



Request for Proposals (RfP) ITHCP Phase II & III Final Evaluation

RfP Reference: IUCN-25-07-P03812-1

Questions and Answers (14 August 2025)

	QUESTIONS	ANSWERS
Q1	In the evaluation criteria table, the item “ <i>Clarity and completeness of the tender</i> ” is mentioned. Could you please clarify what specific elements or documents are expected under this criterion?	The item “Clarity and completeness of the tender” refers to how clearly the submitted offer is articulated and fully addresses all the requirements outlined in the tender documents. Under this criterion, the following elements will be considered: - All required forms and documents have been completed and submitted. - The tender follows the prescribed format and structure. - Information is logically organized and clearly presented. - The tender clearly addresses all aspects of the service requested.
Q2	The table also includes “ <i>Preliminary project sampling and justification</i> ”. Could you please clarify what is meant by this, and what is expected in terms of content or methodology? In particular, does it refer to a sampling of the past projects of the bidder (as a way to demonstrate experience), or to a preliminary sampling of the projects to be evaluated during the assignment?	This refers to the preliminary sampling of the projects to be evaluated during the assignment. As mentioned in the Terms of Reference, “a draft sample of projects to visit should be provided, together with a justification, as part of the proposal. The final sample shall be approved by IUCN and KfW at the inception phase” (please refer to section c) <i>Sampling approach</i> , under 5. <i>Methods and sources</i> in the Terms of Reference).
Q3	Will IUCN facilitate direct access to all grantees and relevant documents, including project logframes, financial reports, and ESMS instruments, especially for grantees whose projects have already ended?	Yes, IUCN will facilitate access to all grantees and relevant documents.
Q4	Is it mandatory for the evaluation team to include national consultants in each country to be visited, or will the inclusion of local expertise in a few selected countries be considered sufficient? The ToR states that “presence of one member of the evaluation team in every country is considered an asset”, but it is unclear whether this is a strict requirement or a scoring advantage.	The statement in the Terms of Reference that “presence of one member of the evaluation team in every country is considered an asset” refers to countries that will be visited and is not a strict requirement, but rather a scoring advantage. This means that while it is not mandatory to include national consultants or team members established in countries that will be visited, proposals that demonstrate a broader in-country presence and experience may be evaluated more favorably.

Q5	The ToR states: "It will also include field visits for onsite observations and meetings with key partners and beneficiaries from at least four projects. It is expected that the team leader travels to the field but can be assisted by local consultant(s)." Can you confirm whether this refers to four different projects located in the four priority countries (Nepal, India, Bangladesh, Indonesia), i.e., one project per country? And will these projects be identified in coordination with IUCN at the beginning of the assignment? Or is IUCN amenable to a proposed sampling as part of the RfP submission and validated through the inception report?	The sampled projects do not necessarily need to be located in four different countries. A preliminary selection of four projects should be proposed by the bidder in the proposal, and the final selection will be agreed with IUCN at the beginning of the assignment.
Q6	Given the estimated total of 70–90 working days, is there a minimum number of days you expect to be spent in the field?	While there is no fixed minimum number of days required to be spent in the field, the expectation is that the proposed fieldwork duration adequately reflects the level of effort that the evaluation will need for collecting data in the field. The number of days should align with the evaluation methodology and be adjusted to the scope of data collection and the number of countries to be visited.
Q7	Will IUCN or project partners make projects' cars available for the field missions of the evaluators? What other field support can be expected?	Grantees will assist in organizing the field missions, including facilitating local coordination and access to project sites. However, the evaluator is expected to cover all transportation costs incurred during the missions, including vehicle rental or usage. Use of project vehicles may be facilitated where feasible, but it should not be assumed or relied upon. Evaluators should therefore plan and budget accordingly for all transport-related expenses.
Q8	Can IUCN confirm whether the costs associated with attending the ITHCP Grantees Workshop in Nepal (November 2025) should be excluded entirely from the proposal budget, including consultant time, per diem, and travel days?	IUCN confirms that travel, accommodation and meal costs related to attending the ITHCP Grantees Workshop in Nepal (November 2025) will be covered separately and should not be included in the proposal budget. However, consultant fees for attending the workshop, including travel days, should be considered in the budget (3 to 5 working days).
Q9	Could you please clarify whether the 10-page limit for team presentation, as stated in the RfP (p3), includes the CVs of team members?	The 10-page limit for team presentation excludes CVs, which can be longer and added as annexes.
Q10	Are all bidders required to provide pre-qualification information?	Yes, all bidders are required to submit all documents requested in the RfP, including the pre-qualification information.