



## **QUESTIONS & ANSWERS**

### **RFP: “UNLOCKING LPG FINANCE FOR CLEAN COOKING”**

1. **Q:** Partnerships: Are consultants free to associate with financial institutions like banks that could bring value to the project’s financial aspects?

**A:** Yes, consultants are welcome and encouraged to engage with a range of stakeholders across the clean cooking ecosystem.

2. **Q:** Research teams on the ground: Our firm has on-the-ground networks it leverages for projects such as this, alongside field trips. Similarly, our envisaged financial partner has boots on the ground in various African countries. However, the two focus countries of the study are unidentified at the moment. Therefore, we wouldn’t be able to give CCA a sense of our local positioning in those countries. How will CCA treat this aspect in the evaluation of proposals?

**A:** As the countries will be selected in a scoping exercise in the first phase of the project, please provide a high-level summary of the countries in which you have presence and networks.

3. **Q:** Admin: Are there any administrative documents that should be attached to the proposal?

**A:** There are no administrative documents that must be submitted alongside the proposal. The only required materials are those outlined in the “Proposal Guidelines and Requirements” section of the RFP.

4. **Q:** Why such a tight selection timeline?

**A:** There is an urgent need for enterprises working in this space to unlock financing to scale and grow. We are keen to deliver results on this work in Q1 2022, and therefore have tightened our selection timeline to enable the work to commence in early Q4, aligned with end of year budget cycles.

5. Q: According to the RFP, “the findings and recommendations of this study could be used by CCA, Shell Foundation and other partners”. Could you please give examples of the “other partners”?

A: The findings of this study will be published and made available as a public good. We hope that a variety of stakeholders across the ecosystem will access these learnings and take action to accelerate financing for LPG cooking solutions.

6. Q: Will the conclusions and recommendations be made public? Otherwise, we fear that Oil Marketing Companies (OMCs) and/or traders might be reluctant to share their views with the consultant (even though the Shell Foundation is independent from the Shell group).

A: Yes, the findings of this study will be published and made available as a public good.

7. Q: Our firm places SDGs at the center of our approach. We intend to identify those countries where LPG presents an improvement socially (e.g., in terms of gender equality, better health, etc.) and economically (e.g., job creations, etc.) without harming the environment (e.g., biodiversity protection, reduced GHG emissions vs. baseline, etc.). We might recommend discarding a country where renewable fuel sources are abundant and easily available. Would that create an issue?

A: The study seeks to assess potential to scale financing in high-potential markets, where LPG presents the best option for accelerating universal access to clean cooking, in line with development and climate goals. Countries should pursue the transition pathways that make the most sense given the local context and resources. It would not create an issue in the country selection process to remove a country where LPG is not the most viable option.

8. Q: Why limit the selection to two countries?

A: The scope of this study is two countries to enable comparison and lessons learned from different markets.

9. Q: For the sake of clarity, please confirm there will be no obligation to select the two countries among the three that the Global LPG Partnership (GLPGP) has already studied.

**A:** There is no obligation to select the two countries from those previously studied by GLPGP or others. However, where there is previous research and analysis in the two selected countries, we hope to leverage and build upon that work.

**10. Q:** Please clarify the working definition of “low-income customers”. Kindly elaborate whether this includes, for example, “residents of low-income urban areas, refugee populations, underserved areas with low access rates, etc.”. Also, please clarify whether this includes health and educational facilities that use traditional biomass sources for cooking and heating. We ask because some of the students and patients being served at these institutions are from low-income households. The potential to transform the current biomass use at the institutional level is immense and comes with potential climate, health, economic, and environmental benefits.

**A:** The definition of “low-income customers” is broad and includes the categories mentioned above: residents of low-income urban areas, refugee populations, underserved areas with low access rates etc., as well as opportunities for improving institutional cooking in these communities.