

## Request for Proposals

**Title: Consultant to Conduct Independent Interim Evaluation for CI GCF Project FP026 in Madagascar**

**RFP No: 2021-CI-GCF-01**

**Date of Issuance:** August 16, 2021

---

- 1. Background** Conservation International (CI), the Contracting entity, is soliciting offers from bidders to submit their full proposals to carry out this Independent Interim Evaluation (IIE) of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) Funded Activity FP026, *Sustainable Landscapes in Eastern Madagascar* (the "Project"). The Project's Executing Entity is CI Madagascar. The Project, which began implementation in 2018, aims to sustainably improve the resiliency of climate-vulnerable smallholder farmer families, reduce greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation, and create opportunities for climate investments in Madagascar. More information on the Project can be found at <https://www.conservation.org/gcf/projects/sustainable-landscapes-eastern-madagascar>.

All GCF-funded projects are required to complete an Independent Interim Evaluation (IIE). This is designed to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of a project by assessing its design, implementation, and achievement of objectives. The evaluation is expected to promote accountability and transparency and facilitate synthesis of lessons learned and recommendations for improved future performance.

**Project Overview** The selected offeror will assess the implementation of the Project in an inclusive and participatory manner, consistent with CI, GCF, and international standards and will produce an Independent Interim Evaluation to be submitted to the GCF, as described in Attachment 2. Evaluation will be made against CI's grant agreement (FAA) with the GCF, the project theory of change, project indicators / logical framework, and other elements described in Attachment 2.

- 2. Scope of Work, Deliverables, and Deliverables Schedule** See Attachment 2.

- 3. Submission Details**

- **Deadline.** Proposals must be received no later than **5:00 PM EDT (UTC-04:00)** on **September 13, 2021**. Late submissions will not be accepted. Proposals must be submitted via email to [ciprocurement@conservation.org](mailto:ciprocurement@conservation.org) and reference the RFP number in the subject line. All proposals are to be submitted following the guidelines listed in this RFP.
- **Validity of bid.** 120 days from the submission deadline
- **Clarifications.** Questions may be submitted to [ciprocurement@conservation.org](mailto:ciprocurement@conservation.org) by the specified date and time in the timeline below. The subject of the email must contain the RFP number and title of the RFP. CI will respond in writing to submitted clarifications by the date specified in the timeline below. Responses to questions that may be of common interest to all bidders will be posted to the CI website and/or communicated via email.
- **Amendments.** If at any time prior to the deadline for submission of proposals, CI may, for any reason, modify the RFP documents by amendment which will be posted to the CI website and/or communicated via email.

- 4. Minimum Requirements**

- a. Required:

- Advanced university degree in economic, public administration, political science, natural resources management, development or other relevant discipline
  - 10 years experience with international development assistance in relevant fields
  - Experience in developing countries on environment and natural resources management, climate change adaptation/mitigation, economic or public management support projects
  - Extensive experience in applying evaluation techniques and conducting evaluations of publicly funded projects focused on climate change
  - Substantive knowledge of GCF mandate, objectives, policies and frameworks
  - Qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis skills
  - Process management skills such as facilitation and ability to negotiate with a wide range of stakeholders
  - Fluency in English and French (written and spoken)
  - Ability to travel to Madagascar, including to remote project sites, to conduct the evaluation. Due to COVID-19 concerns virtual consultations are possible and expected where in-person field work is not possible. To promote local staffing, bidders that have an established presence in the country(ies) where the evaluation will take place will be given preference. This is reflected in the Evaluation Criteria included in Section 7.
- b. Preferred:
- Experience in Madagascar
  - Prior experience with GCF evaluations

#### 5. Proposal Documents to Include

- Signed cover page on bidder's letterhead with the bidder's contact information as well as a brief description on why the bidder considers itself the most suitable for the assignment
- Signed Representation of Transparency, Integrity, Environmental and Social Responsibility (Attachment 1)
- Technical Proposal. (Maximum of 10 pages. [CVs will not count against the page limit]) The Technical Proposal should describe in detail how the Offeror intends to carry out the requirements described in Attachment 2.
  - i. Corporate Capabilities, Experience, Past Performance, and 3 client references. Please include descriptions of similar projects or assignments and at least three client references. If available, you may also provide samples/links to previous evaluations conducted.
  - ii. Qualifications of Key Personnel. Please attach CVs that demonstrate how the team proposed meets the minimum requirements listed in section 5 (Minimum Requirements). The CVs should indicate past experience from similar projects and specifying the relevant assignment period.
  - iii. Technical Approach, Methodology and Detailed Work Plan. The Technical Proposal should describe in detail how the bidder intends to carry out the requirements described in the Scope of Work (Attachment 2). This should consist of a Methodology outline on how the candidate would conduct the work including a work plan and approach to delivering the required outputs within the assignment period.
- Financial Proposal. Offerors shall use the cost proposal template (Attachment 3).

#### 6. Evaluation Criteria

In evaluating proposals, CI will seek the best value for money considering the merits of the technical and costs proposals. Proposals will be evaluated using the following criteria:

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>Score (out of 100)</b>
Is the proposed approach and methodology appropriate to the assignment and practical in the prevailing project circumstances?	15
Is the presentation clear and is the sequence of activities and the planning logical, realistic and promise efficient implementation to the project?	15
Does the bidder's past performance demonstrate recent proven experience doing work relevant to the assignment?	10
Does the bidder and the proposed personnel have the specific technical expertise for the assignment?	20
Does the bidder and the proposed personnel have experience conducting GCF and/or GEF evaluations?	15
Does the bidder have an established presence in the country (directly or through a subcontractor) where the evaluation will take place?	10
Cost: Costs proposed are reasonable and realistic, reflect a solid understanding of the assignment, and are the lowest cost.	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

One of the key facets of the Evaluation Criteria is the Personnel Qualifications for those carrying out the evaluation. Changes in key personnel under the contract must be pre-approved by CI in writing, to ensure that the substitute personnel have similar experience and qualifications.

## 7. Proposal Timeline

RFP Issued	16 August 2021
Clarification questions submitted to CI	30 August 2021
Clarifications provided to known bidders	6 September 2021
Complete proposals due to CI	13 September 2021
Final selection	27 September 2021

- 8. Resulting Award** CI anticipates entering into a Firm Fixed Price Contract with the selected bidder by October 5. Any resulting agreement will be subject to the terms and conditions of CI's Services Agreement. A model form of agreement can be provided upon request. A Firm Fixed Price Contract provides for a price that is not subject to any adjustment on the basis of the contractor's cost experience in performing the contract.

This RFP does not obligate CI to execute a contract, nor does it commit CI to pay any costs incurred in the preparation or submission of the proposals. Furthermore, CI reserves the right to reject any and all offers, if such action is considered to be in the best interest of CI. CI will, in its sole discretion, select the winning proposal and is not obligated to share individual evaluation results. CI reserve the right to split the award (s) among the highest ranked offerors, if such action is considered to be in the best interest of CI.

- 9. Confidentiality** All proprietary information provided by the bidder shall be treated as confidential and will not be shared with potential or actual applicants during the solicitation process. This includes but is not limited to price quotations, cost proposals and technical proposals. CI may, but is

not obliged to, post procurement awards on its public website after the solicitation process has concluded, and the contract has been awarded. CI's evaluation results are confidential and applicant scoring will not be shared among bidders.

**10. Code of Ethics** All Offerors are expected to exercise the highest standards of conduct in preparing, submitting and if selected, eventually carrying out the specified work in accordance with CI's Code of Ethics (<https://www.conservation.org/about/our-policies/code-of-ethics>) and the GCF Policy on Prohibited Practices (<https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/policy-prohibited-practices>). Conservation International's reputation derives from our commitment to our values: Integrity, Respect, Courage, Optimism, Passion and Teamwork. CI's Code of Ethics (the "Code") provides guidance to CI employees, service providers, experts, interns, and volunteers in living CI's core values, and outlines minimum standards for ethical conduct which all parties must adhere to. Any violation of the Code of Ethics or GCF Prohibited Practices, as well as concerns regarding the integrity of the procurement process and documents, should be reported to CI via its Ethics Hotline at [www.ci.ethicspoint.com](http://www.ci.ethicspoint.com).

**11. COVID-19.** Service Provider shall adhere to all applicable international, national or local regulations and advisories governing travel, including safety, health and security measures in effect throughout the Period of Performance. It is expected that CI and the Offeror will take into consideration and plan around the international, national or local regulations and advisories governing travel, including safety, health and security measures in effect in the country(ies) that the consultant(s) is expected to visit. Virtual consultations are possible and expected where in-person field work is not possible.

**12. Attachments:**

Attachment 1: Representation of Transparency, Integrity, Environmental and Social Responsibility

Attachment 2: Scope of Work

Attachment 3: Cost Proposal Template

Attachment 4: Brief Overview of Project Being Evaluated

## Attachment 1: Representation of Transparency, Integrity, Environmental and Social Responsibility

RFP No. 2021-CI-GCF-01

All Offerors are expected to exercise the highest standards of conduct in preparing, submitting and if selected, eventually carrying out the specified work in accordance with CI's Code of Ethics. CI's Code of Ethics provides guidance to CI employees, service providers, experts, interns, and volunteers in living CI's core values, and outlines minimum standards for ethical conduct which all parties must adhere to. Any violations of the Code of Ethics should be reported to CI via its Ethics Hotline at [www.ci.ethicspoint.com](http://www.ci.ethicspoint.com).

CI relies on the personal integrity, good judgment and common sense of all third parties acting on behalf, or providing services to the organization, to deal with issues not expressly addressed by the Code or as noted below.

**I. With respect to CI's Code of Ethics, we certify:**

- a. We understand and accept that CI, its contractual partners, grantees and other parties with whom we work are expected to commit to the highest standards of Transparency, Fairness, and Integrity in procurement.

**II. With respect to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) Policy on Prohibited Practices, we certify:**

- a. We understand and accept that CI, its contractual partners, grantees and other parties with whom we work are expected to comply with the [GCF's Policy on Prohibited Practices](#),

**III. With respect to social and environmental standards, we certify:**

- a. We are committed to high standards of ethics and integrity and compliance with all applicable laws across our operations, including prohibition of actions that facilitate trafficking in persons, child labor, forced labor, sexual abuse, exploitation or harassment. We respect internationally proclaimed human rights and take no action that contributes to the infringement of human rights. We protect those who are most vulnerable to infringements of their rights and the ecosystems that sustain them.
- b. We fully respect and enforce the environmental and social standards recognized by the international community, including the fundamental conventions of International Labour Organization (ILO) and international conventions for the protection of the environment, in line with the laws and regulations applicable to the country where the contract is to be performed.

**IV. With respect to our eligibility and professional conduct, we certify:**

- a. We are not and none of our affiliates [members, employees, contractors, subcontractors, and consultants] are in a state of bankruptcy, liquidation, legal settlement, termination of activity, or guilty of grave professional misconduct as determined by a regulatory body responsible for licensing and/or regulating the offeror's business

- b.** We have not and will not engage in criminal or fraudulent acts. By a final judgment, we were not convicted in the last five years for offenses such as fraud or corruption, money laundering or professional misconduct.
- c.** We are/were not involved in writing or recommending the scope of work for this solicitation document.
- d.** We have not engaged in any collusion or price fixing with other offerors.
- e.** We have not made promises, offers, or grants, directly or indirectly to any CI employees involved in this procurement, or to any government official in relation to the contract to be performed, with the intention of unduly influencing a decision or receiving an improper advantage.
- f.** We have taken no action nor will we take any action to limit or restrict access of other companies, organizations or individuals to participate in the competitive bidding process launched by CI.
- g.** We have fulfilled our obligations relating to the payment of social security contributions or taxes in accordance with the legal provisions of the country where the contract is to be performed.
- h.** We have not provided, and will take all reasonable steps to ensure that we do not and will not knowingly provide, material support or resources to any individual or entity that commits, attempts to commit, advocates, facilitates, or participates in terrorist acts, or has committed, attempted to commit, facilitate, or participated in terrorist acts, and we are compliant with all applicable Counter-Terrorist Financing and Anti-Money Laundering laws (including USA Patriot Act and U.S. Executive Order 13224).
- i.** We certify that neither we nor our directors, officers, key employees or beneficial owners are included in any list of financial or economic sanctions, debarment or suspension adopted by the United States, United Nations, the European Union, the World Bank, or General Services Administration's List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement or Non-procurement programs in accordance with E.O.s 12549 and 12689, "Debarment and Suspension".

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment 2: Scope of Work

### 1. Objectives and Purpose of the Evaluation

In assessing implementation of the GCF Project and its alignment with CI's obligations via its Funded Activity Agreement (FAA), the Interim evaluation will take into consideration assessment of the project in line the following evaluation criteria from the GCF IEU [TOR](#) (GCF/B.06/06) and draft GCF Evaluation Policy along with guidance provided by the [OECD DAC](#);

1. Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of projects and programmes;
2. Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities;
3. Gender equity;
4. Country ownership of projects and programmes;
5. Innovativeness in results areas (extent to which interventions may lead to paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate resilient development pathways);
6. Replication and scalability – the extent to which the activities can be scaled up in other locations within the country or replicated in other countries (this criterion, which is considered in document GCF/B.05/03 in the context of measuring performance could also be incorporate d in independent evaluations);
7. Monitoring & Evaluation Systems; and
8. Unexpected results, both positive and negative.

### 2. Scope and Focus of the Evaluation

#### I. Scope of Work

In assessing the Project and its alignment to the broader FAA, the Interim evaluation will take into consideration the following criteria. Overall, the questions are aligned with the GCF and AE/OECD DAC evaluation criteria and are provided as a general framework for the evaluation of the project in implementation, its progress, overall management, credibility of results/reporting and achievement of results and/or contributions towards expected results, inclusive of behavioral changes necessary to achieve the expected results.

1. Based on an approved work plan, the evaluator will conduct a desk review of project documents including the project Funding Proposal, plans related to the Environmental and Social Safeguards [including Gender and Stakeholder Engagement], Work plans, Budgets, M&E Plans, Quarterly Reports, APRs, documents with project results including GHG emissions reduction calculations, beneficiary calculations, and policies and guidelines used by the Executing Entity.
2. The evaluator will host a workshop (in person/virtual) with the Executing Entity and Accredited Entity to clarify understanding of the objectives and methods of the Evaluation.
3. The conclusion of the workshop will be summarized in an Interim Evaluation Workshop Report with the following information:
  - a. Identification of the subject of the review, and relevant context
  - b. Purpose of the evaluation: why is the evaluation being conducted at this time, who needs the information and why?
  - c. Objectives of the evaluation: What the evaluation aims to achieve (e.g. assessment of the results of the project, etc.)
  - d. Scope: What aspects of the project will be covered, and not covered, by the evaluation

- e. Identification and description of the evaluation criteria (including relevance, effectiveness, results, efficiency, and sustainability)
  - f. Key evaluation questions
  - g. Methodology including approach for data collection and analysis, and stakeholder engagement
  - h. Rationale for selection of the methods, and selection of data sources (i.e. sites to be visited, stakeholders to be interviewed)
  - i. System for data management and maintenance of records
  - j. Intended products and reporting procedures
  - k. Potential limitations of the evaluation
4. The evaluator will undertake the evaluation of the project, including any interviews and in- country site visits.
  5. Based on the document review and the in-country interviews/site visits, the evaluator will prepare a draft evaluation report following the outline in Annex 1. The report will be shared with the Executing Entity and the Accredited Entity (CI-GCF Agency). Each party can provide a management response, documenting questions or comments on the draft evaluation report.
  6. The evaluator will incorporate comments and will prepare the final evaluation report. The evaluator will submit a final evaluation report in word and PDF and will include a separate document highlighting where/how comments were incorporated.

#### II. Guidelines for the Evaluator(s):

- Evaluators will be independent from project design, approval, implementation and execution. Evaluators will familiarize themselves with the GCF programs and strategies, and with relevant GCF policies such as those on project cycle, M&E, co-financing, fiduciary standards, gender, and environmental and social safeguards.
- Evaluators will take perspectives of all relevant stakeholders (including the GCF National Designated Authority) into account. They will gather information on project performance and results from multiple sources including the project M&E system, tracking tools, field visits, stakeholder interviews, project documents, and other independent sources, to facilitate triangulation. They will seek the necessary contextual information to assess the significance and relevance of observed performance and results.
- Evaluators will be impartial and will present a balanced account consistent with evidence.
- Evaluators will apply the rating scales provided in these guidelines in Annex 2.

### 3. Methodology

The Interim Evaluation should be aligned with the principles established in [GCF's \(draft\) Evaluation Policy](#) and pending GCF guidance on conflicts of interest in evaluation, [UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluations](#), that include but are not limited to: impartiality, objectivity, unbiased, independent; relevance, utility; credibility; measurability; transparency, ethics, and partnerships.

The Interim Evaluation should seek to the extent possible to be inclusive and participatory, involving principal stakeholders and beneficiaries in the analysis. During the Interim evaluation, the consultant is expected to apply the following approaches for data collection, analysis and triangulation of evidence for validation.

- Desk review of relevant documents including baseline studies, progress reports and any records of surveys conducted during the Project, stakeholder maps, etc.;



- Survey/Questionnaires, Focus Groups or Key informative interviews with relevant stakeholders, beneficiaries, EE’s, possibly national and or local Governments, and where relevant other development partners;
- Data collection as needed (government data/records, field observation visits; CDM verifications, public expenditure reporting, GIS data, etc.) to validate evidence of results and assessments (including but not limited to: assessment of TOC, activities delivery, and results/changes occurred)

During the implementation of the contract, the Evaluator will report to General Council Office (GCO), who will provide guidance and ensure satisfactory completion of Interim/Final Evaluation deliverables. There will be coordination with the project team who will assist in connecting the Evaluator with senior management, government and development partners, beneficiaries and other relevant key stakeholders. In addition, the project team will provide key project documentation prior to fieldwork, and assist in developing a detailed programme to facilitate consultations as necessary.

#### 4. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

The consultant is expected to deliver the following outputs (in English):

- Key informant questionnaire
- Inception report on proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and structure of the report
- A draft preliminary evaluation report and presentation, to be presented at a debriefing meeting with the CI-GCF Agency and EE project teams
- Final report, including a 2–3-page executive summary, a set of limited and strategic recommendations (not to exceed 10 recommendations total), and response addressing issues raised during presentation of draft.

**Table 1: Deliverables, Timeline, and Proposed Payment Schedule (Consultant Services, travel budget separate)**

Number	Activity	Deliverable	Timeline	Proposed Payment Schedule (Consulting Services)
1	Introductory Call	Introductory call to introduce team members and review evaluation timeline and deliverables	Within one week of signing the service agreement	[Insert Cost US\$]
2	Desk review of all relevant project documents and develop key informant questionnaire	Key Informant Questionnaire	2 weeks of the introductory call	[Insert Cost US\$]
3	Host an Evaluation Inception workshop (in person/virtual) with the Executing Entity	Interim Evaluation Workshop Report	1 week after the completion of deliverable 2	[Insert Cost US\$]

<b>4</b>	Evaluation of the project via interviews and site visits	Presentation of the initial findings to the Executing Entity and CI-GCF Agency. Draft evaluation report based on outline in Annex 1	1 month after completion of deliverable 3	[Insert Cost US\$]
<b>5</b>	Draft Final Report	Interim Evaluation Final Report (Draft)	1 week after the completion of deliverable 4	[Insert Cost US\$]
<b>6</b>	Revise report incorporating comments from CI	Final Interim Evaluation Report (word and PDF), including document showing how comments/questions were incorporated	2-3 weeks after the completion of deliverable 5	[Insert Cost US\$]

\*Dates will be defined before signing out the service agreement

<b>Travel Budget</b>	
<b>Maximum Allotted Travel Reimbursable Expenses (Reimbursement will be based on actual costs)</b>	[Insert Cost US\$]

## 5. Expected Timeline

The detailed schedule of the evaluation and length of the assignment will be discussed with the Evaluator prior to the assignment. The estimated duration of the Consultants' assignment is **3 calendar months**, with the number of working days to be proposed by the offeror in its proposal.

## ANNEX 1: GCF EVALUATION CRITERIA OUTLINE

The Project Interim Evaluation Report should be in English and include the following structure:

- 2-3 page Executive Summary;
- Introduction (including context, scope, methodology);
- Key Strategic Findings and Conclusions: Where relevant and possible, specifically outline role, impact and issues in project assistance/implementation;
- Strategic Recommendations (corrective actions for on-going or future work and where relevant if major changes are considered necessary to ensure delivery of expected results as per the FAA with the GCF); shall not exceed 10 recommendations total
- Summary review matrix/project RMF and achievement by objectives and outputs (triangulated with evidence and data);
- Annexes (mission reports, list of interviewees, list of documents reviewed, data sources used, etc.)

### ***GCF Evaluation Criteria Outline***

1. Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of projects and programmes – aligned with OECD DAC Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency criteria; seeks to assess the appropriateness in terms of

- selection, implementation and achievement of FAA detailed logframe activities and expected results (outputs, outcomes and impacts);
2. Coherence in climate finance delivery with other multilateral entities – looks at how GCF financing is additional and able to amplify other investments or de-risk and crowd-in further climate investment;
  3. Gender equity – ensures integration of understanding on how the impacts of climate change are differentiated by gender, the ways that behavioral changes and gender can play in delivering paradigm shift, and the role that women play in responding to climate change challenges both as agents but also for accountability and decision-making;
  4. Country ownership of projects and programmes – including concepts of OECD DAC Sustainability criteria; examines the extent of the emphasis on sustainability post project through country ownership; on ensuring the responsiveness of the GCF investment to country needs and priorities including through the roles that countries play in projects and programmes; and
  5. Innovativeness in results areas – focuses on identification of innovations (proof of concept, multiplication effects, new models of finance, technologies, etc.) and how changes that bring about paradigm shift can contribute or be attributed to GCF investment;
  6. Replication and scalability – including concepts of the OECD DAC Sustainability criteria; assesses the extent to which the activities can be sustained post project implementation and scaled up in other locations within the country or replicated in other countries and identification what are the explicit conditions/success factors that enable the replication or scalability;
  7. Monitoring & Evaluation Systems - include an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the project M&E plan and its implementation; and
  8. Unexpected results, both positive and negative – identifies the challenges and the learning, both positive and negative, that can be used by all parties (governments, stakeholders, civil society, AE, GCF, and others) to inform further implementation and future investment decision-making.

### ***Evaluation Criteria - Proposed Questions***

Overall the below questions are intended to guide evaluators to deliver credible and trusted evaluations that provide assessment of progress and results achieved in relationship to the GCF investment, can identify learning and areas where restructuring or changes through adaptive management in project implementation are needed, and can make evidence-based clear and focused recommendations that may be required for enhancing project implementation to deliver expected results and to what extent these can be verified and attributed to GCF investment.

#### *Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency*

- Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analyzed and reviewed during project initiation?
- Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
- Is the project Theory of Change (ToC) and intervention logic coherent and realistic? Does the ToC and intervention logic hold or does it need to be adjusted?
- Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
- Are the planned inputs and strategies identified realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results? Were they sequenced sufficiently to efficiently deliver the expected results?
- Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
- Have partners, including government entities, been effective in delivering project results? If not, why?

- What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- To what extent is the project able to demonstrate changes against the baseline (assessment in approved Funding Proposal) for the GCF investment criteria (including contributing factors and constraints)?
- How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
- How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?
- To what extent did the project's M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results?
- Have project resources been utilized in the most economical, effective and equitable ways possible (considering value for money; absorption rate; commitments versus disbursements and projected commitments; co-financing; etc.)?
- As expected co-financing materialized, whether co-financing is cash or in-kind, whether it is in form of grant or loan or equity, whether co-financing was administered by the project management or by some other organization, how shortfall in co-financing or materialization of greater than expected co-financing affected project results, etc.
- Are the project's governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
- To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?
- Were there clear objectives, ToC and strategy? How were these used in performance management and progress reporting?
- Were there clear baselines indicators and/or benchmark for performance measurements? How were these used in project management? To what extent and how the project apply adaptive management?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

#### *Coherence in Climate Finance Delivery with Other Multilateral Entities*

- Who are the partners of the project (including government entities) and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment?
- Is there coherence and complementarity by the project with other actors for local other climate change interventions?
- To what extent has the project complimented other on-going local level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation or mitigation efforts?
- How has the project contributed to achieving stronger and more coherent integration of shift to low emission sustainable development pathways and/or increased climate resilient sustainable development (GCF RMF/PMF Paradigm Shift objectives)? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

#### *Gender Equity*

- Does the project only rely on sex-disaggregated data per population statistics?
- Are financial resources/project activities explicitly allocated to enable women to benefit from project interventions?
- Does the project account in activities and planning for local gender dynamics and how project interventions affect women as beneficiaries?
- Do women as beneficiaries know their rights and/or benefits from project activities/interventions?

- How do the results for women compare to those for men?
- Is the decision-making process transparent and inclusive of both women and men?
- To what extent are female stakeholders or beneficiaries satisfied with the project gender equality results?
- Did the project sufficiently address cross cutting issues including gender?

#### *Country Ownership of Projects and Programmes*

- To what extent is the project aligned with national development plans, national plans of action on climate change, or sub-national policy as well as projects and priorities of the national partners?
- How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?
- To what extent are country level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the project?
- What level and types of involvement for all Is the project as implemented responsive to local challenges and relevant/appropriate/strategic in relation to SDG indicators, National indicators, GCF RMF/PMF indicators, or other goals?
- Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the result achieved?
- The evaluator should indicate the level at which stakeholder and beneficiaries' views and concerns are considered by the project, and stakeholder satisfaction with project performance.

#### *Innovation in Results Areas*

- What role has the project played in the provision of "thought leadership," "innovation," or "unlocked additional climate finance" for climate change adaptation/mitigation in the project and country context? Please provide concrete examples and make specific suggestions on how to enhance these roles going forward.

#### *Replication and Scalability*

- What are project lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
- How effective were the exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints
- What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
- Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
- What are the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability, scalability or replication of project outcomes/outputs/results?

#### *Monitoring & Evaluation Systems*

To assess the quality of the M&E plan, the evaluators will assess:

- Is the M&E plan practical and sufficient?
- Did it: specify clear targets and appropriate (SMART) indicators to track environmental, gender, and socio-economic results; a proper methodological approach; specify practical organization and logistics of the M&E activities including schedule and responsibilities for data collection; and, budget adequate funds for M&E activities?

To assess the quality of the M&E implementation, the evaluators will assess:

- Whether the M&E system is operated as per the M&E plan?
- Where necessary, whether the M&E plan was revised in a timely manner?
- Was information on specified indicators and relevant GCF focal area tracking tools gathered in a systematic manner?
- Whether appropriate methodological approaches have been used to analyse data?
- Were resources for M&E sufficient? How was the information from the M&E system used during the project implementation?
- Is the implementation of the project's impact evaluation appropriate and beneficial to the project (LORTA)?

#### *Unexpected Results*

- What has been the project's ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape? Please account for factors both within the EE and external partners, including the role of government in the Project, and the withdrawal of the European Investment Bank (EIB) from the Project.
- Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project's interventions?
- What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?
- The evaluator should review and assess the project's Grievance Mechanism. The evaluator should analyse and assess whether project stakeholders were aware of the grievance mechanism and whether the mechanism was effective in addressing grievances.
- The evaluator should also review and assess any other safeguard plans that were triggered.
- What have the impacts of COVID-19 been on the project and how has the project addressed them?

### Attachment 3: Cost Proposal Template

The cost proposal will be broken down into two sections. One being Fixed Price for Consultancy services, which must be all-inclusive of profit, fees or taxes. The other being the Travel Budget, which will be reimbursed on actual travel expenditures (the budget submitted by the vendor will be the maximum anticipated cost of travel to interview the stakeholders).

Additional costs cannot be included after award, and revisions to proposed costs may not be made after submission unless expressly requested by CI should the offeror’s proposal be accepted. Nevertheless, for the purpose of the proposal, Offerors must provide a detailed budget showing major expense line items. Offers must show unit prices, quantities, and total price. All items, services, etc. must be clearly labeled and included in the offered price. All cost information must be expressed in US dollars. CI reserves the right to request additional cost information if the evaluation committee has concerns of the reasonableness or completeness of an Offeror’s cost proposal.

If selected, Offeror shall use its best efforts to minimize the financing of any taxes on goods and services, or the importation, manufacture, procurement or supply thereof. If Offeror is eligible to apply for refunds on taxes paid, Offeror shall do so. Any tax savings should be reflected in the total cost.

Cost Breakdown by Deliverable (for Consultant Services)

<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>Price (Consultant Services)</b>
1. Introductory call to introduce team members and review evaluation timeline	
2. Key Informant Questionnaire	
3. Interim Evaluation Workshop Report	
4. Presentation of initial findings	
5. Interim Evaluation Final Report (Draft)	
6. Interim Evaluation Report (Final)	

Please submit the budget for each deliverable using the budget below or use the provided excel file.

<b>[Name of Deliverable]</b>					
<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>Type of Unit</b>	<b>Unit Cost (USD)</b>	<b>Number of Units</b>	<b>Total Funds Requested (USD)</b>	<b>If Applicable, Budget Notes &amp; Assumptions</b>
Origin Country Consultants		\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	
Local/Field Consultants		\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	
Other Costs (Please Specify in Budget Notes)		\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	

Cost Breakdown by Travel (based on projected reimbursable expenses)

Travel Budget (based on reimbursable expenses)					
	Type of Unit	Unit Cost (USD)	Number of Units	Total Funds Requested (USD)	If Applicable, Budget Notes & Assumptions
Lodging, Meals and Incidentals		\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	
Airfare		\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	
Travel Insurance		\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	
Local Transportation		\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	
Fuel		\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	
Other Travel Costs (Please Specify in Budget Notes)		\$0.00	0.00	\$0.00	



## Attachment 4. Brief Overview of Project Being Evaluated

SUSTAINABLE LANDSCAPES IN EASTERN  
MADAGASCAR

Fiscal Year: 2022

Location(s): Madagascar

RFP Number: 2021-CI-GCF-01

**Awarding Agency:** Green Climate Fund (GCF)

**Type of Contract:** Fixed Price Contract for Consultant Services, Plus Reimbursable Expenses for Travel

**Planned Independent Interim Evaluation:** September 22, 2021

**Total Estimated Cost/Amount**

**Range Budget:** \$17,500.00 - \$45,000.00

**Scope of Work/ Deliverables:** Attachment 2 of RFP

**Link to Project Being Evaluated:** <https://www.conservation.org/gcf/projects/sustainable-landscapes-eastern-madagascar>