CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS

RFT: 2026-GEFIS-46
File: AP_6/5/9
Date: 6 November 2026
To: Interested Service Providers
Contact: Procurement Unit (procurement@sprep.org)

Subject: Request for tenders (RFT): Consultancy for a Viability Study on the Collection, Recycling and Sustainable Management of End-of-Life Vehicles (ELVs) in Pacific Island Countries, Including the Identification and Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)-Containing Components

---

Question 1:
Please advise the expected budget for this project?

Response:
Approximately USD100,000

Question 2:
(i) Please clarify that the scope is limited to Conceptual engineering design and specifications at the conceptual level – not detailed design level as mentioned in Expected Outcome?

(ii) What are the expected outcomes from this study? Is it to find the lead cost option, develop options to engage with partners to establish a market, etc.? (T+T2)

Response:
The expected outcome of this engagement is the development of conceptual engineering designs and preliminary technical specifications to inform the proposed infrastructure, facility or system requirements. The designs and specifications shall be prepared at a conceptual level, providing an indicative layout, key design parameters, technical requirements, preliminary material specifications and indicative cost considerations, as applicable.
For clarity, the scope does not extend to detailed engineering design, construction-ready drawings, detailed technical specifications, structural calculations, or engineering documentation required for construction or tendering purposes. These may be undertaken under a subsequent phase of work, subject to further assessment and approval.

Question 3:
Who is the audience of this study?

Response:
Outcome of this engagement will help inform regional and national decision in developing a solution for ELV in the region. This viability study will provide evidence-based recommendations to guide regional decision-making on a cost-effective, environmentally sound, and institutionally feasible ELV management system that reduces the burden on individual countries and strengthens regional cooperation across the Pacific.

Question 4:
How would SPREP envisage the development of different policy scenarios into the analysis (i.e., number of scenarios, definition of specificity, depth of assessment)?

Response:

SPREP envisages the consultant assessing a small number of practical regional ELV management scenarios, including centralised, decentralised and hybrid approaches, to determine the most technically, economically and environmentally viable arrangement for the participating countries. The assessment should build on the findings, recommendations and analysis of previous ELV studies, utilising existing information while addressing identified gaps and updating assumptions where necessary. The scenarios should be sufficiently defined to demonstrate the respective roles and responsibilities of participating countries, collection and consolidation arrangements, transboundary movement requirements, financing considerations and operational arrangements for the proposed regional facility in Fiji. The assessment should provide a comparative analysis of the technical, economic, financial, environmental, logistical and regulatory implications of each scenario, identifying the advantages, limitations and enabling conditions for implementation. The focus should remain on informing the feasibility and design of the proposed regional facility rather than developing detailed policy or legislative frameworks for each of the 14 countries.

Question 5:
Technical threshold. RFT section 6.2 says a proposal is rejected if it does not achieve 70% or more in the technical criteria. Does this mean 70% of the technical score (56 of the 80 technical points), or 70 points out of 80?

Response:
Yes, a technical score of 56 out of 80 technical points is equivalent to 70%, which meets the required pass mark.

Question 6:
Criteria weights. The RFT lists facility design experience at 15%. The Application Form lists it at 10%, making the form total 75% rather than 80%. Which weights apply?

Response:
Application Form has been updated and will be re-attached.

Question 7:
Financial score. In the formula in RFT section 6, is the "lowest bid amount" the lowest among technically qualified proposals only, or among all bids received?

Response:
Yes, the lowest bid amount among the technically qualified proposals, as only these bids will be considered for the financial phase of the tender evaluation.

Question 8:
Legacy ELV validation. How does SPREP expect legacy ELV numbers, and their location, to be verified and validated without on-the-ground work?

Response:

SPREP recognises the limitations associated with obtaining accurate national data on legacy ELV numbers and their locations across the 14 participating countries. The objective of this consultancy is to undertake a Viability Study on the Collection, Recycling and Sustainable Management of End-of-Life Vehicles (ELVs) in Pacific Island Countries, Including the Identification and Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)-Containing Components. The consultant is therefore expected to build on previous studies and undertake further data collection and validation through engagement with relevant national focal points, government agencies and private-sector stakeholders. This may include remote consultations and reviews of available records and supporting information. Physical verification or on-the-ground assessments across all participating countries are not required under this consultancy. However, the consultant should clearly document the sources of information, assumptions, data gaps and limitations, including the level of confidence associated with the estimates provided.

Of particular importance, SPREP is interested in establishing the minimum volume of ELVs that would need to be collected and consolidated from each participating country to make export and processing through the proposed regional facility in Fiji technically and economically viable. This should inform the assessment of regional supply volumes, transportation and consolidation arrangements, and the economic and financial modelling of the proposed facility.

Question 9:
Country priorities. How should the depth of detail, evaluation and validation be prioritised across the 14 participating countries?

Response:
A tiered assessment approach should be adopted, ensuring baseline coverage of all 14 participating countries while prioritising more detailed technical and economic assessments in countries with significant ELV generation, existing stockpiles, potential export volumes and strategic relevance to the proposed regional facility in Fiji. The contractor should build on previous regional and national studies undertaken on ELV management, utilising existing findings, data and recommendations while identifying and addressing gaps, updating outdated information and undertaking additional investigations where necessary. This should be achieved without compromising the phases, scope of work and specific deliverables outlined in the tender. A consistent assessment framework should be applied across

all countries to enable regional comparison, while allowing flexibility to account for differences in national circumstances, data availability, infrastructure and institutional capacity. Findings should be validated through national stakeholder consultations and engagement with relevant government agencies and private-sector operators. Ultimately, the assessment should establish the technical, economic, environmental and logistical feasibility of a regional ELV recycling facility in Fiji, including the capacity and willingness of participating countries to contribute to and utilise the proposed facility.

Question 10:

Legacy recovery costs. The 2023 Economic Study costs ELV collection using Suva-area rates and does not separately cost the recovery and preparation of legacy ELVs in remote locations or other countries. Should the economic model include the full cost of legacy recovery, aggregation and preparation?

Response:

Yes – We are keen to also understand the cost of ELV recovery (collection/depollution and processing/export for recycling) for other countries to ship to Fiji or to other potential (existing) end market.

Question 11:

Sites. Is identifying candidate sites within scope, both for the regional facility and for aggregation, preparation, baling and loading sites in participating countries?

Response:

Site identification and selection are not within the scope of this consultancy. However, the contractor is expected to develop and recommend appropriate site selection criteria for two facility models: (i) a national ELV processing facility, where ELVs would be processed and prepared for export; and (ii) a regional ELV recycling facility designed to receive ELVs from other participating Pacific Island countries for processing. The criteria should consider relevant technical, environmental, economic, logistical, infrastructure, land-use and biosecurity requirements to inform future site identification and investment decisions. Consultant are expected to build on the findings and recommendations from previous study.

Question 12:

Design level. Should the facility design be conceptual, or detailed enough to support an environmental impact assessment and consent application in Fiji?

Response:

The expected outcome of this engagement is the development of conceptual engineering designs and preliminary technical specifications to inform the proposed infrastructure, facility or system requirements. The designs and specifications shall be prepared at a conceptual level, providing an indicative layout, key design parameters, technical requirements, preliminary material specifications and indicative cost considerations, as applicable.

For clarity, the scope does not extend to detailed engineering design, construction-ready drawings, detailed technical specifications, structural calculations, or engineering documentation required for construction or tendering purposes. These may be undertaken under a subsequent phase of work, subject to further assessment and approval.

Question 13:

Supplier visits. Best practice for an investment case based on Best Available Technologies and Best Environmental Practice would include visiting equipment suppliers and recent installations, some in Europe or China. Does SPREP expect this level of verification? If so, should tenderers include it in the price?

Response:

No – this level of verification is not required.

The contractor will instead be expected to provide recommended equipment specifications for the proposed ELV processing facility, with preference given to robust, heavy-duty equipment capable of withstanding the dismantling and processing of vehicles and suitable for sustained operational use.

Question 14:

Data access. Will SPREP facilitate access to national vehicle registration, import and waste audit data, and to the relevant agencies in all 14 countries?

Response:

SPREP will provide a supporting letter to the contractor and set up meetings with country focal points if needed to undertake this work.

Question 15:

Insurance. The Services Agreement requires US$10 million professional indemnity and US$10 million public liability cover. As this is largely a remote desk study with limited travel:
a) What risks is this insurance intended to cover? b) Would lower limits be acceptable?

Response:

(a) The insurance requirements are intended to provide protection against potential liabilities arising from the Suppliers performance of the services including Professional Indemnity Insurance and Public Liability Insurance which are outlined in the Service Agreement template that was attached to the Request for Tender (RFT).

(b) The insurance limits of US$10 million for Professional Indemnity, and US$10 million for Public Liability are standard contractual requirements. Any request for a reduction in these limits would be considered on an exceptional basis only, subject to negotiation and further approvals.

Question 16:

Liability. Is the supplier indemnity in clause 12 limited in any way, for example to the contract value or the insurance limits, or is it uncapped?

Response:

The Supplier's Indemnity clause 12 of the Service Agreement is a standard contractual requirement. Any proposed changes would be considered on an exceptional basis only, subject to negotiation and approvals.

Question 17:
As part of the Investment Case can you confirm if there is to be engagement with potential investors or market sounding?

Response:
Preliminary market sounding and targeted engagement with relevant private-sector operators and potential investors should be incorporated into the Investment Case. This engagement should focus on gauging market interest, understanding commercial expectations, identifying potential investment opportunities and exploring viable financing and operational models for the proposed regional ELV recycling facility. However, this is not intended to constitute a full investment mobilisation exercise. Rather, the findings should inform the Investment Case, strengthen the assessment of commercial viability and support political buy-in from the proposed host country.

Question 18:
Do you expect that the proposed solution would be 'investment ready' and potentially used by third parties to make investment decisions?

Response:
The expectation is for the consultant to develop a comprehensive and evidence-based Investment Case that establishes the technical, economic, financial and operational feasibility of the proposed regional ELV recycling facility. The outputs should be sufficiently robust to inform government decision-making, guide future investment planning and provide a basis for discussions with potential investors and financing partners. However, the consultancy is not expected to deliver a fully investment-ready proposal or investment package. Further due diligence, site identification, financing arrangements and other preparatory work may be required before the project can proceed to actual investment and implementation.

Question 19:
Do you anticipate investment in this facility would be led by private investors or development agencies?

Response:
The preferred investment model has not yet been determined. The consultant is expected to explore and assess potential investment arrangements, including private-sector-led investment, development partner financing and blended financing models involving government, development agencies and private-sector participation. The assessment should consider the commercial viability of the facility alongside its regional environmental benefits, identifying the most practical and sustainable financing and operational arrangements for establishing and maintaining the proposed regional ELV recycling facility in Fiji.

Question 20:
In order to address the potential responses adequately for this RFP we respectfully request an extension of time to submit a proposal?

Response:
SPREP is agreeable to extend the proposal submission deadline to 27 November 2026. An extension of the deadline for the RFT will be posted on the SPREP website.

Question 21:
Level of design: The Expected Outcomes refer to a "Detailed Design of ELV Facility", while the Scope of Work specifies a "Conceptual Engineering Design". Please confirm the required level of design.?

Response:
The expected outcome of this engagement is the development of conceptual engineering designs and preliminary technical specifications to inform the proposed infrastructure, facility or system requirements. The designs and specifications shall be prepared at a conceptual level, providing an indicative layout, key design parameters, technical requirements, preliminary material specifications and indicative cost considerations, as applicable.
For clarity, the scope does not extend to detailed engineering design, construction-ready drawings, detailed technical specifications, structural calculations, or engineering documentation required for construction or tendering purposes. These may be undertaken under a subsequent phase of work, subject to further assessment and approval.

Question 22:
Number of facilities: Please confirm whether there is more than one ELV Facility design required (ie one for proposed regional processing facility in Suva and one for a “distributed” facility)

Response:
The scope of this consultancy is to develop the detailed design for one proposed regional ELV processing facility in Fiji, intended to receive ELVs from participating Pacific Island countries for processing and recovery of materials. A second detailed facility design for a distributed or decentralised model is not required. However, the consultant is expected to undertake a comparative assessment of centralised, decentralised and hybrid regional ELV management scenarios to inform the preferred regional management approach. The detailed facility design should focus on the proposed regional facility in Fiji and build on the findings, recommendations and technical assessments of the previous ELV study, identifying and addressing any outstanding information gaps or areas requiring further investigation.

Question 23:
POPs assessment: Please confirm that the POPs and hazardous components assessment is desktop-based only?

Response:
YES – only desktop

Question 24:
Payment schedule: Will payments be linked to the deliverables in Table 2, and if so, can you please indicate the payment percentage for each milestone?

Response:
This will be confirmed at the contract negotiation phase of this work.

Question 25:

Please provide a copy of the scoping study undertaken by GEF Islands which estimated legacy waste in the Pacific Region of 308,450 units and projected future units of 22,600 a year (the Scoping Study in annex 2 appears to have different numbers). Please provide raw data used to determine the estimated legacy waste in the Pacific Region as well if possible?

Response:

The previous ELV study relied largely on international trade data to estimate ELV generation and volumes due to limited availability of reliable national data across the participating countries. These projections therefore require further assessment and validation. The additional analysis under this contract is intended to address these data gaps, update existing estimates and provide a more accurate evidence base to inform the feasibility assessment, economic and financial modelling, and design of the proposed regional ELV processing facility in Fiji.