

239-PPF-GCFFunding Proposal

1. In section 1.3 it is mentioned that "The deadline for submitting your proposal is January 30, 2025"; As a company interested in participating in the process, we kindly request to extend the deadline by two weeks, until February 15, 2025; since we consider that more time would be necessary to prepare a proposal more in line and coherent with the process; as well as the date for submitting comments to the terms of reference until January 30, 2025.

Answer: Yes, the call for proposals will be extended until February 16th, 2025.

2. We kindly ask you to confirm if there is a maximum budget for the offer.

Answer: Yes, there is a maximum budget for the offer of US \$ 545.000.

3. In the key experts table, for the role on team leader, could you please maintain the 15 years as general experience and modify as follows: At least 15 years of general professional experience in developing and/or implementing projects, and desirable funded by the GCF, GEF, IFC, or other multilateral donors.

Answer: Profile requirements won't be modified. If your personnel have additional experience that you consider to be relevant to your proposal for this project, for instance, working with other donors, then please add those details and CI will assess them as part of the proposal.

4. In the key experts table, for the role on Environmental & Social Safeguard Specialist, could you please add the IDB in this text: Demonstrated experience in working with local communities, Indigenous peoples and vulnerable groups in South America, and producing and implementing the relevant plans for GCF and/or IDB projects.

Answer: Profile requirements won't be modified. If your personnel have additional experience that you consider to be relevant to your proposal for this project, for instance, working with other donors, then please add those details and CI will assess them as part of the proposal.

5. In the key experts table, for the role on Ecosystem based adaptation (EBA) Specialist, could you please add the Ecohydrology and NBS this text: At least ten (10) years of professional experience in data analysis and participatory restoration and conservation strategies or projects related with ecohydrology or Nature-based solutions.

Answer: Profile requirements won't be modified. If your personnel have additional experience that you consider to be relevant to your proposal for this project, for instance, working with other donors, then please add those details and CI will assess them as part of the proposal.

6. The attached PPF Facility Application within the Request for Proposals (RfP) outlines a budget distribution, allocating USD 576,863 for the Consultancy Firm (covering all three activities) and USD 183,870 for the Local Consultant. Could you please confirm whether the RfP's scope covers only the Consultancy Firm's services, or does it also include those of the Local Consultant?

Answer: The budget's upper limit for the Consultancy firm is US \$ 545.000, this value includes the local consultants (Annex b in the Firm's ToRs) that are required to be hired by the firm. There is another set of local consultants that will be hired directly by CI Colombia with an independent budget

that should not be added to the budget for the Consultancy Firm. Please note that the PPF application attached to the RfP has been replaced by a new one with a modification in the budget.

7. Additionally, should travel costs be included in the financial proposal, or will they be directly covered or reimbursed by CI during the contract period upon approval?

Answer: Travel costs should be included in the financial proposal.

8. Could you kindly clarify whether the staff listed under Local and International CI will have any specific involvement in the development of the documents, or if their role will primarily focus on tasks such as coordinating with the local NDA and national stakeholders during project execution?

Answer: Staff listed in the PPF proposal under Colombia CI will support engagement with local stakeholders, reviewing deliverables and providing technical advice but not developing the products. CI international will oversee PPF implementation and provide technical advice to comply with CI and GCF rules and procedures. NDA engagement will be done through both CI-Colombia as Executing Entity and CI-GCF as the Accredited Entity.

9. Considering the size and scope of the project, which includes extensive and detailed feasibility studies, would it be acceptable to include non-key expert positions and backstopping team members in the technical proposal? This addition would provide the team with greater flexibility and responsiveness, ensuring the highest quality of deliverables.

Answer: Yes, it is acceptable to include non-key expert positions and backstopping team member.

10. Could you kindly provide the evaluation criteria and the weighting assigned to the various elements of the proposal, such as company references, personnel competencies, financial proposal, and other relevant aspects?

Answer: It is described in section 2 (page 7) of the RFP.

11. In the ToR, the Deliverable wording seems to be inconsistent. In page 17, Deliverable 2b is described as "the Feasibility Study that includes outputs 1.7. to 1.12.", whereas the Annex on page 20 suggests that Deliverable 2b is the "Financial and Economic Analysis (GCF Annex 3)". This difference makes us wonder about the accurate inclusion of "the Feasibility assessment and design of proposed interventions (Components 1,2,3, and 4)" Would that be part of D-2a or 2-b? Which one should we consider?

Answer: Feasibility assessment and design of proposed interventions (Components 1,2,3,4 – outputs 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11) are part of Activity 1. Feasibility Study – GCF Annex 2.

Financial and Economic Analysis is a separate deliverable, indicated as output 1.13.

There is a mistake in the numbering, there is no deliverable 1.12.

12. The RfP does not clarify in much detail on how this proposal should be developed if the applicant is a Joint Venture. Could you kindly clarify what the requirements would be in that case? Would the page limit vary? Will both firms be required to submit separate Annexes, or would editing the ones provided by CI so that both signatures are included be an option?

Answer: It will be preferable to receive the information of both firms integrated in the same annex and respect the page limit, annex can be edited to include both signatures.

13. In the case of submitting a proposal as a consortium, would it be eligible to apply as a project-specific Joint Venture or would a legal consortium entity be required?

Answer: Joint ventures are eligible and it is expected that it will be legally formalized only in case the proponents are awarded the contract.

14. Regarding the overall budget, we see, on annex 5.2 the following sentence “ CI anticipates that the range of financial offers will be between USD 400,000— USD 545,000” whereas the total assigned budget according to section E of the PPF (adding only amount requested from GCF per activities 1 to 4 and consultancy firm and consultant local) adds to a total of USD 698,733. The “consultancy firm” budget line adds up, on itself, to USD 576,863. We noticed that the financial range might be excluding the total amount assigned for national consultants. We are an international consulting firm and will be sub-contracting all national field work. What should be our approach when estimating our budget?

Answer: The upper limit of the budget for the Consultancy firm is US \$ 545.000, this value includes the local consultants that are required to be hired by the firm. There is another set of local consultants that will be hired directly by CI Colombia with an independent budget that should not be added to the budget for the Consultancy Firm. Please note that the PPF application attached to the RfP has been replaced by a new one with a modification in the budget.

15. In accordance with the ToR, page 18, indicates that “the Project has a separate, limited Budget to organize a kick-off workshop, and public consultations linked to deliverable 4. Consultants may propose additional workshops with partners and beneficiaries in their technical and financial proposals that add value to the project design”. The PPF annex E gives clear indication that there is a travel, meetings and workshops per activity budget. From our experience, activity 1 (the feasibility studies) and activity 2 (ESMF, GAP, IPP, etc) requires extensive field work. The budget notes give a very strong indication of the effort required in terms of stakeholder consultation for activities 1 and 2 (26 consultation meetings for Activity 2). Are we right to assume that the consultancy firm is to include TMW costs for activities 1 and 2 in the overall financial offer ranging between USD 400-545,000?

Answer: As you noted, there are independent budget lines for the kick-off workshop and for TMW for consultations. These budget lines are independent from the cost of the consultancy firm. The consultancy firm does not have to include the cost of TMW in its proposal, unless it proposes additional workshops.

16. Please clarify the expected start date for the consultancy. We are deducing mid- March. Is this correct?

Answer: Correct.

17. While we recognise most if not all local consultations will necessarily be conducted in Spanish, we would propose flexibility in the Spanish requirement for some positions for example, the team leader whose primary job will be to manage the overarching funding proposal and ensuring compliance with CI and GCF technical requirements?. Please clarify the main language of communication between the CI team and the service provider?

Answer: Main language of communication can be chosen by the bidder, however if English is chosen, communication skills in Spanish are required in case there is need for additional clarity.

18. Are there any limitations on forming a consortium, for example, with a local NGO or representative of an INGO?

Answer:No limitations.

19. Which of CI Colombia and CI GCF/AE will be the final arbiter and decision maker on elements of eg project design, the selection of Implementing partners etc, should differences of opinion emerge? Is there an internal mechanism to ensure efficient reviews of drafts and clear accountability for actioning decisions that cannot be actioned by the consultant and fundamentally impact technical design – particularly should differences emerge between CI Colombia and CI GCF?

Answer: CI-Colombia as the EE will guide project design. CI-GCF will oversee and advise on project design and other elements in other to fulfil CI and GCF' policies and requirements. Both, CI-Colombia and CI-GCF will review and approve deliverables and work together throughout the PPF implementation. CI-Colombia will lead engagement and coordination with local stakeholders and partners.

20. Please confirm that CI will be responsible for in the design of Annex 1, 4, 12, 13, 14 and other optional Annexes that are not clearly identified in the ToR. In particular please clarify if Annex 4 is the responsibility of the consultant or CI, and if the Operations and Maintenance Plan is being proposed as an optional Annex, and is not an operations manual (as in optional annex 21). NB there is also no request for Annex 22 (see below).

Answers:

Annex	Responsible
Annex 1 NDA no-objection letter(s)	CI
Annex 4 Detailed budget plan	Consultancy Firm - Project Budget (Output 3.10)
Annex 12 AE fee request	CI
Annex 13 Co-financing commitment lette	CI
Annex 14 Term sheet including a detailed disbursement schedule and, if applicable, repayment schedule	CI
Annex 21 Operations manual	Consultancy Firm – Operations and Maintenance Plan (Output 3.7) Feasibility assessment and design of proposed interventions – Component 3: Financial mechanisms and long-term sustainability and scalability strategy (Output 1.10)
Annex 22 Assessment of GHG emission reductions and their monitoring and reporting	GHG Emissions Baseline Assessment (Output 3.3)

21. Please confirm if CI is working toward a target GCF Board Date?

Answer: CI is working towards B45 in July 2026 or at the latest B.46 in October 2026.

22. Please confirm if the financial proposal should integrate local consultants and the cost of workshops and travel.

Answer: The financial proposal should include local consultants outlined in the ToRs (Annex B: Consultant Roles & Qualifications) and the travel cost of the firm. There is an independent buWorkshops do not need to be.

23. Under the Concept Note (Annex 3) and in the description of the sub-activities under Activity 1, there are references to various studies previously conducted by CI. Do you anticipate these will provide a sufficient basis for, or will additional data gathering be required to undertake:

- downscaled climate-modelling to the project site locations (Output 1.2). **Answer: There are climate scenarios based on the RCP 2.6, 4.5, 6.0 and 8.5 for the paramo corridor. They will need to be complemented analysis for project sites.**
- baseline studies of the local biodiversity (Output 1.4). **Answer: We anticipate current baseline studies should be sufficient.**
- assess sustainable livelihoods, including initiatives focussed on rural tourism (Output 1.8) We have a very comprehensive assessment about the current situation, however, additional. **Answer: alternatives for sustainable livelihoods need to be identified**

Most of the knowledge and information used to conceive this project come from a previous GEF project implemented by CI. You can review the publications at:

<https://www.conservation.org.co/programas/Aguas-y-ciudades/articulos-rios-lagunas/cambio-climatico-en-alta-montana>

[Incorporating Natural Infrastructure in Bogotá’s Water System | World Resources Institute](#)

- Output 1.5 describes the need for options analysis. Can CI please share if they already have some potential options in mind? **Answer: Potential options are a new dam at chingaza or changing the project sites.**
- Output 1.9 discusses efforts to design a Governance structure to implement a IWRM for the Bogota Region. Are there any previous studies or initiatives led by CI in this space that should inform our approach to implementation arrangements and or feasibility? **Answer: CI has successful experiences working with regional and local authorities and can contribute to this task, however, no studies are available.**
- The Concept Note and the ToR mention the pre-selection process of project site locations. Can you clarify if these are confirmed or still in discussion? What has been the engagement with both implementation partners as well as stakeholder engagement exploring potential implementation activities on these project site locations? **Answer: Project sites are not expected to change, they have been chosen following a scientific and consensual process with the key partners of the project. Bogota City administration, Bogota water utility and the Ministry of Environment participated in the definition process and have included these sites into their priorities. Project sites are studied in detail, including land cover and land tenure mapping at 1:2.500 scale, type of intervention required (enhancing conservation on private land, conservation on public land, ecosystem restoration and, transition to sustainable production) at 1:2500 scale. CI has maintained long term relationships with local communities and local authorities in most of the project sites through the implementation of projects since 2008.**

24. Under output 2.2, it appears that there is an expectation for 8 stakeholder engagements (7 in the intervention areas and one with key stakeholders once programme design is finalized). Can you please confirm this is correct and that costs for these are to be included in the financial proposal? **Answer: Yes.**

- Are there any guidelines from CI on expectations for local participation and overarching stakeholder engagement? Are there any expectations on modes of participation? **Answer: Modes of participation shall follow GCF requirements. CI has undertaken substantial participation and stakeholder engagement to build from Follow GCF requirements**
- Under Output 2.4 and 2.5, does CI have accountability and grievance mechanisms and community health, safety and security plans already in place? If yes, how does CI envision this programme to align with these current policies?

Answer: Yes, CI has accountability and grievance mechanisms and community health, safety and security plans already in place. This programme shall be followed, and the consultancy firm shall validate if they need to be complemented to respond to GCF requirements.

- Output 2.6 has indicated that CI has already identified an indigenous people (IP) group that present in a project site, the Muisca community. IP consultation is critical to the GCF process. Can CI confirm if they have previously engaged with the IP group and to what extent? **Answer: CI has met the IP group in more than 4 opportunities to discuss the project. They are aware and willing to participate in the detailed design.**

25. Under Output 3.3, can CI confirm if they are expecting to submit this project as a cross-cutting initiative? **Answer: Project carbon emissions of the project are expected to be modest, however project formulation shall assess the convenience of including carbon emissions reduction.**

26. Has CI conducted any carbon emissions reduction calculations on the project sites? **Answer: yes, there is an initial calculation.**

27. Is CI expecting to submit Annex 22 (see question on CI Annexures above)? **Answer: It will depend on the decision made during project formulation.**

28. Under the Concept Note and under Output 3.5, CI mentions co-financing. Can CI please confirm that CI will be responsible for these and for any associated annexures? **Answer: Yes.**

29. Under Output 3.8, is the main deliverable of this output expected to be Annex 21? Annex 21 is not explicitly mentioned. **Answer: Yes, Operations and Maintenance Plan (Output 3.7) is Annex 21.**

30. Under Output 3.11, can you please advise if CI current has a procurement policy that this programme is expected to build on? **Answer: Yes, CI has a procurement policy that this programme.**

31. Under Output 3.12, can you please confirm if CI has already engaged with legal experts to provide information as a base to Annex 9, whether CI has a legal expert with whom they would prefer to engage, or with whom they have an existing arrangement and can access preferential rates? Should legal costs be included in the financial proposal? No legal expert has been selected. **Answer: The legal cost shall not be included in the proposal of the consultancy firm.**

32. The Concept Note mentions efforts to design financial mechanisms but the TOR does not clarify the scope of work expected of the consultancy. What is the scope of responsibility of the consultancy in terms of detailed design for these mechanisms, particularly concerning public instruments such as tariffs, Payments for Environmental Services (PES), and private capital catalysation mechanisms? Or will this work be carried out by CI Colombia? **Answer: Design of these mechanisms shall include the**

required detail to lunch implementation. Project PES shall be based on the already operational PES implemented in the region but refined to strengthen the results based criteria of the PES. Water tariff shall build from the progress that the Bogota Water utility is making, it shall be endorsed by the utility since it will be implemented by the utility. The task of the consulting firm will be to build from the progress made and address the gaps to make these instruments implementable from the beginning of the project.

33. Is it mandatory to include in the technical proposal the CVs of all team members listed in the aforementioned annex? **Answer: Yes, it is mandatory.**

34. If the consulting firm deems it necessary to propose a different number of personnel to achieve the project's objectives, would it be acceptable to justify and present this alternative in the technical proposal? **Answer: Yes, it is possible.**

35. Should local consultants also be included within the consulting firm's technical proposal, or can they be considered independently? **Answer: Local consultants included in the Consulting Firm ToRs should be part of the firm's technical and financial proposal. Firms can engage with individual consultants through subcontracting agreements.**

36. It is possible to submit a proposal by a foreign firm, without branch/physical or operational headquarters/franchise in Colombia. **Answer: Yes, it is possible.**

37. If the bidder is composed of several firms, what are the requirements of formalizing this agreement/consortium/union? Can it be done by means of a private document and the firms' own formats? Is it necessary to make the constitution of the agreement/consortium/union following some notarial procedure, consult, etc. in Colombia? **Answer: Joint ventures are eligible and it is expected that it will be legally formalized only in case the proponents are awarded the contract.**

38. In case the bidder is composed of several firms, must each of the firms complete all the annexes stipulated in the "Application Instructions" document or must they only be completed by the lead firm, **Answer: It will be preferable to receive the information of both firms integrated in the same annex and respect the page limit, annex can be edited to include both signatures.**

39. If the bidder is a foreign firm and the requirements of the "A) Proof of being up to date in the Payment of social security contributions, parafiscal contribution of your personnel, in accordance with the current law applicable to your company; B) Certificate of the Occupational Health and Safety Management System of your company, in accordance with the legislation applicable to your company and C) Certificates issued on the occasion of the pre-occupational medical evaluation, in accordance with the applicable legislation in force, of the professionals of the work team" what type of evidence/document is considered as suitable to consider the requirement completed or passed? **Answer: The equivalent that is legally required in the country where bidder is registered**

40. What is the estimated start date of this contract? **Answer: Mid-March 2025**

41. Legally, what would be the contracting entity of the service? Is it a branch/entity legally incorporated in Colombia? **Answer: Yes, the contracting entity is an entity legally incorporated in Colombia.**

42. If it is a branch/entity legally incorporated in Colombia, what is the applicable tax regime? Does it have a special agreement with the Colombian State? **Answer: So far there is no special agreement with the Colombian State for tax exceptions applicable to this contract. Each bidder needs to validate which tax regime applies in accordance with its legal nature and Colombian regulation.**

43. In case it is a branch/entity legally incorporated in Colombia, what is the SURECO & Partners | CI estimated tax burden to be paid by the contracting party? **Answer: Each bidder needs to validate which tax regime applies in accordance with its legal nature and Colombian regulation.**

44. In case it is a branch/entity legally constituted in Colombia and the contractor entity is foreign, how will the invoicing of the contract be handled since it does not have electronic invoicing? **Answer: Colombian regulation applicable at the time will have to be followed.**

45. In case of a foreign bidder, please confirm that it is possible to make t payment to a foreign account, and a bank account in Colombia is not required. **Answer: Yes, payments can be made to a foreign account.**

46. What is the estimated date for finalizing the selection process a notifying the awarded firm **Answer: End of February, 2025.**

47. Regarding the consulting team, what is the expected availability of the professionals that will participate in the process, do you consider it necessary that they are available full time?

Answer: No, as long as they are able to fulfill project responsibilities and times.

48. Regarding Annex 2 - Consultant Roles and Qualifications: Can one person fill in more than one role? For example, can the team leader also be the climate adaptation specialist or are you expecting each role to be filled by different team members?

Answer: Yes, it is possible. As long as sufficient time is allocated to the team members to fulfil all project responsibilities.

49. Regarding Deliverable 6 - Revised content from the above deliverables pending GCF feedback: We are aware that the GCF might request adjustments to the Financial Proposal that need to be handled by the consultancy team and that they could require considerable time and effort. However, could you please confirm that if new activities, not considered under the original scope of work, are needed to address GCF comments, Conservation International will be in a position to negotiate how these new activities will be developed by the consultancy team?

Answer: The PPF timeline considers a ~8-month period for revisions with the GCF, in which consultants should address any feedback/requested revision from GCF, including complementary information to the annexes and funding proposal content, base on the scope of work of the ToRs.

As per CI experience developing GCF funding proposals, deliverables considered in the ToRs should provide all necessary information for a full funding proposal under GCF standards. We don't foresee a change to the original scope of work, however, if needed, CI will be in a position to negotiate it.

Additionally, the CI-GCF team will hold periodic meetings with the GCF to ensure the funding proposal is developed according to the GCF expectations.

50. Deadline for submission: We kindly request that you extend the submission deadline as we consider this project to be of high complexity, which entails bringing together a large team of consultants and assessing in detail their roles, responsibilities, and dedication to the development of the financial proposal to the GCF.

Answer: It has been extended to February 16th, 2025.

51. FP components and annexes in scope:

Output 3.3. GHG Emissions Baseline Assessment: While we understand the interest of this analysis, and are able to deliver it, we remember that such an analysis is not mandatory in the context of an Adaptation project, which seems to be the case of Building a Water-Resilient Bogotá-Region Landscape (BWRBRL) according to section A5 of the CN. In the spirit of using CI's resources most efficiently, we wanted to double-check if CI would like to consider deprioritizing it – or if we should keep it in scope, based on CI's preferences or exchanges with the Task Manager. **Answer: Project carbon emissions of the project are expected to be modest, however project formulation shall assess the convenience of including carbon emissions reduction.**

Output 1.5. Options Analysis: Could you please clarify whether CI has a preference on the level of the project design at which the options analysis is expected to be conducted, i.e., whether it is expected to be done:

Answer:

- i. **At the component level** where activities within each component are assessed and selected/deprioritized based on the assessment criteria, e.g., analyzing activities 1.1.1 to 1.3.2 and only selecting ones that fit the assessment criteria
- ii. **At the activity level** where several options for undertaking an activity are assessed and the ones that fit the assessment criteria are selected. For example, Activity 1.3.1 in the concept note involves the development of ecological rehabilitation of the El Tunjo wetland complex, restoring hydrological and ecological connectivity between Tunjelo River and the wetlands floodplain. There are several ways in which this activity can be done, and at this level, the options analysis will assess these different ways and select ones that fit the assessment criteria.

The analysis should be done at the activity level.

52. Clarification on section 3.1 of the Request for Proposals: The section states "*The following documents should not be submitted with the Proposal. They will be requested by CI at the time and to the corresponding applicant. With its application, the proponent acknowledges and declares that it has, and will provide, all the documentation and information indicated.*" As some of the items listed in this section (that should not be submitted with the proposal according to section 3.1) include items that are required to be submitted as part of the proposal according to section 1.4 of the RFP (e.g., Annex 7 Safety Assessment Request Form), could you please clarify which of the items listed under section 3.1 should not be included in the proposal submission. **Answer: Needed documents are listed in section 1.4, the rest will only be required if the firm is selected**

53. Technical proposal appendix: Can you please confirm whether there is any limitation on what we can include in the appendix of the technical proposal, or any page limitations for appendices? **Answer: No.**

54. Team member requirements:

Could we assume that there is some flexibility in the requirements for key personnel in Annex 2 (e.g. for a given position, when the proposed team member meets all requirements but the profession criteria -i.e. academic degree in another field) ? **Answer: Yes, there is certain flexibility.**

For the team leader, is it possible to propose multiple personnel that collectively meet the requirements to act as co-team leads **Answer: No, we need a team leader to coordinate, deliver, and have a clear picture of the whole project. The team leader can be supported by additional people; however, the team leader should fulfil profile requirements.**

Collaboration with CN authors: Can we assume that we will be able to exchange easily with the author(s) of the CN while building upon it to develop the different deliverables? **Answer: Yes, there will be open and continuous communication and coordination channels with the project teams in CI-Colombia and CI-GCF.**

55. Financial Proposal / Budget: We would like to confirm our understanding of the budget guidelines:

Answer:

- Annex 5.2 mentions “CI anticipates that the range of financial offers will be between USD 400,000— USD 545,000”
- Section E of the PPF Application includes a detailed breakdown, including the following amounts for the consultancy firm and the consultant local

	Consultancy firm	Consultant local	Total
Activity 1: Pre-feasibility, Feasibility Studies, and Project Design	\$330,633	\$65,583	\$396,216
Activity 2: Environmental, Social, and Gender Studies	\$70,150	\$20,287	\$90,437
Activity 3: Project Implementation Design and Indicators	\$176,080	\$36,000	\$212,080
Total 3 activities	\$576,863	\$121,870	\$698,733

- Could you please confirm whether the budget for the “Consultant local” can be allocated to cover the costs associated with the local experts listed in the ToRs? **Please note that the numbers you extracted from Section E of the PPF have been modified, a new version of the PPF is now available. As per your question, the upper limit of the budget for the Consultancy firm is US \$ 545.000, this value includes the local consultants, indicated in the ToRs (Annex B: Consultant Roles & Qualifications) who are required to be hired by the firm. There is another set of local consultants that will be hired directly by CI Colombia with an independent budget that should not be added to the budget for the Consultancy Firm.**

56. Admin – Track record of legal entity: Can you please confirm if there are any requirements for the years of operation for a bidding entity? (Dalberg has a legal entity in Colombia, but it was established more recently than other entities of the group) **Answer: No, there are not minimum requirement for the years of operation for a bidding entity.**

57. Specifically, it would be helpful to understand if you have any expectations regarding the scope and level of thoroughness for the field data collection—for example, the number of areas to be covered or the number of interviewees to be included. Additionally, could you please confirm if you have received any guidance from the GCF in this regard? **Answer: Consultations should be representative of the number of beneficiaries.**