



Global Battery Alliance CMAG Request for proposals

Q&A summary document – Last updated: 21st September 2023

About this document:

The Global Battery Alliance is announcing a public tender to support the global development actions undertaken through its internal Critical Minerals Advisory Group through research and publications related to ‘The State of Sustainable Battery Value Chains’ (working title), highlighting key challenges, progress, and recommendations for action.

This document is a collection of the questions and requests for clarification regarding the Request for Proposal launched on the 8th September 2023. Its aim is to ensure that all interested parties have access to the same information and provide clarity to those submitting bids.

I. General questions

1. How do the CMAG SteerCo and GBA Secretariat coordinate (what are their respective responsibilities generally and vis-à-vis this work)? –

The Steering Committee will lead on tender selection process, substantive decision-making and approving the final requirements and content, supported by the Secretariat. The Board of Directors, has final approval on deliverables tied to milestone payment, based on the recommendation by the Steering Committee.

2. Evaluation criteria. “Technical proposal” is weighted at 40%, divided into 20% and 20%. However, it’s not clear to what exactly the two 20% weightings are attributed as there are four bullets. Please could you clarify?

The points listed under the four bullets are weighted at 5% each.

3. The timeline is a bit unclear and since time is of the essence, we want to ensure we are respecting your deadlines. Would it be possible to have a quick call to have it explained further, please, or could you please put some precision on the Gantt chart? For example,
 - a. Page 4 – You state “A preliminary report, not for publication, will be required before the 2nd week of November in order to share the results with GBA



members at the GBA AGM.” Is this before the start or the end of the 2nd week of November, please? What is the exact date you would want it, please?

The preliminary report should be submitted by Friday, November 3rd. High-level points may be summarized in PowerPoint, whereas the table of contents and report outline should be submitted as a draft Word document.

- b. Project commencement is October 11th but survey structure is expected to be agreed upon by October 16th or 17th – is this the date you would expect us to submit the proposed approach or to have already received feedback from the CMAG?

The proposed high-level outline of the survey should be submitted by October 16th.

4. It's not clear if we are to engage with the GBA Secretariat, CMAG Steerco, or the whole CMAG group itself for feedback on research tools and findings. Could you clarify your expectations, please?

The consultant is expected to coordinate approach and project management with the Secretariat, technical guidance with the Steering Committee and provide progress updates and opportunities for feedback to the wider CMAG working group.

5. How much time will CMAG Group/Secretariat / SteerCo need to review our submissions and provide feedback in October / November, given the tight timeframe to get to the communicate and draft reports? Is a 2 work day turnaround considered feasible for the November deadlines?

We plan to expedite the process of review as soon as the deadline is reached, providing recommendations for the Steering Committee to make a quick decision.

6. 2.1 deliverables are both a Microsoft Word report and a PowerPoint. We would propose restricting this to just a PowerPoint deliverable, in order to make things efficient and ensure timeline feasibility. In the background, we would be maintaining and constantly developing a Word version of the report which we would be happy to share with the GBA secretariat and/or CMAG SteerCo at any point for progress tracking purposes, but if this is to be more widely sharable (e.g. with the full CMAG or all GBA members) then it will require considerable additional extra effort which we think is infeasible in the time available and risks compromising the quality of both deliverables (ppt and word report). We believe the PPT will be the most useful tool for the All Members meeting. Would GBA find this approach to be satisfactory?



See answer to question three above. The draft Word document would not be shared with the wider GBA membership or working group, beyond the Steering Committee co-chair(s) and the Secretariat, to serve for alignment purposes.

7. GBA includes an expectation for the consultant to design the communications materials for publication of the final report.
 - a. Does this include the creation of the communications plan for the launch, or will GBA do this and simply instruct us on what assets they need developed to support this?

The GBA will manage the communications plan, but proposals for types of outreach materials by the consultant would be welcome.

- b. Who will sign off on comms? GBA secretariat or CMAG group or steerco? We would propose the GBA Secretariat and CMAG chairs to ensure efficacy.

The GBA Secretariat manages all communications aspects.

- c. We are allowing for a copy editor to review the final publishable report and comms materials. Are we right to assume GBA will handle desktop publishing of the report or should we also include this?

Design and layout of the report will be commissioned separately by GBA.

8. You say that there should be no travel. However, we wonder if there could be an advantage to have the researchers participate in the All Members Meeting. We believe participation in the meetings would provide access to key information points on bottlenecks and best practices, and may generate additional lines of inquiry both through listening to sessions and engaging members directly; this may also allow us to drum up interest in people being interviewed after the event too. Could you advise a.) if this could be of interest and b.) where and when the meeting would be so we might include this as an optional extra within the budget?

Possible participation in the GBA AGM may be determined at a later stage (upon contracting). If travel is required, the GBA may reimburse travel expenses separately.

9. Regarding the interviews, can you provide more information on how you envisioned this happen? Given that GBA has approximately 148 members, conducting one-hour interviews with each member and potentially external stakeholders may pose a significant challenge within the specified timelines. Will the interviews will be limited



to the "priority internal and external stakeholders" as mentioned in the RFP, which will be identified in due course. How many do you envision at this stage? Perhaps around 10? Understanding the desired depth and quantity of interviews will be pivotal in shaping a proposal that effectively aligns with the project's goals. Your insights on this matter would be greatly appreciated.

The CMAG Steering Committee and the GBA Secretariat will assist to identify key members for qualitative interviews. The exact number is to be defined during the early stages of the contract, though it is expected that this number will be between 10 and 20 participants. The contractor will also be expected to use the interviews and learnings from previous GBA internal surveys to contextualise these interviews.

10. Apart from what has been mentioned in section 2.2.2.b in the RFP regarding contextualisation, would you kindly elaborate on what is envisioned regarding the "Proposed contextualisation setting (standards, regulations, global initiatives)"?

The issues and bottlenecks in the battery value chain, as defined and elaborated by internal and external interviews/surveys, should be contextualized with relevant legislation and applicable standards. For example, gaps in requirement, a lack of harmonization, geopolitical situations, high priority issues of citizens and NGOS/Civil society. It should also take into account trends in the design, cost, and popularity of vehicles utilizing batteries. It should also take into account external initiatives e.g. <https://climatechampions.unfccc.int/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/THEBREAKTHROUGHAGENDAREPORT2023.pdf>

11. Is the exact scope of the data points to be collected by step of the value chain already defined?

No, the exact scope of the data points will be defined in collaboration between the Secretariat and the consultant. The aim is to have 1-3 high level recommendations for each step of the value chain for the communiqué to be expanded upon for the full report, but the emphasis may shift as a result of the interviews/ findings.

12. Has the stakeholder mapping already been completed including nomination of relevant contacts to be involved? Can we leverage the last survey population/ interviewee list used for the prior value chain research exercise conducted?

A draft stakeholder mapping exists which will be completed at the launch of the project. The consultant can leverage previous interview recordings and stakeholder lists.



13. The availability of interviewees and responsiveness of survey targets is critical. Have you already confirmed with your members to ensure timely responses and participation? Alternatively, would it be an option for some interviews / surveys to be still completed during the course of November (past the deadline of the interim report on November 1st and potentially the high level communique November 18th)?

The CMAG Steering Committee and the GBA Secretariat will assist in identifying key members for qualitative interviews. Both CMAG Steering Committee members and members of the Board of Directors represent priority stakeholders for interviews, and they have already been prepared to participate in the exercise, being representative of the wider GBA membership. The exact number of external interviewees is to be defined during the early stages of the contract, though it is expected that this number will be between 20-30 participants.

14. In section 2.1 of the RFP, the initial report and the ppt presentation are two separate documents. Can those two documents be merged into one dashboard that we continuously update as the results of the survey (and the rest of the primary and secondary) are analyzed?

The preliminary report should be submitted by Friday, November 3rd. High-level points may be summarized in PowerPoint, whereas the table of contents and report outline should be submitted as a draft Word document.

15. The policy/regulatory landscape to be reviewed can be relatively small or can potentially be huge. Can you give further indication regarding the extent of policy/regulations/standards you envision/require to be considered?

The GBA has already commissioned the development of a regulatory database as part of the Battery Passport project which may be leveraged for this exercise.

16. Given that the timeline is very tight for identifying, inviting/following up potential interviewees and conduct interviews: Which thoughts did you have regarding a feasible and useful sample?

See Question 9.