Responses to questions submitted for the Request for Proposals (RfP) for Independent evaluation of IUCN's influence on policy.
RfP Reference: IUCN-23-07-P04349-1

NOTE: The approach to the Evaluation of Proposals has been amended. An additional criterion for evaluation has been added: RfP Section 5.3.4 now states: "Only proposals with a technical score of 70% or higher will be considered." There are no other changes to the RfP.

	Question	Response
1	Could you please let me know if we need to hand in any formal tender documents or any additional information for the expression of interest?	Expressing interest can be done via email. No other tender documents are required.
2	I would like to know what is the procedure for expressing the interest, and also if you can clarify the eligibility criteria for participating in the tender. Namely, regarding the pre-qualification criterion: *3 relevant references of clients similar to IUCN / similar work.*	Expressing interest can be done via email. No other tender documents are required.
	The team has experience working with various other international organisations. In that regard, I need clarification whether these references are eligible for the said pre-qualification criterion? We have dozens of evaluations performed over the course of two decades, thus I would assume that this is also a valid experience regarding the criterion?	Yes these references are eligible and valid.
	Participating as a partnership of several legal entities. In that regard, could I ask you to please clarify whether in the expression of interest phase we should note all participating entities or just the lead company?	
	Given our previous experience in bidding procedures for other institutions, qualification criteria and annual turnover is considered jointly for all participating companies in the consortium. In regard to this RfP, we would then also provide a Declaration of Undertaking and Pre-Qualification Information (listed on page 2 of the RfP) for each of the participating partners (excluding natural persons). Is this aligned with your expectation?	The purpose of the expression of interest is a) to gauge interest and b) to have contact details for communicating clarifications etc. As such, only one organisation from a consortium or partnership needs to be included in the expression of interest.
	Given that we hadn't noticed exclusion criteria based on an annual turnover, we would also like to inquire on how to address the turnover in the Pre-qualification information, i.e. is there a minimum threshold and basis on which this criteria is evaluated.	We will consider annual turnover and numbers of staff for the consortium in total. The bidder needs to convince us that they have the capacity to perform this work. A Declaration of Undertaking needs to be signed and submitted by each member of the consortium, but the other questions should be answered by the consortium as a whole. We do not have a set minimum of turnover or members of staff that needs to be met.

Responses to questions submitted for the Request for Proposals (RfP) for Independent evaluation of IUCN's influence on policy.
RfP Reference: IUCN-23-07-P04349-1

3	One of the pre qual criteria is to submit "*annual turnover for each of the past 3 years*". We have consolidated financial statements (accountant's compiled reports) available for each year which provides overview of balance sheet and statement of income. We don't have a turn over certificate as of now. Would consolidated financial statements suffice for meeting the aforementioned pre -qual.	Yes, consolidated financial statements would suffice for meeting the aforementioned pre -qual at this stage.
4	We have looked through the RfP documents, but we could not find the declaration of undertaking in the Annex. Would it be possible for you to send the document separately or the RfP documents with the Annexes again?	Declaration of Undertaking is included in the RFP documentation, it has been mislabeled as declaration of understanding. Thanks for pointing out the mistake. There is no specific format for both proposals.
5	We were wondering if you would be open to meeting on Zoom to discuss the assignment in more detail? If so, are there any days and times that might suit you?	Our procurement process is outlined in the RFP. We will not discuss the assignment with potential bidders unless they are invited to do so after the proposal submission stage. Thank you for your understanding and interest.
6	1)The TORs specify that "The review will take place between August 2023 and March 2024. Preliminary findings are expected by the end of 2023." Considering that the evaluation is unlikely to commence in August (given the deadline for the submission of offers being set for August 23rd), could we propose a slightly adjusted timeline with preliminary findings presented to Steering Committee and ExBo by end of January instead of December and a presentation of the final evaluation report by end of April 2024 instead of March 2024? 2)Would it be possible to receive the Questions and Answers document that compiles all the answers to the questions submitted by the other Consultants?	1) A slightly adjusted timeline can be provided. However, please see Question 13, response 4 for more on the intended timeframe. 2) IUCN always shares all Q&A (including those submitted by other consultants).
7	Please can you confirm whether I also need to submit the Pre-Qualification Information document by 10 August 2023 or if this can be submitted along with the other proposal documents by 23 August 2023?	No, it can be submitted with the proposal on the proposal deadline, 23 August.
8	I would also like some clarification on the conditions a company should meet and more specifically the 2nd condition 'Registered on the relevant professional or trade register of the country in which you are established' in section 7.2 of the RfP document. Is this registration the company's corporate registration certificate? And if not, please could you explain further?	The form of registration depends on the country the team is based in, which is why this is deliberately left open. All IUCN requires is for the bidder to confirm (yes/no) that they are legally registered in accordance with applicable laws to do this kind of work. So, yes, a corporate registration certificate is sufficient. No, the proposal deadline cannot be extended.

	Please could I also ask whether there is a possibility to postpone the proposal submission deadline from 23rd August to the beginning of September?	
9	On the IUCN website the estimated value for this contract is listed as CHF 100,000 – 250,000, however, in the TOR (Section 12) it is mentioned that the budget shall not exceed CHF 175,000. Could you please clarify which value should be considered during preparation of the financial proposal?	The value in the ToR is the maximum budget. The value on the website is a range for categorizing the RfP.
10	1. Regarding section 7.3 of the RfP (*"If you are participating in this procurement as a member of a joint venture, or are using sub-contractors, submit a separate Declaration of Undertaking for each member of the joint venture and sub-contractor, and be clear in your Proposal which parts of the goods/services are provided by each partner or sub-contractor"*). If we are a company that works with core staff but also work with external consultants, should we submit a declaration of undertaking for the company (Annex 2a) and also a declaration of undertaking for each individual (Annex 2b) if they are external consultants? 2. Is there a required IUCN's template for the technical proposal? 3. Are there any page or word limits for the technical proposal? 4a. Is there a required IUCN's template for the financial proposal? 4b. What type of detail does IUCN expects to see in the financial proposal?	1. Declaration of undertaking question: Yes, both declarations (Annex 2a) and (Annex 2b) should be submitted. 2. Technical proposal template: No. **3. Page/word limit: There is no page or word limit, but the ability to communicate concisely will be evaluated as part of all aspects of the technical proposal, especially technical evaluation criteria 6 and 7.** 4a. Financial proposal template: There is no financial proposal template. 4b. Detail required in financial proposal: There is no specified requirement for detail in the financial proposal and only the total cost is used to evaluate the financial proposal. Please note the complete approach to financial evaluation is (section 5.4 of RfP): "The financial evaluation will be based upon the full total price you submit. Your Financial Proposal will receive a score calculated by dividing the lowest Financial Proposal that has passed the minimum quality thresholds (see Section 5.3.2) by the total price of your Financial Proposal. Thus, for example, if your Financial Proposal is for a total of CHF 100 and the lowest Financial Proposal is CHF 80, you will receive a financial score of 80/100 = 80%" **However, please note that the evaluation of the technical proposal does include assessment of the total and relative level of effort of the team across the evaluation deliverables through the demonstration of "appropriate and clear milestones and deliverables with *clear and appropriate allocation of consultant days to each*" (see technical proposal criterion 7).)**

Responses to questions submitted for the Request for Proposals (RfP) for Independent evaluation of IUCN's influence on policy.
RfP Reference: IUCN-23-07-P04349-1

	5. In section 8 ("Travel required") of the ToRs it states the following: *"The evaluation is expected to visit a minimum of two (2) Regional offices and potentially Country Offices to assess both the non-portfolio work for national and regional policy influencing and the portfolio sample from the region. Office missions will also be used to meet with external evaluation informants and stakeholders. Where possible, other interviews will be conducted by phone or online as relevant."* Which of IUCN's Regional offices and country offices would you expect us to visit? Is there any regional office or country office that you are confident that the consultant team visits? Or are you expecting the locations to be chosen based on the sampling process?	5. Region visits/sample: Yes, we expect the locations to be chosen based on the sampling process; the criteria and/or specific sample of regions to include and visit should be part of the technical proposal and will be confirmed during inception phase. See other related questions and answers.
	6. How long should the required CVs be? Are two-page CVs accepted, or do you prefer one-page-long documents? 7. Would the payments be submitted from a Switzerland based entity (assuming the payments come from IUCN's headquarters)?	6. CV length: No specified length. 7. Payments: Yes, payment will be from IUCN Headquarters based in Switzerland.
	8. What assistance will IUCN be providing for accessing information (e.g. sharing key documents for review) and key informants to interview in country and regional offices? What about access to external key informants?	8. Assistance to access information: IUCN has assigned an evaluation manager to introduce the evaluation team to project and programme managers of the work sampled to access key documents and stakeholders for interview. Key documents will be shared via a secure online platform. The evaluation manager will work with the evaluation team and other IUCN colleagues to identify external stakeholder contacts and make introductions as needed.
	9. Are there any known limiting factors for conducting some of the data collection remotely? For instance are there issues with access to internet in country offices that would make virtual data collection problematic?	9. Remote data collection: There are no known limiting factors for accessing documents remotely. All documents are expected to be digitally available. We cannot exclude the possibility that some external stakeholders may only be available for interview in person and not online, but in general remote data collection will be possible. The evaluation team is requested to minimize travel while also minimizing the burden of effort on IUCN staff for making introductions. For example, if remote data collection requires additional coordination by local staff to make introductions than if the evaluation team were to collect data in-person, this should be considered
11	- two ROs are mentioned to be a focus of the evaluation; have these yet been selected - are there any indications as to what they could be? (as useful for the team make-up)	The regions have not been selected and one of the criterion for assessing the proposals will be the criteria for sampling, including sampling the regions (technical scoring criterion 6). Availability of team members with regional expertise may be a criteria for the selection of the region.

Responses to questions submitted for the Request for Proposals (RfP) for Independent evaluation of IUCN's influence on policy.
RfP Reference: IUCN-23-07-P04349-1

	- the ToR speaks of on p. 7 "Successful examples of policy impact will be turned into communication products that show funders and other IUCN stakeholders where IUCN has had significant impact on policy" - should budget be put aside to develop these communication products (or at the minimum stand-alone content on success stories)?	**Please take note that IUCN's official languages are English, French and Spanish.** IUCN will create the communication products, so budget does not need to be put aside.
12	1. You mention that during Inception we should 'surface' or 're-create' a Theory of Change for each delivery mechanism (Section 7: Deliverables) and an overall ToC for how these fit together. Are you able to share any previous (no matter how rudimentary or out-of-date) ToCs or relevant materials? 2. Do you have a previous (developed since the 2005 policy influence review) or current overall (i.e. for the organisation/IUCN as a whole) policy influence framework or policy influence strategy that can be shared? 3. The ToRs mention that this exercise will feed into the ongoing IUCN Council Strategic Visioning, would you be able to share the current overall organisation strategic plan?	1. Request to share policy theory of change: The theory of change for each policy objective may differ and therefore this is dependent on the work sampled and is not available until the inception phase of the evaluation. *2.* A policy influence strategy is in development and can be shared during inception. IUCN implements a global Programme, adopted every four years by its Members. The current programme for 2021-2024 is: Nature 2030	IUCN. Past programmes are available at the following links: 2017-2020: WCC-6th-001.pdf (iucn.org); 2013-2016: wcc-5th-003.pdf (iucn.org); 2009-2012: Shaping a sustainable future : the IUCN Programme 2009-2012	IUCN Library System 4. A strategic vision is currently being developed as part of the 20-Year Strategic Vision, a process that is currently underway. A draft for consultation by Members is in preparation but cannot be expected to be available before the end of the data collection period of this evaluation on IUCN's influence on policy.
13	1) We would like to propose for our team, a team member that is participating in another concurrent IUCN evaluation. for this evaluation, we do not see this as a conflict of interest and actually consider this as a positive, as it will enhance efficiency. Would this be allowable? 2) We understand that the this evaluation of IUCN's influence on policy is running concurrently with the 'External Review of the IUCN Programme 2021-2024' and the '20 year strategic review'. Please can you set out any expectations regarding how we may interact with these teams , or proposed activities, so they can be added to our workplan. 3) IUCN themes range from: Biodiversity, Business, finance and economics, Climate change, Freshwater and water security, Governance - law and rights, Nature-based Solutions, Ocean and coasts, protected areas and land use. Regions covered: Asia, Eastern and Southern Africa, Eastern Europe	1. Team members participating in multiple concurrent IUCN evaluations: No, we see this a potential problem for objectivity and capacity planning. 2. Coordination with ER: As stated in the ToR "The evaluation manager will assist the evaluation team to coordinate with the concurrent External Review of IUCN's Programme 2021-2024 and 20-Year Strategic Vision to seek synergies and avoid overlap of work sampled." We do not see the need for joint activities as the two evaluations, each having separate purposes, should be run separately. 3. Prioritisation of themes or regions: The section of the ToR on sampling says "The criteria for the purposeful sample of projects, programmes or initiatives reviewed needs to ensure coverage of a diversity of

and Central Asia, Europe, Mediterranean, Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean, North America, Oceania, South America, West and Central Africa, West Asia. <u>For the purpose of the evaluation, are there priority themes or regions</u>?	geographies, thematic topics, approaches, IUCN constituent involvement, and of geographic scales of influence (roughly 80% regional, national or sub-national and 20% international policy objectives)." Priority themes or regions have not been set. Suggested Commissions and international policy processes have been suggested, based on evaluability considerations and strategic interest. Any regions may be selected for the regional sample. However, IUCN would like to see coverage of work under all five 2021-24 Programme Areas (People, Land, Water, Oceans and Climate; and as these are broad areas, work started before 2021 can be mapped to them). The proposals will be assessed on providing clear and logical criteria to identify a sample with the required coverage across the themes. Proposals will also be assessed on the suitability of the evaluation team's expertise for the sampling criteria proposed. Allowing bidders to determine the sampling criteria within broad IUCN guidelines allows the bidder to assemble a team with the required skills and languages. It also allows for consideration of team member locations with regards to minimizing travel costs.
4) Please can you clarify the timeframe for expected deliverables; the table in section 9 states 4-6 months data collection and analysis which taking into account the proposal submission of 23rd August as Day 0, and the following indicative completion dates, data collection would begin in approximately January 2024, with all dates shifting thereafter. <u>Please can you confirm / update the timeframes outlined in the table, so we can propose an accurate workplan.</u>	4. Time-frame: Data collection is expected to run from contract signature in early September through January (approximately 5 months). We do not understand why the question calculates that data collection would begin in January. Preliminary findings (which can be in the form of slides / presentation) are expected by end 2023. The time frame for the evaluation still requires a final report by the end of Q1 2024.
5) Do any KPIs / indicators currently exist for policy influencing activities of IUCN? Can these be shared.	5. Policy KPIs: There are no globally implemented policy indicators, but projects have policy relevant indicators. Standard global policy indicators for projects are in development and could be used to assess projects in the evaluation. The evaluators are welcome to suggest additional project (or non-project) indicators. The IUCN Annual Report reports regularly on aspects of IUCN's work, in particular science, knowledge and tools, that contribute influencing policy. These can be found on: <u>Annual reports	IUCN</u>
	6. Evaluability: The RfP states that the inception report will provide the criteria for evaluability. These can be presented in the proposal. IUCN

	6) There are some references to evaluability in the ToRs. Undertaking an evaluability assessment for this would be a significant undertaking, has an evaluability assessment already been undertaken? If so, can this be shared.	has not undertaken formal assessments of evaluability of the work to be assessed, but has suggested Commissions and international policy processes based on evaluability (relevance to policy influence and priorities, availability of documentation, clarity of objectives, established for significant time, etc). The following assistance and resources will be available for identifying the sample: IUCN MEL coordinators will facilitate contact with the regional directors and programme teams; IUCN will provide a list of projects from the last 10 years that will include project title, summary (with outcome titles), duration, size, location and other descriptive data. This list will be pre-filtered to remove those without policy outcomes. On the basis of this list the evaluation team will be able to identify the sample of 40 projects for desk review. The 6 projects for in-depth review should be in the same regions selected for the regional policy influence assessment.
	7) Can we be provided with a sense of what pre-existing M&E data exists across all three mechanisms?	7. Pre-existing M&E data available: M&E data will primarily be found in the suggested data sources listed in the section "Approach to sampling and sampling frame" of the ToR. In addition to those listed for international policy processes, the head of delegation for each policy meeting submits a written report on the achievement towards objectives and uptake of IUCN policy messages. These reports will be made available. The M&E data for projects varies by project and may include project indicators and project evaluations in addition to donor reports.
14	What is the total number of projects from which the 40 projects should be selected?	This will depend on the proposed sampling criteria but will be in the range of a few hundred. The list of project titles will be extracted from IUCN's Project Portal and can be filtered on the sampling criteria proposed by the consultant. IUCN will assist with access to this data.