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# Introduction

The clean cooking ecosystem must focus collective efforts on the highest potential capital sources to secure the $150 billion necessary to achieve universal access. Achieving universal access is not only fundamental for individuals, but is essential to addressing the global climate crisis. RBF, particularly through the growth of climate finance and carbon credits, is one of the most promising opportunities of the upcoming decade. While exciting progress has been made to advance RBF for clean cooking in recent years, the value of clean cooking must be better articulated, transaction costs reduced, and participating actors supported for the sector to capitalize on this tremendous opportunity.

In order to drive this acceleration, we will need innovative RBF structures that meet the challenges of diverse contexts and reach the most vulnerable; a robust market of grant, debt, and equity financing to complement RBF as part of the full spectrum of financing tools; verification methodologies and technologies that cost-effectively enable rigorous outcome evaluation; and more.

As part of the [Clean Cooking Systems Strategy](https://cleancookingalliance.org/clean-cooking-systems-strategy/), the Clean Cooking Alliance and its partners are launching a Clean Cooking RBF Accelerator (RBFA), which will fund pilots and research to enable this radical acceleration, in addition to serving connection and communications functions. The RBFA will lead the implementation of an Innovation & Learning Agenda of research questions that, if advanced, could enable RBF to drive greater impact in the clean cooking ecosystem. It will build upon the pioneering recent work by [MECS](https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/14/15/4559), [EnDev](https://endev.info/transforming-energy-access-markets-with-rbf-lessons-from-7-years-of-implementation-under-endevs-rbf-facility-financed-by-uk-aid/), [ESMAP](https://www.esmap.org/what-drives-the-transition-to-modern-energy-cooking-service), and other partners to advance our understanding of how best to use RBF for clean cooking. This agenda will determine the research and pilots the RBFA should undertake to advance the space. The RBFA team will steward the Innovation & Learning Agenda by coordinating partners in advancing each aspect of the agenda.

The Innovation & Learning Agenda has been developed collectively with stakeholders across the clean cooking ecosystem. Over 50 stakeholders working on or adjacent to RBF for clean cooking were consulted in June through September 2021 - their perspectives on the most relevant areas of progress and challenges for the sector informed the early drafts of the Agenda. Thirty-two stakeholders convened on October 26, 2021 to further refine this agenda and define specific learning questions for five of the nine areas listed below. (See Annex for a list of participants). As a result of these discussions, stakeholders concluded that the following progress is needed to catalyze a quantum leap in RBF funding for clean cooking:

1. We need innovative new RBF structures that meet the challenges of diverse contexts.
2. We need a robust market of grant, debt, and equity financing to complement RBF.
3. We need RBF to maximize potential for a sustainable private marketplace.
4. We need RBF to maximize leverage of public resources.
5. We need to maximize the value of the diverse impacts of clean cooking interventions.
6. We need methodologies to support RBF for a diverse array of technologies and contexts.
7. We need cost-effective monitoring and verification technologies that provide transparency about impact achievement.
8. We need enterprises and industry groups to be able to effectively engage in RBF contracts.
9. We need to ensure RBF improves access for vulnerable populations.

The following sections provide additional context on these agenda items and a long list of the learning questions identified by stakeholders via interviews and the October 26th workshop. Moving the agenda forward will require the following actions:

1. Finalize the long list of questions: Because the workshop only covered five of the nine topics, there are four additional topics in the Agenda that will need to be more fully developed with inputs from stakeholders.
2. Prioritize among the long list: The questions will then need to be further prioritized based on several factors, including which questions, if answered, will provide the greatest value for the ecosystem.
3. Develop an action plan: The Learning Dashboard will need to be established acknowledging the specific organization that will be responsible for addressing each knowledge question and the implementation details.

# Areas for progress

## Innovative new RBF structures that meet the challenges of diverse contexts

As the ecosystem addresses ever more complex delivery challenges, it will require increasingly innovative RBF structures to overcome these challenges. Already RBF has been applied in the clean cooking sector beyond the typical transfer to enterprises per stove sold. For example, projects in EnDev’s first portfolio of RBF for clean cooking included incentive structures to generate new products and to encourage market entry to new geographies. The ecosystem will need to continue to push the bounds of how RBF can solve its pressing challenges, including further assessment of the conditions for the use of demand-side RBF, RBF for clean cooking in institutional settings, and RBF to de-risk other forms of financing, among others.

*Learning questions:*

Identifying the necessary conditions for RBF programs

* Which level of market maturity is required for RBF to be most impactful and how do we measure the level of market development?
* When and how is RBF a useful tool to facilitate clean cooking in institutional settings?
* Where are vouchers (demand-side RBF) better suited than subsidies (supply-side RBF) for clean cooking products and services?
* What indicates where upstream RBF (for supporting infrastructure, product inputs, etc.) is needed?
* What conditions are beyond the scope of innovation and are better suited to other financing instruments?
* Incentives: What is the role of monetary and non-monetary incentives to target specific outcomes? Do they generate unintended effects?

Adapting RBF structures to different contexts

* Are there opportunities for a two-step RBF with one part focused on sale and uptake and a second focused on incentivizing the sustained use of clean cooking?
* What is the difference in implementing RBF schemes in urban vs rural settings, and in situations of displacement (e.g., refugee settlements)?
* What price information on alternative fuels is necessary, and what systems are required to gather and use this information to develop effective subsidies?
* How do we anchor RBF schemes in local value chains to incentivize and provide premiums for local business development and job creation? Are outcome buyers willing to pay a premium for outcomes provided by locally owned ventures?
* What are the methodologies for adapting indicators for measuring impact metrics (socio-economic, gender HAP/health, carbon credit generation) in diverse settings and over time?

Defining the role of RBF within the wider system and related to behavior change

* How do we address issues around stovestacking when targeting social impact RBF?

Exploring the potential for RBF within new product development

* How can we better integrate electricity access- and clean-cooking access RBF programming to become a holistic energy-access approach?
* How is RBF going to accelerate new products into markets?

 Exploring the potential for RBF and complementary financing

* Is RBF a suitable tool to complement/integrate climate financing approaches (e.g. carbon credits)?

Developing and disseminating knowledge on RBF innovations

* How do we define and share the best instruments, MRV, and incentives or subsidies?
* How do we capture valuable insights on the feasibility of adopting the RBF strategy to promote RBF in other countries?
* Do programmes succeed in reaching their target groups, especially the poor, women? What are the key KPIs to request from projects developers – impact KPIs – to assess the effectiveness of various incentive mechanisms?
* Is more needed to ensure that we are not double counting at a country level?

## A robust market of grant, debt, and equity financing to complement RBF

RBF (a form of conditional grant financing) is a financing tool that can provide supplemental, outcome-driven funding to help mid-maturity enterprises scale rapidly. The centrality of result verification can help create results-driven cultures at enterprises and ensure supplemental funding is used to greatest effect. That being said, RBF is only well-suited to support enterprises or other entities with sufficient track records of results that are able to predict with decent certainty their expected results and thus revenue. Prior to this point, unconditional grant financing is often better suited. For larger enterprises, the administration of an RBF contract often becomes more burdensome than the value of the RBF payments. Here, traditional debt and equity are better suited as indefinite financing solutions. RBF’s role in the spectrum of clean cooking enterprise maturity is articulated in recent reports from [MECS](https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/14/15/4559) and [EnDev](https://endev.info/transforming-energy-access-markets-with-rbf-lessons-from-7-years-of-implementation-under-endevs-rbf-facility-financed-by-uk-aid/).

Beyond the need for sequential complementarity across the enterprise lifecycle, there is also a need for concurrent complementary financing. Many enterprises do not have cash reserves to cover implementation costs until results are verified and RBF payments triggered. As such, there needs to be a robust market of upfront grant, debt, and equity financing available to cover this cashflow gap. This funding could come from donors, impact investors, or institutional investors.

While a great deal of learning about how RBF complements other financing sources has taken place across sectors as applications of RBF have expanded, there is a need for more specific examples from the clean cooking sector.

*Learning questions:*

* When considering the broader financing needs within a market and across enterprises, who is seeing the market whole to identify the gaps that RBF needs and/or should fill? What problem(s) is the RBF meant to resolve (e.g. demand side subsidy versus supply side subsidy)?
* How do investors perceive enterprises that are engaged in an RBF project/contract? What impact does participation in an RBF program/contract have on the commercial attractiveness of enterprises as potential future investees?
	1. How do companies report RBF on their balance sheets? E.g. under what conditions is an RBF contract considered to be a (bankable) future revenue stream? What level of confidence do investors need of RBF payments?
	2. Is a viability gap that is temporarily filled by RBF going to stimulate investment of long-term capital which extends beyond the RBF term? How can the ‘grant need’ case for RBF be linked to the business case for an investor?
	3. How can RBF more directly incentivize ‘next stage’ investment than just being present? Should timelines be linked to enable add-on investments to follow the realization of the RBF payments?
* What barriers do grant, debt, and equity providers face to providing more funding to enterprises participating in RBF?
* What are the most effective models of ensuring RBF recipients have the upfront grants, debt, and equity they need?
* How do we cover the additional costs associated with these projects (i.e. CAPEX needs, verification technologies, etc.)?
* How do we position RBF so that we are still ensuring enterprises are financially viable beyond the RBF project?
* What can enable RBF recipients to borrow against a carbon credit commitment?

## Maximize potential for a sustainable private marketplace

RBF has the potential to resolve transitory market failures and support the development of a flourishing private sector. For example, difficulties in disseminating information about a product’s benefits may make it challenging for a company to scale beyond an initial pilot. RBF can provide additional price support to resolve this challenge and enable enterprises to scale to a point where they are able to invest adequately in branding and operate sustainably. If poorly designed, RBF can distort markets and stifle competition. Further learning is needed to determine how to avoid detrimental market distortions and promote transitions from RBF to sustainable commercial financing.

*Learning questions:*

* What elements of an RBF structure maximize the potential for enterprises to transition to fully commercial financing?
* How can RBF minimize distortions in markets for clean cooking solutions?
* How do we develop and share best practice incentives for crowding in different private sector participation (financiers, CCS producers, biomass suppliers)?

## Maximum leverage of public resources

Affordability remains a fundamental barrier to access to clean cooking for many. Public funding, from governments and donors, will continue to be essential to achieving universal access to clean cooking solutions. An outcome buyer can catalyze other public funding through matching mechanisms, by de-risking outcome achievement, and by piloting mechanisms with the potential to scale. In a matching mechanism, a donor may offer to match funding contributed to an outcome funding pool or may split the cost of a subsidy with a government. A more risk-tolerant donor may de-risk outcome achievement by putting forward unconditional upfront funding and thus creating an opportunity for a risk-averse donor to pay based on results. Finally, a donor could fund a pilot of a subsidy scheme that a government (or another outcome buyer) is considering, thus generating evidence that can support the case for broader funding.

*Learning questions:*

* What types of matching mechanisms would resolve the barriers outcome buyers presently face to contributing to clean cooking?
* How should donor-funded RBF transition to long-term, public funding?
* How do we satisfy donor requirements to bring more funding into the sector?

## Maximum value of the diverse impacts of clean cooking interventions

Transitioning to cleaner and more efficient cooking solutions has health benefits for the household, saves drudgery time (particularly for women), reduces greenhouse gas emissions, reduces deforestation, generates manufacturing and distribution jobs, and more. The market for carbon credits has facilitated RBF for the reduction in greenhouse gases associated with clean cooking, but RBF based on other outcomes remains nascent. Even where payment is not contingent on these other outcomes, the impact narrative (or “charismatic” element) of the wide array of outcomes of clean cooking interventions can be a source of great value to outcome buyers. Climate-focused outcome buyers range in the degree to which they prioritize the additional outcomes of clean cooking interventions; the clean cooking ecosystem should maximize value across this spectrum. More specifically, the clean cooking ecosystem must identify the impact metrics and develop the evidence that unlock more and higher priced carbon credits.

There is also high potential to mobilize more RBF from donors that focus primarily on health, gender, or conservation outcomes. The ecosystem must develop new ways of verifying these impacts to meet donors’ impact measurement objectives, which could include making RBF payments contingent on verified results or running regular RCTs to monitor the relationship between sale and outcomes.

*Learning questions:*

Building credibility among carbon credit buyers and other outcome payers*.* Ultimately, a priority ambition must be to (a) bring in more outcome payers and carbon credit buyers by improving confidence and credibility in the space and (b) expand the financial value that outcome payers and carbon credit buyers are willing to pay for benefits associated with clean cooking projects (either as a premium price for carbon and/or other outcomes beyond carbon).

* Who are the outcome payers willing to pay for benefits other than carbon, such as health, gender, job creation, etc.?
* How can we create confidence and credibility among outcome payers and carbon credit buyers in the benefits being generated, including reduced GHG emissions, improved health, gender benefits, reduced deforestation, and more?
* How do we communicate the value of diverse impacts of clean cooking projects to carbon credit buyers in particular, specifically to ensure they are willing to pay for the value of these diverse impacts?
* What are the impact verification preferences of each segment of the carbon credit market and other outcome payers?

Filling gaps in pricing and verification methodologies for all diverse impacts, including health, gender, job creation and more.

* What are the pricing and verification methodologies for all the diverse impacts? Do these pricing and verification methodologies sufficiently cover all types of clean cooking technologies?
* How can funding from donors with different impact priorities be combined to achieve high price RBF contracts, such as one donor paying for health outcomes and one paying for climate outcomes for the same project?
* What are outcome payers willing to pay for a ton of black carbon emissions avoided, as a high priority outcome?
* What are outcome payers willing to pay for an hour of a woman’s time not spent in drudgery, as a high priority outcome?

Reducing transaction costs related to structuring RBF and monitoring, reporting and verification.

* How can we more rapidly reduce the transaction costs of structuring RBF deals, particularly those with diverse benefits?
* How do we reduce the Monitoring, Reporting and Verification costs of project-based RBF for measuring, reporting and verifying different types of benefits? How can we use smart data in particular?
* What are good proxies for measuring particular benefits that are cost effective and feasible to monitor and verify?

## Methodologies to support RBF for a diverse array of technologies and contexts

Gold Standard, Verra, and other organizations have developed standardized methodologies that quantify the carbon dioxide emission reduction equivalent associated with transitioning a household from one cooking solution to the next. These methodologies are the basis for the issuance of carbon credits. Both organizations also have methodologies to quantify and certify other impacts associated with clean cooking solutions. Despite a number of exciting developments in recent years (including new methodologies for black carbon emission reduction and metered fuel use), these methodologies need to be calibrated to an array of contexts and new methodologies need to be developed.

*Learning questions:*

Accelerating the verification process. As a pressing priority, we must reduce the time required for verification to ensure enterprises and implementers are able to access associated payments in a timely way, particularly given the challenges many enterprises and implementers face in accessing the pre-financing they require.

* How can methodologies be designed to make them more automated?
* How can we expedite the validation process so that there is reduced time between generating caron revenues and getting associated payments?

Creating the infrastructure that allows for the easy adaptation of existing methodologies. While many methodologies exist or are being developed, we must prioritize efforts to ensure these methodologies are (i) widely accessible and (ii) easily adaptable in other contexts to reduce transaction costs and improve credibility.

* How do we create a shared view of which methodologies exist?
* How do we reduce the difficulty in using and understanding the current methodologies available? For example, could we develop a publicly available online data platform or toolkits to make existing methodologies easier to apply?
* How can we adapt current methodologies for any RBF program?

Standardizing methodologies and improving the rigor of auditing practices. A lack of rigor in auditing practices or extremely divergent methodologies across verification bodies can reduce credibility in the space.

* How can we increase trust in the carbon markets in order to lead to higher prices for clean cooking projects? What role can higher quality standards play?
* How can methodologies be developed which are program agnostic to ensure methodologies followed by various verification bodies or RBF implementers are aligned?
* How can we create minimum quality standards among monitoring companies or organizations? Would there be value in an accreditation program?
* How can the rigor of auditing practices and methodologies (particularly linked to carbon credits) be improved?

Improving existing methodologies can further enhance the credibility and perceived value to outcome buyers. However, usage-based indicators can be challenging and costly to monitor, report and verify.

* How can we change the metric of success from the number of devices sold to indicators that reflect usage and disusage (for example, amount of fuel consumed as a proxy for actual usage)?
* How do time savings methodologies need to be adapted to local context?
* Can existing methodologies be extended to metered use of pellets, ethanol and biogas?

## Cost-effective monitoring and verification technologies that provide transparency about impact achievement

The definitional tenant of RBF is that payments are disbursed conditional on verification of results. Outcome buyers will range in the degree of attribution that must be demonstrated to trigger payments. Though the verification of results is central to RBF’s added value (in creating outcome-driven performance management, ensuring donor/public funding contributes as much as possible to impact, and more), it often makes RBF a more expensive form of grant distribution. In particular for clean cooking, monitoring of usage, health outcomes, and time use outcomes can require time-intensive household surveys. The clean cooking ecosystem needs to develop cost-effective outcome monitoring and verification tools that meet the needs of a range of outcome buyers and ensure impact is achieved.

*Learning questions::*

Applying monitoring and verification technologies for carbon emissions.

* What are the most effective monitoring and verification technologies for tracking carbon emissions displaced?
* Which of these verification and monitoring technology options meets the rigor of existing carbon methodologies; how can these be improved or developed?
* Can technology enable us to measure the ultimate impact of air quality?

Applying monitoring and verification technologies for non-carbon outcomes. A larger ambition of the RBF Accelerator is to expand the potential to monetize a wider set of outcomes. A priority of the RBFA is to find ways in which the application of monitoring and verification technologies can improve the credibility of the space while reducing the challenge of monitoring and verifying these outcomes.

* What are the monitoring and verification technology options to quantify impacts of non-carbon benefits, particularly what technologies can we employ for measuring outcomes that typically rely on or require qualitative metrics (e.g. quality of life improvements for women), macro-level proxies (e.g. deforestation impacts), or survey-based insights (e.g. time poverty)?
* Can satellite imagery be leveraged to monitor forest impacts within methodologies?

Reducing the cost of monitoring and verification to expand the application of these technologies.

* How can we make monitoring and verification as simplified and real-time as possible?
* What is the ideal balance between rigor and practicality that needs to be achieved?
* How do we ensure monitoring and verification technologies are prohibitive for businesses of any size, specifically to ensure these technologies can be accessed by small companies or those in early stages of development?
* How do we employ monitoring and verification technologies for very large projects greater than 250,000 stoves in a cost effective and efficient way?
* Can the cost of monitoring and verification technologies be covered under an RBF?
* For IoT embedded cooking devices, can we make it more effective in terms of generating data aligned with the indicators of impacts?

 Optimizing the application of monitoring and verification technologies.

* How does monitoring and verification technology interplay with methodologies; specifically, what changes to methodologies are needed or possible by utilizing cost effective technology?
* How do ensure monitoring and verification systems account for the way people actually cook while keeping a high standard, notably how do we implement digital technologies while recognizing that most households stack?
* What verification and monitoring technology meets the rigor and price requirements of key audiences, namely large-scale MNC carbon credit buyers and large-scale donors?
* What are cost effective methods of digital verification of various technologies/fuels, including biogas, pellet, ethanol and LPG use?

## Enterprises and industry groups engaging effectively in RBF contracts

Enterprises selling clean cooking solutions are typically the recipients of RBF payments (being paid for verified distribution). These companies face a series of challenges to engage in RBF, including finding opportunities, being approved to participate, complying with verification protocols, and navigating the requirements to process payments. RBF facilities typically provide technical assistance (TA) to support recipients in engaging in their facility, but more is needed.

*Learning questions:*

* What types of TA are most urgently needed by enterprises? How much and what type of TA support is needed for enterprises in order to successfully run the RBF?
* Do we need to expand access to existing TA facilities for enterprises or create new ones?
* How can we create reliable RBFs that give stability and medium term vision to implementing organizations and enterprises?

## Improved access for vulnerable populations

RBF is a powerful tool to improve affordability and access to clean cooking solutions for vulnerable groups. For example, an outcome buyer can agree to pay all or a portion of the cost of a solution distributed to an individual that meets predefined metrics of vulnerability (e.g., income, location). An RBF program could focus exclusively on vulnerable populations or an additional payment could be provided for a vulnerable sub-group. Methods to reach vulnerable groups with RBF are [well documented](https://instiglio.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Guide_for_Effective_RBF_Strategies1.pdf) and there are emerging examples of [applications in clean cooking](https://endev.info/transforming-energy-access-markets-with-rbf-lessons-from-7-years-of-implementation-under-endevs-rbf-facility-financed-by-uk-aid/), further learning is needed to adapt these principles to clean cooking as efficiently as possible. The workshop will focus on populations with low ability to pay and women.

*Learning questions:*

* What is the most cost-effective way to extend RBF to target groups with low ability to pay?
* How can RBF maximize impact for women?

# Annex

## Participants in the October 2021 Innovation & Learning Agenda Workshop

##

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name**  | **Organization**  |  | **Name**  | **Organization**  |
| **1** | Alicia El Mamouni | Garner Advisors | **17** | Matthew Borden | Verra |
| **2** | Alisha Pinto | World Bank | **18** | Mattias Ohlson | Emerging Cooking Solutions |
| **3** | Ash Sharma | Nordic Environment Finance Corporation (Nefco) | **19** | Megan Bomba | Nexleaf Analytics |
| **4** | Benjamin Bartle | RMI | **20** | Michael Golomb | Burn Manufacturing |
| **5** | Carryl Masibo | Burn Manufacturing | **21** | Mikael Melin | Sustainable Energy For All |
| **6** | ChenKai Wang | Zhejiang Huiwenmei Stove Company (SSM) | **22** | Monika Noshin | ATEC International |
| **7** | Christine Eibs Singer | Independent (ex-Sustainable Energy for All) | **23** | Peter George | Clean Cooking Alliance/Spark+ Africa |
| **8** | Esther Altorfer | Sistema.bio | **24** | Philip Mann | UK FCDO |
| **9** | Jan de Graaf | BioMassters | **25** | Rosemary Idem | Sustainable Energy For All |
| **10** | Lea Geron | South Pole | **26** | Russell Lyseight | VITALITE Zambia  |
| **11** | Lokesh Dube | The Gold Standard Foundation | **27** | Shveta Sarin | Shell Foundation |
| **12** | Louis Boorstin | Osprey Foundation | **28** | Siddhartha Sinha | UNHCR |
| **13** | Lucy Heslop | BP | **29** | Susann Stritzke | MECS |
| **14** | Malcolm Bricknell | MECS | **30** | Tamojit Chatterjee | Sustainable Energy For All |
| **15** | Marcel Raats | RVO/EnDev | **31** | Vahid Jahangiri | International Lifeline Fund |
| **16** | María Ana Gonzalez | Verra | **32** | Verena Brinkmann | GIZ/EnDev |

##

## Key existing learning efforts

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Area for progress** | **Key existing learning efforts** |
| Innovative new RBF structures that meet the challenges of diverse contexts | 1. Clean cooking impact bond piloted by Cardano Development
 |
| A robust market of grant, debt, and equity financing to complement RBF | 1. Spark+ initiative
 |
| Maximize potential for a sustainable private marketplace |  |
| Maximum leverage of public resources | 1. The Government of Kenya is acting as outcome buyer in the KOSAP facility, with support of the World Bank
 |
| Maximum value of the diverse impacts of clean cooking interventions | 1. Clean cooking impact bond piloted by Cardano Development
 |
| Methodologies to support RBF for a diverse array of technologies and contexts | 1. Black carbon methodology
2. Methodology for metered & measured energy cooking devices (approved October 2021, led by Gold Standard, ClimateCare, MECS)
 |
| Cost-effective monitoring and verification technologies that provide transparency about impact achievement | 1. Clean Cooking Data Platform (Rwanda pilot with NexLeaf, SEforAll, and CCF)
2. CLIPP (real-time digital climate payments platform, led by A2EI)
 |
| Enterprises and industry groups engaging effectively in RBF contracts | 1. CCA support for enterprises to pursue carbon credits
 |
| Improved access for vulnerable populations | 1. RBF for clean cooking in humanitarian contexts, led by UNHCR
 |