



SPREP

Secretariat of the Pacific Regional
Environment Programme



10th Pacific Islands Conference

NATURE CONSERVATION AND PROTECTED AREAS

Nature Conservation Action for a Resilient Pacific

ANSWERS TO CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS

File: AP_2/39
Date: 22 December 2020
To: Interested suppliers
Contact: Maraea S. Pogi maraeap@sprep.org
Subject: Request for tenders: **Cetacean Review in the Western Central Pacific Ocean - An ecological review of species interacting with fisheries**

Question 1:

Is there any flexibility around the 11 January 2021 due date for tender submissions? It may be difficult to meet this deadline due to Christmas holidays?

Response:

Unfortunately, there is no flexibility. We do not accept late tenders.
Should the tender be extended a notice will be published on our website.

Question 2:

To clarify that this call for tenders is to conduct a desktop review of cetacean populations that interact with the WCPFC purse seine and long line fisheries, and a qualitative risk assessment?

Response:

Yes, a qualitative assessment but not a modelled approach.

Question 3:

Will the data, reports, papers and other material to be reviewed be readily accessible, or will they need to be accessed from agencies? Having to extract data from multiple sources can take time and would be out of the control of the successful tenderers, potentially affecting deadlines or alternatively the quality of the work completed.

Response:

Only publicly available information is available which will be a subset of bycatch data. As part of the review you will be able to discuss with SPC and we can give you some contacts. Peter Williams PeterW@spc.int is the science manager at SPC if you want to contact him

Question 4:

Given the amount of work required, do SPREP have flexibility with the funds available?



Response:

No

Question 5:

Is there also some flexibility with timing on the date of delivery for the final report?

Response:

Yes, we can negotiate that. The aim is to submit a paper though for the Scientific committee meeting in September 2021 for discussion on next steps.

Additional information:

We are looking for a focus on life history, geographic ranges, habitat use, population differentiation, population trends, conservation status and risks to their survival but not a full risk assessment model as such.

This is for two reasons – one we don't have sufficient funds to enable a full and comprehensive risk assessment at this stage and also we wouldn't be able to easily get access to the data required for such a risk assessment. This requires the agreement of all the countries. Not an impossible task, but we also know a first step in any risk assessment is also an understanding of the life history parameters. Our thinking is that we would undertake this comprehensive review of the state of knowledge of those species that are interacting with the tuna fishery and of the risks they face including from fisheries. It would be useful to understand for example if fisheries presents the greatest risk or if other threats are also of concern. This might not be possible to know We do have at least some publicly available information on bycatch in the reports referred to in the RFT which might provide an indication or at least a red flag that more work such as a risk assessment for those most highly bycaught species is required. We would also like to receive advise on the key gaps in knowledge to enable a comprehensive risk assessment. We would then look to submit the cetacean review to the WCPFC to provide some impetus for the Commission to ask SPC for a full risk assessment. At the moment the level of knowledge is very low and unless we provide some information on the potential risks to cetacean populations, we are unlikely to be able to progress with improving the conservation management for cetaceans.