

ANSWERS TO CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS

File: CONV 1/3/1
RFT: 2021/037
Date: 28 May 2021
To: Interested suppliers
Contact: Maraea S. Pogi maraeap@sprep.org
Subject: Request for tenders: **Review of the Noumea Convention**

Question 1:

Can you please advise a "ball-park" figure for the total budget available for this review?

Response:

Approximately USD 25,000.

Question 2:

Can the previous review of the Convention be made available and, if so, can a weblink be provided?

Response:

https://www.sprep.org/sites/default/files/29-SPREP-Meeting/Noumea%20Convention/WP%207.2_Att.1%20-%20Noumea%20and%20Waigani%20Report%20-%20DRAFT%20190718.pdf

https://www.sprep.org/sites/default/files/29-SPREP-Meeting/Noumea%20Convention/WP%207.2_Att.2%20-%20Waigani%20and%20Noumea%20Convention%20Survey.pdf

https://www.sprep.org/sites/default/files/29-SPREP-Meeting/Noumea%20Convention/WP%207.2_Att.3%20Achievements%20180713.pdf

https://www.sprep.org/sites/default/files/29-SPREP-Meeting/Noumea%20Convention/WP%207.2_Att.4%20-%20Publications%20under%20Noumea%20Convention.pdf

Question 3:

Why did COP 15 Parties request that the review be undertaken again?

Response:

Please find below the relevant parts of the COP 15 Report.

AGENDA ITEM 7.2: Review of the Noumea Convention

24. An outcome of the review to evaluate how the Noumea Convention is being implemented at all levels; determine whether the objectives of the Convention are being met by the actions of the Parties; and the effectiveness of the Secretariat was undertaken in conjunction with a review of implementation of the Convention to Ban the Importation into Forum Island Countries of Hazardous and Radioactive Wastes and to Control the Transboundary Movement and the Management of Hazardous Wastes within the South Pacific Region (Waigani Convention) was presented to the Meeting.

25. France and United States agreed with some recommendations of the review.

26. Australia noted the report contained recommendations which may have legal policy and financial implications and would need to consult with stakeholders across government before agreeing to these.

27. France noted it was open to the constructive ideas of strengthening engagement contribution, seeking external funding through concrete examples to mobilise interest, appointment of a project head in charge of reporting, and creating an award for best contribution. France expressed its support to the stability of the financial contributions and its concern regarding the cost of rotating conferences. France recalled that the implementation of the additional protocols to the Convention require a specific expertise.

28. Australia, supported by New Zealand, further noted the need for stronger engagement with Parties through surveys or inter-sessional discussions to provide feedback and ensure strong contribution and input from Parties to the review.

29. New Zealand noted reservations stating further consultations on the recommendations will be needed nationally.

30. United States welcomed the review report and endorsed recommendations 2,3,4,5,6,7,8, eleven, thirteen, fourteen but not 9 and 10 noting the limited financial resources for the Noumea Convention, preferring to maintain the Conferences of the Parties around the biennial SPREP Meetings.

The Meeting:

- 1. Noted the report including recommendations, attached as Annex I; and*
- 2. Requested the Secretariat to consult with Parties*