

## Climate Finance for Development Accelerator (CFDA)

### Request for Proposals (RFP) # 2023-0001-RFP

#### Answers to Questions

---

1. We would like to seek some clarity on the following criteria: Organizations must be a registered U.S. non-profit possessing a non-profit IRS EIN. In the past we have obtained an equivalency determination (ED) through NGOsource, which certified that we are equivalent to a U.S. public charity. This was required to receive funding from certain US philanthropies. Would this ED allow us to meet the above criteria?

Please see amendment 1.

2. We are a profit organisation that runs a fund, which will invest with a gender-lens and climate smart approach in Africa, are we eligible to apply given that we are not non profit? We have an incredible pipeline of more than eighty companies, which require over USD250million of funding. All of these companies are growing rapidly and require finance to ensure an exponential growth trajectory. We will work with selected companies to improve investor readiness, assist them to scale rapidly, create jobs, ensure gender equity, adopt improved climate smart strategies and provide outstanding returns for our investors.

Please see amendment 1.

3. In SoW page 3 it is mentioned that : The primary place of performance for the Subcontractor will be in the U.S. Can you please give more details to this? Is this a requirement for the whole team delivering the work to be U.S based? Or could one of the team members proposed be U.S. based but the rest of the team be Africa based?

CFDA core leadership team and current CGEF stakeholders are U.S. based, and it is anticipated most fundraising will be conducted in the U.S. There is no restriction on the location of the Grants Manager staff.

4. The scope of the fund is global, focusing on emerging and developing economies. Is there any region that have priority? Or that the fund's first corporate partner Amazon would aim for the first competition to focus on?

The CGEF is global and will fund grants in countries [where USAID works](#). However, there may be instances in which funding rounds could include a specific geographic focus as guided by the Advisory Council.

5. Is the Climate Gender Equity Fund for philanthropic fund managers who invest early-stage equity in companies which have a climate and gender focus?

Please consider that references to the “CGEF Fund Manager” in the RFP and scope of work should more accurately be described as the “CGEF Grants Manager”. CGEF will provide grants

and aims to catalyze additional investment from the private sector, see Scope of Work Section II.2

6. Is the Climate Gender Equity Fund RFP just for grant managers? Can impact investors also apply? Who provide grants as early-stage equity?

Please see eligibility requirements, evaluation criteria, and Question 5. The CGEF Fund is not intended to be used for equity investment.

7. Could two organizations co-bid on this, wherein one would be the facility manager (with the corresponding IRS compliance) and the other could support in research, scoping, facility design, etc?

Please see amendment 1.

8. Could the facility manager be a fund of funds or an industry association?

Please see eligibility requirements and evaluation criteria

9. Is the grant facility envisaged as a challenge fund?

Specific funding rounds may include challenge funds.

10. As the fund grows and moves towards the mobilized target fund size of 60 million dollars as anticipated, is there potential for technical resources (from Chemonics via USAID and/or Amazon or other funding) to increase in sync with the fund?

Additional technical resources can be provided by new donors brought in by the Grants Manager through the fundraising process. USAID and Amazon have not allocated resources to CGEF beyond what is detailed in question 11, below.

11. As per the RFP, the estimated maximum subcontract ceiling is at \$2.5 million. Is there any guidance on budget allocation for managing of the fund by the fund manager and awarding of funds to the grantees?

The USAID-funded \$2.5 million is allocated for the indefinite quantity subcontract (IQS) for the management of the CGEF. Funding for the management of the CGEF through this IQS will be incrementally awarded and obligated through sub-task orders for the management of each round of funding. Awards to prospective grantees will be funded separately through contributions to CGEF; for example, Amazon's contribution of \$3 million will be used for grants.

12. What, if any, are the CFDA's objectives and/or measurable goals/outcomes as it relates to the field of blended finance and/or leveraging knowledge from the field to build innovative financing structures?

Please see the CFDA website for information about high level objectives and learning approach. <https://www.climatelinks.org/projects/cfda>

13. Are there clear objectives for the technical assistance? Is it possible to partner with other organizations for technical assistance?

Objectives for the technical assistance will be demand-driven and agreed upon between the successful Offeror and CFDA. At a minimum, the successful offeror will provide technical oversight of CGEF grantees' performance. Please refer to Section 1.4 A in amendment 1 on eligibility for consortia.

14. The fund manager is expected to issue multiple rounds of funding to include a focus on different themes and constituencies ranging from business service providers to grassroots or community-based organizations. Is it envisioned that each cycle call focus on a specific theme and constituency, or is it envisioned that the fund makes separate cycle proposal calls targeting different themes and constituencies? Furthermore, we could envision leveraging its membership network, training platforms, and knowledge creation products for the purposes of driving thought leadership, policy engagement and community advocacy on gender-responsive climate finance theme. In such a case, is the Fund's utilizing existing business lines acceptable to address the theme or is the vision that addressing this pillar is result of a funding cycle(s) as opposed to collaborating with or bolstering existing infrastructure at our engagement and member training practices?

The scope, eligibility requirements, evaluation criteria, geographic focus, impact metrics, size of grants, and other parameters of funding rounds will be determined during implementation. Chemonics will issue sub-task orders to the selected offeror for each funding round with these details. As part of the approach to developing a grantee pipeline and as past performance, Offerors may describe ways to collaborate with existing work, noting CGEF's objectives and the primary responsibility of the Grants Manager as outlined in the scope of work.

15. Given fragmentation in the ecosystem, can this fund be brought in as a window of an existing accelerator without altering the governance structure of that accelerator?

No.

16. Is it possible for entities to submit an expression of interest to serve as the TA facility to whoever the selected fund manager is?

Please join the CFIN to receive updates for solicitations for technical assistance.

17. Can you confirm that the CGEF is a pure philanthropic grant making entity and that recoverable grants are not contemplated?

The CGEF does not expect to generate a return on its grants. However, with a focus on gender-responsive climate finance, the CGEF grants portfolio should seek ways to use grant funding to catalyze private investment in climate finance and unlock capital flows to previously underserved or underrepresented actors in the climate finance ecosystem. A recoverable grant can be one way to achieve that objective.

18. How will geographic distribution of the grant funds be determined? Will it be entirely driven by donor preferences and restrictions? Is the CFDA building (or already have?) existing regional structures in place to support the CGEF Fund's activities.

See answer to question 14.

19. Can grant funding be used to support gender-responsive climate solutions implemented by the Offeror through work outside of the CGEF, or would this be considered a conflict of interest?

See answer to question 14 and 15. As part of the approach to developing a grantee pipeline and as past performance, Offerors may describe ways to collaborate with existing work, noting CGEF's objectives and the primary responsibility of the Grants Manager as outlined in the scope of work.

20. The RFP states that the Offeror must be "eligible to receive tax deductible donations". Does this imply that the Fund Manager be responsible for receiving grant funding directly from donors, rather than from Chemonics under the STOs?

Yes, grant funding will come from donors whereas funding for the management of CGEF will be determined between Chemonics and the Offeror per answers to questions 11 and 14.

21. The RFP states that "the Fund Manager will support fundraising from new potential donors". Does Chemonics anticipate issuing a STO specifically for fundraising, as these activities will likely precede STOs to administer grant funding?

Yes, there will be STOs specifically for fundraising and other portfolio management tasks that are not allocable to a specific funding round. Fundraising will be ongoing. See answer to question 11.

22. The RFP states that "the Fund Manager will support fundraising". However, page 10 the RFP states that the Technical Proposal must include a description of the "Offeror's approach to ensuring CGEF meet its fundraising goals." Is it the responsibility of the Fund Manager to meet those goals, or to support Chemonics to meet those goals?

Please see section II.6.a of Annex 1 for illustrative KPIs of the Grants Manager. Final KPI's will be agreed upon between Chemonics and the selected offeror. Offerors should describe their approach to supporting CGEF towards meeting the \$60 million fundraising goal.

23. The RFP states that the Executive Summary point e) should include the "Offeror's approach to ensuring the CGEF meet its fundraising goals. The SOW states that one of the fundraising goals is "to raise at least \$60 million". Please outline the other fundraising goals of the CGEF.

See answer to question 22.

24. The RFP states that the Executive Summary point d) should include the "Offeror's approach to ensuring the Advisory Committee meet its objectives." Please outline the objectives of the Advisory Committee.

Please note that all references to “Advisory Committee” refer to the Advisory Council. The Advisory Council will provide strategic vision for the CGEF, provide input to the scope of funding rounds, and leverage their networks within the climate finance ecosystem to support CGEF fundraising. The Grants Manager will support the Advisory Council by providing the services detailed in Section II.A of Annex I.

25. Should the second section of the Technical Volume Part 1 be an "Executive summary"? The slide limit and description of information to be included suggest that this should be a comprehensive description of the Technical Approach rather than an Executive Summary.

Thank you for flagging. The title of Technical Volume Part 1 section 2 should be the offeror’s Technical Approach. The executive summary should be the first slide or two of the offeror’s technical approach.

26. Can indirect costs be charged to Materials or should they be loaded in the Labor category only?

Per the RFP section on Cost Volume Part 2: Illustrative STO budgets (a)(ii), if the Offeror has an established indirect rate structure and it is part of their accounting procedures to apply an indirect rate on Materials, this cost must also be included in the illustrative budget. This should be applied as a rate on Materials costs and explained thoroughly in the cost notes.

27. What is the typical size of grants expected to be made? Are the illustrative STO budgets from the RFP (page 14) indicative of expected range (\$100,000 - \$2M)? The RFP states that STOs could be issued to "one or more Offerors". This appears to be inconsistent with the earlier statement on page 6 that "Chemonics anticipates issuing an award to one organization". Please clarify.

STOs and grants are separate; see answers to questions 11 and 14. Please refer to Section 1.4 A in amendment 1 on eligibility for consortia. The size of grants will be determined in consultation between the Offeror, Chemonics, and the Advisory Council per funding round, with a tentative minimum of \$100,000 given the additional administrative costs of managing a high number of grants.

28. In paragraph 1, line 6, the number "1" appears and similarly in paragraph 2, line 8, the number "2" appears. Are these typos or intended to be footnotes? They don't connect to any references.

Reference note 1 refers to [https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/PA00ZPSH.pdf](https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00ZPSH.pdf). Reference note 2 refers to <https://impactalpha.com/gender-lens-climate-finance-broader-reach/>.

29. The RFP includes a list of potential recipients of support, including non-bank financial institutions. Are commercial financial institutions eligible to receive support?

See answer to question 14.

30. The evaluation metrics are focused on numbers of benefitting organizations, number of women benefitted, etc. Will the Offeror be responsible for achieving any climate finance and gender impact results by the grants themselves, such as reduced CO<sub>2</sub>, increased resilience, women's economic empowerment, etc., or are those impacts the responsibility of the Fund grantees?

Please see section II.6.a of Annex 1 for illustrative KPIs of the Grants Manager and impact metrics for the grants portfolio. Final KPI's will be agreed upon between Chemonics and the selected offeror.