



Department
for Environment
Food & Rural Affairs

Clarification Log

Political, Economy and Technical Analysis

Any question submitted to the Authority will be released in this log.

Version

Version	Date	Comments
1	13/5/21	Questions 1 – 7 added.

Ref	Question	Authority Response
1	Could Defra please confirm that DAI and other suppliers engaged in this assignment will not be excluded from participating in any future tenders for work under the BLF?	The Authority does not intend to exclude the Supplier nor any other suppliers engaged in this PETA assignment from any future tenders for work under the BLF.
2	Could Defra confirm whether the Political Economy Analysis and the Technical Analysis should be approached together in unison and Defra is not expecting two separate reports for each aspect?	<p>The Authority is not expecting two separate reports.</p> <p>During our early engagement with the Supplier, the Supplier suggested merging the technical questions into a combined PETA framework due to overlap between the questions covered in the respective 2 sections.</p> <p>The Authority is comfortable with the approach described above.</p>
3	<p>Please could you clarify the timeframe for the PETA project. The Request for Proposal document states the Intended Delivery Date / Contract Duration is within 3 months from the intended Contract Start Date of 26 May 2021.</p> <p>However, Annex 1 Terms of Reference provides an indicative timetable of reporting requirements and the third and final Output has</p>	<p>Thank you for calling our attention to this cross over. The Authority can clarify:</p> <p>Should the Supplier wish to submit reports for all five landscapes simultaneously then the deadline for final submission is 21st July 2021.</p> <p>Should the Supplier wish to take a staggered approach then the deadline for submitting the first two reports is 21st July 2021, with the remaining three landscape reports received by 30th July 2021.</p> <p>The ordering of landscapes must be agreed with the Authority in writing and during the Inception Period.</p>

OFFICIAL

	an indicative end date of July 2021 which is only 2 months after the Contract Start Date.	Should the Supplier determine it necessary, the Authority may have the flexibility to stretch timeframes by up to 10 working days. This can be discussed and agreed during the Inception Period.
4	<p>Are you able to provide further detail on the existing work completed and ongoing in [REDACTED] landscape?</p> <p>This would be useful to map further activities that will be needed to complete the outputs as requested under this Tender.</p>	<p>The Business Cases for our work in [REDACTED] and 2020/21 can be found here:</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] Posts are confident that they are in possession of the majority of the information required to support the formation of a lighter-touch PETA in this landscape. Discussion with [REDACTED] Posts will further elaborate this point; they have recommended starting with a thorough literature review of existing documentation.</p>
5	Please could Defra confirm the level of engagement that has already taken place between Defra and FCDO in each of the five landscapes regarding the BLF scoping?	<p>All landscapes: The Authority has been conducting engagement with FCDO Posts in all landscapes over the last three months with the PETA acting as a key area of discussion. FCDO Posts have had visibility of the PETA ToR and opportunities to discuss the scope of the work and handling.</p> <p>FCDO Posts in all landscapes have recently commenced the formal process to make host governments aware of the PETA and secure their support, if necessary. The Authority expects this process will be completed by the end of this week (week commencing 10 May 2021) but confirmation will follow.</p> <p>[REDACTED] Due to prior work in the region, the Authority has worked particularly closely with FCDO Posts in [REDACTED] countries in order to create the PETA ToR, understanding the information that FCDO Posts already hold in relation to the scope of this work, and areas that FCDO Posts would like to explore further.</p>
6	Please could Defra indicate the likely availability of FCDO in-country posts to participate in the scoping work, beyond initial kick-off call?	<p>As described in the ToR, [REDACTED] Posts will play a key role in the delivery of this work in their landscape.</p> <p>For the other landscape's availability will vary significantly by landscape due to capacity of FCDO Posts. All FCDO Posts are eager to support this work where possible and recognise the importance of this work.</p> <p>As described in the ToR, FCDO Posts may hold entry and exit briefings with the Supplier. FCDO Posts are keen to understand the stakeholders the Supplier plans to meet so that FCDO Posts can accompany the Supplier to meetings with key stakeholders or facilitate access where required.</p>

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

		FCDO Posts have also been briefed to gather any supporting information that will help the Supplier complete this work. The Authority will share this information with the Supplier during the Inception Period.
7	Please could Defra confirm whether the "Thinking and Working Politically on Transboundary Issues" approach (K4D report provided in Annex B) has been applied for the work already carried out for [REDACTED]	No the K4D report was commissioned to help the Authority with our thinking on the PETA and has not been applied to any other workstreams.

End of Document

OFFICIAL

Defra BLF Political, Economic & Technical Analysis

SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT FOR ENVIRONMENT, FOOD AND RURAL AFFAIRS IN RESPONSE TO EXPERT ADVISORY CALL DOWN SERVICE (EACDS) LOT B: STRENGTHENING RESILIENCE AND RESPONSE TO CRISES

19 MAY 2021

SUBMITTED BY DAI ON BEHALF OF THE EACDS LOT B CONSORTIUM IN PARTNERSHIP WITH



AJESH Cameroon

CATIE

DAI Global UK

*International Institute for Environment
and Development (IIED)*

Mokoro

Natural Resources Institute

NIRAS-LTS International

Palladium

Practical Action Consulting

Solutions Lab, LLC

Tetra Tech International Development

Triple Line Consulting



Department
for Environment
Food & Rural Affairs

Post-Tender Clarification Log

Political, Economy and Technical Analysis

The Authority's post-tender clarification questions are presented to the Supplier in this document.

Version Control

Version	Date	Comments
1	24/5/21	Questions 1 – 28 added

Ref	The Authority's Question	The Suppliers Response
1	<p>The Supplier does not list any direct experience in the [REDACTED] landscape.</p> <p>How will the Supplier ensure that its network can provide the required institutional expertise in that region?</p>	
2	<p>How will The Supplier ensure consistency of methodology / interpretation across the landscape teams in real time, over and above PEA training supplied?</p>	
3	<p>How will the potential limitations on community feedback, either through primary or secondary sources, impact on the final landscape reports?</p>	
4	<p>What level / breadth of stakeholder will be engaged in the interview sessions?</p> <p>In particular given the remote approach how will the Supplier engage with host governments?</p> <p>How will engagement be linked to the profiling of agents of change?</p>	
5	<p>The availability of landscape-team members is described in the proposal as imperfect.</p>	

	What residual risk does this carry? How will this risk be mitigated?	
6	<p>Clarify the level of PEA experience across the core team, both in terms of structuring / producing analysis, providing training and doing QA of PEAs.</p> <p>In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is [REDACTED] experience of PEA/TWP? • Which FCDO programmes has [REDACTED] provided PEA on? • What PEA has [REDACTED] done? • Does Alice have GESI experience beyond the tuna study? 	
7	<p>Do any named members of the team have experience in the BLF landscapes?</p> <p>Which ones?</p>	
8	<p>The Authority notes a limited level of protected area management experience listed by the Supplier.</p> <p>How will the Supplier ensure that its network can provide the required expertise for protected area management?</p>	
9	<p>How will the Supplier ensure that the components of the PETA approach it proposes will not create a mountain of documentation?</p> <p>How will the Supplier ensure efficient 'transfer of knowledge' to the Authority?</p>	
10	How would "political feasible" be weighed against "impactful" to ensure that not only the lowest hanging fruits are targeted for investment?	
11	With regards to figure 1 how will the Supplier go about identifying "the problem"?	
12	Why is a landscape analysis lead and a landscape analysis coordinator needed?	

	Could the admin / backstopping be done centrally?	
13	<p>How will the Supplier gather relevant documentation and information in addition to that provided by HMG?</p> <p>How will the Supplier test assumptions and data contained within data provided by HMG?</p>	
14	<p>Can the Supplier indicate which technical questions, as outlined in the ToR section 2.2.3, are not included in the combined analytical framework?</p> <p>Provide an explanation of why questions have been omitted?</p>	
15	<p>How will the Supplier ensure a succinct strategic case with a corresponding Theory of Change, and information relevant for inclusion within the appraisal case, is included within the final product?</p> <p>How does the Supplier envisage the final landscape reports will be structured?</p>	
16	<p>There are products noted in the ToR (section 2.5.2) to support the Authority's landscape appraisal cases (quantitative value for money considerations such as benefits: cost analysis as well as qualitative considerations of the proposed indicative interventions. Include options for delivery, governance and monitoring and evaluation arrangements.)</p> <p>How will the Supplier ensure that these products are delivered?</p> <p>Will the products be presented as part of the Output 2 landscape report or as a separate product?</p>	
17	How will the Supplier ensure that each landscape assignment team will include the necessary mix of skills mentioned in the proposal?	

18	<p>Estimate how many countries in landscapes will have national experts with existing networks of contacts involved?</p> <p>How will IPLCs be engaged and involved?</p>	
19	How will the Supplier ensure the Authority is made aware of the strengths & weaknesses of the evidence base for each landscape?	
20	How will the Supplier ensure conflict sensitivity in their approach that landscape teams take in conducting the work?	
21	<p>The Authority understands spatial analysis to be an essential part of landscape-level conservation and development planning.</p> <p>We did not note a focus on this in the Suppliers response. Will the Supplier provide GIS layers / GIS maps of each landscape with information of options to engage?</p> <p>Will the analysis and GIS layers be available to the Authority after contract delivery?</p>	
22	Will the Supplier make available to the Authority the contact details of relevant stakeholders, taking part in research, in each landscape?	
23	<p>Will the Supplier be able to provide details of stakeholder opinions, if and when the Authority requests it, or will data be anonymised?</p> <p>The Authority may elect to seek additional context to stakeholders opinion.</p>	
24	How will the Supplier ensure the proposed interventions are appropriate for the level of funding available & life span of the BLF?	
25	What level of experience and what geographic location does the Supplier believe is necessary for each landscape lead and team member?	
26	Will / can the Supplier indicate where transboundary programming would not be feasible and a	

	country-level approach would make better sense within landscapes?	
27	<p>The Authority intends to share the Suppliers products with partners within the BLF.</p> <p>Including but not limited to the Fund Manager, Independent Evaluator, Lead Delivery Partners and FCDO Country Post.</p> <p>Does this meet the Suppliers expectations and agreement?</p>	
28	<p>The Authority may elect to instruct additional work be undertaken by the Supplier in relation to this assignment.</p> <p>This was described in section 2.7 of the ToR.</p> <p>At what stage would the Supplier recommend any scaling up be instructed?</p>	

End of Document

Ref	The Authority's Question	The Suppliers Response
1	<p>The Supplier does not list any direct experience in the [REDACTED] landscape.</p> <p>How will the Supplier ensure that its network can provide the required institutional expertise in that region?</p>	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
2	<p>How will The Supplier ensure consistency of methodology / interpretation across the landscape teams in real time, over and above PEA training supplied?</p>	<p>DAI will create templates for all reports and stakeholder consultations to be used by the LA teams, thus ensuring the PETA reports are structured consistently and appropriately.</p> <p>Progress of the teams will be monitored through regular check-ins with the Core Team to support LA delivery in accordance with the determined structure.</p> <p>A key strategy to ensure ongoing quality assurance review will be the Core Team's dynamic 'snowballing' review approach; reviewing live documents developed by the LA teams which will ultimately serve as the key outputs. An internal mid-point presentation and meeting, at which LA teams will present on initial findings to Defra and the Core Team, will provide an opportunity for Defra to directly review progress and provide feedback which will be taken and applied to the final report.</p>
3	<p>How will the potential limitations on community feedback, either through primary or secondary sources, impact on the final landscape reports?</p>	<p>These limitations were acknowledged by DAI when preparing a response to Defra; gathering primary data at community level will impact the depth of analysis on which the reports are based and the ability to validate and triangulate insights from secondary data. This means we will be reliant on existing secondary data sets and studies, which we will mitigate through cross-checking findings as far as possible by our primary interviews and focus group discussions and ensuring inclusion of civil society groups that represent segments of the community. Additionally, we have adopted the following strategies to help mitigate these limitations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) During DAI's objective analysis of the Roster of Expert's CVs, DAI applied weighting to an expert's access to primary or secondary sources. 2) DAI will arrange telephone conversations with high scoring Landscape Analysis Lead candidates, to discuss how they would individually look to mitigate against this limitation and ensure best access to community feedback. <p>All reports will acknowledge any potential limitations on community feedback, therefore ensuring all readers of the report are informed.</p>

4	<p>What level / breadth of stakeholder will be engaged in the interview sessions?</p> <p>In particular given the remote approach how will the Supplier engage with host governments?</p> <p>How will engagement be linked to the profiling of agents of change?</p>	<p>During the inception period, when the Core Team and LA teams are undertaking literature reviews and conducting stakeholder mapping across a range of groups, initial interview lists will be drawn up and host governments will be included in these lists. The approach to engage host Governments will not differ from the team's approach to engage with any other stakeholder, including the need for remote interviews where necessary. During the pandemic, we worked on similar assignments in which we've interviewed and engaged with government stakeholders remotely- using online videoconferencing platforms like Microsoft Teams if appropriate. We have also included a communications budget for each landscape, which can be utilised for calls if internet connections are poor.</p> <p>Stakeholder engagement, including engagement with host governments, will be country specific and agreed with country posts. The selection of stakeholders for interview will stem from the initial literature review to ensure an inclusive and representative range of stakeholders are consulted; this will include individuals or organisations identified as potential agents or blockers of change relevant to the 2-3 problems of focus. This is a core part of understanding the incentives and disincentives of key stakeholders, and where potential entry points may be.</p> <p>The literature review will largely determine the level and breadth of stakeholder engagement. This will be an agenda point to the Core Team kick-off meeting with Defra.</p>
5	<p>The availability of landscape-team members is described in the proposal as imperfect.</p> <p>What residual risk does this carry? How will this risk be mitigated?</p>	<p>All Roster of Expert candidates as proposed by EACDS Lot B Consortium partners were asked to clearly state any known lack of availability during the months of June-August 2021.</p> <p>During DAI's objective analysis of the Roster of Expert's CVs, DAI applied a RAG (red, amber, green) status to an expert's availability during the project period. This RAG index will be assigned a weighting at the point at which DAI assess profiles for Landscape Assignment teams.</p> <p>Further to this, DAI have allocated a Core Team support pool reserve which can act as a backstopping support mechanism to LA teams (upon Defra approval) to ensure that LA teams are fully staffed during all required times and assignments do not lose momentum.</p> <p>Another mitigation tool will be the close monitoring of team outputs/developments, as well as regular touch points with LA Team Leads. This combined with a 'snowballing QA' approach developing outputs on one MS Teams channel through live documents will allow for clear lines of support from the Core Team.</p>
6	Clarify the level of PEA experience across the core team, both in terms of structuring /	<p>What is [REDACTED] experience of PEA/TWP?</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

	<p>producing analysis, providing training and doing QA of PEAs.</p> <p>In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is Paul Harrison's experience of PEA/TWP?• Which FCDO programmes has Shuna provided PEA on?• What PEA has Cleo done?• Does Alice have GESI experience beyond the tuna study?	<div data-bbox="533 147 1460 584"><p>[Redacted]</p></div> <div data-bbox="533 613 1460 1274"><p>Which FCDO Programmes has [Redacted] provided PEA on?</p><ul style="list-style-type: none">• [Redacted]• [Redacted]• [Redacted]</div> <div data-bbox="533 1303 1460 1986"><p>What PEA has [Redacted] done?</p><ul style="list-style-type: none">• [Redacted]• [Redacted]• [Redacted]</div>
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [REDACTED] • [REDACTED] <p>Does [REDACTED] have GESI experience beyond the tuna study?</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
7	<p>Do any named members of the team have experience in the BLF landscapes?</p> <p>Which ones?</p>	<p>[REDACTED] has worked in over [REDACTED] countries globally. Specifically, he has experience in the [REDACTED] landscapes [REDACTED] conducting country and transboundary assignments.</p> <p>In addition, and where necessary, the Core Team can also call upon additional DAI in-house experts. This includes [REDACTED] from the Environment and Natural Resources [REDACTED] currently [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
8	<p>The Authority notes a limited level of protected area management experience listed by the Supplier.</p> <p>How will the Supplier ensure that its network can provide the required expertise for protected area management?</p>	<p>Internally within the Core Team, [REDACTED] is a Member of [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>

		<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div> <p>With respect to LA teams, please refer to Annex B. Roster of Experts as appended to the technical proposal, specific reference to column 'U'. All EACDS Lot B consortium partners were asked to review the broadly defined criteria for the selection of experts across three technical skill set typologies (biodiversity and conservation, governance and institutions, economics and project appraisal) and three role typologies (Landscape Analysis Lead, Landscape Analysis Senior Researcher, Landscape Analysis Researcher) at the proposal development stage. Consortium partners were then asked to propose experts against these criteria, and for more than one type of criteria if applicable. This allowed DAI to review expert level experience in PAM.</p> <p>The Core Team will continue to undertake objective reviews of the information provided, coupled with expert CVs, when proposing Landscape Assignment teams to Defra colleagues for their 'no objection'.</p>
9	<p>How will the Supplier ensure that the components of the PETA approach it proposes will not create a mountain of documentation?</p> <p>How will the Supplier ensure efficient 'transfer of knowledge' to the Authority?</p>	<p>During the inception, DAI and Defra will agree on the structure of the PETA framework and the level of detail in the documentation to be produced by the LA teams. As the scope of work is broad, the full PETA framework is designed to be semi-structured and tailored to the most relevant 2-3 problems identified within each respective landscape. This will result in realistic and absorbable amounts of documentation in each Landscape Assignment.</p> <p>Clear communication and regular check-ins with the LA teams will ensure reports follow this framework.</p> <p>Transfer of knowledge from DAI to the Authority will take place at the milestones agreed upon with the Authority.</p> <p>The ongoing monitoring of the development of reports will ensure that reports are not excessive in the amount of information provided.</p>

10	How would "political feasible" be weighed against "impactful" to ensure that not only the lowest hanging fruits are targeted for investment?	The team understands that political will must be high to ensure uptake. The criteria for prioritisation of investment options will be weighted and will consider impact alongside political will and incentives.
11	With regards to figure 1 how will the Supplier go about identifying "the problem"?	<p>Problem definition is the first step of the political economy analysis and will be informed by the literature review and stakeholder interviews, with the aim of unpacking the proximate causes of biodiversity loss in each landscape to refine the scope of the research. This will use the 'why, why, why' approach, drawing on technical knowledge gathered from interviews, focus group discussions and desk research to get under the surface of why a problem exists. The refinement happens through a snowballing technique where different lines of enquiry are explored and analysis is cross-examined until consensus emerges across the research team on the 2-3 most pertinent issues.</p> <p>We recognise that there are multiple scales of problem statement. The first step is to clearly state and agree on the most prominent issues in the landscape from a nature/people standpoint. Thereafter the PEA work will "drill down" and seek to unpack the specifics/drivers of each problem.</p> <p>Drawing on our Technical Assessment Lead's experience in the biodiverse landscapes and during the kick-off calls with Defra and FCDO posts in the 5 Landscapes, we will hold preliminary discussions about pre-identified issues, which are pertinent to the assignment. That is – problem statements which are relevant and are likely to be addressed through the BLF, based on the overarching BLF Theory of Change parameters.</p>
12	<p>Why is a landscape analysis lead and a landscape analysis coordinator needed?</p> <p>Could the admin / backstopping be done centrally?</p>	<p>The Landscape Analysis Lead will be a Principal Level Expert (15+ years) and will hold responsibility for designing and carrying out (Landscape Assignment) LA specific stakeholder engagement, LA analysis, managing the LA team and will lead on drafting the analysis reports.</p> <p>The Landscape Analysis Coordinator will be responsible for contracting on behalf of the Landscape Assignment supplier (i.e. EACDS Lot B consortium partner), vetting, due diligence and LA administration / backstopping. They will manage all financial tracking and invoicing on behalf of the LA supplier. They will coordinate meetings and organise all LA level documentation. The central Core Team cannot undertake these responsibilities on behalf of suppliers.</p> <p>If in the instance that the LA team are <u>not</u> contracted through one single supplier, instead with a team makeup of 3-5 experts from independent suppliers, DAI will request that the admin / backstopping and roles and responsibilities as detailed above will be undertaken by DAI support staff at the cost identified by the landscape analysis coordinator in the landscape assignment budgets.</p>
13	How will the Supplier gather relevant documentation and	The first step for the Core Team will be to analyse the documentation and information as provided by HMG to ascertain an approach to testing assumptions and data within that provided.

	<p>information in addition to that provided by HMG?</p> <p>How will the Supplier test assumptions and data contained within data provided by HMG?</p>	<p>At this point, the core team will ensure triangulation and validation are central and consistent to the analysis and analytical themes when reviewing the range of primary and secondary data sources.</p> <p>The Landscape Assignment teams have been selected for their prior experience and understanding of these landscapes. Additional and complementary information will be gathered by these teams during the desk research phase. More detail on the methodology will be provided in inception once HMG have provided the referenced information.</p>
14	<p>Can the Supplier indicate which technical questions, as outlined in the ToR section 2.2.3, are not included in the combined analytical framework?</p> <p>Provide an explanation of why questions have been omitted?</p>	<p>We intend to discuss the finalised scope with HMG at the kick-off meeting, or as soon as possible thereafter, to streamline an approach to the report outline and drafting, and to limit where possible any cross-over between political and technical questions and to best rationalise the combined analytical framework.</p> <p>We propose a streamlined PETA framework which incorporates the ToR questions in rationalised structure. There was some overlap between questions in the ToR which were presented as either political economy or technical - we have addressed in the combined PETA.</p> <p>For example, the question 'What are the political, institutional and economic factors driving biodiversity loss?' will be addressed through the PETA structure, especially the institutions, rules of the game, actors and sections 1-4. Poverty dimensions will be addressed as part of the PEA – looking at whose interests are excluded in decision-making.</p>
15	<p>How will the Supplier ensure a succinct strategic case with a corresponding Theory of Change, and information relevant for inclusion within the appraisal case, is included within the final product?</p> <p>How does the Supplier envisage the final landscape reports will be structured?</p>	<p>To be discussed at the kick-off meeting with the relevant authority. We believe it to be unrealistic to produce succinct strategic cases without additional follow-on consultations after the PETA work and checking of assumptions with relevant stakeholders in the region. The timeline for this assignment does not make this a likely option across all 5 landscapes within the 2 months. We propose to review progress with Defra at the mid-point presentation, and to agree jointly on proposed intervention pathways at that stage, which could be further appraised and specific information relevant to the strategic case developed at that stage, should the timeframe allow.</p> <p>The final landscape reports will be structured and developed by the Core Team pending award of contract. These will be developed in the immediate days following the kick-off meeting to ensure HMG's requests are represented accurately.</p>
16	<p>There are products noted in the ToR (section 2.5.2) to support the Authority's landscape appraisal cases (quantitative value for money considerations such as benefits: cost</p>	<p>As indicated under the above response 15, we believe it to be unrealistic to produce succinct strategic cases without additional follow-on consultations after the PETA work and checking of assumptions with relevant stakeholders in the region. The timeline for this assignment does not make this a likely option across all 5 landscapes within the 2 months. We propose to review progress with Defra at the mid-point presentation, and to agree jointly on proposed intervention pathways at that stage, which could be further appraised and specific information and products relevant to the strategic case developed at that stage, should the timeframe allow.</p>

	<p>analysis as well as qualitative considerations of the proposed indicative interventions. Include options for delivery, governance and monitoring and evaluation arrangements.)</p> <p>How will the Supplier ensure that these products are delivered?</p> <p>Will the products be presented as part of the Output 2 landscape report or as a separate product?</p>	<p>Where feasible (time/information), the Landscape Assignment teams will further develop proposed interventions, including options for delivery, governance and monitoring and evaluation arrangements. These recommendations will be based on the best available information and analysis carried out within the 2-month timeframe. These recommendations would then require detailed follow-on consultations and checking of assumptions with relevant stakeholders in the region.</p> <p>The intention would be to provide these products, where feasible, as part of the Output 2 report (to be discussed with the authority).</p>
17	<p>How will the Supplier ensure that each landscape assignment team will include the necessary mix of skills mentioned in the proposal?</p>	<p>Please refer to Annex B. Roster of Experts as appended to the technical proposal, specific reference to column 'L'.</p> <p>All EACDS Lot B consortium partners were provided with broadly defined criteria for the selection of experts across three technical skill set typologies (biodiversity and conservation, governance and institutions, economics and project appraisal) and three role typologies (Landscape Analysis Lead, Landscape Analysis Senior Researcher, Landscape Analysis Researcher) at the proposal development stage.</p> <p>Consortium partners were asked to propose experts against these criteria, and for more than one type of criteria if applicable.</p> <p>The Core Team will undertake an objective review of the information provided, coupled with expert CVs, when proposing Landscape Assignment teams to Defra colleagues for their 'no objection'.</p>
18	<p>Estimate how many countries in landscapes will have national experts with existing networks of contacts involved?</p> <p>How will IPLCs be engaged and involved?</p>	<p>Please refer to Annex B. Roster of Experts as appended to the technical proposal.</p> <p>24 of the 90 experts proposed are of National Expert status. Of the 66 International Experts, a high percentage have in-country experience and/or are based in one of the Landscape Assignment countries. Almost all proposed International Experts have relevant, up-to-date existing networks in the LA regions.</p> <p>Defra will be responsible for confirming 'no objection' to each of the proposed Landscape Assignment teams, therefore will have direct influence on the level of involvement of national experts in landscapes with existing networks.</p>