

Request for Applications: Clarification Document

Questions:	Responses:
<p>Award: According to the call, only one project will be awarded and yet the scope of the coverage of the study (in terms of geographical area) is quite large. Will the principle of sampling of study areas and case studies be allowed?</p>	<p><i>We are amenable to receiving proposals that include samples or case studies, however due to the objectives of the study, we would like a broad overview of the demographic and their energy needs and challenges across our geographical scope of Sub-Saharan Africa and the Indo-Pacific.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, whilst only one grant agreement will be awarded, we are amenable to proposals where organisations co-deliver the project with the understanding that one organisation will lead the project and hold the agreement with the Carbon Trust.</i></p>
<p>Award: Is this opportunity open to any type of candidates (academic, private companies etc.)</p>	<p><i>We welcome applications from any company that believe they have the resources and expertise to successfully carry out the research project.</i></p>
<p>Award: Please confirm whether the project will be lump sum or time and materials</p>	<p><i>All payments will be made in arrears and will be paid for expenses and labour costs incurred within the project's scope.</i></p>
<p>Award: Please confirm that "labour cost" is understood as direct costs + operational margin.</p>	<p><i>Yes, the labour cost is understood to be =SUM(direct costs + operational margin). However, we remind applicants that value for money/day rates will be taken into account in the scoring of the applications.</i></p>

<p>Award: Can Carbon Trust/TEA clarify whether this assessment will result in the commissioning of a follow-on market-based programme/action to service the energy needs of extreme poor communities?</p> <p>If so, would delivering this research piece pose a conflict of interest/render an implementing partner ineligible to bid for a potential follow-on programme?</p>	<p><i>The project's findings will initially be used to inform future TEA delivery options as well as potentially support onboarding of co-funding from other donors or philanthropies.</i></p> <p><i>We do not foresee a conflict of interest for the research project delivery partner applying for, or undertaking, a potential follow-on project.</i></p>
<p>Expression of Interest: Will a link be provided to enable interested applicants to register and submit expressions of interest?</p>	<p><i>There is a no link to submit expressions of interest. If you wish to register an expression of interest, please email Harriet at harriet.bradshaw-smith@carbontrust.com</i></p>
<p>Expression of Interest: Please clarify the actions to be taken on Consultant or Client side for the following application step "Non-application notification deadline, 23 December 2022"</p>	<p><i>This step is for any parties that had previously informed the Carbon Trust of their interest in the project, but since have decided to not apply for the Grant funding.</i></p>
<p>Business Case/Proposal: Will a specific template be provided to guide the proposal writing process (such as the different sections that must be covered including number of words limitations)?</p>	<p><i>As per the RfA (p. 9) we have stated that we will not provide a template for the business case (or proposal).</i></p>
<p>Business Case/Proposal: In the suggested delivery approach (as part of the Schedule 1: Project Scope) you refer to an option – do you expect this option to form part of the standard application, or would you expect it to form part of a variant application (as described in section 7 of the Invitation to Apply for Grant Funding)?</p>	<p><i>The optional element in the Project Scope (p.11) could form part of a standard application.</i></p>

<p>Scope of Work: Is it permissible for any variant application to extend beyond the £100k budget?</p>	<p><i>Please keep all applications within the allotted £100k budget.</i></p>
<p>Scope of Work: The Scope of Work mentions that the target audience for the outputs are policymakers, are you able to describe if you have any specific priority policymakers/audiences and what you hope they would do with the outputs so that we can best design our approach? (E.g. policymakers in donor countries vs those in high energy access deficit ones; use of outputs to raise general awareness of vulnerable groups vs use outputs for more targeted planning/programmes etc).</p>	<p><i>Our primary target audience would be donor IDAs with a view to informing supporting better VfM targeted programmes. The findings will be made publicly available however and will initially be used to inform future TEA delivery options as well as potentially support onboarding of co-funding from other donors or philanthropies.</i></p>
<p>Scope of Work: can you define 'energy access'? Just electrification (e.g. lighting/phone charging) or access to a broader range of products such as solar water pumps, fridges etc? Is clean cooking included as well?</p>	<p><i>We define energy access as per the SDG7 definition, (including clean cooking) however we envisage that this work will primarily be used to inform market based models for the uptake of appliances (e.g. SHS, clean cooking products etc,) rather than mini-grid or on-grid solutions unless a reasonable argument is provided within the proposal for doing so (i.e. lower cost options to achieve higher impact on extreme poor communities). Likewise, we will consider scopes of work that investigate productive use as a market model to support extreme poor energy uptake where a reasonable argument to do so is provided (e.g. to support overarching economics of return for the beneficiary).</i></p>
<p>Scope of Work: Would the study also consider pockets of extreme poor populations within urban and rural settings that present a spectrum of social-economical wealth?</p>	<p><i>The focal demographic of the research project is those living on less than \$2.15 per day, we welcome analysis of the geographical locations of the demographic and of varying challenges that come with those locations. If the partner wishes to add analysis that includes looking at the wider communities within those locations/spaces, it is up to the discretion of the applicant</i></p>

	<i>whether this would be feasible within the current scope, or whether a variant application needs to be submitted.</i>
Project Timeline: Is there a possibility of the timeline being extended to September? If scope is across all energy areas and technologies, consultation and analysis will take some time and peer review/inputs would be beneficial.	<i>Please keep all proposals to within the allotted timeframes.</i>
Literature review: Are there any other categories of the extreme poor that you already want to see explored?	<i>In the RfA (p.10) we have highlighted women, children and people with disabilities, we are open to exploring other groups (e.g. those in conflict zones or displaced) however we would envisage that this categorisation would be finalised in consultation with The Carbon Trust within the early stages of delivery.</i>
Literature review: How granular are you anticipating this data/synopsis should be? E.g. global, provide a sense of scale and showcase different category types (with perhaps some illustrative examples) or are you anticipating a deep dive into different geographies and technologies?	<i>As per the RfA (p.10), the literature review should have specific focus upon Sub-Saharan Africa and the Indo-Pacific (at a regional or national level as deemed more appropriate for the available data) however we would anticipate that the review would likely benefit from a high level (global) narrative on the numbers and trends on extreme poor demographics more broadly (again, dependent upon available data).</i>
Literature review: We also assume that other ways of categorising groups related to potential for access to different electricity solutions would make sense (e.g. urban/rural, proximity to grid/infrastructure, population density, current access to off-grid solar/mini-grid/grid). However, are you anticipating that those would be included, or do you think that they are already well covered by GIS	<i>We are amenable to receiving proposals for different key considerations which should inform categorisation/demographic separation of extreme poor groups bearing in mind that the underlying purpose of this exercise is to inform appropriate targeting of interventions to better support market-based energy access interventions for those categories.</i>

mapping/tracking platforms e.g. ESMAP's Global Electrification Platform .	
Market mechanism review: Are you assuming a review of models for all energy access solutions e.g. off-grid, mini-grid, grid, efficient appliances (if so which appliances) and clean cooking?	<i>We envisage that this work will primarily be used to inform market-based models for the uptake of appliances (e.g. SHS, clean cooking products etc.) rather than mini-grid or on-grid solutions unless a reasonable argument is provided within the proposal for doing so (i.e. lower cost options to achieve higher impact on extreme poor communities). Primarily we would envisage Tier 1 MTF appliances (i.e. SHSs, chargers) however would consider scopes of work that look at higher tier appliances where a reasonable argument to do so is provided.</i>
Alignment mapping exercise: Is the following understanding correct? The findings of the Market Mechanism Review will be used to develop a comparison model to analyse the potential for the various market instruments to reach identified extreme poor demographic groups.	<i>This is the correct understanding.</i>
Alignment mapping exercise: Could this be less of an xl model and more of a framework? [Given the potential for huge contextual differences amongst categories if the scope is broad and timeline is short, we are concerned that we would not have the depth/robustness of inputs required for an Excel tool.]	<i>We are amenable to receiving different approaches for delivery of the alignment mapping exercise scope however would like to ensure the findings are based upon robust, and where possible, quantifiably validated insight or and/or robust causal logic.</i>
Main project outputs: What does success look like to you re. uptake of outputs?	<i>The aims of this call is to undertake research which could better inform policy makers as to who and where the extreme poor demographic are, what their energy needs and challenges are, and what sustainable market-based instruments could best serve their needs.</i>

<p>Main project outputs: How will the outputs of the projects be used and disseminated, and what (if any) role you would wish the successful applicant to play in this (other than delivery of the end of project presentation). Should any allowance be included in the budget for supporting dissemination?</p>	<p><i>The findings, and end of project reports, will be made publicly available on the TEA website and disseminated on social media, which the partner can support. We are open to partners allocating a modest amount of the budget to dissemination activities.</i></p>
<p>Main project outputs: Is the end of project presentation expected to be in-person or online? Who would you want to see in the audience?</p>	<p><i>We would anticipate the final project presentation to be provided in person (although potentially with hybrid attendees) in London to the Carbon Trust and FCDO. Additional select attendees may be invited at the Carbon Trust's discretion.</i></p>