

United Nations Development Programme
Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian People
برنامج الأمم المتحدة الإنمائي/ برنامج مساعدة الشعب الفلسطيني



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

DATE: 14 January 2021
REFERENCE: Ref. RFP-2020- PAL-
124568

Dear Sir / Madam:

We kindly request you to submit your Proposal for Midterm Evaluation of Support to Industrial and Agricultural Economy through JAIP ICT and Incubation Center Development.

Please be guided by the form attached hereto as Annex 3, in preparing your Proposal.

Please note that this procurement process is being conducted through the online tendering system of UNDP. Bidders who wish to submit an offer must be registered in the system. Visit this page for system user guides and videos in different languages: <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/procurement/business/procurement-notices/resources/>

If already registered, go to <https://etendering.partneragencies.org> and sign in using your username and password.

Use “Forgotten password” link if you do not remember your password. Do not create a new profile.

If you have never registered in the system before, you can register by visiting the link below and follow the instructions in the user guide (attached):

<https://etendering.partneragencies.org>

- Username: event.guest
- Password: why2change

It is strongly recommended to create a username with two parts: your first name and last name separated by a “.”, (similar to the one shown above). Once registered you will receive a valid password to the registered email address which you can use for signing in and changing your password.

Please note that your new password should meet the following criteria:

- Minimum 8 characters
- At least one UPPERCASE LETTER
- At least one lowercase letter
- At least one number

You can view and download tender documents with the guest account as per the above username and password, however, if you are interested to participate, you must register in the system and subscribe to this tender to be notified when amendments are made.

Your Proposal must be expressed in the English language, and valid for a minimum period of 90 days

Proposals that are received by UNDP after the deadline indicated above, for whatever reason, shall not be considered for evaluation. If you are submitting your Proposal by email, kindly ensure that they are signed and in the .pdf format, and free from any virus or corrupted files.

Services proposed shall be reviewed and evaluated based on completeness and compliance of the Proposal and responsiveness with the requirements of the RFP and all other annexes providing details of UNDP requirements.

The Proposal that complies with all of the requirements, meets all the evaluation criteria and offers the best value for money shall be selected and awarded the contract. Any offer that does not meet the requirements shall be rejected.

Any discrepancy between the unit price and the total price shall be re-computed by UNDP, and the unit price shall prevail, and the total price shall be corrected. If the Service Provider does not accept the final price based on UNDP's re-computation and correction of errors, its Proposal will be rejected.

No price variation due to escalation, inflation, fluctuation in exchange rates, or any other market factors shall be accepted by UNDP after it has received the Proposal. At the time of Award of Contract or Purchase Order, UNDP reserves the right to vary (increase or decrease) the quantity of services and/or goods, by up to a maximum twenty-five per cent (25%) of the total offer, without any change in the unit price or other terms and conditions.

Any Contract or Purchase Order that will be issued as a result of this RFP shall be subject to the General Terms and Conditions indicated herein. The mere act of submission of a Proposal implies that the Service Provider accepts without question the General Terms and Conditions of UNDP in this link: <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/procurement/business/how-we-buy.html>

Please be advised that UNDP is not bound to accept any Proposal, nor award a contract or Purchase Order, nor be responsible for any costs associated with a Service Provider preparation and submission of a Proposal, regardless of the outcome or the manner of conducting the selection process.

UNDP's vendor protest procedure is intended to afford an opportunity to appeal for persons or firms not awarded a Purchase Order or Contract in a competitive procurement process. In the event that you believe you have not been fairly treated, you can find detailed information about vendor protest procedures in the following link: <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/procurement/protestandsanctions/>

UNDP encourages every prospective Service Provider to prevent and avoid conflicts of interest, by disclosing to UNDP if you, or any of your affiliates or personnel, were involved in the preparation of the requirements, design, cost estimates, and other information used in this RFP.

UNDP implements a zero tolerance on fraud and other proscribed practices, and is committed to preventing, identifying and addressing all such acts and practices against UNDP, as well as third parties involved in UNDP activities. UNDP expects its Service Providers to adhere to the UN Supplier Code of Conduct found in this link : http://www.un.org/depts/ptd/pdf/conduct_english.pdf

Thank you and we look forward to receiving your Proposal.

Sincerely yours,

Shehadeh A. Habash
Head of Procurement
UNDP/PAPP



Annex 1
Description of Requirements

Context of the Requirement	Please refer to the Terms of Reference (ToR)
Implementing Partner of UNDP	Please refer to the ToR
Brief Description of the Required Services	<p>UNDP currently has six ongoing projects under the JAIP-programme, all contributing to the programme's overall objective by targeting one or several of the programme's key areas. The project in question is first and foremost focusing on contributing to increase and strengthen JAIP's contribution to the agricultural sector with innovative solutions to social and environmental barriers for the sector. This through 1) direct investment in new IT/ICT solutions to agricultural communities and 2) support to Palestinian Micro-Small-Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) within the agricultural value chain and sustainable resource utilization through the establishment of an Innovative Business Hub; Palestinian Industrial Capacity Development Center (PICDEC).</p> <p>The main purpose of this midterm evaluation is to provide evidence and recommendations on the achievement and results of the projects phase 0, which consists of a) finalizing the institutional and operational set-up of the Center, 2) finalizing the Catalogue of Services and roll-out the first services to be provided to SMEs and entrepreneurs. The findings and recommendations of the midterm evaluation will be used to adjust the further interventions under phase 1, which consists of 1) the implementation of the Center's operation, 2) review the Catalogue of Services, 3) implement the Center Network Strategy and 4) further support the SMEs and entrepreneurs and ensure best possible results at the end of the project.</p> <p>The purpose of the evaluation will additionally be an assessment of the project's framework itself, where the findings and recommendations will be used for potential revision on the framework to ensure the project staff is able to assess results and achievements the best way possible at the end of the project.</p>
List and Description of Expected Outputs to be Delivered	Please refer to the ToR.
Person to Supervise the Work/Performance of the Service Provider	Julie Motzfeldt - Programme Analyst
Frequency of Reporting	<i>Required as per milestones mentioned in the ToR</i>
Progress Reporting Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation inception report • Evaluation debriefings • Draft evaluation report • Evaluation report audit trail • Final evaluation report • Final presentations to stakeholders

	Please refer to the TOR.
Location of work	<input type="checkbox"/> Exact Address/es <i>[pls. specify]</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The evaluation will cover the relevant locations in the Jericho, broader Jordan Valley and Gaza Strip, where interventions has taken place.
Expected duration of work	30 working days
Target start date	Upon signing the contract
Latest completion date	30 days from the contract signing date
Travels Expected	Internal travels within the West Bank might be needed. Most of the field work will take place in Jericho.
Special Security Requirements	N/A
Facilities to be Provided by UNDP (i.e., must be excluded from Price Proposal)	N/A
Implementation Schedule indicating breakdown and timing of activities/sub-activities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required <input type="checkbox"/> Not Required
Names and curriculum vitae of individuals who will be involved in completing the services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required <input type="checkbox"/> Not Required
Currency of Proposal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> United States Dollars
Value Added Tax on Price Proposal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> must be exclusive of VAT and other applicable indirect taxes
Validity Period of Proposals (<i>Counting for the last day of submission of quotes</i>)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 90 days In exceptional circumstances, UNDP may request the Proposer to extend the validity of the Proposal beyond what has been initially indicated in this RFP. The Proposal shall then confirm the extension in writing, without any modification whatsoever on the Proposal.
Partial Quotes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not permitted

Payment Terms	Payments	Outputs As per the ToR	Percentage	Timing	Condition for Payment Release
	1.	Evaluation Inception Report has been provided and approved	20 %	As stated in the timetable	Within thirty (30) days from the date of meeting the following conditions: a) UNDP's written acceptance (i.e., not mere receipt) of the quality of the outputs; and b) Receipt of invoice from the Service Provider.
	2.	Draft evaluation report for comments has been provided and approved	40 %	As stated in the timetable	
	3.	Final evaluation report and presentation of the findings have been provided and approved.	40 %	As stated in the timetable	
Person(s) to review/inspect/ approve outputs/completed services and authorize the disbursement of payment	UNDP's RBM Coordinator will review and approve along with the Programme Analyst. The latter will approve the completed services and authorize the disbursement of payments,				
Criteria for the Assessment of Proposal In/out eligibility criteria (preliminary)	<p>Non-Discretionary "Pass/Fail" criteria on the technical requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valid business registration certificate; • Valid Tax registration certificate; • The firm has a minimum of five (5) years of experience in evaluation of projects, including in at least one project of similar nature to the subject project; • Proven experience in implementing at least 3 similar assignments in the last 5 years; • Proposed key staff possess all the required experience, credentials & qualifications required in the Terms of Reference (i.e. fully qualified to successfully do the assignment); • At least two (2) Letters of Satisfactory Performance from the top client. <p>Note: If the firm is not compliant in one or more of the above listed mandatory requirements, its proposal will be rejected as non-compliant offer.</p>				

<p>EVALUATION PROCESS</p>	<p>Technical evaluation of proposals (which passed preliminary stage) will be conducted prior to any price proposal being opened and compared/evaluated. The price/financial proposal of the Proposals will be opened only for submissions that passed the minimum technical score (= 70 points) in the evaluation of the technical proposals. The technical proposals will be evaluated on the basis of its responsiveness to the Terms of Reference (TOR) and other documentation provided, applying the evaluation criteria, sub-criteria, and point system specified below.</p> <p>A Proposal shall be rendered non-responsive at this stage if it does not substantially respond to the RFP particularly the demands of the Terms of Reference, which also means that it fails to achieve/attain the minimum technical score (= 70 points).</p> <p>In the final stage, only the Financial Proposals of those Proposers who attained the minimum technical score* (=70 points) will be opened for evaluation, comparison and scoring.</p> <p>The UNDP procuring entity will award the Contract to the Offeror who receives/achieves the <u>Highest Combined Technical and Financial score</u>.</p> <p>The formula for the rating of the Proposals will be as follows:</p>
<p>Criteria for Contract Award</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Highest Combined Score (based on the 70% technical offer and 30% price weight distribution)</p> <p>The formula for the rating of the Proposals will be as follows:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Rating the Technical Proposal (TP):</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">TP Rating = (Total Score Obtained by the Offer / Max. Obtainable Score for TP) x 100</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Rating the Financial Proposal (FP):</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">FP Rating = (Lowest Priced Offer / Price of the Offer Being Reviewed) x 100</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Total Combined Score:</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">(TP Rating) x (Weight of TP, 70%) + (FP Rating) x (Weight of FP, 30%)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Total Combined and Final Rating of the Proposal</u></p> </div> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full acceptance of the UNDP Contract General Terms and Conditions (GTC). This is a mandatory criterion and cannot be deleted regardless of the nature of services required. Non acceptance of the GTC may be grounds for the rejection of the Proposal.</p>

Criteria for the Assessment of Proposal	<u>Technical Proposal (70%)</u>			
	Technical proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria:			
	Technical Evaluation Criteria		Weight	Points
	Capacity and expertise of Firm/ Organization		20	
	FORM 1	a	General Organizational Capability which is likely to affect implementation: management structure, financial stability and project financing capacity, project management controls, extent to which any work would be subcontracted - 50% of the points will be granted based in the quality of the references provided by 2 previous clients.	10
		b	Relevance of specialized knowledge and experience on similar engagement as of the ToR (at least 2 similar assignments conducted within the last 5 years). - 50% of the points will be granted based on the relevance of previous assignments. -50% of the points will be granted based on years of experience within similar engagement.	10
	Staffing Plan		40	
	FORM 2	a	Composition and structure of the team proposed. Are the proposed roles of the management and the team of key personnel suitable for the provision of the necessary services?	10
		B	Lead evaluator	
			Qualification/ education, including relevant training certifications.	3
			General professional experience.	2
			Specific experience relevant to the assignment.	7
			Language skills	3
c		Local youth and business development expert		

		Qualification/ education, including relevant training certifications.		3	
		General professional experience.		2	
		Specific experience relevant to the assignment.		7	
		Language skills		3	
	FORM 3	Evaluation Plan including key milestones		10	
		a	Evaluation plan clearly demonstrates what will be undertaken at each phase to cover all required elements stated in the ToR		10
	FORM 4	Methodology		30	
		a	Clearly illustrates how the evaluation will be conducted to cover all required elements, including a realistic evaluation plan ensuring timely finalization of the assignment.		10
		b	Clearly illustrates how data will be collected		10
		c	Clearly illustrates how each activity will be evaluated to ensure that the overall evaluation covers all project components		5
		d	Clearly illustrates how the final report will be developed and finalized.		5
		TOTAL		100	
	Required minimum passing score = 70 points.				
	<u>Financial Proposal (30%)</u>				
To be computed as a ratio of the Proposal's offer to the lowest price among the proposals received by UNDP.					
UNDP will award the contract to:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> One and only one Service Provider				
Type of Contract to be Signed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract Face Sheet (for Services)				

Contract General Terms and Conditions	<input type="checkbox"/> General Terms and Conditions for contracts (services) Applicable Terms and Conditions are available at: http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/procurement/business/how-we-buy.html
Annexes to this RFP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Form for Submission of Proposal (Annex 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Detailed TOR (Annex 2) with related attachments/annexes.
Contact Person for Inquiries (Written inquiries only)	<p><i>The Procurement Analyst</i> <i>Proc5.papp@undp.org</i> <i>Tel: 02-6268200-277</i></p> <p>Any delay in UNDP's response shall be not used as a reason for extending the deadline for submission, unless UNDP determines that such an extension is necessary and communicates a new deadline to the Proposers.</p>
Deadline to receive proposals	Proposals may be submitted on or before the date and time set in the UNDP eTendering system for this event/RFQ.
Liquidated damages	Will be imposed as follows: 0.5% of contract for every day of delay, up to a maximum duration of 1 calendar month. Thereafter, the contract may be terminated.
Performance Security	<p>Required in the amount of 10% of resulted contract in the form of a Bank Guarantee (please see the relevant template)</p> <p>(a) Within (7) days of contract signature and before issuance of the notice to proceed, the successful Bidder shall furnish a Performance Security to UNDP in the amount of 10% of the contract Value;</p> <p>(b) The Performance Security shall be valid until end of defects liability period (i.e. 12 months after the intended completion date);</p> <p>(c) The proceeds of the Performance Security shall be payable to the UNDP as a compensation for any loss resulting from the Contractors' failure to complete its obligations under the contract;</p> <p>(d) The Performance Security shall be denominated in the currency of the contract.</p>
Professional Liability	The consultant shall be liable for providing high quality services during the whole periods of the contract. To that end, the consultant shall have the professional liability for the completeness, perfection of all requested deliverables.

Annex 2

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Midterm Evaluation of Support to Industrial and Agricultural Economy through JAIP ICT and Incubation Center Development

PROJECT INFORMATION		
Project/outcome title	Support to Industrial and Agricultural Economy through JAIP ICT and Incubation Center Development	
Atlas ID	Award ID: PAL10-00117729 Output ID: PAL10-00119867	
Corporate outcome and output	UNDAF (2018-2022) Outcome 3.2: Palestinians have greater access to decent productive jobs PPF Output 3.1: Capacity investments in small producers in sourcing inputs, product design, business development, marketing enhanced	
Country	State of Palestine	
Region	Jericho, Jordan Valley	
Date project document signed	04 March 2020	
Project dates	Start	Planned end
	March 2020	September 2021
Project budget	USD 1,181,818	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	US\$ 550,000.00	
Funding source	GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN	
Implementing party¹	Leaders International; The Palestinian Fund of Employment & Social Protection (PFESP); Economic and Social Development Center in Palestine	

1. Background and context

Support to Industrial and Agricultural Economy through JAIP ICT and Incubation Center Development (from now on referred to as *Innovative Center Development*) builds on the assistance of the Government of Japan (GoJ) to the Palestinian People through the Initiative of Corridor for Peace and Prosperity. An initiative launched in 2006 with the aim of contributing to the creation of a viable Palestinian economy through regional cooperation between Israel, the Palestinian Authority and Jordan. The initiative has been represented by the joint effort of the Representative Office of Japan in Palestine (RoJ), Palestinian Industrial Estates & Industrial Free Zones Authority (PIEFZA) and UNDP through the establishment and development of the Jericho Agro-Industrial Park-Programme (JAIP).

¹ It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.

JAIP is a flagship programme and was founded in 2012 to support the Palestinian Government in the establishment of a viable Palestinian State with a sustainable economic system through the development and strengthening of agro-industries, including encouragement for investment, promotion of trade and increased use of sustainable energy sources. Combined with efforts to enhance regional cooperation JAIP strives to create sustainable job opportunities in Jericho, Jordan Valley and in the State of Palestine as a whole.

The overall programme attempts among others to address the issues of high unemployment in Palestine, which in 2019 reached 25.3% of the total labour force (21.3% among men and 41.2% among females) and especially youth (18-29 years old), where the unemployment rate during the same period of time reached 40.1% (34.7% among men and 67.1% among females).² This together with the issue of an underdeveloped and underperforming agricultural sector in Palestine. Mainly due to the occupation (e.g. access to land and water) and lack of investment in the sector the contribution of agriculture to the Palestinian economy has diminished over time and in recent decades decreased from 12% of GDP in 1994 to 3% in 2018.³ The sector has furthermore experienced a dramatic decline in the percentage of employed individuals in the sector over the last decades. Out of the total employed individuals in 2004, 12% of employed males and 33.7% of employed females were working within the agricultural sector, which in 2018 had declined to 6.2% among employed males and 6.8% among employed females.⁴ The agricultural sector remains, however, a main shock absorber and plays a major role in poverty alleviation and employment opportunities – particular for women.⁵

The agricultural sector is therefore also a key sector to focus on and strengthen due to the current global pandemic, which to date have had major impact on Palestine. Since the first imposed lockdown on 5 March 2020, after the first registered cases in Bethlehem, Palestine has been in and out of regional and country-wide lockdowns, night curfews and closure of non-essential businesses. The outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic has hereby exacerbated an already fragile and economic landscape as the Government of Palestine (GoP) has been facing a fiscal crisis since 2019. The worsening economic situation due to the pandemic has deteriorated the national unemployment rate and GoP lacks the financial resources to continue essential basic services, including social protection for the most vulnerable. This is especially concerning taking into account the accumulated number of cases registered since March 2020 has reached 119,414 (as of 10 December 2020) and the current number of active cases as of same date has reached 26,508.⁶ The GoP expects that revenues will drop by at least 40% due to COVID-19, increasing the government deficit to USD 1.8-2.4 billion.⁷

With a focus on providing technical support to agro-tech and agrobusinesses in Palestine, with a special focus on women and youth, the JAIP-programme objective have therefore become even more crucial; to create inclusive economic opportunities together with increased use of sustainable natural resources and energy – which is two of the three core areas within UNDP's transformative resilience programmatic framework.

To ensure national ownership of JAIP, the long-term goal is to handover the leadership of the Park from UNDP, who is currently managing JAIP to the Palestinian government. Jericho Agro-Industrial Park Company (JAIPco) were therefore established in 2012 in order to develop, manage and operate JAIP in collaboration with PIEFZA under the Ministry of National Economy – who will be the legal entity responsible for JAIP.

² Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics, 2019

³ UNCTAD (2019), [Palestinian socioeconomic crisis now at breaking point](#)

⁴ PCBS (2018), [Basic Changes for the Agricultural Labour Force in Palestine, 2004-2018](#)

⁵ UNCTAD (2019), [Palestinian socioeconomic crisis now at breaking point](#)

⁶ WHO (2020), [Coronavirus disease 2019 \(COVID-19\) in the Occupied Palestinian Territory](#)

⁷ State of Palestine National COVID-19 Response Plan

UNDP currently has six ongoing projects under the JAIP-programme, all contributing to the programme's overall objective by targeting one or several of the programme's key areas. The project in question is first and foremost focusing on contributing to increase and strengthen JAIP's contribution to the agricultural sector with innovative solutions to social and environmental barriers for the sector. This through 1) direct investment in new IT/ICT solutions to agricultural communities and 2) support to Palestinian Micro-Small-Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) within the agricultural value chain and sustainable resource utilization through the establishment of an Innovative Business Hub; Palestinian Industrial Capacity Development Center (PICDEC).

The aim of the Center is to become a leading Center in Palestine in the fields of agri-food, water and renewable energy technology and business support to Palestinian MSMEs and start-ups with growth potential as well as young entrepreneurs with promising innovative solutions. This by offering ICT solutions and training, quality control and certification services additional to providing office space and business development services such as export and marketing support.

The Innovative Center Development project therefore has three overall outputs it strives to achieve through its activities; 1) The institutional and operational set-up of PICDEC is established, 2) High quality services are provided by PICDEC, and 3) Expanded the Center's contribution to the agricultural sector. As for point 1) and 2) UNDP – in close collaboration with RoJ and PIEFZA – hired a management entity, who will be responsible for developing and implementing a) a suitable institutional and operational set-up of PICDEC and initiate the implementation of the Center operation and b) developing and implement a suitable catalogue of services. As for 3) UNDP has linked the management entity with a national agricultural NGO to implement the following interventions; Direct investment in innovative solutions to agricultural communities in Jordan Valley addressing social and/or environmental barriers for their agricultural activities and technical and business-related support to young entrepreneurs in Gaza and the West Bank with promising innovative ideas. Hereby the project's main target group is three-folded; Farmers in Jordan Valley; Agro- and Agro-Tech MSMEs and; young entrepreneurs. Due to COVID-19 the project has also allocated some of the budget to focus specifically on support to businesses within the agro-food sector affected hardly by the current pandemic through technical support and introduction of innovative solutions and/or approached. The project furthermore strives towards encouraging the inclusion and empowerment of women within agrobusinesses by identifying and providing direct support to women-led agro- or agro-tech businesses.

The support to young entrepreneurs is a part of a yearly AgroTech competition first initiated in 2018 and is an essential part of UNDP and RoJ's joint efforts under JAIP. The AgroTech competitions target youth with innovative solutions for the agricultural sector, where a technical panel is selecting the most promising ideas. The winners hereafter receive mentoring, business and technical support to develop their idea and business. The long-term aim with the competitions is to build up a network of entrepreneurs within JAIP and support them with developing their entrepreneurial ideas into actual businesses.

For the 2020 competition under the Innovative Center Development project has for the first time merged with the Agro-Tech competition; Solve-It, which is an initiative launched by the Prime Minister's Office with the support of UNDP. This year also provides the first opportunity to assess the actual impact of the previous years' support to the competition winners of especially 2018 as well as 2019.

More details on the background, context and expected project results and the JAIP-Programme will be made available to the successful consultant following the signature of the contract.

2. Evaluation purpose, scope and objectives

2.1. Purpose of the evaluation

The main purpose of this midterm evaluation is to provide evidence and recommendations on the achievement and results of the projects phase 0, which consists of a) finalizing the institutional and operational set-up of the Center, 2) finalizing the Catalogue of Services and roll-out the first services to be provided to SMEs and entrepreneurs. The findings and recommendations of the midterm evaluation will be used to adjust the further interventions under phase 1, which consists of 1) the implementation of the Center's operation, 2) review the Catalogue of Services, 3) implement the Center Network Strategy and 4) further support the SMEs and entrepreneurs and ensure best possible results at the end of the project.

The purpose of the evaluation will additionally be an assessment of the project's framework itself, where the findings and recommendations will be used for potential revision on the framework to ensure the project staff is able to assess results and achievements the best way possible at the end of the project.

2.2. Scope of the Evaluation:

The evaluation should be conducted at the end of the project's phase 0, which is March 2021.

Geographically, the evaluation will cover the relevant locations in the Jericho, broader Jordan Valley and Gaza Strip, where interventions has taken place.

In every stage of the evaluation, criteria will be used (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact, coherence, equity and human rights issues). The evaluation will present lessons learned, best practices and recommendations for future interventions under the project's phase 1.

The scope of this evaluation will also focus on assessing the project's contributions to gender equality and women's empowerment and providing actionable, evidence-based recommendations and lessons learned to inform the future work under the project's phase 1.

2.3. Specific objectives

- 1) Assess the formulation and structure of the results framework, including recommendation for potential strategic improvements and/or adjustments of activities, outputs and/or indicators to make sure the results framework enables an assessment and analysis of the achievements of the project's objectives;
- 2) Assess the relevance of the project activities, procedures and structures to the project's context and the achievement of the overall goal, including linkage to the overall JAIP-Programme. Main activities and their assumed objective, which should be assessed are as follows:
 - a. The institutional and operational set-up at the Center and the implementation of services to SMEs and entrepreneurs, which should lead to the implementation of a Business Center in Palestine with high-quality services and a competitive advantage;

- b. Suitable network strategy and financial model in place, which should lead to sustainability of the Center:
 - c. The Center's ability to support and introduce innovative solutions and/or new approaches to agricultural communities, entrepreneurs and/or SMEs in a beneficial way which strengthen the Center's overall contribution to the agricultural sector and its ability to create inclusive economic opportunities.
- 3) Assess the efficiency, effectiveness, impact, institutional capacity, sustainability, coherence, coverage, and risk management of the program, including;
- a. Institutional arrangement: Formulation and implementation stages, assumptions and risks, sustainability of results;
 - b. Partnerships: Assessment of level of involvement and perception of partners and assessment of collaboration level among relevant stakeholders;
 - c. Processes and Administration: Project administration procedures, milestones, key decision and outputs, project oversight and active engagement by UNDP and the Project Board, coordination between UNDP and partners;
 - d. Disbursements: Overview of actual spending against budget expectations and analyse disbursements to determine if funds have been applied effectively and efficiently;
 - e. Budget procedures: Effectiveness of project document to provide adequate guidance on how to allocate the budget; audits and any issues raised in audit and subsequent adjustments to accommodate review recommendations;
 - f. Coordination mechanisms: Appropriateness and efficiency of coordination mechanisms and approaches.
- 4) Develop conclusions and suggest actions to inform the Project Team and Management Team of the Center about what works and what does not so the project can adjust/improve/refine if needed and future interventions under phase 1 can take it onto account. This should include not only the results the project has achieved, but to explain the 'how' and the 'why' – why progress was made, and why not – in order to provide a process focus, rather than only a results focus – and what that learning informs for future programming. A special focus should here be on the performance of the management team of the Center and the results of the AgroTech/Solve It competition;
- 5) Assess different stakeholders' satisfaction from the program and its interventions;
- 6) The evaluation will also cover how gender equality and youth inclusion has been addressed and make recommendations for increased mainstreaming of these issues as required.

3. Evaluation criteria and key guiding questions

3.1. Project evaluation sample questions

The purpose of the evaluation criteria is linked to the purpose of evaluation. Namely, to enable the determination of the merit, worth or significance of the project. The evaluation should be conducted according to the six Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)- Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, the likely impact and sustainability). Each criterion is a different lens or perspective through which the intervention can be viewed. Together, they provide a more comprehensive picture of the intervention, the process of implementation, and the results.

The criteria play a normative role. Together they describe the desired attributes of interventions: All interventions should be relevant to the context, coherent with other interventions, achieve their objectives, deliver results in an efficient way, and have positive impacts that last. The criteria are used in the evaluation to: a) Support accountability, including the provision of information to the public; and b)

Support learning, through generating and feeding back findings and lessons.

Suggested evaluation questions are provided below. These guiding evaluation questions will be further refined by the evaluation team and agreed with the UN evaluation stakeholders.

Relevance:

- To what extent is the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan and the SDGs?
- To what extent does the project contribute to the Transformative Resilience Programmatic Framework of UNDP?
- To what extent are lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?
- To what extent does the original project concept and objectives stress the needs of the targeted beneficiaries and strategies to create inclusive economic opportunities?
- To what extent are perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes – and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results – taken into account during the project design processes?
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and inclusion of youth?
- To what extent is the project flexible, adaptive and context-specific to adjust strategies over time as circumstances evolved (e.g. possible annexation, COVID-19 pandemic, etc.) and the changing external environment?
- To what extent does the project contribute to the JAIP-Programme's strategic framework?
- To what extent is the support to businesses within the agro-tech sector relevant to address the needs during the current pandemic?

Coherence

- To what extent is this intervention coherent with other actors' intervention in the same context. This includes complementarity, harmonisation and co-ordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort. E.g. Palestinian Incubation Centers/Accelerator programmes, similar interventions, etc.
- To what extent is the intervention coherent with national authorities' priorities?

Effectiveness

- To what extent does the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan and national development priorities?
- What factors contribute to achieving or not achieving progress towards intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
- To what extent is the project progressing towards achieving its outputs?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest/fewest achievements so far? Why and what are the contributing factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements or how can they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies can be more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
- Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?
- To what extent are stakeholders involved in project implementation?
- To what extent are project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives?
- To what extent is the project contributing to gender equality, the empowerment of women and inclusion of youth?

Efficiency

- Is the project delivering its expected results of phase 0, including in terms of budget allocation and cost-efficiency of activities?
- To what extent is there an economical use of financial and human resources? Are resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) allocated strategically to achieve outputs?
- To what extent are project funds and activities delivered in a timely manner?

- To what extent are resources used efficiently? Are activities under phase 0 supporting the strategy cost-effective? Why/why not?
- To what extent does the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?
- To what extent is the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- To what extent are the UNDP partnership strategy within the project appropriate and effective?

Likely impact/Impact

- What are the effects of the intervention on recipients' lives? Including the winners of the 2018 and 2019 competition.
- To what extent is the programme on track to support, or likely to support/contribute to capacity change of partners, influence on broader policy/systems and impacts at beneficiary level?
- Does a specific part of the intervention achieve greater results than another likely to create impact?
- Are there unintended (positive or negative) effects for recipients and non-recipients of assistance?
- What is the possible gender-specific impact(s)? Is it likely that the intervention influences the gender context?
- What is the youth-specific impact(s)? Is it likely that the intervention influences the inclusion of youth?
- Is it likely that the specific support to COVID-19 affected businesses and the general services provided by the center can support businesses to survive?
- What is the contribution of phase 0 intervention to the long-term intended results of the project?

Sustainability

- Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outputs?
- To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project so far?
- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
- Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
- What is the risk that the level of stakeholders' ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
- To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
- To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

Evaluation cross-cutting issues sample questions

Human rights

- To what extent do disadvantaged and marginalized groups such as poor agricultural communities, women and youth benefit from the work?

Gender equality

- To what extent are gender equality and the empowerment of women addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?
- To what extent is the project promoting positive changes in gender equality and empowerment of women? Are there any unintended effects/likely effects?

4. Methodology

The midterm evaluation should utilize a participatory and interactive approach using mixed method of data collection. Hence, the evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries. UNDP is strongly encouraging the use of virtual tools such as phone interviews and phone surveys, virtual Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and online and SMS-based surveys, among others, during this period of COVID-19 pandemic.

Additionally, pre-existing secondary data such as administrative datasets and previous survey datasets can be used to answer some evaluation questions. The evaluators should conduct a thorough document review of the programme document, results framework, programme quality assurance reports, annual workplans, activity designs, progress reports, mid-year and annual reports, and results-oriented monitoring report as well as the JAIP-Programmes Strategic Framework.

The evaluators will analyse synergies with existing programmes/projects/organisations that intersect strategically with the project (e.g. the yearly competition) and JAIP based on the list preapproved by the evaluation reference group. The evaluators may also utilise semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders; focus group discussions with beneficiaries and stakeholders; surveys and questionnaires; field visits, where possible; output/outcome mapping, observational visits (if possible), group discussions; and data review and analysis of monitoring reports. Based on the rapidly changing circumstances and the travel and other restrictions due to the COVID-19, the methodology and data collection methods will be adapted keeping the Do-No-Harm and ethical considerations. This will be done in consultation with evaluation managers and the Evaluation Reference Group.

Findings need to be based on facts and recommendations need to be actionable.

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Travel to the country has been restricted since April and travel into and out of the West Bank and Gaza has also been restricted. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the evaluation then the evaluation team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the evaluation virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the Inception report and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

If all or part of the evaluation is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder and beneficiaries' availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home and not all beneficiaries in the country might be accessible online. These limitations must be reflected in the evaluation report.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the evaluation schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the evaluation and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the evaluators. In the likely event that this evaluation will operate mainly through desk-based research, remote engagement and online surveys, the mitigation measures, including protocols for online data protection, should be addressed in the inception report.

UNDP will provide the consultant with up to date stakeholder contact details, and the consultant is encouraged to:

- Inform interviewees in advance of the evaluation with clear purpose and overview of the evaluation, evaluation team and interview expectations. This will also save time during interviews;
- Ensure and explain the principle of full anonymity of all interviews;
- Share a list of questions with interviewees in advance to speed up the process and facilitate interviewee preparation;
- Consult with the interviewee on which virtual tool the interviewee is more comfortable with (Zoom, Skype, telephone etc.).

5. Evaluation products (deliverables)

The following deliverables should be produced as part of the overall evaluation:

- **Evaluation inception report (10-15 pages):** The inception report should be carried out following and based on preliminary discussions with the JAIP-Programme team after the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit, if the current situation allows. The inception report should include the final agreed upon evaluation questions.
- **Evaluation debriefings:** Immediately following the initial data collection phase, the evaluators will be expected to conduct a preliminary debriefing and present findings to UNDP, stakeholders, and development partners for discussion.
- **Draft evaluation report (within an agreed length):** The initial draft should be produced 2 weeks after the conclusion of information collection and/or possible country visit if the situation allows. UNDP and the relevant stakeholders will provide comments to the evaluators within a week of receiving the draft.
- **Evaluation report audit trail:** All products such as inception, draft and final reports will be validated by the evaluation reference group. Comments and changes by the evaluator in response to the draft report should be retained by the evaluator to show how they have addressed comments.
- **Final evaluation report:** This should be provided within a week of the evaluators receiving the comments on the draft evaluation.
- **Final presentations to stakeholders (might be remotely):** This should be done within two weeks of acceptance of the final evaluation report and will be organized for the evaluation team.

The evaluator should follow UNDP Standard templates for [inception report](#) and [evaluation report](#)

The evaluator will need to consider all the quality criteria required as per the [UNDP evaluation guidelines](#) and the [UNEG Quality check list for evaluation reports](#).

6. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

The consultancy firm/individual consultant should have proven experience in implementing at least 2 similar assignments during the last 5 years and should be able to deploy specialized experts for carrying out this assignment. The evaluation team should provide their own computers, communications equipment and personal protective equipment as needed.

Interested consultant should formulate an evaluation team and is encouraged to include both international and national evaluators. The team should include evaluator(s) together covering all the below specific skills, competencies and characteristics as minimum requirements for the evaluator(s). The exact team composition is up to the individual bidder.

Interested consultants should provide details on the management structures and implementation, describing how evaluators will be operating remotely, such as international consultants. Interested consultant should provide details on the management structures and implementation, describing how evaluators will be operating remotely, such as international consultants.

Lead Evaluator

- Master's degree political science, social studies, social development, or related field;
- Minimum 3 years of professional experience in areas of business development, entrepreneurship and/or incubation, innovation, agricultural development and gender equality;
- At least 7 years of experience in conducting evaluations of international development projects and programmes;
- Experience in mixed method data collection;
- Direct experience working with civil society and government institutions is an added advantage;
- Excellent writing skills with a strong background in report drafting;
- Demonstrated ability and willingness to work with people of different cultural, ethnic and religious background, different gender, and diverse political views;
- Demonstrated ability to use critical thinking, conceptualize ideas, and articulate relevant subject matter in a clear and concise way;
- English is required and proficiency in Arabic is an advantage.

Local youth and business development expert

- Master's degree in political science, social studies, social development, gender or related field;
- Minimum 2 years of professional experience in areas of youth inclusion and employment, business development and/or start-up support;
- At least 5 years of experience in conducting evaluations of international development projects/programme and at least 50% with a partial and primary focus on youth;
- Direct experience working with civil society and government institutions is an added advantage;
- Excellent writing skills with a strong background in report drafting;
- Demonstrated ability and willingness to work with people of different cultural, ethnic and religious background, different gender, and diverse political views;
- Demonstrated ability to use critical thinking, conceptualize ideas, and articulate relevant subject matter in a clear and concise way;
- English and Arabic is required.

7. Evaluation ethics

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The consultant (includes all members of the consulting team) will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment.

The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

8. Implementation arrangements

The consultant will start the evaluation process with an inception meeting with UNDP representatives by way of virtual communication. The consultant should submit an inception plan based on the meeting within 3 calendar days of the issuance of contract. The consultant will then undertake the review of documentation, interviews with key stakeholders, field visits, preparation of an evaluation report including lessons learned and recommendations. The consultant will submit the draft product to UNDP and selected stakeholders for comments and finalize the product within 3 calendar days after receiving the feedback.

In consultation with the consultant and as requested, the Programme Portfolio Manager will make available all relevant documentation and provide contact information to key project stakeholders, and facilitate contact where needed. UNDP will facilitate the evaluation process and assist in connecting the evaluator with the senior management, key stakeholders as the Ministry of National Economy (MoNE), PIEFZA, RoJ, Jericho Agro-Industrial Park Company (JAIPCo) and implementing partners. UNDP will also assist in organizing the site visits and meetings and help identify key stakeholders for interviews by the evaluator.

An evaluation reference group will be formed consisting of the Project Board members representing UNDP, RoJ and PIEFZA. Their role will be to review and comment on the inception and the evaluation report before the final submission.

9. Time frame for the evaluation process

This section lists and describes all tasks and deliverables for which evaluators or the evaluation team will be responsible and accountable, as well as those involving the commissioning office, indicating for each the due date or time frame (e.g., workplan, agreements, briefings, draft report, final report), as well as who is responsible for its completion. At a minimum, the time breakdown for the following activities should be included:

- Desk review;
- Briefings of evaluators;
- Finalizing the evaluation design and methods and preparing the detailed inception report;
- In-country data collection and analysis (visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires);
- Preparing the draft report;
- Stakeholder meeting and review of the draft report (for quality assurance);
- Incorporating comments and finalizing the evaluation report.

In addition, the evaluators may be expected to support UNDP efforts in knowledge-sharing and dissemination. Required formats for the inception reports, evaluation reports and other deliverables should be included in the annexes of the TOR for the evaluation being commissioned. This section should also state the number of working days to be given to each member of the evaluation team and the period during which they will be engaged in the evaluation process (e.g., 30 working days over a period of three months).

United Nations Development Programme
 Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian People
 برنامج الأمم المتحدة الإنمائي / برنامج مساعدة الشعب الفلسطيني



Example of working day allocation and schedule for an evaluation (midterm evaluation)

ACTIVITY	ESTIMATED # OF DAYS	DATE OF COMPLETION	PLACE	RESPONSIBLE PARTY
Phase One: Desk review and inception report				
Meeting briefing with UNDP (programme managers and project staff as needed)	-	At the signing of contract	UNDP or remote	Evaluation manager and commissioner
Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluation team	-	At the signing of contract	Via email	Evaluation manager and commissioner
Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed	5 days	Ten days after signing of contract	Home- based	Evaluation Team
Submission of the inception report (15 pages maximum)	-	Ten days after signing of contract	Via email	Evaluation team
Comments and approval of inception report from evaluation reference group	5 days	Fifteen days after signing the contract	UNDP	Evaluation manager
Phase Two: Data-collection mission				
Consultations and field visits, in-depth interviews and focus groups	10 days	Ten days after approval of inception report	In country With field visits	UNDP to organize with local project partners, project staff, local authorities, NGOs, etc.
Debriefing to UNDP and key stakeholders	1 day	Three days after finalizing consultation and field visits	In country	Evaluation team
Phase Three: Evaluation report writing				
Preparation of draft evaluation report (50 pages maximum excluding annexes), executive summary (5 pages)	5 days	Four weeks after signing of contract	Home- based	Evaluation team
Draft report submission	-	Four weeks after signing of contract	Via email	Evaluation team
Consolidated the evaluation reference group's comments to the draft report	-	One week after submission of draft report	UNDP	Evaluation manager and evaluation reference group
Debriefing with UNDP	1 day	One day after the consolidated the comments	Remotely	UNDP, evaluation

			UNDP	reference group, stakeholder and evaluation team
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and evaluation reference group	3 days	6 weeks after signing of contract	Home- based	Evaluation team
Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP country office (50 pages maximum excluding executive summary and annexes)	-	6 weeks after signing of contract	Home- based	Evaluation team
Estimated total days for the evaluation	30			

United Nations Development Programme
 Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian People
 برنامج الأمم المتحدة الإنمائي / برنامج مساعدة الشعب الفلسطيني



10. Annexes

Annex 1 - Code of conduct: Each member of the evaluation team to read carefully, understand and sign the ‘Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the United Nations system’.

Annex 2: [Integrating Gender Equality and Human Rights in Evaluation - UN-SWAP Guidance, Analysis and Good Practices](#)

Annex 3: Key stakeholders and partners.

Annex 4: Evaluation matrix (suggested as a deliverable to be included in the inception report). The evaluation matrix is a tool that evaluators create as map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It also serves as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer, data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.

Table 1. Sample evaluation matrix

Relevant evaluation criteria	Key questions	Specific sub questions	Data sources	Data-collection methods/tools	Indicators/success standard	Methods for data analysis

Annex 6: [inception report](#) standard template

Annex 7: [evaluation report](#)

Annex 8: [UNDP evaluation guidelines](#)

Annex 9: [UNEG Quality check list for evaluation reports](#)

Annex 10: [UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations](#)

the Annexes above include the links. Other Documents will be made available to the successful consultant within 3 calendar days of the issuance of contract.



Annex 3
FORM FOR SUBMITTING SERVICE PROVIDER'S PROPOSAL⁸
(This Form must be submitted only using the Service Provider's Official Letterhead/Stationery⁹)

[insert: Location].

[insert: Date]

To: [insert: Name and Address of UNDP focal point]

Dear Sir/Madam:

We, the undersigned, hereby offer to render the following services to UNDP in conformity with the requirements defined in the RFP dated [specify date] , and all of its attachments, as well as the provisions of the UNDP General Contract Terms and Conditions:

A. Qualifications of the Service Provider

The Service Provider must describe and explain how and why they are the best entity that can deliver the requirements of UNDP by indicating the following:

- a) *Profile – describing the nature of business, field of expertise, licenses, certifications, accreditations;*
- b) *Business Licenses – Registration Papers, Tax Payment Certification, etc.*
- c) *Latest Audited Financial Statement – income statement and balance sheet to indicate Its financial stability, liquidity, credit standing, and market reputation, etc. ;*
- d) *Track Record – list of clients for similar services as those required by UNDP, indicating description of contract scope, contract duration, contract value, contact references;*
- e) *Certificates and Accreditation – including Quality Certificates, Patent Registrations, Environmental Sustainability Certificates, etc.*
- f) *Written Self-Declaration that the company is not in the UN Security Council 1267/1989 List, UN Procurement Division List or Other UN Ineligibility List.*

B. Proposed Methodology for the Completion of Services

The Service Provider must describe how it will address/deliver the demands of the RFP; providing a detailed description of the essential performance characteristics, reporting conditions and quality assurance mechanisms that will be put in place, while demonstrating that the proposed methodology will be appropriate to the local conditions and context of the work.

C. Qualifications of Key Personnel

⁸ This serves as a guide to the Service Provider in preparing the Proposal.

⁹ Official Letterhead/Stationery must indicate contact details – addresses, email, phone and fax numbers – for verification purposes

United Nations Development Programme
 Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian People
 برنامج الأمم المتحدة الإنمائي / برنامج مساعدة الشعب الفلسطيني



If required by the RFP, the Service Provider must provide:

- Names and qualifications of the key personnel that will perform the services indicating who is Team Leader, who are supporting, etc.;*
- CVs demonstrating qualifications must be submitted if required by the RFP; and*
- Written confirmation from each personnel that they are available for the entire duration of the contract.*

D. Cost Breakdown per Deliverable*

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

**This shall be the basis of the payment tranches*

E. Cost Breakdown by Cost Component [This is only an Example]:

Description of Activity	Remuneration per Unit of Time	Total Period of Engagement	No. of Personnel	Total Rate
I. Personnel Services				
1. Services from Home Office				
a. Expertise 1				
b. Expertise 2				
2. Services from Field Offices				
a. Expertise 1				
b. Expertise 2				
3. Services from Overseas				
a. Expertise 1				
b. Expertise 2				
II. Out of Pocket Expenses				
1. Travel Costs				
2. Daily Allowance				
3. Communications				
4. Reproduction				
5. Equipment Lease				
6. Others				
III. Other Related Costs				

[Name and Signature of the Service Provider's Authorized Person]

[Designation]

[Date]