

CLARIFICATIONS

Contract title:

Call for Proposals - Increasing community resilience and preparedness to floods and cyclones, contributing to reduced post-disaster losses in two pilot districts- Mossuril and Namacurra

Reference: MOZ22005-10354

TECHNICAL

N°	Issue / question raised	Response
1	<u>Page Limit – Section 1.3</u> <i>The application template, Annex A, has been updated. However, there appears to be a remaining inconsistency in Section 1.3, which states “Relevance of the action (max. 43 pages)”.</i> <i>Based on the comments included in the first version of Annex A, we understood that the page limit for this section had been increased from 3 to 4 pages, but that the original “3” may have been inadvertently left in the template.</i> <i>Could you please confirm whether the maximum page limit for Section 1.3 is indeed 4 pages?</i>	We confirm that the maximum length for Section 1.3 "Relevance of the action" is 4 pages. The "43" in the heading is a typographical error, and the table of contents still showing "3 pages" is a residual from the earlier version. Please note that the binding overall limit remains 6 pages for Sections 1.1 to 1.3 combined, as set out in the instructions for the preparation of concept notes. Sections 1.4 to 1.6 are not counted within this limit.
2	<u>Logical Framework Matrix</u> <i>Could you please clarify whether applicants are expected to use the Logical Framework Matrix provided in Section 1.7 as it is, or whether they should develop and submit their own version with revised outcomes, indicators, and targets?</i>	Section 1.7 sets out the mandatory results structure and indicator set for this Call. The Specific Objective, the four Expected Results (ER1–ER4), the corresponding indicators and the associated targets must be reproduced as they stand in the logical framework submitted at full proposal stage (Annex C). Applicants may not reformulate the objectives or Expected Results, nor amend or lower the targets. Section 1.7 is not itself a complete logical framework. Applicants are expected to develop their own logframe using the Annex C template, building on the mandatory elements above and adding: • the outputs and activities proposed to deliver each Expected Result; • means of verification for each indicator; • assumptions and risks; • any additional indicators, in particular at output and process level, that complement the mandatory set.
3	<u>Indicators</u> <i>Can we add our own indicators? Can we have access to an indicator handbook from Enabel?</i>	Indicators. The indicators and targets in Section 1.7 of the Guidelines are a mandatory minimum and must be reflected as they stand in the logical framework (Annex C). Applicants may add further indicators — in particular output and process indicators specific to their approach — provided these complement rather than replace the mandatory set,

		and provided the related data collection is realistic within the proposed budget and the 20-month duration. Indicator handbook. no further guidance document will be issued under this Call. Applicants should work from Section 1.7 and, where useful, from publicly available references such as the national Master Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction (PDRRD 2017–2030), the Sendai Framework monitoring indicators, the Sphere minimum standards and the OECD-DAC Gender Marker guidance.
4	<u>Infrastructure</u> <i>Was a technical evaluation conducted of the existing infrastructure, and does it confirm suitability for improvements? Will any technical documentation about the schools be provided?</i>	The priority schools in Cabaceira Pequena (Mossuril) and Mexixine-Namatida-rio (Namacurra) were identified with district authorities on the basis of site visits. No detailed structural engineering assessment has been carried out to date. A hazard-informed technical assessment of the existing structures, and the resulting design, are part of the action and must be included in the proposed activities, workplan and budget. Design solutions must comply with Decree 122/2021 and be adapted to the dominant local hazard, as set out in Section 1.9. Applicants should reflect this in their approach: the technical assessment and design should be scheduled early enough in the 20-month period to allow procurement and completion of works, and applicants are expected to explain in their proposal how they will manage the risk that assessment findings affect the scope or cost of works.
5	<u>Gender and Social Strategy Update</u> <i>Does Enabel have an updated gender and social strategy following the 2019 version?</i>	Yes, Enabel has a new strategy for 2025-2030.
6	<u>Integration of Gender in the Proposal</u> <i>How should gender be integrated into the proposal?</i>	Gender equality and social inclusion are core requirements of this Call and are expected to be reflected in the substance of the proposed design — shelter arrangements, governance structures, early-warning and response mechanisms, and sustainability arrangements — rather than presented as a separate cross-cutting statement. The applicable requirements are set out in Sections 1.4, 1.7, 1.9 (cross-cutting operational requirements) and 1.10 of the Guidelines, and the participation targets in Section 2.1.2. Applicants should also note that gender and inclusion expertise is a specific assessment criterion in the concept note evaluation grid (Annex E1a).

LEGAL

N°	Issue / question raised	Response
----	-------------------------	----------

7	<u>Supporting documents</u> <i>Are references, supporting documents (e.g., contracts, final reports, progress reports), and CVs required at the Concept Note stage?</i>	Yes, all three are required at concept note stage and form part of the administrative and admissibility check; an incomplete submission may be rejected on that basis without proceeding to evaluation. Please refer to Section 3.1 of the Guidelines for the full list of documents to be provided, and to Section 2.2.1 for the detailed requirements on references, supporting evidence and technical team composition. The organisational experience tables are in Annex A, sections 1.4 and 1.5.
8	<u>Deadline</u> <i>What is the exact deadline, given the discrepancy between 11:55 pm on your guidelines and 10:00 am on the submit platform?</i>	Deadline is 14/09 at 11: 55 pm it has been corrected as well on the submit platform.
9	<u>Duration</u> <i>The maximum duration is 20 months. What is minimum duration? Is 12 months acceptable?</i>	Thank you for your question. The Guidelines set a maximum duration of 20 months and do not specify a minimum. Applicants should note, however, that under Section 2.1.2 they must demonstrate that all works, simulations, piloting, documentation and institutional anchoring activities can be completed within the duration they propose. Feasibility of the proposed timeline is assessed as part of the evaluation.
10	<u>Location</u> <i>We understand that the specific location of the project intervention in Namacurra is Mexixine – Namatida Rio. However it is not clear if it is only Namatida Rio or the wider area of Mexixine.</i>	The Namacurra School is located in Mexixine-Namatida Rio, and interventions will be conducted solely at this school. However, engagement with the district government through supervisory services is mandatory. The early warning component for livelihoods will be prioritized to pilot in this community (additional communities might be involved), yet the approach should encompass a district-wide dimension. Due to the nature of the early warning system, it is necessary to involve district authorities, INGD, INAM, and all key institutions outlined in the established national-district institutional mechanisms for early warning coordination.
11	<i>The Guideline does not indicate the Navision Number. Could you please provide it or advise us on what we should do?</i>	Navision code is MOZ2200511
12	<i>The forms for Part A and Part B are included together. When submitting the Concept Note, should Part B be omitted?</i>	Yes. Applicants whose concept notes are shortlisted will be invited to submit a full proposal using Annex A, Part B of the Grant Application File.
13	<i>Should other documents, such as the Statutes, Financial Statements, CVs, among others, all be submitted in English, or does this requirement apply only to the Concept Note?</i>	The concept note (Annex A, Part A) must be submitted in English, as set out in Section 2.2.1 of the Guidelines. Documents forming part of the assessment — CVs, the staffing plan, and the supporting evidence for project references — should be submitted in English. Official documents such as statutes and financial statements should be submitted in English or accompanied by an English translation. This is necessary to allow the Evaluation Committee to properly assess the eligibility and legal status

		of the applicant.
14	<u>Participation in the two lots</u> <i>If applying for both lots, can we submit a single concept note, or is a separate concept note required for each lot?</i>	A separate concept note is required for each lot, as the two lots are evaluated independently. An organization may apply as lead applicant for both lots, provided it submits two distinct concept notes, one per lot.
15	<i>If the same applicant or consortium applies for both lots, will its operational and financial capacity be assessed against the combined requirements of implementing both lots simultaneously, or separately for each lot?</i>	Concept notes and full proposals are evaluated separately for each lot, and scored on their own merits against the criteria in Annexes E1a and E2a. The assessment of financial and operational capacity, however, considers the applicant's capacity to deliver what it has proposed. Where an applicant or consortium applies for both lots, it should demonstrate the capacity to implement both simultaneously — in terms of staffing, management structure, field presence in two provinces, and financial capacity relative to the combined grant value. Applicants are advised to make this explicit in their proposal. This applies in particular at the organisational assessment stage (Section 2.3, Step 3), which is conducted at entity level and examines whether the applicant has the capacity required to complete the action awarded to it. For the financial capacity assessment, the requirement for an external audit report for the last available financial year applies where the total grant amount requested exceeds EUR 100,000, without distinction between lots.
16	Do the lead applicant and co-applicants each need experience across both technical pillars, or can they demonstrate complementary experience?	Complementarity is acceptable. The applicant and co-applicant do not necessarily need to demonstrate experience across both pillars individually, provided that their respective roles and experience are complementary, relevant and clearly justified.
17	Can a co-applicant be removed during implementation?	Applicants should ensure that co-applicants are fully informed, committed and involved in developing the application. A co-applicant is an integral part of the proposed action, and removing an essential co-applicant during implementation could affect the viability of the approved action.
18	<i>Will applications be evaluated and ranked entirely independently for each lot, or may cross-lot coherence, harmonisation and efficiencies offered by the same consortium be considered during evaluation and final award?</i>	Concept notes and full proposals are evaluated and ranked independently for each lot, strictly on the criteria set out in Annexes E1a and E2a. Efficiencies or coherence arising from the same applicant being awarded both lots are not among these criteria and cannot be taken into account in scoring, in order to ensure equal treatment of applicants submitting for a single lot. Applicants applying for both lots must therefore submit, for each lot, a complete and self-standing action covering all four Expected Results and adapted to the hazard profile and target community of that district. A proposal for one lot may not depend on the applicant being awarded the other.

		Where an applicant is selected for both lots, Section 2.1.2 provides that this will lead to a single Grant Agreement. This concerns the contractual arrangements following the award decision and does not affect the evaluation or ranking of applications.
19	Can members of local disaster management committees be involved in the implementation/construction activities and receive remuneration?	The participation of local disaster management committees is encouraged and should be considered in the implementation. However, remuneration of committee members is not mandated by the call and was not established as an eligible cost. Payment of per diem might be possible if aligned with the contracting beneficiary policy and a reasonable amount.
20	<u>Participation of UN agencies</u> Can UNESCO participate as a lead applicant?	UN agencies may participate provided that they meet the eligibility criteria and are able to comply with the applicable conditions of the call. Please note, however, that the standard grant/subsidy contractual conditions, including the requirements concerning the justification of expenditure, will apply. If selected, the applicant would therefore need to accept these conditions in order to enter into a grant contract. The contracting modality cannot subsequently be changed to a cooperation agreement. The draft grant contract and the applicable guidelines has been attached to the call documents, allowing applicants to assess the contractual requirements in advance. Therefore, UNESCO may participate as a lead applicant, provided that it is eligible and is able to accept and comply with the applicable grant/subsidy conditions.
21	<u>Participation of private companies</u> Can private companies participate as co-applicants?	After verification private companies are not allowed under this call
22	<u>Criminal Record Requirement for the Applicant Entity (Italy)</u> We would appreciate clarification regarding the requirement to submit “an extract from the criminal record or an equally valid document issued by the competent judicial or administrative authority” for the applicant entity and its director. Our question concerns specifically the applicant entity. Under Italian legislation, there is no criminal record certificate for legal entities equivalent to the certificate issued for natural persons. Would a declaration signed by the legal representative be accepted as an equivalent document, confirming that the organisation: • is not subject to any pending criminal proceedings; • has not been subject to any final criminal conviction; and	The documents referred to in Section 2.2.1, including the criminal record or equivalent document for the entity and its directors, as well as the certificate or equivalent confirming that the entity is still in business, do not need to be submitted together with the Concept Note. At the Concept Note stage, applicants are required to declare that they will be able to provide these documents upon request during the evaluation process. If requested, the applicant must provide the relevant supporting documents, including: - an extract from the criminal record or equivalent document for the entity and its directors; - a certificate or equivalent confirming that the entity is still in business;

	• does not fall under any of the exclusion criteria set out in the Call for Proposals? The declaration would be a legally binding “Substitute Declaration in Lieu of an Affidavit” under Articles 47 and 76 of Italian Presidential Decree No. 445/2000, which carries legal responsibility for false or misleading statements. If this declaration is not acceptable, could you please indicate which document or alternative evidence would be accepted for an Italian legal entity?	a valid tax compliance certificate; and a valid social security compliance certificate. Where a criminal record or equivalent document for the entity does not exist in the applicant's country, an equivalent document should be provided where available. If no such equivalent exists, the declaration by the applicant may be accepted, subject to verification by Enabel. For the purpose of this requirement, "directors" should be understood broadly and includes managers or persons with representation, internal decision-making or supervisory responsibilities, as well as members of the entity's administrative, management or control bodies.
23	<u>Criminal Record Requirement for the Applicant Entity (Sweden)</u> Our organisation is registered and headquartered in Sweden. Swedish authorities, including the police, do not issue criminal records for legal entities, only for individuals. Could you advise whether we may submit an alternative document instead, such as a signed declaration from the organisation's authorised representative confirming that it is not subject to the relevant exclusion grounds? Separately, regarding the criminal records required for "directors": could you clarify who this term refers to? For example, does it include the board chair, board members, the secretary general, and/or the managers within the global management group?	See 14. Director' of the counterparty must be understood in the broad sense: i.e. the manager or any person with representation, internal decision-making or supervisory capacity at the counterparty's or a member of the counterparty's administrative, management or control body.
24	<u>Supporting Documents – Sections 2.2.1 and 3.1</u> We would appreciate clarification regarding the documents required under Sections 2.2.1 and 3.1 of the Guidelines. Section 2.2.1 appears to require applicants to provide: • a criminal record or equivalent document for the entity and its directors; and • a certificate or equivalent document confirming that the entity is still in business. However, we cannot find these documents in the list of documents to be submitted under Section 3.1. Furthermore, page 20 states that applicants must declare that they will be able to provide upon request:	The documents referred to in Section 2.2.1, including the criminal record or equivalent document for the entity and its directors, as well as the certificate or equivalent confirming that the entity is still in business, do not need to be submitted together with the Concept Note. At the Concept Note stage, applicants are required to declare that they will be able to provide these documents upon request during the evaluation process of the full proposal.

	• an extract from the criminal record or equivalent for the entity and its directors; • a certificate or equivalent confirming that the entity is still in business; • a valid tax compliance certificate; and • a valid social security compliance certificate. Could you please clarify whether the criminal record documents and the certificate confirming that the entity is still in business must be submitted together with the Concept Note, or whether they only need to be provided upon request during the evaluation process?	
25	<u>Supporting Documents – Organisational Experience</u> As providing supporting documents for each project reported could result in a significant volume of documentation, would Enabel accept, at the Concept Note stage, a declaration signed by the legal representative confirming that the reported projects have been or are being implemented by the organisation within the last five years, and undertaking to provide the supporting documents upon request during the evaluation process? The proposed declaration would be a legally binding “Substitute Declaration in Lieu of an Affidavit” under Articles 47 and 76 of Italian Presidential Decree No. 445/2000. Under Italian legislation, such a declaration has the same legal value as certificates issued by competent authorities and carries criminal liability in the event of false or misleading statements.	A declaration in lieu cannot be accepted as a substitute at concept note stage. The supporting documents form part of the administrative and admissibility verification carried out before evaluation, and applications are checked on the documents actually submitted. This applies equally to all applicants. The requirement is, however, lighter than it may appear: • Only one supporting document is required per reference, not all of the listed types. • Extracts are sufficient — for a contract or grant agreement, the cover page and the sections indicating role, budget and duration; for a project report, the cover page and executive summary. • Nothing obliges applicants to report a large number of references. Applicants are advised to present a focused set of the most relevant assignments, ensuring that the three components of the action — resilient infrastructure or shelters, community-based DRR or early warning, and community mobilisation — are each evidenced. • Experience is assessed at consortium level, so references may be distributed across the applicant and co-applicants, provided each is attributed to a named organisation.
26	<u>Supporting documents - References</u> In the case of grant-funded projects to be submitted as references, could an internal report or other document prepared by the organisation be accepted as supporting evidence of the experience and its financial value?	A project report prepared by the applicant is acceptable where it was submitted to the donor or contracting authority in the framework of the assignment concerned — for example a final or interim narrative or financial report. The cover page and executive summary are sufficient. Where available, evidence of the donor's acceptance or approval strengthens the reference. Documents produced solely for internal purposes, and not submitted to the donor or contracting authority, are not accepted as supporting evidence. For grant-funded projects, the grant agreement itself is normally the most straightforward evidence: the cover page

		together with the sections indicating the applicant's role, the budget and the duration is sufficient, and no full copy is required. The four options listed in Section 2.2.1 remain alternatives — only one document per reference is required, and applicants may choose whichever is easiest to produce for each assignment.
27	In cases where the project was funded internally, how could we provide supporting documentation to demonstrate our experience?	A similar project does not necessarily have to have been funded by an external donor to demonstrate relevant technical experience. The applicant should provide sufficient objective evidence to demonstrate the experience, including the organisation's role, the project scope and budget, and how the project was implemented. This information may be subject to verification as part of the due diligence process. However, internally funded projects may not provide evidence of the applicant's experience in managing donor-funded grants, including reporting to and responding to requirements or challenges from an external donor. Applicants should therefore, where applicable, provide additional evidence of their grant-management experience, particularly experience involving external funding and donor requirements.
28	<u>Supporting documents - References</u> Regarding supporting documents for each reference, the guidelines state: "Applicants are required to provide one supporting document for each project reference. This supporting document may be any one of the listed documents (and not necessarily all of them): copy of the project contract or grant agreement (cover page and relevant sections indicating role, budget, and duration); completion certificate or official acceptance letter; final or interim project report (cover page and executive summary); donor or contracting authority reference letter confirming implementation and role." The guidelines also state: "Completed Similar Reference Assignments Table (Annex A, Concept Note, sections 1.4 and 1.5) and evidence of at least one satisfactorily completed similar assignment per pillar, within the last 5 years (e.g., completion certificates, signed contracts, approved reports or invoices)." Could you confirm which of these two provisions applies? Specifically, is it correct that it is sufficient to provide supporting evidence for only one reference per pillar, and that a supporting document is not required for every reference at the concept note stage?	The two provisions are complementary rather than alternative. One supporting document is required for each reference presented in the tables in Annex A, sections 1.4 and 1.5. Only one document per reference is needed, chosen from the four options listed in Section 2.2.1, and extracts are sufficient. In addition, the references presented must demonstrate at least one satisfactorily completed similar assignment for each of the three components of the action — resilient infrastructure or shelters, community-based DRR or early warning, and community mobilisation. Section 3.1 sets this minimum coverage requirement; it does not reduce the evidence requirement for the other references presented. Applicants are therefore advised to present a focused set of the most relevant references rather than an exhaustive list, ensuring that each is supported and that the three components are covered. Experience is assessed at consortium level, so references may be distributed across the applicant and co-applicants.
29	<u>Supporting documents - References</u> Do every member of a consortium fulfill this requirement?	Yes, the co-applicant should demonstrate as well its experience.
30	How many proposals/projects does Enabel	Secondly, the number of concept notes will be reduced

	expect to fund per province?	according to their ranking in the list, by the number of concept notes whose total cumulative amount of contributions requested is equal to 200% of the budget available per lot for this Call for Proposals.
31	Number of applications per lot	A lead applicant can submit only 1 application per lot and can receive only 1 Grant Agreement per lot. A co-applicant can participate in up to 2 applications per lot, but can receive only 1 Grant Agreement per lot. A lead applicant can be a co-applicant in another application. If the same lead applicant is selected for both lots, an optimisation process will result in only 1 Grant Agreement.

FINANCIAL

N°	Issue / question raised	Response
32	<u>Discrepancy Between Guidelines and Online Form on Minimum Grant Value</u> The guidelines specify a minimum value of 400,000–460,000 EUR, but the online form shows 325,000 EUR. Could you clarify the reason for this discrepancy?	The applicable amounts are those set out in Section 1.12 of the Guidelines: Lot 1 (Mossuril): minimum EUR 400,000, maximum EUR 460,000; Lot 2 (Namacurra): minimum EUR 650,000, maximum EUR 740,000. Applicants are reminded that the requested contribution must fall within these limits. This is verified as part of the admissibility check, and applications outside the range cannot be evaluated.
33	<u>Applicability of the €60,000 Sub-grantee Cap to Co-applicants</u> There is a maximum of 60.000 EUR for sub-grantees. Is it also applicable to co-applicants?	The EUR 60,000 ceiling applies to sub-grants only. It does not apply to co-applicants. Co-applicants are not sub-grantees. If a grant is awarded, co-applicants become beneficiaries of the action alongside the contracting beneficiary, sign the mandate statement, and participate directly in implementation. Their share of the budget is determined by their role in the action and is not subject to a ceiling, provided the overall budget remains within the limits set for the lot and is coherent with the responsibilities described in the proposal. Sub-grants, as set out in Section 2.1.2, are awarded to third parties — local organisations or structures that are neither applicants, co-applicants, associates nor contractors — to support limited, clearly defined community-level actions.
34	<u>Grant Disbursement Schedule</u> How will the grant be disbursed?	The grant is disbursed in instalments, on the basis of payment requests submitted by the contracting beneficiary. The specific arrangements, including the schedule and the applicable percentages, are set out in the Grant Agreement. No payment is made before the Grant Agreement is signed. Once it is signed, an initial instalment — a percentage specified in the agreement — is disbursed without prior justification, allowing the organisation to start implementation. Subsequent instalments are disbursed in accordance with the terms of the agreement, on the basis of payment requests supported by the required justification.

		Applicants are referred to the Grant Agreement template (Annex D) and the payment request template (Annex III), published as documents for information, and are reminded that a separate bank account or sub-account allowing identification of the funds received must be opened in case of award (Section 2.5.2).
--	--	---