Request for Proposals

External Review of IUCN 2015

1. Background

IUCN is seeking an evaluation firm or coalition of independent evaluators to undertake the External Review of IUCN in 2015. This External Review is a jointly commissioned activity between IUCN and its framework donors, with the intended purpose of leveraging organizational change within IUCN and as one input to the negotiations of framework agreements between IUCN and its donors.

2. Contract Duration

The contract is intended to commence on 15 April 2015 for the duration of with a deadline for submission of the final External Review of IUCN report by 15 December 2015. The exact contract term will be confirmed upon contract award.

3. Requested services

The required services are detailed in the attached Terms of Reference for the External Review of IUCN. A review matrix of questions, indicators and potential data sources is provided as a starting point on the discussion of the scope and specifics of the External Review, but should not be treated as a final review matrix.

4. Submission instructions

a) Expressions of Interest

Interested parties are encouraged to register their intention to submit a proposal by providing an email contact to evaluation@iucn.org no later than 18:00 (CET) on 30 March 2015. Any updates or clarifications of the Request for Proposals will be made available to all parties who have submitted an Expression of Interest.

b) Submission deadline

Proposals must be submitted no later than 18:00 (CET) on 13 April 2015. Proposals should be sent by email to:

evaluation@iucn.org

Proposals received after the deadline will not be considered.

Proposals may be amended or withdrawn at any point prior to the submission deadline, but cannot be revoked or changed thereafter.
c) **Validity of Proposal**

All Proposals shall remain valid and open for acceptance for a period of 90 calendar days after the submission deadline.

d) **Communication**

Any Bidder may require clarification from IUCN on technical, contractual or commercial matters by sending an email to the above mentioned address **no later than 5 business days prior to the submission deadline**. We encourage all Bidders to submit questions as soon as they occur.

IUCN’s response to all such questions (including an explanation of the query but without identification of the source) will be sent by email to all receivers of this RFP.

There should be no contact with IUCN officials concerning the RFP process, from the date of issue of this RFP to the final selection, other than by email to evaluation@iucn.org.

e) **Change to or termination of process**

IUCN reserves the right to make changes to this RFP at any time prior to the submission deadline, and to accept or reject any Proposal, to cancel the bidding process and/or to reject all bids, at any time prior to the award of the contract, without thereby incurring any liability to any of the Bidders and without any obligation to inform any of the Bidders of the grounds for any such action by IUCN.

f) **Confidential information**

Any IUCN-related information, reports, or other materials given to, prepared or assembled by the Bidder for the purpose of this RFP shall not be sold or otherwise made available to any individual or organization without prior written approval of the IUCN.

Confidential information provided as part of a Proposal in response to this RFP, and which is identified as such by the Bidder, will be kept confidential by IUCN.

g) **Conflict of interests**

Bidders submitting a Proposal in response to this RFP shall disclose any conflict of interests as part of their Proposal. Any Bidder found to have a conflict of interests that was not disclosed shall be ineligible for award of a contract. A Bidder with a disclosed conflict of interests may be considered for the award of a contract provided that the conflict of interests will not impact performance and their Proposal is assessed as the most competitive.
5. Format of response to this RFP:

The successful Bidder’s Proposal in response to this RFP will be incorporated into the final agreement between IUCN and the successful Bidder. Proposals shall be structured as follows:

- **Proposal to address the Terms of Reference**
  How will the review team approach each objective? What strategies will the team employ to ensure that the review will address each objective strategically, while not becoming lost in the details? What approach does the review team suggest for sampling? What methods are proposed for data collection?

- **Qualifications of the review team (CVs of each proposed team member must be included):**
  What mix of skills does the proposed team possess? What skills and experience does each individual member of the team possess? What experience, overall, does the proposed team have in the area of organizational assessment? In evaluating conservation and development? Can the team conduct its work in English, French and Spanish?

- **Cost and budget preparation**
  What is the overall proposed budget? How will consultancies be managed cost-effectively? What are the costs associated with travel, administrative support and other expenses?

- **Quality of the review workplan**
  Is the level of effort clear and appropriate for the task? What time investment will be made on a per unit basis (e.g. for interviews, focus groups, etc.)?

In addition, each firm responding to the Request will be required to submit a **writing sample**, preferably of an evaluation conducted by the firm, or at least on a related topic. Firms failing to submit a suitable writing sample will be disqualified from the competition.

6. Criteria for selection

Each proposal will be scored on a points system against the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quality of the proposal, including technical merit, approach to the objectives, approach to sampling, methods proposed</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Qualifications of the review team, including profile and qualifications of each proposed team member, composition of the team, extent of qualifications in organizational reviews, extent of qualifications in evaluating conservation interventions at practical and policy levels, language proficiency in English, French and Spanish</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cost and budget preparation, including overall proposed cost, cost effectiveness of consultants, transparency of budget</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quality of the review workplan, including level of effort, proposed missions, clarity on per unit time investments per data collection tool (e.g. per interview)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quality of the writing sample, including degree to which the writing sample demonstrates strong evaluation practice</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selection of the External Review Team

The final selection of the successful Bidder will be made by the External Review Steering Committee, comprised of two representatives from IUCN and two from the framework donors based on the criteria for selection. All Parties will be notified one way or the other by the end of the second week of April 2015.

About IUCN

IUCN, International Union for Conservation of Nature, helps the world find pragmatic solutions to our most pressing environment and development challenges.

IUCN works on biodiversity, climate change, energy, human livelihoods and greening the world economy by supporting scientific research, managing field projects all over the world, and bringing governments, NGOs, the UN and companies together to develop policy, laws and best practice.

IUCN is the world’s oldest and largest global environmental organization, with more than 1,200 government and NGO members and almost 11,000 volunteer experts in some 160 countries. IUCN’s work is supported by over 1,000 staff in 45 offices and hundreds of partners in public, NGO and private sectors around the world.
Background

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

The Terms of Reference, its scope and objectives are the direct result of agreements formed during the Annual Meeting of Framework Partners held at IUCN-HQ in June 2014 which included the IUCN Director General and her staff, and representatives of each of the Framework Partners.

About IUCN

IUCN was founded in 1948 as the world’s first global environmental organization. Today, IUCN is the largest professional global conservation network with more than 1,200 member organizations including 200+ government and 900+ non-government organizations. IUCN works with almost 11,000 voluntary scientists and experts, grouped in six Commissions in some 160 countries and is supported by over 1,000 staff in 45 offices and hundreds of partners in public, NGO and private sectors around the world.

IUCN provides a neutral forum for governments, NGOs, scientists, business and local communities to find practical solutions to conservation and development challenges.

Commissioning Authority and Intended Users

The External Review of IUCN 2015 is jointly commissioned by the Director General of IUCN and the Framework Partners as a condition of the framework agreements providing funding to IUCN.¹

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

¹ IUCN’s Framework Partners include Denmark, Finland, France, Korea, the MAVA Foundation, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Arab Emirates.
Oversight and Management of the External Review

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

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

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

Objectives of the External Review

After discussion between IUCN and the Framework Partners, the following objectives were agreed:

1. To assess the relevance, effectiveness and impact of knowledge chains in the IUCN Programme;\(^2\)
2. To assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and lessons learned of working with scientific and technical networks of experts from the six IUCN Commissions;
3. To assess the role and the niche of IUCN as a Union of governments, non-governmental organizations and individual scientists and the fit-to-purpose of IUCN as an organization;

The scope of time to be addressed under Objective 1 will be linked to the life cycle of the knowledge chains in the proposed sample, recognizing that some knowledge chains have a life cycle of 15 years or more. A sample will be defined with the Review Team that will include a mix of IUCN Flagship Knowledge chain and other knowledge chains as well as new and older knowledge chains.

The Terms of Reference will be supported by a review matrix of questions under each objective and approved by the ER Steering Committee.

Methodology

The methodology will include a combination of the following:

\[^2\] A definition of knowledge chains will need to be developed, but the scope should include how knowledge gaps are identified, how knowledge is collected, generated, analysed, managed and disseminated, including in local and indigenous knowledge and how this leads to use, policy influence and conservation action or development practice.
• Purposeful sampling, particularly of knowledge chains and key informants
• Surveys, semi-structured interviews, focus groups and dialogues with key IUCN stakeholders, including Members, partners, donors, staff, and in particular beneficiaries of IUCN programmes and projects;
• A global survey of Members, Commission Members and Secretariat staff (it could be three surveys or one sorted by component);
• Review of relevant documentation, in particular project documentation (proposals, plans, technical reports, monitoring data, donor reports, etc.), programme documentation (IUCN programmes, components programme documents, progress and assessment reports, monitoring reports, Technical documents, etc.), the review of IUCN’s influence on policy, the IUCN performance assessment outcomes, the IUCN regionalization and decentralization review and other relevant evaluations and documentation;

The scope of the External Review will primarily cover the period since the 2011 External Review of IUCN, but in some cases (e.g. long standing knowledge chains such as the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species or in comparing Commissions over time), it may be useful to include evidence from before 2011.

Qualifications of the Review Team

Members of the Review team will be external to both IUCN and the donors and will be mutually agreed upon by IUCN and its framework donors. The Review Team will be selected by a limited tender under IUCN rules and procedures. The profile of the Review team members will be senior professionals with specific expertise in the field of conservation and sustainable development at global and regional levels.

Specific attributes required of the Review team include:
• Documented experience undertaking evaluation covering (a) conservation and development issues, (b) scientific networks and (c) issues related to niche and organizational issues;
• Experience and ability to review conservation and sustainable development programmes and projects, undertake poverty and gender analysis, review policy work;
• Demonstrated experience in applying institutional or organizational assessment methods in the context of large, decentralized organizations working in either the conservation or development sectors;
• Experience in undertaking evaluation work globally;
• Considerable familiarity with IUCN and similar organizations;
• Ability to work in all three official languages of IUCN (English, French, Spanish).

The review leader is responsible for the management and conduct of the Review and review team members, for the quality and credibility of the review process, including the design of the methodology and tools, data collection, analysis and reporting, as well as for the submission of the Final External review Report to IUCN Council.
The Review Team will be recruited through a global Request for Proposals competitive bidding process. Each proposal received will be screened and scored against a transparent set of criteria which will be shared as part of the RFP. IUCN and the Steering Committee reserve the right to reject any proposal received and request that two or more proposals are combined to create a suitable team (if agreement can be reached between the proponents).

Outputs

The consultancy will include the following outputs:

- An inception note, which interprets the TOR, and describes the approach and methodology of the review, table of contents of the study report, etc. consisting of no more than 20 pages;
- A draft and final review report, with background information in annexes, providing an overview of the findings in accordance with the scope of work. The main review report shall not exceed 60 pages exclusive of annexes;
- Full results of the global Secretariat, Membership and Commission surveys.
- A presentation with supporting PowerPoint of the draft and final report to the IUCN Framework Partners convened by IUCN.

Timeline and Deliverables

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Expected due date</th>
<th>Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception of the External Review</td>
<td>Inception Note including detailed budget and work plan</td>
<td>Two weeks after engagement, based on proposal responding to the Request for Proposals</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection/report writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>April - October 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>October 2015 (date to be agreed)</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>Final report</td>
<td>14 December 2015</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Programme Relevance – knowledge chains

**Question:** To what extent are the knowledge chains (sampled) of the IUCN Programme relevant?

1. To conservation and development?
2. To the Membership?
3. To the Commissions?
4. To other stakeholders?
5. What should IUCN be doing or focusing on to increase relevance?

**Indicator:** Degree of fit between the knowledge chains of the IUCN Programme and high level conservation or sustainable development frameworks/scientific situation analyses?

**Method (data source):**
1. Comparative analysis – IUCN Programme and frameworks
2. Survey
3. Survey
4. Survey / or comparative analysis (see footnote 1)

---

### Programme Effectiveness and Impact

**Question:** To what extent are the knowledge chains (sampled) of the IUCN Programme effective?

1. What are the main tendencies in IUCN knowledge chains?
2. In what ways have IUCN knowledge chains been prioritized and developed? What is driving the demand for IUCN knowledge chains?
3. How are knowledge chains being used by target audiences?
4. What evidence is there or results and impacts influenced by IUCN’s knowledge chains? What are the factors that enable effective influence of results and impacts?
5. To what extent does the organization aid or detract in effective delivery (in terms of programme leadership, structure, human resources, communications, financial management, IT support)?
6. To what extent is the IUCN Programme effectively monitored and evaluated?

**Indicator:** Typology of knowledge chains based on top down/western science vs bottom up/traditional knowledge

**Method (data source):**
1. Document review, interviews supporting by a mapping
2. Document review compared with “good practice”
3. Document review, interviews, survey of Members
4. Review of programme reports, interviews, survey
5. Organizational effectiveness review (light version)
6. Document review – PM&E unit – compared with “good practice”

---

3 Also possible to better identify stakeholders (e.g. ODA donors) and means of comparison for establishing relevance (e.g. donor strategic plans, white papers, etc.)

4 Possible comparative frameworks include: Strategic Plan for Biodiversity/Aichi Targets, Sustainable Development Goals, IPBES workplan, GEF-6 Programme

5 A review of guidelines (e.g. programme planning, programme reporting, Project Guidelines and Standards), monitoring reports (e.g. annual progress reporting, internal assessments of implementation, risk analysis, etc) and evaluations for relevance/quality (in context of international good practice), coverage, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Method (data source)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme Effectiveness and Impact, continued</td>
<td>7. What measures should IUCN take to increase results and impact? How should IUCN approach the question of impact?</td>
<td>7. Recommendations only</td>
<td>6. Recommendations only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme sustainability</td>
<td>To what extent are the knowledge chains of IUCN creating sustainable results and impact? TO what extent are these knowledge chains sustainable in their own right?</td>
<td>1. To what extent has use of knowledge chains created results and impact? How?</td>
<td>Examples of results and impacts of knowledge chains</td>
<td>1. Case study analysis (country level case studies?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. What roles do capacity and institutionalization play in creating sustainable results and impact through knowledge chains?</td>
<td>2. No particular indicator</td>
<td>2. Analysis of capacity and institutional aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. no particular indicator</td>
<td>3. Analysis of resourcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. What is the business model for IUCN's knowledge chains?</td>
<td>1. How are knowledge chains resourced currently? (focusing on issues of development, long-term data management, capacity building and use) What is needed to properly resource the knowledge chains?</td>
<td>Current level of resourcing, required level of resourcing</td>
<td>1. Financial data, Tom Brooks’ paper on costing knowledge products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. What is the long term resourcing model for supporting knowledge chains (comparing data-intensive knowledge chains with those which are less data intensive)</td>
<td>No indicator</td>
<td>2. Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. What are the business opportunities for resourcing the development, long-term data management, capacity building and use of knowledge chains (e.g. through non-ODA sources, service provision, etc)</td>
<td>(Potential) value of additional business opportunities</td>
<td>3. Interviews, particularly with external stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Sub-questions</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Method (data source)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(significance)</td>
<td>To what extent do Commissions add value to IUCN?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Sub-questions</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Method (data source)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | To what extent do the Commissions help or drive innovation and new thinking in IUCN? | 1. In what examples have the Commissions contributed to the development of new ideas or innovation in IUCN in the past two intersessional periods?  
2. What are the mechanisms which Commissions tend to effectively use to generate new ideas and innovation?  
3. How valuable to IUCN is the ability of Commissions to generate new ideas and innovation?  
4. In what ways have the Commissions or are the Commissions positioned to incorporate other knowledge systems – traditional or indigenous knowledge – into IUCN’s thinking?  
5. Are there any gaps in the expertise of Commissions that would help support the IUCN Programme, generating new ideas, innovation or incorporating other knowledge systems | 1. Examples  
2. Examples of Commission structures or mechanisms  
3. Perception of worth  
4. Examples  
5. Examples of types of experts that ought to be recruited | 1. Interviews, document review  
2. Interviews, document review  
3. Interviews, Commission and Members survey  
4. Interviews, document review  
5. Interviews, niche/gap analysis, institutional mapping, Commission and Members survey |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Method (data source)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Commissions – efficiency | To what extent are Commissions an efficient mechanism for delivering the IUCN Programme? | 1. What is the value of the Commissions contribution (stratified by Commission) to IUCN? How does this compare with other forms of Programme delivery (Secretariat staff, partners, consultants)?  
2. To what extent is each IUCN Commission efficient in its own right? What are the factors that increase or decrease efficiency?  
3. To what extent are there example of collaboration between Commissions and Members? | 1. Value of volunteer time (estimated), value of fundraising  
2. Various – organizational assessment  
3. Case examples | 1. Survey of Commission Members, financial analysis  
2. Various  
3. Document review, interviews, results of survey of Commissions and Members |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Method (data source)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Sub-questions</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Method (data source)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niche</td>
<td>To what extent has IUCN defined and occupied a unique niche?</td>
<td>1. As a Union 2. In terms of the IUCN Programme 3. In terms of how IUCN operates 4. In terms of the Membership? Does IUCN have the right Membership? 5. In terms of other, similar organizations working on conservation, sustainable development, knowledge and development</td>
<td>1. Uniqueness of the Union 2. Uniqueness of the IUCN Programme relative to other organizations 3. Uniqueness of IUCN’s implementation model(s) 4. Uniqueness of Membership 5. Uniqueness in institutional mapping</td>
<td>1-4 Comparative Analysis 5. Institutional mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent is the understanding of this niche shared by all components of the Union?</td>
<td>1. Do Members, Secretariat Staff and Commission Members share the understanding of the niche? What are the key areas of convergence and divergence?</td>
<td>1. Degree to which components converge or diverge on key elements of the niche</td>
<td>1. Survey of Members, Secretariat and Commission Members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 A comparison sample will need to be developed which should include 3 major conservation NGOs, 2 organizations with a Membership structure of individuals, organizations or both, 3 organizations who specialize in cutting edge knowledge development and delivery and (from the previous), 3 organizations that specialize in science based policy influencing and another 3 that deliver results on the ground through partnerships.