

Title: Assessing the Global Potential for Insetting towards Climate, Nature, and Social Goals

RFP No: 03282024

Clarifications

Distributed on: **April 15 2024**

General	
1. Who are the partners specifically you are referring to in the RFP?	“Partners” is an umbrella term used in the RFP to refer to corporates as well as on-the-ground implementation partners, NGOs, etc.
2. Time seems a bit unrealistic given the wide scope of work, how flexible is CI in terms of extending the timing?	We need results for tasks 1-3 by mid-August at the latest. Otherwise, CI has some flexibility on the timeline, but would expect respondents to clearly state their availability in their proposal as well as provide justification for why an extended timeline is needed in order to achieve the objectives of the work. We recognize this scope could be delivered at multiple levels of rigor, some of which would require much more time and resource. We are targeting the level of rigor that is possible with currently available resources in the time available. It’s possible we will develop follow up work to the work alone or with partners.
3. What is the level of granularity expected from the analysis?	It’s up to the consultant to determine what they can do, with the amount of time available and within the budget range. We know this is a broad scope, but we are expecting to see applications that demonstrate what is possible and we will work with the selected consultant to prioritize where needed. What we are driving towards is a prioritization of the top, actionable insetting opportunities for nature and climate.
4. How does CI foresee distributing the outcomes of the research? Will the outcomes of the research be shared publicly or only used for internal purposes?	The inner workings of the analysis would not necessarily be made public, but the intent is to make the outcomes of this research public.
5. When do you anticipate the project solicited in RFP No 01172024 to be completed? Our assumption is that it would	Whereas the previously issued RFP (RFP1- RFP 01172024- attached) is focused on how to approach insetting projects, this RFP (RFP2- RFP

<p>be ideal to build on the results of this project for alignment with this project.</p>	<p>03282024) is more concerned with where to prioritize investments to maximize benefits for climate and nature. They are separate pieces of work, but progress can be shared so the workstreams can inform each other. We expect the RFP1 work to be completed by Aug 2024.</p>
<p>6. Where do process based models fit into the proposed steps and deliverables, if at all?</p>	<p>CI is open to recommendations from the consultant on how to best achieve the goals of the RFP, which could include process-based models.</p>
<p>7. How many individuals within CI do you anticipate be involved in reviewing and signing off on deliverables from this project?</p>	<p>Four people directly and with limited input from 10-12 steering committee members, which may include representatives from CI and other organizations.</p>
<p>8. Task 2. Outputs should be in a tabular form and mapped. - What exactly does "mapped" mean? Is it expected to provide an interactive map (eg. based on an existing GIS software/tool) or just a static map (eg. jpeg/pdf format)?</p>	<p>Based on your recommendation, we are open to discussing and agreeing to the exact parameters in the official workplan. The ability to visualize the results (as compared to static maps), where we can see layers and maps interacting would be great, but we are not looking for a large, public interactive tool.</p>
<p>9. Task 3: Evaluating cost effectiveness of NCS interventions - What is the expected level of granularity? Eg. high resolution = cost per hectare per intervention for a specific country OR lower resolution = cost scale (eg. low cost - medium cost - high cost)</p>	<p>If possible, we'd want quantified costs (where available and reliable) or ranges (eg. 0-50 USD/tCO₂e, 50-100 USD/tCO₂e, 100+ USD/tCO₂e) as these enable more actionable insights than High/medium/low. CI would be open to evaluating different options as recommended by the consultant.</p>
<p>10. Task 4: Identify companies which are key players identified in Task 3. - Is this an independent ask or is CI mainly focusing on its corporate partner base?</p>	<p>We are asking the selected bidder to identify the companies that are key players in the high priority countries/commodities to target action after the completion of the analysis. Whether they are or are not currently in CI's corporate partner base is irrelevant.</p>
<p>11. Overall: Through multiple recent interviews and market developments, we assume that despite the number and level of corporate commitments, financing climate action will remain slow especially in regions without progressive policy and legislation. Therefore we would like to gauge CI's willingness to include alternative financing of decarbonising agri. value chains and landscapes. Is this something which could be part of the scope?</p>	<p>The objective of this work is first to identify where in the world insetting has the most potential to offer positive climate and nature outcomes, leveraging the highest impact areas of agricultural commodity production, in-country capacity, and connections to global supply chains and commodity markets. We expect this analysis will help understand what kind of financing will be most useful for which areas, but designing that financing is not the primary focus of the work.</p>

	If the consultant has suggestions for how financing could be more substantively included in the analysis, they are welcome to submit as an optional add-on for consideration.
12. When identifying high-potential geographic areas is CI interested in a specific region (for example the global south, tropical regions, temperate regions, etc), or is the aim of the analysis to cover all regions globally?	The focus of this work is not explicitly geographically constrained but if needed to ensure achievement of objectives in the time and budget allocated, the focus would be geographies in the Global South where CI primarily focuses our work. This includes low-income countries and middle-income countries (LICs and MICs) To reference CI's geographies of NCS work please access: https://www.conservation.org/places
13. Are there any specific global supply chains and commodity markets where CI wants to focus on (coffee, cacao, beef, timber, etc...)?	CI wants the research and analysis of this RFP to determine the specific global supply and commodity chains of high potential, and not limit them to currently held assumptions.
14. In terms of climate outcomes is clear in the ToRs that the focus will be reductions and removals. In terms of nature outcomes is there a specific area of interest (for example, biodiversity, water, landscape, etc...)?	CI is interested in all benefits under the nature umbrella.
15. When speaking about GHG mitigation potential for NCS how would CI expect the technical GHG mitigation potential to be presented (quantitatively, qualitatively, both)?	Both.
16. Output 1: How many combinations of country-commodity-NCS types is CI expecting the firm to assess in this initial scoping exercise?	It's up to the consultant to determine what they can do with the amount of time they have and within the budget range available. Wherever possible the consultant should suggest leveraging the best available public datasets (like www.naturebase.org , and trase.earth) to enable consolidated analysis across geographies, commodities, and NCS types.
17. Output 3: How many combinations of country-commodity-NCS types is CI expecting the firm to present in the final prioritized 'countries x commodity'?	It's up to the consultant to determine what they can do with the amount of time they have and within the budget range available with a minimum of 3 NCS types across the different geographies (as noted in ToR)
18. For the analysis of "existing data sets" as described in Attachment 2, for purposes of identifying inseting potential, would any such data sets be provided or specified by CI upon commencement of the project, or would the	The consultant is responsible for sourcing the data sets and suggesting prioritization. CI will provide input and support this process but is looking for a consultant with expertise on this and experience working with these data sets.

consulting firm be responsible for identifying, prioritizing, and sourcing the data sets to be utilized?	
---	--