

ANSWERS TO CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS

File: AP_4/12/19/1
RFT: 2021/055
Date: 21 July 2021
To: Interested suppliers
Contact: Maraea S. Pogi maraeap@sprep.org
Subject: Request for tenders: **Development of Guidance Note for Coastal Engineering Good Practice in Impact Assessment as Addendum to 2016 Strengthening Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines for Pacific Island Countries and Territories**

Question 1:

Can an indicative ceiling budget limit be offered for this consultancy to help me provide granular details on my points below?

Response:

Unfortunately the budget limit cannot be revealed

Question 2:

- i) The guidance note is requested to contain “**proper**” guidelines for mitigating impacts from land reclamation, coastal engineering and dredging to port operations with clear examples to illustrate the required process in determining environmental monitoring and mitigation plans”. Can you better define “proper”?
- ii) How much (for example) engineering detail is needed to be offered in these guidelines to mitigate against different climate scenarios that PICs are facing?
- iii) Also, do the “clear examples” all need to come from PICs or can then be offered from other SIDS around the world?

Response:

- i) Please replace the word “proper” with “relevant” – the guidance note must provide relevant and achievable impact mitigation for Pacific Island countries, an understanding of the geology, biophysical, climatic, political and technical capacities of the islands is needed to produce suitable guidance advice.
- ii) We are looking for both minimum and good practice examples of mitigation measures, highlighting which “standards*” are better for various scenarios (noting there are no standards in the region, global standards can be cited). In many cases in the region ecosystem based adaptation or soft engineering options may be warranted as the best choice therefore Engineering specifications are not required. However relevant global standards can be referred to for hard engineering, in which case references are to be



provided along with the context of those standards. While reference to global standards is welcome the key outcome for this guidance note is not a set of standard but rather a set of prompts for regulators that they have checked the design and mitigation measures have made due consideration of the environmental and social aspects unique to the project.

- iii) Case studies from the Region are viewed favourably for providing context; however as there are few examples of good global practice in the Pacific Islands it is expected regional case studies will be used to set the scene of project types then with examples of similar projects with good practice examples from other regions to provide a clear example of how a project could have been done – taking into account that climatic and local environmental and technical capabilities will differ. Therefore some examples of bespoke methods achievable by local contractors are also requested for atoll and volcanic islands as a minimum.

Question 3:

Task 5 of the ToR requests the need to “*Facilitate a peer review process to seek feedback from experts and practitioners including input from relevant government officials and stakeholders on drafting the guidance note*”. Can this be interpreted as being a series of emails to gather feedback and comment, or are you expecting the consultant to arrange a workshop event (as this would demand more man days to arrange etc and hence increase costs).

Response:

Yes all work is to be conducted via virtual conference calls and or email; please refer to the RFT no travel is expected or required for this work due to the travel bans for Pacific Island countries. SPREP will arrange any virtual workshops for seeking feedback and inputs on drafts from selected country representatives.

Question 4:

Is the tender open to organisations/teams, or only to individual consultants?

Response:

The tender is open to all bidders, teams or individuals will be assessed on their qualifications and merit of their bid.

Question 5:

Task 2: The recommended studies will vary with the type of coastal engineering projects being considered and the specific environmental settings. Should we plan to specifically address the project types listed in the TOR (seawalls and sand mining, coral harvesting and maintenance dredging to full ecosystem-based adaptation projects and port developments), or will we need to be more expansive and consider a wider range of coastal engineering works? For example within the coastal protection sector alone we could also look at groynes, detached breakwaters, berm-top barriers, sand re-distribution, reclamation, artificial reefs etc....).

If we are considering others across the full spectrum of coastal/port engineering works, this becomes quite open-ended. Or do you envisage a level of prescriptiveness that is higher-level and addresses broader project categories only?

Response:

Since this is a guidance note and not an enforceable standard SPREP is seeking higher-level guidance that addresses broader project categories rather than prescriptive set of standards for limited set of project types. Ie SPREP are looking for a guidance note for projects ranging from Deepwater Port developments to beach sandmining etc. Unlike the PRIF guidelines which focused on the engineering requirements of a set of coastal engineering project types to address coastal erosion and protection the SPREP guidance note is intended to provide a set of prompts for regulators that they have checked the design and mitigation measures of the EIA and suitability of the EMMP for coastal engineering projects. The SPREP guidance note is to assist regulators and project developers in identifying the types of risks and impacts associated with coastal projects and appropriate studies to inform the level of those risks and impacts and appropriate mitigation. This will include providing examples of the types of studies to include information on such as social assessments, hydrodynamic studies, modelling and habitat mapping etc. to inform decision makers and cautions on not considering cumulative impacts of adhoc engineering interventions. The guidance note must also include clear instruction on how to design an environmental monitoring and management plan for a coastal engineering project, hopefully in a checklist template style.

Question 6:

Task 3: How many case studies? One case study from each of the main types of coastal engineering project categories (say Engineered Coastal Protection Structure, Port Development, Ecosystem-Based Coastal Management)? Or perhaps a case study from each of a few different environmental settings (Industrial/urban area with already-reduced ecosystem value, sheltered natural mangrove coastline, pristine fringing coral reef/lagoon coastline?). Or perhaps many case studies for different project types in different environmental settings?

Response:

Case studies from the Region are viewed favourably for providing context; however as there are few examples of good global practice in the Pacific islands it is expected regional case studies will be used to set the scene of project types then with examples of similar projects with good practice examples from other regions to provide a clear example of how a project could have been done – taking into account that climatic and local environmental and technical capabilities will differ. Therefore some examples of bespoke methods achievable by local contractors are also requested for atoll and volcanic islands as a minimum. Experience from other guidelines in the region show that the Pacific region practitioners engage better when the information is presented in context. Feedback most often calling for more case studies to assist in helping them understand lessons learnt and risks etc. Preferably the consultant can provide as many case studies as project types and environmental settings they intend to cover in the guidance note, which SPREP can then determine the appropriateness for inclusion in the guidance.