

ANSWERS TO CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS

File: AP 5/4/5
Date: 08 July 2019
To: Interested suppliers
Contact: Maraea S. Pogi (maraeap@sprep.org)
Subject: Request for tenders: **Marine Assessment, Coral Restoration and Monitoring in Tokelau and Kiribati**

Q1. Possible (anticipated) maximum budget allowed

Response: We are open to all offers and all bids will be assessed based on best value for money, taking into account all considerations. We wish to elicit budgets from bidders and allow each bidder to propose their estimated cost they deem necessary. We want to encourage bids to be thorough and bidders to design the best possible work package for the in-country recipients whether bidders feel the work requires USD 50,000, 75,000, 100,000, or some other number.

Q2. the time scale required, in order to plan the outputs and budget the time needed.

Response: The successful applicant will need to provide the services described in 2.2 and 2.3 of the TOR by 15 May 2020.

Q3. I also have a concern that Kiribati may be too far gone to do as much coral work as you may hope to do- the Gilbert chain has been under condition two bleaching for 30 out of the past 60 months, and there does not yet seem to have been any sort of post bleaching reef assessment or recovery assessment. Due to post bleaching predation of surviving corals, I wonder if there will be enough corals left to do a restoration project?

Response: This project aims to try, nonetheless.

Q4. Are you able to advise the total budget for each project?

Response: See Response to Q1.

Q5. Involvement of national government agencies and local communities is essential - are the costs of their involvement to be covered by the consultancy and thus costed in the tender - or will they provide their inputs and involvement as in-kind support?

Response: The successful bidder should not be required to directly pay national government agencies and local communities for their time. The bidder should, however, include all other costs associated with collaboration, capacity building, and technology/knowledge transfer with these groups (e.g., sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.5 of the TOR).

Q6. What other levels of in-kind support might be provided by national government and local communities? e.g.

- work boats,
- dive tanks and air fills,
- access to coastal land / lagoon area for establishing mangrove, seagrass and coral nurseries,
- accommodation and ground transport for expert team,
- etc
- or should all of these be costed in the Tender?

Response: These costs should be included in the tender. For recent, previous work in Kiribati, a boat was hired locally in Nanikai via the Ministry of Fisheries for approximately 170 AUD per day, including local boatman, not including fuel.

Q7. To allow development of a phased work-plan, working back from the required end dates in the ToE, are you able to advise the latest start date for each project (given the necessary tender assessment and contract award timelines from Tender closing)?

Response: Given the deadline for completion noted in response to Q2, start date should be as soon as possible.

Q8. Given that the coral restoration project includes Nanikai village at Tarawa (the same site as the separate Mangrove and Seagrass Tender), to achieve synergies, implementation efficiencies and cost savings, could that be carved off the Tokelau coral project and added to the Kiribati mangrove/ seagrass project - as an "alternative" tender?

Response: In order for us to evaluate like-kind tenders, we need to stick to the RFT terms as described.

Q9. If no scuba diving, then the assumption is that all surveys/restoration/monitoring activities will be no deeper than about 10m (surveys and monitoring) and 5m (for restoration/farming/replanting).

Response: We are open to all approaches, including skin diving only and mixing skin and scuba diving.

Q10. If there can be scuba diving, then the preferred approach would be a mix of scuba/skin diving that allows both deeper and more detailed survey access and works on sites with both shallow and deep components to mitigate against possible (likely) bleaching and swells/storms.

I ask because scuba diving obviously takes more planning (and cost), especially in some outer island locations in Tokelau. I am however, very familiar with South Tarawa – and have done diving assessments on the ocean side in several locations (Bikenibeu, Bairiki, and Betio).

Response: See response to Q9.

Q11. If you do want scuba diving in one or all locations, any guidance you can offer with respect to project partners with available tanks/compressor in both Tokelau and Tarawa would be appreciated. I can of course ship in such gear in, but that would be an unnecessary cost to include in the financial proposal if it was otherwise locally available.

Response: We have contacts in both countries, and contact information will be provided to the successful applicant. At this time, we cannot confirm the availability of tanks or compressors.

Q12. Are there any preferred restoration/farming/replanting methods by SPREP or the communities/partners involved?

I ask because I have experience in a wide variety of fragmentation and relocation methods: Biorock, in situ wet cement slabs, cyanoacrylate on live rock and cement cookies on mesh/later epoxied on substrate, elevated tables/rebar structures, epoxy with drilled holes in the substrate, lift bags and large colonies/table corals with large bases intact moved into new holes, stabilization of smaller whole colonies, in situ vs. land-based preparation, etc.

Response: We are open to all approaches.

Q13. I am aware of advancements in identifying some coral species (and symbionts) for both bleaching and acidification. However, practical applications have largely only been applied for bleaching. To what extent are you expecting that coral typologies – either OA resilient or bleaching resistant/resilient or both, and are locally and readily available for transplant – are to be used? *Pocillopora damicornis* (preliminarily OA resilient) and *Porites cylindrica* and *Porites rus* (largely bleaching resistant during the 2014-2017 Pacific-wide bleaching event) are certainly candidates (among a few others), but would not reflect the habitat and diversity characteristics of a ‘restored’ site. Or are you open to a wide variety of transplant types, with the underlying assumption that diversity raises overall resilience even though bleaching risk going forward remains high? I ask because this would obviously factor into the work plan in terms of the time it takes to locate the right transplants.

Response: We are open to all approaches, and this includes targeting OA and/or temperature resilient species where appropriate.

Q14. Is there any measure of the size of the areas that are expected to receive transplanted fragments? Something like x sq m of substrate with a coral cover of y% in each site? Without a measure, I will only be able to estimate the number of weeks of work at each site.

Response: The area to be restored at each site is flexible and should be based on the marine assessment described in section 2.2.1 of the TOR.

Q15. I have a team of a few individuals that I can work into my proposal, and fly in from the region and elsewhere. However, for capacity development/continuity reasons I'd prefer to use local project partners to the extent they are available. I have done this on projects in the past. Is there any guidance as to personnel that are willing and available? Of course they would need to be worked into the cost, and I would need to be in touch with them if any contacts can be provided.

Response: We have local contacts in both countries, and contact information will be provided to the successful applicant.

Q16. If you don't have answers to all the above, might I suggest that applicants be encouraged to submit a financial proposal/lump sum for work phases over a suggested timeline (with flexible time at the end of each field visit), and then just add a cost per day if the scope becomes such that more work is needed?

Response: In order for us to evaluate like-kind tenders, we need to stick to the RFT terms as described.

Q17. Why is this an ocean acidification focus, rather than bleaching resistance focus, as the former is less of a threat than the later, at least in the coming two decades.

Why downplay global warming, when, in Kiribati, it bleached for 30 of the past 60 months. Corals must first survive this horrific first hurdle- bleaching, after they do that, only then they will they have hope of surviving the second hurdle- acidification.

Response: We certainly do not downplay global warming, and ocean warming indeed poses a dire threat to coral reef ecosystems. It's not evident, however, that OA is less of a threat than warming, when research shows that coral reefs will transition to net dissolving by 2050 due to OA, and some reefs are already experiencing net sediment dissolution¹. OA is a stress multiplier for coral reef ecosystems, and this project, while focused on addressing OA, aims to enhance the overall resilience of coral reef ecosystems for the benefit of the communities that depend on them.

Q18. What materials are available like 12mm rebar, 3.5mm prewelded mesh (with 15 x 15cm holes) and electricity cable like 6-8mm² single core or 12mm² dual core armoured cable

Response: We have contacts in both countries, and contact information will be provided to the successful applicant. At this time, we cannot confirm the availability of specific materials.

Q19. Are there boats available for deploying larger objects like mooring blocks?

Response: See response to Q6

¹ Eyre, Bradley D., et al. "Coral reefs will transition to net dissolving before end of century." *Science* 359.6378 (2018): 908-911.

Q20. How about access to Dive facilities? Weights? Compressors? Tanks?

Response: See response to Q11

Q21. Any recommendation regarding accommodation? How many people can be hosted?

Response: We have contacts in both countries, and contact information will be provided to the successful applicant. At this time, we cannot confirm specific accommodation details.

Q22. Are we working together with local NGOs that give man/woman power?

Response: See response to Q5

Q23. How many people can we train and will be available for long term monitoring and maintenance? Are they experienced already or should we start with the basics?

Response: Number of people available to train and specific level of readiness for each site will need to be determined by the successful applicant.

Q24. How suitable is it for strict vegetarians?

Response: We cannot confirm the suitability for vegetarians, however these atolls are remote locations.

Q25. What would be the port of call if we send material ahead in a container f.e.?

Response: Tokelau shipments usually go through Apia, Samoa. Kiribati can receive shipments directly. All logistics will need to be confirmed by the successful bidder.

Q26. How big are you expecting the nurseries to be? 1000 fragments? 25000 fragments?

Response: See response to Q14

Q27. Do you know the energy requirements (MWatts) for the 4 locations?

Response: We cannot predict the energy requirements required by each bidder's proposal.

Q28. Is this part of an existing project already?

Response: Yes, the PPOA project is described in the TOR 1.1 and 1.2.

Q29. would you be able to tell us why the site (Nanikai Village) was selected?

Response: Sites were selected in consultation with community members and governments.

Q30. Is there are chance for extension of project timeline? To find the best methods for planting we would need to set up a mangrove nursery as well as direct planting and the nursery alone takes 4-5 months to set up before transplanting can even take place.

Response: While TOR 2.4 states that "The successful applicant will need to provide the services described in 2.2 and 2.3 by 15 May 2020," it is expected that operations set up by this work will sustainably continue beyond that date. For the example of mangrove restoration, the nursery and all systems for making transplants at the appropriate time should be in place by project deadline, however, it is understood that transplanting may occur after that deadline.

Q31. Is there any funding for Reconnaissance?

Response: Such costs should be included in the bid.

Q32. One final question – what is USP’s role as a collaborator in this project?

Response: USP was represented at the inception meeting in Apia, and therefore had a voice in some of the initial discussions that resulted in selection of the three pilot sites.