



Funded by the European Union



الاتحاد الفلسطيني للهيئات المحلية
Association of Palestinian Local Authorities

SUB-GRANTS OPERATIONAL MANUAL

“Guidelines for Piloting Local Socio-Economic Development (LSED) innovations in Area
“C” through financial support to third parties (Village Councils)”

Main Project: APLA’s Multiannual Action Plan (MAAP) 2021-2025

Reference: ENI/2021/425-904

Prepared By:

The Association of Palestinian Local Authorities "APLA"



الاتحاد الفلسطيني للهيئات المحلية
Association of Palestinian Local Authorities

Funded by: The European Union



EUROPEAN UNION
الاتحاد الأوروبي

April – 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	2
LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	4
1. INTRODUCTION.....	5
1.1 BACKGROUND – MAAP PROJECT.....	5
1.2 RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES.....	5
2. BASIC REGULATIONS AND RULES.....	6
2.1 EU GUIDELINES FOR SUB-GRANTS (SG).....	6
2.2 THE EX-ANTE CONTROL PRINCIPLE.....	6
2.3 AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS AND SUSPENSION CLAUSE.....	6
2.4 RULE OF NON-PROFIT.....	7
2.5 TRANSPARENCY.....	7
2.6 IMPARTIALITY, CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND CONFIDENTIALITY.....	7
3. SUB- GRANT MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE.....	8
3.1 THE PROPOSAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE “PEC”.....	10
3.1.1 Composition and functions.....	10
3.1.2 Chairperson.....	10
3.1.3 Evaluators.....	10
3.2 THE COMPLAINT COMMITTEE “CC”.....	11
3.2.1 Composition and functions.....	11
3.3 THE PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM “PMT”.....	11
4. THE CALL FOR PROPOSAL.....	13
4.1 OVERVIEW.....	13
4.2 APPLICANTS’ GUIDELINES.....	13
5. THE PROJECT CYCLE OF THE GRANT AWARD.....	14
5.1 STEP “1” - ANNOUNCEMENT OF CALL FOR PROPOSALS AND INFORMATION SESSIONS.....	14
5.2 STEP 2 - SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS.....	14
5.3 STEP 3 - OPENING SESSION AND ADMINISTRATIVE CHECK.....	15
5.3.1 STEP 4 - Request for clarifications/complaints.....	15
5.4 STEP 5 - THE EVALUATION.....	15
5.4.1 The Application Evaluation Form.....	16
5.4.2 The Final Evaluation Report.....	16

5.4.3	STEP 6 - Request for clarifications/complaints	17
5.5	STEP 7 - FINAL NEGOTIATION	17
5.6	STEP 8 - SIGNATURE OF THE PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT.....	18
5.7	STEP 9 – FILING	18
5.8	STEP 10 – PUBLICATION	18
6.	LIST OF ANNEXES TO THE OPERATIONAL MANUAL.....	19

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AGs	Application Guidelines
APLA	Association of Palestinian Local Authorities
CBO	Community-Based Organization
CfPs	Call for Proposals
CSO	Civil Society Organization
ED	Executive Director
EU	European Union
FA	Financing Agreement
FAO	Financial and Administrative Officer
LGU	Local Government Unit
LSED	Local Socio-Economic Development
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MS	EU Member State
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
PSU	Programme Support Unit
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal 2030
SG	Sub-grant
SP	Strategic Plan
SO	Specific Objective
TA	Technical Assistance
TSC	Technical Steering Committee
ToR	Terms of Reference
TSU	Technical Support Unit
VC	Village Council

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND – MAAP PROJECT

The Action “Association of Palestinian Local Authorities’ (APLA’s) Multi-Annual Action Plan 2021-2025” (henceforth the **MAAP**) is a joint contribution of the European Union (EU) and Member States (MS) Belgium and Germany to the implementation of APLA’s Strategic Plan (SP). The formulation of the SP was previously financed by the EU through the Area (C) Resilience Development Initiative (the ARD Initiative). The MAAP is a co-financing Action by the EU, the Belgian Development Agency (ENABEL), the German Technical Cooperation (GIZ) and APLA. Furthermore, it is based on the EU Financing Agreement (FA) ENI/2020/042-362 “Support productive investment in Palestine” signed between the EU and the Palestinian Authority (PA) on 30.03.2021. APLA is designated to implement the MAAP.

1.2 RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES

The MAAP reflects the strategic priority of the EU to support local authorities and their associations in partner countries in order to unlock their development potential and contribute effectively and efficiently to the formulation and implementation of national development policies and plans.

The Overall Objective of the MAAP is to strengthen LGU collaborations on service delivery and local participatory development, and improve contributions to territorial integration, particularly Area C.

The Specific Objectives (SOs) are aligned to APLA’s SP and aims to support the role of APLA as LGU representative and dialogue partner for the PA in order to strengthen the role of the LGUs in the state building process of Palestine. The three SOs are:

SO1: The institutional and operational capacities of APLA strengthened.

SO2: The capacity of LGUs to provide better services to citizens enhanced.

SO3: The interests & needs of LGUs lobbied & advocated, locally & internationally.

As a part of MAAP project, and one of the project’s most important **working packages** is the sub-grants to area (C) for socio-economic initiatives through the village councils as third parties sub-granting. APLA is working to launch a call for proposals for sub-grants to be awarded to local authorities in the piloting Local Socio-Economic Development “LSED” innovations in Area C through financial support to third parties, implemented by VCs or clusters of VCs, and if needed, in partnership with Community Based Organizations (CBOs), the private sector or other stakeholders.

2. BASIC REGULATIONS AND RULES

2.1 EU GUIDELINES FOR SUB-GRANTS (SG)

The European Commission (EC) re-introduced in May 2007 the option of sub-granting in its grant contracts. Sub-granting is the award of a grant as a restitution of a service in the form of a project implemented by a third party. The main purpose of sub-granting is to allow small non-state actors to contribute to community-based development and access European funds.

The Association of Palestinian Local Authorities (APLA) envisages this financial instrument as an opportunity to foster its mission and cooperation with local members from the Palestinian LGUs, thus deciding to use the sub-granting as an additional process towards development. This document aims at providing procedural guidance to all staff concerned. In particular, this manual provides users with comprehensive information on the basic principles and rules related to this kind of intervention, the structure to adopt in terms of management of sub-granting, awarding process and contract preparation. Annexes include the tools necessary to ensure transparency and accuracy all along the awarding phase.

The basis and the rationale for this Operational Manual can be found in the following documents:

- a) Procurement and grants for European Union external actions – A Practical Guide (ePRAG)
- b) General conditions to the Grant Contract signed between the European Commission and APLA
- c) Special conditions to the Grant Contract signed between the European Commission and APLA
- d) The Financial Regulations² and its Rules of Application³ Title VI – Grants
- e) Common Rules and Procedures for the Implementation of the Union’s instruments for External Action (CIR)⁴
- f) APLA’s internal procedures and manuals (financial, procurement, and administrative manuals).

2.2 THE EX-ANTE CONTROL PRINCIPLE

In the framework of the EU instruments for external actions, and in the context of this project, APLA is the Legal Entity (the ‘Applicant’) that signs the contract with the European Commission for implementing the project that includes a sub-grant component. In the context of a sub-granting scheme and within the contents of this Operational Manual, APLA is the legal entity that signs the SG partnership agreements with third parties (Village Councils) and therefore is the contracting authority towards sub-grantees.

2.3 AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS AND SUSPENSION CLAUSE

Before initiating any procedure, funds must be available by APLA. A Call for Proposal may exceptionally be launched with a suspension clause after prior agreement between APLA and the European Commission and only if there is a real need in terms of timeframe. The suspension clause shall be explicitly stated in the Applicants’ Guidelines. For no reason a SG Partnership Agreements can be signed until funds are available.

2.4 RULE OF NON-PROFIT

Grant awarding must not have the purpose or effect of producing a profit within the framework of the action, unless the nature of the project imposes the creation of profit (i.e. micro credit, cash distribution, etc.). The non-profit rule applies to the action and not to the SG beneficiary.

2.5 TRANSPARENCY

The availability of grants must be publicized widely and in an easily accessible way primarily by publishing calls for proposals with relative Applicants' Guidelines. This manual shall be made public and available for consultancy to third parties using the most suitable means of communication and, as a minimum requirement, APLA websites.

2.6 IMPARTIALITY, CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND CONFIDENTIALITY

The grant award process must be completely impartial. This means that the proposals must be evaluated by an evaluation committee using published criteria (i.e. the evaluation grid). APLA expressively condemns any distortive act done by its employees and other members of the evaluation committee due to conflict of interest and misconduct. A conflict of interest is when the impartial and objective exercise of the functions of a voting member of the Proposal Evaluation Committee is compromised for reasons involving family, emotional life, political or national affinity, economic interest or any other shared interest with the applicant. If any member has a personal or economic relationship/interest related to any of the applicants (be it organization or any of its members) s/he shall declare such relationship and withdraw from the decision-making process.

3. SUB- GRANT MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

Sub-granting entails the launch of Calls for Proposals to award projects to Local Authorities as defined in the Applicants' Guidelines. APLA is committed to the provision of high quality and fair evaluation and selection and all procedural passages and the whole process must obey the principles of transparency, proportionality and equal treatment/impartiality. To this purpose APLA is willing to abide by the below management structure that has to be formally put in place for any call for proposals called by APLA where a sub-grant scheme project is implemented. At any stage of the evaluation, the Delegation of the European Union (or any other counterpart donor) can request for an own observer to be presented.

3.1 APPLICATIONS AND SUBMISSION INFORMATION:

The process of submitting a grant application will go through two steps:

3.1.1 Grant Summary Application (Concept Paper) - (Step 1)

Summary Application (Concept Paper) Process

- Interested LGUs are invited to submit a "Grant Summary Application(Concept Paper)" using a standard Template, along with an overall cost estimate. Applications will be accepted on a rolling basis and will be reviewed per the schedule outlined in the call for proposals. All applications will be reviewed based on compliance with the set requirements, technical merit of the program ideas, cost, and feasibility for participation in the second stage (Step 2: Full Application).
- Submission of questions: Questions on this stage should be addressed to a specified email by APLA in the call and will be reviewed and answered as applicable on a rolling basis. The deadline for receipt of questions will be included in a table titled "Question Deadlines".
- Telephone calls regarding technical content will not be entertained.

Summary Application Instructions & Requirements

- In this stage (step 1), all applicants are required to submit a brief and summary of their technical concept and an overall summary budget, using the standard template "*Grant Summary Application(s)*" presented in Annex A.
- The total number of Grant Summary Application pages should be No more than (5) pages with all required information necessary for the evaluation team to evaluate submission and make a more informed decision (the indicated number of pages doesn't include the Application's attachments and supporting documents).
- Applicants should clearly mention the geographic areas in which project activities will be implemented.
- The "Grant Summary Application(s)" should clearly and concisely explain the Need(s) or challenge(s) that will be addressed, the thematic sector of choice selected from the applicant.

- The activities to address the needs and challenges and related milestones that will be achieved and the linkages of the milestones and their contribution to the CALL goal and objectives.
- Applicants must provide the start date and end date, the needed staff and desired experience as well as the targeted towns and governorates need to be included.
- For applicants to Anchor and intermediate categories, the names of the CBOs and their geographic locations will need to be included.
- The summary application must also demonstrate the applicant’s capabilities and expertise with respect to achieving the goals of this grant.
- The application must include a summary budget up to the allowed ceiling.

Grant Summary Application(s) (Concept Papers) form will be provided to all applicants as a unified template with specific required information.

3.1.2 FULL APPLICATION (Step 2)

- Applicants that have presented a viable and successful “Grant Summary Application(s)” may be asked to submit full technical and cost applications through written invitation letters.
- Only after having been invited by APLA in writing, applicants will have access to the grant Full Application Form, budget template, work plan template, and M&E template.

Full Application Process

- The Full Application must be only submitted through filling the application form of the sub-grant
- The applications must be prepared in accordance with the needed instructions based on the applicants’ guidelines. Selection for award will be made in accordance with the evaluation criteria as specified.
- Applicants should retain for their records one copy of all parts of the application and all enclosures that accompany their application.
- Note that all applicants may be subject to a pre-award financial and management review by APLA

SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

- The full application form will be in Arabic language, Submission material may be in Arabic or English. Arabic is preferred but full consideration will be given to materials in either language.

Required Documents: The applicants must provide the following attachments with the **full application package**:

- **Full Grant Application** and Completed Detail Budget using the needed Templates.
- One-page letter of support signed by the Director of the LGU indicating that they have reviewed the proposal and **agree to the targets and resource** commitment presented in the application.
- Formal signed “**Commitment letter**” from the LGU with the max. ceiling of the sub-grant budget
- Any kind of **contribution from the LGU** to complete the proposed project (signed letter).

3.2 THE PROPOSAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE “PEC”

3.2.1 Composition and functions

The committee will consist of at least 3 (three) Evaluators. The PEC is responsible for:

- (a) The administrative check of the applications received. In this case the individual applications are checked according to point 5.3 of this operational manual.
- (b) The evaluation of the proposals, their scoring and ranking according to point 5.4 of this operational manual.

The proceedings from the opening session(s) to the conclusion of the work and final selection of the winning applications is totally confidential.

3.2.2 Chairperson

1. The Chairperson of each call for proposals will be the Executive director of APLA.
2. Ensures the Committee impartiality and transparency.
3. Nominates the other members of the Committee (the evaluators).
4. Leads and is responsible for the decisions taken by the PEC.
5. Coordinates the work during the opening session(s) (the administrative check) and the whole evaluation process in accordance with procedures sets in this Operational Manual
6. Calls for PEC meetings, sets the meeting agenda and time schedule, moderates among different evaluations with the objective to find consensus.
7. Decides whether the evaluation process must be derogated or restarted. This decision must be recorded, and reasons must be included in the evaluation report.

3.2.3 Evaluators

1. They are appointed by the Chairperson amongst APLA, there will be min. 2 (two) members or evaluators, the Projects Manager and the TSU Manager.

2. EU representative – as external evaluator
3. SDC representative – as external evaluator
4. Chairperson shall decide to include in the committee external assessors if particular technical competencies are required;
5. Evaluators shall have the technical and administrative capacities to give an informed opinion on the proposals;
6. All evaluators have equal voting rights.

3.3 THE COMPLAINT COMMITTEE “CC”

3.3.1 Composition and functions

It is composed of APLA Director and the projects manager in APLA. The CC will seek to ensure that all requests and complaints are treated seriously and constructively. It will also seek to ensure answers will be provided promptly with fairness and consistency, and with due regard to the APLA anti-fraud and corruption policy. The Complaints Committee:

- (a) Is responsible for addressing request for clarifications and/or complaints after the launch of a Call for Proposal. The CC can request the support of the chairperson and the members of the evaluation committee in order to produce an exhaustive and thoughtful reply.
- (b) Has the power to re-admit an applicant that has lodge a complaint considered as justified.

All its communications shall be in writing and annexed to the evaluation final report.

3.4 THE PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM “PMT”

The project management team refers to all the staff that is fully or partially dedicated to the implementation of the sub-grants. The PMT shall be composed of:

- (a) The Projects Manager responsible for the overall coordination of the sub-grant scheme including:
 - Strategic coordination with sub-grantees
 - Coordination, guidance and management of project staff
 - Assuring donor and internal compliance
 - Supervising/authorizing the transfer of funds and authorize budget variations
 - Supervising monitoring plan and activities
 - Assure achievement of expected results and objectives
 - Conflict resolution
 - Leads if exclusion criteria arise after the signature of the SG Partner Agreement - Reporting to donor/APLA
2. The Sub Grant Coordinator (Projects Coordinators) responsible for the operational aspects of the sub-grant scheme including:
 - Operational coordination with sub-grantees LGUs

- Preparation of the Call for Proposal and the Applicants' Guidelines under the supervision of the projects manager
 - Finalization of the award procedure/final negotiation with eligible applicants
 - Preparation of Partnership agreements with sub-grantees
 - Planning of the activity/compliance with action plan
 - Implementation of the monitoring plan including monitoring missions and monitoring mission reports
 - Quality check on sub-grantees expenditures
 - Reporting
3. The Financial Department – responsible for the overall supervision of the financial aspects of the sub-grant scheme:
- Specific supervision and leading on sub-grant budget
 - Specific supervision and leading on sub-grantees accountancy
 - Checks on sub-grantees financial documentation
 - Preparation of all finance format and templates
 - Training and capacity building in finance aspects towards sub-grantees
4. APLA staff with ex-ante control responsibility on accuracy of procedures and papers. Specifically, on:
- The Call for Proposal and Applicants' Guidelines;
 - The evaluation final report prepared by the PEC;
 - Partnership agreements with sub-grantees.
 - Visibility and outreach works

Specific job descriptions for each position are in place, but, the above-mentioned roles are specific for the management of the sub-grant component.

4 THE CALL FOR PROPOSAL

4.1 OVERVIEW

MAAP Project action includes four main Work Packages:

Work Package 1 - Strengthening the institutional and operational capacities of APLA

Work Package 2 - Member service improvements to enhance LGU capacities

Work Package 3 - Piloting Local Socio-Economic Development innovations in Area C through financial support to third parties

Work Package 4 - Local and international lobbying and networking

The Project is expected to finance up to 20 sub grants addressing Piloting Local Socio-Economic Development innovations in Area C through financial support to third parties.

Each applicant may not submit more than one (1) application under each Call for Proposal (Call).

4.2 APPLICANTS' GUIDELINES

In order to ensure the widest possible participation and the requisite of transparency, a specific Applicants' Guidelines has been produced for each Call for Proposal on the basis of a standard format. (Annex VII) AGs are published, as a minimum requirement, in APLA website, as well as national printed media and social media.

The Applicants' Guidelines obligatorily contain:

- A. The exact total amount to be awarded in the form of sub-granting;
- B. Minimum and maximum amount that may be allocated to third parties per proposal;
- C. Objectives and results to be obtained by the sub-grantees;
- D. The definition of eligible applicants which may receive such financial support and the criteria to give it;
- E. A non-exhaustive list containing the types of activities which may be eligible for sub-granting;
- F. The definition of eligible and ineligible costs;
- G. Indications on how to apply;
- H. Indications on evaluation and selections of applications;
- I. An indicative time schedule of the awarding process.

Applicants' Guidelines is a unique document and will be published in the website homepage as a single file.

5 THE PROJECT CYCLE OF THE GRANT AWARD

6.1 STEP “1” - ANNOUNCEMENT OF CALL FOR PROPOSALS AND INFORMATION SESSIONS

APLA will ensure appropriate promotion and dissemination of information to all interested stakeholders. Information campaign will include but not be limited to: web publications (APLA website, Facebook, twitter, partner website, etc.).

The minimal information that web announcement shall contain is the following:

APLA is seeking proposals for the Call I of Sub-grants for - *Piloting Local Socio-Economic Development innovations in Area C* - as part of the Project “Multi -Annual Action Plan “MAAP” – 2021-2025”, financed from European Union under Reference ENI/2020/042-362.

The full Applicants’ Guidelines are available for consultation at <https://www.apal.ps/Projectsinfo>.

Additionally, you can receive them if you send an email at: Info@apla.ps

The deadline for submission of proposals for Call II is 6st August 2023, in accordance with the minimum period of 25 calendar days required from the date of publication of this notice.

Information sessions on this Call for Proposals will be announced on <https://www.apla.ps> and shall be held at latest 7 days before the deadline for submission of proposals. Info sessions will cover all aspects of the Call for Proposal and the sub-grant scheme: background and rationale, the roles, the objectives and scopes of the sub-grant scheme; the formats used (project proposal template, budget, the principle of eligibility (of applicants and of costs) and other basic rules (chapter 2 of this manual); the SG evaluation process (Chapter 5 of this manual), and all other relevant points. Sufficient question time will be guaranteed.

FAQ

After the info sessions, participants can request for clarifications using the project email: m.musleh@apla.ps. In this case APLA will collect all the questions, eventually group them if of similar nature, and make a document with all the replies that will be published on the APLA’s website on <https://www.apla.ps>. By answering APLA staff shall refer as much as possible to the manual and the AG. There should be a time limit for applicants to pose questions and sufficient time should be allowed after APLA replies for the applicants to be able to act accordingly.

6.2 STEP 2 - SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

Proposals must be submitted in accordance with the instructions given in the Applicants’ Guidelines. On receiving proposals APLA will give them a protocol number. If received by hand the receiver must provide a receipt (‘Annex I – Receipt Form’). The receptionist shall be instructed by APLA administrative assistant to the PEC on the proper way to fill the form (including assigning proper protocol numbering). The envelopes will remain closed until the opening session.

6.3 STEP 3 - OPENING SESSION AND ADMINISTRATIVE CHECK

The Projects manager to the Evaluation Committee, under the supervision of the Chairperson and eventually with the support and presence of other members of the committee or external, opens the numbered envelopes and proceeds with the administrative check. This is based on the 'Annex III – Administrative Check Form', by which APLA certifies that:

- (a) The application complies with the submission deadline as detailed in the Applicants' Guidelines. If the deadline has not been met, the application will automatically be rejected;
- (b) The applicant fulfills the administrative criteria (Annex III-Part A). In case of missing documents, the Project officer reports to the Chairperson that will request the incumbent to complete the application within the next 5 working days. If the request is not or partially fulfilled, the application will automatically be rejected;
- (c) The application responds to the eligibility criteria (Annex III-Part B). If any of the requested information is missing or is incorrect, the application may be rejected on the sole basis and application will not be evaluated further;

After the administrative check the Projects manager will prepare a table as per 'Annex IV – Administrative check summarizing table', for approval of the PEC as a whole and then prepare the communication letters to applicants to inform them about the outcome of the check using the format in 'Annex VII – Communication letter to sub-grantees (Administrative check)'. The Chairperson can decide to derogate to the standard procedure. The motivation shall be clearly explained in the Evaluation Final Report.

6.3.1 STEP 4 - Request for clarifications/complaints

Applicants whose application was rejected at the stage of the administrative check, can request for clarifications or lodge a complaint within five (5) working days after the notification of the decision to the Complaint Committee in writing (specific e-mail address shall be written in the Applicants Guidelines). The CC replies within five (5) working days and takes position (confirming or retracting) on the decision of the PEC. All requests for clarification/complaints shall be duly included in the evaluation final report.

6.4 STEP 5 - THE EVALUATION

The Chairperson fixes the first meeting of the PEC in which s/he:

1. must check that the Declarations of Confidentiality and Impartiality have been signed by each voting member and properly archived by the projects manager;
2. sets the indicative timetable for individual evaluations and plenary session(s);
3. shares the results of the administrative check and distributes the proposals to the evaluators.

Voting members evaluate the proposals using the 'Annex V – Application Evaluation Form'.

6.4.1 The Application Evaluation Form

The evaluation form is made of two separate parts: the first part is for identification of the applicant while the second part must refer exactly to the Evaluation Grid published in the AGs. The evaluation grid sticks pragmatically to the paragraphs of the Project Application Form and the evaluator must assign a score from one (1) to five (5) on each topic on the sole basis of what is stated in the project proposal regardless of the reputation of the applicant and any other external, not requested, information. The evaluation grid is divided in four (4) sections: the operational capacity of the applicant, the relevance of the action towards the objectives and priorities of the call for proposal, the quality of the project proposal and finally the budget/cost effectiveness. Each section contains a box for comments and justifications. The evaluation of a project proposal is performed in two moments:

1. Initially evaluators evaluate individually each proposal and assign a personal score. The evaluators must use the comments/justification box in each section to explain the score they are assigning and/or to recommend budget or action reviews.
2. Next, the PEC, in plenary session and collectively reviews the individual evaluations and prepares a consolidated Evaluation Form assigning a final score. The arithmetical average of the individual evaluations is the general rule to apply. In case individual scoring differ considerably, under the coordination of the Chairperson, a debate shall bring consensus. As extrema ratio, the arithmetical average will still prevail. The Consolidated Evaluation form must synthesize the comments on the individual forms and include points eventually discussed in plenary session(s). The discussion shall be reflected in the Evaluation Final Report.

The evaluation form is the same for the two moments.

The definitive ranking is finally brought in a table in the Evaluation Final Report.

6.4.2 The Final Evaluation Report

At the end of the process, in the last meeting, PEC finalizes the Final Evaluation Report as per 'Annex VI – Final Evaluation Report'. The report is a summary of the whole evaluation process and, together with its annexes, provides a comprehensive and detailed description of the decision-making process. In the summarizing table a single list of the projects evaluated shall be drafted in descending order starting with the highest score downwards according to the final score obtained through the evaluation grid. Applications are ranked and classified as following:

- Recommended: are those applications that received the higher score and that are suitable to be awarded the grant. taking into consideration the availability of funds and the SG scheme output requirements. Although it is possible to recommend projects for a total amount superior to the budget availability and then reduce the financial requests of single proposals during negotiation phase (see 5.5), it is advisable to remain very close to the limit in excess.

- In Reserve list: are those applications that received a sufficient score and that would be suitable to be awarded a grant but for which there is no availability of funds. They will be taken into consideration in the event of other candidates in the recommended list renouncing the grant, or in case of further budget availability. The Reserve list is valid only for the Call for Proposal for which applicants have applied. Applications put on a reserve list cannot be taken into consideration for other Calls for Proposals.
- Not Recommended: are those applications that did not received the minimum score established in the Applications' Guidelines and that are considered of too poor quality to be awarded a grant.

The final evaluation report is signed by all members of the Committee.

Note that:

- (a) PEC may reject a proposal if it has selected another which is of a similar nature but has been awarded a higher score (i.e., two or more proposals having similar objectives, and/or proposing similar activities with the same partners and/or in the same geographical area)
- (b) PEC may decide not to allocate all the available funds if it finds that there are too few proposals of the quality required to receive a grant.
- (c) Any attempt by a candidate or applicant to influence the process in any way (whether by making contact with members of the evaluation committee or otherwise) will result in the immediate exclusion of its proposal from further consideration.
- (d) The Chairperson of the Evaluation Committee decides whether the evaluation process must be restarted or if derogations are needed. That decision must be recorded and reasons must be included in the evaluation final report.

Letters to successful and unsuccessful applicants must be sent within 10 working days of the award decision using the format in 'Annex VIII – Communication letter to sub-grantees (full evaluation)'.

6.4.3 STEP 6 - Request for clarifications/complaints

Applicants whose application was rejected can request for clarifications or lodge a complaint within five (5) working days after the notification of the decision to the Complaint Committee in writing (specific e-mail address shall be written in the Applicants Guidelines). The CC replies within five (5) working days and take position (confirming or retracting) on the decision of the PEC. All requests for clarification/complaints shall be duly included in the evaluation final report.

6.5 STEP 7 - FINAL NEGOTIATION

In this phase the successful applicants are summoned by the PMT to discuss of eventual request for minor modifications. Requests for adjustments/modifications can include only points highlighted

during the evaluation in the appropriate comment/justification box. Even if modifications of the budget and/or the action (including the action plan) are requested, the core of the proposal shall not be altered. Modifications cannot lead in any case to an increase in the amount of the grant. It is in this phase that it is recommended to proceed with the pre-award assessment of the sub-grantees to assess together program/admin/financial capabilities and limits and identify needs for specific trainings and support.

6.6 STEP 8 - SIGNATURE OF THE PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

The relations between APLA and the Sub-grantee are ruled by the 'Annex IX - Partner Agreement' and its annexes. The agreement is prepared by the PMT, it is signed by the **President of APLA** and it takes effect on the date of the last signature.

6.7 STEP 9 – FILING

All documentation related to the evaluation process must be archived in order under the direct responsibility of the Project officer of the PEC and the supervision of the chairperson. The folder must include:

1. The call for proposal;
2. All applications received;
3. All communication between the PEC and CC with applicants;
4. The final evaluation report with annexes;
5. SG Partnership Agreements.

6.8 STEP 10 – PUBLICATION

At the end of the process APLA will publish on its webpage the list of the LGUs that received the grant. The list shall include the name of the LGU, the title of the project, location of implementation and a summary of the narrative objectives/expected results.

7. LIST OF ANNEXES TO THE OPERATIONAL MANUAL

Annex I	Receipt Form
Annex II	Declaration of impartiality and confidentiality
Annex III	Administrative Check Form
Annex IV	Administrative check summarizing table
Annex V	Application evaluation form
Annex VI	Final Evaluation Report
Annex VII	Application Guidelines
Annex VIII	General Information

ANNEX I – RECEIPT FORM



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT – HAND DELIVERY

Name and address of the Applicant:

Call for proposals: <reference number & title>

Title of your action: <.....> (one action only per acknowledgement of receipt)

Your application was received on <date and hour> and was assigned the protocol number

<insert protocol number>.

APLA-AO SPACE
Name:
Signature:
Date and Hour of receipt:

APPLICANT SPACE
Name:
Signature:

ANNEX II - DECLARATION OF IMPARTIALITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that I agree to participate in the evaluation of the proposals received in the framework of the Call for Proposal **“Piloting Local Socio-Economic Development (LSED) innovations in Area “C” through financial support to third parties (Village Councils)”** launched on/...../..... as a voting member of the Proposal Evaluation Committee.

By making this declaration, I declare that I am aware that a conflict of interests exists where the impartial and objective exercise of the functions of a Proposal Evaluation Committee is compromised for reasons involving family, emotional life, political or national affinity, economic interest or any other shared interest with a recipient.

Therefore:

I hereby declare that, to my knowledge, I have no conflict of interest with the operators who have applied to participate for this grant award.

I confirm that if I discover during the evaluation that such a conflict exists or might exist, I shall declare it immediately to the chairperson of the evaluation committee. In the case that such conflict is confirmed by the chairperson, I agree to cease from participating in the evaluation committee.

I confirm that I have familiarized myself with the information available to date concerning this Call for Proposals, including the provisions of the Operational Manual for the Sub-Grants Scheme relating to the evaluation process.

I shall execute my responsibilities impartially and objectively. I further declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I am not in a situation that could cast doubt on my ability to evaluate the application(s).

I shall maintain the strictest confidentiality in respect of all information acquired as a result of my involvement in the evaluation process of the above-mentioned call, as well as any information relating specifically to the object of this call.

I undertake neither to disclose such information to any person who is not already authorized to have access to such information, or to discuss it with any person in any public place or where others could overhear it. I furthermore undertake to use this information only in the context, and for the purposes of, the evaluation of this specific call.

After the conclusion of the evaluation, I undertake not to retain copies of any written information, as well as any templates or models used in the course of my duties. I undertake to maintain this duty of confidentiality after the conclusion of my term as a member of this evaluation committee.

I understand that any unauthorized disclosure by me will result in the termination of my role as a member of this evaluation committee and may also render me liable to legal action.

Name of the PEC member: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

ANNEX III – ADMINISTRATIVE CHECK FORM

(For exclusive use of the Project officer of the PEC. This form must be attached to the application)

Reference number:	
Applicant name:	
Applicant number:	
Title of action:	

	Yes	No
The submission deadline has been met. *		
Part A (administrative) **		
1. The correct grant application form has been used		
2. The budget is presented in the format requested and stated in EUR/ALL		
3. One original copy (signed) of documents 1 and 2 is included		
4. An electronic version of the proposal (USB/CD-Rom) is enclosed		
OPTIONAL FOR APPLICATIONS TO SMALL GRANTS		
Part B (eligibility)*		
5. The proposal has been typed and is in Arabic		
6. The amount requested is within the minimum and maximum allowed by the call for proposal		
7. The applicant is a registered LGU.		
8. The duration of the action is within the limits of the call for proposal		
9. The action will be implemented in a region of West bank, Palestine		

	Yes	No
Decision		
A. The PEC has decided to evaluate the full application, which passed the administrative check.		
B. The PEC has requested integration of missing documents		
C. The PEC has rejected the application		

Signature of the Project officer _____

Signature of the Chairperson _____

according to 5.3 'Opening session and administrative check' point a) and c), if any of the answers to these questions are NO, then decision to be taken is C

** according to 5.3 'Opening session and administrative check', point b), if any of the answers to Part A is NO, then decision to be taken is B

ANNEX IV – ADMINISTRATIVE CHECK SUMMARIZING TABLE

(For exclusive use of the Project officer of the PEC)

Title of the project:

Deadline for submission:

Reference number:

Language to be used:

[Number of the Round]:

Min. and Max amount allowed:

Date/period of administrative check:

Duration limits of the action:

Country/Region eligible:

Legal status:

legal person:

#	Name of the LGU	Title of the action	Protocol number	Request for additional documentation	Documentation received	Missing Documentation	Decision	Points of no compliance as per manual to be shared with Applicant (incl. Part B of the Checklist for Applicants)
1				<List missing documentation as per applicant checklist and physical evidence>	<List documentation received >	<Cleared/not cleared>	<Accepted/rejected>	
2								
....								

	Name	Signature
Chairperson		
Project officer		
Evaluator		
Evaluator		
Evaluator		
Evaluator		

N.B. Attach all clarification correspondence with applicants

ANNEX V - APPLICATION EVALUATION FORM

(For exclusive use of the voting members of the PEC)

Date: __/__/2__

Grid completed by: <insert evaluator name or 'PEC' in case it is the consolidated form>

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Reference number:	<insert the reference number as in the first page of the Call for Proposal Applicants' Guidelines>
Applicant name:	
Applicant number:	
Title of action:	
Amount requested	EUR _____
Duration:	___ months

II. EVALUATION GRID

Scoring guidelines: 1= very poor; 2= poor; 3= adequate; 4= good; 5= very good

The evaluation grid sticks pragmatically to the paragraphs of the Project Application Form. The evaluator must assign a score on each topic on the sole basis of what is stated in the proposal regardless of the reputation of the applicant and any other external, not requested, information.

Each section contains a box for comments. These comments serve to explain the reasons behind the score assigned and to address the issues covered by that section. Comments must be made on each section. Extra space may be used for comments if required.

Please remember that only the points raised formally in the “Comments & Justification” field can be part of the negotiation with awarded applicant.

1. Operational capacity	Score	Total	Comments & Justification
1.1. Does the applicant have sufficient knowledge of the issues to be addressed?	1-5*2	/10	
1.2. Does the applicant have sufficient management capacity? (Including staff, equipment and ability to handle the budget for the action?)	1-5*2	/10	

2. Relevance of the action	Score	Total	Comments & Justification
2.1 How relevant is the proposal to the particular needs and constraints of the country or region?	1-5*2	/10	
2.2 How relevant is the proposal to the objectives and priorities of the Call for Proposals?	1-5*2	/10	
2.3 How clearly defined and strategically chosen are the final beneficiaries and/or target groups? Have their needs been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately?	1-5*2	/10	

3. Quality of the project proposal	Score	Total	Comments & Justification
3.1 Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the expected results?	1-5*2	/10	
3.2 Is the action plan clear and feasible?	1-5	/5	
3.3 Is the visibility of the action clearly explained and appropriate?	1-5	/5	
3.4 What is the degree of sustainability of the expected results?	1-5	/5	

3.5 Is the implementation methodology clearly explained?	1-5	/5	
--	-----	----	--

4. Budget and cost-effectiveness of the action	Score	Total	Comments & Justification
4.1 Are the activities appropriately reflected in the budget?	1-5*2	/10	
4.2 Is the ratio between the inputs/resources and the expected results satisfactory?	1-5*2	/10	

5. Total score and recommendations	Score
1. Operational capacity	/20
2. Relevance of the action	/25
3. Quality of the project proposal	/35
4. Budget and cost-effectiveness of the action	/20
TOTAL:	/100

[Check if the total amount is below the minimum score allowed for this Call for Proposal]

[To be used only for consolidated PEC forms]

<input type="checkbox"/> Recommended	<input type="checkbox"/> Provisionally selected	<input type="checkbox"/> Not recommended
--------------------------------------	---	--

ANNEX VI - Final Evaluation Report



Funded by the European Union



الاتحاد الفلسطيني للهيئات المحلية
Association of Palestinian Local Authorities

Association of Palestinian Local Authorities – APLA

“Piloting Local Socio-Economic Development (LSED) innovations in Area “C” through financial support to third parties (Village Councils)”

The Sub-Grant Scheme – Round #1

Final Evaluation Report

Contents:

1. Timetable
2. Administrative and eligibility check
3. Evaluation
4. Summarizing table

Annexes:

- Annex I. Declarations of impartiality and confidentiality
- Annex II. Administrative check summarizing table
- Annex III. [Clarification correspondence with applicants]
- Annex IV. Minutes of meetings
- Annex V. Individual/PEC evaluation forms

1. TIMETABLE

	Date	Time	Purpose of the meeting	Attendance
Meeting 1				
Meeting 2				
Etc.				

2. ADMINISTRATIVE AND ELIGIBILITY CHECK

The evaluation committee made a first administrative and eligibility check based on Annex III – Administrative check form. Total number of applications received was <insert Nr.>. Out of them:

- (a) <insert Nr.> applications passed the check and were allowed the next phase of the evaluation.
- (b) <insert Nr.> applications were rejected automatically because they were submitted after the deadline (cf. 5.3 (a)); [If relevant, list the excluded applications]
- (c) <insert Nr.> applications were rejected automatically because they were missing one or more of the points stated in Annex III – Administrative check form Part B (cf. 5.3(c)) [If relevant, list the excluded applications]
- (d) <insert Nr.> applications were missing one or more documents listed in Annex III – Administrative check form Part A and were thus requested integration (cf. 5.3(b)). Of these:
 - I. <insert Nr.> supplied requested documentation within the time limit and were therefore allowed the next phase of evaluation
 - II. <insert Nr.> did not supply requested documentation or supplied incomplete or insufficient documentation or supplied it past the time limit and were therefore rejected.

Detailed results are showed in table annexed to this document (Annex IV). Applicants were notified in writing.

2.1 REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATIONS/COMPLAINTS

A total of <insert Nr.> applicants requested for clarifications or lodged a complaint within the set deadline (cf.5.3.1). The Complaints Committee (CC) has analyzed the request/complaint and took position on the decision of the PEC. Of these:

- I. The decisions of the PEC were confirmed for <insert Nr.> applications and the applicants were finally not admitted to the next phase of the evaluation
- II. The decisions of the PEC were retracted for <insert Nr.> applications and the applicants were admitted to the following phase of the evaluation.

Applicants concerned were notified in writing. Finally, the total number of applications that were allowed the next phase of the evaluation is <insert Nr.>

3. Evaluation

The evaluation committee assessed <insert Nr.> applications using the 'Annex V - Application evaluation form' to give their personal scoring. The evaluation committee then discussed them and the final result and ranking is displayed in the table below in a descending order starting with the project that has received the highest score. The minimum score allowed to be considered eligible for a grant was established to be <insert Nr.>

<Please include here a narrative of all relevant discussions that took place in the plenary sessions of the PEC>

The total budget available for this call for proposal is EUR <insert value> [if relevant detail for lots]

The first <insert Nr.> project proposals have been recommended for grant award for a total budget request of EUR <insert value>. The PEC reserves to negotiate the budget with the applicant in order to cut <insert percentage> approximately.

4. SUMMARIZING TABLE

Title of the Action:

Call for proposal/Round:.....

#	Name of Applicant LGU	Title of the project	Prot. Nr	Final Score	Grant amount requested in Euro	Time span in months	Decision	Thematic Area/ Priority	Comments/Justifications

Number of applications recommended: <...>.

Total amount requested for the selected applications: EUR <...> Total amount available: EUR <...>.

Total budget cut requested: <...%...>

Signatures

	Name	Signature
Chairperson		
Project officer		
Evaluator		
Evaluator		
Evaluator		
Evaluator		

Approved by APLA: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____