



"INTEGRATED NUTRIENT POLLUTION CONTROL"
PROJECT MANAGEMENT UNIT

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Consultancy services - Technical Assistance for the evaluation of the Concept Notes and Full Proposals received under the Calls launched within the Integrated Nutrient Pollution Control Project (INPCP) - Additional Financing

1. Background

Romania has received a loan from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and a Grant from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to support the implementation of the Integrated Nutrient Pollution Control Project (the Project) in selected localities vulnerable or potentially vulnerable to the pollution with nutrients. The overall development objective of the project is to support the Government of Romania to meet the EU Nitrates Directive requirements by (a) reducing nutrients discharges to water bodies, (b) promoting behavioural changes at the communal level, and (c) strengthening institutional and regulatory capacity. The ultimate goal is to reduce over the long-term the discharge of nutrients and other agricultural pollutants into the Danube River and Black Sea through integrated land and water management.

The closing date of the initial INPC Project was 31st of May, 2017. Following this initial Project, Ministry of Waters and Forests (MoWF) received an Additional Financing (AF) for the (INPC) Project to finance the costs associated with the scale-up nationwide of the initial Project activities, to be implemented over a six years period. The Additional Financing for scaling-up will broadly maintain the objectives and structure of the Integrated Nutrient Pollution Control Project (INPCP) with slight modifications, intended to reflect the realities of the current situation and lessons learned so far under initial INPCP. The Additional Financing will finance works, goods, services and operating costs and will comprise four components, which are largely the same as in the initial INPCP, with slight modifications: (i) Component 1: Investments in Local Communities to Reduce Nutrient Pollution; (ii) Component 2: Support for Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Building; (iii) Component 3: Public Awareness and Information Support; (iv) Component 4: Project Management.

Through the Additional Financing the overall development objective of the Project became to support the Government of Romania towards meeting the EU Nitrate Directive requirements at a national scale. The proposed interventions will build on the successes and lessons learned from the initial Project as well as from similar projects in Europe and Central Asia and other regions.

The Additional Financing for the Project became effective on 13th of April 2017 and it was ratified by Romania through law 46/03 April 2017. Its closing date is March 31, 2022.

Under Component 1 - “Investments in Local Communities to Reduce Nutrient Pollution”, the financial support provided by the Additional Financing of the Project will be demand-driven, supported on competitive grounds, based on the beneficiary communities’ requests and eligibility. The beneficiaries will propose sub-projects, selected from a menu of investments based on agreed eligibility criteria and having the main objective to reduce water pollution with nutrients. The selection and approval of sub-projects will be done on a competitive basis, for eligible activities and applicants. For this purpose, detailed *Competitive Financing Program „Investments in Local Communities to Reduce Nutrient Pollution” - Procedures & Guidelines For Applicants* are already developed. They describe in detail the eligibility criteria, selection and award procedure and provide guiding principles and rules for implementation of the sub-projects at the local, regional and national levels.

The 1st Call for Concept Notes was launched in April 2017 and the current deadline for submission by applicants (beneficiary communities) of concept notes is 30th of June 2017.

The Request for submission of sub-projects together with the Guidelines for applicants, in Romanian language, as launched, are attached to these ToRs.

2. Objectives of the Assignment

Overall objective of the assignment is to employ qualified evaluators who will support capacity building at the level of the Project Management Unit (PMU) and assist the Client (Ministry of Waters and Forests) in the selection of the best proposals for sub-projects received under the *Competitive Financing Program „Investments in Local Communities to Reduce Nutrient Pollution”* of Component 1 of the INPC Project, in line with the criteria set in the Guidelines for applicants, to achieve a high-quality, complete and coherent selection process of sub-projects.

Specific objectives of the consultancy services under this assignment are to provide technical assistance and direct support to the Client by carrying out the assessment and evaluation of the Concept Notes and of Full Proposals for the selection of sub-projects to be financed out from Component 1 of INPC Project and to ensure that the principles of transparency, proportionality, equal-treatment and fair competition are fulfilled throughout all the phases of the evaluation, selection and awarding process.

3. Scope of the Services, Tasks and Expected Deliverables

The Consultants are required to assist the Client in the selection of sub-projects to be financed under Component 1 of the INPC Project by carrying out the activities foreseen

for the evaluation and selection process, as described in detail in the Guidelines for applicants, and the filing and archiving related activities.

Currently, it is expected that during the five years duration of the INPC Project - Additional Financing there will be launched about three calls for proposals. In relation with this expectation, the assignment will be made up of three sub-assignments, which will be implemented in phases, each phase being related to each call for proposals launched. Also, commencement of services under the 2nd and 3rd sub-assignments (phase) will be conditioned by a successful and satisfactory implementation of the previous sub-assignment(s) (phase(s)).

The final number of sub-assignments may be decreased or increased subject to the total number of calls that will be launched and to a satisfactory implementation by the Consultant of the previous sub-assignment(s).

Under each call, Evaluation and selection process will be carried out in two major phases, which broadly will be as follows: Phase 1 - Concept Notes and Phase 2 - Full Proposals. The two-phase evaluation and selection process is intended to reduce operational costs by eliminating from the start the applications that fail to meet the objective of the INPCP-AF and /or the eligibility criteria. The applicable Guidelines for Applicants set out the exclusion criteria and award criteria, both for the Concept Notes and Full Proposals. Only the applicants receiving a score over a threshold in the first phase - Concept Notes will be invited to prepare and submit Full Proposals that will be evaluated in the second phase.

Phase 1: Evaluation of the Concept Notes

The evaluation will be based on the review of the information provided in the Concept Note. It will take place in two steps:

Step 1: **checking**, against the exclusion criteria, whether the proposed Concept Notes can be further evaluated;

Step 2: **evaluation**, against the award criteria, of the Concept Notes that pass the exclusion step.

Only Concept Notes meeting the requirements of Step 1 will pass on to Step 2.

Phase 2: Evaluation of the Full Proposals

The evaluation will be based on the review of the information provided in the Full Proposals. It will take place in two steps:

Step 1: **verification** of the Full Proposals on the basis of the exclusion criteria;

Step 2: **evaluation** of Full Proposals on the basis of the award criteria.

Only Full Proposals meeting the requirements of Step 1 will pass on to Step 2.

Each Concept Note/Full proposal will be assessed by 3 independent evaluators. Based on the results of the assessment, the evaluator rapporteur will reach agreement among evaluators and integrate the individual opinions of the evaluators and will present a consensus report to the PMU. Based on the recommendations in the consensus report the

PMU will exclude from further participation in the evaluation step all Concept Notes/Full proposals of sub-projects that do not meet all the exclusion criteria established by the Guidelines for Applicants.

Only Concept Notes/Full proposals that are not excluded based on the exclusion criteria will be further qualitatively assessed by the independent evaluators on the basis of the technical award criteria and corresponding scores will be given. The evaluator rapporteur will agree and integrate the individual opinions of the evaluators and will present a consensus report to the PMU.

The award criteria are divided into topics and sub-topics. Each sub-topic will be given a score between 1 and 5 in accordance with the following assessment categories: 1 - very poor, 2 - poor, 3- adequate, 4- good, 5 - very good.

Scoring definition:

1 - Very Poor. The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are significant weaknesses;

2 - Poor. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses;

3 - Adequate. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary;

4 - Good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible;

5 - Very Good. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.

For each Concept Note, the conclusion of the independent evaluators will be presented as a recommendation to the PMU as follows:

Total Score	Recommendation
$< 40 / 100$	Rejected
$40 \leq x < 70$	Accepted with amendments
$70 \leq x \leq 100$	Accepted

For each Concept Note accepted with amendments, the Evaluator will prepare and submit to the PMU a request letter addressed to the Legal Representative of the Single Applicant or of the Partnership, including the list with additional information, documents or clarifications that are requested as being necessary for finalizing the evaluation. The additional data should be submitted by the applicant within 5 working days as from the notification of the request.

In case the Concept Note is accepted with amendments the Legal Representative of the Single Applicant or of the Partnership will be informed and invited to submit additional data within 5 working days from the notification of the request. After receipt of the requested information the independent evaluators will review the Concept Note and will

update the total score (and the final recommendation). Only Concept Notes that score more than 70/100 will be recommended for acceptance by the independent evaluators.

In case of Full proposals, the conclusion of the independent evaluators will be presented as a recommendation to the PMU as follows:

Total Score	Recommendation
$< 50 / 100$	Rejected
$50 \leq x < 70$	Accepted with amendments
$70 \leq x \leq 100$	Accepted

For each Full proposal accepted with amendments, the Evaluator will prepare and submit to the PMU a request letter addressed to the Legal Representative of the Single Applicant or of the Partnership, including the list with additional information, documents or clarifications that are requested as being necessary for finalizing the evaluation. The additional data should be submitted by the applicant within 5 working days as from the notification of the request.

In case the Full proposal is accepted with amendments the Legal Representative of the Single Applicant or of the Partnership will be informed and invited to submit additional data within 5 working days from the notification of the request. After receipt of the requested information the independent evaluators will review the Full proposal and will update the total score (and the final recommendation). Only Full proposals that score more than 70/100 will be recommended for acceptance by the independent evaluators.

The recommended Concept Notes will be ranked in their decreasing scores order and, based on the total budget allocated for the Call, the List Containing the Accepted Concept Notes will be drawn up.

The Concept Notes recommended for acceptance but ranked under the line drawn for the allocated budget of the Call could be taken into consideration under the following Call/Calls being placed again on the recommended Concept Notes list, and will be again ranked in the decreasing scores order together with the scores obtained by the new submitted Concept Notes, thus resulting a new List Containing the Accepted Concept Notes.

The list containing the accepted Concept Notes/Full proposals under each call will be published on the website of the INPC Project.

The Legal Representative of the Single Applicant or of the Partnership will afterwards be informed whether their Concept Note/Full proposal has been accepted and also on how to appeal in case of rejection.

Settlement of Complaints

The complaints regarding the result of the selection process of Concept Notes/Full proposals will be sent by the Complainants in writing (by fax or email to the address indicated for help-desk) within 3 working days as from the communication of the results by publication on the INPC Project website.

Each Concept Note/Full proposal for which a complaint is submitted will be re-assessed by 3 independent evaluators. Based on the results of the assessment, the evaluator rapporteur will reach agreement among evaluators and integrate the individual opinions of the evaluators and will present a consensus report to the PMU.

The 3 independent evaluators and evaluator rapporteur assigned for the re-assessment of the Concept Notes/Full proposals for which a complaint is submitted will not be the same with those who have previously made the assessment of the respective Concept Notes/Full proposal.

The deadline for complaints settlements is 2 working days.

For each accepted Full Proposal, the Consultant will prepare the so called “Document de avizare”, with the content presented in Annex 2.

The accepted Full Proposals, together with the “Document de avizare”, will be submitted to the Technical - Economic Committee of the MoWF for approval. After that, the list with the finally approved Full Proposals will be published on the website of the INPC Project.

The selected Consultant is expected to carry out the following **prior activities** in order to achieve the scope and objectives of the assignment:

- a) Get extensive knowledge of the (i) Competitive Financing Program „Investments in Local Communities to Reduce Nutrient Pollution” - Procedures & Guidelines For Applicants, in order to be able to understand the principles and rules for its implementation at the local levels;
- b) Examine the Additional Financing INPC Project documents (Project Paper, Loan Agreement, Project Operational Manual, Project Procurement Plan, Project Action Plan among others);
- c) Participate in an one-day orientation training on the implementation of the Competitive Financing Program organized by the PMU at the PMU office;
- d) Have prior meetings with the PMU team, especially the PMU Director, Procurement Manager, Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist and Component 1 Coordinator, to discuss and plan in extensive detail the activities under the assignment and the schedule for their implementation.

Tasks

Broadly, the Consultant’s tasks under each sub-assignment will be as follows:

Tasks of the members of the Evaluation team

- a) Read and assess the proposals of sub-projects (Concept Notes/Full Proposals);

- b) Write an individual assessment report (IAR) for each proposal to record individual opinion, giving scores and providing comments against the evaluation criteria;
- c) submit IAR for review to the evaluator rapporteur (who can request clarifications but cannot challenge the opinion of the evaluator); If applicable, revise IAR based on rapporteur's comments;
- d) Once the consensus report (CR) is drafted by the rapporteur, approve or reject it; In case of rejection, the decision needs to be motivated and justified (with comments);
- e) Participate actively to reach consensus;
- f) Multiple versions of a CR can be drafted, and in case no consensus can be reached, the proposal is discussed with the PMU representatives.

Tasks of the evaluator rapporteur

- a) Quality check of IARs;
- b) Lead the process to arrive at a consensus between the individual views of the evaluators once their IARs are finalized and checked;
- c) Draft the consensus report (CR) based on the assessment made by each independent evaluator & score the proposal based on the comments (NO OPINION);
- d) Open the discussion with the evaluators, participate and help in reaching consensus; If no consensus can be reached during the evaluation, the proposal is discussed with the PMU representatives;
- e) Prepare the points that need to be discussed during the consensus meeting and inform the PMU representatives;
- f) Once a consensus is reached, finalize the consensus report (CR).

Tasks of the members of the Complaints settlements team

- a) Read and assess the proposals of sub-projects (Concept Notes/Full Proposals) for which complaints on the result of the selection process was submitted;
- b) Write an individual assessment report (IAR) for each proposal for which complaints on the result of the selection process was submitted;
- c) Participate actively to reach consensus.

Tasks of the evaluator rapporteur of the complaints settlements team

- d) Quality check of IARs;
- e) Lead the process to arrive at a consensus between the individual views of the evaluators once their IARs are finalized;
- f) Draft the consensus report (CR);
- g) Participate and help in reaching consensus;

- h) Finalize the consensus report after reaching consensus.

It is currently expected that under the first call for proposals the Consultant will have to assess and evaluate about 120 Concept Notes and about 100 Full Proposals.

The same assumption is made for the number of Concept Notes (120) and Full Proposals (100) under the second and third calls.

Based on the experience of the first phase (first calls/full proposals), the Consultant will prepare a concise **assessment report** with conclusions and recommendations for improvements, possible changes for competitive financing, and for the sub-projects considered as having the most important impacts and positive effects for the general INPC project objective. This assessment report of Phase I will represent the basis for preparing the subsequent phases of competitive financing.

Tasks regarding filing and archiving

The Consultant will have the responsibility for filing all the individual assessment reports, consensus reports and consensus reports following complaints settlements. Also, after the evaluation of Concept Notes is finalized and after the evaluation of Full Proposals is finalized, under each sub-assignment, the Consultant shall organize and put in archive all the originals of the unsuccessful Concept Notes and Full Proposals or parts thereof that are not going to be used in elaborating corresponding financing agreements.

4. Consultant's Profile, Team Composition and Qualification Requirements for the key Experts

The Consultant should be an eligible specialized consulting firm, or an association of such firms having extensive expertise in evaluations of proposals in accordance with procedures developed in Guidelines for applicants and in elaborating evaluations related reports. Education institutions, research and development institutes, universities, NGOs may be associated only as sub-consultants.

The Consultant should demonstrate a relevant general professional experience and a proven specific experience.

Under the Co-ordination of a Team Leader, the Consultant will assign experts for the following other **Key Personnel positions** (independent evaluators and evaluator rapporteur), as follows:

- a) Three or Four evaluation teams (to cover the domains of the call and in accordance with the Concept Notes/Full Proposals received), each of them consisting of 3 independent evaluators with relevant qualifications in the domain of the call to which he/she is assigned. The teams will work in parallel, each team being assigned with the evaluation of the Concept Notes/ Full Proposals corresponding to their domain of expertise, as received. Additionally, one evaluator rapporteur will have to integrate the assessment undertaken by the evaluation teams into a consolidated report;

- b) Similarly, complaint settlements teams, consisting of 3 independent evaluators, will be set up in relation with the domains of the complaints. The complaints settlement team(s) will have to re-assess the Concept Notes/ Full Proposals for which there are received complaints following their initial evaluation. One evaluator rapporteur will have to integrate the re-assessment undertaken by the complaint settlement teams into a final consolidated assessment report, which will include the final ranking resulted from the complete evaluation and complaint settlement process. The experts nominated as members of evaluation teams and the evaluator rapporteur who were previously involved in the evaluation of the Concept Notes/Full Proposal for which a complaint is submitted, cannot be also members/rapporteur for the complaint settlements process of the same Concept Notes/Full Proposal.

Requirements for the Team Leader

Professional Qualification

- Academic education in the following areas: engineering, economics, management, environment or another ancillary area relevant for the requirements of the position;
- Certified as Projects Evaluator, cod COR 241263 (Classification of Occupations from Romania) or equivalent cod ISCO-88 241960 (International Standard Classification of Occupations), holding a certificate in this respect, would be an advantage;
- Training in project management.

Experience

- Preferably 10 years of relevant working experience but a minimum of five years required;
- Participated in at least two similar types of assignments;
- Experience in leading and supervising multi-disciplinary teams, providing business advice;
- Experience in program/project planning, design, evaluation, implementation and management and reporting under different EU or other external financing programs;
- Experience in working with Government's, international organizations' and/or donors' procedures;

Other Skills

- Advanced PC skills and sound knowledge of the MS Office package (Word, Excel, Outlook, Power Point);
- Strong analytical and data collection skills, and proven managerial and team building skills;
- Excellent written and verbal skills and good command of spoken and written English;

Requirements for the other key Personnel (independent evaluators and evaluator rapporteur)

Professional Qualification

- Academic education in the following areas: engineering, environment, civil construction engineering, agriculture, forestry, or another ancillary area relevant for the domains of the calls;
- Certified as Projects Evaluator, cod COR 241263 (Classification of Occupations from Romania) or equivalent cod ISCO-88 241960 (International Standard Classification of Occupations), holding a certificate in this respect;
- Training in project management would be an advantage.

Experience

- Preferably 10 years of relevant working experience but a minimum of five years required;
- Participated in at least two similar types of evaluations (evaluation of investment financing proposals/project proposals);
- Experience in report writing;
- Experience in program/project planning, design, evaluation, implementation and management under different EU or other external financing programs, would be considered an advantage;
- Experience in working with Government's, international organizations' and/or donors' procedures;
- Experience regarding the permitting procedures for public environmental investments is desirable.

Other Skills

- Advanced PC skills and sound knowledge of the MS Office package (Word, Excel, Outlook, Power Point);
- Advanced skills in evaluation techniques and processes and strong reporting skills;
- Strong analytical and data collection skills, oral and written communication and team building skills;
- Good command of spoken and written Romanian and English;

1. Code of conduct for evaluators:

General Principles:

- Evaluators must complete the tasks assigned, upholding confidentiality and examining each application fairly, impartially and equally;

- If an evaluator were to have a direct or indirect interest in the evaluated application, or any personal or family connection with the applicant, the PMU representatives must be notified immediately (see “Conflicts of Interest”);
- Prior to submitting the draft IAR to the evaluator rapporteur, the evaluators must not contact each other with regards to the applications examined and must not discuss the contents of the applications with anyone else, least of all with the applicants;
- The Evaluators should ensure the integrity and confidentiality of the documentation they have been given access to and ensure that it is not accessible to third parties who may or may not be interested in the progress of the selection process;
- The documentation provided is used exclusively for evaluating the applications. Therefore it must not be used for any other purpose;

Conflict of Interest & Confidentiality:

A conflict of interest is a situation in which financial, personal or professional considerations could compromise or bias the neutrality, impartiality and objectivity of an individual whose position is susceptible to affect, directly or indirectly, the result of a selection process.

Evaluators must immediately notify the PMU representatives should a possible conflict of interest arise during the execution of his or her task in the selection process.

The existence or possibility of a conflict of interest does not imply that the evaluator cannot complete the evaluation of the application. The PMU representatives must determine, according to the particular circumstances of each case, whether or not the conflict compromises the activity of the evaluator. If the PMU and the evaluator conclude that the potential conflict of interest does not compromise the evaluator’s task, effective and reasonable controls will be established to guarantee that the scores have not been affected in any way. Otherwise, the Consultant must ensure and appoint a fourth independent evaluator to substitute the evaluator being in conflict of interest.

A conflict of interest exists when:

- The evaluator has actively intervened in the preparation of an applicant’s application;
- The evaluator has a family connection with the applicant;
- The evaluator has actively intervened in the elaboration of the proposal that is the subject of the Concept Note / Full Proposal;
- The evaluator has been challenged (objected) by one of the applicants or he/she has had a clear friendship or enmity with any of the applicants.

A conflict of interest could exist when:

- The evaluator has had a contractual relationship with the applicant during the last 3 years;
- The evaluator has or has had a close personal or professional relationship with the applicant;
- With regards to the application or the applicant, the evaluator finds himself or herself in any other situation that, in his/her opinion or that of a third party, could compromise his/her ability to examine the application with neutrality.

Objectivity: Assess and score the proposal based on the information provided (no assumptions or interpretations).

Accuracy: Assess against the exclusion and evaluation criteria and nothing else.

Consistency: Apply the same standard of judgment to each proposal.

5. Duration of the assignment, Reporting Requirements and Time Schedule for Deliverables

The Consultant is expected to work in three phases, under three separate sub-assignments, which will be related to each of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd calls. Under each of the three sub-assignments, the consultant should consider the following time durations and an average of 120 Concept Notes and 100 Full Proposals:

Based on the assumption of receiving 120 Concept Notes under each call, the duration for the evaluation of the Concept Notes under each sub-assignment shall not take more than 12 working days as from the commencement of the evaluation process.

If the case may be, the duration for the settlements of complaints regarding the evaluation of the Concept Notes is estimated at about 2 working days from the complaints submission deadline.

Based on the assumption of receiving 100 Full Proposals under each call, the duration for the evaluation of the Full Proposals under each sub-assignment shall not take more than 20 working days as from the commencement of the evaluation process.

If the case may be, the duration for the settlements of complaints regarding the evaluation of Full Proposals is estimated at about 2 working days from the complaints submission deadline.

Each assessment team will have to evaluate at least an average of five Concept Notes per day and respectively an average of at least three Full Proposals per day. The same averages shall be considered for the re-assessment of Concept Notes/Full Proposals following complaints. For any fractions of less than five Concept Notes and respectively less than three Full Proposals will be allocated one working day per team.

Under the 1st sub-assignment, commencement of services will be within two days as from contract signing. Under the 2nd and 3rd sub-assignments, commencement of services will be subject to a successful and satisfactory performance of the Consultant under the previous sub-assignment(s), and will be within five days as from Client's Commencement Letter.

It is expected that the evaluation of Concept Notes under the 2nd call to commence at the end of 2018 and the evaluation of Concept Notes under the 3rd call to commence at the end of 2019, with six months envisaged for the preparation by the applicants of Full Proposals following the communications of the results of the Concept Notes selection process.

Inception Report: Further to carrying out the **prior activities** described in Chapter 3. Scope of Services, Tasks and Expected deliverables, the Consultant will submit, under the 1st sub-assignment, an inception report which will set out the Consultant's approach to the assignment. Included in the approach will have to be the articulation of the overall requirements of the assignment as related to the proposed methodology, program of work, and staffing requirements and deployment, together with the activities that are planned and their timing in order to meet assignment's objective under its all three phases (sub-assignments).

The inception report will be elaborated in 2 hard copies as well as in electronic format (editable format and scan format), in Romanian and English language, within 5 working days as from the date of the commencement of services and prior to the commencement of the evaluation process under the first sub-assignment.

The indicative content of the Inception Report will address at least the following aspects:

Evaluation teams members' personal preparation for evaluation:

- i. Gathering information on the type of projects to be reviewed, the assessment requirements, the domain concerned;
- ii. Analyzing the appropriateness of the assessment requirements with his/her professional profile, identify his/her personal weaknesses and strengths;
- iii. Preparing the application for evaluation with the real information, concise and clearly expressed, and providing objective arguments on compliance with evaluation requirements.

Consultant's organization of the evaluation process

- i. Establishing the objectives of the evaluation considering the priorities and objectives of the Integrated Nutrient Pollution Control Project, management system requirements, regulatory restrictions;
- ii. Identifying the evaluation characteristics based on documents and procedures of the call;
- iii. Preparing the assessment framework to include the evaluation plan, logistic arrangements, evaluation procedures, evaluation resources, methods, techniques and tools used to record results, registration and maintenance of the evaluation results, monitoring, reviewing and improving results, reporting assessment results;
- iv. Developing the assessment tools depending on the characteristics of the call for proposals and adapted to the activity of the project, based on objective and unequivocal assessment criteria.

Under each sub-assignment, the Consultant will deliver the following reports:

Assessment Reports and Final Assessment Reports of the Concept Notes: the Consultant will deliver a consolidated assessment report of the Concept Notes (of the reports elaborated by each team), addressing the evaluation undertaken for each of the two steps of Phase 1 (Step 1: checking whether the proposed Concept Notes pass the exclusion criteria and thus can or cannot be further evaluated; Step 2: evaluation of Concept Notes that passed the exclusion criteria step) and containing a **centralized list**

of assessed Concept Notes. After publication on the INPC website of the list of Concept Notes and following complaints settlement process, if the case will be, the Consultant will integrate the results of the re-assessment with the initial assessment into a **Final Assessment Report of the Concept Notes.** The Final Assessment Reports should address any sensitive activities or issues encountered, and give general recommendations for potential solutions and approaches for improving the processes.

The reports will be elaborated in 2 hard copies as well as in editable and scan electronic format, in Romanian language, within 5 days as from the end of the assessment of the Concept Notes (including complaints settlement).

The indicative content of the Final Assessment Reports of the Concept Notes will address at least the following aspects:

- i. A centralized list of assessed proposals, the score and the proposed ranking;
- ii. Individual Assessment Reports (IAR) for each proposal of Concept Note;
- iii. Individual Assessment Reports (IAR) for each complaint regarding the Concept Note evaluation, if the case will be;
- iv. Consensus reports (CR) after reaching consensus for each proposal of Concept Notes and, if the case will be, the Consensus reports (CR) for complaints settlements process.

Assessment Reports and Final Assessment Reports of the Full Proposals: the Consultant will deliver a consolidated assessment report of the Full Proposals (of the reports elaborated by each team) for each of the two steps of Phase 2 (Step 1: verification of the Full Proposals on the basis of the exclusion criteria; Step 2: evaluation of the Full Proposals on the basis of the award criteria) and containing a **centralized list of assessed Full Proposals.** After publication on the INPC site of the list of Full Proposals and following complaints settlement process, if the case may be, the Consultant will integrate the results of the re-assessment with the initial assessment into a **Final Assessment Report of the Full Proposals.** The Final Assessment Reports should address any sensitive activities or issues encountered, and give general recommendations for potential solutions and approaches for improving the processes.

The reports will be elaborated in 2 hard copies as well as in editable and scan electronic format, in Romanian, within 5 days as from the end of the assessment of the Full Proposals (including Complaints settlement).

The indicative content of the Final Assessment Reports of the Full Proposals will address at least the following aspects:

- i. A centralized list of assessed Full Proposals, the score and the proposed ranking;
- ii. Individual Assessment Reports (IAR) for each Full Proposal;
- iii. Individual Assessment Reports (IAR) for each complaint regarding the Full Proposals evaluation, if the case will be;
- iv. Consensus reports (CR) after reaching consensus for each Full Proposal and, if the case will be, the Consensus reports (CR) for complaints settlements process.

- v. The “Document de avizare” elaborated for each accepted Full Proposal in hard copy and in electronic format (editable format).

In addition, both the Final Assessment Report of the Concept Notes and the Final Assessment Report of the Full Proposals, under each sub-assignment, should present the following information and comments regarding the following:

Evaluation of the project proposal

- i. Studying the project proposal based on the correlation of the information content between various documents and sections, compliance of the structure of the data from the templates and the relevance of the information provided;
- ii. Appreciating of the proposal using appropriate terms, objectively, concise, relevant, expressed clearly and directly related to the evaluation criteria established;
- iii. Registering the outcome of the evaluation in standard forms, digitally and on paper using the appropriate technology;
- iv. Ways to assure permanently the confidentiality of the evaluation results.

Validation of the project evaluation

- i. Compiling the reports presenting objective arguments to support the assessment, in established formats and according to the assessments carried out, and within the set forth planned time periods;
- ii. Establishing the evaluation results based on the clarifications received from applicants, the reviewed report and its consistency with the specific documentation requirements and the guidelines for applicants;
- iii. Improving results of the evaluation process based on the procedures for obtaining the consensus among evaluators, applying the principles of professional ethics.

Based on the experience of the first phase (first calls/full proposals), the Consultant will include in the Final **assessment report** conclusions and recommendations for improvements, possible changes for competitive financing, and for the sub-projects considered as having the most important impacts and positive effects for the general INPC project objective. This section of the final assessment report of Phase I will represent the basis for preparing the subsequent phases of competitive financing.

Additionally, each Final Assessment Report will be accompanied by a separate section with the Consultant’s statement regarding the corresponding resources employed and the specific inputs in terms of staffing and individual and total allocated time.

All reports will be prepared in 2 hard copies as well as in electronic format (editable format and scan format) in Romanian language and submitted to the PMU for approval in accordance with internal procedures. The approved reports will constitute basis for the payments that will be made to the Consultant under the contract.

6. Institutional arrangements, Data, Local Services, Client's Input and Counterpart Personnel, Location and Facilities to be provided by the Client

The independent evaluators and evaluator rapporteur will closely coordinate their activities with the PMU on activities related to the assignment and will work full time in the project, in Bucharest, at the premises of the PMU in order to ensure proper implementation of allocated activities.

All documentation prepared by the Consultant in the course of the assignment will remain the absolute property of the PMU. The Consultant will, not later than upon finalization of the activities under each sub-assignment, or termination or expiration of the contract, deliver all such documentation to the PMU.

Consultant's assessments related activities will take place exclusively at the Client's premises but the Consultant should use his/her own equipment and working capital to carry out the tasks included in these Terms of Reference.

The Client (MoWF) through PMU-INPC will provide access to existing data and information related to the scope of work, available at the level of the ministry and will facilitate the Consultant's contact with other consultants whose activity is relevant for the assignment. The PMU will be available for consultations and discussions as required.

Annex 1: The Call for Concept Notes and Guidelines for applicants, as published (in Romanian) available at the link: <http://apepaduri.gov.ro/proiect-de-apel-de-depunere-subproiecte-cu-nr-map012017-aferent-programului-competitiv-de-finantare-investitii-la-nivelul-comunitatilor-locale-pentru-reducerea-poluarii-cu-nutrienti/>

Prelungire termen de depunere Note Conceptuale:

<http://apepaduri.gov.ro/prelungire-termen-de-depunere-ump-nutrienti/>

Annex 2: Format of the "Document de avizare"