



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

FOR SERVICES

Project Title:	Independent Institutional Review of SPC)
Nature of the services	Independent Institutional Review
Location:	Pacific region
Date of issue:	24/01/2024
Closing Date:	21/02/2024
SPC Reference:	24-6153

Contents

PART 1: INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 ABOUT THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY (SPC)	3
1.2 SPC'S PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES	3
1.3 SPC'S REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) PROCESS	3
PART 2: INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS	4
2.1 BACKGROUND	4
2.2 SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS	4
2.3 CLARIFICATIONS	4
2.4 EVALUATION	5
2.5 CONTRACT AWARD	5
2.6 KEY DATES	6
2.7 LEGAL AND COMPLIANCE	6
2.8 COMPLAINTS PROCESS	7
PART 3: TERMS OF REFERENCE	8
A. BACKGROUND / CONTEXT	8
B. PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES, SCOPE OF SERVICES	10
C. TIMELINES	14
D. REPORTING AND CONTRACTING ARRANGEMENTS	15
E. SKILLS AND QUALIFICATIONS	15
F. SCOPE OF BID PRICE AND SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS	15
G. ANNEXES TO THE TERMS OF REFERENCE	16
PART 4: PROPOSAL EVALUATION MATRIX	17
4.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA & SCORE WEIGHT	17
4.2 FINANCIAL EVALUATION	18
PART 5: PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS	19
ANNEX 1: BIDDER'S LETTER OF APPLICATION	19
ANNEX 2: CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATION	20
ANNEX 3: INFORMATION ABOUT THE BIDDER AND DUE DILIGENCE	22
ANNEX 4: TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORM	25
ANNEX 5: FINANCIAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORM	27

Part 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 About the Pacific Community (SPC)

The Pacific Community (SPC) is the principal scientific and technical organisation of the Pacific region, established by treaty in 1947 with the signing of the Agreement Establishing the South Pacific Commission (the Canberra Agreement).

SPC has our headquarters in Noumea, New Caledonia and has regional offices in Fiji, the Federated States of Micronesia and Vanuatu, as well as an office in France. SPC works across the Pacific and has staff in nearly all of our Pacific Island Country and Territory members.

SPC works for the well-being of Pacific people through the effective and innovative application of science and knowledge and is guided by a deep understanding of Pacific Island contexts and cultures. Our unique organisation covers more than 20 sectors and is renowned for knowledge and innovation in such areas as fisheries science, public health surveillance, geoscience and conservation of plant genetic resources for food security.

For more information about SPC and the work that we do, please visit our website: <https://www.spc.int/>.

1.2 SPC's procurement activities

SPC's procurement activities are guided by the principles of high ethical standards, value for money, open competition and social and environmental responsibility and are carried out under our Procurement Policy.

SPC's *Procurement Policy* provides the framework for ensuring that SPC obtains the best value for its purchases, in terms of both cost and quality; demonstrates financial probity and accountability to its members and development partners; manages and prevents the potential for conflicts of interest; reduces its environmental impact and manages any other risks.

At SPC, all procurement follows the same main steps: planning; statement of needs; requisition; solicitation; evaluation; award; receipt; and payment. Different procedures apply depending on the value of the goods, services and works to be procured.

For further information or enquiries about SPC's procurement activities, please visit the procurement pages on our website: <https://www.spc.int/procurement> or email: procurement@spc.int.

1.3 SPC's Request for Proposal (RFP) Process

At SPC, procurement valued at more than EUR 45,000 must be advertised through a Request for Proposal (RFP) with any bids received evaluated by SPC's Procurement Committee to determine the offer that provides the best value for money.

This RFP sets out SPC's requirements and it asks you, as a bidder, to respond in writing in a prescribed format with pricing and other required information. The RFP contains detailed instructions and templates to enable you to submit a compliant bid. It sets out the overall timetable; it confirms the evaluation criteria that SPC will use to evaluate proposals; it explains the administrative arrangements for the receipt of the bids; and it sets out how bidders can request further information.

Your participation confirms your acceptance of SPC's conditions of participation in the RFP process.

Part 2: INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS

2.1 Background

SPC invites you to submit a bid to deliver the services as specified in [Part 3](#).

SPC has advertised this RFP on its website and may send it directly to potential vendors. The same specifications, submission and other solicitation requirements will be provided to all vendors.

SPC has compiled these instructions to guide prospective bidders and to ensure that all bidders are given equal and fair consideration.

Please read the instructions carefully before submitting your bid. For your bid to be considered, you must provide all the prescribed information by the closing date and in the format specified.

2.2 Submission instructions

Your submission must be clear, concise and complete and should only include information that is necessary to respond effectively to this RFP. Please note that you may be marked down or excluded from the procurement exercise if your submission contains any ambiguities or lacks clarity.

Your proposal must include the following documents (annexes of [Part 5](#) of the RFP):

- a) Bidder's Letter of Application (**Annex 1**);
- b) Conflict of Interest Declaration (**Annex 2**);
- c) Information about the bidder and Due diligence (**Annex 3**);
- d) Technical proposal submission form (**Annex 4**);
- e) Financial proposal submission form (**Annex 5**).

Your proposal must be submitted in **two separate emails**.

You must submit your **Technical proposal** (Annexes 1 to 4 and all their supporting documents) in English as an attachment to one email. No financial information may appear in the technical proposal.

You must submit your **Financial proposal** (Annex 5) in a separate email. All prices in the proposal must be presented in USD. Your Financial proposal is to be password protected. SPC will request the password in the event that it is required.

Both emails are to be sent to procurement@spc.int with the subject line of your email as:

Submission RFP24-6153 Independent Institutional Review of SPC.

Your proposal must be received no later than **21/02/2024 by 11.45 pm New Caledonia time**.

Only one bid per bidder is permitted.

SPC will send a formal acknowledgement to each proposal received before the deadline.

SPC reserves the right to exclude from consideration any proposal not received by the deadline, with incomplete information or in incorrect form.

2.3 Clarifications

You may submit questions or seek clarifications on any issue relating to this RFP. The questions are to be submitted in writing to procurement@spc.int with the subject line:

Clarification RFP24-6153 Independent Institutional Review of SPC.

The deadline for submission of clarifications is **9/02/2024 by 4 pm New Caledonia time**.

Details will be kept of any communications between SPC and bidders. This assists SPC to ensure transparency of the procurement process. While SPC prefers written communication in the RFP process, at any point where there is phone call or other conversation, SPC will keep a record or a file note of the exchange with prospective bidders.

2.4 Evaluation

Validity

Each proposal will be assessed for compliance with the submission requirements by the Bids Opening Committee. At this stage, basic due diligence will also be undertaken.

To assist in the examination, evaluation and comparison of proposals, SPC may ask the bidder for clarification of its proposal or additional information. The request for clarification will be in writing.

Technical

All valid proposals will be assessed against the technical evaluation criteria set out in Part 4. The criteria are provided with weighted scores according to the relative importance of each. SPC will not change the evaluation criteria set out in the RFP at any stage of the procurement process. Any changes in the evaluation criteria will result in the RFP process being re-issued.

Bidders are expected to familiarise themselves with local conditions and take these into account in preparing their proposal. Where minimum qualifications are set as specific evaluation criteria (which may include educational qualification, professional accreditation or certification, licensing, experience and expertise), proposals submitted must necessarily meet these criteria.

Shortlisted bidder's presentation

Bidders that are short-listed during the RFP evaluation process shall be required to conduct a presentation to, and respond to queries of, SPC's Procurement Technical Evaluation Committee (via conference call). The bidders will be provided an opportunity to provide an overview of the operational aspect of the services they are proposing.

Financial

Any bids that pass the minimum technical evaluation requirements will pass onto financial evaluation.

During the financial evaluation, if there is a discrepancy between the unit price and the total price, the lower price shall prevail. If there is a discrepancy between words and figures the amount in words will prevail.

The total cost of the proposal must be submitted inclusive of taxes in accordance with the applicable legislation, and is not subject to revision.

2.5 Contract award

SPC may award the contract once the Procurement Committee has determined that a bidder has met the prescribed requirements and the bidder's proposal has been determined to be the most responsive to the RFP documents, provide the best value for money and best serve the interests of SPC.

SPC's [General Terms and Conditions of Contract](#) will apply to any contracts awarded under this RFP, unless otherwise agreed. Any requested changes to the General Terms and Conditions of Contract must be foreshadowed in the submission.

The award of the contract will be made by contract signed and dated by both parties.

2.6 Key dates

Please see the proposed procurement timetable in the table below. This timetable is intended as a guide only and while SPC does not intend to depart from the timetable, it reserves the right to do so at any stage.

STAGE	DATE
RFP advertised	24/01/2024
Deadline for seeking clarification	9/02/2024
RFP Closing Date	21/02/2024
Bid Presentation	4/03/2024
Award of Contract	22/03/2024
Commencement of Contract	2/04/2024
Conclusion of Contract	28/02/2025

2.7 Legal and compliance

Child and vulnerable adult protection: SPC is committed to the well-being of children and vulnerable adults. All SPC contractors are required to commit to the principles of SPC's Child and Vulnerable Adult Protection Policy ([XI.G Manual of Staff Policies](#)). Breach of this requirement can result in SPC terminating any contract with a successful bidder. Any allegations of potential misconduct in relation to this RFP involving children or vulnerable adults should be sent to complaints@spc.int.

Confidentiality: Unless otherwise agreed by SPC in advance or where the contents of the RFP are already in the public domain when **shared** with the bidder, bidders shall at all times treat the contents of the RFP and any related documents as confidential. SPC will also treat the information it receives from the bidders as confidential.

Conflict of interest: Bidders must take all necessary measures to prevent any situation of conflict of interest. You must notify SPC in writing as soon as possible of any situation that could constitute a conflict of interest during the RFP process. If you have any familial connection with SPC staff, this must be declared, and approval will then be sought for you to engage in the RFP process. Breach of this requirement can result in the exclusion of the bidder from the RFP process or in SPC terminating any contract with a successful bidder.

Cost of preparation of proposals: Under no circumstances will SPC be liable for any proposal submission costs, expenditure, work or effort that you may incur in relation to your provision of a proposal (including if the procurement process is terminated or amended by SPC).

Currency, validity, duties, taxes: Unless specifically otherwise requested, all proposals should be in USD and must be net of any direct or indirect taxes and duties and shall remain valid for 120 days from the closing date. The successful bidder is bound by their proposal for a further 60 days following notification they are the preferred bidder so that the contract may be awarded. No price variation due to escalation, inflation, fluctuation in exchange rates, or any other market factors shall be accepted at any time during this period.

Eligibility: Bidders are required to disclose to SPC whether they are subject to any sanction or temporary suspension imposed by any international organisation, or whether they are subject to bankruptcy proceedings. You may not be bankrupt or suspended, debarred, or otherwise identified as ineligible by any international organisation. Failure to disclose such information may result in debarment and termination of any contract issued to the bidder by SPC.

Fraud and corruption: SPC has zero tolerance for fraud and corruption. All contractors have an obligation to report potential fraud and corruption. Breach of this requirement can result in the exclusion of the bidder from the RFP process or in SPC terminating any contract with a successful bidder. Allegations of potential misconduct by an SPC staff member or contractor involving fraud or corruption can be sent to complaints@spc.int.

Good faith: The information in this RFP is provided by SPC in good faith. No representation, warranty, assurance or undertaking (express or implied) is or will be made, and no responsibility or liability will be accepted by SPC in relation to the adequacy, accuracy, completeness or reasonableness of this RFP or any information provided by SPC in relation to this RFP.

Modifications: Any clarifications, corrections or modifications will be published on the SPC website prior to deadline. In the event a bidder has submitted a bid before the clarification, correction or modification, the bidder will be informed and may modify the bid. The modified bid will still need to be received before the deadline.

No offer of contract or invitation to contract: This RFP is not an offer to contract or an invitation by SPC to enter into a contract with you.

Privacy: The bidder is to comply with the requirements of applicable legislation and regulatory requirements in force for the use of personal data that is disclosed for the purposes of this RFP. SPC will handle any personal information it receives under the RFP in line with its [Privacy Policy](#), and the [Guidelines for handling personal information of bidders and grantees](#).

Right to amend, seek clarity, withdraw, not award: SPC reserves the right to: (1) amend, add to or withdraw all or any part of this RFP at any time, or to re-invite bids on the same or any alternative basis; (2) seek clarification or documents in respect of any bidder's submission; (3) choose not to award a contract as a result of this RFP; (4) make whatever changes it sees fit to the timetable, structure or content of the procurement process, depending on approvals processes or for any other reason. Please note that while SPC will not change the evaluation criteria set out in the RFP without the RFP process being re-issued, SPC does reserve the right at the time of award of contract to vary the quantity of services and goods specified in the RFP and to accept or reject any proposal at any time prior to award of the contract without incurring any liability to the affected bidder or any obligation to inform the affected bidder/s of the grounds for SPC's action.

Right to disqualify: SPC reserves the right to disqualify: (1) any bidder that does not submit a proposal in accordance with the instructions in this RFP; (2) any bidder that misrepresents information to SPC; (3) any bidder that directly or indirectly canvasses any SPC employee concerning the award of a contract.

Use of material: Bidders shall not use the contents of the RFP or any related material for any purpose other than for the purpose of considering submitting, or submitting, a bid to SPC.

Warranty, representation, assurance, undertaking: The bidder acknowledges and agrees that no person has any authority to give any warranty, representation, assurance or undertaking on behalf of SPC in connection with any contract which may (or may not) follow on from this RFP process.

2.8 Complaints process

Bidders that consider they were not treated fairly during any SPC procurement process may lodge a protest. The protest should be addressed to complaints@spc.int. The bidder must provide the following information: (1) full contact details; (2) details of the relevant procurement; (3) reasons for the protest, including how the alleged behaviour negatively impacted the bidder; (4) copies of any documents supporting grounds for protest; (5) the relief that is sought.

Part 3: Terms of Reference

A. Background / Context

The Pacific Community

The Pacific Community (SPC) is the principal scientific and technical organisation in the Pacific region, proudly supporting development since 1947. SPC has been working to support the realisation of development goals, at both regional and national level, through its provision of scientific expertise advice and technical support across all its programming areas and is one of nine member organisations in the Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP). The Pacific Community is owned and governed by its 27 country and territory members, including all 22 Pacific Island countries and territories (PICTs). SPC is proud to be applying its collective capabilities in science, knowledge and innovation to serve the people of the Pacific in reaching their sustainable development goals and aspirations. By placing Pacific people at the centre of its approaches, and with its deep understanding of Blue Pacific contexts and worldviews, the organisation has embarked on the journey to implement the [Strategic Plan 2022-2031](#), which encompasses the insights and foresight of SPC members, staff and key stakeholders. It builds on learning from previous plans and, alongside the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and other CROP organisations, commits to the [2050 Strategy for the Blue Pacific Continent](#).

Organisational structure

SPC is governed by the Conference of the Pacific Community, which meets every two years. Between conference meetings, the Committee of Representatives of Governments and Administrations (CRGA) is empowered to make decisions on governance issues. There are three subcommittees reporting to the CRGA: (i) the CRGA Subcommittee for the Strategic Plan; (ii) the Pacific Board for Educational Quality; and (iii) the Audit and Risk Committee.

There are currently eight programmes and divisions at SPC: the Fisheries, Aquaculture and Marine Ecosystems Division; the Educational Quality and Assessment Programme; the Climate Change and Environmental Sustainability Division; the Land Resources Division; the Geoscience, Energy and Maritime Division; the Statistics for Development Division; the Public Health Division; and the Human Rights and Social Development Division.

SPC has made steps towards more integrated, trans-disciplinary ways of working. It is led by a three-person Senior Executive, the Director-General and two Deputy Directors-General, one with primary responsibility for science and capability (based in Suva) and the other for operations and integration (based in Noumea).

SPC is supported through functions in communications, executive advice, finance, human resources, information services, internal audit and risk, partnerships, integration and resource mobilisation, regional services and engagement, strategic leadership, Pacific women and girls, strategy, performance and learning. The Senior Leadership Team is a forum that supports the Director-General through advice, information and recommendations on concerns, resolutions, priorities and resource allocation.

Strategic Plan 2022–2031

The Pacific Community's *Strategic Plan 2022–2031* was endorsed by its member countries at the Pacific Community Conference held in Noumea in November 2021. [The Framework for Pacific Regionalism](#), which was approved by Pacific Leaders at the 2014 Pacific Islands Forum Meeting, and the [2050 Strategy for the Blue Pacific Continent](#), endorsed by Pacific Leaders in 2022, are the key reference points in shaping how the Pacific Community will support its members. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals provide a common framework for tracking progress in the region.

There were a number of firsts in the development and production of *Strategic Plan 2022–2031*. The membership provided three guiding principles – inclusivity, ownership and futures – to shape the participatory process. The CRGA Subcommittee held the pen to co-create the structure and content of the plan; the process leant into Pacific ways of knowing and being, and included Pacific values, metaphors and illustrations. The engagement approach included foreign affairs through the CRGA Subcommittee and full membership, youth through the Pacific Youth Council, and technical focal points through the sectoral official and ministerial platforms, implementing partners and staff.

The plan organises the work of the organisation under four overarching goals, listed below.

- Goal 1: All Pacific people benefit from sustainable economic development.
- Goal 2: All Pacific communities and cultures are empowered and resilient.
- Goal 3: All Pacific people reach their potential and live long and healthy lives.
- Goal 4: One SPC delivers integrated programmes through streamlined services.

These goals are further shaped through seven key focus areas (KFAs) and five common pathways, shown below.

- KFA 1. Resilience and climate action
- KFA 2. Natural resources and biodiversity
- KFA 3. Food systems
- KFA 4. Equity, education and social development
- KFA 5. Sustainable economies and livelihoods
- KFA 6. Planetary health
- KFA 7. Transforming institutional effectiveness

Five common pathways: policy to action; data, statistics and knowledge; innovation and research; digitalisation and technology; capability and influence.

Regional context

The independent institutional review (IIR) is being conducted in response to the recommendation from CRGA 52 to conduct an organisation level review within the context of the Review of the Regional Architecture (RRA) process. The Forum Leaders agreed the RRA is an opportunity to comprehensively consider the suitability of the current architecture, to effectively deliver and realise the Leaders' vision as articulated in the *Strategic Plan 2022–2031*.

In 2022, the Forum Leaders agreed to the mandate of the RRA to consider:

- a. the political setting: to review political groupings, leadership, collective interests and decision-making and sustained political will;
- b. institutional processes, systems and mechanisms: to review processes, systems and mechanisms supporting collective decisions, actions and advocacy;
- c. governance mechanisms: to review mechanisms in place to effect cooperation and coordination among the various regional entities and their engagement with the Pacific Islands Forum; and
- d. engagement and partnerships: to consider how the Pacific Islands Forum interacts with international partners and stakeholders to progress regionalism.

Organisational context

The IIR sits within a landscape of nine previous organisational reviews from 2012–2022. The most recent organisation level review was conducted in 2022 as a Capstone Report to the *Pacific Community Strategic Plan 2016–2020*. (See Section G. for a list of the reviews).

The Secretariat has used the evaluative findings to inform decision-making and course correction for the term of the *Pacific Community Strategic Plan 2016–2020* and in the development of *Strategic Plan 2022–2031*.

At its June 2022 meeting, the CRGA Subcommittee agreed to review the strategic plan at the three-, five- and eight-year milestones. The following year, at its June 2023 meeting, the Subcommittee considered the focus on relevance and the purpose of learning and adaptation for the three-year review milestone. The scope of the three-year horizon review was agreed as alignment, coherence and fit-for-purpose. At the same meeting, the Subcommittee considered the merit of an evaluative approach that brings the evaluative strands of the IIR, the *Strategic Plan 2022–2031* three-year review and the RRA together in a meaningful and coherent way.

These terms of reference have been developed within this broader regional and organisational context.

B. Purpose, objectives, scope of services

The purpose of this evaluative activity is to provide an independent opinion and set of recommendations to the full CRGA membership on the Pacific Community as a Pacific-owned scientific and technical capability in service to the region.

IIR objectives

Objective 1: To assess to what extent the organisation is fit-for-purpose to deliver regional aspirations and priorities.

Objective 2: To assess to what extent the organisation is fit-for-purpose to deliver the aspirations in its strategic plan in relation to Goal 4 and KFA 7.

Objective 3: To assess SPC’s operational model, governance arrangements and institutional capacities and identify strengths, areas for improvement and opportunities.

Objective 4: To assess relevance in relation to member needs and service delivery.

Objective 5: To review the alignment and implementation process at the three-year horizon of the SPC *Strategic Plan 2022–2031* within the broader context of this institutional review.

The review will seek the views of and be useful to SPC membership and a range of SPC’s internal and external stakeholders. It will be framed by the value proposition in the Strategic Plan:

The Pacific Community supports sustainable development by applying a people-centred approach to science, research and technology across all of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). We serve our members by interweaving and harnessing the nexus of climate, ocean, land, culture, rights and good governance; through trusted partnerships; investing in Pacific people; and understanding Pacific contexts (SPC Strategic Plan 2022–2031: 7).

Specific activities will be negotiated with the successful consultant(s) and the CRGA Subcommittee (or an alternative evaluation steering committee). However, some aspects of previous reviews, such as the 2018 member survey, were received positively by members and should be considered in negotiating activities. Additionally, the important work of the PacMEL initiative to contextualise and advocate for Pacific MEL methodologies should also be considered when negotiating the activities.

The extent to which the terms of reference and evaluative activities for the mid-term review of the Women in Leadership initiative relates to the KFA 7 aspect of this IIR should also be considered at the appropriate time.

Review methodology

The review is expected to adopt a non-experimental, mixed-methods approach, with a utilisation and strategic level focus, requiring both regional and country-level analysis.

The exercise will not be a complete analysis of individual programmes or project activities, but rather build on the institution itself. Where the availability of data may be a challenge, triangulation can be used to provide credible evidence.

A refined methodology will be finalised by the CRGA Subcommittee and the successful bidder during the inception phase.

The review will be in three phases: (i) preparation/inception; (ii) data collection, analysis, and validation; (iii) reporting, launch and presentation.

Final outputs will include a final synthesis report, a summary report (4–6 pages) and a PowerPoint presentation or alternative knowledge product to communicate key findings and recommendations to the CRGA Subcommittee and the CRGA.

It is expected that the synthesis will adopt key guidance in the [Pacific monitoring, evaluation and learning capacity strengthening rebbilib](#), and the [UNEG Norms and standards for evaluations \(2016\)](#) and respect the [UNEG guidance on Integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluation](#).

Evaluation questions

The review will be guided by the following questions:

Objective 1: To assess to what extent the organisation is fit-for-purpose to deliver regional aspirations and priorities

Evaluation question	Source/s
What has been SPC's regional progress in realising Pacific aspirations (e.g. the 2050 Strategy and other regional commitments)?	2022 Friends of the Chair review
Identify 2050 Strategy priorities that are relevant to SPC's work and mandate. What readiness and resourcing does SPC have to help deliver on these?	Survey of Subcommittee
What is SPC's unique role and contribution relative to other regional partners, including other CROP agencies, bilateral and multilateral donors and other regional development actors?	2012 Independent external review 2022 Australia-SPC partnership
How has SPC contributed to the delivery of regional public goods?	2022 Capstone
To what extent does the organisation's strategy take into account the specific needs of PICTs and complement national strategies?	BetterEvaluation: European Commission
What course corrections or changes may be required post-RRA findings?	Suggested by CRGA Subcommittee on 21.07.23

Objective 2: To assess to what extent the organisation is fit-for-purpose to deliver the aspirations in its strategic plan in relation to Goal 4 and KFA 7

Evaluation question	Source/s
How effective are SPC's governance arrangements to deliver high quality, timely results, in terms of goal/strategy setting, accountability and oversight of	2014 Governance review

SPC business, and in terms of collective decision-making?	
To what extent do members have their views considered in decisions and have influence in relation to institutional effectiveness and strategic direction setting?	2014 Governance review
To what extent have the monitoring, evaluation and reporting frameworks and arrangements aligned with the regional and organisational contexts, and provided evidence for improved programme management and accountability for results?	2022 MFAT-SPC core funding mid-term review 2012 <i>Report of the expert reference group</i>
To what extent has there been use of robust evidence to judge organisational performance, clear lines of accountability and the ability to address areas where performance falls short?	2014 Governance review
What can SPC learn from its existing partnerships? How can it establish stronger partnerships to achieve its strategic goals and priorities? What partnerships should it consider pursuing?	2022 Capstone
To what extent and how are the SPC values built into and affect decision making processes?	McKinsey 7S Model
Where are the organisation's capability strengths and gaps in relation to Goal 4 and KFA 7?	McKinsey 7S Model

Objective 3: To assess SPC operational model, governance arrangements and institutional capacities and identify strengths, areas for improvement and opportunities

Evaluation question	Source
How effective and efficient are the current SPC services provided to PICTS?	2012 <i>Report of the expert reference group</i>
Is the operating style, decision-making on operational matters, and service delivery model fit-for-purpose?	Seven-s model, Subcommittee discussions
To what extent have administrative procedures of allocating funds and managing actions facilitated or impeded progress towards the strategic objectives?	BetterEvaluation: European Commission
What are the ideal organisational governance arrangements and structure to support optimum service delivery to PICTs?	2012 <i>Report of the expert reference group</i>
What are the factors enabling or hindering change in relation to SPC's operational model, governance arrangements and institutional capacities?	2019 Capacity development
Are the skills, experience and knowledge of SPC's staff matched to the competencies required to deliver services to members?	McKinsey 7S Model
Are staff recruitment processes, job descriptions, salaries and working conditions adequate for improving and enabling technical competencies in Pacific staff?	Friends of the Chair review recommendation
Is the operating system supporting the capability needs and workforce development, i.e. is there appropriate resourcing, policies and processes?	McKinsey 7S Model

Objective 4: To assess relevance in relation to member needs and service delivery

Evaluation question	Source
Discuss, explore and assess SPC technical service delivery and relevance of services experienced by each PICT at the technical line ministry/agency level and against wider national development plan achievement	2022 Friends of the Chair review
What priority did the PICTs give to specific programmes and how important was SPC's work to the development programmes of individual members?	2012 Independent external review
To what extent have the strategies and implementation approaches of <i>Strategic Plan 2022–2031</i> contributed to position SPC as a key player in national and regional development agendas?	2022 Capstone
What recommendations are identified for the future focus and strategic direction of SPC's long-term core services, building on the work done under this review, the <i>2050 Strategy</i> Implementation Plan and the RRA?	2012 <i>Report of the expert reference group</i>

Objective 5: To review the alignment and implementation process at the three-year horizon of SPC's *Strategic Plan 2022–2031* within the broader context of this institutional review

Evaluation question	Source
What course corrections to the plan would better guide the operations of SPC to support members' development needs?	2018 Mid-term review of the strategic plan
How has the operationalisation of the strategic plan been taken up, including strategic shifts and components of programme activities being well designed and logically aligned to the achievement the strategic plan? This includes flagships, integrated programming, funding sources and mobilisation strategies, human resources, knowledge generation and utilisation, COVID-19, etc.	2022 Capstone
To what extent has implementation of the strategic plan contributed to prioritisation and integration of appropriate strategies to advance human rights, gender-based approaches, social and environmental responsibility mainstreaming, and consideration of target groups (e.g. gender, age, traditional knowledge holders, persons with disabilities, other relevant target groups)?	2022 Capstone, 2018 Mid-term review of the strategic plan
What have been the main enabling factors and barriers to delivering this Strategic Plan and what are we learning from them?	2018 Mid-term review of the strategic plan
To what extent and how has SPC implemented the pathways of KFA 7 on its journey to the 2031 Future State?	Source: Evaluation of the shifting systems initiative
To what extent is <i>Strategic Plan 2022–2031</i> aligned with global, regional and national development goals and priorities?	2022 Capstone

C. Timelines

Details of expected outputs and timeframe		
Milestones / Outputs	Detail	Timeframe
Phase 1: Preparation / Inception		April 2024
<u>Deliverable 1.1:</u> Inception report with methodology and implementation timeframe, submitted to the CRGA Co-Chair	1.1.1. Desk review and consultative meetings, refine synthesis questions and TOR 1.1.2. Preparation of an inception report with detailed methodology (in response to the draft questions), plus a proposed workplan / timeframe to be shared with CRGA Subcommittee for comments and approval	
Phase 2: Desk reviews, interviews, field visits and validation		May-October 2024
<u>Deliverable 2.1:</u> Comprehensive list of relevant references, with summary of surveys if implemented <u>Deliverable 2.2:</u> First draft of emerging findings to CRGA Co-Chairs <u>Deliverable 2.3:</u> Consultation workshop with CRGA Subcommittee and other stakeholders	2.1.1. Undertake data research and conduct key informant interviews/surveys, etc. and prepare list of references and surveys/interviews 2.2.1. Data cleaning, consolidation and analysis 2.2.2. Development of preliminary findings, conclusions, and recommendations in first draft of synthesis Capstone report, including two case studies, one under Goal 4 and one under KFA 7 of <i>Strategic Plan 2022–2031</i> 2.3.1. Consultation workshop with SPC and other stakeholders to validate findings, conclusions and workshop recommendations	
Phase 3: Reporting and presentation of final synthesis results and recommendations		November 2024 – February 2025
<u>Deliverable 3.1:</u> Draft report, summary and presentation to CRGA Subcommittee Co-Chairs <u>Deliverable 3.2:</u> Final draft report, summary and presentation to CRGA <u>Deliverable 3.3:</u> Final report and summary incorporating feedback from CRGA.	3.1.1. Prepare draft review report, summary report (4–6 pages), and a PowerPoint presentation or alternative knowledge product to communicate key findings and recommendations for CRGA Subcommittee to review 3.1.2. CRGA Subcommittee review and provide consolidated feedback 3.2.1. Finalise the review report, summary report and knowledge product 3.2.2 Presentation of findings and recommendations to CRGA	

D. Reporting and contracting arrangements

The consultant(s) will work under the guidance of the CRGA Subcommittee Co-Chairs, who will provide governance oversight throughout the implementation. The Director Strategy, Performance and Learning, the Lead – Strategy and Innovation and the Lead – Quality and Impact will provide day-to-day contract and process management, including logistical, budget support and approval of deliverables and payments. The CRGA Subcommittee for the Strategic Plan will provide quality assurance to the findings and conclusions of the review, and propose improvements if required.

The assessment is expected to last over a period of 11 months, starting from 2 April 2024 and ending on 28 February 2025.

The assignment will largely be carried out remotely with the addition of duty travel.

E. Skills and qualifications

The expected skills and qualification of the consultant(s) are outlined below:

- Post-graduate qualification in evaluation, international development, policy and administration or equivalent experience.
- Experience conducting reviews and evaluations with a strategic level focus, requiring regional and country-level analysis. Experience in evaluating international or regional organisations / institutions / public entities is an advantage.
- Demonstrated competence and experience in review methodologies, and data collection methods and analysis.
- Proven track record of delivering high-quality reviews and evaluations in an ethically and sensitive manner, observing international best practice in ethics and research integrity.
- Good knowledge of the Pacific, including on regionalism (governance mechanisms) and the regional architecture. Experience working with inter-governmental organisations in the Pacific is desirable.
- Strong communication skills to interact with various stakeholders; and the ability to clearly document findings and recommendations. An ability to communicate in French and / or another Pacific language is considered an asset.

F. Scope of Bid Price and Schedule of Payments

Three lump sum payments will be made on achievement of deliverables, on acceptance by the CRGA Subcommittee Co-Chairs and the Director, Strategy, Performance and Learning (see table below).

Any expected travel in relation to delivery of the services will be fully covered by SPC according to its travel policy.

However, the contractor will be solely responsible for obtaining and payment of any visa and travel insurance required for the performance of the services.

Terms of payment will be in accordance with the provisions of Article 10 of the SPC General Terms and Conditions of Contract.

The payment term of 30 (thirty) days runs from the day the invoice is accepted by SPC, after successful completion of the related milestone.

Milestones / Deliverables	Deadline
Preparation / Inception Deliverable 1.1: Inception report with methodology and implementation timeframe, submitted to the CRGA Co-Chairs	30 April 2024
Data collection, analysis, and validation Deliverable 2.1: Comprehensive list of relevant references, with summary of surveys, if implemented Deliverable 2.2: First draft of emerging findings to CRGA Co-Chairs Deliverable 2.3: Consultation workshop with CRGA Subcommittee and other stakeholders	31 October 2024
Reporting, launch and presentation Deliverable 3.1: Draft report, summary and presentation to CRGA Subcommittee Co-Chairs Deliverable 3.2: Final draft report, summary and presentation to CRGA Deliverable 3.3: Final report and summary incorporating feedback from CRGA	28 February 2025

G. Annex to the Terms of Reference

List of past reviews

The nine previous reviews, including their terms of reference (ToRs), are available online.

2012 Independent External Review

https://www.spc.int/DigitalLibrary/SPC/Collection/SPC_Evaluations

2012 Report of the expert reference group

http://repository.usp.ac.fj/6166/1/Report_of_the_Expert_Reference_Group_Editted_06022012_Final.pdf

2014 Governance review

https://www.spc.int/DigitalLibrary/Doc/SPC/Meetings/CRGA/CRGA_44/SPC_Governance.html

2018 Mid-term review of Strategic Plan 2016–2020: Partnership survey

https://www.spc.int/DigitalLibrary/Doc/SPC/Strategic_Plans/SPC_Strategic_Plan_mid_term_review_Partnership_Survey_Executive_Summary.html

2019 Capacity development

<https://purl.org/spc/digilib/doc/uuxw9>

2022 Synthesis evaluation of SPC's Strategic Plan 2016–2020: Capstone Report

<https://purl.org/spc/digilib/doc/qxzyi>

2022 Friends of the Chair review

<https://purl.org/spc/digilib/doc/x6h7o>

2022 Australia-SPC partnership

<https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/australia-spc-partnership-evaluation-final-evaluation-report.docx>

2022 MFAT-SPC core funding mid-term review

<https://www.mfat.govt.nz/assets/Aid-Prog-docs/Evaluations/2022/Mid-term-Review-MFAT-SPC-Core-Funding-2020-2024-FINAL-For-Release.pdf>

Part 4: PROPOSAL EVALUATION MATRIX

4.1 Evaluation criteria & score weight

A two-stage procedure will be utilised to evaluate the proposals, with evaluation of the **Technical proposal** being completed prior to any **Financial proposal** being opened and compared.

The competencies which will be evaluated are detailed in [Part 3](#).

The evaluation matrix below also reflects the obtainable score specified for each evaluation criterion (technical requirement) which indicates the relative significance or weight of the items in the overall evaluation process.

The technical component, which has a total possible value of **700 points**, will be evaluated using the following criteria.

Evaluation criteria	Score Weight (%)	Points obtainable
Mandatory requirements		
All the documents required for the technical and financial proposals as detailed in Part 2 - § 2.2	Bidders will be disqualified if any of the requirements are not met	
Administrative requirements		
A. Quality of submission	20%	140
Quality of the proposal: presentation, content, supporting documents.		
Technical requirements		
1. Qualifications	10%	70
Post-graduate qualification in evaluation, international development, policy and administration or equivalent experience.		
2. Experience – Strategic reviews & evaluations	20%	140
Proven experience in conducting reviews and evaluations with a strategic level focus, requiring regional and country-level analysis. Experience in evaluating international or regional organisations / institutions / public entities is an advantage.		
3. Experience – Review methodologies, data collection methods & analysis	20%	140
Demonstrated competence and experience in review methodologies, and data collection methods and analysis.		
4. Experience – International best practice in ethics & research integrity	10%	70
Proven track record of delivering high-quality reviews and evaluations in an ethically and sensitive manner, observing international best practice in ethics and research integrity.		

Evaluation criteria	Score Weight (%)	Points obtainable
Technical requirements		
5. Knowledge of the Pacific	10%	70
Good knowledge of the Pacific, including on regionalism (governance mechanisms) and the regional architecture. Experience working with inter-governmental organisations in the Pacific is desirable.		
6. Communication Skills	10%	70
Strong communication skills to interact with various stakeholders; and the ability to clearly document findings and recommendations. An ability to communicate in French and / or another Pacific language is considered an asset.		
Total Score	100%	700
Qualification score	70%	490

4.2 Financial evaluation

The financial component of the proposal will be scored on the basis of overall costs for the delivery of the services and financial incentives and benefits provided to SPC. The lowest financial proposal will be awarded a maximum **300 points** and other financial offers and incentives will be awarded points as per the formula below:

$$\text{Financial Proposal score} = (\text{Lowest Price} / \text{Price under consideration}) \times 300$$

The Financial Proposal Submission Form (Annex 5) must be stamped & signed and protected by a password.

Part 5: PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS

Annex 1: BIDDER'S LETTER OF APPLICATION

Dear Sir / Madam:

Having examined the Solicitation Documents, the receipt of which is hereby duly acknowledged, we the undersigned, offer to supply the required services for the sum as may be ascertained in accordance with the Financial Proposal attached herewith and made part of this proposal.

We acknowledge that:

- SPC may exercise any of its rights set out in the Request for Proposal documents, at any time;
- The statements, opinions, projections, forecasts or other information contained in the Request for Proposal documents may change;
- The Request for Proposal documents are a summary only of SPC's requirements and is not intended to be a comprehensive description of them;
- Neither the lodgement of the Request for Proposal documents nor the acceptance of any tender nor any agreement made subsequent to the Request for Proposal documents will imply any representation from or on behalf of SPC that there has been no material change since the date of the Request for Proposal documents, or since the date as at which any information contained in the Request for Proposal documents is stated to be applicable;
- Excepted as required by law and only to the extent so required, neither SPC, nor its respective officers, employees, advisers or agents will in any way be liable to any person or body for any loss, damage, cost or expense of any nature arising in any way out of or in connection with any representations, opinions, projections, forecasts or other statements, actual or implied, contained in or omitted from the Request for Proposal documents.

We undertake, if our proposal is accepted, to commence and complete delivery of all items in the contract within the time frame stipulated.

We understand that you are not bound to accept any proposal you may receive and that a binding contract would result only after final negotiations are concluded on the basis of the Technical and Financial Components proposed.

For the Bidder: *[insert name of the company]*

Signature:

Name of the Bidder's representative: *[insert name of the representative]*

Title: *[insert Title of the representative]*

Date: *[Click or tap to enter a date]*

Annex 2: CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATION

INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS

What is a conflict of interest?

A conflict of interest may arise from economic or commercial interests, political, trade union or national affinities, family, cultural or sentimental ties, or **any other type of relationship or common interest between the bidder and any person connected with the contracting authority** (SPC staff member, consultant or any other expert or collaborator mandated by SPC).

Always declare a conflict

The existence of a potential or apparent conflict of interest does not necessarily prevent the bidder concerned from taking part in a tender process. **However, the declaration of the existence of such a conflict by the persons concerned is essential and allows SPC to take appropriate measures to mitigate it and prevent the associated risks.**

Bidders are therefore invited to declare any situation, fact or link which, to their knowledge, could generate a real, potential or apparent conflict of interest.

Declaration at any time

Conflicts of interest may arise at any time during the procurement process or the implementation of a contract (e.g. new partner in the project) or as a result of a change in personal life (e.g. marriage, inheritance, financial transaction, creation of a company). If such a relationship is found and could be perceived by a reasonable person as likely to influence a decision, a declaration of the situation is necessary. In case of doubt, a conflict situation must be declared.

Declaration for any person involved

A declaration must be completed for each person involved in the tender (principal representative of the bidder, possible subcontractors, consultant, etc.)

Failure

Failing to declare a potential conflict of interest may result in the bidder being refused a contract or placed on SPC's list of non-responsible suppliers.

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, *[name of the representative of the Bidder]*, acting in the name and on behalf of the company *[name of the company]*, declare that:

<input type="checkbox"/>	To my knowledge, I am not in a conflict-of-interest situation.
<input type="checkbox"/>	There is a potential conflict of interest with regard to my <i>[Choose an item]</i> relationship with <i>[name of the person concerned]</i> in his or her capacity as <i>position/role/personal or family link with the person concerned</i> , although, to the best of my knowledge, this person is not directly or indirectly involved in any stage of the procurement process.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I may be in a conflict of interest with regard to my <i>[Choose an item]</i> relationship with <i>[name of the person concerned]</i> in his or her capacity as <i>position/role/personal or family link with the person concerned</i> , as this person is, to the best of my knowledge, directly or indirectly linked to the procurement process.
<input type="checkbox"/>	To my knowledge, there is another situation that could potentially constitute a conflict of interest: <i>[Describe the situation that may constitute a conflict of interest]</i>

In addition, I undertake to:

- declare, without delay, to SPC any situation that constitutes a potential conflict of interest or is likely to lead to a conflict-of-interest;
- not to grant, seek, obtain or accept any advantage, whether financial or in kind, to or from any person where such advantage constitutes an unfair practice or an attempt at fraud or corruption, directly or indirectly, or constitutes a gratuity or reward related to the award of the contract;
- to provide accurate, truthful and complete information to SPC in connection with this procurement process.

I acknowledge that I and/or my company and/or my business partners who are jointly and severally bidding on the **RFP 24-6153** may be subject to sanctions such as being placed on SPC's list of non-responsible vendors, if it is established that false statements have been made or false information has been provided.

For the Bidder: *[insert name of the company]*

Signature:

Name of the representative: *[insert name of the representative]*

Title: *[insert Title of the representative]*

Date: *[Click or tap to enter a date]*

Annex 3: INFORMATION ABOUT THE BIDDER AND DUE DILIGENCE

Please complete the following questionnaire and provide supporting documents where applicable.

VENDOR INFORMATION			
Are you already registered as an SPC vendor?			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
1. Please provide information related to your entity.			
Company name	<i>[Enter company name]</i>	Address	<i>[Enter address]</i>
Director/CEO	<i>[Enter name of the executive person]</i>	Position	<i>[Enter position of the executive person]</i>
Business Registration/License number	<i>[Enter company registration/license number (or tax number)]</i>		
Date of business registration	<i>[Enter date of business registration]</i>		
Country of business registration	<i>[Enter country of business registration]</i>		
Status of the entity: <input type="checkbox"/> For-profit entity (company), <input type="checkbox"/> NGO, <input type="checkbox"/> International organisation, <input type="checkbox"/> Government body, <input type="checkbox"/> University, <input type="checkbox"/> Association, <input type="checkbox"/> Research Institute, <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <i>[insert details]</i>			
2. Please provide relevant documentation to support and verify the legal existence of the entity, the authority of its officer and proof of its address, such as:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Delegation of authority or power of attorney document <input type="checkbox"/> Certificate of business registration/license <input type="checkbox"/> Memorandum, Articles or Statutes of Association <input type="checkbox"/> Telephone, water, or electricity bill in the name of the entity <input type="checkbox"/> Bank account details bearing the name of the entity			
3. How many employees does your company and its subsidiaries have?		<i>[provide answer]</i>	
4. Do you have professional insurance against all risks in respect of your employees, sub-contractors, property and equipment?			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If 'No', what type of business insurance do you have?</i>		<i>[provide answer]</i>	
5. Are you up to date with your tax and social security payment obligations?			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If 'No', please explain the situation:</i>		<i>[Provide details]</i>	
6. Is your entity regulated by a national authority?			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If 'Yes', please specify the name:</i>		<i>[Insert name of the national regulation authority]</i>	
7. Is your entity a publicly held company?			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
8. Does your entity have a publicly available annual report?			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>Please send SPC your audited financial statement from the last 3 financial years if available</i>			

DUE DILIGENCE			
9. Does your entity have foreign branches and/or subsidiaries?			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<i>If you answered 'yes' to the previous question, please confirm the branches:</i>			
• Head Office & domestic branches			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
• Domestic subsidiaries			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
• Overseas branches			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
• Overseas subsidiaries			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

10. Does your entity provide financial services to customers determined to be high risk including but not limited to:					
Foreign Financial Institutions	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Casinos	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Cash Intensive Businesses	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Foreign Government Entities	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Non-Resident Individuals	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	Money Service Businesses	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<input type="checkbox"/> Other, please provide details:			[Provide details]		
11. If you answered 'yes' to any of the boxes in question 10, does your entity's policies and procedures specifically outline how to mitigate the potential risks associated with these higher risk customer types?				<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If 'Yes', please explain how:			[Provide explanation]		
12. Does your entity have a written policy, controls and procedures reasonably designed to prevent and detect fraud, corruption, money laundering or terrorist financing activities?				<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If 'Yes', please send SPC your policy in English.					
If 'No', what process does your entity have in place to prevent and detect money laundering or terrorist financing activities?				[provide answer]	
13. Does your entity have an officer responsible for anti-corruption, or anti-money laundering and counter-terrorism financing policy?				<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If 'Yes', please state that officer's contact details:			[Insert name and contact details]		
14. Has your entity or any of its current or former directors or CEOs ever filed for bankruptcy?				<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If 'Yes', please provide details:			[Provide details]		
15. Has your entity or any of its current or former directors or CEOs ever been the subject of any investigations or had any regulatory or criminal enforcement actions resulting from violations of any laws or regulations, including those relating to money laundering or terrorism financing?				<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If 'Yes', please provide details:			[Provide details]		

SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY (SER)

16. Does your entity have a written policy, controls and procedures to implement its Social and Environmental Responsibility (SER) commitments?				<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If 'Yes', please send SPC your policy in English.					
If 'No', what process does your entity have in place to ensure your social and environmental responsibility?				[provide answer]	
Does your Policy or Process cover the followings?					
<input type="checkbox"/> Child protection <input type="checkbox"/> Human rights <input type="checkbox"/> Gender equality <input type="checkbox"/> Social inclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Sexual harassment, abuse or exploitation <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental responsibility					
Please, outline the major actions you have undertaken in these areas:			[provide answer]		
17. Does your entity have an officer responsible for Social and Environmental Responsibility (SER)?				<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If 'Yes', please state that officer's contact details:			[Insert name and contact details]		

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS (where relevant)	
• Business registration/license proof	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Bank account details document	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Address of the entity and Authority of officer proofs	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Audited financial statement from the last 3 financial years	<input type="checkbox"/>
• Fraud, corruption, anti-money laundering and counter terrorist financing Policy	<input type="checkbox"/>
• SER Policy	<input type="checkbox"/>

I declare that the particulars given herein above are true, correct and complete to the best of my knowledge, and the documents submitted in support of this form are genuine and obtained legally from the respective issuing authority.

I declare that none of the funds received or to be received by my company will be used for criminal activities, including financing terrorism or money laundering.

By sending this declaration to SPC, I agree that my business and personal information may be used by SPC for due diligence purposes. I also understand and accept that SPC will treat any personal information it receives in connection with my proposal in accordance with its [Privacy Policy](#), and the [Guidelines for handling personal information of bidders and grantees](#).

For the Bidder: *[insert name of the company]*

Signature:

Name of the representative: *[insert name of the representative]*

Title: *[insert Title of the representative]*

Date: *[Click or tap to enter a date]*

Annex 4: TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORM

INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS

Please fill the table below and provide supporting documentation as required. Please provide the resume of the proposed consultant(s) and any other supporting documentation that will help the submission.

The following form is given as an indication, the bidder may submit its technical proposal to SPC in another format, if it complies with the instructions detailed in this RFP and contains the information requested below.

Technical Requirements	
References and Experience	
Details for three references:	
1. Client's name: <i>[insert name of client 1]</i>	
Contact name:	<i>[insert name of contact]</i>
Contact details:	<i>[insert contact details]</i>
Value contract:	<i>[insert value of contract]</i>
2. Client's name: <i>[insert name of client 2]</i>	
Contact name:	<i>[insert name of contact]</i>
Contact details:	<i>[insert contact details]</i>
Value contract:	<i>[insert value of contract]</i>
3. Client's name: <i>[insert name of client 3]</i>	
Contact name:	<i>[insert name of contact]</i>
Contact details:	<i>[insert contact details]</i>
Value contract:	<i>[insert value of contract]</i>
Details about the contractor's experience:	
Contractors' experience:	<i>[insert details about consultants' experience]</i>
Evaluation criteria	Response by Bidder
1. Qualifications	
Post-graduate qualification in evaluation, international development, policy and administration or equivalent experience.	<i>[Bidder's answer]</i>
2. Experience – Strategic reviews & evaluations	
Proven experience in conducting reviews and evaluations with a strategic level focus, requiring regional and country-level analysis. Experience in evaluating international or regional organisations / institutions / public entities is an advantage.	<i>[Bidder's answer]</i>

Evaluation criteria	Response by Bidder
3. Experience – Review methodologies, data collection methods & analysis	
Demonstrated competence and experience in review methodologies, and data collection methods and analysis.	<i>[Bidder's answer]</i>
4. Experience – International best practice in ethics & research integrity	
Proven track record of delivering high-quality reviews and evaluations in an ethically and sensitive manner, observing international best practice in ethics and research integrity.	<i>[Bidder's answer]</i>
5. Knowledge of the Pacific	
Good knowledge of the Pacific, including on regionalism (governance mechanisms) and the regional architecture. Experience working with inter-governmental organisations in the Pacific is desirable.	<i>[Bidder's answer]</i>
6. Communication Skills	
Strong communication skills to interact with various stakeholders; and the ability to clearly document findings and recommendations. An ability to communicate in French and / or another Pacific language is considered an asset.	<i>[Bidder's answer]</i>

For the Bidder: *[insert name of the company]*

Signature:

Name of the representative: *[insert name of the representative]*

Title: *[insert Title of the representative]*

Date: *[Click or tap to enter a date]*

Annex 5: FINANCIAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORM

INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS

In their financial proposal, bidders should detail as much as possible the price requested in response to the technical specifications.

Good detail in their financial proposal helps bidders to give clarity and transparency to their proposal and makes it easier for SPC to score the proposals received.

The contract to be concluded with the selected bidder must mention all the costs incurred for the execution of the assignment entrusted to him. No additional costs can be claimed from SPC after the contract has been signed. Bidders must mention in their financial proposal all additional costs foreseen for the execution of the contract (material, equipment, travel, etc.). These costs will either be included in their fees, paid or reimbursed by SPC upon presentation of supporting documents. In any case, they must be estimated by the bidder in its financial proposal and will form an integral part of SPC's evaluation of proposals.

Bidders must also mention any special conditions relating to the amount of their proposal or the terms of payment.

The financial proposal must be submitted inclusive of taxes in accordance with the applicable legislation. However, the final amount of the awarded contract may be paid to the successful bidder inclusive or exclusive of taxes, depending on the tax exemptions enjoyed by SPC as an intergovernmental organisation in its member countries and territories.

The following form is given as an indication, the bidder may submit its financial proposal to SPC in another format, provided that it complies with the instructions detailed in this RFP and in particular:

The Financial Proposal Submission Form must be stamped & signed and protected by a password.

BIDDER'S FINANCIAL PROPOSAL – SERVICES

Independent Institutional Review of SPC				
Milestones / Deliverables	Unit	Unit Price USD	Total Quantity	Total Amount USD
Preparation / Inception Deliverable 1.1: Inception report with methodology and implementation timeframe, submitted to the CRGA Co-Chairs	Lump Sum	[unit price]	[quantity]	[total amount]
Data collection, analysis, and validation Deliverable 2.1: Comprehensive list of relevant references, with summary of surveys, if implemented	Lump Sum	[unit price]	[quantity]	[total amount]
Deliverable 2.2: First draft of emerging findings to CRGA Co-Chairs	Lump Sum	[unit price]	[quantity]	[total amount]
Deliverable 2.3: Consultation workshop with CRGA Subcommittee and other stakeholders	Lump Sum	[unit price]	[quantity]	[total amount]
Reporting, launch and presentation Deliverable 3.1: Draft report, summary and presentation to CRGA Subcommittee Co-Chairs	Lump Sum	[unit price]	[quantity]	[total amount]
Deliverable 3.2: Final draft report, summary and presentation to CRGA	Lump Sum	[unit price]	[quantity]	[total amount]
Deliverable 3.3: Final report and summary incorporating feedback from CRGA	Lump Sum	[unit price]	[quantity]	[total amount]
Total				[total amount]

No payment will be made for items which have not been priced. Such items are deemed to be covered by the financial offer.

Bidders will be deemed to have satisfied themselves, before submitting their proposal as to its correctness and completeness, taking into account all that is required for the full and proper performance of the contract and to have included all costs in their rates and prices.

<p>For the Bidder: <i>[insert name of the company]</i></p> <p>Signature:</p> <p>Name of the representative: <i>[insert name of the representative]</i> Title: <i>[insert Title of the representative]</i> Date: <i>[Click or tap to enter a date]</i></p>
