

# Resource Mobilization, Communication and Advocacy Strategy

## Questions & Answers

---

### 1. TEAM SET-UP:

- Is there potential for a shared working team- to enable capability transfer and setting CGIAR RM up in the longer run
- From the scope- We will need to heavily draw on CGIAR's staff for 1:1 interview to better understand existing assets, and capabilities. What is the expected engagement with the wider CGIAR team- especially the RM Task team and center staff?
- To truly benefit from this work, it will be essential for the CGIAR team to begin refining the strategies as laid out in the RMCA strategy document in parallel to this analysis process, and progressively scope each action area as evidence is uncovered. Is there opportunity to design an involved process such as this?

### RESPONSE:

How does the CGIAR team envision its role/level of involvement during the project? **It is envisioned that CGIAR staff will be involved in implementation of these analysis, mainly through guided discussions and approach. Bidders are welcome to submit suggestions for how the CGIAR team could be involved, and what they should be focusing on.**

### 2. PROJECT TIMING:

- We would aim to scope the project in the time CGIAR has envisioned, however, we would like to propose a slightly different order of deliverables/ extended timeline- would this be feasible?
- Are there specific external or pre-set deadlines (key meetings, workshops etc.) that we should be aware of and work around in terms of the support requested?

### RESPONSE:

**Bidders are welcome to submit suggestions for order of deliverables as they would approach the tasks. There are no external or preset deadlines influencing the timeline.**

### 3. OVERALL PROJECT SCOPE:

- Is there already a process envisaged to develop engagement strategies that this analysis will feed into? If yes, what is the priority/ relative level of focus on the different action areas going forward?
- If we are looking at proposals for a specific area- are you envisioning work split by the tasks areas outlined or the action areas of the strategy

### RESPONSE:

**Draft engagement strategies exist for certain AAs, and the analysis would feed into these. All AAs are prioritized at this point in time. We anticipate that the work will be split by the Action Areas and analysis completed by the supplier will be applied to the appropriate Action Area.**

#### 4. ACTION AREA 2:

- Are any additional countries expected over/ above China, India, Mexico, Nigeria, South Africa- specifically (with some CGIAR presence) Philippines, Turkey, Bangladesh, (others) Brazil, Iran
- What is the level of focus on in-country funding from these governments vs contribution to multilaterals/international efforts?

#### RESPONSE:

Initial countries have been selected based on existing CGIAR analysis and current CGIAR presence. Bidders are welcome to suggest alternate/additional countries where a high ROE is envisioned. Focus here is on in-country funding, to complement one AA that is examining in-country funding and IFIs.

#### 5. ACTION AREA 3:

Does the analysis envisaged extend beyond global multilateral funding instruments to bilateral climate funding instruments (Such as IKI)

#### RESPONSE:

All types of climate funding that is applicable to CGIAR is of interest and additional options are welcome by the supplier.

#### 6. ACTION AREA 4:

Would scope only be focused on IFIs or also bilateral funding (as referenced in the strategy) and other pooled funding mechanisms that apply a country lens?

Could you clarify which developing countries would be of interest/ priority and (in the case of IFIs for instance) the balance between an overview of approaches vs country specific setup/intelligence

#### RESPONSE:

Currently, the main focus is on IFI's for in-country funding. Dependent on the additional analysis conducted by the supplier and potential ROE case on sources of funding, this focus could be adapted or extended. It is expected that the rationale and analysis would provide us with opportunity for prioritization. However, a strong case for additional or improved ROE would need to be made.

#### 7. TASK 2: BEST PRACTICES SCAN AND GAP ASSESSMENT OF INTERNAL CAPACITIES AND EXPERIENCE

In terms of a deliverable here : is the ask limited to an assessment of the operating model and success factors for accessing funding, or extend to content that helps to develop successful proposals /systematizing the proposal process?

Bidders are expected to provide an assessment of best practices in terms of operating models for accessing funding. In the case of one or two Action Areas, there may be a need to provide a scan of best practices that includes the proposal process (i.e. AA3 or AA5).

#### 8. RFP PROCESS:

Is there expected to be a meeting/opportunity to address questions from across bidders during the bidding process?

At the moment, there is no plan to have an open questioning period for bidders.

## **9. BUDGET:**

Budget/ scale of effort: Given the many different possibilities in delivering extensive scope of this nature and the limited time for delivery, is there an indication of the funding envelope for this project or the possibility to provide a financial proposal that is modular/ optional in nature?

Bidders are welcome to suggest an operational approach and budget that they think would be best suited to accomplish the task. Bidders have the option to provide a modular or options-based budget proposal as well.