



Request For Quotation (RFQ)

RFQ 2023/012 – Consultancy Services for Evidence Review on Market-Based Approaches to Mitigation and Adaptation

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|
| TO ALL INTERESTED BIDDERS | Date: 19 April 2023 | DS HN |
| | GCF Reference: RFQ 2023/012/hn | |

Dear Sir /Madam:

The Green Climate Fund (GCF) or the “Fund” now requests that your company/corporation/organisation/Firm submit your quotation/offer/proposal for the provision of **Consultancy Services for Evidence Review on Market-Based Approaches to Mitigation and Adaptation**. Details of the assignment and expected deliverables can be found in the Terms of Reference (TOR) attached herein as Annex 1.

Please refer to Annexes when preparing your quotation/offer/proposal.

Quotations/offers/proposals must be submitted on or before **Thursday, 11 May 2023 @ 23.00 hours** Korean Standard Time (KST) and E-mail to the address below:

Green Climate Fund (GCF)
Procurement Unit, Division of Support Services (DSS)
G-Tower, 175 Art Center-daero, Songdo-dong
Yeonsu-gu, Incheon 22004
Republic of Korea

Contact Person:

Helena Ngau, Procurement Officer
E-mail: hngau@gcfund.org and procurement@gcfund.org

Your responsibility is to ensure that your Quotation will reach the address above on or before the deadline. For whatever reason, the quotations that GCF receives after the deadline indicated above shall not be considered for evaluation.

If you submit your Quotation by e-mail, kindly ensure it is signed and in the .pdf format.

| | |
|--|--|
| Delivery Term based on Incoterms 2020 (Pls. link this to the price schedule) | <input type="checkbox"/> DDU (Delivered Duty Unpaid, Incoterms 2020) GCF Office, Songdo, Incheon, South Korea (for goods & services) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable (for Services only) |
| Delivery Address / Location | Green Climate Fund (GCF) Procurement Unit, Division of Support Services (DSS) G-Tower, 175 Art Center-daero, Songdo-dong Yeonsu-gu, Incheon 22004 Republic of Korea |



| | |
|---|---|
| Method of RFQ Submission: | <i>RFQ for Services: One Envelope with Technical and Financial offer, clearly labelled with Bidder's name, address and the RFQ reference number;</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> By E-mail to Procurement@gcfund.org <input type="checkbox"/> By Courier or Postal Mail |
| Delivery Date: | <i>[indicate number]</i> days from the issuance of the Purchase Order (PO) |
| Preferred Currency of Quotation ¹ | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> United States Dollars <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Korean Won <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Euro |
| Tax ² on Price Quotation | Offer must be exclusive of VAT and other applicable indirect taxes as GCF is exempt from taxes. |
| Payment Terms | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 100% within 30 days upon GCF's acceptance of the services delivered as specified and receipt of an invoice; <input type="checkbox"/> Others <i>[please. specify]</i> |
| Conditions for Release of Payment | Delivery of Services/Deliverables as per Purchase Order or Contract terms and conditions |
| Other after-sale services/support required | <input type="checkbox"/> Required: duration (months) _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable |
| Deadline for the Submission of Quotation | <input type="checkbox"/> Close of Business, [Day], [Date] and [Time] KST. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> As defined on the first page of this RFQ |
| All documentation, including catalogues, instructions and operating manuals, shall be in this language. | English |
| Additional documents to submit | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Certificate of Registration <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Company Profile and Organization Structure <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Experiences with similar services or projects <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Description of Approach, Methodology and Work Plan to perform and implement the required Services. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proposed Timeline to Implement the Services. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Team composition and task assignments for the project. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proposed personnel's CV to be engaged as per TOR qualifications |

¹ Local vendors must comply with any applicable laws regarding doing business in other currencies.

² (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.



| | |
|--|--|
| Period of Validity of Quotes Starting the Submission Date | <input type="checkbox"/> 60 days <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 90 days |
| Partial Bids / Partial Awards / Split Awards | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not permitted. Only for total quantities required items. <input type="checkbox"/> Permitted [<i>please provide conditions for partial bids</i>] |
| Evaluation Criteria [<i>check as many as applicable</i>] | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full compliance with all requirements listed in Annex 1. <input type="checkbox"/> The Contract/Purchase Order will be awarded to the lowest price substantially compliant offer. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Bidder that achieves the highest combined technical and financial score, as detailed in TOR in Annex 1. |
| Annexes to this RFQ | 1) Terms of References (TOR) (Annex 1) 2) Forms for Submission of Proposal/Offer (Annex 2) 3) RFQ - Quotation Form (Annex 3) 4) GCF Model Contract for Consultancy Services (Annex 4) |
| Contact Person at GCF for Inquiries | Helena Ngau, Procurement Officer E-mail: hngau@gcfund.org |

- 1) The Services proposed shall be reviewed based on completeness and compliance of the quotation/offer/proposal with the minimum specifications and requirements or as described in the Terms of Reference (TOR) above or any other annexes providing details of GCF's requirements.
- 2) The quotation/offer/proposal that complies with all of the specifications and requirements mentioned in the TOR and evaluation criteria will be accepted. Any quotation/offer/proposal that does not meet the specifications and requirements will be rejected.
- 3) Any discrepancy between the unit price and the total price (obtained by multiplying the unit price and quantity) shall be re-computed by GCF. The unit price shall prevail, and the total price shall be corrected. If the vendor does not accept the final price based on GCF's re-computation and correction of errors, its quotation/offer/proposal will be rejected.
- 4) Any agreement/contract issued shall be subject to the General Conditions attached to the RFQ. (*Note: if PO is the resultant agreement, then GCF's PO terms and conditions are attached. If the Contract is the resultant agreement, conditions from the Model Contract for Services are attached.*)
- 5) GCF is not bound to accept any quotation, award a Contract/Purchase Order, or be responsible for any costs associated with your preparation and submission of a quotation, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the selection process.
- 6) GCF reserves the right to accept or reject any quotation/offer/proposal, to render any or all quotation/offer/proposal as non-responsive, and to annul the solicitation process and reject all quotation/offer/proposal at any time before the award of the Contract without thereby incurring any liability to the affected Bidder/Proposer, or any obligation to inform the affected Bidders/Proposer(s) of the grounds for GCF's action. GCF shall not be obliged to award the Contract to the lowest price offer.
- 7) Before the expiration of bid/proposal validity, the Contract may be awarded to the Bidder/Proposer whose proposal is determined to be in the best interests of the Agency, based



upon the evaluation method indicated in the Data Sheet and with due consideration given to the general principles governing GCF procurement activities.

- 8) At the time of award of the Contract or Purchase Order (PO), GCF reserves the right to vary the quantity of services and/or goods by up to a maximum of 15%.
- 9) GCF implements a zero tolerance on fraud and corruption (prohibited practices) and is committed to preventing, identifying and addressing all such acts and practices against GCF and third parties involved in GCF activities.

We look forward to receiving your quotation/offer/proposal for this Request For Quotation by the deadline mentioned above. If you have further questions about this RFQ, please contact the procurement officer responsible for this RFQ.

Sincerely yours,

DocuSigned by:

6D578B87059F4B3...
Dragoljub Kelecevic
Procurement Manager

April 19, 2023 | 2:41 PM KST



ANNEX 1 - TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) - SERVICES

Consultancy Services for Evidence Review on Market-Based Approaches to Mitigation and Adaptation

1. BACKGROUND

The GCF is a multilateral fund created in 2010 to support developing countries in responding 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. 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, including 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 discharging both an accountability function and supporting a learning function. These are central to the GCF being a learning organisation as laid out in its Governing Instrument. For more information, please check the documentation available on the IEU's [website](#).

2. AIMS

- 1) The Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) of the GCF wishes to procure consultancy services from a small team of 1 or 2 consultants for a synthetic review on market-based approaches to mitigation and adaptation to be completed by 01 November 2023.
- 2) 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 IEU will own the intellectual property. For subsequent use and citation, members of the contracted team will be informed.



- 3) This document lays out the terms of reference for the evidence review.

3. BACKGROUND TO THE ASSIGNMENT

- 1) The most recent and comprehensive estimates of global climate financing suggest around USD 620 billion and USD 640 billion of tracked domestic/international flows for mitigation/adaptation in 2019 and 2020, respectively. This is less than a fifth of requirements for this decade, which increase from USD 3 trillion to USD 4 trillion over this period of time. Currently, 90-93% of all tracked climate finance flows is directed for pure mitigation purposes, with the remaining proportion split between adaptation and dual purpose (termed as cross-cutting projects in the Green Climate Fund). Almost half of climate flows were in East Asia. Just over half of current climate flows are from public actors, predominantly national and multilateral development finance institutions. Globally, the balance of public and private investment varies considerably, with private flows dominating in Annex I countries, especially the US, and public flows dominating in non-Annex I parties (especially sub-Saharan Africa).

In order to close the mitigation and adaptation financing gap, the involvement of the private sector is important. As public funding can only cover a fraction of financing needs, effective involvement of the private sector is key for enhanced climate action. Of the multilateral climate funds, the GCF has the strongest private sector focus and the GCF's Governing Instrument offers the mandate to house a "private sector facility that enables it to directly and indirectly finance private sector mitigation and adaptation activities at the national, regional and international levels". The Governing Instrument also outlines how this facility will "promote the participation of private sector actors in developing countries, in particular local actors, including small- and medium-sized enterprises and local financial intermediaries". The need for private sector investment, in combination with the GCF's mandate, means the Fund is well positioned to take a leading role in further engaging the private sector in climate action, to support new business models and raise awareness about how return-generating projects and programmes can be originated and implemented.

- 2) The synthesis will respond to the following two research questions:
- *To what extent have the selected market-based approaches relevant to mitigation and adaptation been effective at achieving desired outcomes in developing countries?*
 - *What factors influence the effectiveness and efficiency of these market-based approaches in developing countries?*
- 3) The synthesis will be a comprehensive and rigorous collation, assessment, and presentation of evidence previously presented solely in systematic reviews (using both peer-reviewed and grey literature). The synthesis will be relevant to the policies and practices of the GCF and will be based on an appraisal of the quality of evidence based on clear criteria. It will offer a clear descriptive and analytical synthesis of the evidence base (as defined below).
- 4) 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. This includes the possibility of utilising expert knowledge in sub-



areas and canvassing the experience of search specialists and systematic review specialists.

4. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

- 1) The objective is to produce a synthesis of the causal evidence presented in systematic reviews on four market-based approaches of relevance to mitigation and adaptation interventions. The synthesis aims to highlight commonalities across the selected market-based approaches to inform learning within the Green Climate Fund. Specifically, the review will offer an in-depth analysis of the findings and approaches taken, including a critical appraisal of the methods used to establish the evidence base, for: payments for environmental services, willingness-to-pay assessments, insurance products and results-based payment modalities. All outcome areas relevant to mitigation and adaptation interventions will be considered.
- 2) **Payments for Environmental Services (PES)** refer to agreed exchanges between environmental service providers and consumers, under specific conditions. Providers not only manage resources to continue to provide environmental services but are proactive in keeping the service aligned with wider targets and goals. A 2018 systematic review³ found more positive than negative impacts on livelihoods, especially financial benefits. The same systematic review (SR) also found trade-offs between different livelihood activities as well as a limited amount of evidence on social or cultural impacts. A 2015 SR⁴ looked specifically at the effect of PES on deforestation and poverty outcomes, and how those effects might be influenced by institutional and social conditions. The review found a very weak evidence base with none of the studies investigating forest conservation and welfare effects simultaneously. Overall, the effectiveness of PES to reduce deforestation was limited and, depending on the context, barriers at the institutional level may have played a significant role.
- 3) **Willingness-to-pay assessments** use contingent valuation methods to reveal preferences to pay for goods or services, and the factors that may either hinder or support the willingness to pay. A 2012 SR⁵ on evidence from Bangladesh, Ghana, Kenya, and Zambia on the willingness-to-pay for clean water found that willingness to pay is often less than the cost of point-of-use water treatment methods and demand is very sensitive to price. The review also highlighted how seemingly minor factors hindered trust and reduced demand in the provided resource – such as taste, appearance, or temperature. A 2015 review on enrolment into community-based

³ Genowefa Blundo-Canto et al., “The Different Dimensions of Livelihood Impacts of Payments for Environmental Services (PES) Schemes: A Systematic Review,” *Ecological Economics* 149 (July 2018): pp. 160-183, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.03.011>.

⁴ Cyrus Samii et al., “Payment for Environmental Services for Reducing Deforestation and Poverty in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review,” *3ie Systematic Review 17*, March 2015, <https://doi.org/10.23846/sr41073b>.

⁵ Null, C., Kremer, M., Miguel, E., Hombrados, J. G., Meeks, R., & Zwane, A. P. (2012). Willingness to pay for cleaner water in less developed countries: systematic review of experimental evidence. The International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3iE).



health insurance schemes in LMICs,⁶ also focused on willingness-to-pay for insurance schemes. In terms of enrolment into the scheme, the review found that low levels of income, limited financial resources and poor healthcare quality reduced registration rates. In addition, the level of trust in the health insurance scheme and provider was found to play a significant role. Educated, younger men in larger households were more willing to pay for insurance products.

- 4) A limited number of evidence reviews have looked at the effectiveness of index-based **insurance**. For example, one systematic review⁷ found low adoption rates at less than 25%, despite studies on the willingness to adopt highlighting that up to 90% of respondents stated a preference to take part. The study also highlighted that the relationship between insurance and credit is uncertain such that the efficacy of bundling credit and insurance products is not yet proven. A 2019 review of systematic reviews⁸ did not find an existing rigorous systematic review or meta-analysis of insurance products, despite a substantial underlying evidence base. Whilst meta-analyses exist, insurance products were either too recent to evaluate or were deemed as being of low quality during the assessment of methodology. The authors of this study highlight the importance of a high-quality, up-to-date systematic review or meta-analysis on this topic.
- 5) **Results-based payments**, also referred to as performance-based contracts, impact investments or conditional transfers, “involve a funder who agrees to make payments to agents for achieving pre-agreed, verified results, (as a) unique approach that can potentially address misaligned incentives by making (conditional) payments to service providers or beneficiaries”.⁹ As highlighted in a previous IEU evidence review, such modalities provide public incentives or subsidies with the potential to bridge public-private collaborations “not for project inputs but in response to demonstrated, independently verified outputs or outcomes, thus shifting (financial burdens, as well as) investment and performance risks from the public to the private sector.”¹⁰ When executed well, results-based payments (RBPs) have the potential to offer multi-layered benefits in both public and private sectors. The IEU review highlighted regional patterns of RBP modalities in developing countries up to 2020, finding most evidence in North America, East Asia and Pacific, sub-Saharan Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean - while evidence from the Middle East and North Africa was limited. Furthermore, almost half of all available evidence was from the health sector, followed by agriculture and forestry, and education. RBP evidence

⁶ Esther F. Adebayo et al., “A Systematic Review of Factors That Affect Uptake of Community-Based Health Insurance in Low-Income and Middle-Income Countries,” *BMC Health Services Research* 15, no. 1 (December 8, 2015), <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-015-1179-3>.

⁷ Ana Marr et al., “Adoption and Impact of Index-Insurance and Credit for Smallholder Farmers in Developing Countries,” *Agricultural Finance Review* 76, no. 1 (March 2016): pp. 94-118, <https://doi.org/10.1108/afr-11-2015-0050>.

⁸ Maren Duvendack and Philip Mader, “Impact of Financial Inclusion in Low- and Middle- Income Countries: A Systematic Review of Reviews,” *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 15, no. 1-2 (January 2, 2019), <https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2019.2>.

⁹ Meuth Alldredge, Josh, Emma De Roy, Elangtlhoko Mokgano, Peter Mwandri, Tulika Narayan, Martin Prowse, Jyotsna Puri, William Rafferty, Anu Rangarajan, and Faraz Usmani (2020). Evidence review on results-based payments: Evidence Gap Map and Intervention Heat Map. IEU learning paper, December 2020. Independent Evaluation Unit, Green Climate Fund. Songdo, South Korea.

¹⁰ Meuth Alldredge et al.. *Evidence review on results-based payments: Evidence Gap Map and Intervention Heat Map*. IEU learning paper. Independent Evaluation Unit, Green Climate Fund (2020:viii).



related to the energy sector was limited.

- 6) This review synthesises the evidence base from existing systematic reviews in terms of these four key market-based approaches which hold potential for scaled climate action from the private sector. This synthetic review will define the private sector as the segment of an economy owned and managed by individuals or organisations that are not directly under the control of the government or any public agency, such as households and individuals, for-profit enterprises, sole traders, partnerships and corporations. Additionally, mixed and co-participation formulas of public-private partnerships (PPP) can also deliver a service or business venture to society and studies which focus on PPPs will be included in the synthetic review.
- 7) The synthetic review will include systematic reviews from both the peer-reviewed and grey literature. The language proficiency of the selected team will determine the language(s) included in the scope of the review. The review will use the PICO model (population, intervention, comparison, and outcome model) to describe the inclusion and exclusion criteria for studies in the synthesis.

4.2 PICO Model for Synthesis

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

- 1) **Population:** The synthetic review will only include systematic reviews on interventions rolled out in developing countries defined as non-Annex I countries in the Kyoto Protocol. The synthetic review will include studies conducted at several units of observation, including individuals, households, communities, and firms.
- 2) **Interventions:** The synthetic review will assess the extent to which the selected market-based approaches been effective at achieving desired outcomes. The synthetic review will focus only on systematic reviews of quantitative studies that evaluate the causal effect of the selected market-based approaches.
- 3) **Comparison:** 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 district level, then the comparison group will consist of districts. The synthetic review will summarise two types of studies:
 - a) Experimental designs. This type of study specifically uses random assignment of the intervention. It evaluates the effect by comparing the outcome with a control group and by using an appropriate methodology. These studies could also be natural experiments.
 - b) 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 are not restricted to) regression discontinuity designs, instrumental variable approaches, difference-in-difference designs and propensity score matching.



- 4) In the absence of randomisation, studies may be limited in their ability to make claims about causality as confounding factors may not be controlled for. This should be fully recognised within the synthetic review. The studies within existing systematic reviews may include underpowered experimental studies and the synthetic review will check sample sizes on a case-by-case basis.

5) **Outcomes:** The synthetic review will determine and refine outcome measures of relevance to mitigation and adaptation. Outcome measures will not form part of the criteria for including systematic reviews in the synthesis.

5. SCOPE OF THE WORK AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The evidence review will respond to the following research questions:

- *To what extent have market-based approaches relevant to mitigation and adaptation been effective at achieving desired outcomes?*
- *What factors influence the effectiveness of these market-based approaches in developing countries?*

6. METHODS AND APPROACHES

The aim of the assignment is to complete a synthesis with the following steps:

- 1) Examine existing systematic reviews that use statistical meta-analysis to inform search strategies and to screen for inclusion into this review. In addition, screen repositories and registers and search for systematic reviews on the same and similar intervention types.
- 2) Refine the review question and map out the landscape of systematic reviews through an iterative search process. The selected small team should pilot the data extraction tool. The engagement committee and the IEU will assess early results from the initial search and screening.
- 3) Complete a draft approach paper according to the requirements of a reputable repository.
- 4) The approach paper will explain and justify the proposed search, the proposed screening tools, and other appropriate parameters.
- 5) This draft approach paper will be revised considering comments from the IEU and an engagement committee. The selected small team will subsequently submit a final approach paper.
- 6) The selected small team will undertake and document the search and extraction processes described in the approach paper.
- 7) Provide a presentation to the IEU and engagement committee on the first draft of the draft synthesis. The draft should include any forms of meta-analysis that are deemed appropriate.



- 8) Address all comments made by IEU and engagement committee on draft and final reports, as well as PowerPoint presentations.
- 9) Deliver the final draft of the synthesis (including any relevant meta-analysis).

7. STRUCTURE OF SMALL EVALUATION TEAM AND THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES

- 1) Teams should have 10 years of expertise and experience in literature reviews, systematic reviews, evidence gap maps, and meta-analyses (including systematic searching, quality appraisal, data extraction, and data analysis);
- 2) Teams should have at least 3 years of expertise and experience in assessing private sector approaches to climate and development interventions, including at least one of the market-based approaches outlined above.
- 3) Teams should have in-depth experience with statistical analysis and demonstrate a strong understanding of counterfactual methods;
- 4) Essential qualifications include at least one member educated to a minimum of master's and preferably doctoral level alongside demonstrating gender awareness, ability to work in multiple languages, ability to travel, and responsiveness;
- 5) Teams should have qualified database search specialists and/or have access to relevant databases;
- 6) 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 (4) stages, each of which contains several milestones:

- a) Draft and final approach papers for the synthesis review (Milestone 1)
 - (i) Define review question(s) and area(s) of interest
 - (ii) Develop theory of change
 - (iii) Meet with engagement committee
 - (iv) Define search strategy
 - (v) Define data management and coding process
 - (vi) Define data analysis strategy
 - (vii) Produce draft approach paper
 - (viii) Meet with engagement committee and integrate comments into draft
 - (ix) Submit final approach paper
- b) Data collection, cleaning, and management (Milestone 2)
 - (i) Execute screening process outlined in approach paper
 - (ii) Assess eligibility of studies through an iterative exclusion process
 - (iii) Produce a fully coded file with the search process and results
 - (iv) Produce data collection report
- c) Data analysis and reporting (Milestone 3)
 - (i) Perform data analysis and synthesis



-
- (ii) Report findings of analyses, adhering to PRISMA and GRADE standards if applicable
 - (iii) Conduct presentation of findings with engagement committee and IEU
 - (iv) Deliver draft synthesis, any associated meta-analysis and integrate comments
 - (v) Produce final synthesis, associated meta-analysis and integrate comments
 - (vi) Contribute to dissemination, outreach and uptake
- 1) Draft and final approach paper for the synthesis. This phase covers Milestone 1 in Table 1 below.
 - 2) Data collection, cleaning, and management. These deliverables correspond to Milestone 2 in Table 1 below.
 - 3) Data analysis and reporting. These deliverables correspond to Milestone 3 in Table 1 below.



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

Table 1. Deliverables and suggested payment schedule

| Milestone | Phases | Deliverables | Tentative Dates for Deliverables submission | Suggested Payment (%) |
|------------------|--|---|--|------------------------------|
| 1 | Draft and final approach papers for the synthetic review | Completed draft approach paper, satisfactory integration of comments from GCF-IEU and engagement committee, and delivery of final approach paper | 01 July 2023 | 20% |
| 2 | Data Collection, Cleaning, and Management | Fully coded file for the synthetic | 01 September 2023 | 20% |
| | | Data collection report for the synthetic review | | |
| 3 | Analysis and reporting | Draft synthetic review and relevant meta-analysis, satisfactory integration of comments from GCF-IEU and engagement committee, including socialising, reviewing and production of the final synthetic review and relevant meta-analysis | 01 November 2023 | 60% |

A more detailed work plan will be completed by the project team.

9. ENGAGEMENT COMMITTEE

The engagement committee will inform the process and substance of this review. The committee will be constituted by several experts in the field of evidence and systematic reviews and/or individuals with expertise relevant to the questions under review. The engagement committee may include internal GCF staff as well as external members. The engagement committee will provide input on the design, scope and quality of the key deliverables. These include but are not limited to the approach paper and the synthetic review report.



Appendix 1 – Evaluation Criteria

A. *Evaluation of the Proposal*

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

B. *Acceptance of Submissions*

The proposer is expected to adhere to the requirements for submitting a proposal. If the proposals fails to comply, it shall be disqualified from further consideration as part of this evaluation. In particular:

- Full compliance with the formal requirements for submitting an offer/proposal.
- Submission of all requested documentation
- **Acceptance of the GCF Model contract– Where the Bidder notes issues, these must be raised as part of the technical proposal for consideration during the evaluation.**

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 experiences with similar projects in the past/currently.
- Description of Approach, Methodology and Work Plan to perform and implement the required Services.
- Proposed Timeline to implement the Services.
- Team composition and task assignments for the project, proposed personnel's CV to be engaged as per TOR qualifications.

C. *Evaluation of Technical Proposal*

A reviewing committee shall be established by GCF to evaluate each technical proposal. The technical evaluation shall include the following steps:

(i) *Evaluation Criteria (Scored Criteria)*:

The technical proposal will be evaluated individually based on 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.

| SN | Criteria | Sub-score | Score |
|----------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 1 | Technical | | 30 |
| 1.1 | Firm expertise and experience in literature reviews, systematic reviews, evidence gap maps, and meta-analyses (including systematic searching, quality appraisal, data extraction, and data analysis) based on the present Terms of Reference | 15 | |



| SN | Criteria | Sub-score | Score |
|----------|--|-----------|------------|
| 1.2 | Experience and expertise of the firm in assessing private sector approaches to climate and development interventions, including at least one of the market-based approaches outlined above. | 15 | |
| 2 | Methodology and Workplan | | 30 |
| 2.1 | The scope, magnitude, urgency and challenge of the overall task are fully understood and reflected in the technical proposal, which extends the ToR in important aspects | 15 | |
| 2.2 | The technical proposal, tools and work plan are well defined and are relevant and correspond to extending the ToR. | 15 | |
| 3 | Personnel | | 40 |
| 3.1 | Proven team leader with the capacity to directly, energetically and creatively lead and organise the process under tight time constraints, with an emphasis on statistical analysis and counterfactual methods. | 15 | |
| 3.2 | Ability to work to tight deadlines and history of timely delivery of practical, strategic documents that add value | 10 | |
| 3.3 | Appropriate team members and arrangements: The proposed team is appropriately composed, has experience of conducting evidence reviews, the ability to work across languages, and relevant academic qualifications. Demonstrated ability of key staff to work and analyse quantitative and qualitative data by using well-recognised methods, especially as related to statistical methods, meta-analysis, causal and non-causal designs, synthesis, screening and knowledge of bibliographic databases. | 15 | |
| | TOTAL | | 100 |

Technical proposals that score at least 75% will be considered as qualified for the review of the financial proposal. Any proposal less than that will be disqualified from proceeding to the next step.

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.

(1) 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 Bidder that achieves the highest combined technical and financial score will be invited for contract negotiations or GCF may proceed to contract award.

(2) *Award of Tender/Contract*

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



ANNEX 2

TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL OFFER - SERVICES

Bidders are requested to complete this form, sign it and return it as part of their Quotation along with Annex 3 - Quotation Submission Form. The Bidder shall fill in this form in accordance with the instructions indicated. No alterations to its format shall be permitted and no substitutions shall be accepted.

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Name of Bidder: | Click or tap here to enter text. | |
| RFQ reference: | Click or tap here to enter text. | Date: Click or tap to enter a date. |

Bidders are required to submit the following:

A. TECHNICAL OFFER

The Technical Proposal shall include:

- (1) A brief company description, including ownership details, date, and place of incorporation of the firm, objectives of the firm, partnerships, qualifications, certificates, etc.;
- (2) Details to demonstrate vast experience in working with relevant multilateral development funds & international organisations, and familiarity with their operations; and also experiences with similar projects in the past/currently ongoing.
- (3) Description of Approach, Methodology and Work Plan to perform and implement the required Services.
- (4) Proposed Timeline to implement the Services.
- (5) Team composition and task assignments for the project, proposed personnel's CV to be engaged as per TOR qualifications.
- (6) **Acceptance of the GCF Model contract (attached)– Where the Bidder notes issues, these must be raised as part of the technical proposal for consideration during the evaluation.**

B. FINANCIAL OFFER

Bidders shall submit a fixed-term lump sum amount for the provision of the services stated in the Terms of Reference and shall be in line with your technical offer. The lump-sum amount should include all costs of preparing and delivering the Services. All daily staff rates shall be based on an eight-hour working day.

Currency of Quotation: Click or tap here to enter text.

Table 1 – Breakdown Of Fees And Expenses¹¹ Per Cost Component

| Description | Unit of measure | Total Period for Services (in working days) | Daily Staff Rate/ Unit Rate | Total Cost for the Period |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| I. Remuneration Costs: | | | | |

¹¹ The Bidder can estimate the travel cost (economy-class based on the proposed methodological approach) and DSA. The actual travel & other-related costs shall be paid on a cost-reimbursable basis following the reimbursement rules that shall be



Table 1 – Breakdown Of Fees And Expenses¹¹ Per Cost Component

| Description | Unit of measure | Total Period for Services (in working days) | Daily Staff Rate/ Unit Rate | Total Cost for the Period |
|---|-----------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Team Leader/Project Manager | Workday | | | |
| Expert/Consultant | Workday | | | |
| Associate Expert/Consultant | Workday | | | |
| Other staffs (if any) | Workday | | | |
| Sub-Total = | | | | |
| II. Other Related/Admin/Mgmt. Costs: (list below) | | | | |
| (a) | | | | |
| Sub-Total = | | | | |
| III. Travel Costs: (list below) | | | | |
| (a) | | | | |
| Sub-Total = | | | | |
| TOTAL (Total Cost of Financial Proposal) | | | | |

TABLE 2: Breakdown of Fees and Expenses per Deliverables

| SN | Deliverables [list them as referred to in the TOR] | Percentage of Total Price | Price (Lump Sum, All-Inclusive) |
|---|--|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 | Deliverable 1 | | |
| 2 | Deliverable 2 | | |
| 3 | Deliverable 3 | | |
| N | | | |
| TOTAL PRICE (excluding travel costs) | | 100% | |

Daily Staff Rate:

Please provide the information below; this be used to establish cost of future work/services or payments to the Firm for possible future work/services requested by the GCF)

TABLE 3 - Breakdown of Remuneration or Price List for Experts

| Name | Position or Title | Daily Staff Rate |
|------|-------------------|------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

1 – Form FIN-3 shall be filled in for the same Professional and Support Staff list in Technical Offer. You can also list other proposed experts for future work/services required by GCF.

2 – Professional Staff shall be indicated individually; Support Staff shall be indicated per category (e.g., technician, draftsmen, clerical staff).

3 – Positions of Professional Staff shall coincide with the proposed experts for the project; You can also list other proposed experts for future work/services requested by GCF.

4 – Daily Staff Rates shall be firm and fixed during the duration of the future Contract.

All other information that we have not provided automatically implies our full compliance with the requirements, terms and conditions of the RFQ.

[Name and Signature of Bidder's Authorized Person]

agreed upon by both parties before the contract is signed. **Please also note that the travel cost is not subject to the financial proposal assessment. The financial score will be given based on the proposed contract amount excluding travel costs.**



[Designation]
[Date]



ANNEX 3

RFQ – QUOTATION FORM

The Quotation Form must be completed, signed and returned to GCF. Quotations must be made in accordance with the instructions contained in this request.

The undersigned, having read the terms and conditions of Quotation No. GCF RFQ/_____ set out in the attached document, hereby offers to provide the services and related goods (if applicable) specified in the RFQ at the price or prices quoted, in accordance with any specifications stated, and subject to the terms and conditions set out or specified in the bid document.

I, _____ (Name of Authorized Signing Official) _____, certify that I am _____ (Position/Title) _____ of _____ (Legal Name of Company) _____; that by signing this RFQ bid for and on behalf of _____ (Legal Name of Company) _____ I am certifying that all information contained herein is accurate and truthful and that the signing of this bid is within the scope of my powers.

Name: _____

Title/Position _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Provide the name and contact information for the primary contact from your company for this Quotation:

Name: _____

Title/Position: _____

Mailing Address (No., Street, City, Province, Zip code, Country): _____

Tel. No.: _____

Fax No.: _____

E-mail Address: _____

Offer valid until: (Date) _____

Must be at least 90 days from closing date

Currency of offer: USD/Euro/Korean won (exclusive of taxes):

GCF Payment terms: 30 days, after receipt and acceptance of deliverable and invoice; Accepted (Yes/No):



Annex 4

Model Contract and General Conditions of Contract for Services
