



## Climate Finance for Development Accelerator (CFDA)

### Indefinite Quantity Subcontract (IQS) Request for Proposals (RFP) # 2023-0008-RFP

#### Answers to Questions

---

##### Technical

1. Do you expect C3F to overlap or engage with other Climate funding mechanisms supported by USAID beyond the missions, e.g. Climate Finance + or Prosper Africa, among others?

There are no immediate plans to work with other climate finance mechanisms, though it may be that projects proposed for review under C3F have received some support from other USAID or donor mechanisms. Initially, the primary focus will be on engaging and supporting USAID country and regional missions. Should the opportunity arise, C3F will collaborate with other USAID mechanisms as appropriate.

2. Does Chemonics have any starting hypotheses on natural capital projects to prioritize / focus on based on USAID Mission priorities and technical capabilities, e.g., mangroves, seagrass, or coastal peatbeds and peatlands?

Project and project site prioritization will be determined after the rapid opportunity screening and in consultation with the relevant USAID Mission.

3. How much variability (in terms of stage of development of projects, funding requirements, etc.) does CFDA expect to have in the opportunities coming from the missions?

While it is expected that most projects will be at early stages, CFDA expects variability regarding stage of development.

4. Do you expect the screening criteria to adjust to different stages of project development?

No. CFDA expects the Anchor Partner to develop one methodology for the rapid opportunity screening. Once the four USAID Missions that will pilot C3F are identified, the Anchor Partner will use the rapid opportunity screening developed to evaluate, at a high-level, where investible blue carbon or other coastal resilience projects could be developed. The rapid opportunity screening methodology developed should be flexible enough to capture different stages of project development but not adjust to project/project sites individually.

5. Have the missions with potential opportunities will be identified and engaged by CFDA or will the contractor be expected to engage a broader number of missions to promote the facility and explore interest?

Chemonics and USAID/Washington staff will engage Missions to identify interest in C3F and will facilitate connections between the Missions and the Anchor Partner. The Anchor Partner will not be expected to and should not plan to engage USAID Missions to garner interest in C3F.

6. Is the scope of the facility limited to capacity building activities or will direct investment also be considered?

The scope of the facility spans capacity building and technical assistance activities with local communities and project developers to generate projects that are attractive enough to private sector actors to eventually proceed to full implementation with minimal or no ongoing support from USAID. Direct investments by private sector actors may be made once the projects reach a level of bankability, and the matchmaking process has concluded. As noted in the RFP, these activities would not fall under Sub-task Order 1 (STO 1) and would be contingent on USAID missions committing additional funding to C3F.

7. With the information provided by the rapid screening process, who will be making final decisions on the projects participating in the facility? Will there be an investment committee established across USAID, Chemonics and the Contractor?

CFDA will establish an advisory panel comprised of representatives from USAID, CFDA, and the Anchor Partner. The panel will select projects/project sites based on the results of the rapid opportunity screenings and funding from the relevant USAID Mission.

8. Does CFDA have some specific desired objectives and targets for the Community of Practice?

CFDA would like the Anchor Partner to facilitate learning and dialogue on blue carbon and coastal resilience opportunities, challenges, and standards for local inclusion, benefit-sharing, and biodiversity through the community of practice. See Section II.2. in the RFP for a list of illustrative goals.

9. What is the expectation for how awardee will engage other CFIN network members? How will non-awardees from CFIN benefit from this community of practice?

CFDA will invite members of the Climate Finance Investment Network (CFIN) with technical expertise relevant to C3F to join the community of practice. Learnings gathered from the community of practice will be circulated with the CFIN.

10. Who would this Affinity Network report to and how will it relate to potential future additional Affinity Networks?

The community of practice will be coordinated by the Anchor Partner with oversight from CFDA. The Anchor Partner is expected to work with CFDA to come up with a strategy for engagement and cross-cutting learning that is complementary to C3F.

11. How many and what types of convenings and knowledge products does Chemonics and USAID hypothesize as will be most valuable for this community of practice?

The Anchor Partner is expected to propose an appropriate strategy for the community of practice in line with the budget allocation under STO 1 outlined in the RFP. The strategy should be complementary to C3F. The successful offeror will engage with CFDA and USAID to finalize this approach after the award of the subcontract and finalize the strategy in the associated deliverables.

12. The Annex 2 guide and cost proposal instruction state that “*Offerors should assume 5 days of travel for two travelers to Senegal for deliverable #9 and use a plug figure for travel and per diem of \$10,000.*” However, there is no other mention of Senegal as a country focus in the scope of work. Would it be possible to clarify what, if any, relationship or activities under the RfP scope are anticipated in Senegal?

Senegal was included as a hypothetical country for this budgeting exercise.

13. Is there an initial pipeline of projects that have already been sourced by CFDA or Missions and if so, would it be possible to provide examples of these projects? We would be particularly interested in understanding at what stage those projects are (pre-feasibility, pre-PDD, post-PDD).

No.

14. The RFP mentions Investment Matchmaking as a potential subsequent Sub Task Order (STO), and II.3 Activity Indicators are centred around amount of investment mobilized. What is the total number of projects that are expected to be sourced and screened under STO1? What about the number of projects that are expected to be supported under subsequent STOs in this IQS?

The Anchor Partner will conduct at least four rapid opportunity screenings under STO 1. The total number of projects to be sourced in subsequent STOs is contingent on screening results as well as USAID Mission concurrence and funding.

15. The scope of work (page 14) mentions the anchor partner being responsible for identifying promising opportunities for facilitating private investment. We would expect that to include direct sourcing of blue carbon projects and project developers. That is not however mentioned in the table of deliverables (page 17/18). Which deliverables, if any, would include activities related to sourcing?

The Anchor Partner will recommend project sites and a menu of services to advance the identified projects as a result of Deliverables 3 and 4. In future STOs, the Anchor Partner will support with service provider sourcing and facilitate the matchmaking process (Deliverable 11).

16. Could a firm submit a response to the RfP in partnership with another, as a consortium partner?

Offerors may submit a proposal as a consortium but CFDA will give preference to one organization to lead C3F and coordinate the community of practice.

17. Does CFDA already have in mind a set of priority geographies / projects for C3F to initially engage with, or would this be for the selected offeror to determine in collaboration with CFDA as part of the geographic strategy?

No. Priority geographies will be determined in collaboration with USAID upon award of this subcontract.

18. Are you able to provide any information on the expected developmental status of potential opportunities, and the level of technical / landscape information that is likely to be already available?

No. CFDA will liaise with USAID Missions to facilitate as much contextual information as possible to inform rapid opportunity screenings.

19. Are you able to provide any information on the expected level / detail of feasibility analysis to be undertaken as part of the Rapid Opportunity Screenings? E.g. qualitative assessment, and/or quantitative such as potential carbon volumes, financial modelling, breakeven prices required

The Anchor Partner will conduct desk research and remote key informant interviews informed by the relevant Mission and its portfolio of activities to understand basic project parameters and to determine if, for example, the national enabling environment is conducive to investible coastal resilience and/or blue carbon project development. The purpose of the rapid opportunity screening is to determine the viability of a C3F project in the country and to narrow the possible project sites. Assuming receptivity of local

stakeholders, the Anchor Partner would seek further data inputs and finalize the screening, producing a recommendation for the most suitable site(s) to support, an assessment of the site's needs to develop an investible coastal resilience and/or blue carbon opportunity, and recommendations for specific technical assistance and capacity building activities to be considered for further scopes of work.

20. The RFP notes that the selected offeror should work with least four USAID Missions to conduct Rapid Opportunity Screenings (ROS). Is there an expectation that a minimum of four potential projects are taken through the ROS process under the initial STO, or would a different number be expected? Does Chemonics / CFDA have a target for the number or scale of projects which it intends to ultimately support through this process, over a given time period?

There is no minimum/maximum number of project sites expected; project site selection will depend on rapid opportunity screening results and USAID Mission concurrence. Project development timelines will depend on each individual project's needs and stage of development. C3F is a 2-year project (with possibility of extension but will not extend beyond CFDA's current period of performance - September 2027).

21. Would the selected offeror be excluded from delivering any follow-on feasibility or capacity building work to support investment readiness of potential opportunities?

Yes, the Anchor Partner will be excluded from procurements that occur after project site selection. CFDA plans to competitively select local organizations and/or project developers to deliver this follow-on work.

22. Does the award of this STO preclude the selected contractor from bidding on follow on work?

See answer to question 21.

23. Is it expected that C3F will have any further role in enabling investment transactions beyond initial matchmaking between opportunities and potential investors?

Partnership discussions will be facilitated by the Anchor Partner to ensure the final partnership arrangement (between investor(s) and local stakeholders) is equitable, transparent, and sustainable. No further role in enabling investment transactions beyond matchmaking is envisioned.

24. Is two years (with possibility of extension, as noted in the RFP) the expected duration of the overall IQS, or the initial STO? If the former, does CFDA have a target timescale within the two year period for completion of works outlined under the initial STO?

Two years (with the possibility of extension) is the expected duration of the IQS. The majority of C3F-specific activities under STO 1 should be completed within the first year; we understand there may be overlap between STO 1 and future STO(s) during these two years that are dependent upon the initial round of rapid opportunity screening results and pilot project site selection. The community of practice coordination is expected to span the entire two years.

25. Page 8 of 38 of the requirements for the IQS Technical Proposal on RFP # 2023-0008-RFP indicates offerors should provide:

*Geographic strategy demonstrating how the offeror plans to adapt to different USAID priority countries and markets with stakeholders and investors.*

Please advise where offerors can access a list of “USAID priority countries and markets” in order to respond to this request in our proposals.

USAID presence countries can be [found here](#). Priority countries and markets will be chosen in coordination with USAID/Washington and based on USAID Mission interest.

26. Can you confirm/clarify which countries or regions will be part of the assessment?

See answer to question 25.

27. Is the expectation that there will be one methodology across all countries/regions or that different frameworks for different target regions might be needed?

See answer to question 4.

28. Can you confirm or clarify the number of expected rapid opportunity screenings per USAID Mission?

One rapid opportunity screening is expected per USAID Mission. As such, the rapid opportunity screening methodology should be designed to quickly analyze and prioritize multiple project opportunities.

29. Can you confirm that USAID missions will provide a pipeline of blue carbon and coastal resilience investments to conduct remote rapid opportunity screenings?

No. The Anchor Partner will screen countries, or specific areas of countries, based on USAID Mission interest. Once the Missions are identified the geographic areas of interest may be narrowed down based on available data and information provided by the Mission, however it is not possible to say in advance of Mission identification what data will be provided up front and what would need to be collected by the Anchor Partner as supplemental information.

30. Should all deliverables be produced in only English, or will the languages specific to the target regions also be required?

Deliverables should be produced in English.

### **Cost**

1. The RFP indicates a “ceiling value of \$750,000 along with an initial firm fixed price sub-Task Order (STO) valued between USD\$350,000-\$375,000. “Is the initial STO budget part of the overall \$750,000?”

Yes. The initial STO budget is part of the overall value.

2. Is the recommended budget for the Community of Practice 25% of the total ceiling value of \$750,000?

The budget for the community of practice must not exceed 25% of STO 1.

3. Should the activities required to manage the Community of Practice over two years be fully budgeted under this STO?

Yes. Activities required to manage the community of practice over two years should be fully budgeted under STO 1.

4. What is the expected process and timing for the following STOs for deliverables 4 to 6 on page 18?

Deliverables 1-8 correspond to STO 1. The due dates for deliverables 4 and 5 are listed in Section II.5 Expected Deliverables. Offerors should propose the due date for deliverable 6.

Deliverables 9-11 correspond to future STOs. Due dates are contingent on STO 1; the offeror is not expected to propose a due date for these deliverables. For the purposes of pricing, offerors should budget for a single handover report and a single matchmaking event and propose a price for a series of periodic monitoring briefs.

5. With regard to the indicative budget to be provided for future STOs, should we budget indicatively for these deliverables for a single opportunity, or a series of opportunities over a given time period?

See answer to question 4.

6. Annex 5 (Terms and Conditions) is referenced in the documentation but appears not to be included in the information provided. Is it possible to have sight of this?

Annex 5 (Terms and Conditions) has been included within the RFP.