REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

Subject: Evaluation of Project “Strengthening Environment Quality Authority Regularity Functions”

Date: 24 October, 2013

Dear Sir/Madam,

1. The United Nations Development Programme/Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian People (UNDP/PAPP) is seeking qualified firms to provide the services under subject as detailed in this RFP. You are invited to submit a quotation in accordance with the terms and conditions included in this Solicitation Document.

2. Offerors shall prepare two copies of the Proposal, clearly marking each “Original Proposal” and “Copy of Proposal” as appropriate. In the event of any discrepancy between them, the original shall govern.

3. It is required that proposals shall be submitted in two separate sealed envelopes, one containing the technical proposal and one the financial proposal. Both Envelopes shall be sealed in one outer envelope.

4. The outer sealed envelope shall be delivered to the below address no later than 10 a.m. (Jerusalem time) on 12 November 2013.
   United Nations Development Programme (UNDP / PAPP)
   4A Ya’qubi Street, PO Box 51359, Jerusalem
   Tel: 02-6268200

   The outer envelope shall be clearly marked as follows:
   Mr. Khaled Shahwan
   Deputy Special Representative
   (Operations) - UNDP/PAPP
   RFQ-2013-312: Evaluation of Project “Strengthening Environment Quality Authority Regularity Functions”

   Late Proposals will be rejected.

5. Any request for clarification related to this RFP should be submitted in writing to proc3.papp@undp.org no later than 1 November 2013. Answers to any clarifications received will be sent in writing on 5 November 2013.

Sincerely Yours,

Khaled Shahwan
Deputy Special Representative
(Operations) - UNDP/PAPP
TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. BACKGROUND
The oPt is very vulnerable to critical environmental threats such as untreated wastewater, uncontrolled dumping of hazardous waste and unregulated pollutants from growing industries. The sector faces serious challenges among of which the lack of control over limited natural resources, inefficient environmental management systems, inadequate implementation of environmental policies and strategies as well as insufficient regulatory framework and weak enforcement of the environment law and other related laws. The environment governance is not effective yet due to overlapping in roles and responsibilities of sector agencies and lack of inter-agency coordination in planning, monitoring and enforcement.

The project phase I, 2010-2012, and the bridging year of 2013 intend to enhance EQA’s work environment, capacity for better environmental protection through improving the regulatory framework, environmental planning and monitoring, and enhancing coordination with sector stakeholders. It particularly supports improving environmental monitoring and enforcement through development of bylaws, monitoring manuals, and building technical capacities in monitoring and enforcement.

The project is in line with the environment sector strategy and will contribute to reaching the 2011 – 2013 Environment Sector Strategy objectives of a) Palestinian natural resources are managed in sustainable manner, and b) the institutional and legal environment framework is strong and effective. It is also in consistent with PAPP development for freedom: consolidated plan of assistance for years 2012-2014 to strengthening environment governance in oPt through enhancement of the capacities of environment sector agencies.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE ASSIGNMENT:
• To assess the performance of the project in relation to achieving the indented results
• To assess the linkages between the project and the overall EQA responsibilities
• Developing recommendations for further initiating of follow up actions in the future
• Drawing key lessons learned in terms of strength and weaknesses to contribute to organizational learning
• Assess long-term impacts of project implementation

3. EVALUATION SCOPE AND CRITERIA:

Quality and Relevance of Design
Assess the continuing appropriateness and relevance of the Design. The project context, threats and opportunities may have changed during the course of the project. Assess what adjustments have been made and what others might be necessary. In particular:
• To what extent does the project respond to priority issues?
• To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid?
• Is the project team planning the most appropriate strategies?
- Are there any major risks or ‘killer assumptions’ that are currently not being taken into account?
- Do stakeholders care about the project and believe it makes sense?

**Effectiveness**
Assess the major achievements of the project to date in relation to its stated objectives and intended results. Focus on the higher level results.
- Assess what has been achieved, the likelihood of future achievements, and the significance/strategic importance of the achievements
- Include also qualitative evidence e.g. opinions on the project’s effectiveness based on impressions and interviews with target groups, partners, government, etc.
- Describe any major short-comings of the project to date, explaining the reasons behind them.
- Describe any unforeseen impacts (whether positive or negative).
- Identify any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted e.g. case-studies, stories, best practice

**Efficiency of Planning and Implementation**
Assess to what extent resources are being used economically to deliver the project. Are plans being used, implemented and adapted as necessary? And assess other program management factors important for delivery

**Impact**
Assess to what extent is the project contributing to a long-term positive effects and does it make a difference.

**Potential for sustainability, and up scaling**
Assess the key factors affecting sustainability of the project, such as:
- What are political parameters that contribute to the acceptance of the project?
- Will the project contribute to lasting benefits? Which organisations could/will ensure continuity of project activities in the project area (ownership and sustainability)
- Is there evidence of possible up scaling of project activities beyond the immediate project scope
- Assess whether the project is considered as delivering value for money for its present scope/scale of impact. What are the cost implications for scaling up impact?
- Are there savings that could be made without compromising delivery?
- Assess and make recommendations on the key strategic options for the future of the project i.e. exit strategy, scale down, replication, scale-up, continuation, major modifications to strategy
- Comment on any existing plans
- Make recommendations in addition.
4. RESPOSIBILITES OF THE CONSULTING FIRM:
Under the overall supervision of the Project Manager and in close cooperation with EQA, the consulting firm will review the project file to implement the followings:

1- Prepare an evaluation workplan: The consulting firm shall prepare a workplan that describes how the evaluation will be carried out and the time table for each activity. The workplan should address the followings:
   - Overview of the project
   - Expectations of evaluations
   - Roles and responsibilities
   - Evaluation methodology
   - Evaluation frame work
   - Information collection and analysis
   - Reporting

2- Data Collection: Data should be collected through field observations, interviews, focus groups, questionnaires, participatory methodologies that the consulting firm shall include with project counterparts and the stakeholders. All visits and meetings shall be coordinated through the Project manager, the project assistant and EQA.

3- Evaluation report: the consulting firm shall prepare an evaluation report that describes the evaluation and puts forward the evaluator’s findings, recommendations for future activities and lessons learnt. The report should also highlight gaps, strengths and weaknesses in the project design and implementation. It should also pinpoint all measures that can be taken into consideration in order to enhance the sustainability of the project outputs

5. RESPOSIBILITES OF UNDP:
The contract will be made by and with UNDP/PAPP. The work will be facilitated by EQA and UNDP. Payments will be made after approval of UNDP Program Manager.

6. DOCUMENTS TO BE CONSULTED:
A list of important documents that the evaluators should read at the outset of the evaluation and before finalizing the evaluation design. This should be limited to the critical information that the evaluation team needs. Data sources and documents may include:
- Project document
- Latest Annual work plans
- progress reports
- Key outputs produced
- Partnership arrangements e.g. agreements of cooperation with ministries

7. REQUIRED FORMAT FOR THE EVALUATION REPORT:
Executive Summary (1-4 pages):
- Brief project description and context
- Purpose and expected use of the evaluation
Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian People

• Objectives of the evaluation
• Summary of the evaluation methodology
• Principle findings and conclusions, especially relating to project goals / targets
• Key recommendations for future activities
• Summary of lessons learned, strength and weakness

8. DELIVERABLES:
   ▪ An inception report is to be submitted one week after signing the contract. The inception report should include the project site visits plan.
   ▪ Draft evaluation report should be submitted five weeks after signing the contract.
   ▪ Briefing for the project team by week #5.
   ▪ Final evaluation report will be submitted three days after receiving the comments from UNDP/PAPP and EQA on the draft evaluation report.

9. LEVEL OF EFFORTS:
   It is estimated that this assignment will need 30 working days to accomplish which will be distributed over a period of six (6) weeks. It is anticipated that the work will start before the end of November 2013.

10. LOGISTICS
    The consulting firm will be contracted by the UNDP/PAPP and its work will be facilitated and supervised by the Programme Manager. The consulting firm shall report to the UNDP Programme Manager with cc to EQA.
    Notes: All required information about the project will be provided.

11. EVALUATION ETHICS
    Evaluations in UNDP shall be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG “Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation”.

12. PAYMENT TERMS:
    Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>% Payment</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upon satisfactory completion of the Inception Report</td>
<td>25 %</td>
<td>1 Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upon satisfactory completion of the Evaluation Report</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>30 Dec 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback on the outputs will be made within two weeks after the submission is made by the Consulting firm.

All payments will be issued upon certification of UNDP Programme Manager.
Payments are based upon output, i.e. upon delivery of the services specified in the TOR.
13. REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

A team of two experts; one with minimum postgraduate degree in Environmental Studies, Engineering or related fields and the other with postgraduate degree in public administration or related fields.

- The team leader shall have the following minimum requirements:
  - proven experience (at least 10 years) in environmental management projects and related fields.
  - Minimum five (5) years experience in results based management and evaluation of environmental projects.
  - Experience in financial management
  - Proven experience in management issues.
  - Excellent oral and written communication skills in English and Arabic.
  - Solid analytical and conceptual skills and the ability to think creatively.
  - Good knowledge of local context (culture, politics, and geography).

- A second expert shall have the following minimum requirements:
  - 10 years of experience in capacity building
  - Proven experience in management issues.
  - Excellent oral and written communication skills in English and Arabic.
  - Solid analytical and conceptual skills and the ability to think creatively.
  - Good knowledge of local context (culture, politics, and geography).

Both shall have:
- Good knowledge of capacity building tools and techniques
- Adequate knowledge in environment.
- Enough knowledge of national environmental plans, bylaws, strategies, procedures and agreements.

14. TECHNICAL PROPOSALS

The technical proposal shall describe the approach and methodology that will be applied by the consulting firm to meet the objectives and scope of the Assignment and shall include the following:

a) The methodology
b) A work-plan
c) Description of tools that will be used and provided.
d) Company Profile including description of company facilities.
e) List of relevant projects undertaken within the last two years.
f) Contact of three previous clients that can be used for reference purposes to whom similar services has been provided and completed.
g) Staffing Plan and profile of each staff included in the plan. A matrix should be provided to show which staff will work on what activities and for what duration.

h) CVs of the core/key staff members who will participate in conducting the assignment.

The proposal shall be valid for a minimum of 120 days from the date of bid closing and shall be duly signed by the official representation of the consulting firm and stamped.

15. FINANCIAL PROPOSALS

The offeror is asked to prepare the Price Schedule in **US Dollars** as a separate envelope from the rest of the RFP. The financial proposal shall specify a total lump sum amount all-inclusive for the provision of the requirement.

The lump sum amount shall be broken down to show the following level of detail:

- Daily rates of staff
- Administrative costs
- Overhead and profit
- Man rate per hour
- Cost of workshops
- Any other applicable costs

16. EVALUATION

A two-stage procedure is utilized in evaluating the proposals, with evaluation of the technical proposals prior to any price proposal being opened and compared. The price proposal of the Proposals will be opened only for submissions that passed the minimum technical score (70%) in the evaluation of the technical proposals. The technical proposals are evaluated on the basis of its responsiveness to the Terms of Reference (TOR).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Proposal Evaluation</th>
<th>Points obtainable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Expertise of Firm /Organization</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Staffing Plan and CVs of the Team</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Evaluation Plan including key milestones</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Methodology</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation form for the technical proposals follow. The obtainable number of points specified for each evaluation criterion indicates the relative significance of weight of the item in the overall evaluation process.
### Technical Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Expertise of Firm/Organization</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Does the Company Profile reflect the requirements of the TOR?</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Do projects undertaken within the last 2 years relate to the TOR? (Minimum 2 years experience in provision of similar services to TOR)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Quality of References provided by 3 previous clients</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Quality of examples of Evaluation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Staffing Plan</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Is overall staffing plan sufficient to undertake TOR?</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Are profiles of each staff adequate to undertake TOR?</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Team Leader (minimum post-graduate degree &amp; 5 years relevant experience)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Evaluators previous experience and level of education (minimum post-graduate degree &amp; 5 years relevant experience)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Knowledge of the evaluators with the Palestinian Environment and capacity building programs and</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Evaluation Plan including key milestones</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Evaluation plan clearly demonstrates what will be undertaken at each phase</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Project will be completed within the time specified in the TOR?</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Clearly illustrates how the evaluation will be conducted to cover all required elements</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Clearly illustrates how data will be collected</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Clearly illustrates how each activity will be evaluated to insure that the overall evaluation covers all project components</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Clearly illustrates how the final report will be developed and finalized.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Second Stage, the price proposal of all Offerors, who have attained the minimum 70% score in the technical evaluation will be opened and evaluated.

### 17. Award of Contract

The procuring UNDP entity reserves the right to accept or reject any Proposal, and to annul the solicitation process and reject all Proposals at any time prior to award of contract, without incurring any liability to the affected applicant or any obligation to inform the affected applicant or applicants of the ground for the UNDP’s action.

The UNDP procuring entity will award the Contract to the Offeror who receives the **Highest Combined Technical and Financial score**.
Only proposals that achieve above the minimum of 70% on the substantive presentation shall be reviewed for competitiveness of fees, in the following manner:

30 points shall be allotted to the lowest total fees proposed among those invited firms which obtain the threshold points in the evaluation of the substantive presentation. All other fees proposals shall receive points in inverse proportion to the lowest total fees; e.g. [30 Points] x [US$ lowest total fees]/[US$ other] = points for other proposer’s fees.

The General mark or combined score for each proposal will be arrived as follows:
The score of the Technical proposal multiplied by 70% will be added to the Financial Proposal 30%. The offeror whose proposal received the highest combined score will be the successful bidder.