



**Global Battery Alliance
Battery Passport PHASE II – Request for proposals**

Q&A summary document

About this document:

Following the successful launch of the world's first [battery passport](#) proof-of-concept, the GBA is [seeking to recruit](#) (a) professional services firm(s) to support the further refinement and development of the Battery Passport concept and content. On June 2nd the Secretariat of the Global Battery Alliance hosted a public Q&A session for interested firms. Questions received by email and raised during the session and the respective answers are summarized below.

I. General questions

1. Does GBA already have a list of ESG KPIs to start with?

Yes. The full list is available in the 'Annex 2 – 2021 Indicator long-list' page 20 in the request for proposal document.

2. What is the contracting entity so that we can clarify the tax position in the RFP?

The contracting entity is The Global Battery Alliance. Incorporated on 13.5.2022 as a Not-for-Profit Entity in Belgium. Incorporation number: 0786222414

3. Is any template of the proposal be offered for reference?

This is the first RFP issued by the GBA, we do not have a standard template beyond the tender requirements listed in the RFP.

4. Does the GBA want to include the IRA policies in crafting battery passport or confine them to EU regulations? Which are those selected jurisdictions?

Whilst requirements that are mapped in the GBA passport should allow companies to adhere to the EU battery regulation, the GBA is looking at establishing globally applicable framework for sustainability performance expectations as they pertain to batteries. We therefore anticipate and expect battery (passport) specific regulatory requirements in other jurisdictions (i.e. US, China etc.) to be considered by the consultants.

5. How does GBA see alignment with the work of CIRPASS - as a consortium partner?

The GBA is an affiliate member of the CIRPASS project, and as such works in close collaboration with its consortium. We encourage all applicants to build on the work being undertaken in this project, where appropriate.

6. Can we submit an RFI together with the proposal? Or has the GBA already prepared a set of documentation that will be shared after the contract award?



An RFI may be submitted with the application, however it will not be considered when scoring the application. All relevant planning and strategy for the implementation of the work should be included in the main body of the application. The GBA will work closely with the winning consortium to provide necessary information on an ongoing basis throughout the project.

7. Is it possible to submit a proposal on a portion of the work package? For example, 1.6?

Yes, it is possible for an applicant to submit a proposal for specific aspects of the proposal. However, we strongly encourage applications to be part of an established consortium that covers all aspects of the call. The GBA is not able to provide matchmaking services or build consortium agreements for multiple applicants.

8. Has GBA taken a decision to intentionally focus only on written (documented) requirements of different industry schemes when considering their equivalence for Battery Passport KPIs? For example, in the GBA Human Rights Index, IRMA has the same equivalence rating for certain criteria as the RRA or RMI ESG, even though how those criteria would be assessed (e.g., the rigour of the audit) by different schemes through their audits is radically different.

The standard equivalency assessments in the indices are indicative only and are expected to be further refined in the standards mapping exercise. For the purposes of scoring other standards, the relevant data assurance framework for standards should be considered and compared to the GBA's own recommendations for data assurance and auditing and verification. As this is not yet developed, what is seen in the human rights rulebook is indicative only to show the intent of interaction with other standards in GBA indices and battery passport rulebooks.

9. What is the final goal of GBA regarding the BP? Become the benchmark/reference? Do you already have preliminary documentation of other battery passport initiatives and how they compare with your solution?

The overall aim of the Battery Passport is to:

- **Provide transparency in practices and the impact of the battery along the value chain to all relevant stakeholders in the battery value chain**
- **Create a framework for benchmarking batteries along criteria by identifying those that are best and worst in class and providing minimum acceptable standards for a sustainable and responsible battery**
- **Validate and track progress toward sustainable, responsible, and resource-efficient batteries.**

Whilst other passport initiatives are under development, the GBA aims to develop a globally applicable framework of sustainability performance expectations, beyond regional or national regulatory requirements. The GBA aims to develop this from the ground up, with input and collaboration from all actors across the entire value chain.

10. The proposal guideline, sent in the PDF, mentions the need to form consortia in order to effectively work on the respective package. Is this a requirement?



If a single entity feels they have the technical and resource capacity to undertake all required tasks within the project, it is not necessary to form a consortium to submit a proposal. However, any consortium bid must have a dedicated consortium leader to coordinate the work, as this will not be done by the GBA.

11. Quality of ESG disclosures by suppliers depends on the sectoral players' maturity. Shall the Consultant assume the pragmatic plan (e.g., to be in line with existing data availability) for the initial implementation period?

The GBA's battery passport framework is aspirational regarding the operationalization of sustainable, responsible and circular battery value chains. The indices therefore include expectations of what a company should implement 'in an ideal world'. This helps to show the pathways for impact and provides a framework to distinguish exceptional efforts in certain domains beyond legally required minimum standards. No company would be expected to already have the answers to all questions raised in the indices today.

12. Where is the work supposed to be delivered (Remote full-time/ Part Time)? If travel is expected, can you give more details on the location and frequency expected?

The work undertaken is expected to be carried out remotely. Some opportunities may be available (such as the Brussels based AGM in November) to engage directly with the GBA and its members, and this should be planned and considered in the bid. Time should be allocated for regular updates and virtual meetings with the GBA secretariat. Additionally, the work allocation should be planned to be completed no later than the specified deadline, regardless of fulltime or part-time application.

13. At the moment, we do not have any information about the partners that will be involved in the various work packages. However, we are eager to create consortia. Would you be able to provide us with your support here?

See response to question 7 'Yes, it is possible for an applicant to submit a proposal for specific aspects of the proposal. However, we strongly encourage applications to be part of an established consortium that covers all aspects of the call. The GBA is not able to provide matchmaking services or build consortium agreements for multiple applicants. '

II. Packages and tender structure

1. Is the ultimate goal of each ESG key performance indicator to be auditable? You note the concept of "beyond compliance" scoring - Some of these proposed indicators are notoriously poor at being detected within an audit setting, e.g., forced labour. Is it the role within WS1 to determine the best methodology for detection also?



Yes. The summary report for the GBA proof of concept and implementation includes several qualifiers. Part of this identifies the battery passport as a verifying tool. Auditable data is part of the requirement for the Battery Passport quality seal. The framework for auditability is depending on the specific action is expected to be included, taking into account the type of environment.

2. Please clarify: “The exact number of indicators to be developed in WP2 is subject to the competitive proposal.” (page 3) What does this mean?

The GBA has already spent 2 years developing 3 out of around 30 indicators (human rights, child labour and greenhouse gas). We expect to expedite this process to further develop indicators in this 2nd wave. As we don't include final validation by GBA members in this process, we hope for prior learnings to improve delivery speed. We anticipate each bidder to submit and commit to developing between 5 and 10 indicators of the same quality (we do not believe more than 10 is feasible given the timeframe). Bidders with robust proposals to develop more than the minimum five indicators will be considered favourably but the evaluation will be done on quality of the approach and not on the maximum number of proposed indicators alone.

3. Can we have some more information on the voluntary standards equivalency in Workstream 2? Would this involve mapping against all potential voluntary standards a supplier may have? We have, for example, over 200 voluntary standards mapped for equivalency in the TDis database, and there are still many more. What is the scope here?

We plan to react to proposals for prioritisation. We do not expect all standards to be reflected in the proposal. We expect existing standards to be compared as part of the project proposal and the most valid and significant of those to be included as potential priority work areas for the Battery Passport. The proposal for priority standards to be considered would need to be validated by GBA governance bodies, i.e. the Battery Passport Steering Committee.

4. Please elaborate on the exact meaning of „High-level requirements definition for the future IT system“. [software frameworks, concepts of data governance, other?] To which level of technical detail should this be defined?

We anticipate more of a business view rather than a specific IT view. As at this moment the GBA focuses primarily on how the ecosystem works overall and how different actors engage within it, including the exact role of the GBA in helping to orchestrate this ecosystem, we would want to define whether the GBA needs any internal IT capacity (“future IT system”) to deliver on this mission. If yes, what should be the main requirement for a such a system. At this point we would not expect detailed interfaces, APIs etc. to be described.

5. What does “physical implementation” mean? How is data collected and validated? Or penetration/uptake by companies?

This refers primarily to the quality seal, a concept developed by the GBA where the basic idea that it provides an incentive for those companies that want to go further than the regulatory requirements and demonstrate the implementation/uptake of the indicators that go beyond the



minimum requirements. By physical implementation we mean physical appearance of an individual quality seal – digital certificate, sticker on a battery of OEM, etc.

6. Is the ultimate goal of each ESG key performance indicator to be auditable?

Yes. The summary report for the GBA proof of concept and implementation includes several qualifiers. Part of this identifies the battery passport as a verifying tool. Auditable data is part of the requirement for the Battery Passport quality seal.

7. Ref WP 1.6 - what work has been done to date to define the technical architecture, and what granularity regarding tech requirements is needed as an output from this phase?

A core principle of the GBA is to be pre-competitive, technologically and company agnostic. We strongly believe in interoperability and to date, the GBA has refrained from endorsing any specific technical standards especially if they imply commercial aspects. The proof-of-concept has demonstrated that the passport may be delivered by independent track and trace solutions with elements of interoperability without strong standardization. However, we anticipate that these results will not be scalable without standardisation. At this stage the GBA seeks to understand how to enable track and trace companies “assemble” passports in an interoperable way to ensure the GBA may run the necessary analysis of large numbers of externally stored passports after issuing and what level of technical standardization should be in place to ensure this interoperability.

8. Given the envisioned project timelines for the two workstreams and the dependence of WP2 on the outcome of WP1, how do you see this working?

We don't intend to start WP2 until we have finalised the list of indicators in WP1. However, this does not preclude initial aspect of the work in WP2 to begin in parallel if some indicators are clearly established or build on and improve on existing indicators.

9. For which stakeholders is it mandatory to share information, and for which ones is it optional? Is the aggregated score only intended to consider the mandatory information?

The GBA doesn't define mandatory data as this is to be done by regulators (and given global perspective of the GBA some data may be mandatory in one jurisdiction but still voluntary in others). The GBA BP mission is to provide a “common language” for ESG performance measuring and a tool to ensure structured data collection. In a later stages the GBA may consider imposing its own view on mandatory data in order to deliver a quality seal.

10. Can Annex 2 – indicator long list be explained in further detail? For example, there is no specific category for labour rights within the long list of indicators. You cluster labour rights as the next priority cluster – (number 2 within the social dimension), but there are no specific labour rights indicators apart from h&s and forced labour, e.g., working hours and contracts. Alongside this, human rights, which was a priority, is not listed on this long list?



Can you explain the Cluster 2 in more detail and whether you would expect more to be added from the WS1 work?

In the case of the (prioritized) child labour index the working group concluded that a freestanding child labour indicator is not possible without based human rights due diligence requirements which would be applicable to multiple risks and impacts. For this reason, the child labour index was transformed into the 'twindicator' of human rights and child labour.

Regarding the first selection of issues and indicators, they should be considered as a starting point that may (and should) be revised and re-prioritized by GBA members according to a robust and inclusive methodology.

11. Annex 2 – indicator long list does not deal with responsible purchasing practices of buyers they are risks specific to a supplier. Is it expected that this be developed into an all-encompassing ESG topic list, eventually including responsible purchasing practice integration?

We do not expect the development of specific indicators for supplier relationships beyond the way in which they are already covered within individual indices (impact domain 2 in the child labour and human rights indices).

III. Collaboration with GBA and members

1. Given the fact that there are today many more members in the GBA - is the intention to actively involve all (new) members in developing the to be prioritised list of KPIs?

All members of the GBA should be invited to participate in the prioritization of the new indicators. However, we do not expect full validation of all members for each deliverable. A representative set of members (the Battery Passport Steering Committee) will collaborate with successful bidders to ensure alignment. Individual outreach for specific topics (e.g. reaching out to the most interested members regarding specific indicator) in a form of working groups is possible and desirable.

2. Given the timeline and deadlines, how does the GBA envision to collaborate with the winning service providers? And how will GBA facilitate engagement with key stakeholders and members of the GBA?

The GBA secretariat will be relaunching its battery passport working groups in order to respond to the prioritised proposed indicators. Part of the proposal is to highlight how the winning bid plans to work with these groups and the GBA as a whole – such as specific working groups, surveys and most effective ways of working. The secretariat will work with the winning bidder to review at milestones and provide feedback as needed. We anticipate the winning bidder to participate in our AGM meeting November.



3. What is the approximate size of the GBA teams one would be engaging with when working on this proposal? What is the availability of the teams for correspondence/meetings during the duration of the work packages?

The overall management will be coordinated by the GBA secretariat with dedicated programme managers, as well as the Executive Director and administrative staff providing logistical support. Dedicated meetings will be planned around key milestones of the project, as well as ad hoc support for project implementation. The BP Steering Committee (~16 people) will act as a guiding partner.

4. As an IT provider for the eventual Passports themselves, should we avoid participating in this consulting project to avoid potential conflicts of interest?

There is no restriction for participation. Though we remind all participants that we aim to provide a technology agnostic/neutral solution.