2025_EOI_001

FOR SERVICES RELATED TO CARBON CREDIT-FINANCED REFORESTATION/TREE-BASED INTERVENTIONS AND CLEAN COOKING PROJECTS UNDER THE REFUGEE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (REP) FUND

S/L no.	Question	UNHCR Answer
Q1	What share would be allocated to REP?	Assuming "share" in this question means financial share, this initial stage assesses market capacity and selects partners for further discussions. Successful selection from this phase will lead to a co-creation phase where we will focus on project design and clarify governance and cooperation roles between UNHCR and the partners, this includes the right financial structure based on type of organization selected to proceed and the roles expected to be played by different partners.
Q2	What share (if any) would be allocated to support ongoing project operational costs	The allocation of financial resources, including shares for ongoing operational costs, host governments, and refugee/host communities, will be determined during the co-creation phase. This phase will clarify the governance and cooperation structure between UNHCR and its partners, ensuring an appropriate financial model that aligns with project sustainability and impact. The exact distribution will depend on the type of organization selected and the agreed-upon implementation approach.
Q3	What share (if any) would be allocated to host governments?	The allocation of financial resources, including shares for ongoing operational costs, host governments, and refugee/host communities, will be determined during the co-creation phase. This phase will clarify the governance and cooperation structure between UNHCR and its partners, ensuring an appropriate financial model that aligns with project sustainability and impact. Additionally, country carbon frameworks may mandate a minimum revenue-sharing requirement with the government and/or host communities, irrespective of their direct involvement in project financing or implementation. This requirement will need to be assessed and integrated into project design. These factors will be clarified during Phase 2. If meeting higher environmental and social objectives requires increased project costs, we may adjust revenue-sharing expectations accordingly to ensure financial viability while maximizing impact.
Q4	What share (if any) would be allocated to refugee and hosting communities?	The allocation of financial resources, including shares for ongoing operational costs, host governments, and refugee/host communities, will be determined during the co-creation phase. This phase will clarify the governance and cooperation structure between UNHCR and its partners, ensuring an appropriate financial model that aligns with project sustainability and impact. The exact distribution will depend on the type of organization selected and the agreed-upon implementation approach.
Q5	What share could an investor expect to receive? This is particularly relevant as we present this opportunity to our network of potential investors who would benefit from an indication of the return on their investment in order to commit financially to the project.	The REP Fund's financial model is structured around carbon credit generation to support reforestation and clean cooking initiatives in refugee-hosting areas. The return on investment for potential investors will depend on the specific financial structures agreed upon during the co-creation phase, including carbon credit revenues, co-financing mechanisms, and partnership arrangements. UNHCR aims to support financial sustainability and scalability while maximizing social and environmental impact, and any potential financial return for investors will be determined within that framework. The project design will be co-defined with UNHCR to ensure financial viability while maintaining high environmental and social standards. While exact financial returns cannot be specified at this stage, successful implementation will contribute to a broader pipeline of projects that may be replicated in future tenders.
Q6	What is the estimated timeframe for the establishment of Frame Agreements and the beginning of implementation of initiatives?	The estimated timeframe for the establishment of Frame Agreements and the beginning of implementation follows the phased procurement process outlined during the webinar. While timelines beyond Phase 1 remain **tentative**, the key milestones currently identified are: - Phase 0 – Pre-engagement & EOI Submission (Closing: 28 February 2025) - Phase I – Pre-selection of developers (Goal for closure: Beginning of April 2025) - Phase II – Requirements review and finalization (Goald for co-creation phase closure: June 2025) Phase III – Final selection and implementation readiness (Goal for closure: July 2025) Target for agreements in place: August 2025. This aligns with key planting and implementation windows in Uganda (September–November) and Rwanda (October–December). **These timelines remain indicative and subject to adjustment based on the co-creation process and engagement with shortlisted developers.**
Q7	Eligibility for the EOI: Are all entities, including NGOs, eligible for this EOI? And are the same criteria used for their selection?	All entities, including NGOs, are eligible to submit an Expression of Interest (EOI), provided they meet the mandatory requirements outlined in the REOI document. Selection criteria remain the same across all applicants, with evaluations based on technical expertise, financial viability, governance and stakeholder collaboration, scalability and replicability, and impact measurement and assurance. Organizations of different types (private sector, NGOs, consortiums) may have different strengths in these areas, and the co-creation phase will help refine roles and contributions accordingly.
Q8	Consortium Submissions: In the case of a consortium submission, does each partner need to submit all the documentation proving their eligibility for the requirements they fulfill? Or is it only the lead partner who must submit the full set of documents, highlighting any specific capacity gaps that the consortium partners may cover?	For consortium submissions, the lead partner is responsible for submitting the full set of required documents on behalf of the consortium. However, the submission should clearly outline the roles, responsibilities, and contributions of each consortium member, specifying how they fulfill different eligibility criteria. Each consortium partner does not need to submit a separate set of documents, but their relevant expertise, financial viability, and experience should be demonstrated within the lead partner's submission. Additionally, a letter of association among consortium members must be included, confirming their joint commitment and outlining how specific capacity gaps are addressed collectively.
Q9	Technical Requirements for Cookstoves: Looking at the table on pages 4-5, which provides an overview of the project scope and targets, are Lorena cookstoves and Pesitho's ECOCAs the only eligible technologies for the Improved Cookstoves component, or are they mentioned only as examples? Could you provide more specifics on the technical requirements and standards for the cookstoves and reforestation technologies to be implemented?	**NOTE that these technical requirements will be relevant from Phase 2 onward and not for this current phase submission.** The Lorena cookstoves and Pesitho's ECOCAs mentioned in the table are provided as examples of technologies identified during feasibility studies. They are not the only eligible technologies for the Improved Cookstoves component. Bidders are encouraged to propose alternative technologies that meet the overall objectives of the project, including efficiency, affordability, durability, emissions reduction, and user adoption feasibility in displacement settings. Regarding technical requirements and standards, all proposed cookstove solutions should: - Demonstrate measurable improvements in fuel efficiency and emission reductions compared to traditional cooking methods - Align with recognized clean cooking standards (e.g., ISO/IWA Tier ratings for efficiency and emissions) - Be adaptable to local market conditions and culturally appropriate - Support a sustainable supply chain, including potential for local production, repair, or maintenance where feasible. For reforestation solutions, proposals should: - Align with national forestry and land-use policies - Incorporate climate-resilient tree species suitable for the target environment - Use evidence-based methodologies such as agroforestry, ecosystem restoration, or improved forest management. - Ensure feasibility for carbon credit certification under recognized high quality standards (e.g., Gold Standard). Bidders should justify their technology choices based on feasibility, scalability, and alignment with the REP Fund's objectives.
Q10	Alignment with other Initiatives: How do these projects align with other ongoing UNHCR initiatives or similar initiatives by other stakeholders? Are there opportunities for integration with existing programs and can this be made explicit within a bid?	**NOTE that these technical requirements will be relevant from Phase 2 onward and not for this current phase submission.** The REP Fund's projects are designed to align closely with ongoing UNHCR initiatives, particularly those under the Strategic Framework for Climate Action (SFCA) and the Climate Resilience and Environmental Sustainability strategy. Additionally, these projects aim to leverage synergies with initiatives by other stakeholders across several priorities and adopt a landscape level approach wherever possible. Bidders will be encouraged to explicitly outline opportunities for integration with existing initiatives in their submissions. This includes potential collaborations, co-financing models, or complementary programming that enhance impact, scalability, and resource efficiency.
Q11	Carbon financing: Does UNHCR have any pre-conceived ideas about how the generate of carbon financing should flow, or is it up to bidders to present what they think is the most compelling and impactful business and financing model?	There is no rigid pre-determined financing structure, and bidders are encouraged to propose compelling and impactful business and financing models. Bidders should present models that: - Ensure long-term financial sustainability through carbon credit revenues - Maintain high environmental and social integrity, aligning with recognized carbon standards (e.g., Gold Standard) - Balance cost-effectiveness with equitable benefit-sharing for refugee and host communities - Demonstrate scalability and replicability across different displacement settings The co-creation phase (Phase 2) will refine financing flows in collaboration with selected partners to ensure alignment with both UNHCR's objectives and market best practices.
Q12	How the financing structure is going to work here? What will UNHCR be refunding?	UNHCR is fundraising for the REP Fund projects and grants may be used to de-risk projects. In the case of Rwanda and Uganda, we currently do not expect the REP Fund would need to provide any upfront financing. This will be confirmed during Phase 2. UNHCR encourages self-funded proposals that outline UNHCR's expected role. UNHCR can facilitate solutions within refugee camps and has funds for complementary activities or risk mitigation, though developers are not required to request or use this funding if they can finance the project independently. Further details will be provided in later stages of the procurement process with successful applicants.
Q13	How does UNHCR plan to manage risks associated with carbon credit projects, especially those related to market volatility, reputational risk, and regulatory changes? Or is this entirely upon the bidder to manage?	UNHCR manages project risks according to high climate standards, prioritizing community benefits while mitigating exposure to market volatility. Internal governance mechanisms monitor projects to address risks related to community and government engagement, ensuring compliance with best practices. Reputational and over-crediting risks are key concerns, and UNHCR will ensure adequate monitoring is in place to uphold environmental and social integrity. Additionally, UNHCR might bring in additional partners, including financial ones, to support project implementation where necessary. However, bidders are expected to manage price volatility risks, which we anticipate will be factored into their final proposals. Further details on risk allocation and mitigation strategies will be refined during later stages of the procurement process with selected applicants.
Q14	With regards to clean cooking and agroforestry, to what extent both need to be combined in a proposal? Probably it will be possible to get credits issued for one of the two area (clean cooking and agroforestry): how you will score those activities whether you have to work only on one?	Both clean cooking and agroforestry/reforestation interventions are critical to achieving the objectives of the REP Fund. While proposals may focus on either clean cooking or agroforestry, the project design to be co-created at later stages is expected to incorporate both types of interventions to maximize climate, social, and economic benefits for refugee and host communities. Under Gold Standard methodologies, both clean cooking and agroforestry projects can generate high-quality carbon credits, but they follow distinct certification pathways: - Clean Cooking: credits are issued based on verified emission reductions (VERs) from improved fuel efficiency and reduced deforestation. Projects must demonstrate fuel savings, adoption rates, and sustained use over time. - Agroforestry/Reforestation: credits are based on carbon removals (CO_2 sequestration) and require robust permanence measures, biodiversity benefits, and sustainable land-use practices. Further details will be provided in later phases, once the procurement process advances and co-creation begins, allowing for the refinement of approaches that ensure both interventions are effectively integrated for maximum climate and social impact.
Q15	How are you suggesting that we work together here? What is the value add that UNHCR is proposing here.	This initial stage assesses market capacity and selects partners for further discussions. This leads to a co-design phase where we clarify governance and project roles between UNHCR and the partners, ensuring a well-structured project design with the chosen developers. Further details will be provided in later stages of the procurement process with successful applicants.
Q16	I would be able to facilitate formation of consortia building: could you share with prior consent from the attendees their details, contact details.	No, we will not be able to share any names or details of companies. Each individual company is allowed to search and find partnerships on their own without UNHCR's involvement.
Q17	In this project as a developer of reforestation and clean cooking we are supposed to bring the expertise, bring the fund, implement the project, create carbon credits, sell the carbon credits in the market and then share the revenue with the communities and UNHCR. So the whole investment, development and taking the credits to the market and selling them if they could be sold is all our responsibility. Is this correct?	The procurement process is not yet at the stage of determining final governance, operational and financial structures. The current phase is focused on assessing market capacity and identifying capable partners. While developers are expected to bring technical expertise, implement projects, and generate carbon credits, the specific investment structure, operational responsibilities under cooperation agreements, revenue-sharing mechanisms, and market engagement strategies will be co-designed in later phases. UNHCR is committed to ensuring a sustainable and equitable financial model, working with selected partners to define a structure that balances financial viability with community impact. **At all stages of the process, what is expected is professionalism in engagement, a deep understanding of UNHCR's mandate and priorities, and the ability to think critically about project feasibility, financing, and long-term sustainability.**
Q18	Assuming there is the requested capacity in the market, what is your vision now for UNHCRr's role in this partnership ? I know you have raised $7,000,000 in grants you mentioned in trying to kind of raise the remaining amount. So with some of these grants go into some development. How do you see this partnership if there's capacity within the market?	Given the diverse participants in this initiative, the goal is to strengthen and scale up projects in specific locations to achieve the desired impact. In cases where no single entity can handle all activities, we will seek proposals that outline how to execute these projects effectively and maximize impact. UNHCR's potential investment will vary based on the commercial viability of each site and the partner's proposal. While funding is available, it is primarily dedicated to projects in areas where full commerciability may not be possible, helping to bridge gaps and ensure implementation in challenging contexts. We are also seeking the market's input on the most effective ways to utilize these funds to support project development where commercial financing is less feasible. Further details will be provided in later stages of the procurement process with successful applicants.
Q19	Should the selected partners or developers have experience on specific locations mentioned. Of course the partners should be having the experience, the location of implementation, but they also should have the registration in that country or can be a foreign company?	Registration is not mandatory, but local expertise and understanding of the specific context are required. If you lack expertise in a particular area, we encourage you to form a coalition to address that gap.
Q20	Would UNHCR accept projects in one country?	Proposals focussing on a single country are valid. However, we need comprehensive expertise, so if you identify gaps in your capabilities based on the REOI, we encourage you to partner with others.
Q21	What do these refugee communities currently do for baseline fuels? Do they purchase it? Or do they collect it (thus spending no cash)? If they purchase it, does UNHCR provide this cash for fuel expenditures? Or are the community members responsible on their own for coming up with money to pay for fuel?	Studies show that both local populations and refugees primarily rely on firewood and charcoal for cooking, often using basic stoves. - Some refugees purchase fuel, while others collect firewood, though this often comes with environmental and protection risks (e.g., deforestation, gender-based violence during firewood collection). In Rwanda, firewood is banned for refugees, yet some still collect it. Local communities typically have free access to forests, while refugees usually must buy fuel. UNHCR does not systematically provide cash for fuel expenditures in the locations under this scope. However, in some Rwandan camps (not included in this project), UNHCR provides LPG. This initiative aims to address these energy challenges by exploring market-based approaches, including LPG, ethanol, biomass, and briquettes, as more sustainable, scalable alternatives that could also leverage carbon financing.
Q22	What is the thought about Article 6 or only targeting the voluntary carbon markets for now?	UNHCR is exploring various carbon finance pathways, including both voluntary carbon markets (VCM) and potential Article 6 opportunities. While the initial focus is on VCM, we are closely monitoring Article 6 agreements and their evolving frameworks. UNHCR has already engaged with governments in select countries, recognizing that some are developing or have established national carbon policies. The feasibility of aligning with host country Article 6 frameworks will be considered in later phases, particularly in jurisdictions where agreements are in place and regulatory clarity exists. Further details will be provided in later stages of the procurement process with successful applicants, ensuring that projects align with the most effective and high-integrity carbon financing models.

Q23	Expected Milestones and KPIs: What are the expected milestones and key performance indicators?	We have an existing performance framework that will be further refined during the co-design phase. More details will be shared at a later stage, but key milestones and KPIs will align with international best practices and the REP Fund's overarching objectives. This framework includes: - Social and environmental impact indicators, measuring improvements in community well-being, ecosystem restoration, and sustainable resource use - Carbon and sustainability metrics, ensuring high-integrity credit generation and long-term financial viability - Economic and livelihood outcomes, supporting job creation, equitable opportunities, and access to clean energy solutions All indicators will be aligned with recognized global standards and developed in collaboration with selected partners to ensure effective measurement, scalability, and long-term sustainability.
Q24	You mentioned about the number of pages. Did I get it well, was it 20? Also, in your own words, could you kind break down for me the documents that you expected exactly to receive in the e-mail? What happens after the period of implementation? What is like the long term goal post the project?	Please refer to the REOI document for specific details. The proposal should be a maximum of 20 pages in PDF format, with annexes allowed. EOI submissions should be sent via email to hqrepfund@unhcr.org, with Simona Paola Mosconi (mosconi@unhcr.org) in copy. Regarding the long-term vision of the project, we have ambitious plans for scaling. After the initial pilot phase, successful projects that meet scalability and impact criteria will be expanded to additional locations. UNHCR aims to support projects in both commercially viable and non-commercially viable areas, ensuring solutions reach refugees and host communities with the most pressing needs.
Q25	By extension I assume the idea is to position the REP as part of host country NDCs, correct?	The REP Fund aligns with the broader climate and sustainability priorities of host countries, and where relevant, it can contribute to Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). However, its primary objective is to drive high-integrity carbon projects that deliver measurable environmental, social, and economic benefits in refugee-hosting areas. Engagement with host governments is key, and where opportunities arise, REP projects may be integrated into national climate strategies, policies, or frameworks, including NDC implementation plans. The specific positioning will depend on government engagement and national carbon governance structures. Further discussions on alignment with national and international climate commitments will take place during the co-design phase with selected bidders.
Q26	Are there existing developers working in these areas who have distributed ICS devices outside of this UNHCR proposal? what is the baseline for ICS devices in these areas?	Yes, there are existing developers and organizations that have distributed Improved Cookstoves (ICS) devices in some of the targeted areas. However, the scale, adoption rates, and long-term sustainability of these initiatives vary significantly. Many past efforts have been limited in scope, short-term, or lacked integration with large-scale carbon financing mechanisms, which this initiative aims to address. Baseline assessments indicate that ICS penetration remains low in many refugee-hosting areas, with a high dependence on traditional biomass fuels. The REP Fund aims to build on existing efforts, integrate market-based approaches, and ensure a scalable, sustainable model that maximizes both carbon credit generation and community benefits. Further details on baseline data will be refined during the co-design phase in collaboration with selected bidders.
Q27	Are developers expected to cover implementation costs from their balance sheets/ the pre-finance they can secure? Or is REP funding these activities? It would be helpful to walk us through the model of partnership if possible	The financial structure of the REP Fund partnerships will be refined during the co-design phase, but the general expectation is that developers should have the capacity to pre-finance implementation. UNHCR is not providing full upfront funding but aims to leverage multiple financing mechanisms to support implementation in areas where commercial viability is limited. The partnership model is designed to: - Encourage developers to bring financing capacity, whether through balance sheets, investment partners, or carbon pre-financing mechanisms - Ensure UNHCR's role is catalytic, facilitating access to refugee-hosting areas, risk mitigation, and potential co-financing where needed. - Prioritize sustainability and scalability, ensuring projects are not solely reliant on grant-based funding but instead integrated into long-term market-driven solutions. Further details on financing will be co-developed with selected partners as the procurement process progresses.
Q28	Are you able to share the budget for the programme?	The budget for the pilot phase will depend on the final selection of partners and project designs. While UNHCR has secured initial funding to support targeted interventions, the expectation is that developers will bring financing capacity, including pre-financing, investment partners, or carbon market mechanisms to ensure scalability. Budget allocations will be determined during the co-design phase, based on project feasibility, site selection, and expected impact. Further details will be shared with selected partners as the procurement process advances.
Q29	Who will own the ER rights? Does UNHCR require that the ER rights be assigned to UNHCR/REP?	The ownership of Emission Reduction (ER) rights will be determined as part of the co-design phase in collaboration with selected partners. UNHCR does not require ER rights to be assigned to UNHCR or the REP Fund, but the structure of ER ownership must align with: - The financial model of the project, ensuring sustainability and equitable benefit-sharing. - Host country regulations related to carbon rights and environmental policies. - Stakeholder agreements, particularly regarding revenue allocation and reinvestment into refugee and host communities. The key objective is to ensure that carbon finance is leveraged effectively to support project sustainability, impact, and scalability. Further details will be finalized with selected partners as the procurement process advances.
Q30	Who will set up and manage the carbon project? UNHCR/REP or us?	Project developers are expected to lead the setup and management of the carbon project, including implementation, monitoring, and carbon credit certification. UNHCR/REP will not directly manage the projects but will play a facilitating and enabling role, which may include: - Providing access to refugee-hosting areas and ensuring alignment with humanitarian needs - Supporting risk mitigation and stakeholder engagement with governments, communities, and regulatory bodies - Exploring co-financing mechanisms to help bridge funding gaps The specific roles and responsibilities will be further defined during the co-design phase to ensure effective execution, compliance with carbon market standards, and long-term sustainability.
Q31	Who sells the carbon (finds a buyer, negotiates the transaction, receives the revenue)? UNHCR/REP or us?	The responsibility for selling the carbon credits (including identifying buyers, negotiating transactions, and managing revenue flows) will be defined during the co-design phase, based on the project's financing model and governance structure.
Q32	Do the evidence-based solutions need to be evidence-based in refugee camps only, or can they also be of other market-based models in other areas in the target countries?	The evidence-based solutions do not need to be exclusively from refugee camps and/or settlements. While the focus of the REP Fund is on supporting refugees and host communities, we recognize that successful market-based models from other areas in the target countries can offer valuable insights, scalability potential, and best practices. Proposals can draw from proven models implemented in other regions, provided they can be adapted to displacement settings and demonstrate feasibility, impact potential, and sustainability in refugee and host community contexts. The co-design phase will further refine how market-based approaches can be integrated, ensuring alignment with both humanitarian needs and broader national climate and development strategies.
Q33	Is the project going to be awarded as a grant or service contract?	The final contracting mechanism has not yet been determined and will depend on the specific project structure, financing model, and partner engagement strategy.
Q34	Can a foreign company (with no registration in countries of implementation) compete as a lead company of consortium?	Yes, a foreign company without local registration can compete as the lead entity in a consortium. However, it is strongly recommended that the consortium includes local partners who can facilitate on-the-ground implementation, regulatory compliance, and community engagement.
Q35	Do the implementers have to implement in both countries, or it is allowed to propose project that targets one country?	Yes, implementers can submit a proposal for only one location, and such proposals will be accepted and evaluated. However, the overall project objective is to ensure implementation across all three identified sites in Rwanda and Uganda. While single-location proposals will be considered, implementers should be aware that the broader need remains for all locations. Further discussions on coverage and potential collaborations may take place during the co-design phase to ensure the full geographic scope is met.
Q36	How long will the pilot lasts as the REOI does not provide this information? Not for profit/for profit/public institutions allowed to apply?	The exact timeline will be finalized during the co-design phase with selected partners. The goal is to ensure sufficient time for implementation, monitoring, and assessment of feasibility before potential scale-up. More details, including suggestions from feasibility findings on expected durations, implementation timelines, and key milestones, will be shared at a later stage. The REOI is open to for-profit, non-profit, and public institutions.
Q37	Has the pilot so far considered additionality concerns relating to carbon credit projects which include international aid?	Yes, additionality has been carefully considered as part of the feasibility assessments for the pilot. Given that carbon credit projects must demonstrate that emissions reductions would not have occurred without the intervention, we are ensuring that: - Carbon finance plays a catalytic role rather than substituting for existing aid-funded initiatives - The projects align with recognized carbon standards (e.g., Gold Standard) to ensure compliance with additionality criteria - International aid funding is clearly delineated from revenue-generating activities to avoid double counting and ensure market integrity. Further details, including specific findings from feasibility assessments on additionality, will be shared in later phases. The co-design process will also refine the financial structuring to ensure full compliance with best practices in carbon markets.
Q38	We noted that the Lorena and ECOCA cooking stoves have been preselected as eligible solutions. Given this, I would like to ask whether applications featuring alternative solutions would still be considered?	Yes, applications featuring alternative clean cooking solutions are welcome and will be considered. The mention of Lorena and ECOCA cookstoves is based on feasibility studies and does not imply exclusivity. Applicants are encouraged to propose technologies that meet or exceed key criteria, including: - Improved fuel efficiency and emissions reduction - Affordability and long-term adoption feasibility in displacement settings - Alignment with recognized clean cooking standards (e.g., ISO/IWA Tier ratings) - Scalability and replicability in refugee and host community contexts
Q39	What are the expected timelines for the REP/projects under the EoI? (for the delivery of activities)	For expected timelines of procurement process duration, please refer to Q6. The exact duration of pilot projects will be further refined during later stages. Initial feasibility findings suggest project-specific timelines based on site conditions and implementation needs. More details, including proposed feasibility findings on expected durations, will be shared at a later stage.
Q40	Any specific format the application is expected in?	The application must be submitted in PDF format, adhering to specified page limits, with font size ≥11pt and clear section headings. Please refer to REOI for the specific sections and information required.
Q41	Financial viability: what kind of upfront capital investment is required? Does it have to be new funding or can existing funding and committed funding leveraged?	The financial model allows for flexibility in sourcing capital investment. Both new funding and existing or committed funding can be leveraged to demonstrate financial viability. Proposals should outline a clear financial sustainability strategy, including cash flow projections, funding mix, and return mechanisms. The evaluation will focus on the ability to secure necessary funding and manage financial risks effectively over the project period. Evidence of secured funding commitments, investor letters demonstrating interest or commitments, or donor agreements will strengthen submissions.
Q42	What level of financing is required to start up a project? How are the projected 30-yr costs spread over that time-period?	The level of financing required for project startup will depend on the specific intervention, scale, and location, as well as the proposed implementation and financing model. While no fixed amount is prescribed, proposals should demonstrate financial feasibility, outlining upfront capital requirements and long-term sustainability. Regarding 30-year cost projections, financial models should account for: - Initial capital investment for project setup - Operational and maintenance costs over time - Revenue generation potential, including carbon credit revenues or other financing mechanisms - Risk mitigation measures to ensure financial resilience. Further details on expected financial structuring and long-term sustainability expectations will be provided in later stages of the procurement process.
Q43	What is the minimum scale? Both during pilot and post-pilot phases	Assuming the question refers to the minimum scale of implementation in terms of project size, the scale will depend on several factors, including feasibility, funding availability, land availability, and expected impact. - During the pilot phase, the focus is on testing and validating methodologies across the identified sites in Rwanda and Uganda. The scale must be sufficient to demonstrate proof of concept while ensuring feasibility for carbon credit generation and long-term sustainability - Post-pilot phase, projects are expected to scale up based on lessons learned, replicability, and financial viability. The long-term ambition is to reach a scale that ensures meaningful impact for refugee and host communities while aligning with carbon market requirements. Further details on expected project scale will be refined during the co-creation phase based on feasibility findings and stakeholder engagement.
Q44	Is there a forecasted credit sharing split? Understanding the respective share %s for the project developer, UNHCR, the community and investors would be helpful	The specific credit-sharing structure has not yet been finalized. The allocation of revenue from carbon credits will be determined in Phase 2, ensuring a sustainable and equitable model while balancing financial viability and community benefits.
Q45	Are the selected stoves for each project confirmed? We are interested in pursuing Article 6 authorisation for projects in development and are also conscious of the increasingly stringent governmental regulations within Rwanda/Uganda regarding these project types. We need to ensure compliance on both of these lines.	The selection of stoves for each project is not yet finalized. The feasibility studies identified Lorena and ECOCA stoves as examples, but the project remains open to alternative solutions that meet efficiency, affordability, and emissions reduction criteria. Proposals featuring technically sound and scalable stove models will be considered. Regarding Article 6 authorization and regulatory compliance, UNHCR and the REP Fund team are actively engaging with governmental authorities in both Rwanda and Uganda to ensure alignment with national carbon frameworks. The team has already initiated discussions with the relevant ministries and regulatory bodies and aims to secure Non-Objection Letters (NOLs) before project kick-off. On carbon certification, projects will be designed to align with recognized standards (Gold Standard), ensuring environmental and social integrity. The REP Fund team is closely monitoring Article 6 developments and will work with partners to explore opportunities for compliance and crediting under bilateral agreements or international carbon markets.

Q46	Has the supply of fuel for stove technologies been investigated at this stage? In our experience, specifically in Rwanda, we are not aware of widespread LPG supply to facilitate the suggested approach	The supply of fuel for stove technologies has been investigated as part of the feasibility studies conducted for the project. The pilot will consider multiple approaches, including a Pay-as-You-Cook LPG model with hardware subsidies for both refugees and host communities, and LPG subsidies for refugees only. Regarding Rwanda specifically, while there are known challenges with widespread LPG availability, the project aims to assess the feasibility of different fuel supply mechanisms, including locally produced and alternative fuel sources such as briquettes and improved biomass solutions. The selected developers will play a key role in refining these models to ensure sustainability within local supply chains.
Q47	We remain concerned regarding additionality given the suggestion of government co-financing of activities. Will the host country receive a share of credits under the project? If so, this would lead to eligibility concerns under crediting mechanisms. More information on how this concern will be addressed would be very useful.	The project design takes additionality concerns seriously and aims to ensure compliance with leading crediting mechanisms. While government engagement is essential to ensure alignment with national policies and long-term success, the project structure will be designed to prevent risks related to non-additionality. More details will be shared with selected partners as the project governance and financial structure are refined in later phases.
Q48	Is access to global climate funds something you have considered for the REP fund, or are you focused only on carbon financing? Just to make sure we are aligned in our thinking, pushing in the same direction.	Yes, access to global climate funds is very much a consideration for the REP Fund. While carbon financing is a core component, we recognize that a diversified funding approach is essential to ensure long-term sustainability and scalability and we are actively exploring multiple financing avenues. This includes applying to relevant global climate funds that align with the Fund's objectives.
Q49	What criteria would determine whether UNHCR purchases the carbon credits or pays for the services of project development and certification? Or, in other words, is UNHCR the only owner of the generated carbon credits?	UNHCR does not assume ownership of the carbon credits generated under the REP Fund. The specific financial structure and ownership model will be determined during the co-design phase in collaboration with selected partners.
Q50	Is there a possibility of a hybrid model where we receive both payment for the service and a share of the carbon credit revenue?	The final structure will be determined during the co-design phase, considering feasibility, financing needs, and stakeholder roles. Throughout the co-creation phase, we will collaborate with selected partners to establish the most appropriate financial structure, ensuring a balance between cost recovery, long-term sustainability, and market alignment.
Q51	Are you providing a specific document template that we shall use for submitting our EOI? Do you have specifications related to the document format we should submit?	There is no specific document template for submitting the EOI. However, submissions must adhere to the required structure and page limits outlined in the REOI. The document should be in PDF format, using a font size of at least 11pt, with clear section headings. Specific requirements regarding content areas and maximum page limits for different sections are detailed in the REOI document.
Q52	Could you clarify what is all eligible when proving the 'financial viability' of the applicants? For example, can we also include existing and committed funding streams?	Yes, applicants can include existing and committed funding streams when demonstrating financial viability. Eligible proof includes secured funding commitments (e.g., donor agreements, investor letters), committed funding streams backed by formal agreements, historical financial performance, co-financing arrangements, and revenue models such as anticipated carbon credit revenues. Applicants should clearly outline their financial strategy, including cash flow projections, funding mix, and risk mitigation measures, to demonstrate resilience over the project's duration.
Q53	I would like a clarification about the combination of clean cooking and agroforestry in carbon calculations. I checked with my colleague, and according to ICVCM there are no methodologies/standards that combine both in 1. We know that when both projects would be claiming carbon credits in close proximity, the risk of overclaiming is very high. Therefore, we would prefer the focus on carbon credits from one of the two, and use carbon revenue streams from sales to finance the other. Is this an option?	The approach of focusing carbon credit generation on one activity—either clean cooking or agroforestry—while using the resulting revenue to finance the other is a viable option and aligns with best practices for avoiding overclaiming. While methodologies under ICVCM do not currently integrate both activities into a single crediting framework, projects can still be structured to ensure clear attribution of emissions reductions and removals. The co-design phase will provide an opportunity to refine how these elements interact, ensuring methodological integrity and compliance with high-integrity carbon standards.
Q55	Does UNHCR have a preferred revenue model for projects under this initiative?	UNHCR does not prescribe a rigid revenue model for projects under this initiative but prioritizes financial structures that ensure long-term sustainability, equitable benefit-sharing, and high environmental and social integrity. The final revenue model will be co-designed with selected partners during Phase 2, considering factors such as carbon credit revenues, co-financing mechanisms, and reinvestment into refugee and host communities. Proposals should present financially viable models that align with these principles while demonstrating scalability and resilience.
Q50	Are there specific expectations or recommendations for carbon credit certification (e.g., Gold Standard, VCS)?	Yes, UNHCR recommends certification under Gold Standard, given its strong emphasis on environmental and social integrity, robust additionality criteria, and alignment with high-quality carbon market principles. We are seeking the highest level of impact and credibility for carbon credits generated under this initiative.
Q51	Does the requirement for "demonstrated financial readiness" mean that suppliers must already have secured funding specifically for this project, or can prior funding commitments for similar initiatives be considered?	The requirement for "demonstrated financial readiness" does not mean that suppliers must have already secured funding specifically for this project. Prior funding commitments for similar initiatives can be considered, as long as they demonstrate the applicant's ability to mobilize resources, manage financial risks, and sustain project implementation. Proposals should outline a clear financial strategy, including past successful fundraising efforts, existing funding pipelines, and the ability to leverage investment or co-financing mechanisms to support this initiative.
Q52	What level of detail is expected in financial projections for the EOI submission?	For the EOI submission, financial projections should provide a high-level overview demonstrating financial viability and sustainability. Applicants should outline estimated budget ranges, potential funding sources (secured, committed, or anticipated), and a revenue generation strategy, particularly for carbon finance. A financial sustainability plan should also be included to show how ongoing costs will be covered. More detailed financial projections, including cash flow analysis and investment structures, will be required during the Phase 2 co-design process.
Q53	What level of engagement with local government authorities is expected from suppliers?	Suppliers are expected to engage proactively with local government authorities to ensure project alignment with national policies and regulatory requirements. While UNHCR facilitates high-level government engagement, suppliers should demonstrate their capacity to navigate local permitting, compliance, and partnership requirements as needed.
Q55	Can you share the presentation of the 31st webinar?	References to procurement part in the presentation should not be considered as official UNHCR position, but only taken into account for general reference. **The webinar presentation is attached as Annex 1**