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PART 1 – INSTRUCTIONS TO PROPOSERS AND PROPOSAL CONDITIONS

1.1. About IUCN
IUCN is a membership Union uniquely composed of both government and civil society organisations. It provides public, private and non-governmental organisations with the knowledge and tools that enable human progress, economic development and nature conservation to take place together.

Headquartered in Switzerland, IUCN Secretariat comprises around 950 staff in more than 50 countries.

Created in 1948, IUCN is now the world’s largest and most diverse environmental network, harnessing the knowledge, resources and reach of more than 1,300 Member organisations and some 10,000 experts. It is a leading provider of conservation data, assessments and analysis. Its broad membership enables IUCN to fill the role of incubator and trusted repository of best practices, tools and international standards.

IUCN provides a neutral space in which diverse stakeholders including governments, NGOs, scientists, businesses, local communities, indigenous peoples organisations and others can work together to forge and implement solutions to environmental challenges and achieve sustainable development.

Working with many partners and supporters, IUCN implements a large and diverse portfolio of conservation projects worldwide. Combining the latest science with the traditional knowledge of local communities, these projects work to reverse habitat loss, restore ecosystems and improve people’s well-being.

www.iucn.org
https://twitter.com/IUCN/

1.2. Summary of the Requirement
IUCN invites you to submit a Proposal for the SCA Grants Portal. The detailed Terms of Reference can be found in Part 2 of this RfP.

1.3. The procurement process
The following key dates apply to this RfP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RfP Issue Date</td>
<td>13 December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RfP Closing Date and Time</td>
<td>24 January 2020 at 10:00 CET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Contract Award Date</td>
<td>14 February 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4. Conditions
IUCN is not bound in any way to enter into any contractual or other arrangement with any Proposer as a result of issuing this RfP. IUCN is under no obligation to accept the lowest priced Proposal or any Proposal. IUCN reserves
the right to terminate the procurement process at any time prior to contract award. By participating in this RfP, Proposers accept the conditions set out in this RfP. Proposers must sign the “Proposer’s Declaration” and include it in their Proposal.

1.5. Queries and questions during the RfP period
Proposers are to direct any queries and questions regarding the RfP to the above IUCN Contact. No other IUCN personnel are to be contacted in relation to this RfP.

Proposers may submit their queries no later than 16th January 2020 at 14:00 CET. As far as possible, IUCN will issue the responses to any questions, suitably anonymised, to all Proposers. If you consider the content of your question confidential, you must state this at the time the question is posed.

1.6. Amendments to RfP documents
IUCN may amend the RfP documents by issuing notices to that effect to all Proposers and may extend the RfP closing date and time if deemed appropriate.

1.7. Proposal lodgement methods and requirements
Proposers must submit their Proposal to IUCN no later than 24 January 2020 at 10:00 CET by email to: camilla.lude@iucn.org. The subject heading of the email shall be [RfP – SCA Grants Portal- [Proposer Name]]. Electronic copies are to be submitted in PDF and native (e.g. MS Word) format. Proposers may submit multiple emails (suitably annotated – e.g. Email 1 of 3) if attached files are deemed too large to suit a single email transmission.

IMPORTANT: Submitted documents must be password-protected so that they cannot be opened and read before the submission deadline. Please use the same password for all submitted documents. After the deadline has passed and no later than 10:00 CET on 24 January 2020, please send the relevant password to the same email address as used for submitting your Proposal. This will ensure a secure bid submission and opening process. Please DO NOT email the password before the deadline for Proposal submission.

Proposals must be prepared in English and in the format stated in Part 3 of this RfP.

1.8. Late and Incomplete Proposals
Any Proposal received by IUCN later than the stipulated RfP closing date and time, and any Proposal that is incomplete, will not be considered. There will be no allowance made by IUCN for any delays in transmission of the Proposal from Proposer to IUCN.

1.9. Withdrawals and Changes to the Proposal
Proposals may be withdrawn or changed at any time prior to the RfP closing date and time by written notice to the IUCN contact. No changes or withdrawals will be accepted after the RfP closing date and time.

1.10. Validity of Proposals
Proposals submitted in response to this RfP are to remain valid for a period of 90 calendar days from the RfP closing date.

1.11. Evaluation of Proposals
The evaluation of Proposals shall be carried out exclusively with regards to the evaluation criteria and their relative weights specified in part 3 of this RfP.
PART 2 – THE REQUIREMENT

IUCN seeks a contractor to implement the two main deliverables contained in this section:

1. Development of the IUCN Species Conservation Action (SCA) Grants Online Portal
2. Maintenance of the SCA Grants Online Portal

1. Development of the SCA Grants Online Portal

The contractor will be required to deliver the portal according to the detailed concept and timeline presented below.

1.1 Introduction

The IUCN SCA Unit consists of the SOS – Save Our Species and the Integrated Tiger Habitat Conservation Programme (Tiger Programme) grant-making mechanisms. Currently SOS and the Tiger Programme utilise different portals for grant application and evaluation, which only offer limited online functionalities. None of the existing portals provides a reporting and monitoring module. As both grant-making facilities are under the same management, it is necessary to converge both facilities into one portal, expand the functionality and make it truly online.

1.2 Objective

The objective is to design a multilingual, user-friendly online portal for grant-making that can be applied by SOS and the Tiger Programme, and which can be easily adapted to be applied by other grant-making programmes in IUCN in the future.

The main functions of the SCA Portal are:

1. to provide potential applicants the documentation and information about the SCA funding opportunities (publically available), and
2. to allow online, transparent, user-friendly processes for grant application, evaluation, reporting and monitoring (available with a user account).

The content of the portal must reflect its main functions, presented in a user-friendly and simple way. Given that many potential applicants who may use it may reside in areas with poor or intermittent internet connectivity, the portal should be built in such a way that its main functions remain available offline.

1.3 Features of the Portal

1.3.1 Content management system (CMS):
A graphical interface that allows administrators to create and manage users, forms and content.

1.3.2 Server and SSL (digital certification):
Proposers should include details on the hosting solutions required by their proposal, as well as a non-binding hosting proposal.

1.3.3. Language:
The Portal must be trilingual English-French-Spanish.

1.3.4. Bandwidth:
The Portal must be accessible from areas with very low internet connection, and retain full functionality.

1.3.5. Branding:
The Portal must follow the IUCN visual identity.

1.4 Description of the SCA Grants Portal

The main functions of the SCA Portal are:

1. to provide the potential applicants the documentation and information about the SCA funding opportunities (publically available), and
2. to allow online, transparent, user-friendly processes for grant application, evaluation, reporting and monitoring (available with a user account).

The work flow is depicted in the diagram below. Steps that should take place on the portal are written in CAPS:
Categories of users

There are four categories of users for the portal:
1) Applicants (who become Grantees if their application is successful)
2) Grantees
3) Reviewers
4) Auditors
5) Administrators (IUCN staff)

There should be a logical separation between applicants, grantees, reviewers, auditors and administrators. There should be user activity logs and each user category should have different access rights in the overall system.

Applicants:
Applicants should be able to:
- Create and edit profiles
- Create applications (respond to the Calls for Proposals and invitation to submit full proposals)
- Upload documents related to their application
- Type text on online forms and save progress in the application development (an autosave function is required to avoid losing work in progress in case of poor internet connectivity)
- Modify their proposals any time prior to the application deadline (Even after submitting them, for example to add missing documents. Only until the application deadline)
- Select relevant indicators from the Monitoring and Evaluation framework, and provide baseline data for the selected indicators. These indicators will later be used by Grantees to report on the impact of their projects
- Submit final application
- Check the status of their application after submission ("draft", "submitted", "in review")
- See the final status of their application ("accepted", "rejected") only after the review period is finished
- Consult feedback provided by the IUCN SCA Unit (Administrators)
- Modify their proposals after the application deadline only if these proposals have been shortlisted following the review process

Applicants become Grantees once a Grant Agreement has been signed. As the signing of a Grant Agreement happens offline, Administrators should be able to change the concerned Applicants into Grantees through a simple click of a button.

Grantees:
- Edit their profile
- Submit technical and financial progress reports through online reporting templates
- Receive automatic reminders concerning reporting deadlines
- Input data into the Monitoring and Evaluation framework based on the indicators selected during the application phase

Reviewers:
- Create and edit their profile
- Receive notifications when proposals are assigned to them for evaluation
- Declare if they have any possible conflict of interest for any of the applications submitted
- Access submitted proposals only after the submission deadline
- “Download all” function to download all the documents related to a proposal they have to evaluate
- Type in their evaluation of the concept note or full proposal in the relevant section of the portal. Written comments on all review topics are mandatory
- Assign a rating from 1 (poor) to 5 (outstanding) for each review topic. Assigning ratings is mandatory for all criteria
- Save progress of each review at any time, in addition to an autosave function
- Submit final review only when all mandatory fields have been filled
- Edit their own reviews prior to a review deadline defined by Administrators
- Reviewers cannot delete or edit any documents submitted by Applicants
- Reviewers can only view their own reviews and do not have access to other reviewers’ inputs in the system

Auditors
Auditors may be involved only under certain Calls for Proposals. They intervene at the global annual expenditure verification stage and at the individual project expenditure verification stage. They check the financial reporting package, make a selection of the supporting documents, assess that after the project has been approved, the grantees follow the approved contract, review supporting documents to be uploaded by the grantees, check financial documents (they can see/ annotate/ comment and download docs). Auditors can have profiles as soon as grants start being implemented.

Administrators:
These will be IUCN staff. However not all IUCN staff administrators will have the same rights. Some administrators will only have rights over certain Calls for Proposals.

- Create and modify profiles (applicant, grantee, reviewer, administrator). Notably, change successful Applicants into Grantees after the signing of Grant Agreements
- Search and view profiles
- Search, filter and view applications only after the submission deadline. May not edit applications in any way.
- Change application status (delete, draft, submitted, in review, accepted, rejected).
- Change IUCN status of applications (Eligibility pending”, “Eligible”, “Not eligible”)
- Assign proposals to reviewers
- Lock reviews after the review deadline
- View reviews
- Edit or delete any documents on the portal
- Provide feedback to Applicants
- Extract reports submitted by grantees
- Run analyses and queries of reports submitted by grantees through the Monitoring and Evaluation framework
- Review and provide comments on reports submitted by grantees
- Validate reports submitted by grantees (limited to specific administrators only)
- Administrators must approve the auditors as users

1.4.2 Content of the SCA Grants Portal

Landing page (publicly available – not an exhaustive list)
The landing page of the Portal should contain:
- information about the ongoing SCA initiatives.
- Advertise, per initiative, when the Calls for Proposals are open.
- An archive of closed Calls for Proposals
- For each of the Calls for Proposals, reference documents should be available for download (Detailed guidelines for applicants, application templates in Word and/or Excel (as reference), grant agreement templates, due diligence questionnaire, ESMS questionnaire, applicant declaration form).
- Users login
- Frequently asked questions.

Grant application process
When applying for a grant the user is met by a dashboard listing the ongoing Initiatives (e.g. SOS Lemurs, SOS African Wildlife). After selecting the Initiative of interest, the user can either apply for a grant, edit a draft of an existing application or view a submitted or closed application (closed application meaning projects that have been fully completed).

In case of applying, the user creates a new request for a grant and starts filling in the online application forms as well as uploading all of the requested information.

- Applicants should be able to fill in the forms offline, save progress and submit online.

- There may be two or more open Calls for Proposals at the same time: Grant applications should be sorted by initiative (i.e. the system should maintain separate lists of applications for each call). There should be restrictions on who can access (view) what is in the system. For example, the programme officer for SOS African Wildlife should not have access to SOS Lemurs applications.

- The system should allow the same organisations to apply under different calls and possibly make multiple submissions per call (SOS allows applicants to be the lead organisation in up to two applications under one call). Organisations already implementing a grant should be able to apply for more grants or make more submissions.

- The online application forms consist of a proposal template, a budget template, the applicant declaration form, and the due diligence form (see annex 1-4).

- The online application templates should be customisable for each call. There may be differences in what is required in the forms but all of these should be captured in the online form/system. Administrators should then be able to activate or deactivate fields in the application form according to their relevance for the call in question, as well as customize selected sections within those fields as required for each call.

- A section in the application template will include a Project Monitoring Plan whereby applicants will need to select indicators from the standard SOS Monitoring and Evaluation framework (see section on M&E).

- There should be room for submitting a limited number of supplementary documents (usually those for the due diligence/partner screening tool) during the application phase.

- The system should allow for programming: for example if a call closes at midnight, it should close and stop accepting applications automatically at the designated time.

- The status of applications should be automatically changed from ‘Draft’ to ‘Submitted’ once the applicant has submitted it; and from ‘Submitted’ to ‘In review’ as soon as the deadline has passed.

- The system should be able to generate a letter to be sent automatically to the applicant confirming successful submission of the proposal. When applications are rejected because they are considered ineligible, the system should generate a letter indicating the status of the proposal and reason for rejection, however, sending this letter to the applicant should not be automated (i.e. Administrators should press a button to send the letter). Administrators should be able to select which eligibility criterion has not been met (multiple selections possible). Reviewers should be able to see the reasons why proposals are considered ineligible. Reviewers can also view ineligible proposals, but cannot submit a review for them.

- Administrators should be able to change the eligibility status of proposals if Reviewers unanimously agree that an error was made during the eligibility check.

**Evaluation process**

Each application will be reviewed by multiple Reviewers (minimum 3). Each Reviewer is asked to review the assigned applications using a scoring form (see annex 5). In the scoring form, Reviewers are asked to assess the project’s conservation value. For each criterion, they are asked i) to score the project from 1 to 5 (1 – Poor, 2 – Fair, 3 – Good, 4 – Very good, 5 – Outstanding) and, ii) to write comments explaining the given scores. To assist the decision making process, it is important that Reviewers address all the questions, and that they provide sufficient written comments. In the same form Reviewers should also provide an overall rating of the proposal (Poor, Fair, Good, Very good, Outstanding) and a recommendation on whether or not to fund the proposal [Yes (no changes); Yes (with small changes); Maybe (with major changes); No].
• Reviewers who sit on the Technical Advisory Group for a specific Call for Proposals must declare if they have any possible conflict of interest for any of the applications submitted under that call. In case of real or perceived conflict of interest, Reviewers should not be able to submit a review form for the application concerned.

• There are 8-10 Reviewers per Call for Proposals. Each proposal will be assigned to minimum 3 of these Reviewers so that each proposal receives 3 reviews. The system should be able to accept the entry and restricted use of external Reviewers (those not on the IUCN domain) and Reviewer comments and scores per proposal are to be confidential (only visible to the secretariat staff/Administrators).

• Reviewers should perform reviews at least for the proposals to which they have been assigned, but they are free to write additional reviews for any other proposals submitted under the same Call for Proposals, provided that they do not have a conflict of interest.

• The system needs to be able to generate an excel document with summaries of all reviews per Call for Proposals, enabling Administrators and relevant Reviewers to see the overall rating of each proposal and the recommendation for funding from each Reviewer (Reviewers remain anonymous to each other, but are known to Administrators).

• There should be an e-mail alert system for users. Each time a user changes anything in the system, an email should be generated and shared to the relevant persons – periodic alerts should be sent to those that have started filling applications reminding them about the deadline for the call. Similar reminders should be sent to reviewers who have started a review but not submitted it.

The application cycle varies for the different grant making programmes. Some have one stage (full proposal) and others two (concept note + full proposal). The portal should be developed with a one-step application process in mind, but should remain flexible enough to easily adapt to a two-step application process if such are adopted in the future.

Workflow
1. Administrator issues a Call for Proposals, and uploads all the documentation to which the system assigns a unique reference number
2. Administrator creates review form (evaluation criteria).
3. Applicant creates an account on the Portal.
4. Applicant creates a Proposal using his/her existing or newly created account. The full application will be automatically included in a list on the portal with a reference number, and information related to the applicant, the region, the country and the project title.
5. Applicant submits Proposal (by completing the relevant technical and financial sections and uploading the necessary additional documents).
6. Applicant receives an automatic e-mail notification from the portal that the full proposal has been submitted, with the indication of the time and date.
7. Administrator screens Proposals for their eligibility and indicates if the proposal is eligible or not.
8. Administrator assigns (at least 3) Reviewers to each proposal
9. Reviewers get individual credential for accessing to the information on the Full Proposals of their assigned applications.
10. Reviewer logs into the site.
11. Reviewers should perform reviews at least for the proposals to which they have been assigned, but they are free to write additional reviews for any other proposals submitted under the same Call for Proposals, provided that they do not have a conflict of interest.
12. Reviewer completes the online relevant review section for each proposal and saves it in the system, mentioning whether or not they recommend the award of a grant to the project and their reasons why.
13. Administrators (secretariat staff) review and after the Advisory Committee meetings, with a final decision made, the status is changed from “under review” to “awarded”, “unsuccessful”, “under negotiation-major changes”, “under negotiation-minor changes”. Applications that require substantial revisions (i.e. the funding recommendation following the Advisory Committee meeting is “Maybe (with major changes)”, the revised application should again be reviewed and discussed by the Advisory Committee to make a final decision.
15. Administrator changes Proposal status. Applicant can now see the status of their submission on the portal.

Reporting
The portal should be able to allow for reporting by the grantees to be done online (see reporting templates in annex 6-13). This will include interim and final technical and financial reports, detailed transaction reports, (all filled in online by the grantee) and site visit reports (filled in by the Secretariat staff). Reporting schedules should be recorded online, and reminders sent to grantees automatically 1 month prior to the deadline, 1 week prior to the deadline, and weekly after the deadline has passed. The status will vary from scheduled, due, submitted, validated.

1. The online report (technical and financial) would have all relevant sections to be filled in online and in terms of reporting, the portal should be able to:
   a. Send notifications to Grantees and Administrators
   b. Have a section for review where comments by Administrators can be made and for validation
   c. Receive attachments from Grantees
   d. Capture details of when the report submission is made (date and time stamp)

2. There should be an email alert system for users (grantee and secretariat staff) to indicate each time there is a change in the system.
3. There should be the possibility to download applications, reports and other documents from the system in word to ease review.
4. Grantees should be able to upload supporting documents in this section.

**Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)**
A common M&E framework should be set up to monitor progress towards a commonly agreed set of indicators. The M&E framework will allow for monitoring progress at the grant-making programme level (e.g. SOS versus Tiger Programme), at the initiative levels (e.g. SOS Lemurs versus SOS African Wildlife) and at the individual grants level.

Currently there are two (similar) M&E systems, one for the Tiger Programme and one for SOS. The two systems consist of a series of tables in Excel and fixed indicators (see annex 14). The Excel tables should be transformed into an online M&E framework for grantees. The system should allow some flexibility to add/remove/change indicators to the framework if requested by donors, if a new initiative requires it, or if gaps are identified by the secretariat or through user feedback.

1. Applicants should be able to select during the application phase, the indicators to which their project will contribute. Grantees during the reporting process should report on progress for those selected indicators (i.e. their reporting templates will incorporate only the indicators selected during the application). The selection of indicators can be changed in consultation with the SOS Secretariat.
2. The progress recorded during reporting will be used to communicate and assess the impact of IUCN’s grant making programmes as a whole and for each of the grant making initiatives individually. Thus, the system needs to allow for interrogation so that information can be obtained at all levels.

**1.4.3 Timeline for delivering the Portal:**
The contractor is expected to start implementing this deliverable immediately after the signature of the contract (expected around February 2020). The Grants Portal must be online, fully functional according to this concept, by June 2020. The detailed steps from the contract signature until the portal publication will be defined and agreed between IUCN and the contractor.

**2. Maintenance of the SCA Grants Online Portal**

After its launch, the portal will need:
- Modifications and improvements that do not modify the core structure of the portal that will be developed.
- Standard maintenance, backup and updates to the server and the CMS environment.

The expectation is for the contractor to respond within 6 hours to any issue regarding security and 24 hours to any client request involving modifications.

The maintenance contract for the Portal will be offered for one year starting with the date of the portal publication and it will be renewed annually at the mutual agreement between IUCN and the contractor.

Further developments needed to the Portal that are not in the scope of the maintenance and require additional effort from the contractor will be mutually agreed and acknowledged accordingly in future maintenance contracts.
PART 3 – THE EVALUATION MODEL

The evaluation of proposals shall be carried out exclusively with regards to the evaluation criteria and their relative weights specified in the table below:

3.1 Technical evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Approach and implementation plan</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Adequacy of technology and systems proposed</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Experience in developing web applications and handling projects of similar scope and size, including demonstrated ability to meet deadlines</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Sufficient, relevant and competent staff</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Positive and relevant references</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Technical Score (A)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each criterion will be scored out of 5 (where 1 – Poor, 2 – Fair, 3 – Good, 4 – Very good, 5 – Outstanding). Any proposals scoring 1 in any Criterion will not be considered further.

Technical proposals meeting the Quality Threshold will have their technical scores normalised by dividing their score by the highest-scoring technical proposal, and converting this value into a percentage to give the Normalised Technical Score. Thus:

\[
\text{highest technical score} = \frac{X}{Y} \times 100\%\\
\text{bid A's normalised technical score} = \left(\frac{Y}{X}\right) \times 100\%
\]

3.2. Financial evaluation

The financial evaluation will be based upon the full fixed and firm price submitted in the Proposal. The price of each Proposal that has met the Quality Threshold for the Technical Score will then be normalised by dividing the lowest bid price value by that bid’s price value, and this value turned into a percentage (Financial Score). Thus:

\[
\text{lowest bid value} = \text{CHF} X\\
\text{bid A's value} = \text{CHF} Y\\
\text{bid A's normalised financial score} = \left(\frac{X}{Y}\right) \times 100\%
\]

3.3. Total Score

The Normalised Technical Score will be multiplied by the Technical Weighting Factor (60%), the Financial Score multiplied by the Financial Weighting Factor (40%) and the two weighted scores added together to provide a Total Score for each bid excluding those that do not meet the Quality Threshold.

The contract will be awarded to the Proposal which has obtained the highest Total Score subject to the Proposal Conditions in Part 1 above and the following caveat:

**IMPORTANT:** In the event that the Proposal achieving the highest Total Score is deemed not affordable, IUCN reserves the right to engage in direct negotiation with the 3 (three) highest-scoring Proposers to identify whether any – and, if so, which – aspects of the Requirement may be excluded in order to reduce the total price to an affordable level. In this case, the terms and criteria of the final selection will be communicated to the three highest-scoring Proposers prior to opening the negotiations.
PART 4 – INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED BY PROPOSERS

By participating in this RfP, Proposers are indicating their acceptance to be bound by the conditions set out in this RfP.

This Part details all the information Proposers are required to provide to IUCN. Submitted information will be used in the evaluation of Proposals. Proposers are discouraged from sending additional information, such as sales brochures, that are not specifically requested.

Each of the following must be submitted as a separate document, and will be evaluated separately.

4.1. Declaration

Please read and sign the Declaration and include this in your proposal.

4.2. Technical information/Service Proposal

Proposers are required to submit the following details in their technical proposal:

1. Website of the Proposer including digital portfolio;
2. A Proposal detailing the Proposer’s approach and implementation plan for the development of the portal including suggested timeframe for testing and debugging for each component as well as a concrete description on how the Proposer will ensure that the portal is ready by June 2020 and what actions it suggests taking in case of delays;
3. Description of proposed technology with justification that highlights its pros & cons with regards to quality and security including your preferred system architecture to support high-level traffic;
4. Details of three relevant examples of past work demonstrating the capacity of the Proposer to produce quality web applications and interactive online systems which are comparable to this project. Please note any differences between the examples and what the Proposer would provide for IUCN;
5. Details on the technical hosting requirements for the final Online Portal.
6. An outline of the team that the Proposer will assign to the project, including the CVs of the staff that will work on the project;
7. Confirmation that the Proposer will have the personnel and other capacity to develop and deliver by the deadline; if the Proposer is based in a different time zone, please add a short paragraph on how you will ensure efficiency in coordinating and delivering services efficiently.
8. References – contact details of 3 referees familiar with the Proposer’s experience relevant to web applications and online system development;
9. A statement that Proposer accepts the terms and conditions of the contract as set forth in the annex 15. If Proposer is unwilling to accept the terms and conditions, the Proposer shall identify those terms and conditions it does not accept, and, if applicable, shall include proposed alternative terms and conditions that would be acceptable to the Proposer; and
10. Additional Services – details of additional, related services that the Proposer considers would enhance the overall effectiveness of the project. Please note that these will not form part of the evaluation of Proposals and will only be used in the final contract negotiations with the selected Proposer.

4.3. Pricing information

Prices include all costs

Proposers are required to submit a fixed and firm price for the total of the core services. Submitted rates and prices are deemed to include all costs, insurances, taxes, fees, expenses, liabilities, obligations, risk and other things necessary for the performance of the Requirement. Any charge not stated in the Proposal as being additional, will not be allowed as a charge against any transaction under any resultant Contract.

For the avoidance of doubt, the fixed and firm price must include the following (if applicable):

- Maintenance for the first year of operation
- Third party services or licenses required to run the Portal
- Travel for face-to-face meetings or training that are considered necessary for the implementation

Applicable Goods and Services Taxes

Proposal rates and prices shall be exclusive of Value Added Tax.

Currency of proposed rates and prices
Unless otherwise indicated, all rates and prices submitted by Proposers shall be in Euro.

**Rates and Prices**
Within the total fixed and firm price, please also provide subtotals for each subset of deliverables, and indicate the daily consultancy/development rates upon which the price offer is based.

**Additional services**
If the Proposer elects to include additional services or items, please provide separate fixed and firm prices for each additional service, including:
- Travel for face-to-face meetings or trainings
- Recommended improvements or additional functionalities not described in this RfP
- Recommended third party services or licenses.
- Hosting proposal costs

**Ongoing maintenance**
The Proposers should include the price for long-term hosting and maintenance of the Portal should IUCN decide to extend the contract.

**Contract**
The contractor will be offered a standard IUCN consultant contract. Amendments to it will only be accepted in exceptional circumstances, at IUCN’s discretion.
PART 5 – PROPOSED CONTRACT

Below is the proposed Contract for the SCA Portal. IUCN reserves the right to amend the proposed Contract prior to signature but, in submitting a Proposal, Proposers acknowledge that this is a standard IUCN contract template and will only be amended at IUCN’s discretion.

See annex 15.
PART 6 – DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this Request for Proposal (RfP) the following definitions apply:

Contract  Means any contract or other legal commitment that results from this Request for Proposals.
Contractor  Means the entity that forms a Contract with IUCN for provision of the Requirement.
Instructions  Means the instructions and conditions set out in Part 1 of this Request for Proposals.
IUCN  Means IUCN, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.
IUCN Contact  Means the person IUCN has nominated to be used exclusively for contact regarding this Request for Proposals and the Contract.
Proposal  Means a written offer submitted in response to this Request for Proposals.
Proposer  Means an entity that submits, or is invited to submit, a Proposal in response to this Request for Proposals.
Requirement  Means the supply to be made by the Contractor to IUCN in accordance with Part 2 of the RfP.
RfP  Request for Proposals
Annexes

Please note that most of these Annexes are indicative only and may be amended at IUCN’s discretion.

Annex 1: Proposal template
Annex 2: Budget template
Annex 3: Applicant declaration form
Annex 4: Due diligence questionnaire
Annex 5: Review form
Annex 6: Interim technical report_template
Annex 7: Interim financial report_template
Annex 8: Reporting Instructions_SOS Interim Reports_verNov2018
Annex 9: Interim ESMS questionnaire
Annex 10: Final technical report_template
Annex 11: Final financial report_template
Annex 13: ESMS questionnaire project closure
Annex 14: M&E framework
Annex 15: Consultancy_agreement_self-employed_template_ola_v3_13oct17_final