

REQUEST FOR TENDERS

RFT: 2024/007
File: AP_6/15
Date: 5 March, 2024
To: Interested consultants
From: Julie PILLET, Senior Project Officer, SWAP

Subject: Request for tenders (RFT): End-of-Project Evaluation for 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 organisation 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. For more information about the SWAP: <https://swap.sprep.org/>
- 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 consultants who can offer their services to undertake an end-of project evaluation for the ‘Committing to Sustainable Waste Actions in the Pacific’ (SWAP) Project.
- 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://library.sprep.org/sites/default/files/sprep-organisational-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.

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. 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*).
Provide examples of past related work outputs
For the Technical and Financial proposals you may attach these separately.
 - iv. Must meet local registration requirements
- 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 **SPREP-AFD Declaration of honour** 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 consultant satisfies the conditions stated above and in the Terms of Reference and is capable of meeting the specifications 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*).
Provide examples of past related work outputs
For the Technical and Financial proposals you may attach these separately.
 - b) **SPREP-AFD declaration of honour**
 - 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 workplan, schedule of activities and other items as deemed necessary by the applicant.
 - e) **Financial Proposal** – using the Financial Proposal Form provided in Annex B. For clarification, the bidder can provide a detailed outline of the costs involved in successfully delivering this project submitted in United States Dollars (USD) and inclusive of all associated taxes.
 - f) Where relevant provide:
 - i. Business registration/license (For Entities/ Individual consultant's as per relevant national legislations)

- ii. Tax Identification Number (TIN) Letter (If applicable for Individual consultant's as per relevant national legislations)
- 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. The Proposal must remain valid for 90 days from date of submission.
- 4.8. 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 13 March 2024. A summary of all questions received complete with an associated response posted on the SPREP website www.sprep.org/tender by 15 March 2024.
- 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 tender 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 – 80%

Criteria	Detail	Weighting
Qualifications and Experience	i. Details of the review team including their role and experience in conducting evaluations of similar projects or programmes within the Pacific region at national or regional level including but not limited to design, approach, and implementation strategies. Please provide examples and link to work/reports. (Noting the minimum requirements of the team as outlined in Section 7.1 of the ToR).	20%
	ii. Proven experience in stakeholder consultations. Fluent in English (oral and written), excellent communication and interpretation skills.	15%
Technical Proposal / Methodology	iii. Proposed methodology to undertake the End-of-project Evaluation 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%
	iv. Proposed workplan including timelines to complete the deliverables	15%

II. Financial Score – 20%

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

$$\text{Financial Score} = a \times \frac{b}{c}$$

Where:

a = maximum number of points allocated for the Financial Score

b = Lowest bid amount

c = 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.

8. Deadline

- 8.1. **The due date for submission of the tender is: 26 March 2024, 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 2024/007: **End-of-project Evaluation for 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 reject any or all tenders and the lowest or any tender will not necessarily be accepted.

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

End-of-Project Evaluation 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 waste: used oil, marine debris, disaster waste and an overarching issue on sustainable financing mechanisms. Six countries and territories benefit from this project which include Fiji, 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 training programs in collaboration with regional partners;
- b) The implementation of pilot projects; and
- c) The development and delivery of tools for sharing of good practices through a Community of Practice for PICTs including French OCTs.

Following a consultation phase with SWAP Members, a pilot projects allocation matrix was defined, depending on the needs and expectations of each country and territory. This matrix is shown in table 1.

Table 1 – Pilot Project Allocation Matrix

Project Component	Pilot Project	Fiji	Samoa	Solomon Islands	Tonga	Vanuatu	Wallis and Futuna
Sustainable Financing	Support to CDS						
Used oil management	Development of used oil management plan						
	Support to processing and disposal						
Disaster waste management	Scoping study to identify landfills for rehabilitation						
	Rehabilitation of disposal facility				Cancelled		
Marine debris management	Coastal clean-up Day						
	Pilot project including beach clean-up campaign and data collection						

For more information about the SWAP project and its activities, please visit our website: <https://swap.sprep.org/>.

2. OBJECTIVES OF END-OF-PROJECT EVALUATION

2.1. Purpose of the Evaluation

The End-of-project Evaluation 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 overall objective of the End-of-project Evaluation is to review the achievements made to deliver the specified objectives and outcomes under the AFD-funded SWAP project as indicated in the Financing Agreement signed on February 27th, 2020. It will establish the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, performance, and success of the project including the sustainability of results.

2.2. Evaluation Approach

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful, assessing project performance and management. In particular, the evaluation will thoroughly assess Project implementation progress, efficiency and effectiveness, analyse constraints and challenges encountered and develop recommendations to enhance overall performance and implementation effectiveness in preparation for the SWAP Phase II.

The end-of-project evaluation will qualitatively and quantitatively review the following elements of Project performance:

- a) Overall performance;

- b) Implementation progress according to the indicators and targets listed in the Logical Framework including any underlying causes and issues contributing to targets that have not been adequately achieved;
- c) Sustainability of the Project's outputs and expected outcomes;
- d) Major constraints that have affected implementation and identification of the causes, , including AFD and SPREP administrative/legal constraints (e.g. financial agreement and its amendments, Procurement Plans, procedures for developing, contracting and implementing pilot projects in countries/territories, etc.), and viable solutions to remedy them in the forthcoming phase II;
- e) Any delays in project implementation, their causes, and draw lessons from the delays and provide recommendations for improved implementation of phase II;
- 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).

To this end, the evaluator(s) will review all relevant sources of information, such as project documents, project reports, project publications and all other project related materials that the evaluator(s) considers useful for the conduct of an evidencebased Terminal Evaluation. A list of the beforementioned documents will be provided to the evaluator(s) to provide support in their review.

Also, the evaluator is expected to follow a consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, SPREP and other key stakeholders that were involved with the SWAP project.

Note: It is expected this activity will **be undertaken remotely**, and there will be no travel involved in the SWAP countries and territory. As such, all forms of stakeholder engagement will be held via online platforms. However, a team of consultants can be considered if a lead or support consultant has reliable experience and is based in either Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga or Vanuatu that can undertake in-person consultation with pilot-project communities. Also, if the contract is signed by then, the evaluator would be invited to attend the final Project Steering Committee Meeting scheduled for the week of 13th May 2024 in Apia, Samoa, either virtually or face-to-face if a travel can be arranged. This would be a good opportunity for the evaluator to meet the SWAP focal points and partners and learn project achievements, challenges, etc. In that case, the travel costs (airfare and accommodation) would be covered by SPREP via the SWAP project. The consultant will be responsible for his own travel insurance.

2.3. Audience for the End-of-project Evaluation

The audience refers to people or groups of people who are the primary intended users of the findings of the end-of-project evaluation. The SWAP Project Terminal Review is initiated by SPREP as the Implementing Entity as per requirements of AFD. The primary audience of the evaluation includes the SWAP Project Management Unit of SPREP and the Agence française de Développement.

2.4. 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, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Vanuatu, and Wallis and Futuna), as well as partner projects such as PacWastePlus, POLP, J-PRISM, GEF ISLANDS, PAWES. The SWAP Project Management Unit is also a crucial audience.

2.5. Evaluation principles

This evaluation will be 'utility focused', credible, timely, and relevant. The recommendations will be developed in a way so that they are pragmatic, actionable and presented in ways that promote learning.

All sources are to be cited fully and accurately. The findings, conclusions and recommendations must be based on clear evidence presented and documented in a way that allows the reader to follow the logic of the analysis.

Where there is conflicting evidence or interpretations, the report should note the differences and justify the findings.

In conducting the evaluation, the team will be transparent, independent, and operate in partnership to the greatest extent possible. The team must have no vested interest in the outcomes of the evaluation and are independent of those responsible for policy making, design, delivery and management of a development intervention.

All processes and outputs are required to be robust and independent (carried out in a way that avoids any adverse effects of political or organisational influence on the findings) and transparent (process open and understood by all parties). Cross-cutting issues such as human rights, gender and the environment should be considered where applicable.

In support of consultative and participatory approach, the team is expected to engage with stakeholders as appropriate in completing the evaluation.

3. SCOPE OF WORK

This evaluation will review the achievements of the SWAP Project and will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the Project from February 27th, 2020 to date. The terminal evaluation will be conducted according to the guidance and procedures outlined in the Standard Evaluation Criteria (below).

It is expected the Terminal Evaluation will compare planned outputs / outcomes of the Project to final outputs / outcomes, and assess achievements to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objectives.

The end-of-project review will extract lessons learned, diagnose and analyse issues and formulate a concrete and viable set of recommendations in preparation for the forthcoming SWAP Phase II. 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.

The findings of the evaluation will aid in the overall enhancement in planning the next phase of the SWAP.

The results of the evaluation will be reported and disseminated to SPREP, relevant partner government institutions and other key stakeholders.

There is an expectation that the evaluation will be published.

3.1. Detailed scope of the Terminal Evaluation (TE)

The project implementation results will be evaluated against the project outputs, inputs and outcomes as indicated in the results framework.

The TE will assess the project performance against expectations set out in the project logical results framework. It will assess the results according to the key questions indicated in the 'scope of work' and based on the completion of each activity as required in each of the outcomes and objectives in the results framework.

The findings section of the TE report will cover but will not be limited to the topics listed below:

3.1.1. – 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.
- 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;
- Complementarity and collaboration with other regional waste management projects and activities.
- Assess extent to which relevant gender issues and environmental and social safeguards were integrated in the project design.
- Sustainability considerations in project design.
- Recommend areas for improvement in the design of the project in preparation for phase II.

3.1.2. – 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.
- 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.

3.1.3. – Project results in relation to Outputs, Outcomes and Impacts

- Achievements 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 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.

3.1.4. – Sustainability

- 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?

3.1.5. – 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 phase II.
- Based on AFD and SPREP administrative/legal constraints and key contractual challenges that were faced during the implementation of the project, recommend improvements on the contractual terms and conditions between AFD and SPREP, and provide a model-type convention between AFD and SPREP to make the implementation of phase II smoother and efficient.

3.2. Standard Evaluation Criteria

The review will assess the SWAP project according to Standard Evaluation Criteria as elaborated below:

3.2.1. – 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?

3.2.2. – 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 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.

3.2.3. – 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.

3.2.4. – 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 Log frame / 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 from this project.

3.2.5. – 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.

3.2.6. – 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.

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. Evaluation Design & Methods:

In proposing an evaluation design, the evaluation team should identify the most appropriate approach, methodology and tools to generate credible evidence that corresponds to the evaluation's purpose.

4.2. Document review:

Relevant documents and data will be provided to the successful evaluation team including, but not limited to:

- Contractual documents: Financial Agreement and its amendments;
- Project Annual Reports;
- Project Half-year Progress Reports;

- Annual Technical and Financial Action Plan including Project budget forecasts and work-plans;
- Pilot Project Proposals;
- Financial Agreement and its amendment;
- Steering Committee Reports;
- GESI Strategy;
- Monitoring and Evaluation Plan;
- Activity reports; and etc.

4.3. SWAP Final Steering Committee Meeting:

If the contract is signed by then, the consultant or one of the representatives of the consultants' team will be invited to attend the final Project Steering Committee Meeting scheduled for the week of 13th May 2024 in Apia, Samoa. In this case, the travel costs (airfare and accommodation) would be covered by SPREP via the SWAP project. The consultant will be responsible for his own travel insurance.

4.4. 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 evaluator and discussed with the SWAP Project Management Unit for approval.

4.5. Final Report:

The TE report will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.

The section on conclusions will be written considering the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, and respond in detail to the key focus areas described above.

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations, and lessons for activities at the national /territorial level (Fiji, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Vanuatu and Wallis & Futuna). To the extent that recommendations and lessons can be applied in other similar political, geographic, socio-economic contexts, these should also be highlighted. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. In addition, country specific recommendations should also be noted by the evaluator(s) for the SWAP project related countries to indicate avenues they can take to sustainably continue completed activities in preparation for phase II.

Also, the evaluator will attach a model-type convention between AFD and SPREP to the final report to make the implementation of phase II smoother and efficient.

5. DELIVERABLES - TIMELINE

The activities are to be completed no later than **01 September 2024** to allow the SWAP PMU time to make it translated into French before the SWAP completion date.

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
<u>Option: SWAP Final Steering Committee Meeting</u>	1. Summary	Week of the 13 th May 2024
<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 evaluation including the tools to be used in the review. 3. Complete work plan for the entire evaluation period. 4. Draft Report Template containing Table of Contents for the final report. 	3 weeks after the inception meeting
<u>TE 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 6 weeks upon approval of phase 2
<u>TE Final Report</u>	5. Incorporation of the inputs provided at the presentation meeting	<u>01 September 2024</u>

6. SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

Payments will be made per phase after validation of the deliverables, based on the table provided in Annex B – Financial Proposal Form.

7. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

7.1. Qualification of the Consultant/consultants

There is no limitation in the number of consultants involved in the end-of project Evaluation. However, the Team Leader must have at least 5 years' experience related to international development and/or waste management projects. The team/consultant's experience should include:

- i. Strategic thinking ability and research and analysis skills;
- ii. Ability to engage with, listen to, and learn from a broad range of evaluation stakeholders, encouraging their meaningful participation;

- iii. Knowledge of best practice in programme evaluations and experience in preparation of Evaluations for Development Activities;
- iv. Experience in evaluating projects of a similar nature and scope, and preparing and presenting an Evaluation Report in a manner that increases the likelihood that they will be used and accepted by a diverse group of stakeholders;
- v. Experience in waste management, environmental science, climate change, or related social science fields (e.g. sociology, governance, policy);
- vi. Experience working in the Pacific and the ability to understand the context of the programme and how it affects programme planning, implementation, outcomes and even the evaluation;
- vii. Previous experience working with SPREP would also be an added value;
- viii. Excellent written and cross-cultural communication skills.

7.2. Travel Arrangements

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

However, if the contract is signed by then, the evaluator would be invited to attend the final Project Steering Committee Meeting scheduled for the week of 13th May 2024 in Apia, Samoa. In this case, the travel costs (airfare and accommodation) would be covered by SPREP via the SWAP project. The consultant will be responsible for his own travel insurance.

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 to be included in this assignment.**

7.4. Consultant Responsibilities

The consultant will be responsible for:

- scheduling meetings with service/technology providers, SWAP country and territory representatives, and SWAP PMU, SWAP partner projects (PacWastePlus, J-PRISM, POLP, GEF ISLANDS, PAWES);
- taking minutes; and
- distributing these for comment prior to finalising.

7.5. Management arrangements for the Evaluation

The principal responsibility for managing the progress of this evaluation resides with the SPREP/SWAP Project Management Unit in Samoa.