Powered by

UK PACT

Brazil-UK PACT Fund

Forests sector

Call for Proposals Q&A

December 2024

Contents

Introduction

This document compiles questions and answers from the Brazil-UK PACT Call for Proposals (CfP) on Forests Sector (November 2024)

They are divided into 4 categories:

1. Post event communication

Q. What will be the launch date of this call?

A. Scheduled for November 25, 2024. Emails registered on the UK PACT website (https://www.ukpact.co.uk/contact-us) will be notified as soon as the CfP is launched.

Q. What will be the deadline for submitting proposals?

A. Scheduled for January 6, 2025. Confirmation of the deadline will be presented in the Terms of Reference once this CfP is launched. However, we do not foresee an extension of the deadline.

Q. Is it possible to receive a copy of the presentation?

A. The presentation and recording of the Market Engagement Event are available on our website https://www.ukpact.co.uk/brazil-uk-pact-mee-forest-sector-2024

Q. Is it possible to arrange a new meeting to present the call?

A. No. However, the presentation and recording of the event are available on our website https://www.ukpact.co.uk/brazil-uk-pact-mee-forest-sector-2024. If you have any further questions, applicants will be able to contact the UK PACT team by email for a period of 1 week after the call is launched.

2. Scope and focus of the CfP and project execution

Q. Does the proposal have to cover all 3 pillars or can it cover just 1 of the pillars?

A. Proposals must cover all 3 pillars, and all activities included in the Terms of Reference.

Q. Is there any definition of priority area, state or biome or are all eligible?

A. The strategy is national, so all biomes need to be covered. Furthermore, since the strategy also needs to consider its impact on territories, it will be necessary to look at the differences in regional and local scales. Therefore, when necessary, these sub-national scales should also be addressed, such as biomes, river basins, states and municipalities, among others that are relevant.

Q. In the different arrangements of Pillar 1, are models expected to be developed considering areas under federal government management or also considering state and municipal areas?

A. State and municipal scales should also be considered, within the national scale approach. PLANAVEG is a national strategy. It is a public-private plan and has governance that seeks to connect and achieve actions in the territory (states, municipalities, river basins, biomes, landscapes, etc.). The same reasoning applies to the other pillars.

Q. For the submission of proposals, can the development of a financial strategy have a state and municipal focus aligned with the federal strategy?

A. Yes, proposals must consider the scope of the national-scale strategy in the territories where the strategy will be implemented. This may require different approaches, including considering the integration of policies and the participation/leadership of states and municipalities within national-scale strategies. Or even other scales of territorial management, such as river basins and biomes. The definition of strategies and approaches for scales of action will also be defined throughout the project.

Q. Is a national-scale approach expected for all these activities, or is it possible to focus on biome-based strategies?

A. The strategy is national in scale. However, at the same time, it must consider its application in the territories, biomes and/or regions, which requires looking at the differences on a regional and local scale, establishing priorities in relation to subnational states or other territories (such as River Basins), in line with the analyses of prioritization of areas for Recovery of Native Vegetation (conducted by DFLO/SBio and partners, expected to be concluded in April/2025), and with the opportunities for resources and/or financial mechanisms identified in the states/territories.

Q. Is there already a definition of priority areas for this project?

A. Priority areas for the recovery of native vegetation are defined based on a set of criteria (final impacts), including biodiversity conservation, water, climate and food security. These analyses are being conducted by the Department of Forests/ Secretariat of Biodiversity, Forests and Animal Rights (DFLO/SBio) as another axis of implementation of PLANAVEG, and the first results should be available in April 2025. In parallel with the biophysical analyses, socioeconomic and financial opportunity analyses (for each implementation arrangement and for the PLANAVEG goal itself) must be carried out by the consultancy to be hired in this call, in order to consolidate an investment strategy that enhances impact with real opportunities for attracting resources and more effective implementation.

Q. The implementation of PLANAVEG will most likely require the development of new public policies and possibly specific regulations to make some mechanisms viable. Should the proposal include the proposal of these possible policies and regulations? Considering the complexity of developing these activities, which may require more time to implement.

A. The implementation of PLANAVEG may require the development or review of policies and relevant legislation, with CONAVEG (National Commission for the Recovery of Native Vegetation) being the competent body to deliberate and propose such revisions. As part of the results of the analyses, the consultancy may indicate necessary changes in existing laws and/or the creation of new regulations, which will be assessed and deliberated by CONAVEG.

Q. We would like to know about the blue carbon line from mangroves. For measuring blue carbon inventory with high accuracy. Since certain areas have different characteristics

A. Carbon credit lines, including for blue carbon, can, like other financing possibilities, be considered in the analysis of financing alternatives in structuring the financial strategy.

Q. Could you clarify whether large-scale RPF (Forest Landscape Restoration) projects in the Atlantic Forest are potentially contemplated? Will you help calculate the carbon mitigation impact? Will you help develop the methodology?

A. As stated above, the consultancy should operate on a national scale, defining priority strategies in territories for the three implementation arrangements – which could be in the Atlantic Forest or in any other biome.

The consultancy may use the results and analyses currently underway by the MMA or another public partner – such as those related to calculating the carbon mitigation impact and/or prioritizing areas for recovery of native vegetation, among others. When detailing the work plan, the DFLO/SBio team will provide all available information as well as timelines for those being built, and the consultancy should work with them, creating alternatives in the event that some data is not yet available.

Q. Could you indicate a more robust example in a state or biome, taking into account that only 1 proposal will be considered and that it will have to develop plans and strategies for the country as a whole, aligned with gaps and state laws, and of course with PLANAVEG?

A. The environmental regularization of rural properties is a good example of policy integration between the three spheres of government. Another example would be the use of resources through water use fees, which, if it were a prioritized strategy, would require the engagement of basin committees. The concessions of environmental services in Conservation Units (UC), on the other hand, is a strategy that is within the federal scope, but can also be replicated in other spheres of government, as is the case in Pará state.

Q. Regarding the activity "Develop and implement a fundraising strategy, including the development of technical content and outreach materials, identification and prioritization of public and private stakeholders, and key events related to the intervention" of pillar 2: is it correct to understand that the support for fundraising by the selected consortium will be technical and operational in nature?

A.Yes. Support for fundraising will encompass both technical and operational aspects, addressing not only the identification and planning stages but also the implementation phase of the fundraising strategy, which includes mobilizing funding sources. The implementation and mobilization efforts will be carried out under the guidance of the DFLO/SBio team.

Q. Regarding the expected result of Pillar 3 "Development of a strategy and monitoring system that provides a detailed view of how investments impact different social groups, promoting a more equitable and inclusive approach to resource distribution.": does the word "system" refer to management software? Or is the expectation that a design of indicators and a prototype of what this system *would be like* will be produced?

A. The word “system” does not refer to software. As detailed in the activities of pillar 3, a strategy and monitoring model are expected to be outlined (objectives, guidelines, indicators and potential tools).

Q. The Terms of Reference (ToR) mention that the objective is to provide technical support for macro-level actions of PLANAVEG related to financial planning. Does the scope limit itself to technical support and strategic planning, or does it also include direct execution of actions, such as implementing financial mechanisms or fundraising?

A. Yes. Support for fundraising will encompass both technical and operational aspects, addressing not only the identification and planning stages but also the implementation phase of the fundraising strategy, which includes mobilizing funding sources. The implementation and mobilization efforts will be carried out under the guidance of the DFLO/SBio team.

Q. There are activities related to all three pillars (investment plan development, financing strategy, and financial monitoring), but the deliverables' descriptions seem to repeat similar approaches.

A. The deliverables for each pillar should align closely with the scope of their planned activities. Notably, there is a thematic similarity among the three pillars, as they collectively represent aspects of PLANAVEG's financial strategy. While it is both expected and desirable for the deliverables of each pillar to converge, each pillar maintains a distinct scope defined by the outcomes of its specific activities.

Q. What are the practical differences between *developing investment plans* in Pillar 1 and *financing strategy* in Pillar 2? Both include resource identification, cost projections, and designing financial mechanisms. How can duplication of efforts between these pillars be avoided?

A. In Pillar 1, the investment strategy should be tailored to each specific arrangement. In Pillar 2, the financing strategy adopts a broader approach for the recovery of native vegetation. The outcomes are expected to intersect and complement one another. However, there are distinct deliverables outlined in the scope of activities for each pillar.

Q. Governance proposals are mentioned in both Pillar 1 and Pillar 2, but the ultimate purpose is unclear. Will the governance models be: Focused on the implementation arrangements of PLANAVEG (Pillar 1)? Designed for specific financial mechanisms for each arrangement? Created for financial mechanisms as a whole (Pillar 2)? A single governance model for one financial mechanism only?

A. Governance must be addressed on two distinct levels. The first level involves identifying the governance structures associated with each funding source, applicable to both Pillar 1 and Pillar 2. This identification is crucial for the funding access process. However, in both pillar 1 and pillar 2, it is essential to consider broader governance strategies (second level) that facilitate access to the prioritized funding sources. This applies not only to specific arrangements in Pillar 1 but also to overarching strategies in Pillar 2. The consultancy should collaborate with the DFLO/SBio team to identify the most suitable governance models, including their operational scales, for the integrated fundraising process relevant to each pillar (1 and 2).

Q. Support for Fundraising (Pillar 2) - The text indicates that the consultancy is responsible for developing a fundraising strategy and supporting its implementation through roadshows, meetings, and fundraising missions. What will be the consultancy's exact role? Active participation in negotiations and events? Only developing technical and strategic materials?

A. Yes. Support for fundraising will encompass both technical and operational aspects, addressing not only the identification and planning stages but also the implementation phase of the fundraising strategy, which includes mobilizing funding sources (dialog/negotiation with funders). The implementation and mobilization efforts will be carried out under the guidance of the DFLO/SBio team.

Q. Development of Financial Mechanisms (Pillars 1 and 2) - Emphasis is placed on developing/strengthening financial mechanisms, but expectations are unclear. Should the consultancy only propose mechanisms or deliver more concrete outputs such as prototypes, financial vehicle models, or even an implementation plan?

A. Financial mechanisms are expected to be proposed, encompassing the fundamental design of their institutional arrangements, legal status (public or private), potential funding sources, objectives, and operational and financial management models (or enhancements to existing designs). The aim is to outline the strategy and basic structures for the governance and operation of these mechanisms. However, the development of procedures, manuals, and other operational documents, as well as team composition, is not included in this scope.

Q. Financial Intelligence (Pillar 1) - Pillar 1 mentions "financial intelligence," but the term is undefined. What is expected under this heading? Does it involve financial risk analysis, cash flow forecasting, or strategic resource mapping?

A. Financial intelligence will be delivered as a result of the activities set out in pillar 1. The scope of these activities represents what financial intelligence is expected for each implementation arrangement.

Q. Social and Gender Inclusion Indicators - The expected outcomes highlight the promotion of social and gender inclusion in governance and financing strategies. Will this require diagnostics to assess prior inequalities or simply proposing inclusion guidelines?

A. It is expected that the consultancy will develop guidelines to foster social and gender inclusion.

Q. Transparency in Financing - Transparency in funding criteria is mentioned to ensure more diverse access to funds. Will this require developing new tools (digital platforms, manuals, or guides) or just strategic recommendations?

A. The consultancy is anticipated to provide strategic and operational recommendations aimed at enhancing the transparency of funding processes. While it is expected that suggestions will include the use of platforms and other tools to promote transparency, the development of these tools is not within the scope of this consultancy

Q. Financial Monitoring System (Pillar 3) - Pillar 3 emphasizes the need for a financial monitoring system, but implementation details are unclear. Will the system be conceptual/strategic, or should it include practical tools (e.g., a digital platform or automated system)?

A. As detailed in the activities of pillar 3, a strategy and monitoring model are expected to be outlined (objectives, guidelines, indicators and potential tools). The aim is to design a monitoring strategy/model and indicate potential tools that can absorb the monitoring strategy/model. The development of systems, software, and related components is not anticipated.

Q. Cost Analysis Scope - To what extent will the cost analysis build on the ongoing review explicitly mentioned in the call: "*Achieving this outcome will require a series of actions and activities involving diverse expertise and stakeholders. Some of these are already underway, such as the review of the cost projections for the national restoration goal.*" Will this ongoing analysis be shared with the consultancy to develop further details?

A. The methodologies and results of cost projections related to the recovery of native vegetation will be disseminated to the consulting team. It is anticipated that these findings will be published for public access. Additionally, efforts will be made to engage the institutions involved in the study to facilitate dialogue with the consultants.

Q. The ToR specifies in the first result and expected impact of Pillar 2 (p. 9): "*Financing and fundraising strategies for the recovery of native vegetation designed, in coordination with the definition of priority territories, both on the basis of multi-criteria analysis (under development by DFLO/SBio—not the subject of this work).*" Does this exclusion apply only to the multi-criteria analysis or to the entire result/impact?

A. This exclusion applies only to the multi-criteria analysis.

3. Application process & requirements

Q. Can organizations that already have active projects with UK PACT apply for this call?

A. Yes, they can apply without any limiting factors.

Q. Will the project be in Portuguese or can it be carried out in Spanish?

A. The project must be conducted in Portuguese and deliveries and reports must be submitted in English.

Q. What legal instrument will enable the partnership between the selected organization + UK Pact + SBio/MMA?

A. The grant agreement will be signed between Palladium – as the UK PACT grants manager – and the selected partner.

Q. Can international organizations or consultants apply as consortium partners, including to receive funding?

A. Yes. The requirement is that the consortium lead or organization applying individually be a Brazilian institution, that is, one that has a registered CNPJ.

Q. Regarding eligibility, can international organizations that have an organization registered in Brazil, with a CNPJ, apply as lead?

A. Yes, if the institution is duly registered in Brazil, with a CNPJ (for example, a Brazilian branch of an international organization), it can apply as lead through its Brazilian organization.

Q. Are administrative/overhead fees eligible expenses?

A. Yes, as long as they follow the recommendations to be presented in the Applicant Handbook.

Q. Is it possible to purchase equipment for field evaluation?

A. Funds are not permitted for tangible assets, such as cars, computers, furniture, etc.

Q. Will it be necessary to issue an invoice to receive funding? If so, the value of taxes on the issuance of the invoice must be included in the proposal, correct?

A. Yes. Fees/taxes can be considered in the financial proposal, as long as they follow the recommendations to be presented in the Applicant Handbook.

Q. Is there a limit on the number of organizations that can form a consortium for submitting a proposal?

A. No, but it is expected that consortia do not need more than 4 partners to deliver the project.

Q. Will only one partner or a consortium be selected for the call?

A. A single proposal will be awarded. The awarded proposal may be from a single partner or a consortium.

Q. Will the daily rates for measuring the effort be pre-defined by the program?

A. No. Each applicant must measure the resources for delivering the project.

Q. Will the materials available on 11/25 also be in English, since they ask that proposals be submitted in English?

A. All documents and guidelines will be provided in English for the call. All documents must be submitted in English.

Q. Will payments be via reimbursement?

A. Yes. In some exceptional cases, a request for advance payments may be assessed by the UK PACT team.

Q. In other UK PACT Brazil calls, a prior relationship with the requesting Ministry was requested. Will this also be required in this call? If so, is there an established channel through which we can make this contact with the MMA?

A. For this call, it will not be necessary to present evidence of the Ministry's involvement in the development of the proposal.

Q. The project is large and will require hiring if approved. Would it not be possible to consider only the CVs of the project coordinators?

A. CVs for positions already allocated, especially for coordination positions, should be presented together with the full proposal.

Q. Is it possible for an organization (with the same Brazilian CNPJ) to submit one proposal as a proponent and another as part of a consortium? Or two proposals as part of consortia with different partners?

A. Yes. One organization can apply just once as a lead or sole applicant, but it is possible to join one or more consortia as partner.

Q. If a single non-profit organization want to apply, can this organization be registered in a country outside Brazil?

A. No. the lead organization in a consortium or a sole applicant must be a Brazilian organization. Partners in a consortium can be international organizations.

Q. 6.2 In the Applicant Handbook, section 3.4 (*Safeguarding within UK Pact Projects*), the links to the *Inter-Agency Minimum Operating Standards* and *https://safeguardingsupporthub.org/essentials* are not working. We were blocked from accessing them. Could you provide the correct links?

A. *https://safeguardingsupporthub.org/essentials*

Q. In the budget template, should we include the personnel name in column "E," even if it is filled in gray?

A. Yes, all columns in the "staff" tab must be filled in, containing information on the entire project team (including partner organizations in the consortium)

Q. Where should we include the institutional information in the proposal, and how will this information be evaluated during the selection process?

A. In chapter 10 of the full proposal document. The selection and eligibility criteria are presented in the Terms of Reference