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

1.2. Summary of the Requirement

IUCN invites you to submit a Proposal for the External Review of IUCN 2019. 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:

| RfP Issue Date | 10 September 2019 |
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 23 September 2019, 23:59 (11:59pm) CET.

As far as possible, IUCN will issue the responses to any questions, suitably anonymised, to all Proposers. If you consider the content of you 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 30 September 2019 23:59 (11:59pm) CET by email to: eric.martrou@iucn.org. The subject heading of the email shall be [RfP – External Review of IUCN 2019- [Proposer Name]]. Electronic copies are to be submitted in PDF 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 1 October, 11am CET, 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

Background

External Reviews of IUCN have been undertaken every four years since 1991 as a joint exercise of IUCN and its Framework Partners. The External Review is typically undertaken in the year prior to the World Conservation Congress and the final report is presented to the IUCN Members at the Congress.

The Terms of Reference, its scope and objectives, are the direct result of agreements formed during the Annual Meeting of Framework Partners held at IUCN-HQ in February 2019 which included the IUCN Director General and her staff, and representatives of each of the Framework Partners.

Commissioning Authority and Intended Users

The External Review of IUCN 2020 is jointly commissioned by the Director General of IUCN and the Framework Partners as a condition of the framework agreements providing funding to IUCN.

The framework partners intend to use the results of the External Review to inform discussions internally in their agencies on the future support to IUCN. The Director General of IUCN will use the results of the External Review to continue the organizational development process at IUCN and inform the implementation of the IUCN Programme 2021-2024.

Oversight and Management of the External Review

Oversight of the External Review is provided by a Steering Committee comprised of two members of the IUCN Secretariat appointed by the Director General, and two members of the Framework Partners, nominated by the group.

The Steering Committee’s role is to provide oversight and approvals at each stage in the External Review process, including approval of these Terms of Reference, the recruitment of the review team, the inception note and the draft and final reports. The Steering Committee will be updated by the External Review Team via conference call and/or email once every six to eight weeks to ensure that the Steering Committee is well informed on the process of conducting the External Review.

On a day-to-day basis, the External Review is managed by the Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, who manage the independent evaluation function on behalf of IUCN.

Objectives of the External Review

The objective of the review is to evaluate the overall performance of the IUCN Programme 2017-2020 to ensure the accountability of IUCN towards IUCN Members, donors and other stakeholders, and to provide lessons learnt that will generate actionable recommendations for the effective implementation of the Programme 2021-2024.

The IUCN Programme 2017-2020 will be assessed according to the OECD/DAC criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability, and the cross cutting themes of gender responsiveness and social inclusion. The IUCN Programme scope for the purpose of this review covers delivery by both the IUCN Secretariat and the IUCN Commissions.

The Terms of Reference are supported by a review matrix of questions under each criterion and approved by the ER Steering Committee (see annex 1).

Methodology

The methodology will include a combination of the following:

1. The Consultant will conduct a portfolio analysis of the Programme in accordance with the evaluation criteria;
2. The Consultant will review the annual reports 2017, 2018 and 2019 and the annual work plans 2017 to 2020.

3. The Consultant will conduct online surveys, semi-structured interviews, focus groups and dialogues with key IUCN stakeholders, including beneficiaries of IUCN programmes and projects, Secretariat staff, the Programme and Policy Committee of Council, Members, partners and donors; interviews with IUCN members must be conducted at least in the 3 official languages (French, Spanish, English);

4. The Consultant will conduct in-person interviews with IUCN Secretariat staff in Gland;

5. The Consultant will conduct field visits to three (3) regional offices followed by three (3) countries in that region where IUCN operates;

6. The review will have access to all relevant documentation, in particular project documentation (proposals, plans, technical reports, monitoring data, donor reports, etc.), programme documentation (IUCN programmes, components programme documents, progress and assessment reports, monitoring reports, Technical documents, etc.), the evaluation database, and relevant presentations and strategies.

The Swiss Development Corporation mandated an External Review of IUCN’s Development Relevancy. The Consultant will collaborate closely with the SDC External Review by sharing findings of the country case studies. The Consultant will integrate the findings from the SDC External Review to complement the information obtained from primary sources including the country case studies to be reviewed as part of the SDC External Review. The SDC external review final report will be available in February 2020. The SDC-led review will cover the following questions:

- How does IUCN contribute in a systemic way to sustainable development in its three dimensions: environmental, social and economic development?
- How does IUCN approach and operationalize the equitable and just governance of natural resources as a development prerequisite?
- What is IUCN’s contribution to inter-national and national policy coherence for sustainable development?
- What is IUCN’s value added in the international cooperation architecture for sustainable development?

The scope of the IUCN External Review will primarily cover the period from 1 January 2016 until 31 December 2018, but in some cases (e.g. long standing policy engagements); it may be useful to include evidence from before 2015.

This review is expected to meet the principles in the IUCN Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, see in particular section 6.3 Monitoring and evaluation principles and note that section 6.2 Evaluation criteria does not necessarily apply to this review.

The budget for this Review using the above methods is set at 150,000 CHF including travel costs.

**Qualifications of the Review Team**

The profile of the Review team members will be senior professionals with specific expertise in the field of conservation and sustainable development at global and regional levels.

Specific attributes required of the Review team include:

- Documented experience undertaking corporate, program and portfolio-level evaluations, reviews, assessments and consulting assignments for international organizations;
- Demonstrated experience in conservation and natural resource management, governance and policy;
• Proven ability to integrate gender equality and women’s empowerment, and the inclusion of indigenous people;
• Considerable familiarity with international organizations;
• Experience in assessing implementing agencies (e.g. of GEF, GCF) and/or grant making agencies;
• Ability to work in all three official languages of IUCN (English, French, Spanish).

The review leader is responsible for the management and conduct of the Review as well as for the submission of the Final External Review report. Review team members, for the quality and credibility of the review process, including the design of the methodology and tools, data collection, analysis and reporting.

Outputs

The consultancy will include the following outputs:

• **An inception note**, which interprets the TOR, and describes the approach and methodology of the review, the analysis frameworks, case selection, table of contents of the study report, etc., the detailed work plan consisting of no more than 20 pages;
• **A draft and final review report**, with background information in annexes, providing an overview of the findings in accordance with the scope of work. The main review report shall not exceed 60 pages exclusive of annexes;
• **A presentation with supporting PowerPoint** of the draft and final report to the IUCN Framework Partners convened by IUCN.

Timeline and Deliverables

The timeline and deliverables are proposed as follows, noting that adjustments may be necessary due to currently unforeseen circumstances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Expected due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception</td>
<td>Inception Note</td>
<td>15 November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>10 April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report presentation to the Framework Donor meeting</td>
<td>PPT presentation</td>
<td>TBD (April 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>25 April 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 3 – THE EVALUATION MODEL

The evaluation process is as follows:
Technical criteria and financial proposal will be given a score from 1 to 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical criteria</th>
<th>Points available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of the proposal, including technical merit, approach to the objectives, approach to sampling, methods proposed</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quality of the review team, including composition of the team, profile, qualifications and estimated time input of each proposed team member, extent of qualifications in organizational reviews, extent of qualifications in evaluating conservation interventions at practical and policy levels</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quality of the review work plan, including level of effort, proposed missions, clarity on per unit time investments per data collection tool (e.g. per interview)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality of the writing sample, including degree to which the writing sample demonstrates strong evaluation practice</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual technical criteria' scores will be weighted as indicated by the percentages in brackets below. A total score will be awarded composed of Technical criteria score (60%) and Financial (40%).

Selection of the External Review Team

The final selection of the successful Bidder will be made based on the above criteria for selection by the External Review Steering Committee, comprised of two representatives from IUCN and two from the framework donors. All parties will be notified one way or the other by mid October 2019.
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:

I. Project Methodology – describing in adequate detail how the Consultant intends to undertake the project delivery, justifying the approach described (maximum of 4 pages);
II. Project Team – identifying Team Leader and supporting experts;
III. CVs of all project Team Members (maximum 2 pages per CV);
IV. Activity Work Plan – using weekly/monthly intervals for the activities and tasks identified in the Project Methodology;
V. Staffing Work Schedule – identifying weeks of input of staff identified in the Project Team, for the activities identified in the Work Plan in the weeks/months they are estimated to occur;
VI. Evidence of similar projects undertaken within the last 5 years – where this experience is provided by sub-consultants this needs to be clearly identified as such;
VII. References – contact details of three referees familiar with the proposer’s experience relevant to the External Review.

4.3. Pricing information
This clause sets out the information necessary for Proposers to furnish rates and prices as consideration for delivering the Requirement under any resultant Contract.

Prices include all costs

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.

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 Swiss Francs.

Rates and Prices
Proposers are required to submit a fixed and firm price for the total of the services. Within this total, please also provide subtotals for each subset of deliverables/activities.
**PART 5 – DEFINITIONS**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Means any contract or other legal commitment that results from this Request for Proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Means the entity that forms a Contract with IUCN for provision of the Requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions</td>
<td>Means the instructions and conditions set out in Part 1 of this Request for Proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>Means IUCN, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN Contact</td>
<td>Means the person IUCN has nominated to be used exclusively for contact regarding this Request for Proposals and the Contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Means a written offer submitted in response to this Request for Proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposer</td>
<td>Means an entity that submits, or is invited to submit, a Proposal in response to this Request for Proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>Means the supply to be made by the Contractor to IUCN in accordance with Part 2 of the RfP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RfP</td>
<td>Request for Proposals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 1 – External Review of IUCN – Review Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Review Questions</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relevance  | To what extent has the Programme been relevant to the needs of conservation and the equitable management of natural resources globally? Are the interventions appropriate to the resources available? To what extent does IUCN programming adapt to change?  
Are IUCN Secretariat business lines and offerings adapted to the objectives of the Programme and to the needs of target beneficiaries?  
To what extent have Secretariat programs and projects been relevant to and aligned with the Programme, and the global, regional and country context, national and international policy?  
Have potential synergies between programs and projects been optimized? Have potential synergies between IUCN and other agencies/governments/local agencies as implementing or executing partners or co-financiers etc. been optimally exploited? | 1. Alignment between context/needs, Programme and program/projects  
2. Alignment between regional and global programmes  
3. Pipeline development process  
4. Relative positioning between programs/projects  
5. Relative positioning between IUCN and other agencies | 1. Documentary review of Programme, unit and project documents  
2. In-depth interviews with Secretariat staff and partners  
3. Review of Evaluation reports  
4. 3 country case studies |
| Efficiency  | To what extent are programs and projects efficiently implemented and managed?  
To what extent have resources been well used in achieving Programme results?  
To what extent has the Programme succeeded in raising financial resources commensurate with its objectives?  
To what extent were IUCN Secretariat resources and capacities appropriate to manage the IUCN program and project portfolio effectively? How well does IUCN perform its delivery models? How efficient and mature is IUCN in its implementing and grantmaking agency delivery model?  
To what extent has risk been well managed? To what extent can IUCN manage indirect exposure to risk in its role as implementing or grantmaking agency? | 1. Portfolio and financial analysis  
2. Risk management maturity  
3. Communication effectiveness  
4. Partnership effectiveness  
5. Project efficiency rating  
6. Implementation and work quality closure rating | 1. Review of corporate programmatic and financial reports  
2. Review of evaluation reports  
3. In-depth interviews with Secretariat staff and partners  
4. Project portfolio review  
5. Review of policies and procedures |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were the intended outcomes of the Programme achieved?  How effective is IUCN in promoting policy change at the national, regional and global levels?  To what extent has the Programme provided value for money? To what extent has the One Programme Approach added value to Programme results?  To what extent do IUCN’s delivery models have the ability to promote change at scale and systemic change?</td>
<td>1. Impact rating 2. Impact measurement adequacy 3. Knowledge gaps</td>
<td>1. Review of impact studies and evaluation reports 2. Meta-analysis of impact literature 3. Country case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>What long term changes for nature and people have occurred as a result of the Programme? How can IUCN define and enhance its impact? To what extent can long term changes be linked to the outcomes of the IUCN Programme?  To what extent do different delivery models of IUCN achieve impact at scale?  Does have IUCN have the systems to measure intended, expected and actual impacts of its work? How can IUCN best formulate what it aims to achieve?</td>
<td>1. Soundness of theory of change and exit strategy 2. Partnership risk level 3. Financing mobilization 4. Ability to enhance long term financial sustainability</td>
<td>1. Documentary review of Programme, unit and project documents, including exit strategy 2. In-depth interviews with Secretariat staff and partners 3. Financing risk assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>What is the explicit or implicit theory of sustainability underlying the Programme? Are Programme results/benefits likely to be resilient to risk and sustained?  To what extent has the Programme established/enhanced institutional and human resource capacity, processes and systems in the Union and among stakeholders that are likely to be sustained?  Is IUCN able to mobilize financing for conservation outcomes and support their financial sustainability after project exit?</td>
<td>1. Project gender marker 2. Inclusiveness in planning and execution of policy influencing</td>
<td>1. Review of corporate programmatic reports 2. Review of evaluation reports 3. In-depth interviews with Secretariat staff and partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender responsiveness and Social Inclusion</td>
<td>To what extent is IUCN programming gender-responsive?  To what extent is IUCN mainstreaming gender equality and the inclusion of indigenous people in policy influencing?</td>
<td>1. Inclusiveness in planning and execution of policy influencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>3. Ability of partnerships to promote inclusion</td>
<td>4. Project portfolio review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do different IUCN Secretariat delivery models enhance gender equality and the inclusion of indigenous people in conservation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review of policies and procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>