustainable development.
- 1.2. SPREP approaches the environmental challenges faced by the Pacific guided by four simple Values. These values guide all aspects of our work:
 - We value the Environment
 - We value our People
 - We value high quality and targeted Service Delivery
 - We value Integrity
- 1.3. This tender is developed under the ‘Committing to Sustainable Waste Actions in the Pacific’ (SWAP) Project funded by the Agence Française de Développement (AFD). The 3 million Euro SWAP Project aims to improve sanitation, environmental, social, and economic conditions in Pacific island countries and territories through proper waste management.
- 1.4. For more information, see: www.sprep.org.

2. Specifications: statement of requirement

- 2.1. SPREP wishes to call for tenders from qualified and experienced consortiums of consultants to undertake the SWAP Project Mid-Term Review.
- 2.2. The Terms of Reference of the consultancy are set out in Annex A.
- 2.3. The successful consultant must supply the services to the extent applicable, in compliance with SPREP’s Values and Code of Conduct: https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Corporate_Documents/spreporganisational-values-code-of-conduct.pdf. Including SPREP’s policy on Child Protection, Environmental Social Safeguards, Fraud Prevention & Whistleblower Protection and Gender and Social Inclusion.
- 2.4. SPREP Standard Contract Terms and Conditions are non-negotiable.



SPREP

Secretariat of the Pacific Regional
Environment Programme

3. Conditions: information for applicants

- 3.1. To be considered for this tender, interested consultants must meet the following conditions:
- i. Submit a detailed Curriculum vitae detailing qualification and previous relevant experience for each proposed personnel;
 - ii. Provide three referees relevant to this tender submission, including the most recent work completed;
 - iii. Provide examples of past related work outputs;
 - iv. Complete the **tender application form** provided (*Please note you are required to complete in full all areas requested in the Form, particularly the Statements to demonstrate you meet the selection criteria – DO NOT refer us to your CV. Failure to do this will mean your application will **not** be considered*).
For the Technical and Financial proposals you may attach these separately; and
 - v. Provide a copy of valid business registration/license.
- 3.2. Tenderers must declare any areas that may constitute conflict of interest related to this tender and sign the **conflict of interest form** provided.
- 3.3. **Tenderer is deemed ineligible due to association with exclusion criteria, including** bankruptcy, insolvency or winding up procedures, breach of obligations relating to the payment of taxes or social security contributions, fraudulent or negligent practice, violation of intellectual property rights, under a judgment by the court, grave professional misconduct including misrepresentation, corruption, participation in a criminal organisation, money laundering or terrorist financing, child labour and other trafficking in human beings, deficiency in capability in complying main obligations, creating a shell company, and being a shell company.
- 3.4. Tenderer must sign a declaration of **honour form** together with their application, certifying that they do not fall into any of the exclusion situations cited in 3.3 above and where applicable, that they have taken adequate measures to remedy the situation.

4. Submission guidelines

- 4.1. Tender documentation should demonstrate that the interested consortium satisfies the conditions stated above and in the Terms of Reference and is capable of meeting the required services and timeframes. Documentation must also include supporting examples to address the evaluation criteria.
- 4.2. Tender documentation should be submitted in English and outline the interested consultant's complete proposal:
- a) **SPREP Tender Application form and conflict of interest form.** (*Please note you are required to complete in full all areas requested in the Form, particularly the Statements to demonstrate you meet the selection criteria – DO NOT refer us to your CV. Failure to do this will mean your application will **not** be considered*).
For the Technical and Financial proposals you may attach these separately.
 - b) **Honour form**
 - c) **Curriculum Vitae** of the proposed personnel to demonstrate that they have the requisite skills and experience to carry out this contract successfully.
 - d) **Technical Proposal** which contains the details to achieve the tasks outlined in the Terms of Reference, including timelines to complete the deliverables.
 - e) **Financial Proposal** to outline all costs associated with the undertaking of the review including professional fees.

Note: It is expected this activity will be undertaken remotely, and there will be no travel involved.

- 4.3. Provide three referees relevant to this tender submission, including the most recent work completed.
- 4.4. Tenderers/bidders shall bear all costs associated with preparing and submitting a proposal, including cost relating to contract award; SPREP will, in no case, be responsible or liable for those costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the bidding process.
- 4.5. The tenderer/bidder might be requested to provide additional information relating to their submitted proposal, if the Tender Evaluation Committee requests further information for the purposes of tender evaluation. SPREP may shortlist one or more Tenderers and seek further information from them.
- 4.6. The submitted tender proposal must be for the entirety of the Terms of Reference and not divided into portions which a potential tenderer/bidder can provide services for.
- 4.7. Tender submission must be in United States Dollars (USD).
- 4.8. The Proposal must remain valid for 90 days from date of submission.
- 4.9. Tenderers must insist on an acknowledgement of receipt of tender.

5. Tender Clarification

- 5.1. a. Any clarification questions from applicants must be submitted by email to procurement@sprep.org before 08 June 2022. A summary of all questions received complete with an associated response posted on the SPREP website www.sprep.org/tender by 10 June 2022.
- b. The only point of contact for all matters relating to the RFT and the RFT process is the SPREP Procurement Officer.
- c. SPREP will determine what, if any, response should be given to a Tenderer question. SPREP will circulate Tenderer questions and SPREP's response to those questions to all other Tenderers using the SPREP Tenders page (<https://www.sprep.org/tenders>) without disclosing the source of the questions or revealing any confidential information of a Tenderer.
- d. Tenderers should identify in their question what, if any, information in the question the Tenderer considers is confidential.
- e. If a Tenderer believes they have found a discrepancy, error, ambiguity, inconsistency or omission in this RFT or any other information given or made available by SPREP, the Tenderer should promptly notify the Procurement Officer setting out the error in sufficient detail so that SPREP may take the corrective action, if any, it considers appropriate.

6. Evaluation criteria

- 6.1. SPREP will select a preferred consultant on the basis of SPREP's evaluation of the extent to which the documentation demonstrates that the tenderer offers the best value for money, and that the tendered satisfies the following criteria:
- 6.2. A proposal will be rejected if it fails to achieve 70% or more in the technical criteria and its accompanying financial proposal shall not be evaluated.

I. Technical Score – 70%

Criteria	Detail	Weighting
Experience	i. Details of the review team including their role and experience in conducting formative and or summative evaluations of project or programme within the Pacific region at national or regional level including but not limited to design, approach, and implementation strategies. Specifically for formative evaluation- provide example(s) of the evaluations conducted citing its recommendations(noting the minimum requirements of the team as outlined in Section 7.1 of the ToR).	20%
Technical Proposal Methodology	ii. Proposed methodology to undertake the Mid-Term review while mindful of the limitations of the project may consider the formative evaluation process citing a) its key elements- assessment tools, approach, design, interaction, progress, gaps, and lessons learnt; b) effectiveness, efficiency and potential impact of the project; and c) inclusion of crosscutting areas such as gender integration, risk management, and results accountability.	30%
	iii. Proposed workplan including timelines to complete the deliverables	20%

II. Financial Score – 30%

A detailed budget is to be provided by the bidder(s) for each of the activities to be carried out.

The following formula shall be used to calculate the financial score for ONLY the proposals which score 70% or more in the technical criteria:

$$\text{Financial Score} = 30 \times \frac{\text{Lowest Bid Amount}}{\text{Total Bidding Amount of the Proposal}}$$

7. Variation or Termination of the Request for Tender

- 7.1 a. SPREP may amend, suspend or terminate the RFT process at any time.
- b. In the event that SPREP amends the RFT or the conditions of tender, it will inform potential Tenderers using the SPREP Tenders page (<https://www.sprep.org/tenders>).
- c. Tenderers are responsible to regularly check the SPREP website Tenders page for any updates and downloading the relevant RFT documentation and addendum for the RFT if it is interested in providing a Tender Response.
- d. If SPREP determines that none of the Tenders submitted represents value for money, that it is otherwise in the public interest or SPREP's interest to do so, SPREP may terminate this RFT process at any time. In such cases SPREP will cancel the tender, issue a cancellation notice and inform unsuccessful bidders accordingly.



SPREP

Secretariat of the Pacific Regional
Environment Programme

8. Deadline

- 8.1. **The due date for submission of the tender is: 15 June 2022, midnight (Apia, Samoa local time).**
- 8.2. Late submissions will be returned unopened to the sender.
- 8.3 Please send all tenders clearly marked 'RFT 2022/026: **Mid-Term Review of the 'Committing to Sustainable Waste Actions in the Pacific' (SWAP) Project**

Mail: SPREP

Attention: Procurement Officer
PO Box 240
Apia, SAMOA

Email: tenders@sprep.org (MOST PREFERRED OPTION)

Fax: 685 20231

Person: Submit by hand in the tenders' box at SPREP reception,
Vailima, Samoa.

Note: Submissions made to the incorrect portal will not be considered by SPREP. If SPREP is made aware of the error in submission prior to the deadline, the applicant will be advised to resubmit their application to the correct portal. However, if SPREP is not made aware of the error in submission until after the deadline, then the application is considered late and will be returned unopened to the sender.

SPREP reserves the right to enter into negotiation with respect to one or more proposals prior to the award of a contract, split an award/awards and to consider localised award/awards between any proposers in any combination, as it may deem appropriate without prior written acceptance of the proposers.

A binding contract is in effect once signed by both SPREP and the successful tenderer. Any contractual discussion/work carried out/goods supplied prior to a contract being signed does not constitute a binding contract.

For any complaints regarding the Secretariat's tenders please refer to the Complaints section on the SPREP website

<http://www.sprep.org/accountability/complaints>

Annex A: Terms of Reference

Mid-Term Review of the ‘Committing to Sustainable Waste Actions in the Pacific’ (SWAP) Project

1. BACKGROUND

Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs) offer some of the richest areas of biodiversity on the planet. These areas, and their island communities, are under increasing pressure from development and growing human population, and the social and economic pressures associated with this growth.

Increased populations and urbanisation have led to increased product importation, production, and waste generation. Much of the waste generated through these imported products cannot economically be managed due to issues of small and isolated populations; economic volatility; geographical isolation from large economies; limited institutional, financial and human capacity; and inadequacy of infrastructure to capture and process waste materials. Poor waste management poses risks to the economies of PICTs, as most rely heavily on clean environments for agricultural activities and a vibrant tourism industry, therefore polluted and degraded environments pose a significant threat to PICTs.

The Project funded by the Agence française de Développement (AFD), referred to hereafter as “Committing to Sustainable Waste Actions in the Pacific (SWAP)”, aims to improve sanitation, environmental, social, and economic conditions in Pacific Island countries and territories through proper waste management. To achieve this, the project will focus on three streams of wastes: used oil, marine debris, disaster wastes and an overarching issue on sustainable financing mechanisms. Eight countries and territories will benefit from this project which include Fiji, French Polynesia, New Caledonia, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Vanuatu, and Wallis and Futuna.

The objective of this project is to strengthen communities and local authorities’ capacity in the areas of technical waste management, institutional governance, and finance through several activities:

- a) The development and delivery of a regional vocational training program in collaboration with regional partners;
- b) The implementation of pilot projects; and
- c) The development and delivery of tools for a sharing of good practices through a Community of Practice for PICTs including French OCTs.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW

2.1. Purpose of the Review

The Mid-Term Review is commissioned by SPREP as the Implementing Entity within the framework of the Financing Agreement between the Agence française de Développement (AFD) and SPREP. The purpose of the Mid-Term Review is to review and assess the implementation of the AFD-funded SWAP project since its commencement date – February 27th, 2020.

The mid-term review is geared towards promoting project performance improvement, accountability, learning and evidence-based decision making and management. In particular, the review will thoroughly assess Project implementation progress, efficiency and effectiveness, analyse constraints and challenges encountered and develop recommendations to enhance overall performance and implementation effectiveness.

The Mid-term Review will qualitatively and quantitatively review the following elements of Project performance:



SPREP

Secretariat of the Pacific Regional
Environment Programme

- a) Overall performance and the likelihood of achieving the PO by project closure;
- b) Implementation progress according to the indicators and targets listed in the Logical Framework including any underlying causes and issues contributing to targets that are not adequately achieved;
- c) Sustainability of the Project's outputs and expected outcomes;
- d) Major constraints affecting implementation and identification of viable solutions;
- e) Any delays in project implementation, their causes, and draw lessons from the delays and provide recommendations for improved implementation to avoid further delays going forward and to ensure achievement of the project objectives;
- f) Project management and effectiveness of the Project Management Unit and other institutional implementation units and actors; and
- g) Project supervision and implementation support performance of the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP).

The Mid-term Review is intended to identify strengths and weaknesses as well as opportunities and risks of the project and develop recommendations for any necessary changes in the overall design and orientation of the project by evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of its implementation and delivery of project outputs and outcomes to date. Consequently, the review is also expected to assess the effectiveness of implementation and partnership arrangements and make detailed recommendations for the remaining project period. It will also provide an opportunity to propose any necessary adjustments needed to refocus the project.

2.2. Audience for the Review

The audience refers to people or groups of people who are the primary intended users of the findings and will ensure implementation of the necessary changes. The SWAP Project mid-term review is initiated by SPREP as the Implementing Entity as per requirements of AFD. The primary audience of the review includes the SWAP Project Management Unit of SPREP and the Agence française de Développement.

2.3. Stakeholders for Review

Stakeholders are individuals, groups, organisations, agencies or entities which have an interest in and / or are likely to be affected by the outcome of the review. The key stakeholders include the implementing entity (SPREP), the donor (AFD), SWAP Countries and Territories (Fiji, French Polynesia, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Vanuatu, and Wallis and Futuna). The SWAP Project Management Unit is also a crucial audience.

3. SCOPE OF WORK

The scope of the mid-term review will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the Project from February 20th, 2020 to date. It is expected the review will compare planned outputs / outcomes of the Project to actual outputs / outcomes and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives. The mid-term review will extract lessons learned, diagnose and analyse issues and formulate a concrete and viable set of recommendations. It will evaluate the efficiency of project management undertaken by the Project Management Units (PMU), including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency.

3.1. Standard evaluation Criteria

The review will assess the SWAP project according to standard evaluation criteria as elaborated below:

3.1.1. – Relevance

- Assess the extent of the contribution of the project towards the achievement of national waste management objectives and assess if they are still valid.
- Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the overall goal and attainment of its objectives?
- Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the intended impacts and effects?
- Assess the relevance of the actions and activities undertaken under the SWAP to assist SWAP countries and territories in enhancing waste management.
- Are the interventions doing the right things?

3.1.2. – Effectiveness

- Assess the extent that expected outcomes and objectives of the project have been achieved thus far?
- Review whether the project has accomplished its outputs or progress towards achieving outcomes.
- Assess the performance of the project so far with particular reference to qualitative and quantitative achievements of outputs as defined in the project documents and workplans and with reference to the project baseline.
- Assess the effectiveness of the project management arrangements, including the performance of the PMU.

3.1.3. – Efficiency

- Assess whether the project has utilised project funding as per the agreed workplan and budgets to achieve the projected targets.
- Analyse the role of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and whether this forum is optimally being used for decision making.
- Assess the qualitative and quantitative aspects of management and other inputs (such as equipment, monitoring and review and other technical assistance and budgetary inputs) provided by the project vis-à-vis achievement of outputs and targets.
- Assess whether the project was implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives.
- Identify factors and constraints on how the implemented activities affected the cost-efficiency of the project implementation including technical, managerial, organisational, etc issues including other external factors unforeseen during the project design.

3.1.4. – Sustainability and Impact

- Assess preliminary indications of the degree to which the project results are likely to be continued beyond the project's lifetime (both at the government and community level) and provide recommendations for strengthening sustainability.
- Assess the key factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the sustainability of the project interventions in terms of their effect on the communities and governments as outlined in the Project's Logframe / Results framework.
- Assess the difference that the activity made to the beneficiaries of the project. Provide an estimate as to how many people have benefitted this project.

3.1.5. – Networks and Linkages

- Evaluate the level, degree and representation by the beneficiaries and stakeholders in the implementation of the project.
- Assess the alignment of the project with regional strategies and/or policies (e.g. Cleaner Pacific 2025), identifying linkages and opportunities for achievement of objectives / targets.
- Assess the project's knowledge management strategy and outreach and communications to all stakeholders.

3.1.6. – Lessons learnt / Conclusions

- Analyse areas for improved project planning, especially with respect to settling activities, delivery of activities, targets, relevance and capacity of institutions for project decision making and delivery.
- Identify significant lessons or conclusions which can be drawn from the project in terms of effectiveness (relevance and potential impact), efficiency, sustainability and networking.

3.2. Project Design

- Assess the value added of the project design approach.
- Review the problems addressed by the Project, the underlying assumptions and the effect on achieving the project results as outlined in the project document.
- Appropriateness of the design to the current economic, institutional and environmental situation.
- Is the level of interaction and co-operation amongst the executing / delivery partners effective? Do the executing / delivery partners recognize themselves as active partners in a joint initiative? Do the partners take advantage of their individual capacities to reach optimized results?
- Relevance of the project to local/regional waste management needs and priorities;
- Assess extent to which relevant gender issues and environmental and social safeguards were integrated in the project design.
- Results framework analysis:
 - Assess the project objectives, outcomes, indicators and targets and determine whether they are clear, practical, and feasible within the project time frame;
 - Undertake a critical analysis of the project's results, indicators and targets and determine if there are any specific revisions required for the remaining period; and
 - Assess the development of the gender aspects of the project and if they are being monitored effectively.
- Sustainability considerations in project design.
- Recommend areas for improvement in the design of the project.

3.3. Project Implementation

- General implementation and management of Project components in terms of quality of inputs and activities, adherence to work plans and budgets, major factors which have facilitated or impeded the progress of the project implementation.
- A review of Project performance in relation to the indicators, assumptions and risks specified in the project documents.
- Review of the compliance to the Financial Agreements.
- Adequacy of management arrangements as well as monitoring and backstopping support to the project by all parties concerned.



SPREP

Secretariat of the Pacific Regional
Environment Programme

- Assessment of the capacity, cooperation and performance project executing / delivery partners (SPREP, ongoing regional waste management projects, SWAP Countries and territories).
- An assessment of the functionality of the project Steering Committee.
- Review of project coordination and management arrangements including the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, financial management; partnership strategy, risk identification and management system and communication.

3.4. Project progress in relation to Outputs, Outcomes and Impacts

- Achievements to date of SWAP outputs and outcomes as compared with the end-of-project targets outlined in the project monitoring and evaluation plan.
- Assess causality and attribution of results to SWAP project activities.
- Level of the awareness and ownership of the project by the stakeholders.
- Assess the likelihood of achieving project targets within the remaining project implementation period.
- Review aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.
- Identify barriers to achieving the project objectives and targets in the remainder of the project.
- Identify significant unexpected effects, whether beneficial or detrimental.

2.4. Sustainability

- Is there an exit/sustainability strategy in place?
- Assess the extent to which the interventions and benefits of the project will continue after the end of the current external funding.
- Is it likely that the benefits of the project (capacities developed; linkages, mutual learning and knowledge and experiences shared) are sustainable?

2.5. Learning

- Identify good practices and lessons learned.
- Based on project successes, identify areas where knowledge generation and sharing is required.
- Documentation of the main challenges of SWAP and recommendations on how to overcome the challenges.
- Identify what works, under what context and why for waste management to the target streams.
- Based on the findings and emerging lessons on what works recommend clear areas of focus for future programming.

4. METHODOLOGY

The consultancy team should propose the methodology to be used to carry out the review. The proposed methodology should address sufficiently the preliminary issues and questions outlined within the ToR, specifying the specific review issues, questions, methods of data collection and analysis that will be undertaken. It should encompass a combination of both qualitative and quantitative methods. It should also allow for wide consultation with all interested parties and stakeholders. It is suggested that the methodology should include, but not be limited to the following, but consultants must propose their own methodology and justify and explain that proposal.

4.1 Document review:

The consultant will review of relevant project documents including, but not limited to:

- Project Annual Reports
- Project Half-year Progress Reports
- Annual Technical and Financial Action Plan including Project budget documents
- Mission Aide Memoires
- Project Proposal Document
- Financial Agreement
- Steering Committee reports
- GESI Strategy
- Monitoring and Evaluation Plan;
- Activity reports,
- Etc.

4.2 Interviews:

Virtual interviews will be conducted during the mission with relevant Project beneficiaries, stakeholders, partners, Advisory Board and Technical Steering Committee members as well as team members to obtain input, share insights and identify recommendations to improve Project performance.

Appropriate questionnaires shall be developed by the Mission team and discussed with the SWAP Project Management Unit for approval.

4.3 Final Report:

The report should be logically structured, contain evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations, and should be free of information that is not relevant to the overall analysis. The report should respond in detail to the key focus areas described above. It should include a set of specific recommendations formulated for the project, and identify the necessary actions required to be undertaken, who should undertake those and possible timelines.

A brief documenting the changes (if any) will be attached to the MTR report for input into the SWAP project document.

The report shall be written in English.

6. DELIVERABLES - TIMELINE

The activities are to be completed no later than **9 weeks from Agreement signing date** of the contract with a preference for the activities to be completed much earlier.

Expected project activity is detailed in Table 1, it is expected that tenderers will detail how and when each of these steps will be delivered.

Table 1: Project Schedule

Phase	Deliverables / Activity	Timeline
Execution Contract Signing		
<u>Inception meeting</u>	1. Summary	1 week from date of Execution Contract Signing



SPREP

Secretariat of the Pacific Regional
Environment Programme

Phase	Deliverables / Activity	Timeline
<u>Inception Report</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comprehensive description of the consultant's understanding of the Terms of Reference and indicating any major inconsistency or deficiency in the ToR and proposed amendments. 2. Detailed methodology for the review including the tools to be used in the review. 3. Complete work plan for the entire review period. 4. Draft Report Template containing Table of Contents for the final report. 	2 weeks after the inception meeting
<u>MTR Draft Report</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Document review 2. Interviews 3. First draft report 4. 2-hour presentation meeting (including facilitation, presentation, etc.) with the SWAP PMU, Donor and Steering Committee 	Within 4 weeks upon approval of phase 2
<u>MTR Final Report</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Incorporation of the inputs provided at the presentation meeting 	Within 2 weeks following the Presentation Meeting and receipt of comments
	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>9 weeks</u>

7. SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

The consultant's consortium shall be paid the consultancy fees upon completion of the following milestones:

- 20% after submission and presentation of the inception report
- 50% after submission and presentation of the draft report
- 30% after the approval of the final report

7. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

7.1. Qualification of the Team

The MTR Mission will consist of at least a two-member team of consultants, each with at least 5 years of experience related to international development / waste management projects. The team's experience should include:

- Prior experience in evaluating projects of a similar nature and scope;
- Experience in conducting mid-term reviews or end of project evaluations for donor agencies, including demonstrated experience in evaluation report writing in accordance with donor evaluation requirements;
- Experience in waste management, environmental science, climate change, or related social science fields (e.g. sociology, governance, policy);
- The Team Leader will have expertise in one of the technical areas listed above as well as expertise and demonstrated experience in designing evaluation methodology and data collection tools and demonstrated experience in leading similar reviews / evaluations; and
- The role of the Team Leader will be defining the approach and methodology, guiding and managing the review team, leading the mid-term review mission, drafting and revising, as required, the MTR reports and debriefing and presenting the findings.

Tenders may wish to include additional team members – experience and roles need to be clarified in the proposal. Note the team composition as submitted in the proposal is not subject to change.

The proposal should clearly outline each team member, their role or function within the team and their relevant experience.

7.2. Institutional Arrangement

It is expected this activity will **be undertaken remotely**, and there will be no travel involved. If needed, introductions to SWAP country and territory representatives can be made.

7.3. Interpretation services

If interpretation services are required for interviews with the French territories, it will be provided via the SPREP interpretation service. **Related costs are not included in this assignment.**

7.4. Consultant Responsibilities

The consultant will be responsible for scheduling meetings with service/technology providers, country representatives, and SWAP PMU, taking minutes, and distributing these for comment prior to finalising.

7.5. Management arrangements for the Review

The SWAP Project Management Unit will have the overall management and coordination role of the review.