

## Request for Applications: Clarification Document

Questions:	Responses:
<p>1. The TOR states that “The focus of this 2nd mid-term review will be on the TEA Theory of Change and approach since the 2021 scale-up of the platform announced at COP26, although the full arc of the platform from 2016 and the findings of a previous mid-term review conducted in 2020 will be considered”. Can the Carbon Trust please confirm if the expectation is that the supplier will rely on the findings of the previous mid-term review for progress on the project prior to 2021, or whether there is an expectation that the current review will also conduct primary research on / reviews of TEA work prior to 2021?</p>	<p>The supplier will rely on the findings of the previous mid-term review for progress on the project prior to 2021. There is no expectation that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Mid-Term Review will also conduct primary research and review of TEA work prior to 2021.</p>
<p>2. Does the modified TEA Theory of Change shown in the business case for TEA scale-up cost extension represent the current Theory of Change for the programme or has it been further modified since then? If the latter, is it possible to share an up-to-date version of the Theory of Change?</p>	<p>Yes, the TEA Theory of Change shown in the business case for TEA scale-up cost extension is still relevant, however the <a href="#">addendum published in Jan. 2024</a> facilitates the funding of country level demonstration activity.</p>

<p>3. Can the Carbon Trust please confirm what it considers the work packages to be?</p>	<p>The applicant can delineate work pages in their proposal to meet the ToR requirements as they determine appropriate, however the work has two main output requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Value for Money assessment</li> <li>2. Mid Term Review Report</li> </ol> <p>The applicant may wish to either break down these outputs or propose their own work packages in addition to meet the requirements of the ToR.</p>
<p>4. The Grant price calculation sheet provided has a 'finance forecast' tab that has four repeated sets of cells (lines 16-36, 41 to 61, 66 – 86 and 91- 111). It is not clear why these lines are repeated – is it a requirement for example that if a consortium applies, different partners' costs must be provided separately?</p>	<p>This is to provide forecasts for multiple delivery partners if a consortium applies. The repeated fields may be left blank if there is only one organisation applying.</p>
<p>5. The Grant price calculation spreadsheet provides space for travel and accommodation expenses. Is it correct to assume that the inclusion of these expenses in the Grant Price Calculation Sheet is because it is a generic tool used by the Carbon Trust and that there is no actual expectation that international travel will be needed or required to fulfil this TOR?</p>	<p>The inclusion of these budget lines is due to the Grant Price Calculation Sheet being a generic budgeting tool. This provides a space for the applicant to include budget for an in-person kick-off meeting if they wish to include this in their proposal (see question 9).</p>
<p>6. Can the Carbon Trust please confirm which criteria will be applied to score the experience</p>	<p>Section 17.1 has been updated to the following:</p>



<p>of the consultant, those listed under section 17.1, those listed under 'Professional Qualifications', or both?</p>	<p><b>Sector knowledge and experience in assessment and writing evaluation reports:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In the Proposal, Applicants should elaborate on their experience of the criteria described (see Schedule 1) and explain how this is relevant to the application.</li><li>• In addition, Applicants should provide at least two examples (with reference to specific roles, responsibilities, and activities the Applicant undertook) of previous work. These should include evidence of the consultant or organisation's expertise in evaluation methods and conducting reviews of large-scale international development programmes, clean energy access and transition space, reviewing organisational and programme VfM.</li><li>• (Applicants may wish to refer to submitted examples of previous work for other clients).</li><li>• Applicants are advised that experience is considered a key important criterion and partnerships with other companies to support certain areas of experience are welcomed. All experience / case studies should be attached as an appendix to the Proposal.</li><li>• Clearly detail, with actionable points, how they plan to remain impartial in their review, and include the FCDO in their reviewing process. The applicant should also use examples that demonstrate how they have achieved this in previous projects.</li></ul>
<p>7. Is there a maximum number of pages or words that would be accepted for the Tender Submission?</p>	<p>Although there is no formal maximum page count, we encourage applicants to submit proposals with the length of no more than approximately 20 pages.</p>
<p>8. Para 7.1 - Could you please define further what is meant by a 'variant application'?</p>	<p>A "variant application" is an application which is variant in its delivery to the ToR by providing the opportunity for additional scopes of work or value for money which exceeds the ToR requirements.</p>



<p>9. Para 16.1 - Under 'Interviews and Site Visits' it states N/A. Is it to be assumed then that there is no in-person data collection expected and that the mid-term review, <b>including the 'in-person kick-off meeting'</b>, will be entirely remote?</p>	<p>There is no expectation for in-person data collection. If possible, an in-person kick-off meeting in our London office is encouraged, but not required.</p>
<p>10. Schedule 1, page 11 - It is noted that consultants/organisations from TEA's target countries are encouraged to apply. Can a group of individual consultants apply as a consortium or is it expected for a consulting company to apply?</p>	<p>A group of individual consultants are welcome to apply as a consortium, however the contracting for this grant will be conducted through a single entity, and this entity must meet due diligence requirements.</p>
<p>11. Schedule 1, page 11 - Is there any publicly available or shareable report detailing activities since April 2022 (Phase 2) that can be provided?</p>	<p>Please find all available annual review documents of Transforming Energy Access <a href="#">here</a>.</p>
<p>12. Schedule 1, Page 11 &amp; 13 - Is there an expected number of interviews for the data collection phase? The previous review conducted 35 interviews. Would you like the applicant to propose a sampling strategy and preliminary sample already in the Tender Submission? Given the expanded network of over 750 innovators, academics, entrepreneurs and civil society partners who are considered stakeholders/beneficiaries, it seems</p>	<p>Yes, there will be an increase in interviews comparable to the expanded scale, budget, and reach of the programme. A preliminary sampling strategy should be considered in the applicant's proposal as part of the proposed activity "Conduct desk review, design methodology, evaluation criteria, inception report and workplan, including identifying and requesting key datasets needed".</p>



<p>reasonable to anticipate an increase in the number of interviews.</p>	
<p>13. Schedule 1, Page 11 &amp; 13 - Have the work streams remained consistent with the six main ones identified in the previous review document, or have new work streams been established under Carbon Trust, Innovate UK, Shell Foundation, and ESMAP? How have these work streams evolved or changed? Could you provide any additional information on these changes and developments at this stage?</p>	<p>Applicants are encouraged to review the business scale up proposal and latest amendment <a href="#">here</a>.</p>