



Q&A on the Calls for Expression of Interest in the fields of municipal infrastructure and socio-economic support – February 2019-1

<i>Call for expression of interest in the field of municipal infrastructure</i>	
Q1	There are provinces in Southern part of Turkey which have the high number of Syrians, like Kahramanmaraş or Hatay. When we think of South-eastern provinces, these are out of scope but as per the discussions made in November 2018 during the introduction meeting in Brussels, it was mentioned that 12 provinces will be covered. What are the 10-12 provinces in specific that will be covered under municipal support proposals?
A1	<p>Please refer to section 2.1.2 of the Guidelines for the Call for expression of interest, to Q/A2 of the Q&A from the Information session and to Q/A1 of the Q&A of January 2019.</p> <p>As per section 2.1.2 of the Guidelines, “Actions must take place in the Turkish provinces most affected by the refugee crisis and should mainly focus on the South-East of Turkey. The environmental sensitivity of geographical areas likely to be affected by interventions must be considered ...”</p> <p>Proposals for alternative provinces <u>in the vicinity</u> should be duly justified in terms of refugee impact, i.e. percentage of refugees compared to the total population and the national average, municipality incomes or GDP per capita, etc.</p>
Q2	The Guideline requests feasibility studies to be completed before proposal submission. Some projects have studies underway, expected to be completed by end of 2019. However, we assess that these projects are all feasible, but just need paper work and formal approval from Ministry of Environment. Would it be feasible to include those projects in proposals?
A2	Maturity of projects is a key component in the assessment of the proposals. Entities should indicate the relevant studies/works that have been carried out and check to ensure sufficient maturity of the action (section 1.2 of the application form). In addition, entities are reminded that relevant Turkish authorities should be involved in the preparation of the proposals to ensure smooth implementation of the potential activities, to be reflected in the documentation. In case of proposals including blending, a formal endorsement is required as per section 2.2.1 of the Guidelines.
<i>Call for Expression of interest in the field of socio-economic support</i>	
<p><i>Clarification on ESSN beneficiaries under Section 2.1.2 of the Guidelines</i></p> <p>Please note that the intervention proposed under this call for expression for interest should target the following categories:</p> <p>(i) ESSN beneficiaries with a limited capacity to work -'some productivity capacity', who could be integrated in livelihood programmes covered by socio-economic support;</p>	

	<p>(ii) ESSN beneficiaries with a 'higher productivity capacity', who could be accompanied towards employability through socio-economic support.</p> <p>The ESSN beneficiaries with no/limited productive capacity (iii) will continue to be supported by other interventions in the framework of the second tranche of the Facility.</p>
Q3	<p>The guideline mentions only less vulnerable ESSN beneficiaries with High/Some capacity to work (to be targeted under this call) and the most vulnerable ESSN beneficiaries with limited capacity to work (to be supported by other interventions). The guidelines therefore does not mention highly vulnerable ESSN beneficiaries with high/some capacity to work, which, according to WFP vulnerability profiling, represent the largest number of the current ESSN caseload (78% of beneficiaries are vulnerable, 83% of which have high/some capacity to work). Given that these beneficiaries seem to have some degree of employability, could/should they be targeted by programmes under this call? Similarly can / should ESSN applicants also be targeted?</p>
A3	<p>As per section 2.1.2 of the Guidelines to this call, <i>proposals should primarily target the refugee caseload of the ongoing ESSN programme, while taking into consideration also host communities and refugees outside of the scope of ESSN as relevant</i>. Therefore, ESSN beneficiaries and applicants should be targeted under this call.</p> <p>In relation to the categories of ESSN beneficiaries, please refer to the clarification above. The first two categories should be the focus of interventions proposed under this Call.</p>
Q4	<p>The Guidelines does not indicate any infrastructure/construction related work as ineligible but would it be acceptable for the Commission to involve construction work (i.e Entrepreneurship hubs, vocational training centers, etc) which is key to reach the objective of the Call?</p>
A4	<p>As per Q/A4 of the Q&A from the Information session, a direct link to the objectives of the Call concerned is essential. The description of the action should justify the proposal, both in terms of expected results and outcomes. Incidental investments and interventions should also be directly linked to the objectives of the Call, and cannot be the main purpose of the proposed action.</p>
<p><i>Q&A applicable to both Calls for expression of interest in the fields of socio-economic support and municipal infrastructure</i></p>	
Q5	<p>The guidelines in the first paragraph “Legal bases and considerations” make clear “the possibility for the Union's financial assistance to be implemented indirectly by entrusting budget implementing tasks to, amongst others, international organisations and their agencies.”</p> <p>Under paragraph Responsibilities of the entrusted entity, we can read”...among others, preparation, implementation and conclusion of grant and procurement contracts, and management of corresponding expenditures.”</p> <p>Our understanding:</p> <p>When concluding a grant contract with implementing partners, the entrusted entity will accept Direct costs and Indirect Costs as the Grantees’ Total Costs.</p> <p>The entrusted entity will present these Grantees’ Total Costs as part of the entrusted entity’s implementation/eligible costs</p> <p>To these implementation/eligible costs will be added the Remuneration declared on the basis of a flat-rate, which shall not exceed 4% of the implementation/eligible costs.</p>

	<p><u>Question 1:</u> Could you confirm that our understanding of Implementing Partners Indirect Costs and Entrusted Entity's Remuneration Costs is correct?</p> <p>The Guidelines make reference to a Contribution Agreement to be implemented in indirect management. The Guidelines Section 2.4. mentions the Contribution Agreement template. We are more familiar with the PAGODA template used for Delegation Agreements.</p> <p><u>Question 2:</u> Could you share with us the Contribution Agreement template with its attached set of General and Special Conditions?</p> <p>Our Application Form will define from the start which Implementing Partners will be part of the Action. No selection of our grantees will be launched.</p> <p><u>Question 3:</u> Is it possible in the frame of this call?</p>
A5	<p><u>Answer 1</u> - No. Remuneration costs are set to a maximum of 4% of the total eligible costs. No indirect costs are to be covered separately.</p> <p><u>Answer 2</u> - With the entry into force of the new 2018 Financial Regulation, the contribution agreement replaces the pillar assessed grant or delegation agreement template (PAGODA). However, organisations that have signed framework agreements with the European Commission may continue signing PAGODA-based agreements until a new FFPA linked to the contribution agreement has been agreed on or the organisation agrees to sign the contribution agreement without any additions/derogations.</p> <p><u>Answer 3</u> - The choice of implementing partners rests solely with the entity submitting the proposal. No specific procedure for the identification of implementing partners is required. However, under 'Methodology and implementation approach' in the application form, entities should describe whether they (...) intend to work with implementing partners.</p>