



**SPREP
PROE**

REQUEST FOR TENDERS



File: AP_6/5/8/1
Date: 14 February, 2020
To: Interested consultants
From: Sela S. Simamao, PacWastePlus Finance and Procurement Officer

Subject: Request for tenders: Development of Decision Support Tool for the improvement of Waste Management in the Pacific Region

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. For more information, see: www.sprep.org.

2. Specifications: statement of requirement

- 2.1. SPREP would like to call for tenders from qualified and experienced consultants who can offer their services to develop a decision support tool that will assist project managers and government officials to undertake an assessment process to ensure the intervention that is being considered will meet stakeholder needs and appropriately address issue at hand.
- 2.2. The Terms of Reference of the consultancy are set out in Annex A

3. Conditions: information for applicants

- 3.1. To be considered for this tender, interested suppliers must meet the following conditions
 - Submit a detailed Curriculum Vitae detailing qualification and previous relevant experience for each proposed personnel
 - Provide at least 3 references as part of the tender application
 - Provide examples of past related work outputs
 - Complete the **tender application form** – (note you are required to complete all areas in full as requested, particularly the statements to demonstrate you meet the selection criteria. **DO NOT** refer us to your CV or Technical proposal. Failure to do so will result in the application **NOT** being considered)

4. Submission guidelines

- 4.1. Tender documentation should demonstrate that the interested supplier satisfies the conditions stated above and is capable of meeting the specifications and timeframes. Documentation must also include supporting examples to address the evaluation criteria. Describe any additional minimum content and format requirements.
- 4.2. Tender documentation should outline the interested supplier's complete proposal:
 - Personnel (individual CV's which highlight relevant qualification and experience)
 - Technical Proposal (details to achieve tasks outlined in Annex A)
 - Financial Proposal (include timeframe and costs, proposal to remain valid for 90 days and quoted in USD)
- 4.3. Tenderers/Bidders must insist on an acknowledgement of receipt of tenders/proposals/bids.

5. Tender Clarification

- 5.1. Any clarification questions from applicants must be submitted by email to Sela Soakai-Simamao on selas@sprep.org and copy tenders@sprep.org before 21 February 2020. A summary of all questions received with an associated response will be posted on the SPREP website www.sprep.org/tender by 26 February 2020.

6. Evaluation criteria

- 6.1. SPREP will select a preferred supplier 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 tenderer satisfies the following criteria.
- (a) Has a minimum of 5 years' experience in the waste/environmental management and has demonstrated experience in assisting organisations to employ evidence-based decision-making processes. 25%
 - (b) Demonstrated experience in assessing technical reports and explaining complex information in report format that both technical and non-technical audiences can understand. 20%
 - (c) Detailed methodology for how the project is proposed to be delivered (including timeframe and responsibilities) 30%
 - (d) Detailed financial proposal. 25%

7. Deadline

- 7.1. **The due date for submission of the tender is: 02 March 2020 (local Samoa time)**
- 7.2. Late submissions will be returned unopened to the sender.
- 7.3. Please send all tenders clearly marked 'TENDER: Development of Decision Support Tool for the improvement of Waste Management in the Pacific Region' to one of the following methods:

Mail: SPREP
Attention: Procurement Officer
PO Box 240
Apia, SAMOA

Email: tenders@sprep.org

Fax: 685 20231

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

SPREP reserves the right to reject any or all tenders and the lowest or any tender will not necessarily be accepted.

For any complaints regarding the Secretariat's tenders please refer to the Complaints section on the SPREP website
<http://www.sprep.org/accountability/complaints>

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Development of a Decision Support Tool for the Improvement of Waste Management in the Pacific Region

1. BACKGROUND

The Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) is working with the European Union's Delegation to the Pacific, and 14 Pacific Island Countries and Timor-Leste to undertake the PacWastePlus Programme, which seeks to improve and enhance waste management activities and the capacity of governments, industry and communities to manage waste to reduce the impact on human health and the environment.

PacWastePlus seeks to generate improved economic, social, health and environmental benefits for Pacific Island Countries arising from stronger regional economic integration and the sustainable management of natural resources and the environment. The programme activities will be designed to assist Countries to ensure the safe and sustainable management of waste with due regard for the conservation of biodiversity, reduction of marine litter, health and well-being of Pacific island communities, and climate change mitigation and adaptation requirements.

Countries participating in the PacWastePlus programme are:

Cook Islands, Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Marshall Islands, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu

2. OBJECTIVE

The objective of this engagement is to develop a simple to use Decision Support tool that will assist project managers and government officials to undertake an assessment process to ensure the intervention they are considering implementing with meet the needs of stakeholders and appropriately address the issue they are attempting to manage or resolve.

3. SCOPE OF WORK

This engagement seeks the development of a decision support tool that will assist PacWastePlus participating countries to assess the suitability of waste management projects for their national context, and against the waste hierarchy. The intent of the decision-support tool will be to assist in transparent decision making, and ensure appropriate consideration to national priorities, stated policy positions, and best value use of resources when waste management projects are being developed.

The uses envisaged or desired for decision support include:

- Identifying realistic management choices;
- Integrating information into a coherent framework for analysis and decision making, discerning key information that impacts decision making from more basic information;
- Providing a framework for transparency (i.e. all parameters, assumption, and data used to reach the decision should be clearly documented) and ensuring that the decision-making process itself is documented.

The successful consultant shall develop a set of criteria to be the basis of the Decision Support Tool. The criteria shall consider economic, environmental, social and cultural sustainability, and governance (Refer to Appendix 1) when assessing performance of the tool, i.e. the "Quadruple Bottom Line.

Specifically:

- Environment: flora, fauna, air, water, land
- Social: community, stakeholders, heritage, workforce, supply chain
- Economic: financial sustainability, budgets, materials lifecycles, maintenance cycles
- Governance: asset maturity, risk and opportunity management, climate change adaptation, resilience

The tool shall include considerations of the Waste Management Hierarchy (please note, the successful consultant shall confirm the version of the hierarchy used in the tool); Environmental & Social Safeguards (ESS) and Gender and Social Inclusion (GESI) considerations; in its development and use.

The waste hierarchy is a set of priorities for the efficient use of resources. The waste hierarchy is

- avoidance including action to reduce the amount of waste generated by households, industry and all levels of government
- resource recovery including re-use, recycling, reprocessing and energy recovery, consistent with the most efficient use of the recovered resources
- disposal including management of all disposal options in the most environmentally responsible manner.

ESS and GESI helps manage environmental and social risks and impacts that might arise through projects. The purpose of ESS is to avoid or minimize any potential negative impacts of this work while also looking to maximise benefits. GESI reinforces PacWastePlus commitment to gender equality and the empowerment of women, recognizing the importance of both men and women being equally involved in the planning and management of the environment and its natural resources at all levels. Additional information on both these policies can be found on the SPREP website at the following address: <https://www.sprep.org/accountability/environmental-social-safeguards>.

3.1 Mode of Delivery

The required tasks are outlined as follows:

Task 1 – Literature Review

The successful consultant shall undertake a review to determine if such a tool or undertaking is currently available for use. At a minimum the review should include SPREP metropolitan member countries (Australia, New Zealand, UK, France, USA) and EU member countries.

The range of decisions and their inter-relationships lead to a great variety of decision support approaches. Different decisions matrices address different management problems, different segments of each problem, and that they operate on a variety of scales and complexities, using a variety of analysis and techniques.

Note that decision support tools available in the USA have been reviewed by Sullivan et al (1997, 1999-2000), and new methods are regularly announced on the US Environmental Protection Agency's (US EPA) "TechDirect" service [www.clu-in.org].

With appropriate reference to the outcomes of the literature review, a plan for the design of the decision support tool shall be developed, along with the provision of the waste hierarchy for inclusion in the decision support tool.

Consultants shall include the Hunter Councils Decision Support Tool of Coastal Adaptation in their review, as the basis of this document is considered suitable for use in the development of this tool (<https://www.hccrems.com.au/product/1975/>).

Required outputs:

1. Literature review of similar processes or decision support tools, especially to suit the Pacific context.
2. Plan for criteria and decision support tool design.

Task 2: Design of the Decision Support Tool (DST)

The DSTS shall be designed to provide the user a documented project decision pathway that guides users to an informed decision, without directing the decision outcome.

The DST shall be designed for use in a widely accepted and used computer program (e.g. MS Word or MS Excel) as the tool needs to be accessible by all member countries and should not be tied to programs that will require additional license or software fees.

Please refer to Attachment 2 for a checklist that provides appropriate user-centered design criteria of the tool. Note that not all of these criteria necessarily need to be met, but the list shall be used to compare competing DSS systems

The desired outcome DST shall:

- provide documented evidence of decision considerations
- ensure necessary consultation has occurred in decision determination
- the decision has appropriately considered the best possible outcome with respect to the waste hierarchy
- identification and mitigation of likely perverse impacts of issue / project being assessed.

Required outputs:

1. Completed DST and appropriate guidance on its use.
2. Documents or report displaying evidence of consultation, and decision consideration.

3.2 Schedule of Work

The activities are to be completed no later than **May 31, 2020** with a preference for the activities to be completed much earlier.

Expected project activity is detailed in Table 2, it is expected that tender responses will detail how and when each of these steps will be delivered.

Table 2: Project Schedule

Activity
<i>Notification of Successful Consultant & Contract Signing</i>
1. Introductory and Planning teleconference between successful consultant and PacWastePlus project management unit (PMU)
2. Approval of work plan and methodology
3. Submission of Task 1 Outputs
4. Review of Task 1 Outputs by PacWastePlus PMU
5. Submission of Task 2 Outputs
6. Review of Task 2 Outputs by PacWastePlus PMU

7. Acceptance of all Deliverables.

3.3 Budget

Submissions are required to itemise all financial elements of their proposal in USD, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Salary costs (hourly rate)
- All applicable taxes

Please note: Submissions that exceed USD 15,000 will not be considered.

4. Other Information

The successful consultant will be provided with any relevant project documentation by the PacWastePlus team.

Attachment 1

Issues for consideration of inclusion in the Decision Support Tool

The following items are offered to assist consultants with defining the scope and inclusions into the design of the decision support tool.

Applicability and scalability of the tool

- Scalability: Small scale (community) to National
- What it can assist with
- Source of information

When should the tool be used?

- What will system manage / address (problematic waste items)
- Assessing waste management interventions (systems, collections, technologies, governance, community engagement, etc.)
- Present opportunity for tradeoffs that can help increase recycling diversion rate.

Possible issues for inclusion:

- **Waste hierarchy (higher value management)**
- Economic considerations
 - o Sustainability,
 - o Maintenance costs
 - o Recurrent expenses, technical knowledge, operational environments, fit for climate and purpose in Pacific (Lifecycle management)
 - o Conflict of interest (PPP and contracting)
 - o Inform a cost (risk) benefit analysis (strengthen resilience) – direct and indirect outcomes (positive and negative)
- Cultural considerations
 - o Social benefits and impacts (job creation, job enhancement, job transfer, equity)
 - o Applicability to community to be serviced (small community solutions compared to urban solutions)
 - o Advice on consultations regarding issue being considered:
 - Consultations with key Gov. stakeholders
 - Dept. Climate
 - Dept. Environment
 - Dept. women and communities
 - Infrastructure
 - Customs
 - Maritime (fisheries)
 - Community (who we need to get feedback from)
 - Men
 - Women
 - Youth / age
 - Disabilities
 - Vulnerable groups
 - Others
 - Faith-based
 - NGO
 - Environmental groups
 - Youth – sports
 - Industry (waste and recyclers associations)

- Women's groups
 - Research / academic
- Environmental impacts
 - Land use / aquaculture etc. (what impact on current and future use)
 - Tenure
 - Resources required (people and money)
 - Multiple streams of waste able to be managed (co-benefits) is technology shared or able to provide multi uses, etc.
 - Transport (in country, between island, between countries)
 - Resilience to pacific environment and hazards (cyclones, etc.)
 - Impact on climate change
- Governance impacts
 - Sustainability (normative): Policy requirements to support implementation; life of management action; enabling legislative environment
 - Geo-political considerations
 - Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and issues raised, created.
 - Barriers (legal, cultural, etc.)

Attachment 2

Decision Support System (DSS) User-Centered Design Checklist

EASY TO UNDERSTAND

1. Does the DSS user interface design focus on the decision task, e.g., approving loan applications, monitoring key results metrics, allocating resources?
2. Does the interface style reflect the user's point of view and conception of what is being done, rather than the designer's point of view?
3. Does the DSS user interface present only information relevant to the user's decision task(s)?
4. Do system capabilities enhance user task accomplishment? For example, is color or blinking text used appropriately?
5. Are abbreviations, mnemonics, codes, and acronyms based on normal language usage, specific job-related terminology, or a known logic?
6. Does the DSS design take advantage of what the user already knows?
7. Is terminology for labeling, commands, messages, and prompts consistent with the user's frame of reference? A term should mean what a user thinks it means.
8. Do icons directly represent the associated object or action?
9. Is the DSS designed to do what the user would naturally or naively guess it should do?
10. Does the DSS design maintain visual consistency as well as action consistency?
11. Does the DSS design maintain consistency in the display, labeling terminology, system control, and abbreviations?
12. Is the DSS designed so the user is able to easily predict how it will respond to actions?

EASY ORIENTATION AND NAVIGATION

1. Is the DSS designed so the user knows where they are, what they can do there, and how they can leave a page or the system?
2. Does each screen and window have a descriptive title, placed in a consistent location?
3. Does the DSS design provide cues to identify the currently displayed page and the total number of pages in a multipage display?
4. Are applicable menus and control options available to the user at all times?
5. Does the DSS design provide the user a means to log-off a DSS by a single action (e.g., menu option, command input)?
6. Does the DSS design require a confirmation to exit without saving changes?

ENHANCE PRODUCTIVITY

1. Does the DSS design and specific features take job requirements and decision tasks into consideration and support job accomplishment?
2. Does the DSS design avoid the use of acronyms and abbreviations?

3. Does the DSS design require recognition rather than recall memory where possible?
4. Does the DSS design use units of measurement familiar to the user? Do not require the user to transform units of measurement.
5. Does the DSS design maintain consistent display formatting within the system?
6. Does the DSS design use colors for coding and emphasis?
7. Does the DSS design display only task-related information and place all data related to one task on a single screen?
8. Does the DSS design highlight data, a message, a menu item, an icon, or other display structure as feedback to acknowledge that the user has selected the item?
9. Does the DSS design provide users with information about the current system status as it affects their work (for example, printing delays, inoperable peripherals, and processing delays due to system load)?
10. When the completion of a command results in a consequence that is not visible to the user, does the DSS design provide a feedback message that describes the actions resulting from the command in simple, direct, positive language?

MAINTAIN INTEGRITY OF THE DSS

1. Does the DSS design maintain the integrity of DSS data?
2. Does the DSS design build protection around dangerous operations and permit the user to undo things that have been done?
3. Does the DSS design require users to confirm that they want to perform a critical, potentially hazardous, or potentially destructive command before execution?
4. Does the DSS design provide on-line Help with summary information initially, and with more detailed explanations available on request?
5. Does the DSS design permit the user to enter Help at any point and use a simple, standard action for the user to request Help?
6. Does the DSS design provide an easy means of returning to the task after accessing Help?

PROVIDE CONTROL TO USERS

1. Does the DSS design help the user feel in control of a decision support session?
2. Does the DSS design give the user multiple means for doing things and let the user, not the computer, set the pace?
3. Does the DSS design provide for simple command language control of a DSS by advanced users?
4. Does the DSS design require the user to enter any particular data only once and then have the system access that data if needed?
5. Does the DSS design permit the user to request a more detailed explanation of feedback?
6. Does the DSS design use neutral wording in feedback messages?
7. Is the DSS designed so users are unlikely to make "errors"?

