



## Request for Proposals (RfP)

Consultancy Services to Conduct a Mid-Term Review for the GEF-funded project Improving Environmental Management through Sustainable Land Management in St. Kitts and Nevis

**International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources**

**Regional Office for Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean**

**Country: St. Kitts and Nevis**

**Name of the Project: *Improving Environmental Management through Sustainable Land Management in St. Kitts and Nevis***

**Budget Line: PA03159.ME**

**AOP Code: 24-SKN64**

*Proposers are hereby invited to submit a technical and financial proposal for the aforementioned*

**3. CONTACT DETAILS**

3.1. 3.1

- c. Copy of resume
- d. Letter of interest signed, indicating that the Consultant have read, understood and accept the content of these Terms of Reference. (Annex 2)
- e. Signed Declaration of Undertaking (Annex 3a)
- f. Human Resources Questionnaire filled and signed (Annex 4)

i.

- vi. Expenses related to vehicle maintenance, purchase of electronic equipment, cell phone expenses, consumption expenses or purchase of alcoholic beverages will be considered ineligible expenses.
- vii. Breakdown of the Financial Proposal.

For information purposes, it is recommended that the details of the financial proposal be broken down as follows:

	Description	Quantity	Unit price	Total price
1				
2				
3				

*\*USD currency*

5.2. Additional information not requested by IUCN should not be included in the proposal and will not be subject to evaluation.

## 6. SENDING

6.1.

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

## 10.2. Technical Evaluation

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

### 10.2.1. *Scoring Method*

Proposals will be assigned a score from 0 to 10 for each of the technical evaluation criteria, will not be considered further.

### 10.2.2. *Technical Score*

The score for each technical evaluation criterion will be multiplied with the respective relative weight and these weighted scores added together to give the score.

## 10.3. Financial Evaluation and Financial Scores

The financial evaluation will be based upon the full total price submitted. Financial proposals 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.

**The proposals total score will be calculated as the weighted sum of the technical score and financial score.**

The relative weights will be:

**Technical: 70%**  
**Financial: 30%**

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

## 11. EXPLANATION OF PROCUREMENT PROCEDURE

11.1. IUCN is using an Open Procedure for this procurement.

11.2. You are welcome to ask questions or seek clarification regarding this procurement. Please email the IUCN Contact (see Section 2), taking note of the deadline for submission of questions in Section 3.1. 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 in this RfP. No other criteria will be used to evaluate proposals. The contract will be awarded to the Proposer whose proposal received the highest Total Score. IUCN does, however, reserve the right to cancel the procurement and not award a contract at all.

11.3.



- Any price fixing or collusion with other Proposers 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.

### 13. CONFIDENTIALITY AND DATA PROTECTION

13.1.2. The information a Proposer submits to IUCN as part of this procurement will be treated as confidential and shared only as required to evaluate the 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 the proposals in its entirety for 10 years after the end of the contract. The information is available to IUCN staff and donors as and when requested.

13.2. In the Declaration of Undertaking (Attachment 3) the Proposer needs to give IUCN express permission to use the information submitted in this way, including personal data that forms part of the proposal. Where a Proposer include personal data of employees (e.g. names, contact details, etc.) they should be clearly identified as such in the Declaration of Undertaking.

## **Annex 1**





ensure that land uses gave due considerat





detailed in Appendices 1 and 2 of the project documents. Detailed Consultants Costs are presented in Appendix 9 of the project documents, while Terms of Reference for key project staff are presented in Appendix 13. The distribution of the GEF funding and corresponding co-financing is presented in Table 2 below.

**Table 2. Project Costs**

<b>Component</b>	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	<b>Co-Financing</b>	<b>Total</b>
1: Integrated and strengthened environmental planning and management on the islands of St. Kitts and Nevis to support island sustainability	862,921	4,760,466	5,623,387
2: Mainstreaming BD conservation, SLM and CCM into key development and resource management sectors	1,356,476	15,177,280	16,533,756

<p>for Mangrove Ecosystems Consultancy, the Consultancy to Develop a Mangrove Training Manual, the Consultancy to Develop a Knowledge Management Strategy, the Consultancy to Develop a SLM Training Manual and the Crop Market Suitability Study and SLM Cost Cost-Benefit Analysis Consultancy.</p>	<p>stakeholders to advance technical aspects of project activities.</p>
<p>In the case of the Scholarship Program for public servants under Component 1, the project design document had not clearly established the coordination and funding mechanism with the students and universities. This implied a financial and operational risk that generated negotiations between IUCN and SKN to define a management scheme, with roles and responsibilities, as well as procedures for financial management, payment and quality control procedures. This also caused a delay in the disbursement of university fees in the beginning.</p>	<p>IUCN and SKN signed a cooperation agreement specific to the Scholarship Program, in which SKN assumed the responsibility of overseeing the channelling of funds to the universities and students, and it established a joint mechanism to follow up on the performance of the students and the execution of funds.</p>
<p>The Legislative process has proven to be slow and identified in the risk register, it could extend beyond the life of the project with planned regulatory reforms not getting formally enacted/adopted by end of project.</p>	<p>In the absence of a coordinator, efforts were made by staff at the ORMACC office to advance this activity and it was one of the first to commence however it has still proven to be a slow process. It is hoped that the current engagement of high-level government officials would help to garner their support and move the process along so that it can be completed by the end of the project.</p>

## Section 2. OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW

### 7. Objective of the Review

In line with the UNEP Evaluation Policy<sup>4</sup> and the UNEP Programme Manual<sup>5</sup>, the Mid-Term Review (MTR) is undertaken approximately half-way through project implementation to analyze whether the project is on-track, what problems or challenges the project is encountering, and what corrective actions are required.

### 8. Key Review Principles

Mid-Term review findings and judgements will be based on sound evidence and analysis, clearly documented in the Review Report. Information will be triangulated (i.e. verified from different sources) as far as possible, and when verification is not possible, the single source will be mentioned (whilst anonymity is still protected). Analysis leading to evaluative judgements should always be clearly spelled out.

Possible questions to be considered include, (*MTR Review Framework Questions available from UNEP Project Manager*):

- 
- Is the

- Are results statements in keeping with UNEP definitions (e.g. outcomes are expressed as the uptake or use of outputs)
- Are roles and responsibilities commonly understood and playing out effectively?
- from, and supports, reporting)?
- Is the rate of expenditure appropriate for the mid-point?
- Have plans for inclusivity , equality and/or equity been implemented as planned, or does more need to be done?
-

The Mid Term Review (MTR) will assess the extent to which the activity is suited to the priorities and policies of UNEP, the donors, implementing regions/countries and target beneficiaries and is operating in a way that is complementary to other ongoing interventions.

The MTR will assess whether there have been any changes in priorities since the project was designed and whether the project has/should adapt to address the changing policy/strategy context.

This criterion comprises two elements:

***Alignment to UNEP's, Donors and Country (global, regional, sub-regional and national) strategic priorities***

The Review should assess the pro  
Programme Of Work (POW) under which the project was approved and include, in its narrat(s)c35rities

Consultant will confirm whether any amendments<sup>9</sup> have been made to the activities and/or results of the project. This includes changes to the formulation of results statements as well as changes in results indicators and/or project targets and the associated budget. Where revisions have been made the Consultant should confirm that formal documentation for these amendments is available and that UNEP/donor policies for revisions have been followed. In the absence of such formalisation the Review Consultant will make appropriate recommendations.

**C. Effectiveness**

The Review will assess effectiveness across three dimensions: availability of outputs, progress towards project outcomes and adaptive management. The Review Consultant will confirm that all<sup>10</sup> and make recommendations for adjustments

that need to be in place to support the uptake of outputs are evident/emerging and consider whether sufficient effort and attention is being directed towards reaching outcome levels.

The Review Consultant will review the project Theory of Change (TOC) and confirm that it properly reflects all levels (outputs, outcomes, intermediate states and long-lasting impact) of results included in the project design. Where necessary, the TOC should be reconstructed, in discussion with the project team, to better guide and strengthen project implementation.

### ***Likelihood of Impact***

Based on the articulation of long-lasting effects in the reconstructed TOC (i.e. from project outcomes, via intermediate states, to impact), the Review will assess the likelihood of the intended, positive impacts becoming a reality.

The Review will consider the extent to which the project has played a catalytic role<sup>14</sup> or has promoted scaling up and/or replication as part of its Theory of Change (either explicitly as in a project with a demonstration component or implicitly as expressed in the drivers required to move to outcome levels) and as factors that are likely to contribute to greater or long-lasting impact.

### ***Adaptive Management***

The Review will assess whether any adaptive management<sup>15</sup> is evident, possibly reflected in annual reports or reports on performance to-date from a risk perspective considering: a) the likelihood of any non/late delivery of outputs, operational risks and safeguard issues and c) factors undermining the endurance of project achievements.

During the MTR, forward plans should be reviewed and adaptive management strategies discussed

***D. Financial Management***

Under financial management the Mid-Term Review will assess: a) whether the rate of spend is

-









- Review relevant groups such as IUCN, WWF, and the Sea Turtle Monitoring Network, and...

**Field vi**

**Other** ... to be decided by the Review Consultant at the inception phase

**10. R**

See /  
criter

**Incep**

confir  
analy.

**Prelin**

prelimi  
ensure

findings.

**Draft and**

an Executiv  
findings orga  
recommendatio

**Review Procedures**

... of tools and guidance available, see Annex 2 for a list of review assessed. The Review Consultant will prepare:

... of these TOR for guidance on structure and content) containing work and Theory of Change of the project, project stakeholder representative review schedule.

... ally, in the form of a PowerPoint presentation, the sharing of ... support the participation of the project team, act as a means to ensure findings are processed and provide an opportunity to verify emerging

... (on structure and content) containing detailed analysis of the review findings orga ... lessons learned and

**Review of the draft**

Project Manager and review of adequate quality has been

(SIDS) is desired. English and French are the working languages of the United Nations Secretariat. For this consultancy, fluency in oral and written English is a requirement. Working knowledge of the UN system and specifically the work of UNEP is an added advantage. The work will be home-based with one (1) field visit.

The Review Consultant will be responsible, in close consultation with the UNEP Project Manager, for overall management of the Review and timely delivery of its outputs, described above in Section 10 Review Deliverables, above. The Review Consultant will ensure that all review criteria and

In case the consultant is not able to provide the deliverables in accordance with these guidelines, and in line with the expected quality standards by the UNEP Project Manager, payment may be

### Annex 3: Mid Term Review Criteria Ratings Table

The Review should provide individual ratings for the review criteria described in the table below. A suite of support tools, templates and guidance notes is available from the Evaluation Office to support the assessment of performance against these criteria (contact: [janet.wildish@un.org](mailto:janet.wildish@un.org)).

Criteria will be rated on a six-point scale as follows: Highly Satisfactory<sup>25</sup> (HS = 6); Satisfactory (S = 5); Moderately Satisfactory (MS = 4); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU =3); Unsatisfactory (U = 2); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU =1).

A Criteria Ratings Matrix is available, within the suite of tools, to support a common interpretation of points on the scale for each review criterion. The Overall Performance Rating is calculated as a simple average of the ratings for each criterion (A-H). **Any criterion assessed as being in the**



**Annex 4: Guidance on the Structure and Contents of the Mid-Term**

**6. Review methods** Describe all review methods

## **Annex 5: Guidance on the Structure and Contents of the Main Mid-Term Review Report**

***NOTE:** The final product is called a **Review Report** (and not an Evaluation Report). Review Consultants are kindly advised to refer the reader to paragraphs in different parts of the report instead of repeating material.*

*Please refer to the “Cover Page Prelims and Style Sheet Main Mid Term Review Report” for the report template.*

*See the SharePoint link shared with you containing a suite of tools, templates and guidance notes. Please make a fresh download for every new Mid Term Review as we update these materials regularly.*

### **Preliminaries**



	<p>he results as stated in the approved/revised ProDoc logframe/TOC and b) as formulated in the TOC at Review<sup>35</sup>. <i>The two results hierarchies should be presented as a two-column table to show clearly that, although wording and placement may have changed, the results 'goal posts' have not been 'moved'</i>.</p> <p>This section should include a description of how the <i>TOC at Review</i> was reconstructed (who was involved, which source documents were used, formal revisions, need for reconstruction, etc.)</p> <p>The <i>TOC at Review</i> should be presented clearly in both diagrammatic and narrative forms. Clear articulation of each major causal pathway (starting from outputs to long term impact), including explanations of all drivers and assumptions as well as the expected roles of key actors. The insights gained by preparing the <i>TOC at Review</i> should be identified (e.g. gaps or disconnects in advantages that were highlighted; lessons in project design that became apparent etc).</p> <p>Work to promote human rights and gender equality is central to the aims of UNEP but does not always appear within results frameworks. The TOC should include assumptions/drivers relating to human rights and gender equality and the TOC narrative should discuss how greater equality and inclusivity was expected to be achieved by the project. For example, if the project document includes commitments to gender equality/gender strategies etc, these should be identified as drivers. <u>If the project document is silent, then the UN expectations on human rights and gender equality should be included as assumptions.</u> <b>(2 pages + diagram)</b></p>
<p><b>Review Findings</b></p> <p><b>**Refer to the TOR for descriptions of the nature and scope of each criterion**</b></p>	<p>This chapter is organized according to the <u>review criteria</u> presented in the TORs and reflected in the project performance ratings table. The Review Findings section provides a summative analysis of all triangulated data relevant to the parameters of the criteria. Review findings should be objective, relate to the review objectives/questions, be easily identifiable and clearly stated and supported by sufficient evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report and incorporates indicative evidence<sup>36</sup> as appropriate.</p> <p>review criteria as cross-cutting issues. Ratings should be provided at the end of the assessment of each review criterion and the complete ratings table should be included under the conclusions section, below. <i>Please see the Performance Criteria Ratings Matrix in the suite of tools provided on the Communities Platform.</i></p> <p><u>Review Criteria:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Strategic Relevance</li> <li>B. Quality &amp; Revision of Project</li> <li>C. Effectiveness (includes availability of outputs, progress towards outcomes, likelihood of impact and adaptation management)</li> <li>D. Financial Management</li> <li>E. Efficiency</li> <li>F. Monitoring and Reporting</li> <li>G. Sustainability</li> </ul>

TOC at Review Inception

at Review

TOC

	<p>H. Factors Affecting Performance (<i>Project Inception; Quality of Project Management and Supervision; Stakeholder Participation and Cooperation; Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equality; Economic and Social Safeguards; Country Ownership and Communication and Awareness</i>)</p> <p><b>(Max 15 pages)</b></p>
<b>Conclusions</b>	<p>This section should summarize the <u>main conclusions of the Review regarding the performance of the project to-date</u> following a logical sequence from cause to effect. The conclusions should highlight the main strengths and weaknesses and a short explanation of how these were achieved, and then moving to the less successful aspects of the project and explanations as to why they occurred. Answers to the key strategic review questions should be provided. All conclusions should be supported with evidence that has been presented in the review report and can be cross-referenced to the main text using paragraph numbering. The conclusions section should end with the overall assessment of the performance of the project, followed by the ratings table.</p> <p>The conclusions section should not be a repeat of the Executive Summary but focuses on the main findings in a compelling story line that provides both</p> <p><b>(Max 2 pages)</b></p>
<b>Lessons Learned</b>	<p>Lessons learned should be anchored in the conclusions of the review, with cross-referencing to appropriate paragraphs in the review report where possible. Lessons learned are rooted in real project experiences, i.e. based on good practices and successes which could be replicated in similar contexts. Alternatively, they can be derived from problems encountered and mistakes made which should be avoided in the future. Lessons learned must have the potential for wider application and use and should briefly describe the context from which they are derived and those contexts in which they may be useful. Specific lessons on how human rights and gender equity issues have been successfully integrated into project delivery and/or how they could have could have been taken into consideration, should be highlighted.</p>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p>As for the lessons learned, all recommendations should be anchored in the conclusions of the report, with paragraph cross-referencing where possible. Recommendations are <u>proposals for specific actions to be taken by identified people/position-holders to resolve concrete problems affecting the project or the sustainability of its results</u>. They should be feasible to implement within the timeframe and resources available (including local capacities), specific in terms of who would do what and when, and set a measurable performance target in order that the project team/Head of Branch/Unit can monitor and assess compliance with the recommendations.</p> <p>Structure the recommendation as a SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-oriented recommendation), followed by a summary of the finding that supports it (this is the challenge/ problem identified and needs to be addressed) and an indication of the priority level, type of recommendation, responsibility, and proposed timeframe.</p> <p>Also, in some cases, the same challenge/problem can lead to separate recommendations (prescribed actions) to be addressed by different groups e.g. Project or Partners recommendations. In cases where the recommendation is addressed to a third party, compliance can only be monitored and assessed where a contractual/legal agreement remains in place. Without such an agreement, the recommendation should be formulated to say that UNEP project staff should pass on the recommendation to the relevant third party in an effective or substantive manner. The effective transmission by UNEP of the recommendation will then be monitored for compliance.</p> <p>Address the strengthening of human rights and gender dimensions of UNEP interventions, in (at least) one recommendation. Alternatively, include human rights and gender-related practice carried out by the intervention as a lesson learned.</p>
<b>Annexes</b>	<p>These may include additional material deemed relevant by the Review Consultant but must include:</p>

1. Response to stakeholder comments received but not (fully) accepted by the

## ANNEX 6: LETTER OF INTEREST

Fill in the information in blue

[Place and date]

TO: [IUCN]

The undersigned, [name of the professional], after having examined the Terms of Reference for the Contracting of the Professional Consulting Services for (name of the consultancy) and offers to perform these services in accordance with the call for date \_\_\_\_\_.

The attached Financial Proposal is for the total sum of [amount in letters and figures], which includes all taxes required by law.

The period of time in which the signatory of this document agrees to provide the services is from the date of signing the contract, until the date of termination thereof, without price variation, unless modifications are made resulting from contract negotiations. on, unless

### ATTACHMENT 3a – SELF-EMPLOYED PROPOSER

#### **DECLARATION in relation to RfP < Consultancy Services to Conduct a Mid-Term Review of the UNEP/GEF project Improving Environmental Management through Sustainable Land Management in St. Kitts and Nevis >**

I, the undersigned, hereby confirm that I am self-employed and able to provide the service independent of any organisation or other legal entity.

Full name (as in passport):

Home or Office (please delete as appropriate) Address (incl. country):

I hereby authorise 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 my 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 requested.

I further confirm that the following statements are correct:

1. I am legally registered as self-employed in accordance with all applicable laws.
2. I am fully compliant with all my tax and social security obligations.
3. I am free of any real or perceived conflicts of interest with regards to IUCN and its Mission.
4. I agree to declare to IUCN any real or perceived emerging conflicts of interests I may have concerning IUCN. I acknowledge that IUCN may terminate any contracts with me that would, in IUCN sole discretion, be negatively affected by such conflicts of interests.
5. I have never been convicted of grave professional misconduct or any other offence concerning my professional conduct.
6. I have never been convicted of fraud, corruption, money laundering, supporting terrorism or involvement in a criminal organisation.
7. I acknowledge that engagement in fraud, corruption, money laundering, supporting terrorism or involvement in a criminal organisation will entitle IUCN to terminate any and all contracts with me with immediate effect.
8. I am 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. I agree that I will not provide direct or indirect support to firms and individuals included in these lists.
9. I have not been, am not, and will not be involved or impl  
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  
exploitation, sexual abuse, or sexual harassment.

---

<Date and Signature>





\_\_\_\_\_

If so, please indicate which of the following Commissions:

- \_\_\_\_\_ World Commission on Protected Areas
- \_\_\_\_\_ International Law Commission
- \_\_\_\_\_ Species Survival Commission
- \_\_\_\_\_ Commission on Ecosystem Management
- \_\_\_\_\_ Commission on Education and Communication
- \_\_\_\_\_ Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy

**For Consultant Companies:**

Is the Company/Organization an IUCN Member?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

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

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