



Date: 12 February 2020

Reference: RFP 2020/003

Request for proposals (RFP 2020/003) Evidence Review on Results-Based Payments

1. Background

- 1.1 The Green Climate Fund (the “GCF”, or the “Fund”) was established with the purpose of making a significant and ambitious contribution to the global efforts towards attaining the goals set by the international community to combat climate change. In the context of sustainable development, the Fund will promote a paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways by providing support to developing countries to limit or reduce their greenhouse gas emissions and to adapt to the impacts of climate change. The Fund’s headquarters are located in Songdo, Incheon City, Republic of Korea.
- 1.2 The GCF was designated as an operating entity of the financial mechanism of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (“UNFCCC”). It is governed and supervised by a Board that has responsibility for funding decisions pursuant to the Governing Instrument for the Green Climate Fund (the “Governing Instrument”). It is supported by an independent Secretariat, accountable to the Board, having management capabilities to execute day-to-day operations of the GCF, providing administrative, legal and financial expertise.
- 1.3 The Independent Evaluation Unit (the “IEU” or the “Unit”) of the GCF is mandated by the Board under paragraph 60 of the Governing Instrument to inform its decision making. The IEU has several objectives including: to guide the GCF and stakeholders as a learning institution through providing strategic guidance; to conduct periodic independent evaluations of GCF performance to objectively assess the effectiveness and efficiency of its activities; and provide evaluation reports to the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement through periodic reviews of the Financial Mechanism. The IEU has a mandate to discharge an accountability function and to support a learning function.

2. Invitation

- 2.1 Through this request for proposals (“RFP”), the IEU of the Green Climate Fund is seeking to contract a qualified, reputable and experienced Firm to carry out evidence review on results-based payments. The terms of reference included in Annex 1 provides the details of the assignment and expected deliverables. For the purposes of this RFP, the IEU and the GCF are one legal entity.
- 2.2 Proposals must be submitted to the GCF no later than **11 March 2020 at 23.00 hours Korean Standard Time**
- 2.3 The RFP includes the following annexes:

Annex 1	Terms of Reference
Annex 2	Requirement for Firm’s Proposals
Annex 3	Evaluation Criteria
Annex 4	Company Profile Form



Annex 5	Acknowledgement Letter
Annex 6	Timeline
Annex 7	Model Contract

- 2.4 The terms set forth in this RFP, including all the annexes listed above, will form part of any contract, should the IEU of the GCF accept your proposal. Any such contract will require compliance with all factual statements and representations made in the proposal, subject to any modifications agreed to by the IEU of the GCF in the context of any negotiations entered into it.
- 2.5 The IEU of the GCF may, at its discretion, cancel the requirement in part or in whole. It also reserves the right to accept or reject any proposal and to annul the selection process and reject all proposals at any time prior to selection, without thereby incurring any liability to proposers/firms.
- 2.6 Proposers may withdraw their proposal after submission provided that written notice of withdrawal is received by the IEU of the GCF prior to the deadline prescribed for submission of proposals. No proposal may be modified subsequent to the deadline for submission of proposals. No proposal may be withdrawn in the interval between the deadline for submission of proposals and the expiration of the period of proposal validity.
- 2.7 All proposals shall remain valid and open for acceptance for a period of 90 calendar days after the deadline for submission of proposals. A proposal valid for a shorter period may be rejected. In exceptional circumstances, the IEU of the GCF may solicit the proposer's consent to an extension of the period of validity. The request and the responses thereto shall be made in writing.
- 2.8 Effective with the release of this solicitation, all communications relating to this RFP must be directed only to the Head of Procurement by email at procurement@gcfund.org. Proposers must not communicate with any other personnel of the GCF regarding this RFP.
- 2.9 This RFP is issued under the GCF Administrative Guidelines on Procurement 1. Information regarding the guidelines can be found at http://www.greenclimate.fund/documents/20182/574763/GCF_policy_-_Administrative_Guidelines_on_Procurement.pdf/b767d68e-f8b7-46d1-a18c-b6541f3dc010

3. Joint Venture, Consortium or Association

- 3.1 If the Proposer is a group of legal entities that will form or have formed a joint venture, consortium or association at the time of the submission of the Proposal, they shall confirm in their Proposal that:
 - a) they have designated one party to act as a lead entity, duly vested with authority to legally bind the members of the joint venture jointly and severally,
 - b) if they are awarded the contract, the contract shall be entered into, by and between GCF and the designated lead entity, who shall be acting for and on behalf of all the member entities comprising the joint venture.
- 3.2 After the Proposal has been submitted to GCF, the lead entity identified to represent the joint venture shall not be altered without the prior written consent of the GCF. Furthermore, neither the lead entity nor the member entities of the joint venture can submit another proposal:
 - a) either in its own capacity; nor
 - b) as a lead entity or a member entity for another joint venture submitting another Proposal.
- 3.3 The description of the organization of the joint venture/consortium/association must clearly define the expected role of each of the entity in the joint venture in delivering the requirements

¹ Annex II "Corporate Procurement Guidelines on the Use of Consultants"



of the RFP, both in the Proposal and the Joint Venture Agreement. All entities that comprise the joint venture shall be subject to the eligibility and qualification assessment by GCF.

- 3.4 Where a joint venture is presenting its track record and experience in a similar undertaking as those required in the RFP, it should present such information in the following manner:
 - a) Those that were undertaken together by the joint venture; and
 - b) Those that were undertaken by the individual entities of the joint venture expected to be involved in the performance of the services defined in the RFP.
- 3.5 Previous contracts completed by individual experts working privately but who are permanently or were temporarily associated with any of the member firms cannot be claimed as the experience of the joint venture or those of its members, but should only be claimed by the individual experts themselves in their presentation of their individual credentials.
- 3.6 If a joint venture's Proposal is determined by the GCF as the most responsive Proposal that offers the best value for money, the GCF shall award the contract to the joint venture, in the name of its designated lead entity. The lead entity shall sign the contract for and on behalf of all other member entities.

4. Request for Clarification of RFP Documents

- 4.1 A prospective proposer requiring any clarification of the solicitation documents may notify the GCF in writing to the email address procurement@gcfund.org by the specified date and time mentioned in Annex 6. The subject line of the email **MUST** have the reference number and title of the RFP **i.e. RFP 2020/003 – Evidence Review on Results-Based Payments**. The GCF will respond in writing to any request for clarification of the solicitation documents that it receives by the due date published in Annex 6. Written copies of the GCF response which contain information that may be of common interest to all bidders (including an explanation of the query but without identifying the source of inquiry) will be posted on the GCF website and/or communicated via email.

5. Amendments to RFP Documents

- 5.1 At any time prior to the deadline for submission of proposals, the GCF may, for any reason, whether at its own initiative or in response to a clarification requested by a prospective proposer, modify the RFP documents by amendment. The amendments will also be posted on the GCF website and/or communicated via email.
- 5.2 In order to allow prospective proposers reasonable time in which to take the amendment into account in preparing their proposals, the GCF may, at its sole discretion, extend the deadline for the submission of proposal.

6. Language of Proposals

- 6.1 The proposals prepared by the proposer and all correspondence and documents relating to the proposal exchanged by the proposer and the GCF, shall be written in English. Supporting documents and printed literature furnished by the proposer may be in another language provided they are accompanied by an appropriate translation of all relevant passages in English. In any such case, for interpretation of the proposal, the translation shall prevail. The sole responsibility for translation and the accuracy thereof shall be the responsibility of the proposer.



7. Submission of Proposals

7.1 **Format and form of submission of bids:** Bidders are requested to send a Bid preferably² through the GCF Supplier portal at <https://gcf.supplier.ariba.com> (a supplier manual can be found on the GCF website <https://www.greenclimate.fund/who-we-are/procurement> as an attachment under this RFP) **or** via email to procurement@gcfund.org and copied to bnveda@gcfund.org

i) Submission through the Supplier Portal (SAP Ariba)

1. Open <https://gcf.supplier.ariba.com/>
2. Click Register Now
3. Fill in Company Information, Fill in User account information and details under ‘Tell us more about your business’
4. Check ‘I have read and agree to the Terms of Use and ‘I have read and agree to the SAP Ariba Privacy Statement’ then click ‘Register’
5. Check your email and click the activation link.
6. Fill in additional information required, click Save and Close.
7. Your company information will be submitted to GCF and will be reviewed and approved. Once you register, please send an email to procurement@gcfund.org with the RFP number and title as the email reference and confirm that you are interested in submitting a bid. You will then be invited to participate in the RFP. You will receive the RFP event notification email from the Green Climate Fund with a link to access the RFP. This link can be used only once. If you require to access the portal after you have activated the link, you can log in on <https://gcf.supplier.ariba.com> with your user name and password.
8. Review Prerequisites and Click ‘I accept the terms of this agreement’
9. Open the Technical Section of the RFP section and download the RFP document and technical proposal submission forms
10. Open the Financial Section of the RFP and download the financial bid submission forms
11. When ready to submit your bid, upload the technical bid under the TECHNICAL section and the financial bid under the FINANCIAL section. Please **DO NOT** enter or upload any financial information under the TECHNICAL section as this may result in disqualification.
12. Click ‘Submit Entire Response’ to submit bid.

(For detailed instructions on how to access and submit a bid, see the supplier manual. It is recommended that bidders register on the portal as early as possible.)

ii) Submission via email

Two separate files (technical and financial bids) should be attached to the email as below.

The Technical file should contain the technical proposal and be named as follows:

RFP2020003-TECH-name of proposer

Please **DO NOT** include any financial information in the technical proposal as this may result in disqualification.

The financial file should contain the financial proposal and be named as follows:

RFP2020003-FIN-name of proposer

² Suppliers shall note that GCF will be phasing out e-mail submission in the near future, therefore suppliers are encouraged to register and submit their Bid/Proposal through the GCF Supplier portal (SAP Ariba)



The subject line of the email should be as follows:

RFP 2020/003 – Evidence Review on Results-Based Payments

- 7.2 The **Financial Proposal MUST be password protected**. The authorized procurement officer will contact the bidders that pass the qualifying technical score for the password to open the Financial Proposal. Bidders should **NOT** send the password to the financial proposal until they are requested to do so by the procurement officer. Financial Proposals that are submitted without password protection may be rejected for non-compliance.
- 7.3 All prospective proposers are kindly requested to return the completed Acknowledgement Letter of RFP receipt (Appendix 5) by the date indicated in Appendix 6, duly signed by an authorized representative, via email, advising whether they intend to submit a proposal by the designated closing date/time. Please also notify the Procurement Specialist immediately if any part of this RFP is missing and/or illegible.

8. Late proposals

- 8.1 Any proposals received by the GCF after the deadline for submission of proposals prescribed in Annex 6 of this document shall normally be rejected.

9. Opening of Technical Proposals

- 9.1 Technical Proposals will be opened on the date indicated in Annex 6. The purpose of this public opening is to record the names of proposers having submitted proposals by the due date and time. Only technical proposals will be opened at the public opening. The financial proposals will not be opened. Proposers submitting proposals are welcome to send one (1) representative, with proper authorization from their company, to observe the opening and recording of proposals received.

10. Opening of Financial Proposals

- 10.1 GCF shall notify in writing those Proposers that have achieved the minimum qualifying technical score and request for the password for the Financial Proposals.

11. Corrupt, Fraudulent, Coercive, Collusive and other Prohibited Practices.

- 11.1 The GCF requires that all GCF staff, proposers/bidders, suppliers, service providers and any other person or entity involved in GCF-related activities observe the highest standard of ethics during the procurement and execution of all contracts. The GCF may reject any proposal put forward by proposers, or where applicable, terminate their contract, if it is determined that they have engaged in corrupt, fraudulent, coercive, collusive or other prohibited practices.

12. Conflict of Interest

- 12.1 In their proposal, proposers must (i) confirm that, based on their current best knowledge, there are no real or potential conflicts of interest involved in rendering Services for the GCF, and (ii) set out their policy on dealing with conflicts of interest should these arise.

13. Confidentiality

- 13.1 Information relating to the evaluation of proposals and recommendations concerning selection of Firms will not be disclosed to Firms that submitted proposals.



Terms of Reference for an Evidence Review on Results-Based Payments

Provision of consultancy services for the Independent Evaluation Unit of the Green Climate Fund

1. Aims

- The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of the GCF wishes to procure consultancy services for an evidence review on results-based payments to be completed by 30th December 2020.
- The assignment will be a joint engagement between the IEU and the contracted party. All products emerging from this work are joint products but the intellectual property will be owned by the IEU. For subsequent use and citation, members of the contracted team will be informed.
- This document lays out the terms of reference for the evidence review and associated meta-analysis. It consists of the following nine further sections and application templates.

2. Background to the assignment

- The objectives are to produce two evidence gap maps, an intervention heat map and subsequently a systematic review with relevant meta-analysis on the following three review questions:

What is the evidence base on the effectiveness of results-based payment interventions (also known as impact investments, impact bonds, outcome-based financing, results-based financing, output-based aid or conditional transfers)? (Evidence gap maps)

Where has the GCF allocated project finance to date within the intervention/outcome framework developed for the evidence gap map? (Intervention heat map)

To what extent have results-based payment interventions been effective at achieving change in desired outcome areas at the micro, meso and macro scales? (Systematic review)

- The evidence review will be a comprehensive, systematic and rigorous collation, assessment, presentation (through clear organisation in a [map](#), and subsequently a systematic review on selected sectors) and relevant meta-analysis of evidence (in both published formats and grey literature). The evidence review will be relevant to the policies and practices of the GCF and be based on a structured literature search guided by a protocol, an appraisal of the quality of evidence based on clear criteria and will offer a clear descriptive and analytical synthesis of the evidence base (as defined below).
- The assignment will follow all the necessary protocols, search requirements, coding procedures and replicability requirements as set out by leading global institutions on evidence synthesis. In particular, it will ensure the title, protocol, review and subsequent publication adhere to all mandatory requirements in the Campbell Policies and Guidelines Series No. 3 – Methodological expectations of Campbell Collaboration intervention reviews: Conduct standards.
- This includes the possibility of utilizing specialist search strings for different databases, ‘snowball’ sampling, searches in sub-areas, utilising expert knowledge in sub-areas, and canvassing the experience of search specialists and systematic review specialists. Quality assurance will be conducted by an advisory committee. The advisory committee will be constituted by experts in the field of evidence and systematic reviews and/or the questions under review and will include members of the Campbell



Collaboration Consultative Group on Climate Solutions.

3. Background to the GCF

- The GCF is a multilateral fund created in 2010 to support developing countries respond to the challenges of climate change. The GCF contributes to achieving the objectives of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Paris Agreement. In the context of sustainable development, the GCF advances and promotes a paradigm shift towards low-emission and climate-resilient development pathways. As a designated financial entity of the UNFCCC, the GCF provides funding for climate mitigation and adaptation projects and programmes in developing countries while accounting for their needs and supporting particularly those most vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change. A Board governs the GCF, composed of an equal number of members from developed and developing countries. The GCF is operated by a Secretariat headed by an Executive Director. The GCF has three independent units including the Independent Integrity Unit (IIU), Independent Redress Mechanism (IRM) and Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU). The Governing Instrument of the GCF outlines the mandate of the Fund to provide new, additional, adequate, and predictable mitigation and adaptation support to developing countries. This is through thematic and integrated funding windows based on a results-based approach.
- The fund provides resources through the Division of Mitigation and Adaptation (DMA), blended forms of finance from the Private Sector Facility (PSF) and the Simplified Approval Process Pilot Scheme (SAP) for smaller-scale projects or programmes from the Division of Country Programming (DCP). DMA has facilitated most adaptation projects to date as the financial instruments mobilised have mainly been grants and concessional loans. Projects are assessed against a range of investment criteria including paradigm shift potential, sustainable development potential, needs of the recipient, country ownership, efficiency/effectiveness and impact potential.
- The IEU of the GCF, is mandated by the GCF Board under paragraph 60 of the Governing Instrument to inform its decision making. The IEU has several objectives:
 - Informing decision-making by the Board and identifying and disseminating lessons learned, contributing to guiding the GCF and stakeholders as a learning institution, providing strategic guidance;
 - Conducting periodic independent evaluations of GCF performance to objectively assess the results of the GCF and the effectiveness and efficiency of its activities; and
 - Providing evaluation reports to the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Paris Agreement for purposes of periodic reviews of the Financial Mechanism.
- The IEU has a mandate for both discharging an accountability function and supporting a learning function. These are central to the GCF being a learning organization as laid out in its Governing Instrument and its initial strategic plan. For more information, please check the documentation available on the IEU's [website](#).

4. Purpose and Objectives

- Results-based payments (also known as impact investments, impact bonds, outcome-based financing, results-based financing, output-based aid or conditional transfers) apply different degrees of conditionality to the transfer of finance from one party to another, often based on the degree to which a verified threshold has been passed (which is sometimes measured by a third party or independent arbitrator). This financial model has been applied at multiple scales from the national level (through

REDD+ transfers), municipal level (such as improvements in waste disposal systems) through to household-level transfers such as conditional cash transfers (where conditions relate to health or education conditionalities, especially regarding children). Further examples include reducing reoffending within justice systems, conditionalities around aid transfers, conditionalities for conservation and social welfare, and results-based payments for environmental services.

- The evidence review will use the PICO model (population, intervention, comparison, and outcome model) to describe the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the evidence gap map and the subsequent systematic review. In the initial screening phase and for one of the evidence gap maps (see Section 4.1), the assignment will include non-experimental studies (which do not use a causal design). For the systematic review (see Section 4b), the assignment will use only causal designs. These ToR now describe two PICO models: one for the evidence gap map and intervention heat map (4.1); and one for the systematic review and meta-analysis (4.2).

4.1 PICO Model for Evidence Gap Map and Intervention Heat Map

This sub section describes the PICO Model for the evidence gap map and intervention heat map.

- **Population:** The evidence gap map will include interventions rolled out globally including in low- and middle-income countries, as defined by the 2020 World Bank categorization, and interventions in high-income countries (including in low-income contexts in these countries).
- **Interventions:** The evidence gap map will assess *what evidence exists with respect to the effectiveness of results-based payment interventions (also known as impact investments, impact bonds, outcome-based financing, results-based financing, output-based aid or conditional transfers) in desired outcome areas at the micro, meso and macro level.* The types of interventions for the evidence gap map will be informed by a meta theory of change illustrating the reason why results-based payments are needed above and beyond conventional forms of financing for the most important sectors and sub sectors including infrastructure, social transfers, health, education, justice, aid, mitigation, poverty, adaptation, conservation and payments for environmental services. The evidence gap map will focus on studies which seek to evaluate the effect of an intervention that has been implemented at the national, state, sub-national or district scale by any organisation. The evidence gap map will include studies with different modes of delivery, doses, durations, intensities, co-interventions and degrees of complexity. Importantly, the evidence review will only include systematic reviews of studies on conditional cash transfers and other forms of social assistance that use a results-based payment model.
- Interventions should include pilot studies and those that test innovations. Sample sizes should be assessed on a case-by-case basis as requirements depend on sampling procedures, the type of research designs (such as clustered designs) and/or the type of analysis to be conducted (as certain analytical techniques have certain requirements). The evidence gap map should include underpowered experimental studies and broader studies which have small sample sizes.
- **Comparison:** The evidence gap map should consider quantitative studies that aim to evaluate the causal effect of an intervention on outcomes (i.e. experimental or quasi-experimental approaches or similar causal designs) as well as non-causal designs. One evidence gap map should include studies that have a clearly defined comparison group for evaluation of the treatment effect. The nature of the comparison group depends on the type of research design used in the study. For instance, if the treatment assignment is at the household level, then the comparison group will consist of households. One evidence gap map should *also* include quantitative studies that use observational data to analyse the effectiveness of results-based payment interventions (i.e. including non-experimental designs, modelling approaches, regression-based analyses, qualitative comparative analysis or similar techniques).

- **Outcomes:** The evidence gap map will develop and utilise an intervention/outcome framework (see below). However, outcome measures will not form part of the criteria for including studies. Overall, outcome indicators should reflect the most appropriate forms of measurement results-based payments. Studies that capture unintended and indirect consequences should also be included. Indeed, the evidence gap map will consider potential adverse effects from interventions. To allow for detecting change, the outcomes of the studies should be measured a reasonable time after the onset of intervention. While collecting data a reasonable time after the intervention is in many cases not sufficiently long to be certain of lasting change (e.g. such as changes in political or administrative leadership) a higher threshold may lead to the exclusion of too many studies. Studies may look at outcomes that in themselves can be considered signals of change, especially investment decisions signalling long-term use, scaling up and replication in different contexts. In the initial screening phase, the assignment will include non-experimental studies (which do not use a causal design). The development of the intervention/outcome framework to capture the effectiveness of results-based payment interventions will be a substantive output from the assignment.

The development of the intervention/outcome framework is central to all three review questions outlined above. The intervention/outcome framework will be based on the meta theory of change (which illustrates the reasons why results-based payments are needed above and beyond conventional forms of financing) and will be developed through a participatory workshop with the consultancy team, IEU staff, and the advisory group including quality assurance experts from the Campbell Collaboration.

The intervention heat map will utilise this intervention/outcome framework to illustrate where the GCF has allocated project finance to date, how much finance has been allocated and to assemble relevant data about these investments including from IEU datasets. This information will include but is not limited to approved and allocated GCF financing, co-financing, total financing, approved and allocated GCF finance by type of finance instrument (grants, reimbursable grants, senior loans, subordinated loans, junior debt, equity, senior equity, guarantees), disbursements to date and M&E budget (both nominal amounts and as a proportion of the total budget).

4.2 PICO Model for Systematic Review

This sub section describes the PICO model for the systematic review and associated meta-analysis.

- **Population:** The Review will include interventions rolled out in low- and middle-income countries, as defined by the 2020 World Bank categorization. It will also include studies of interventions in high-income countries as it is common for results-based payment interventions to be implemented in low-income areas in these contexts.
- **Interventions:** The systematic review will assess the *extent to which results-based payment interventions have been effective at achieving change in desired outcome areas at the micro, meso and macro scales*. The types of interventions for the assignment will be informed by the evidence gap map which will highlight the sectors and sub sectors with the highest potential for the systematic review. The systematic review will focus *only* on quantitative studies which seek to evaluate the causal effect of a results-based payment intervention. The assignment will include studies with different modes of delivery, doses, durations, intensities, co-interventions and degrees of complexity. Interventions should include pilot studies and testing of innovations. Sample sizes should be re-assessed on a case-by-case basis as the systematic review now only includes causal designs. The systematic review should include underpowered experimental studies.
- **Comparison:** The systematic review should consider only quantitative studies that aim to evaluate the causal effect of an intervention on outcomes, i.e., experimental or quasi-experimental approaches or similar causal designs. The assignment should include studies that have a clearly defined comparison group for evaluation of the treatment effect. The nature of the comparison group depends on the type of

research design used in the study. For instance, if the treatment assignment is at the household level, then the comparison group will consist of households. The systematic review will include studies of two types:

- Experimental designs. This type of study specifically uses random assignment of intervention to the treatment group and evaluates the effect by comparing the outcome with the control group and by using an appropriate methodology. These studies could also be natural experiments.
 - Quasi-experimental designs. In cases when the assignment of treatment is not random, various quasi-experimental designs are used to evaluate the treatment effects. These methods include but will not be restricted to regression discontinuity design (RDD), instrumental variable (IV), difference-in-difference designs (DID) and propensity score matching (PSM) approaches.
- In the absence of randomization, the main challenge is the possibility of the treatment to be endogenous, i.e. it can be confounded with unobservable factors correlated with both the treatment and the outcome. The systematic review will include studies that deal with this potential endogeneity issue, either by relying on experimental designs, other form of exogenous assignment of the treatment using appropriate instruments or by constructing comparable control groups through analytical procedures. The assignment will ensure that studies with multiple arms meet the eligibility criteria and that double counting will not occur.
 - **Outcomes:** The systematic review will utilise and refine the outcome measures for results-based payments. Outcome measures will not form part of the criteria for including studies in the systematic review. Outcome indicators should reflect the most appropriate forms of measurement for results-based payments. Studies that capture unintended and indirect consequences should also be included. Indeed, the systematic review will consider potential adverse effects from interventions. To allow for detecting change, the outcomes of the studies should be measured a reasonable time after the onset of intervention. While collecting data a reasonable time after the intervention is in many cases not sufficiently long to be certain of lasting change, e.g. such as changes in political or administrative leadership, a higher threshold may lead to the exclusion of too many studies. Importantly, studies may look at outcomes that in themselves can be considered signals of change, especially investment decisions signalling long-term use, scaling up and replication in different contexts.

The meta-analysis will ascertain overall effect sizes (and confidence levels) for groups of interventions spread over multiple studies (as determined by the project team, IEU and the advisory committee). Both interventions and outcomes will need to be very similar/identical and this will rely on expert judgement. Forest plots will be generated to illustrate how by aggregating studies the estimates of effect sizes become more precise as sample sizes increase (with narrower confidence intervals). If a critical mass of experimental and quasi-experimental studies are available, meta-regression will be conducted including the inclusion of moderator variables. The steps required here include:

- (i) Ensuring outcome variables are all continuous/scale
- (ii) Extract data from the studies in the format that is required (value of outcome variable in T and C; standard deviation of outcome measure for T and C; sample size for T and C).
- (iii) Convert the mean differences in effect sizes into standardized effect sizes
- (iv) Ensure the direction of causality is correct
- (v) Calculate the weighted average of the intervention effects where individual weights are chosen to reflect the amount of information that each study contains.
- (vi) Check for heterogeneity between studies by assessing visually if confidence intervals overlap or not. If heterogeneity exists, consider using an appropriate statistical test such as Chi-squared.
- (vii) Choose whether a fixed effects or random effects model for meta-regression is appropriate.
- (viii) Choose which study characteristics can be included as independent (and moderator) variables
- (ix) Ensure data are normally distributed and transform if necessary (with appropriate adjustments in interpretation)
- (x) Use meta-regression add-ins or modules in R, Stata or other statistical software to conduct the meta-regression



If a critical mass of experimental or quasi-experimental studies is not available, logit/probit regressions or other meta techniques will be considered as a form of meta-analysis.

5. Scope of the work and research questions

The evidence review will respond to the following research questions:

Evidence gap maps

What is the extent of the evidence base on the effectiveness of results-based payment interventions?

Intervention heat map

Where has the GCF allocated project finance to date within the intervention/outcome framework developed for the evidence gap maps?

Systematic review

To what extent have results-based payment interventions been effective at achieving change in desired outcome areas at the micro, meso and macro scales?

How can these interventions be clustered most effectively to allow aggregation and meta-analysis?

To what extent have the form of the financial instrument and/or the institutional architecture determined *significant change* within groups of interventions?

6. Methods and approaches

The aim of the assignment is to complete an evidence gap map and systematic review with the following steps:

1. Examine existing relevant evidence gap maps and systematic reviews that use statistical meta-analysis in order to inform search strategies and to screen for inclusion into this review. In addition, screen trial registers and search within other systematic reviews on the same and similar topics.
2. Refine the review question and map out the landscape of studies through an initial title-abstract screening using Scopus and relevant bibliographic databases and searching reference lists (using double coding when relevant) to allow for the focus, design and context of studies to be collated (but not restricting by publication status). At this stage, initial screening should include studies that use non-causal designs: in other words, research designs that do not use an experimental or quasi-experimental design will not, at this stage, be an exclusion criterion. The extraction tool to be used to delineate information from each study will be piloted with early results from the initial screening assessed by the advisory group and quality assurance panel before full screening is conducted.
3. Organise the studies clearly in a framework which consists of interventions in rows and attributes/conditions/contexts and outcomes in columns.
4. Complete one version of the evidence gap map for causal and non-causal designs, and one version which only includes causal studies (i.e. those using experimental or quasi-experimental designs, or equivalent



approaches). In addition, utilise the same intervention/outcome framework to complete the intervention heat map as described above.

5. Provide the IEU with the refined and operational intervention/outcome framework, a completed evidence gap map of all studies, a completed evidence gap map containing only causal designs, and the completed intervention heat map
6. Provide a draft Review Protocol which includes the following sections: 1. Background; 2. Objectives; 3. Methodology; 4. Roles and responsibilities; 5. Source of support; 6. Declaration of interest; 7. Preliminary timeframe; 8. Plans for updating the review; 9. Funding; 10. Author declaration; 11. Appendix (includes search strategy data extraction forms, screening tool and eligibility criteria tables, critical appraisal tools any definitions etc.); 12. References; 13. Author details.
7. The protocol will explain and justify the search strategies to be employed, the screening tools to be used and further appropriate parameters including eligibility requirements. For example, it will discuss search strings, how hits for search strings for databases will be reported, whether snowballing will be required, the degree of single and double screening, how disagreements will be arbitrated, data extraction and management, unit of analysis issues, risk of bias assessment procedures, choice of effect measures (ensuring that scales are comparable), specify standardized effect sizes which would lead to inclusion in meta-analyses, offer a sub-group analysis plan and the assessment and investigation of heterogeneity, assessment of reporting biases, and how meaningful synthesis and meta-analysis will be conducted (including potential moderator analysis).
8. This draft Review Protocol will be revised in light of comments from the IEU and advisory panel (including external peer review by the Campbell Collaboration Consultative Group on Climate Solution). Provide a final protocol in light of comments from the advisory panel and IEU.
9. Once agreement is reached on the specific sectors and sub sectors for the systematic review, conduct and document the search process as described in the protocol (using data collection forms to describe studies and capture numerical data, checking for consistency when doubts arise) and include studies where outcome data is reported in a usable or unusable format. Ensure that multiple copies of reports are collated.
10. Provide a presentation to the IEU and advisory panel on the first draft of the draft systematic review. This should be structured according to Campbell systematic review templates. Submit the draft systematic review to the IEU who will send comments and ensure external peer review by the advisory group (including members of the Campbell Consultative Group on Climate Solutions).
11. Address the comments made by IEU and advisory panel including on the meta-analysis results of studies in the form of forest plots and appropriate statistical approaches, including refining aggregate effect size estimates in terms of the assessment of heterogeneity (including the use of qualitative comparative analysis, if applicable), publication bias and meta-regression.
12. Deliver the final draft of the systematic review (including meta-analysis) using the sections stipulated by the Campbell systematic review template.
13. Integrate any comments from both IEU and the advisory panel before submitting the final report.

7. Structure of the evaluation team and responsibilities

- Teams should have strong in-team expertise and experience in systematic reviews, evidence gap maps

- and meta-analysis (including systematic searching, quality appraisal, data extraction and data analysis);
- Teams should have strong expertise and experience in results-based payment interventions;
- Teams should have in-depth experience with statistical analysis and demonstrate a strong understanding of counterfactual methods;
- Desirable qualifications include consideration of gender diversity, ability to work in multiple languages, ability to travel, and responsiveness;
- Teams should have qualified database search specialists and access to relevant databases;
- Teams should be able to commit that they will be able to produce a highly credible, well-written evaluation report in the period requested.

8. Timeline and deliverables

- The deliverables for this evidence review are structured in four stages:
 - Inception, planning and EGM creation (April 2020 – June 2020)
 - Draft and final protocols for the systematic review (June 2020 – August 2020)
 - Data collection, cleaning and management (August 2020 - October 2020)
 - Data analysis and reporting (October 2020 - December 2020).
- Inception, planning and EGM creation (April 2020 – June 2020). This phase covers steps 1-5 above. It includes starting the engagement with the IEU by the selected team and the completion of the intervention/outcome framework, draft and final evidence gap maps alongside the draft and final intervention heat maps. The due date for the final set of deliverables (both the final evidence gap maps and the intervention heat map is on or before 20 June 2020) upon which 20% of the payment will be made to the selected team if the deliverables are satisfactory.
- Draft and final protocols for the systematic review (June 2020 – August 2020). This phase covers steps 6-8 above. The selected team must ensure the protocol and systematic review will be eligible for registration with the Campbell Collaboration. The selected team must allow sufficient time for the receipt and integration of comments on the draft protocol. The integration of comments must be done in a professional manner and the registration process for the Campbell Collaboration must be completed when the final protocol is delivered on or before the 20th August 2020.
- Data collection, cleaning and management (August 2020 - October 2020). During this phase, the selected team will undertake the necessary bibliographic and screening tasks. There are two main deliverables under this phase: first, the selected team will complete and deliver a fully coded file detailing the process and results of the search, the nature of included studies, reasons for exclusion, risks of bias assessments and sampling strategies used in studies. The due date for this deliverable is on or before 20 September 2020 upon which 10% of the payment can be made if the deliverable is deemed satisfactory by the IEU and the advisory board. The second deliverable under this phase is writing and delivering the data collection report for the systematic review. The due date for this deliverable will be 20 October 2020 upon which 10% of the payment can be made if the draft is deemed satisfactory by the IEU and the advisory board.
- Reporting (October 2020 - December 2020). The completion of the systematic review and relevant meta-analysis will be completed in this phase. Both will be shared, socialized, and reviewed for quality. The selected team is required to keep track of the feedback in a systematic and logical format. The socialisation process will include sharing of lessons with the GCF, followed by finalization of the draft, a presentation, and the sharing and wider use and utilization of the report. The main deliverable under this phase include presentation to the IEU and advisory panel of the draft systematic review (alongside meta-analysis), the integration of comments, and delivery of the written report (adhering to the conventions stipulated by the Campbell Collaboration). In addition, it is expected that all data collected and generated during the review and meta-analysis (including code and syntax) will be delivered. The due date for this deliverable will be on or before the 30 December 2020. Once comments are integrated satisfactorily and a polished report delivered, the remaining 40% of the payment can be made. This is conditional on the delivery of the final report to the Campbell Collaboration adhering to all the necessary

requirements for the publication of the evidence review. The selected team must allow sufficient time for the receipt and integration of comments on draft and final systematic reviews.

The broad details of the deliverables and payment schedule are detailed in Table 1 below:

Table 1 Deliverables and payment schedule

Phases	Deliverables	Payment date	Payment (%)
Inception, Planning and EGM creation	Completed evidence gap map of all studies, completed evidence gap map containing only causal designs, and completed intervention heat map.	20 June	20%
Draft and final protocols for the systematic review	Delivery of the draft and final protocols for the systematic review	20 August	20%
Data Collection, Cleaning and Management	Fully coded file for systematic review	20 September	10%
	Data collection report for systematic review	20 October	10%
Reporting	Draft systematic review and meta-analysis, including socializing, reviewing and production of the final systematic review and meta-analysis	30 December	40%

A more detailed workplan will be completed by the project team.

9. Advisory Committee

- The advisory committee will be formed to inform the process and substance of this review will be constituted by four experts in the field of evidence and systematic reviews and/or the questions under review (and will include experts from the Campbell Collaboration Consultative Group on Climate Solutions).



GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND

Annex 2

Requirements for Firms' Proposals Technical Proposal

The technical proposal will be submitted in a separate file and will address all aspects of the Terms of Reference. The Technical Proposal shall have all the necessary details in response to the Terms of Reference and the proposer shall fill in the technical Forms (TECH Forms) which follow in this annex and which must be filled in accordingly.



TECH Forms

Form TECH-1: Technical Proposal Submission Form

[Location, Date]

To: [Name and address of Client]

To whom it may concern:

We, the undersigned, offer to provide the consulting services for [Insert title of assignment] in accordance with your Request for Proposal dated [Insert Date] and our Proposal. We are hereby submitting our Proposal, which includes this Technical Proposal, and a Financial.

We are submitting our Proposal in association with: [Insert a list with full name and address of each associated Consultant if submitting as an association]

We hereby declare that all the information and statements made in this Proposal are true and accept that any misinterpretation contained in it may lead to our disqualification.

If negotiations are held during the period of validity of the Proposal, i.e., before the date indicated in Paragraph Reference 2.6 of the RFP, we undertake to negotiate on the basis of the proposed staff, methodology and approach. Our Proposal is binding upon us and subject to the modifications resulting from Contract negotiations.

We undertake, if our Proposal is accepted, to initiate the consulting services related to the assignment.

We understand you are not bound to accept any Proposal you receive.

We remain,

Yours sincerely,

Authorized Signature [In full and initials]: _____

Name and Title of Signatory: ____

Name of Firm: .

Address: _____



Form TECH-2: Firm's Organization and Experience

A - Organization

[Provide here a brief (two pages) description of the background and organization of your firm/entity and each associate for this assignment.]

B - Experience

[Using the format below, provide information on each assignment for which your firm, and each associate for this assignment, was legally contracted either individually as a corporate entity or as one of the major companies within an association, for carrying out consulting services similar to the ones requested under this assignment. Use not more than 20 pages.]

Assignment name:	Approx. value of the contract (in current US\$ or Euro):
Country: Location within country:	Duration of assignment (months):
Name of Client:	Total N° of staff-months of the assignment:
Address:	Approx. value of the services provided by your firm under the contract (in current US\$ or Euro):
Start date (month/year): Completion date (month/year):	N° of professional staff-months provided by associated Consultants:
Name of associated Consultants, if any:	Name of senior professional staff of your firm involved and functions performed (indicate most significant profiles such as Project Director/Coordinator, Team Leader):
Narrative description of Project:	
Description of actual services provided by your staff within the assignment:	

Firm's Name: _____



Form TECH-3: Comments and Suggestions on the Terms of Reference and on Counterpart Staff and Facilities to be Provided by the Client

On the Terms of Reference

[Present and justify here any modifications or improvement to the Terms of Reference you are proposing to improve performance in carrying out the assignment (such as deleting some activity you consider unnecessary, or adding another, or proposing a different phasing of the activities). Such suggestions should be concise and to the point, and incorporated in your Proposal.]



Form TECH-4: Description of Approach, Methodology and Work Plan for Performing the Assignment

[Technical approach, methodology and work plan are key components of the Technical Proposal. You are suggested to present your Technical Proposal (Not more than 40 pages, inclusive of charts and diagrams) divided into the following three chapters:

- a) Technical Approach and Methodology,
- b) Work Plan, and
- c) Organization and Staffing,

a) Technical Approach and Methodology. In this chapter you should explain your understanding of the objectives of the assignment, approach to the services, methodology for carrying out the activities and obtaining the expected output, and the degree of detail of such output. You should highlight the problems being addressed and their importance, and explain the technical approach you would adopt to address them. You should also explain the methodologies you propose to adopt and highlight the compatibility of those methodologies with the proposed approach.

b) Work Plan. In this chapter you should propose the main activities of the assignment, their content and duration, phasing and interrelations, milestones (including interim approvals by the Client), and delivery dates of the reports. The proposed work plan should be consistent with the technical approach and methodology, showing understanding of the Terms of Reference and ability to translate them into a feasible working plan. A list of the final documents, including reports, drawings, and tables to be delivered as final output, should be included here. The work plan should be consistent with the Work Schedule of Form TECH-8.

c) Organization and Staffing. In this chapter you should propose the structure and composition of your team. You should list the main disciplines of the assignment, the key expert responsible, and proposed technical and support staff.]



**GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND**

Form TECH-5: Team Composition and Task Assignments

Professional Staff				
Name of Staff	Firm	Area of Expertise	Position Assigned	Task Assigned



Form TECH-6: Curriculum Vitae (CV) for Proposed Professional Staff

1. **Proposed Position** [only one candidate shall be nominated for each position]: _____

2. **Name of Firm** [Insert name of firm proposing the staff]: _____

3. **Name of Staff** [Insert full name]: _____

4. **Date of Birth:** _____ **Nationality:** _____

5. **Education** [Indicate college/university and other specialized education of staff member, giving names of institutions, degrees obtained, and dates of obtainment]: _____

6. **Membership of Professional Associations:** _____

7. **Other Training** [Indicate significant training since degrees under 5 - Education were obtained]: _

8. **Countries of Work Experience:** [List countries where staff has worked in the last ten years]: ____

9. **Languages** [For each language indicate proficiency: good, fair, or poor in speaking, reading, and writing]: _____

10. **Employment Record** [Starting with present position, list in reverse order every employment held by staff member since graduation, giving for each employment (see format here below): dates of employment, name of employing organization, positions held.]:

From [Year]: _____ To [Year]: _____

Employer: _____

Positions held: _____



<p>11. Detailed Tasks Assigned</p> <p>[List all tasks to be performed under this assignment]</p>	<p>12. Work Undertaken that Best Illustrates Capability to Handle the Tasks Assigned</p> <p>[Among the assignments in which the staff has been involved, indicate the following information for those assignments that best illustrate staff capability to handle the tasks listed under point 11.]</p> <p>Name of assignment or project: _____</p> <p>Year: _____</p> <p>Location: _____</p> <p>Client: _____</p> <p>Main project features: _____</p> <p>Positions held: _____</p> <p>Activities performed: _____</p>
---	---

13. Certification:

I, the undersigned, certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief, this CV correctly describes myself, my qualifications, and my experience. I understand that any wilful misstatement described herein may lead to my disqualification or dismissal, if engaged.

[Signature of staff member or authorized representative of the staff] Date: _____
Day/Month/Year

Full name of authorized representative: _____



Form TECH-7: Staffing Schedule¹

	Name of Staff	Staff input (in the form of a bar chart) ²							Total staff-week input
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Total
1									
2									
3									
n									
Grand Total									

- 1 For Professional Staff the input should be indicated individually; for Support Staff it should be indicated by category (e.g.: draftsmen, clerical staff, etc.).
- 2 Weeks are counted from the start of the assignment. For each staff indicate separately staff input.

Form TECH-8 Work Schedule

N°	Activity ¹	Weeks ²						
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1								
2								
3								
4								
n								

- 1 Indicate all main activities of the assignment, including delivery of reports (e.g.: inception, interim, and final reports), and other benchmarks such as Client approvals. For phased assignments indicate activities, delivery of reports, and benchmarks separately for each phase.
- 2 Duration of activities shall be indicated in the form of a bar chart.

Financial Proposal

The Proposer is required to prepare and submit the Financial Proposal in a separate file from the Technical Proposal.

The Financial Proposal must provide a detailed cost breakdown and a payment schedule preferably linked to the schedule of deliverables presented in Annex 1. Provide separate figures for each functional grouping or category including fees and cost-reimbursable expenses. The Financial Section shall provide details of unit /daily fee rate per proposed team member and total consultancy fees based on the time proposed for performance of the services. Any estimates for cost-reimbursable expenses, should be listed separately and capped. The Financial Proposal should be inclusive of the taxes where applicable³, and the applicable taxes should be clearly specified.

The Financial Proposal must also have the total consultancy fee summarized in addition to the break down covering the lump sum amount for purposes of determining the financial score and contract price. Financial Proposal Standard Forms (FIN Forms) shall be used for the presentation of the Financial Proposal.

³ (a) Under Article 10 of the Headquarters Agreement, the property of the Green Climate Fund (“Fund”), including the property of any offices, subsidiary bodies or facilities established by the Fund, the Fund’s operations and transactions, and any property of the Fund in transit to or from the Headquarters, are:

- (i) Exempt from all direct taxes, except those which are, in fact, no more than charges for public utility services;
- (ii) Exempt from all indirect taxes, including any value-added tax and/or other similar tax, and excise duties levied on important purchases of goods and services for official purposes; and
- (iii) Exempt from customs duties, prohibitions and restrictions on imports and exports in respect of articles of any kind imported or exported by the Fund for its official use, except for prohibitions and restrictions on imports or exports relating to health and safety.

(b) under bilateral agreements concluded between the GCF and certain countries, the GCF may be exempt from all taxation and from all customs duties, and from any obligation for the payment, withholding or collection of any tax or duty.



FIN Forms
Form FIN-1: Financial Proposal Submission Form

[Location, Date]

To: [Name and address of Client]

To whom it may concern:

We, the undersigned, offer to provide the consulting services for [Insert title of assignment] in accordance with your Request for Proposal dated [Insert Date] and our Technical Proposal. Our attached Financial Proposal is for the sum of [Insert amount(s) in words and figures¹].

Our Financial Proposal shall be binding upon us subject to the modifications resulting from Contract negotiations, up to expiration of the validity period of the Proposal.

We understand you are not bound to accept any Proposal you receive.

We remain,

Yours sincerely,

Authorized Signature [In full and initials]: _____

Name and Title of Signatory: _____

Name of Firm: _____

Address: _____

¹ Amounts must coincide with the ones indicated under Total Cost of Financial proposal in Form FIN-2.

Form FIN-2: Summary of Costs

Item	Costs
	Indicate with Currency
Total Costs of Financial Proposal ¹	

A. Total Cost of Financial Proposal

<i>Item</i>	<i>Costs</i>
	<i>Indicate with Currency</i>
Total Costs of Financial Proposal ¹	

B. Break down of Fees and expenses per Cost Component

Description	Unit of measure (e.g. days, month, etc)	Total Period of Engagement	Unit cost / rate	Total Cost for the Period
I. Remuneration Costs				
Staff 1				
Staff 2				
.....				
<i>Sub-total</i>				
II. Travel Costs				
<i>Sub-total</i>				
III. Other Related Costs (Please specify)				
<i>Sub-total</i>				
TOTAL				

C. Breakdown of Fees and Expenses per Deliverables

SN	Deliverables <i>[list them as referred to in the TOR]</i>	Percentage of Total Price	Price (Lump Sum, All Inclusive)
1	Deliverable 1		
2	Deliverable 2		
3		
	Total	100%	USD

Indicate the total costs, net of local taxes, to be paid by the Client in each currency.

Form FIN-3: Breakdown of Remuneration¹ (Lump-Sum)

(Information to be provided in this Form shall only be used to establish payments to the Consultant for possible additional services requested by the Client)

Name ²	Position ³	Staff-daily Rate

- 1 Form FIN-3 shall be filled in for the same Professional and Support Staff listed in Form TECH-7.
- 2 Professional Staff should be indicated individually; Support Staff should be indicated per category (e.g.: draftsmen, clerical staff).
- 3 Positions of the Professional Staff shall coincide with the ones indicated in Form TECH-5.

Annex 3

Evaluation Criteria

A. Evaluation and Comparison of Proposals

1. The proposals will be evaluated in a three-stage procedure, starting with administrative compliance to ensure the proposals includes all necessary required documents and is duly signed by the authorized representative. Evaluation of the technical proposal will follow and will be completed prior to any financial proposal being opened and evaluated. The financial proposal will be considered only if the submissions fulfil the minimum technical requirements.

B. Acceptance of Submissions

2. All proposers are expected to adhere to the requirements for submitting a proposal. Any proposals that fail to comply will be disqualified from further consideration as part of this evaluation. In particular:
 - Full compliance with the formal requirements for submitting a proposal
 - Submission of all requested documentation
 - Acceptance of the GCF Model contract – Where the proposer notes issues, these must be raised as part of the technical proposal for consideration during evaluation
3. The Technical Proposal shall include:
 - A brief description, including ownership details, date and place of incorporation of the firm, objectives of the firm, partnerships, qualifications, certificates, etc.;
 - Details to demonstrate vast experience in working with relevant multilateral development funds and familiarity with their operations; and
 - Demonstration of the firm’s deep understanding of the GCF, mandate/business model and Investment Framework.

C. Evaluation of Technical Proposal

4. A reviewing committee shall be established to evaluate each technical proposal. The technical proposal is evaluated individually on the basis of its responsiveness to the technical requirements and will be assessed and scored according to the evaluation criteria below and as per scores in the table.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

	Criteria	Sub-score	Score
1	Technical		30
	Firm expertise and experience in systematic reviews, evidence gap maps and meta-analysis (including systematic searching, quality appraisal, and data extraction), based on the present Terms of Reference, with specific emphasis on statistical analysis and counterfactual methods.	15	
	Experience and expertise of the firm in results based payment interventions and/or sustainable finance/climate finance.	15	
2	Methodology and Workplan		30
	The scope, magnitude, urgency and challenges of the overall task are fully understood and reflected in the technical proposal, which extends the ToR in important aspects.	15	
	The technical proposal, tools and work plan are well defined and are relevant and correspond to extending the ToR, in particular in terms of the approach to create evidence gap maps and conduct systematic review while using statistical meta-analysis and literature review.	15	
3	Personnel		40

	Strong, proven team leader with the capacity to directly, energetically and creatively lead and organize the process under tight time constraints and manage complex teams and evidence gap maps, with an emphasis on statistical analysis and counterfactual methods. This includes extensive experience in systematic reviews, academic and implementation experiences, capacity, time availability, and demonstrable ability to motivate all members that are proposed as part of the team	15	
	Demonstrated excellent communication skills of the team leader, ability to work to tight deadlines and history of timely delivery of practical, strategic documents that add value	10	
	Demonstrated appropriate team members and arrangements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed team is appropriately composed, including the expertise and experience of key team members, the structure of the team, as reflected in gender balance, experience with results based payments, good knowledge on complexity, the ability to work across languages, and relevant academic qualifications - Demonstrated ability of key staff to work and analyze quantitative and qualitative data by using well-recognized methods, especially as related to statistical methods, meta-analysis, causal & non causal designs, synthesis, screening, and knowledge of bibliographic databases. 	15	
	TOTAL		100

Technical proposals that score at least 75 points out of 100 will be considered as qualified for the review of financial proposal. Any proposal less than that will be disqualified from proceeding to the next step and its financial proposal shall be returned unopened following the award of the contract.

D. Evaluation of Financial Proposal

The financial proposal of all proposers which have attained the minimum score in the technical evaluation will be evaluated subsequently. The lowest evaluated Financial Proposal (Fm) is given the maximum financial score (Sf) of 100. The formula for determining the financial scores (Sf) of all other Proposals is calculated as following:

$Sf = 100 \times Fm / F$, in which “Sf” is the financial score, “Fm” is the lowest price, and “F” is the price of the proposal under consideration.

E. Consolidated evaluation

The weights given to the Technical (T) and Financial (P) Proposals are:

T = 0.70, and P = 0.30

Proposals will be ranked according to their combined technical (St) and financial (Sf) scores using the weights (T = the weight given to the Technical Proposal; P = the weight given to the Financial Proposal; T + P = 1) as following: $S = St \times T\% + Sf \times P\%$.

The firm achieving the highest combined technical and financial score will be invited for contract negotiations.

F. Award

The Award will be made to the responsive proposer who achieves the highest combined technical and financial score, following negotiation of an acceptable contract. GCF reserves the right to conduct negotiations with the Proposer regarding the contents of their offer. The award will be in effect only after acceptance by the selected proposer of the terms and conditions and the technical requirements.

Annex 4

Company Profile Form

Please respond to all questions.

Company details - vendor's name

Name:

General Information

Primary contact for sales/client services	
Address	
	Postal Code: Country:
Telephone:	Fax:
E-mail:	Web site:
Parent company, if any	
Subsidiaries, Associates, and/or Overseas Rep(s), if any	
Year established	
Registration Number	
Type of organization	Public enterprise () Private company () Organization sponsored (assisted by Government) () Other (please specify): ()
Type of Business	Manufacturer () Retailer () Authorized Agent () Consulting Company () Other (please specify): ()
Summary of main business activities	
No. of employees (by location)	
Staff turnover rate	
In-house working language (s)	
Bank Name: Bank Address: Account Holder: Account Number: IBAN: SWIFT:	

Prior experience with international organizations

List contracts with international organizations in the last three years BRIEFLY list recent contracts that used relevant tools, technologies, and techniques: Attach additional sheets if necessary.
1
2
3



Environmental Policy

Does your company have a written statement of its environmental policy?
YES () Please attach copy NO ()

Contract disputes

List any disputes your company has been involved in over the last three years

References

List suitable reference projects and contacts. What options would there be for a site visit to a reference project and/or the vendor's site?
1
2
3

Partners

If this is a part bid, list relevant recent experience of working with partners. Are there already formal or informal preferred partnership agreements in place?
1
2
3

Conflict of interest

Are there any likely circumstances or contracts in place that may introduce a conflict of interest with the parties to this contract? If so, explain how this will be mitigated
1
2

Certification

I, the undersigned, confirm that the information provided in this annex is correct. In the event of changes, details will be provided.

Name: _____ Title: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____



**Annex 5
Acknowledgment Letter**

To whom it may concern,

We, the undersigned, acknowledge receipt of your Request for Proposal (RFP) No. RFP/2020/003 dated 12 February 2020 and hereby confirm that we:

INTEND DO NOT INTEND

to submit a proposal to the secretariat of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) by the deadline date of 11 March 2020, and that we:

INTEND DO NOT INTEND

to send one (1) authorized representative to observe the public opening procedure on 12 March 2020, 10.00 Hrs Korean Time. (Note: attendance to the public opening procedure is optional.)

We acknowledge that this RFP is confidential and proprietary to the GCF, and contains privileged information.

Name of Authorized Representative: _____

Signature: _____

Title: _____

Name and Address of Vendor: _____

Telephone: _____

Facsimile: _____

If you do not intend to submit a proposal to the GCF, please indicate the reason:

We do not have the capacity to submit a proposal at this time.

We cannot meet the requirements for this RFP.

We do not think we can make a competitive offer at this time.

Other (please specify): _____

Kindly return this acknowledgement letter immediately via e-mail to procurement@gcfund.org

NOTE: Due to current security arrangements, your authorized representative must present a completed copy of this letter in order to observe the public opening procedure.

**Annex 6
Timeline**

The Green Climate Fund will follow the timeline below for this RFP. Any changes to this timeline will be posted on the GCF website. Please note that the target dates and may be adjusted.

	Event	Responsible Party	Date (and time, KST*)
1	Issuance of RFP	GCF	12 February 2020
2	Last day to send completed Acknowledgement Letter of RFP receipt	Tenderer	28 February 2020
3	Last date for requests for clarification of the RFP	Tenderer	28 February 2020
4	Last date to reply to questions received/ Last date for amendment	GCF	3 March 2020
5	Date by which proposal must be received in Korea by GCF	Tenderer	11 March 2020; 23:00 Hrs Korean Time
6	Date of opening of Technical Proposals	GCF	12 March 2020

* KST: Korean Standard Time (Seoul Time)



Annex 7

GCF Model Contract (Attached as a separate document)

By submitting a proposal to this RFP, Bidders are considered to have carefully reviewed the GCF Model Contract and be in agreement with all its terms and conditions. Where the bidder has specific issues of concern, those must be raised and indicated in the Technical proposal clearly for consideration during evaluation. Any request of amendments to GCF Model Contract and terms and conditions must be accompanied by detailed and compelling justification for review and consideration by GCF. It should be noted that request of amendments to GCF Model Contract and terms and conditions may negatively affect evaluation of the proposal and, in some cases, where such amendments are incompatible with GCF's binding policies and rules, may prejudice the final award.

NB: For this particular contract, the Performance Standards (Clause 8), Insurance (Clause 9) and Performance Security (Clause 10) of the Special Conditions of Contract (SCC) will not be applicable.

*Note: The Board adopted at the recent meeting a new policy on SEAH (Sexual Exploitation, Sexual Abuse and Sexual Harassment) and therefore the GCF is required to include new provisions in the General Conditions of Contract. While the specific wording is yet to be formulated, the eventual contract will need to include such new provisions.