Mid-Term Evaluation of “Global Subnational Climate Fund – Technical Assistance Facility” (GCF ID FP151)

RfP Reference:

Welcome to this procurement by IUCN. You are hereby invited to submit a proposal. Please read the information and instructions carefully as non-compliance with the instructions may result in disqualification of your proposal from this procurement.

Summary: IUCN, the contracting entity, is soliciting offers from bidders to submit their full proposals to carry out this independent Mid-Term Evaluation of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) Funded Activity FP151, Global Subnational Climate Fund – Technical Assistance Facility (the “Project”). The Project is implemented by IUCN and executed by Catalytic Finance Foundation (formerly R20), IUCN, and Gold Standard.

The project started in April 2021 and is part of a two-project initiative: The Global Subnational Climate Fund (SCF) – a global blended finance initiative that seeks to invest in mid-sized ($5-$75 million USD) infrastructure projects in the fields of sustainable energy, waste and sanitation, regenerative agriculture and nature-based climate solutions. SCF targets investment in 42 GCF-eligible countries in four regions: Mediterranean, Latin America and the Caribbean, Sub-Saharan Africa, and Asia-Pacific. The goal of the Fund is to catalyze long-term climate investment at the sub-national level for mitigation and adaptation solutions through a transformative financing model.

The SCF initiative consists of two linked GCF projects: The Global SCF Equity project (GCF ID FP152), managed by Pegasus Capital Advisors, and the Global SCF Technical Assistance Facility (SCF TA; GCF ID FP151) that provides technical support and grant funding to stakeholders for identifying and strengthening investment proposals for the SCF Equity fund (the Fund). The SCF TA project is the focus of this mid-term review. More information on the SCF can be found at: https://www.subnational.finance

All GCF-funded projects are required to complete an Independent Mid-Term Evaluation. 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 IUCN, GCF, and international standards and will produce an Independent Mid-Term Evaluation to be submitted to the GCF, as described in Attachment 1. Evaluation will be made against IUCN’s grant agreement (FAA) with the GCF, the
project theory of change, project indicators / logical framework, and other elements described in Attachment 1.

1. REQUIREMENTS

A detailed description of the services and/or goods to be provided can be found in Attachment 1.

2. CONTACT DETAILS

During the course of this procurement, i.e. from the publication of this RfP to the award of a contract, you may not discuss this procurement with any IUCN employee or representative other than the following contact. You must address all correspondence and questions to the contact, including your proposal.

**IUCN Contact:** Joshua Schneck, GEF/GCF Portfolio Manager for IUCN Centres, joshua.schneck@iucn.org

3. PROCUREMENT TIMETABLE

This timetable is indicative and may be changed by IUCN at any time. If IUCN decides that changes to any of the deadlines are necessary, we will publish this on our website and contact you directly if you have indicated your interest in this procurement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 December, 2023</td>
<td>Publication of the Request for Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 December, 2023</td>
<td>Deadline for submission of questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 December, 2023</td>
<td>Planned publication of responses to questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 January, 2024</td>
<td>Deadline for submission of proposals to IUCN (&quot;Submission Deadline&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 January, 2024</td>
<td>Proposal selection announced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 January, 2024</td>
<td>Planned date for contract award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 January, 2024</td>
<td>Expected contract start date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please email the IUCN contact to express your interest in submitting a proposal by the deadline stated above. This will help IUCN to keep you updated regarding the procurement.

4. COMPLETING AND SUBMITTING A PROPOSAL

Your Proposal must consist of the following three separate documents:

1. Signed Declaration of Undertaking (see Attachment 2)
2. Technical Proposal (see 4.1 below)
3. Financial Proposal (see 4.2 below)

Proposals must be prepared in English.

Your Proposal must be submitted by email to the IUCN Contact (see Section 2). The subject heading of the email shall be [RfP Reference – bidder name]. The bidder name is the name of the company/organisation on whose behalf you are submitting the proposal, or your own surname if you are bidding as a self-employed consultant. Your proposal must be submitted in PDF format. You may submit multiple emails suitably annotated, e.g. Email 1 of 3, if attached files are too large to suit a single email transmission. You may not submit your Proposal by uploading it to a file-sharing tool.

**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 within 12 hours,** please send the password to the IUCN Contact. This will ensure a secure bid submission and opening process. Please DO NOT email the password before the deadline for Proposal submission.

**Minimum requirements:**

1. **Required:**
   1. Advanced university degree in economics, environmental law, environmental/climate finance, public administration, political science, natural resources management, development or other relevant discipline
   2. 10 years of experience with international development assistance in relevant fields
   3. Experience in developing countries on environment and natural resources management, climate change adaptation/mitigation, economic or public management support projects
   4. Extensive experience in applying evaluation techniques and conducting evaluations of publicly-funded projects focused on climate change
   5. Substantive knowledge of GCF mandate, objectives, policies and frameworks
   6. Extensive knowledge and understanding of good governance structures within the context of funds and the private finance sector
   7. Competent understanding of financing mechanisms
   8. Qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis skills
   9. Demonstrated experience in making realistic and actionable recommendations to improve project implementation
   10. Process management skills such as facilitation and ability to negotiate with a wide range of stakeholders
   11. Fluency in English and excellent writing skills
   12. Complete independence from IUCN, the SCF consortium members (the Executing Entities (EEs) of the Technical Assistance Facility and Pegasus Capital Advisors), and Government agencies

2. **Preferred:**
   1. Prior experience with GCF evaluations
   2. Prior experience with reviews of blended finance initiatives
4.1 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 1. Where CVs are requested, these must be of the individuals who will actually carry out the work specified. The individuals you put forward may only be substituted with IUCN’s approval. Elements to address in the technical proposal include the following:

1. **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.

2. **Qualifications of key personnel.** Please attach CVs that demonstrate how the team proposed meets the minimum requirements listed above (minimum requirements), The CVs should indicate past experience from similar projects and specify the relevant assignment period.

3. **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 Terms of Reference (Attachment 1). 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.

IUCN will evaluate technical proposals with regards to each of the following criteria and their relative importance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Relative weight (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the proposed approach and methodology appropriate to the assignment and practical in the prevailing project circumstances?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the presentation clear and is the sequence of activities and the planning logical, realistic and promise efficient implementation to the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the bidder’s past performance demonstrate recent proven experience doing work relevant to the assignment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the bidder and the proposed personnel have the specific technical and thematic expertise for the assignment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the bidder and the proposed personnel have experience conducting GCF and/or GEF evaluations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Financial Proposal

The financial proposal must be a fixed and firm price for the provision of the goods/services stated in the RfP in their entirety.

*Prices include all costs:* Submitted rates and prices are deemed to include all costs, insurances, taxes (except VAT, see below), fees, expenses, liabilities, obligations, risk and other things necessary for the performance of the Terms of Reference or Specification of Requirements. IUCN will not accept charges beyond those clearly stated in the Financial Proposal. This
includes applicable withholding taxes and similar. It is your responsibility to determine whether such taxes apply to your organisation and to include them in your financial offer.

Applicable Goods and Services Taxes: Proposal rates and prices shall be exclusive of Value Added Tax.

Currency of proposed rates and prices: All rates and prices submitted by Proposers shall be in USD

Breakdown of rates and prices:

1. Itemized consultancy fees/costs, inclusive of all taxes
2. Itemized field data collection expenses, including lines for airfare, lodging and transportation, travel insurance
3. Itemized administrative expenses

Additional information not requested by IUCN should not be included in your Proposal and will not be considered in the evaluation. Your proposal must remain valid and capable of acceptance by IUCN for a period of 90 calendar days following the submission deadline.

IUCN will evaluate financial proposals as follows:

Your financial proposal will receive a score calculated by dividing the lowest financial proposal that has passed the minimum quality thresholds by the total price of your financial proposal. Thus, for example, if your financial proposal is for a total of USD 100 and the lowest financial proposal is USD 80, you will receive a financial score of 80/100 = 80%

4.3 Total Score and Selection of Bidder

IUCN will firstly check your proposal for completeness. Incomplete proposals will not be considered further.

Total Score: Your proposal’s total score will be calculated as the weighted sum of your technical score and your financial score. The relative weights will be:

1. Technical: 80%
2. Financial: 20%

Thus, for example, if your technical score is 83% and your financial score is 77%, you will receive a total score of 83 * 80% + 77 * 20% = 66.4% + 15.4% = 81.8%.

Subject to the requirements in Sections 4 and 7, IUCN will award the contract to the bidder whose proposal achieves the highest total score.

Withdrawals and Changes: You may freely withdraw or change your proposal at any time prior to the submission deadline by written notice to the IUCN Contact. However, in order to reduce the risk of fraud, no changes or withdrawals will be accepted after the submission deadline.
5. **COST**

The maximum available budget for this Midterm evaluation is **USD 45,000**. The evaluator(s) shall be paid upon completion of the following milestones:

1. 30% upon signing of the contract
2. 30% after presentation of the draft report
3. 40% after the approval of the final report

6. **EXPLANATION OF PROCUREMENT PROCEDURE**

IUCN is using the Open Procedure for this procurement. This means that the contracting opportunity is published on IUCN’s website and open to all interested parties to take part, subject to the conditions in Section 7 below.

You are welcome to ask questions or seek clarification regarding this procurement. Please email the IUCN Contact (see Section 2 above), taking note of the deadline for submission of questions in Section 3.

All proposals must be received by the submission deadline in Section 3 above. Late proposals will not be considered. All proposals received by the submission deadline will be evaluated by a team of three or more evaluators in accordance with the evaluation criteria stated in this RfP. No other criteria will be used to evaluate proposals. The contract will be awarded to the bidder whose proposal received the highest Total Score. IUCN does, however, reserve the right to cancel the procurement and not award a contract at all.

IUCN will contact the bidder with the highest-scoring proposal to finalise the contract. We will contact unsuccessful bidders after the contract has been awarded and provide feedback. The timetable in Section 3 gives an estimate of when we expect to have completed the contract award, but this date may change depending on how long the evaluation of proposals takes.

7. **CONDITIONS FOR PARTICIPATION IN THIS PROCUREMENT**

To participate in this procurement, you are required to submit a proposal, which fully complies with the instructions in this RfP and the Attachments.

It is your responsibility to ensure that you have submitted a complete and fully compliant proposal. Any incomplete or incorrectly completed proposal submission may be deemed non-compliant, and as a result you may be unable to proceed further in the procurement process.

IUCN will query any obvious clerical errors in your proposal and may, at IUCN’s sole discretion, allow you to correct these, but only if doing so could not be perceived as giving you an unfair advantage.

In order to participate in this procurement, you must meet the following conditions:

1. Free of conflicts of interest
2. Registered on the relevant professional or trade register of the country in which you are established (or resident, if self-employed)
3. In full compliance with your obligations relating to payment of social security contributions and of all applicable taxes
4. Not been convicted of failing to comply with environmental regulatory requirements or other legal requirements relating to sustainability and environmental protection
5. Not bankrupt or being wound up
6. Never been guilty of an offence concerning your professional conduct
7. Not involved in fraud, corruption, a criminal organisation, money laundering, terrorism, or any other illegal activity.

You must complete and sign the Declaration of Undertaking (see Attachment 2).

If you are participating in this procurement as a member of a joint venture, or are using sub-contractors, submit a separate Declaration of Undertaking for each member of the joint venture and sub-contractor, and be clear in your proposal which parts of the goods/services are provided by each partner or sub-contractor.

Each bidder shall submit only one proposal, either individually or as a partner in a joint venture. In case of joint venture, one company shall not be allowed to participate in two different joint ventures in the same procurement nor shall a company be allowed to submit a proposal both on its behalf and as part of a joint venture for the same procurement. A bidder who submits or participates in more than one proposal (other than as a subcontractor or in cases of alternatives that have been permitted or requested) shall cause all the proposals with the bidder’s participation to be disqualified.

By taking part in this procurement, you accept the conditions set out in this RfP including the following:

1. It is unacceptable to give or offer any gift or consideration to an employee or other representative of IUCN as a reward or inducement in relation to the awarding of a contract. Such action will give IUCN the right to exclude you from this and any future procurements, and to terminate any contract that may have been signed with you.
2. Any attempt to obtain information from an employee or other representative of IUCN concerning another bidder will result in disqualification.
3. Any price fixing or collusion with other bidders in relation to this procurement shall give IUCN the right to exclude you and any other involved bidder(s) from this and any future procurements and may constitute a criminal offence.

8. Confidentiality and Data Protection

IUCN follows the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). The information you submit to IUCN as part of this procurement will be treated as confidential and shared only as required to evaluate your proposal in line with the procedure explained in this RfP, and for the maintenance of a clear audit trail. For audit purposes, IUCN is required to retain your proposal in its entirety for 10 years after the end of the resulting contract and make this available to internal and external auditors and donors as and when requested.
In the Declaration of Undertaking (Attachment 2) you need to give IUCN express permission to use the information you submit in this way, including personal data that forms part of your proposal. Where you include personal data of your employees (e.g. CVs) in your proposal, you need to have written permission from those individuals to share this information with IUCN, and for IUCN to use this information as indicated above. Without these permissions, IUCN will not be able to consider your proposal.

9. COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE

If you have a complaint or concern regarding the propriety of how a competitive process is or has been executed, then please contact procurement@iucn.org. Such complaints or concerns will be treated as confidential and are not considered in breach of the above restrictions on communication.

10. CONTRACT

The contract will be based on IUCN's template, the terms of which are not negotiable. They may, however, be amended by IUCN to reflect particular requirements from the donor funding this particular procurement.

11. 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 1,000 staff with offices 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 people’s 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
12. ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1  Terms of Reference
Attachment 2  Declaration of Undertaking
Attachment 3  Evaluation Questions
Attachment 1. Terms of Reference for IUCN-GCF Midterm Evaluation of Global Subnational Climate Fund Technical Assistance Facility

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for an International Firm/Consultant, for the IUCN-GCF Midterm evaluation (MTE) of the project titled “Global Subnational Climate Fund – Technical Assistance Facility” (GCFID FP151) implemented by IUCN and executed by Catalytic Finance Foundation (formerly R20), IUCN, and Gold Standard. The project started on April 20, 2021, and is in its third year of a 7-year planned implementation. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTE.

2. OVERALL OBJECTIVES, AUDIENCE AND USE OF THE EVALUATION

This Midterm evaluation fulfils IUCN requirements to conduct an independent evaluation for the purpose of learning and reflection on project management and early results. It is expected that the findings and recommendations of this Midterm evaluation will help to identify any needed course corrections in the Project’s approach and activities and bring valuable external reflections to help strengthen the Project and complement the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning system of the Project through by facilitating adaptive management.

The primary intended users of this Midterm evaluation are:

- IUCN GEF/GCF Portfolio Manager for the purpose of ensuring overall oversight of the project and GCF investment
- The SCF Project managers and staff in IUCN, Catalytic Finance Foundation (formerly R20) and Gold Standard for the purpose of managing the Project, and in particular, for making adjustments to improve delivery of outcomes;
- Other important users of the evaluation are Pegasus Capital Advisors as manager of the SCF Fund, the SCF Initiative High-level Advisory Committee, GCF and other stakeholders that will benefit from and up-to-date review of the SCF TAF progress and achievements to date

3. OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS

In assessing implementation of the GCF Project and its alignment with IUCN’s obligations via its Funded Activity Agreement (FAA), the Midterm evaluation will take into consideration assessment of the project in line with the following evaluation criteria from the Evaluation Policy for the GCF (GCF/B.28/05/Rev.01), along with guidance provided by the OECD DAC:
1. **Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of projects and programs** – 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 programs** – 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 programs; 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.
9. **Governance structure of the SCF Initiative** – assessment of strengths of the governance structure, organizational representations and roles, and the degree to which the equity and TA components are collaborating and generating synergies.

In addition to the above evaluation criteria, the Midterm evaluation will also ensure that the following lines of inquiry are addressed to test the key assumptions in IUCN’s institutional theory of change:

1. One Programme Approach:
2. Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS)

Attachment 3 provides a set of questions intended to guide evaluators to deliver credible and trusted evaluation. It is expected that the evaluators will draw on these questions to develop the evaluation matrix that will be presented as an output of the Inception Report

The Midterm evaluation will be carried out in conformity with IUCN Evaluation Policy (2023) and explore the Project’s work and achievements with the aim of assessing progress so far and
providing guidance on how to maximize the potential for achieving the intended results and improve learning in its remaining timeframe (end date June 30th, 2028). Through the assessment of the performance and lessons learnt, the Midterm evaluation will 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.

4. METHODOLOGY

In assessing the Project and its alignment to the broader FAA, the Midterm 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.

- 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 the project ESMS and Gender Action Plan, 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 Entities.
- The evaluator will develop and submit Key Informant Questionnaire and Draft inception Report on proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and structure of the report.
- The evaluator will host a workshop (in person or virtual) with the SCF Consortium and Accredited Entity to clarify understanding of the objectives and methods of the Evaluation.
- The conclusion of the workshop will be summarized in an Inception Report with the following information:
  - Identification of the subject of the review, and relevant context
  - Purpose of the evaluation: why is the evaluation being conducted at this time, who needs the information and why?
  - Objectives of the evaluation: What the evaluation aims to achieve (e.g. assessment of the results of the project, etc.)
  - Scope: What aspects of the project will be covered, and not covered, by the evaluation
  - Identification and description of the evaluation criteria (including relevance, effectiveness, results, efficiency, and sustainability)
  - Key evaluation questions
  - Methodology including approach for data collection and analysis, and stakeholder engagement
• Rationale for selection of the methods, and selection of data sources (i.e. any sites to be visited, stakeholders to be interviewed)
• System for data management and maintenance of records
• Intended products and reporting procedures
• Potential limitations of the evaluation

• The evaluator will undertake the evaluation of the project, including any interviews and in-country site visits (if needed).
• Based on the document review and the in-country interviews/site visits, the evaluator will prepare a Preliminary Evaluation report. The report will be shared with the SCF Consortium and the Accredited Entity (IUCN-GCF Agency). Each party can provide a management response, documenting questions or comments on the draft evaluation report.
• 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.

The Midterm Evaluation should be aligned with the principles established in GCF’s Evaluation Policy (GCF/B.28/05/Rev.01), 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 Midterm Evaluation should seek to the extent possible to be inclusive and participatory, involving principal stakeholders and beneficiaries in the analysis. During the Midterm evaluation, the consultant is expected to apply the following approaches for data collection, analysis and triangulation of evidence for validation.

1. Desk review of relevant documents including baseline studies, progress reports and any records of surveys conducted during the Project, stakeholder maps, etc.;
2. 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;
3. Data collection as needed 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 the IUCN GEF/GCF Portfolio Manager for Centers, who will provide guidance and ensure satisfactory completion of Midterm 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 any fieldwork and/or interviews with partners and assist in developing a detailed program to facilitate consultations as necessary.

**Stakeholders to be consulted**
The evaluation will adopt a consultative approach, seeking and sharing opinions with stakeholders at different stages throughout the evaluation process. Stakeholder categories include, but are not limited to: IUCN, Catalytic Finance Foundation (formerly R20), Gold Standard and Pegasus Capital Advisors project staff, and external stakeholders involved in delivery of the project. External stakeholders may include TAF and Equity Fund beneficiaries, decision makers, partner NGOs, project consultants and/or private sector and financial institutions among others.

The list of stakeholders to be consulted will be presented and validated through the Inception Report. The total number of stakeholders to be consulted in the different region where the Project is implemented is however estimated to XXX. IUCN will provide a suggested list of stakeholders in different categories during inception. The evaluation team may propose changes or additions.

To date the project has been implemented in 21 countries and is expected to expand further. The consultant may propose to sample the number of countries or investments supported by the project. The sample of countries and investments will be confirmed during inception with the project team.

5. EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

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

1. Key informant questionnaire
2. Draft inception report and Inception report on proposed evaluation methodology, work plan and structure of the report
3. A Draft Preliminary Evaluation report and presentation, to be presented at a debriefing meeting with the IUCN-GCF Agency and SCF Consortium
4. Final Mid-Term Evaluation 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.

MidTerm Evaluation Report Criteria and Outline

The Midterm evaluation Report should be in English and include the following structure:

1. 2-3 page Executive Summary;
2. Introduction (including context, scope, methodology);
3. Key Strategic Findings and Conclusions: Where relevant and possible, specifically outline role, impact and issues in project assistance/implementation;
4. 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
5. Summary review matrix/project RMF and achievement by objectives and outputs (triangulated with evidence and data);
6. Annexes (mission reports, list of interviewees, list of documents reviewed, data sources used, etc.)
6. TRAVEL REQUIREMENTS

The Consultant may be requested to conduct field missions on one or two of the projects supported by the SCF. Potential project sites are Morocco, Senegal and/or Jamaica, but may be subject to change.

7. SCHEDULE

It is expected that evaluator(s) will submit their deliverables according to the following schedule in Table 1:

Table 1. Activities, Deliverables, Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Indicative completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductory call</td>
<td>Introductory call to introduce team members and review evaluation timeline and deliverables</td>
<td>Within 1 week of signing the service agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review of all relevant project documents and develop draft inception report and key informant questionnaire</td>
<td>Draft Inception Report</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks of the introductory call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host an Evaluation Inception workshop (in person/virtual) with the SCF Consortium</td>
<td>Inception Report</td>
<td>2 weeks after the delivery of the Key informant questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the project via interview and site visits (if needed)</td>
<td>Presentation of initial findings to the Executing Entities and the IUCN GCF Agency.</td>
<td>8 weeks after delivery of the Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN review of preliminary evaluation report</td>
<td>IUCN comments on the Preliminary Evaluation report</td>
<td>2 weeks after delivery of the Preliminary Evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise report incorporating comments from IUCN</td>
<td>Final Midterm Evaluation Report</td>
<td>2 weeks after delivery of IUCN comments on the Preliminary Evaluation report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Global Subnational Climate Fund (SCF) is a GCF-supported global blended finance initiative that seeks to invest in mid-sized ($5-$75 million USD) infrastructure projects in the fields of sustainable energy, waste and sanitation, regenerative agriculture and nature-based climate solutions (NbS). SCF targets investment in 42 GCF-eligible countries in four regions: Mediterranean, Latin America and the Caribbean, Sub-Saharan Africa, and Asia-Pacific. The goal of the Fund is to catalyze long-term climate investment at the sub-national level for mitigation and adaptation solutions through a transformative financing model. The SCF’s
business model is designed to attract private institutional investment and to deliver certified climate and sustainable development impacts and Nature-based Solutions at global scale.

The SCF initiative consists of two linked GCF projects: The *Global SCF Equity* project (GCF ID FP152), managed by Pegasus Capital Advisors and supported by up to $150 million in GCF funding, and the Global SCF Technical Assistance Facility (SCF TA; GCF ID FP151), supported by $18.5 million in GCF grant financing and that provides technical support and grant funding to stakeholders for identifying and strengthening investment proposals for the SCF Equity fund (the Fund). The SCF TA project – the focus of this mid-term review – is implemented by IUCN and executed by Catalytic Finance Foundation (formerly R20), IUCN, and Gold Standard.

The SCF TA project is structure around three components and linked outputs:

- **Feasibility Studies** – providing support for development of feasibility studies on investment opportunities that enhance countries’ climate mitigation as well as climate change adaptation co-benefits. These studies shall serve as the basis for Global SCF Equity project investment decision making. Outputs are:
  - Output TA1.1: Projects are screened and early lessons learned incorporated into deal sourcing design
  - Output TA1.2: Conduct pre-feasibility assessments, studies and contractual arrangement
  - Output TA1.3: Perform technical, legal or economic feasibility assessment and studies
  - Output TA1.4: Perform additional ESIA and other related ESS assessment to comply with SCF ESMS
  - Output TA1.5: Support deal finalization during SCF due diligence

- **Capacity building** – to enable countries to build bankable projects centered around climate mitigation as well as adaptation co-benefits. Outputs are:
  - Output TA2.1: Various stakeholders are trained fit-for-purpose to fast track project investments
  - Output TA2.2: Best practices, guidelines and tools are developed, disseminated and applied

- **Tools and Metrics** – development of climate change mitigation metrics as well as related Sustainable Development Goals and Nature-based Solutions metrics, tools and indicators. These shall be applied to identify, decide on, and monitor investment opportunities. Outputs are:
  - Output TA3.1: Standardized metrics, tools, indicators and methodologies are deployed to raise ambition in project design and contribute to maximum project impact.
  - Output TA3.2: Process is in place to ensure transparent and robust project indicators and methodologies support sub-national and national policies.
  - Output TA3.3: Climate Project SDG and NbS impacts are certi

The overall high-level target for the SCF TA project is: $28 million is invested in Technical Assistance to support 35-50 high-integrity, bankable projects, integrating NbS where feasible.
Implementation and execution arrangements for the SCF TA are as follows:

- **IUCN**, through its Multilateral Finance Team, serves as the GCF-accredited Implementing Agency charged with overall oversight of the project and GCF investment
- **Catalytic Finance Foundation** (formerly R20) is leading execution of Component 1, Feasibility Studies, and is also in charge of the Project Management Unit (PMU) charged with coordination of the project
- **IUCN**, through its Enterprise and Investment Team, is leading execution of Component 2, Capacity building
- **Gold Standard** is leading execution of Component 3, Tools and Metrics

**Attachment 2. Declaration of Undertaking**

**IUCN**

In relation to RfP: 

I, the undersigned, hereby confirm that I am an authorised representative of the following organisation:

Registered Name of Organisation (the “Organisation”): __________________________

Registered Address (incl. country): ____________________________________________

Year of Registration:__________________________________________________________

I hereby authorize IUCN to store and use the information included in the attached Proposal for the purpose of evaluating Proposals and selecting the Proposal IUCN deems the most favorable. I acknowledge that IUCN is required to retain the Proposal in its entirety for 10 years after then end of the resulting contract and make this available to internal and external auditors and donors as and when reasonably requested.

Where the Proposal includes Personal Data as defined by the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), I confirm that the Organization has been authorized by each Data Subject to share this Data with IUCN for the purposes stated above.

I further confirm that the following statements are correct:

1. The Organisation is duly registered in accordance with all applicable laws.
2. The Organisation is fully compliant with all its tax and social security obligations.
3. The Organisation and its staff and representatives are free of any real or perceived conflicts of interest with regards to IUCN and its Mission.
4. The Organisation agrees to declare to IUCN any real or perceived emerging conflicts of interests it or any of its staff and representatives may have concerning IUCN. The Organisation acknowledges that IUCN may terminate any contracts with the Organisation that would, in IUCN sole discretion, be negatively affected by such conflicts of interests.
5. None of the Organisation’s staff has ever been convicted of grave professional misconduct or any other offence concerning their professional conduct.
6. Neither the Organisation nor any of its staff and representatives have ever been convicted of fraud, corruption, money laundering, supporting terrorism or involvement in a criminal organisation.
7. The Organisation acknowledges that engagement by itself or any of its staff in fraud, corruption, money laundering, supporting terrorism or involvement in a criminal organisation will entitle IUCN to terminate any and all contracts with the Organisation with immediate effect.
8. The Organisation is a going concern and is not bankrupt or being wound up, is not having its affairs administered by the courts, has not suspended business activities, is not the subject of proceedings concerning those matters, or in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure provided for in national legislation or regulations.
9. The Organisation complies with all applicable environmental regulatory requirements or other legal requirements relating to sustainability and environmental protection.
10. The Organisation is not included in the UN Security Council Sanctions List, EU Sanctions Map, US Office of Foreign Assets Control Sanctions List, or the World Bank listing of ineligible firms and individuals. The Organisation agrees that it will not provide direct or indirect support to firms and individuals included in these lists.
11. The Organisation has not been, is not, and will not be involved or implicated in any violations of Indigenous Peoples’ rights, or injustice or abuse of human rights related to other groups or individuals, including forced evictions, violation of fundamental rights of workers as defined by the International Labour Organization’s (ILO) Declaration on the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, child labour, sexual exploitation, sexual abuse, or sexual harassment.

Date and signature of the authorized representative of the Proposer__________________________________________

Name and position of the authorized representative of the Proposer__________________________________________
Attachment 3: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The below questions are intended to guide evaluators in delivering a credible and trusted evaluation:

_Relevance, Effectiveness and Efficiency_

1. Were the context, problem, needs and priorities well analyzed and reviewed during project initiation?
2. Are the planned project objectives and outcomes relevant and realistic to the situation on the ground?
3. 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?
4. Do outputs link to intended outcomes which link to broader paradigm shift objectives of the project?
5. 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?
6. Are the outputs being achieved in a timely manner? Is this achievement supportive of the ToC and pathways identified?
7. Have partners, including government entities, been effective in delivering project results? If not, why?
8. What and how much progress has been made towards achieving the overall outputs and outcomes of the project (including contributing factors and constraints)?
9. 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)?
10. How realistic are the risks and assumptions of the project?
11. How did the project deal with issues and risks in implementation?
12. To what extent did the project’s M&E data and mechanism(s) contribute to achieving project results?
13. 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.)?
14. Has 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.
15. Are the project’s governance mechanisms functioning efficiently?
16. To what extent did the design of the project help or hinder achieving its own goals?
17. Were there clear objectives, ToC and strategy? How were these used in performance management and progress reporting?
18. 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?
19. What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project objectives?

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

1. Who are the partners of the project (including government entities) and how strategic are they in terms of capacities and commitment?
2. Is there coherence and complementarity by the project with other climate change interventions?
3. To what extent has the project complimented other on-going local level initiatives (by stakeholders, donors, governments) on climate change adaptation or mitigation efforts?
4. 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**

1. Does the project only rely on sex-disaggregated data per population statistics?
2. Are financial resources/project activities explicitly allocated to enable women to benefit from project interventions?
3. Does the project account in activities and planning for local gender dynamics and how project interventions affect women as beneficiaries?
4. Do women as beneficiaries know their rights and/or benefits from project activities/interventions?
5. How do the results for women compare to those for men?
6. Is the decision-making process transparent and inclusive of both women and men?
7. To what extent are female stakeholders or beneficiaries satisfied with the project gender equality results?
8. Did the project sufficiently address cross cutting issues including gender?

**Country Ownership of Projects and Programs**

1. 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?
2. How well is country ownership reflected in the project governance, coordination and consultation mechanisms or other consultations?
3. To what extent are country level systems for project management or M&E utilized in the project?
4. 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?
5. Were the modes of deliveries of the outputs appropriate to build essential/necessary capacities, promote national ownership and ensure sustainability of the result achieved?
6. 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**

1. 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**

2. What are project lessons learned, failures/lost opportunities to date? What might have been done better or differently?
3. How effective were the exit strategies and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project including contributing factors and constraints
4. What factors of the project achievements are contingent on specific local context or enabling environment factors?
5. Are the actions and results from project interventions likely to be sustained, ideally through ownership by the local partners and stakeholders?
6. 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**

1. Is the M&E plan practical and sufficient?
2. 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:

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

**Unexpected Results**
1. What has been the project’s ability to adapt and evolve based on continuous lessons learned and the changing development landscape?
2. Can any unintended or unexpected positive or negative effects be observed as a consequence of the project’s interventions?
3. What factors have contributed to the unintended outcomes, outputs, activities, results?
4. 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.
5. The evaluator should also review and assess any safeguard plans that were triggered.

One Programme Approach:

1. To what extent did the project leverage the IUCN Union to achieve its objectives?
2. To what extent did the project engage IUCN constituents in its design or implementation so far?

Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS)

1. To what extent has the project implemented the mitigation measures identified through the ESMS process?