



Section 4 Appendix A

CALLDOWN CONTRACT

| Framework Agreement with: | Pegasys International Ltd |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| | |

Framework Agreement for: IMDP

Framework Agreement Purchase Order Number: 8373

Call-down Contract For: DEFRA ODA 30x30 Global Facility Evidence & Scoping

Contract Purchase Order Number: ecm_65173

I refer to the following:

- 1. The above mentioned Framework Agreement dated **May 2019**;
- 2. Your proposal of **8**th **June 2022**

and I confirm that the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) requires you to provide the Services (Annex A), under the Terms and Conditions of the Framework Agreement which shall apply to this Call-down Contract as if expressly incorporated herein.

1. Commencement and Duration of the Services

- 1.1 The Supplier shall start the Services no later than **11th July 2022** ("the Start Date") and the Services shall be completed by **14th November 2022** ("the End Date") unless the Call-down Contract is terminated earlier in accordance with the Terms and Conditions of the Framework Agreement.
- 1.2 DEFRA may extend the Contract for a period of up to 3 months' by giving not less than 1 months' notice in writing to the Supplier prior to the End Date. The terms and conditions of the Contract shall apply throughout any such extended period.

2. Recipient

2.1 FCDO requires the Supplier to provide the Services to the **Department for Environment, Food** and Rural Affairs ("the Recipient").

3. Financial Limit

- 3.1 Payments under this Call-down Contract shall not, exceed £289,880.00 ("the Financial Limit") and is exclusive of any government tax, if applicable as detailed in Annex B.
- 4. Officials

DEFRA





4.1 The Contract Officer is:

Horizon House, Deanery Road, Bristol, BS1 5TL

4.2 The Project Officer is:

Horizon House, Deanery Road, Bristol, BS1 5TL

Supplier

- 4.3 The Contract Officer is:
- 4.4 The Project Officer is:

5. Key Personnel

5.1 The following of the Supplier's Personnel cannot be substituted by the Supplier without DEFRA's prior written consent:



6. Reports

6.1 The Supplier shall submit project reports in accordance with the Terms of Reference/Scope of Work at Annex A.

7. Duty of Care

- 7.1 All Supplier Personnel (as defined in Section 2 of the Agreement) engaged under this Calldown Contract will come under the duty of care of the Supplier:
 - I. The Supplier will be responsible for all security arrangements and Her Majesty's Government accepts no responsibility for the health, safety and security of individuals or property whilst travelling.
 - I.1. All Supplier staff with access to DEFRA group sites and assets must be subject to Baseline Personnel Security Standard (BPSS). Any additional clearance is to be determined on a case by case basis by the Recipient in line with the requirements of the contract.
 - II. The Supplier will be responsible for taking out insurance in respect of death or personal injury, damage to or loss of property, and will indemnify and keep indemnified DEFRA in respect of:
 - II.1. Any loss, damage or claim, howsoever arising out of, or relating to negligence by the Supplier, the Supplier's Personnel, or by any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier, in connection with the performance of the Call-down Contract;





- II.2. Any claim, howsoever arising, by the Supplier's Personnel or any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier, in connection with their performance under this Call-down Contract.
- III. The Supplier will ensure that such insurance arrangements as are made in respect of the Supplier's Personnel, or any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier are reasonable and prudent in all circumstances, including in respect of death, injury or disablement, and emergency medical expenses.
- IV. The costs of any insurance specifically taken out by the Supplier to support the performance of this Call-down Contract in relation to Duty of Care may be included as part of the management costs of the project, and must be separately identified in all financial reporting relating to the project.
- V. Where DEFRA is providing any specific security arrangements for Suppliers in relation to the Call-down Contract, these will be detailed in the Terms of Reference.
 - V.1. For the avoidance of doubt, if other policies of the Recipient are referenced in the Conditions and Annexes, those policies will also apply to the Contract on the basis described therein.
 - V.2. The Recipient may require the Supplier to ensure that any person employed in the delivery of the Deliverables has undertaken a Disclosure and Barring Service check. The Supplier shall ensure that no person who discloses that they have a conviction that is relevant to the nature of the Contract, relevant to the work of the Recipient, or is of a type otherwise advised by the Recipient (each such conviction a "Relevant Conviction"), or is found by the Supplier to have a Relevant Conviction (whether as a result of a police check, a Disclosure and Barring Service check or otherwise) is employed or engaged in the provision of any part of the Deliverables.

8. Limitation of Liability

8.1 The Supplier's limit of liability shall be as provided for in Clause 35.2 of Section 2 (Standard Terms and Conditions).

9. Monitoring of Call-down Contract Performance

9.1 The Supplier shall comply with the performance monitoring conditions set out in Annex A.

10. Commercial Caveats

- 10.1 The following commercial caveats shall apply:
 - Fees will only be paid for productive days or whilst travelling at DEFRA's request.
 - DEFRA will not pay for a day of rest following travel, either Overseas or in the UK.
 - DEFRA will only pay for security services which have been mutually agreed in advance and at cost.
 - DEFRA will not reimburse costs for normal tools of the trade (e.g. portable personal computers).





- Rented accommodation should be used whenever possible and in particular for Long Term visits.
- Hotel accommodation should be compliant with the expenses policy and justified on the basis of Value for Money, with costs kept to a minimum.
- Receipts must be retained for all expenses.
- As detailed elsewhere in the tender documents, DEFRA will only pay for expenses e.g. travel, subsistence and accommodation at actual cost within the pre-agreed policy.

11. Call-down Contract Signature

- 11.1 Execution of the Call-down Contract is carried out in accordance with EU Directive 99/93 (Community framework for electronic signatures) and the Electronic Communications Act 2000. The Contract is formed on the date on which both Parties communicate acceptance of its terms on the Recipient's electronic contract management system ("Bravo").
- 11.2 If the original Form of Call-down Contract is not returned to the Contract Officer (as identified at clause 4 above) duly completed, signed and dated on behalf of the Supplier via Bravo within 15 working days of the date of issue by DEFRA, DEFRA will be entitled, at its sole discretion, to declare this Call-down Contract void.





Annex A – Terms of Reference

Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs

Terms of reference

Evidence review and scoping work to support area-based conservation and the 30by30 target in ODA-eligible countries

| | gn, Commonwealth velopment Office | UKaid from the British people |
|--------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 1. Int | ^F Contents roduction | 4 |
| | ckground | |
| | • | 4 |
| 3. Ob | jectives | |
| | | 5 4. Scope |
| of wo | rk | 7 |
| 4.1. progran | Workstream 1: Evidence Review and Theory of Change to nme and policy development on 30by30 | - |
| 4.1. | 1. The Evidence Review | 7 |
| 4.1.2 | 2. A high-level Theory of Change | 9 |
| 4.2. priorities | Workstream 2: Which countries should HMG support ar s in these geographies to deliver 30by30? | |
| 4.2. | 1. Country prioritization to develop long-list | 9 |
| | 2. High-level country assessments of needs, priorities and op | |
| | Workstream 3: How can HMG best support high-ambition co als on 30by30? | |
| 4.3. | 1. Assessment of different funding facility models | 12 |
| 4.3.2 | 2. Interventions appraisal | 13 |
| 4.3.3 | 3. Country case studies | 13 |
| 4.4. | Outputs, Key Deliverables and Indicative Timetable | 15 |
| 4.5. | Recipient | 18 |
| 4.6. | Budget for the Services | 18 |
| 4.7. | Official Development Assistance | 18 |
| 4.8. | Authority Co-ordination | 18 |
| 4.9. | Capability | 18 |
| 4.10. | Methodology and approach | 20 |
| 4.11. 4.12. | Phases and activities Delivery Chain Mapping | |
| 4.13. | Reporting and review | 24 |
| 4.13 | .1. Update and report requirements | 24 |
| | | September 2020 |

| | n, Commonwealth elopment Office | UKaid from the British people |
|------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| 4.13.2 | 2. Review of reports by the Authority | 25 |
| 4.14. (| Government ReportingError! Bookmar | k not defined. |
| 4.15. | Conflict of Interest | 25 |
| 5. Legal & | Regulatory Compliance | |
| 5.1. | Safeguard Considerations | 26 |
| 5.2. | Disability Considerations | 26 |
| 5.3. | Prevention of Fraud and Bribery | |
| 5.4. | UK Aid Branding | 26 |
| 5.5. | Transparency | 27 |
| 5.6. I | Duty of Care | 27 |
| Annex A: | Additional indicative questions for Workstream 1 | 29 |
| Annex B: | Additional indicative questions for Output 4 | 32 |
| Annex C: studies (O | Additional considerations and indicative questions four to utput 5) | • |



1. Introduction

The Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs (the Authority) is the UK government department responsible for safeguarding our natural environment, supporting our world-leading food and farming industry, and sustaining a thriving rural economy. The Authority also helps to deliver the government's international poverty reduction and sustainable development priorities through its international programming. The Authority's broad remit means it plays a major role in people's dayto-day life, from the food we eat, and the air we breathe, to the water we drink.

30by30 is essentially a call to action to protect the world's vital ecosystems and bend the curve on biodiversity loss by protecting or conserving at least 30% of global land and at least 30% of global ocean by 2030. The 30by30 target is one of the proposed targets for the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) currently being negotiated by the parties to the CBD.

The Authority is seeking a supplier (the Supplier) to carry out an evidence review and programme design and scoping study. The combined products will inform and support Defra's Business Case to develop 30by30 Official Development Assistance (ODA) programming, as well as developing policy positions, and will be completed by early autumn 2022.

2. Background

The Authority has three overarching international objectives centred on:

- **Global environment**: Our strained relationship with nature affects the climate, global health, the economy and national resilience. This objective focuses on halting biodiversity loss, scaling up the use of nature-based solutions, protecting and enhancing ocean health and resilience, conserving endangered species, and sustainable land-use and wider resource use.
- **Global trade**: Increasing secure, high-quality trade will be fundamental to supporting our stakeholders and UK consumers, projecting the UK's global reputation for excellence, and safeguarding our national interest.
- **Global health**: Improving human, animal and environmental health, based on a One Health approach, will be essential if the UK is to reduce the public health and economic impact of future disease emergence at home and abroad.

International Climate Finance (ICF) is a UK government commitment to spend £11.6bn between 2021-2026 to support developing countries to respond to the challenges of climate change. Of this spend, £3bn is committed to support the role of nature and nature-based solutions in tackling climate change. Defra's role in delivering the ICF enables the UK to meet its international commitments to support developing countries to protect and reverse biodiversity loss; promote sustainable livelihoods through improved land use and low carbon agriculture; and contribute to global food security and resilience to climate change.

Area-based conservation measures such as protected areas (PAs), private reserves, Indigenous Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs) and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) are important tools for conserving biodiversity and maintaining ecosystem services. These areas contribute directly or indirectly to local economies, livelihoods and meeting local peoples' basic needs,



as well as providing a variety of nature-based solutions (NbS), including climate mitigation and adaptation, and increasing climate resilience.

There has been good progress in expanding the area of terrestrial protected and conserved areas globally, with 17% of global land area formally recognized as protected or conserved, thereby meeting the CBD's Aichi Target 11 for the period 2010-2020.¹ However, according to recent assessments, the quality of many of these areas and their contribution to global biodiversity goals is falling short (for example, due to weaknesses in design and management, gaps in ecological representation and a range of threats from illegal activities to climate change).² There is urgent need to both expand the existing network of protected and conserved areas and strengthen its effectiveness if we are to bend the curve on biodiversity loss and ecosystem degradation. This may require implementation of the full suite of potential approaches to area-based conservation including ICCAs and OECMs. However, the potential scope and contribution of these types of mechanisms to biodiversity, climate and economic development outcomes needs to be better understood. For instance, OECMs are a relatively new concept and include diverse types of areas under different types of ownership, governance and use.

3. Objectives

The Authority is seeking a supplier to carry out an evidence review (Workstream 1) and programme design and scoping study (Workstream 2 and 3). Our initial assumption for the structure of this programme, which we would like the Supplier to test and inform, is a demand-led competitive facility. Workstreams will inform and support Defra's Business Case to develop a new ICF-funded programme to support achievement of the 30by30 target, as well as the development of policy and programming. The work will be completed by early autumn 2022 (with earlier intermediate milestones).

Workstream 1: Evidence Review and Theory of Change to guide HMG programme and policy development on 30by30

Through the evidence review, the Authority seeks to understand what has and has not worked in terrestrial area-based conservation, and the challenges and opportunities presented by different approaches to area-based conservation, including statedesignated and managed PAs, ICCAs, private reserves and OECMs. Relevant regional and national differences should be noted. For example, concerns have been raised that that the push to deliver 30by30 could adversely affect IPLCs' rights and claims in certain regions and countries over their customary resources, lands and territories, which are known to hold significant areas of intact ecosystems and biodiversity, while in others 30by30 is seen by IPLCs as a potential means of securing land and resource tenure.

The evidence review will consider lessons learnt from past and ongoing relevant initiatives supporting area-based conservation; map relevant donor funded and other programmes and provide a high-level theory of change to guide business case development. The review should summarise the evidence on

¹ https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/press-release/world-met-target-protected-areacoverageland-quality-must-improve

² https://livereport.protectedplanet.net/



the impact of area-based measures on conserving biodiversity and ecosystem services, addressing climate change and reducing poverty. It should particularly consider the kinds of trade-offs involved in different types of area-based conservation and the associated costs and benefits, including opportunity costs (e.g. the decision to allocate land towards conservation may mean reduced land availability for food production and increase food insecurity). Such trade-offs typically vary by stakeholder group and context, and the review should assess and compare these accordingly. The review should also identify best practices and critical gaps and limitations in the global protected area system (e.g. in ecological coverage and connectivity, management effectiveness and financing, etc). This should build on and not duplicate existing studies, including work recently carried out for Defra on best practice in delivering the 30by30 target.

Workstreams 2: Which countries should HMG support and what are the priorities in these geographies to deliver 30by30?

Workstream 2 will focus on a shortlist of around 10 countries pre-selected by Defra, including a sub-set of 3-5 priority countries identified for case studies in Workstream 3. It will include validating and/or adapting Defra's proposed 3-5 case study countries based on objective criteria to be agreed with Defra. This will include a high-level analysis of country needs, priorities and opportunities with regards to areabased conservation and delivering the 30by30 ambition.

Workstream 3: How can HMG best support high-ambition countries to meet their goals on 30by30?

Workstream 3 includes three elements: the assessment of different models funding facility models, the interventions appraisal and the country case studies. These will build on the evidence review and theory of change to consider 30by30 programme design options, as well as more involved case studies in a short list of the priority countries. Programme design is considered in two parts: what model of funding facility is to be developed and what interventions in support of area-based conservation are to be financed.

This will directly inform the strategic and appraisal (and other) cases of the Authority's Business Case which require assessment of a long list of options for intervention, and more detailed analysis (including a full cost benefit analysis and Value for Money assessment) on a short list of options for intervention, including expected benefits to biodiversity/ecosystems, climate and people.

This exercise will identify opportunities for and challenges to ODA-eligible countries to deliver 30by30 and how the Authority could support country ambition and implementation through a new ICF programme; it will identify those countries and areas most in need of support and best placed to take advantage of it; types of interventions needed, potential co-funders and levels of potential demand and pipeline readiness.

4. Scope of work

Please also see Annexes A–C which include more detailed indicative questions the Authority considers relevant to Workstreams 1-3 respectively and which we anticipate will be answered during this work. We do not consider these to be exhaustive and welcome proposals for further questions and/or changes. Discussion during inception will be important to agree question prioritization and any additions or other changes.

4.1. Workstream 1: Evidence Review and Theory of Change to guide HMG's



programme and policy development on 30by30

The Authority seeks to understand how to increase the effectiveness and long-term viability of protected and conserved areas in the context of climate change and other drivers of land use change, as well as the potential of ICCAs and OECMs to contribute to global goals on biodiversity, climate and sustainable development.

The evidence review will both inform HMG international terrestrial 30by30 policy and support the strategic case of a planned business case for new programming on the terrestrial 30by30 ambition. It will cover existing published and other literature and, in the first instance, would not include any new data collection or modelling. However, the option to upscale is reserved if the need for this is identified and we expect that the Supplier will have or could secure the necessary skills and experience to do this. Some external stakeholder engagement with relevant organizations may be needed to verify information and fill data gaps. The proposed methodology will be discussed and agreed with Defra.

4.1.1. The Evidence Review

a. <u>A comprehensive review of the current network of global protected and conserved</u> <u>areas and analysis of the evidence on the effectiveness of different approaches to terrestrial</u> <u>area-based conservation</u> in terms of achieving biodiversity outcomes and benefits for climate change and poverty reduction. The analysis should include both national and major donorsupported initiatives supporting area-based conservation and consider:

• What have (and have not) been successful conservation measures in different countries and circumstances and why? What are the criteria for success; what does success look like? Are successful measures transferable or limited to specific local circumstances in a particular country? What measures have been used to assess biodiversity, climate change and poverty reduction outcomes?

• What types of trade-offs have been identified? For example, there can be trade-offs between the delivery of provisioning services (timber) and regulating services (hydrological regulation and carbon storage). Or tradeoffs of distributional impacts where some groups (eg natural resource dependent local communities) face high opportunity costs of protected areas, but benefit little from the (global) benefits (carbon and biodiversity). Are there gender-based differences?

• Which aspects of the enabling environment contribute to the effectiveness of areabased conservation (e.g. integrated land use planning, good governance, local community engagement, etc).

• What and where are the major gaps and weaknesses in area-based conservation with respect to biodiversity outcomes (i.e. in terms of adequate and effective coverage of unique habitats and species and ecological integrity and function) and what are the reasons for these gaps and weaknesses?

b. <u>A summary of the evidence base for the 30by30 target</u> and wider contextual considerations in relation to the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF). Are there instances in which the 30by30 target could conflict or be synergistic with any of the other post-2020 targets or climate and development objectives?





C. Given the findings from (a) and (b) above, what types of interventions are needed to advance effective, equitable and area-based conservation as a mechanism for addressing the global challenges of climate change, biodiversity loss and poverty reduction? How can more systemic, transformative change be catalysed to maximise multiple benefits and impact?

d. <u>A broad classification of the different area-based conservation approaches and types</u> <u>of interventions</u> in support of biodiversity, climate and poverty reduction outcomes, highlighting the most successful and promising approaches and interventions together with brief contextual information. This will provide a structure for the interventions appraisal in Workstream 3.

4.1.2. A high-level Theory of Change

Based on the evidence review, **develop an overarching theory of change to deliver 30by30**, i.e. to reduce biodiversity loss and deliver climate and poverty reduction benefits through area-based conservation measures. This will include clearly identifying the problem to be addressed, pathways for intervention, key assumptions, risks and weaknesses and gaps in the evidence base.

Products arising from Workstream 1 will include a report of the Evidence Review including Annexes, the details of which will be agreed with the Authority at Inception and a high-level Theory of Change. These products will feed into the delivery of Workstreams 2 and 3.

4.2. Workstream 2: Which countries should HMG support and what are the priorities in these geographies to deliver 30by30?

Defra is currently carrying out an internal country prioritisation exercise. The Supplier should focus on a shortlist of around 10 countries pre-selected by Defra, and validate and/or adapt the proposed subset of 3-5 priority countries identified for case studies in Workstream 3. To support the selection of the case study countries in our business case, the Supplier will undertake high-level analysis of their needs, priorities and opportunities with regards to area-based conservation and delivering the 30by30 ambition. Defra is initially focusing on sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and the IndoPacific region.

4.2.1. Country prioritization

The criteria used by the Supplier to develop their methodology to validate and refine our selection of countries should include the following. The criteria below are not exhaustive and additional criteria and/or changes may be proposed by the Supplier for consideration by the Authority.

a. HMG priorities on biodiversity, climate and poverty reduction, including

Defra and Foreign and Commonwealth Development Office (FCDO) geographic priorities. This should take into account the recent Integrated Review³ and other relevant reviews including the ICAI Review³.

³ International climate finance: UK aid for halting deforestation and preventing irreversible biodiversity loss





b. Countries with high ambition for terrestrial 30by30 (e.g. Leaders' Pledge for Nature signatories, members of the High Ambition Coalition (HAC), support for GBF Target 3 or other statement in support).

c. Countries who are implementing / planning to implement an integrated approach to 30by30 as part of their area-based conservation efforts that may also be linked to their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs).

d. Countries supportive of IPLC and local people's rights over their land, territories and resources and of Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC).

e. Global biodiversity priorities: countries with globally important biodiversity at risk, including a clear articulation of the criteria used to define 'global importance' and the rationale for using these (e.g. Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA), habitat, faunal and functional intactness, relative threat level, critical gaps in effective protection and/or management of priority biodiversity areas, etc)

f. Global climate priorities, countries with ecosystems of high importance for global or regional climate mitigation, adaptation and regulation.

g. Potential for generating large-scale poverty reduction and increased resilience to external shocks through the maintenance and/or restoration of biodiversity and ecosystem services

h. Capacity to implement ambitious 30by30 plans, e.g. local capacity, land tenure arrangements, governance arrangements, etc. This should build on evidence from CBD country capacity assessments (e.g. National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA), the Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA), etc).

i. Presence of complementary/synergistic initiatives (including bilateral, multilateral, philanthropic, private sector and INGOs/NGOs) to build on or collaborate with having similar objectives with regards to halting biodiversity loss, climate change mitigation and poverty reduction through area-based conservation.

j. Presence of duplicative initiatives negating a role for the Authority's support.

To confirm Defra's pre-selection of case study countries (or replacement countries from reserve list if changes are needed), the high-level analysis of these countries should consider the following:

a. The approach being proposed to meet 30by30 and, where applicable, being implemented in these countries.

³

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97 5077/Global_Britain_in_a_Competitive_Age-

_the_Integrated_Review_of_Security__Defence__Development_and_Foreign_Policy.pdf 4.2.2. *High-level country assessments of needs, priorities and opportunities with regards to area-based conservation in the 3-5 case study countries (and relevant reserve list countries).*





b. The kinds of support and types of interventions that countries are looking for to advance on the terrestrial 30by30 target, including potential demand for support from HMG.

C. An independent assessment of country needs and opportunities to meet the 30by30 target and deliver biodiversity and climate outcomes as well as poverty reduction.

d. Identification of potential applicants to a 30by30 demand-led Facility (e.g. national/subnational government and/or other institutions, MDBs, (I)NGOs, CSOs and other local-level community groups, etc)

e. An assessment of the main likely in-country beneficiaries of this support, e.g. rural communities, IPLCs, women, children etc.

f. Feasible quick wins through building on existing HMG initiatives, e.g. jurisdictional Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD+) programmes, the Land Facility, the Biodiverse Landscapes Fund, Darwin Initiative programmes, etc.

g. Mapping of other funding sources for 30by30.

4.3. Workstream 3: How can HMG best support high-ambition countries to meet their goals on 30by30?

There are broadly three sections to Workstream 3, which aim in combination to help answer the above question:

- Assessment of different models of funding facility (design options appraisal)
- Interventions appraisal
- Country case studies

Our initial hypothesis is that there is sufficient demand and appropriate investment opportunities in 30by30 high-ambition countries in HMG priority geographies to justify the development of a demandled competitive facility that would allow countries to put forward their proposals for financing to advance strategic, effective and equitable areabased conservation and deliver against the global 30by30 target. However, the Supplier should test this initial hypothesis and assess a demand-led competitive facility against alternative funding facility models identified in this Workstream, taking into account Defra requirements with regards to the Authority's internal resourcing, strategic priorities and approaches of the philanthropic organizations that have pledged \$5 billion⁴ towards the delivery of 30by30 as well as other major funding mechanisms that support this target.

The proposed delivery approach and interventions should be consistent with the discussions on Longterm Strategic Framework for Capacity Development⁵ and the other means of implementation of the post-2020 GBF which will be agreed at CBD COP15.

⁴ <u>Philanthropies pledge \$5 billion to 'Protecting Our Planet Challenge' | Philanthropy news | PND (philanthropynewsdigest.org)</u>

⁵ Draft Long-Term Strategic Framework for Capacity Development (cbd.int)



We envision that the Supplier will have to work closely with the Steering Committee (see Section 4.8) to understand the key evidence needs for HMG to deliver an effective appraisal case, including with Government Economists.

The Authority envisages the following activities:

4.3.1. Assessment of different funding facility models

a. <u>A comparative analysis of existing funding facilities</u>, including but not limited to, Darwin Initiative, NAMA Facility, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) including its Small Grants Programme administered by United Nations Development Programme), Green Climate Fund (GCF), the Forest Farm Facility, PROGREEN, Forest Governance, Markets and Climate Programme, Partnerships for Forests, the Land Facility, Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund and the Legacy Landscapes Fund. The comparative analysis should consider structure, governance, costs, efficiency and impact (i.e. results) of demand-led and other types of facilities relevant to area-based conservation; based on this analysis the Supplier should provide and justify recommendations of the best models for a new cost-effective funding facility to support delivery of the post-2020 global target for area-based conservation in priority geographies.

b. <u>Assessment of the different models of funding facility identified in (*a*), recommending which is the most appropriate model for Defra's 30by30 Global Facility and why. The Authority would expect to co-create the criteria used to select the appropriate model.</u>

C. <u>A proposal for how the 30by30 Global Facility could operate</u>, including an assessment of different mechanisms of managing the Facility (e.g. by MDB,

CSO, private sector supplier, potential intermediaries) and the implications of

d. <u>Identification of potential public and private co-financiers/funders</u> of an HMG programme to implement 30by30 in ODA eligible countries.

e. <u>A proposal for eligibility criteria for potential applicants to the funding facility</u>. i.e. who could apply for funds through the facility (e.g. NGOs governments, CSOs, IPLCs, etc.)

f. <u>Development of a basic set of principles or operating standards on how the programme</u> will support all legitimate tenure rights and then develop appropriate strategies and procedures to implement this in practice. This should also include red lines for discussions with governments and on what kinds of projects it will and will not fund so this is clear upfront.

4.3.2. Interventions appraisal

a. <u>Identification of options for intervention</u>. The Supplier should use the broad classification grouping of interventions from the Evidence Review (4.1.1 d) and the theory of change developed in Workstream 1 (4.1.2). The Supplier should also be informed by indications of demand and other

using different types of managers for efficiency and inclusivity with respect to potential applicants. This should also include complementary activities such as support to pipeline development or other capacity building / technical assistance activities.



findings identified in Workstream 2 in long-list geographies (4.2.2) as well as by the more detailed country case studies developed for Output 5 (4.3.3). The Supplier should consider what mechanisms and tools are available to assess the costs and benefits of different types of areabased measures, including biodiversity, climate adaptation/mitigation and livelihood outcomes?

b. <u>Appraisal of options for intervention</u>. The full suite of options for intervention presented in a long list and filtered down to a short list using explicit and clearly defined criteria agreed with Defra. The costs and benefits of a small number of short list options should be presented quantitively, focusing on biodiversity, climate and people. The country case studies will be used to develop simple models to estimate costs and benefits.

c. <u>A proposal for monitoring plans for the overall programme and for the facility</u>. This should include what to monitor, when and how and which indicators should be used, including the UK Government's ICF Key Performance Indicators.

4.3.3. Country case studies

More detailed pipeline analysis and country-specific scoping through case studies to inform our appraisal case:

a. Using the country list refined and validated in Workstream 2, carry out three to five case studies⁶ of priority countries/landscapes for analysis of potential pipeline and potential results (geographies to be agreed with the Steering Committee). This activity is to understand the types of projects we can reasonably expect to be put forward for funding, including the types of interventions and activities, the range in funding request size, potential delivery partner(s), investment and implementation readiness, as well as indicative results based on the ICF Key Performance Indicators. The latter would include outcomes and impacts related to the value of ecosystem services conserved, people helped to adapt to climate change, CO₂ emissions avoided, hectares of forests restored or deforestation/forest degradation prevented, etc. The Steering Committee may suggest additional indicators that could be considered to assess indicative results. This information will directly inform our appraisal case.

Case studies will be used to develop simple models to estimate costs and benefits. These will be informed by Outputs 1-3 and emerging findings from Output 4a and will feed into the interventions appraisal (Output 4b) and the appraisal case of the Authority's business case.

⁶ Bidders should assume that there are five case studies for their costing. Please also see instructions to tenderers.





4.4. Outputs, Key Deliverables and Indicative Timetable

Table 1: Workstream outputs, milestones, deliverables and indicative timetable

| Workstream/Output | Key Milestones & Deliverables | Indicative Timetable | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| Inception phase and periodic updates: | | | | | | | |
| 1. Output 1 a. Kick-off meeting and a. As | soon as | | | | | | |
| Inception report detailing the scope, governance contract | summary readout possible after | objectives, | | | | | |
| arrangements, methodology, b. <u>Outline</u> of | inception report signature | | | | | | |
| stakeholder engagement plan, work- b. 1 | week from | | | | | | |
| plans and outputs. contract | | | | | | | |
| c. Inception report, no more signature than | 20 pages, in line with | | | | | | |
| Checkpoints / updates every two the consultancy ^{contract} | approved report outline ^{c. 2 weeks} | from weeks throughout | | | | | |
| carried out via Microsoft Teams. d. <u>Updates</u> | to the ^{Authority signature} and/or | Steering Committee | | | | | |
| d. Updates every | | | | | | | |
| (SC) two weeks | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Workstream 1: Evidence review and Theory of Change to guide HMG's programme and policy | | | | | | | |
| development on 30by30 | • • | - - | | | | | |



| <u>Output 2</u> a. <u>Evidence review</u> An assessment of area-based conservation | a. <u>Outline</u> of proposed a.4 weeks fro report(s) including details of length and content of |
|--|--|
| globally covering the evidence review questions noted in the Scope of Work. Also see Annex A. The report will include a review of critical gaps, key lessons, promising approaches in area-based conservation and outline remaining evidence needs. Report annexes | annexes. b. <u>Workshop</u> to present initial evidence review findings and a draft theory of change to the Steering Committee and wider HMG audience for consideration and challenge prior to finalisation of |
| will include, but are not limited to: A summary of major existing areabased conservation initiatives. An up-to-date summary of the world's protected and conserved areas including details of extent, global and regional distribution, size, ecological coverage, connectivity management effectiveness, etc A broad classification of the different | c. <u>Quality assured draft</u> <u>evidence review report</u> (no more than 30 pages including 3 page executive summary) <u>and theory of change</u> (diagram and brief narrative) in line with approved report outline (a) |
| area-based conservation approaches and types of interventions in support of | |
| biodiversity, climate and poverty reduction outcomes. | e. e. 11 weeks fro inception |
| b. <u>Overarching theory of change</u> See 4.1.2 | f. Final theory of change (4.1.2) which has responded to review comments by SC. Final quality assured evidence review report (4.1.1) which has responded to peer review comments. |
| Workstream 2: Which countries shoul geographies to deliver 30by30 | d G support and what are th e priorities in these HM |

| Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office | | UKAIC from the British people |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| Output 3: Scenario and geographic analysis a. indicating which are priority countries and what they need in support of 30by30 | including details of length and content of annexes. | a. 4 weeks from inception |
| b | Presentation and quality assured written report (no more than 30 pages including 3 page executive summary) in line with approved report outline (a) | b. 8 weeks from inception |
| c. | <u>Final report</u> responding to review comments by SC. | C. 11 weeks from inception. |
| Workstream 3: How can HMG best sup on po 30by30? | ort high-ambition countries t | o meet their goals |
| Output 4: a. Assessment of different models of funding facility (design options appraisal) • The different models that there are for the structure, design and management of the funding facility showing which are recommended and why. • Alternatives for the governance/delivery of the funding facility showing facility showing which are recommended and why. • Recommended monitoring requirements. • Potential public and private cofinanciers/funders. | b. <u>Outline</u> of proposed reports (4a, 4b and final report) including details of length and content of annexes. c. <u>Quality assured draft report</u> of <u>Output 4a</u>, <u>assessment of</u> <u>funding facility models</u> d. <u>Quality assured draft report</u> <u>of Output 4b</u>, <u>interventions</u> <u>appraisal</u> | from inception |
| See also Annex B. | | |



| b. <u>Interventions appraisal</u> Drawing on the interventions identified in the evidence review, the types of interventions that the programme and therefore the facility should support (Workstreams 1&2 should inform this, as will Output 5). Expected costs and benefits? How interventions could be designed to reduce gender inequality and empower women and girls. | <u>combining 4a and 4b (no</u> more than 40 pages including 4 page executive summary), in line with approved report outline (a) and including specific inputs to strategic, appraisal and other cases of | e. 14 weeks from inception |
|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | τ. | f. 16 weeks from inception |
| Output 5: 3-5 country case studies of priority countries: detailing potential pipeline and scoping the approach to areabased conservation (see Annex C) | a. <u>Outline</u> of proposed report(s) including details of length and content of annexes. | inception |
| | b. <u>Presentation and</u> <u>quality assured written report</u> for each country (no more than 20 pages including 2 page executive summary), in line with approved report outline (a), and including specific inputs to strategic, appraisal and other cases of our business case as agreed at inception and described in Scope of Work. | b. 14 weeks from inception |
| | C. <u>Final report</u> responding to review comments by SC. | |
| Conclusion of work: | | |
| <u>Final presentation</u> to Defra and other relevant cross-Whitehall stakeholders in PowerPoint. | a. Summary final presentation of all outputs to Defra and other relevant cross-Whitehall stakeholders in PowerPoint. | inception |
| | b. A complete set of the final approved deliverables for all outputs and workstreams shared with the Authority. | |

September 2020





As a matter of importance, the Supplier's tender response must work towards delivering all the outputs of this Terms of Reference by the above timetable. If during delivery, the Supplier believes delivering all the outputs by this timetable is not achievable, then they must notify the Authority at the earliest opportunity to ensure a solution can be put in place. Exact dates for delivery of the outputs will be confirmed during the Inception Phase.

4.5. Recipient

The primary recipient of the exercise will be the Authority.

4.6. Budget for the Services

The Suppliers bid will not exceed GBP £300,000 exclusive of VAT, this budget is an allocation from the Authority's ODA budget. The Supplier must explicitly demonstrate provision of value for money.

The Authority will make payments upon satisfactory completion of milestones: 20% on completion of Output 1, including a satisfactory inception report; 40% on completion of Output 2 including a satisfactory report, the outline of proposed Output 3 report and the mid-point presentation for Workstream 3; and, 40% on acceptance of final reports for Outputs 3,4 and 5.

4.7. Official Development Assistance

All expenditures must meet the requirements of Official Development Assistance (ODA).

ODA is a term created by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) to measure aid. ODA should be undertaken by the official sector (official agencies, including state and local governments, or their executive agencies) and has promotion of economic development and welfare as the main objective.

An overview of, and the requirements imposed by, ODA can be obtained from the UK Governments website by accessing the following link: <u>https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/official-</u>

development-assistance-oda--2 4.8. Authority Co-ordination

The evidence review and programme design and scoping study (all workstreams) will be overseen by a Steering Committee consisting of HMG technical advisers; there will also be a peer review of the evidence review, Workstream 1, arranged by the Authority. The Authority requires the Supplier to work in an adaptive and participatory way with the Steering Committee throughout, via the Authority, so that interlinked workstreams can be adapted and refined in response to emerging findings. For all Workstreams, the Supplier will report to Sultana Bashir, Catrina Moss, David Thomas and Catherine Zawadowsky.

4.9. Capability

The Supplier must provide documented expertise in a range of areas, particularly as they apply in a developing country context. These include: biodiversity conservation; area-based conservation policy, planning, finance and practice; natural resource management, economics and governance; climate change mitigation and adaptation; political economy analysis, social sciences and international development; and programme design and environmental financing mechanisms, particularly different types of funding facilities. An understanding of IPLC priorities, concerns and perspectives in relation to 30by30 will be important. Ability to think innovatively will need to be demonstrated.



Where consultants are identified to work on the project after the point of tender, i.e. consultants who are not named at the point of tender, the Authority reserves the right to assess and approve consultants being selected to ensure appropriate skills and experience for delivery.

Specific skills, specialist knowledge and experience needed will include:

• Demonstrated experience of evidence reviews and research, including data and spatial analysis, and information gathering through stakeholder consultations. If a scale up were required for additional work in Workstream 1 (see Section 4.1), experience of data collection and modelling would also be required.

• Proven ability to engage with relevant stakeholders including HMG Posts in country, partner governments and relevant ministries, the private sector, international agencies including intergovernmental bodies (e.g. United Nations agencies, IUCN) and Multilateral Development Banks (MDBs) and Trust Funds (e.g. GEF, GCF), relevant international and national NGOs, Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) and producer groups (e.g. small-scale farmer groups), including bodies and groups representing Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs).

• Knowledge and expertise in:

<u>Area-based conservation and technical programme design</u> o Biodiversity conservation, land use planning and natural resources management (including forests and other ecosystems), including the ecological, socio-economic, land tenure and governance dimensions of conservation, particularly in developing and middle-income countries, but also in advanced economies. o The CBD Aichi targets progress and post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework including the discourse around 30by30. o Protected/conservation area types and systems and conservation planning, including priority setting exercises, protected/conservation area designation, governance, management and effectiveness. Examples in the lands and territories of IPLCs would be particularly relevant as well as knowledge of ICCAs and OECMs.

• Conservation finance including both innovative and tried and tested models of financing for improved biodiversity and ecosystem management with associated livelihood benefits.

• Ecosystem assessment and valuation, spatial analysis and Geographic Information Systems (GIS). • Area based conservation programme design including technical assistance to support improved biodiversity and ecosystem management, for national and local government, IPLCs and other stakeholders.

<u>Funding facility architecture and design</u> o Relevant demand-driven and other facilities supporting climate. nature and people, including respective structure, functioning and costs of operation.

o Evaluation of different financial mechanisms.

<u>Fund / Programme development and management</u> o Development of theories of change and monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL)

• HMG business case development, particularly the appraisal case

Additional Requirements o Fluency in English is essential for drafting and communications.

 \circ Regular, efficient communication and coordination with the Authority o For incountry scoping:



+ Fluency in languages required to communicate effectively in relevant countries is essential;

+ Proven ability to work through political economy analysis lens combining with technical analysis to develop change pathways and plausible interventions in the specific geographies.

+ As case study countries are yet to be selected, the Supplier should show how they could source and propose the relevant experts at the right time (perhaps through illustration of networks or their recruitment capacities).

4.10. *Methodology and approach*

The Authority anticipates that the Supplier will propose a range of methodologies, including a comprehensive review of relevant evidence and literature and additional spatial and other analysis, as well as targeted interviews and group consultations to verify information and fill data gaps. The Authority will require the Supplier to engage with a wide variety of stakeholders representing a mix of international, national, regional and local interests. Key stakeholders include other HMG departments (notably within Defra, FCDO, including Country Posts, and Department for Business,

Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), as well as bilateral and multilateral donors, relevant intergovernmental organizations, academia, NGOs and other CSOs, including ones representing IPLCs.

The Authority expects most of the work to be desk-based, except potentially for the country case studies (Output 5). However, it expects the Supplier to have an extensive network and to demonstrate how the views of countries, including local people and other stakeholders will be established particularly for the country prioritization, interventions appraisal and the country case studies. Particular attention should be given to gender-related implications at the country level. The work should consider other HMG scoping exercises/evidence reviews to ensure alignment and to avoid duplication and should also seek to include lessons learnt from similar HMG ODA programmes.

In planning and delivering this work, the Supplier should consider the interlinkages between different outputs and workstreams. For example the evidence review and Theory of Change from Workstream 1 are expected to feed into subsequent workstreams; the country case studies (Output 5) feed into the interventions appraisal (Output 4). The Authority expects the Supplier to work in an iterative and participatory way with the Authority's Steering Committee to ensure a joined-up approach.

Different workstreams will have different methodologies and the following are additional though not exhaustive points the Authority considers relevant to individual workstreams:

Workstream 1

In addition to proposing the overall approach to the evidence review and theory of change development, the Supplier should use a workshop format (most likely virtual) that would allow the Supplier to present initial findings from the evidence review and a draft theory of change to the Steering Committee and wider HMG audience for consideration and challenge prior to finalisation of the reports for Workstream 1. Additionally, the Authority will arrange a peer review of the draft products from Workstream 1. The Supplier will also need to address peer review comments before finalizing these products for the completion of Output 2.



Workstream 2

The Supplier's proposed methodology for validating and refining the Authority's country selection (c. 10 countries), including a sub-set of 3-5 priority case study countries which are proposed as initial partner countries, should take into account the criteria listed in 4.2.1. The methodology and the high-level analysis of countries will be discussed and agreed with the Authority. The list of countries for high-level analysis - the 3-5 priority case study countries and any additions or changes - will be discussed and agreed by the Steering Committee. The Supplier will be required to present findings from Workstream 2 to the Steering Committee for consideration and challenge prior to finalizing the report for Workstream 2 (Output 3).

This work will inform the more detailed case studies for Output 5 under Workstream 3. It should build on the findings of Workstream 1 and draw upon previous geographic prioritisation and studies carried out by Defra where possible and should bring together secondary information. As in Workstream 1, some external stakeholder engagement and interviews may be needed. The methodology will be discussed and agreed with the Authority during inception, especially elements such as the criteria used for prioritizing countries and how potential demand will be assessed.

Workstream 3

The Supplier's proposed methodology for the assessment of different models of funding facility (design options appraisal), the interventions appraisal and the country case studies will be discussed and agreed with the Authority. The sequencing of different activities is flexible, recognising that much is inter-related. Close coordination between the Supplier and the Steering Committee during update meetings will be crucial to ensure an adaptive approach to developing these products. There will also need to be close working with Defra analysts to ensure appraisal case requirements are met.

If in-country work is deemed to be necessary by the Steering Committee, the Supplier will engage openly and constructively with FCDO Posts. The Supplier must ensure that any in-country work is undertaken with the full prior knowledge and formal agreement of the concerned climate/environment staff at selected HMG Posts, and also build on established knowledge and to keep discussions within Defra's oversight. Any external stakeholder engagement necessary should be discussed and agreed with, and coordinated by HMG Posts. Entry and exit meetings with HMG staff at British Embassies/High Commissions will be held to brief the Supplier prior to in-country work and to feedback findings to FCDO Posts on completion of in-country work. British Ambassadors / High Commissioners, or their staff, may choose to accompany the Supplier to some meetings, e.g. with Ministers or government officials. The Supplier must seek approval from British Ambassadors or High Commissioners, as relevant, or their authorised representatives prior to arranging meetings with foreign government officials.

Given travel restrictions around the Covid-19 pandemic the Supplier must still ensure the requirements are fully met. The Supplier must assess the risk of each landscape as part of their proposal and ensure in-country consultants and expertise is draw upon.

4.11. Phases and activities

The Authority expects the Supplier to lead and deliver the following specific phases and associated activities and deliverables:





Inception

• Conduct kick-off meeting with the Authority to clarify scope, aims and objectives and define ways of working for the different workstreams. The Supplier should produce a summary readout from this meeting;

• Interview around five Defra officials to develop understanding of needs of the consultancy;

• Review Defra's existing evidence base and key documents (including a report recently completed for Defra on best practice in delivering the 30by30 target). The Supplier should take particular care not to duplicate existing reports but rather build on these to provide further analysis in line with the Authority's requirements;

• Provide a short inception report with annexes (Output 1), outlining the scope, objectives, governance arrangements, overall approach to delivering the work as well as the methodology (the Authority recognises that methodologies for Workstreams 2 and 3 will develop based on the products of Workstream 1) stakeholder engagement plan and work plan for delivering the outputs and suboutputs for each workstream:

• This will be an update to the approach and work plan outlined in the Supplier's original proposal, with refined research questions for the evidence review in Workstream 1 (to be approved by Defra), and realistic timelines based on actual start date.

• It will provide a preliminary list of stakeholders to be interviewed and key literature and data sets to be reviewed during the research phase. The timeline and format for presenting a more detailed stakeholder engagement plan to the Authority for approval will be agreed, including for completing the delivery chain mapping (see Section 4.12).

• It will outline the Supplier's plan for coordination of the work and their governance arrangements with any sub-contractors.

Research phase

• Gather evidence and conduct broader investigation into relevant issues, questions and lessons learnt through literature and secondary data reviews, donor assessments, interviews with relevant experts and institutions and other appropriate research methods (describe data sources and research);

• Conduct diverse stakeholder interviews over videoconferencing/phone/in person, as appropriate, (information provided by interlocutors may require double-checking before being presented as fact);

• The Supplier will present their ToC to relevant HMG experts in a workshop format with the aim to challenge findings and refine;

• Broader investigation and analysis to develop the programme design and options for intervention. Taking onboard lessons learnt and building on successful experience will be a major part, but innovative out-of-the-box thinking will be valued both in programme development as well as potential incountry scoping.



• Every two weeks to provide updates to and informal discussions with the Steering Committee on progress, reflections upon emerging findings and upcoming decision points.

• Interim / mid-point presentations and written materials at pre-agreed milestones to discuss proposed approach and structure and content of the final reports with the Steering Committee.

Present quality assured reports in English for review.

Conclusion

• Present all findings in summary in a final presentation to Defra and other relevant cross-Whitehall stakeholders in PowerPoint.

• Satisfactory completion of the Outputs in Table 1 and a complete set of final deliverables for all workstreams shared with Defra.

4.12. Delivery Chain Mapping

Delivery Chain Mapping (DCM) is a process that identifies and captures, usually in visual form, the name of all partners involved in delivering a specific good, service or charge, down to the end beneficiary.

DCM addresses risk throughout the network to reduce exposure and vulnerability. DCM will capture risks such as poor performance, financial melt-down or financial corporate responsibility.

Before engaging with private sector, civil society, or multilateral partners the Supplier must carry out a DCM exercise. The DCM will form a part of the Supplier's due diligence, decision making, and tender process. The Authority is required to report the above throughout the intervention to ensure all Authority monies can be tracked through the chain.

4.13. *Reporting and review*

The Supplier will provide to the Authority the reports and other products for each Workstream noted in Table 1. The indicative delivery timetable in Table 1 assumes contract award in early June and will be finalised and agreed during the inception phase.

4.13.1. Update and report requirements

Supplier updates (as per Table 1) should include a summary of progress, challenges, next steps, input/decision needed from Authority and/or Steering Committee. Succinct Powerpoints should be used to present information when appropriate.

The reports must meet the following requirements:

- Language: Reports must be in English, well-written and follow the structure agreed with the Authority. Meetings with the Authority must be held in English.
- Format: Draft documents in Microsoft (MS) Word to allow review with main body of report in Arial font 12 with 1.15 line spacing. Final documents should be shared in both MS Word and pdf format; other types of product (eg presentations) should be submitted in agreed digital formats.





• Length: Please see Table 1 for page length requirements. These can be discussed further and agreed during the Inception Phase. Reports that exceed the specified length will not be accepted for review by the Authority.

• Structure: including sections/chapters, annexes, etc. to be agreed during the Inception Phase.

• Feedback and review comments: The Supplier must clearly show how feedback from the Authority and the Steering Committee and peer review comments on the evidence review have been taken on board and addressed interim and final reports and other deliverables.

4.13.2. *Review of reports by the Authority*

The Authority will endeavour to review reports in the following timescales:

- 2 weeks to review and comment on the final draft written documents after oral presentation.
- 2-3 weeks for the Authority to arrange an external peer review of Output 2 2 weeks to review a final report and confirm its acceptance

Draft reports that do not meet the agreed length, structure and expected standard of the Authority will be returned to the Supplier for revising before these will be reviewed by the Authority and the Steering Committee. 4.14. *Conflict of Interest*

Suppliers working on the design of the 30by30 Programme will be <u>eligible</u> to participate in any future procurement exercise related to the implementation of the Programme.

To ensure that Suppliers for the design are not party to any privileged information about 30by30, the Authority will make all materially relevant design outputs available to the market at the time of such tendering process. These outputs will include the reports and products related to the delivery of outputs in Table 1. Defra may also share information and findings generated through the contract with third parties, as it deems fit.

5. Legal & Regulatory Compliance

5.1. Safeguard Considerations

All organisations that work with or come into contact with children must have safeguarding policies and procedures to ensure that every child, regardless of their age, gender, religion or ethnicity, can be protected from harm. Protection from violence, exploitation, and abuse through involvement, directly or indirectly, with Authority programmes. This includes sexual exploitation and abuse but must also be understood as all forms of physical or emotional violence or abuse and financial exploitation.

The Supplier must have appropriate policies and procedures in place to expressly prohibit sexual exploitation and abuse and to receive and address reports of such acts.

5.2. Disability Considerations

The Authority takes disability inclusive development to means that people with disabilities are systematically and consistently included in and benefit from international development. Civil Society and Private Sector partners must outline their approach to disability inclusion and how people with disabilities will be consulted and engaged throughout the project.





5.3. Prevention of Fraud and Bribery

In line with ODA guidance, the Authority has a zero-tolerance approach to corruption and will pursue aggressive recovery approaches.

The Supplier, and all organisations associated with the delivery of this Contract, must adopt a zerotolerance approach to fraud and corruption; to act immediately if it is suspected, to cooperate fully with HMG and other authorities to bring perpetrators to account, and to pursue aggressive loss recovery approaches.

The Supplier must have systems in place to detect and combat fraud. Section 48 of the overarching Framework Terms and Conditions sets out this requirement in more details.

5.4. UK Aid Branding

The Supplier, and all organisations associated with the delivery of this Contract, that receive funding from the Authority must use the UK aid logo on their development and humanitarian programmes to be transparent and acknowledge that they are funded by UK taxpayers. The Supplier, and all organisations associated with the delivery of this Contract, must acknowledge funding from the UK government in broader communications but no publicity is to be given to this Contract without the prior written consent of the Authority.

The UK aid logo can be provided to the Supplier by the Authority upon written request.

5.5. Transparency

The Authority has transformed our approach to transparency, reshaping our own working practices and pressuring others across the world to do the same. The Authority requires Suppliers receiving and managing funds, to release open data on how this money is spent, in a common, standard, re-usable format and to require this level of information from immediate sub-contractors, sub-agencies and partners.

The Supplier must release data in accordance with International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standards. Further information IATI information is available from the following URL:

http://www.aidtransparency.net/

The Supplier must ensure appropriate tools are in place to enable routine financial reporting, publishing of accurate data and providing evidence of this to the Authority.

5.6. Duty of Care

The Supplier is responsible for the safety and well-being of their Personnel and Third Parties affected by their activities under this Contract, including appropriate security arrangements.

The Authority will share available information with the Supplier on security status and developments in country where appropriate.

The Supplier is responsible for ensuring appropriate safety and security briefings for all of their Personnel working under this Contract and ensuring that their Personnel register and receive briefing as outlined above.



Travel advice is available on the FCDO website and the Supplier must ensure they and their Personnel are up to date with the latest position.

The Supplier understands that the Supplier remains fully responsible for Duty of Care in line with the details provided above. In particular, the Supplier understands that:

• The Supplier is fully responsibility for Security and Duty of Care. • The Supplier understands the potential risks and affirms that the Supplier has the required knowledge and experience to develop an effective risk plan.

• The Supplier have the capability to manage their Duty of Care responsibilities throughout the life of the contract.

The Authority will not accept any responsibility with regards to the Suppliers Duty of Care obligations.

Whilst the Authority, and our wider HMG partners, will share information pertinent to security status, developments or other similar pieces of information, the Authority makes no warrant, commitment or guarantee regarding the accuracy of any information which is shared. The Supplier shall at all times be responsible for making their own enquiries regarding their Duty of Care obligations.





Annex A: Additional indicative questions for Workstream 1

A.1 Selected background evidence questions

a. What is the geographic extent, global distribution and ecological coverage of protected and conserved areas globally listed in the World Protected Areas Database, the ICCA registry and the OECMs registry?

b. What are the most critical gaps in ecological coverage and connectivity and the challenges relating to the management effectiveness (in terms of biodiversity and other outcomes) in the existing global network of PAs, ICCAs and OECMs?

c. What are the opportunities and barriers to increasing the ecological representation, connectivity and effectiveness of existing national PA systems, ICCAs and OECMs in ODA-eligible countries? What are the potential socioeconomic, environmental and other implications of expanding areabased conservation in terms of restricting or displacing other types of land use and economic activities?

d. What is the evidence on whether and how biodiversity on community and indigenous lands has been maintained, compared with other types of protected and conserved areas? What is the role of local knowledge and customary practices in maintaining ecosystems and biodiversity?

e. What is the evidence that greater support to strengthen IPLC tenure and custodianship of their lands, territories and resources would be more beneficial to biodiversity, climate and poverty reduction outcomes than other forms of areabased measures?

f. What is the difference between 'protection' and 'conservation' and the basis for area targets for 'strict' protection versus other levels of 'protection' or 'conservation'? Is there an accepted definition of these terms?

g. What is the evidence base for the 30by30 target? Please provide a critical analysis of key scientific evidence supporting the target and any counter-evidence.

h. What are the main types of costs and benefits and trade-offs associated with different types of area-based measures for conserving biodiversity (including strict protection), and how are these distributed across different stakeholder groups (government, private sector, local communities, minority groups, global community etc. including any gender or other group-related difference at the local level)?

i. What are the major known threats to existing PAs, OECMs, ICCAs and IPLC customary lands and territories globally and in priority geographies of high global biodiversity significance?

j. What additional complementary measures are needed to ensure area-based measures are effective and sustained in the long-term?

k. What are the key gaps in the scientific evidence-base on the effectiveness of different types of area-based measures for delivering biodiversity, climate and poverty reduction outcomes?

I. What are the synergies and trade-offs between the 30by30 target and other post2020 global biodiversity framework targets? Does 30by30 help achieve other targets (e.g. Sustainable Development Goals), or could it conflict with these, and if so under what circumstances and how could these trade-offs be managed?



A.2 <u>Lessons</u>

a. What are the main lessons arising from progress towards Aichi Target 11 at a global level? What are the key geographies, thematic areas and types of interventions where investment and support are needed to advance global goals on effective area-based conservation?

b. What are the main lessons from past donor, national and other initiatives on area-based conservation in different geographies, including advanced economies and ODA-eligible countries, and what types of biodiversity, climate and development benefits have been achieved?

a. What factors (direct and indirect drivers) have contributed to successful biodiversity and other outcomes?

b. What mechanisms have worked well and why? What has not worked well and why?

C. This analysis should consider both individual effectiveness of a site as well as the effectiveness of a network of sites across a region, country or other scale that is intentionally linked.

d. What are the opportunities and barriers to generating revenue streams and other tangible benefits from protected and conserved areas, including the potential mechanisms for rewarding owners and custodians of the land and resources generating valuable ecosystem services through fiscal transfers, payment for ecosystem services (PES) schemes and other mechanisms?

e. What are the opportunities and barriers to better integrate protected and conserved areas into wider landscape-level land use, sector and development planning (e.g. through recognition of the benefits provided by such areas and changes to national accounting)?

f. What are the lessons on replication, scaling and long-term sustainability? For example, are there any lessons on ideal duration and funding size of programmes, types of grant recipients (national/subnational government, NGOs, CSOs, local communities, etc) and delivery mechanisms?

g. What are the key enabling conditions needed to catalyse and promote longterm sustainability and scaling of past investments in area-based conservation and the barriers to this? What are some examples of past investments in areabased conservation that have been successfully scaled and/or sustained in the long-term?

h. What innovative mechanisms and approaches to delivering 30by30 are under consideration or being implemented by countries who have domestic commitments to 30by30?

The Authority would like a comparative analysis of existing or proposed approaches to delivering the 30by30 target in selected G7 economies (including the UK) and priority ODA-eligible countries with countries to be agreed in advance with the Authority.

This analysis should explore mechanisms and approaches for strengthening protected and conserved areas globally through improvements and innovations in design, land use planning, designation, management, governance, resourcing, financing, partnerships and other relevant parameters. The analysis should consider cross-cutting nature of future protection and conservation in multi-use landscapes.





A.3 ICCAs, OECMs and IPLC lands and territories

a. What is the potential contribution of IPLC lands and territories to the 30by30 target as ICCAs, OECMs or other self-determined areas? What are the potential costs and benefits to IPLCs of participating in the 30by30 initiative including any regional variations? What are the barriers to their participation?

b. What are the enabling conditions and other factors required to ensure that biodiversity and ecosystem services in PAs, ICCAs, OECMs and IPLC lands and territories continue to be conserved effectively in the long-term?

C. What safeguards are needed to ensure that actions to support the delivery of the 30by30 target in ODA-eligible countries are effective (e.g. avoid focusing on

'quantity' over 'quality') and do not adversely impact local communities, including vulnerable or marginalized groups such as women or IPLCs, through displacement from their homes and lands or in terms of their rights, access to resources, livelihoods and wellbeing.

A.4 Monitoring results and assessing long-term impact

a. What tools and measures are currently used to monitor management effectiveness and biodiversity and other outcomes and evaluate the impact of different types of area-based measures? What else is needed?

b. How will the post-2020 GBF Monitoring Framework enable and support countries' to report on 30by30?





Annex B: Additional indicative questions for Output 4

Annex B focuses on the structure and operation of the proposed 30by30 funding facility. It does not cover the interventions appraisal part of Output 4 as we believe relevant questions are already included in Annex A, the Scope of Work (Sections 4.14.3), and in Annex C on the potential interventions in case study countries.

Recommendations on the structure and operation of the 30by30 Global Facility should consider the following questions and areas:

a. What should be the scope of the Facility to avoid duplication and add lasting value in line with HMG priorities? What is HMG's comparative advantage given other major sources of finance and technical assistance for area-based conservation including 30by30?

b. What design features will allow flexibility and enhance agility of design and adaptive management, for example, allowing for flexing scope, scaling, geography, focus and changing ways of delivering to improve performance?

• How can simplicity of design be maximised, allowing rapid implementation and minimal resource for HMG to run the Facility?

 \circ How can the Facility incorporate the flexibility to incorporate other donor (eg philanthropic) funding?

C. What are the eligibility criteria for accessing the Facility? Who can be a beneficiary? What are the pro and cons of allowing access to different types of beneficiaries? What are the options for working with national governments?

d. What are the considerations for, and implications of, increasing access and inclusivity of the Facility to marginalised groups, e.g. to enable access by IPLC groups, in-country/local CSOs including producer/natural resource user or other relevant groups led by women and girls?

e. Are there ways in which the Facility could be designed to reduce gender inequality and empower women and girls in relation to area-based conservation (e.g. by reducing gender-based adverse impacts on these groups and/or ensuring equitable distribution of benefits arising from area-based conservation for women and girls?

f. Should the facility operate more than one window? If so, how many and what types of windows and for what purposes?

g. What additional capacity is likely to be needed by different potential categories of applicants and in different countries to ensure a sufficient pipeline for the Facility, for example technical assistance to develop proposals of an adequate standard?

h. What safeguards are needed in the operation of the Facility to address the risks and trade-offs associated with 30by30 and the expansion of area-based conservation generally?

i. How will the Facility appraise proposals submitted competitively?





j. How should monitoring, evaluation and learning be managed, ensuring also that the impact of the facility can be evaluated against ICF KPI and other relevant metrics of biodiversity and poverty reduction outcomes.

k. What mechanisms can be put in place to allow the delivery model to be adaptive?

I. What type of organisation should manage it and what would be the governance arrangements?

m. How will quality control be assured? Consider how to meet our due diligence requirements?





Annex C: Additional considerations and indicative questions for country

case studies (Output 5)

As noted in Section 4.10/Workstream 3, this work should be carried out by the Supplier in close collaboration with climate/environment staff at selected HMG Posts, to build on established knowledge and relationships, while ensuring the Authority (Defra) continues to have full oversight of in-country work and discussions. Any external engagement that is necessary in-country should be coordinated by HMG Posts. We recognise that this may restrict evidence gathering and any such limitations which may impact the quality of the studies should be raised and discussed with the Authority.

Each of the 3-5 priority country case studies should include

1) a general profile of area-based conservation in the country covering the elements identified in the evidence review (Output 2);

2) the priority interventions for advancing 30by30 goals setting out the rationale for selecting each of these, including identification of HMG's comparative advantage if any over other donors; and

3) an assessment of potential demand for and operation of the Facility in-country, including potential beneficiaries/applicants, the existing pipeline, the likely technical assistance/capacity building needs for high quality project preparation/proposal development.

The following are indicative points and questions to be considered by the Supplier to prepare each of these elements of the country case studies. The list is not exhaustive and will be refined in agreement with HMG Post and the Authority.

C.1 <u>Case study country profiles:</u>

a. Summarise relevant current country situation in relation to ambitions on 30by30, effectiveness of biodiversity conservation efforts to date in particular area-based conservation and progress towards Aichi target 11, including details of existing national network of protected and conserved areas, ICCAs and OECMs, as well as of any IPLC lands and territories.

b. Summary of the key threats to biodiversity including the main drivers of deforestation and relevant country strategies and plans to address these e.g. NBSAPs, Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), REDD+ strategies.

C. What are the key challenges to meeting terrestrial 30by30, including limitations of the existing network of protected and conserved areas?

d. What are the main national conservation priorities to ensure sufficient representative ecosystems are effectively conserved and managed? How are area-based measures incorporated into the NBSAP? What country plans and initiatives exist or are being developed in support of the 30by30 target?

e. What is the appetite and scope for expansion of protected and conserved areas amongst different key stakeholder groups (different levels of government, private sector, civil society)?



f. What is the potential contribution of OECMs to the 30by30 target and what is the appetite and scope for identifying OECMs?

g. Where IPLC lands and territories could potentially contribute to 30by30, what is the current tenure of these lands and the needs and aspirations of the IPLCs? Are there any sensitivities, including land and natural resource use conflicts with other groups including government?

h. What mechanisms are in place to safeguard IPLC rights to their lands, territories, and resources and to engage IPLCs effectively in decisions that could potentially affect these, e.g. is there legal recognition of IPLC collective rights over land and natural resources?

i. What financing and/or benefit-sharing mechanisms already exist in relation to PAs or other types of conservation areas?

j. What are the relevant existing area-based conservation initiatives and how are these currently financed and managed? Where are there gaps and how could Defra add value? What opportunities are there for joint working with partners?

C.2 <u>Potential interventions</u>

The assessment of potential interventions will be used to develop Defra's business case including the appraisal case. These should be grounded in a political economy analysis.

a. What types of support are governments, private sector, local people, IPLCs and other stakeholders looking for to enhance area-based conservation?

b. What are the types of interventions that will best address the triple challenge of biodiversity, climate and livelihoods and support delivery of 30by30, not only in terms of 'quantity', i.e. land area of conserved or protected, but also with respect to management effectiveness, benefit-sharing and local support. What are the risks and trade-offs associated with different types of interventions?

C. What are the potential incentives for different stakeholders to engage in advancing the 30by30 target and the opportunities and constraints for HMG to help raise ambition and action?

d. What is the rationale and theory of change for the proposed interventions including the problem statement, change pathway and assumptions and risks?

e. Provide specific inputs to our business case (see Section 4.3.3). This will include sufficient supporting information for Defra's appraisal case and in particular the interventions appraisal. As noted in 4.3.3, the Supplier must develop a long list of interventions (using the classification defined in Workstream 1/Output 2), and assess these further against explicit criteria to propose a shortlist of interventions. The Supplier is expected to provide an assessment of the economic costs and benefits of the shortlist of interventions as an input to Defra's interventions appraisal case.

C.3 Potential demand for the Facility and in-country operation

a. How could the potential facility structure outlined in Output 4 operate in each country? September 2020





b. Who would be likely beneficiaries/applicant types, what might be the funding size and scale of projects?

C. What might demand be annually for the facility proposed in Output 4?

d. What types of ecosystems and landscapes are most likely to be included in applications, and how is this impacted by other criteria?

e. Where project preparation services might be required?





Annex B – Charges

Defined terms within this Annex:

E-Invoicing: Means invoices created on or submitted to the Recipient via the electronic marketplace service.

Electronic Invoice: Means an invoice (generally in PDF file format) issued by the Supplier and received by the Recipient using electronic means, generally email

1. HOW CHARGES ARE CALCULATED

- 1.1 The Charges:
 - 1.1.1 shall be calculated in accordance with the terms of this Annex; and
 - 1.1.2 cannot be increased except as specifically permitted by this Annex.
- 1.2 Any variation to the Charges payable under the Contract must be agreed between the Supplier and the Recipient and implemented using the procedure set out in this Annex.

2. RATES AND PRICES





| | Ratecard (by day) | | | Number of staff days by Workstream | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|-------|----------|--------------|-------|----------|----------|
| | | | | Workstream 1 | | Workstream 2 | | | Workstream 3 | | | |
| | Entry | Standard | Advanced | Entry | Standard | Advanced | Entry | Standard | Advanced | Entry | Standard | Advanced |
| Inte | ernational Ceiling | J Day Rate (£ sterlin | g) | | | | | | | | | |
| | Job I | Family | | | | | | | | | | |
| Programme Leadership | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Programme Management | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Technical Advisory/Expert | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Support and Administration | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reg | | Rate Card (£sterlin | ng) | | | | | | | | | |
| | Job I | Family | | | | | | | | | | |
| Programme Leadership | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nat | | Rate Card (£sterlin | g) | | | | | | | | | |
| | Job I | Family | | | | | | | | | | |
| Programme Leadership | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Programme Management | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Technical Advisory/Expert | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Support and Administration | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Workstream cost: | | | Workstream 1: Workstream 2: | | | Workstream 3: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | otal Contract Pr | | | | | | | |
| | (Travel & Subsistence included within total price) | | | | | | | | | | | |

September 2020





3. CURRENCY

All Supplier invoices shall be expressed in sterling or such other currency as shall be permitted by the Recipient in writing.

4. VARIATIONS

The Recipient may make reasonable changes to its invoicing requirements during the Term after providing 30 calendar days written notice to the Supplier.

5. ELECTRONIC INVOICING

- 5.1 The Recipient shall accept for processing any electronic invoice that it is valid, undisputed and complies with the requirements of the Recipient's e-invoicing system:
 - 5.1.1 Within 10 Working Days of receipt of the Supplier's countersigned copy of this Contract, the Recipient will send the Supplier a unique PO Number. The Supplier must be in receipt of a valid PO Number before submitting an invoice.
 - 5.1.2 To avoid delay in payment it is important that the invoice is compliant with this Annex. Non-compliant invoices will be sent back to the Supplier, which may lead to a delay in payment.
 - 5.1.3 If you have a query regarding an outstanding payment please contact the Recipient's Contract Officer(s).
- 5.2 The Supplier shall ensure that each invoice is submitted in a PDF format and contains the following information:
 - 5.2.1 the date of the invoice;
 - 5.2.2 a unique invoice number;
 - 5.2.3 the period to which the relevant Charge(s) relate;
 - 5.2.4 the correct reference for the Contract
 - 5.2.5 a valid Purchase Order Number;
 - 5.2.6 the dates between which the Deliverables subject of each of the Charges detailed on the invoice were performed;
 - 5.2.7 a description of the Deliverables;
 - 5.2.8 the pricing mechanism used to calculate the Charges (such as fixed price, time and materials);
 - 5.2.9 any payments due in respect of achievement of a milestone, including confirmation that milestone has been achieved by the Recipient's Contract Officer;





- 5.2.10 the total Charges gross and net of any applicable deductions and, separately, the amount of any reimbursable expenses properly chargeable to the Recipient under the terms of this Contract, and, separately, any VAT or other sales tax payable in respect of each of the same, charged at the prevailing rate;
- 5.2.11 a contact name and telephone number of a responsible person in the Supplier's finance department and/or contract manager in the event of administrative queries; and
- 5.2.12 the banking details for payment to the Supplier via electronic transfer of funds (i.e. name and address of bank, sort code, account name and number);
- 5.3 The Supplier shall submit all invoices and any requested supporting documentation through the Recipient's e-invoicing system or if that is not possible to: Shared Services Connected Ltd, PO Box 790, Newport, Gwent, NP10 8FZ with a copy (again including any supporting documentation) to such other person and at such place as the Recipient may notify to the Supplier from time to time.
- 5.4 Invoices submitted electronically will not be processed if:
 - 5.4.1 The electronic submission exceeds 4mb in size
 - 5.4.2 Is not submitted in a PDF formatted document
 - 5.4.3 Multiple invoices are submitted in one PDF formatted document
 - 5.4.4 The formatted PDF is "Password Protected"