

**Call For Proposals for
Support to Civil Society Organisations in
Implementing Informal Waste Pickers`
Social Inclusion Projects**

Programme:

PRO - Local Governance for People and Nature

CFP reference number: PRO LGPN 04/2024

CFP document issue date: 15 October 2024

1. PARTICULAR

1.1. UNOPS project objective(s)

The PRO-Local Governance for People and Nature (PRO LGPN) Programme is designed to contribute to improving the well-being and quality of life of citizens through improved local governance, social inclusion and environmental protection in 110 cities and municipalities throughout Serbia. The Government of Switzerland has allocated USD 9.4 million to fund the Programme which will be implemented by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) in partnership with UN¹ agencies over a period of 48 months.

To achieve the Programme's Objective, the intervention will focus on three key Pillars and Outcomes:

1. Pillar Good Governance, Outcome 1: LGs improve capacities and apply good governance principles in practice;
2. Pillar Social Inclusion, Outcome 2: LGs and other relevant local actors improve capacities and develop evidence-based local social protection policies;
3. Pillar Environmental Governance, Outcome 3: LGs improve capacities and apply environmental governance processes in practice.

The key stakeholders, but also direct users of support at the local level, will be local governments (cities and municipalities), including their administrations/staff, organisations, and local institutions (Centres for Social Work - CSWs, Primary Health Centres - PHCs, pre-school institutions and schools), local Civil Society Organisations – CSOs. The final users of support will be the citizens from participating LGs.

All Programme activities will be undertaken in partnership with the Government of Serbia, especially the Ministry of Public Administration and Local Self-Governments (MPALSG), the Ministry of Labour, Employment, Veteran and Social Affairs (MLEVSA), the Ministry of Environmental Protection (MEP), and the Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities (SCTM).

The Programme will coordinate its activities with the key line-national-level institutions, while observing the national strategies, laws and relevant development documents, which will contribute to sustainability, ensure national ownership and develop national capacities.

Within the Social Inclusion Outcome, the Programme will also provide support to a number of informal waste pickers, affected by modernisation of the waste management system on the territory of 42 LGs² covered by the [Solid Waste Programme](#), co-financed by the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) and French Development Agency (AFD). This Programme intervention aims at enhancing livelihood recovery and access to the public services relevant for informal waste pickers' social inclusion such as health, education and social protection.

The Solid Waste Programme (SWP) will upgrade Serbia's waste management system development of six regional waste management centres along with closure of 15 municipal dumpsites causing many informal waste pickers to face losing their livelihoods. Although the Programme determined that a total of 63 families with 321 family members with the residence on 12 LGs³ will be directly impacted by the SWP, the

¹ UN Agencies as implementing partners: UNICEF, UNFPA, UNEP

² Apatin, Arilje, Babušnica, Bač, Bajina Bašta, Barajevo, Bela Palanka, Bogatić, Čačak, Čajetina, Dimitrovgrad, Ivanjica, Koceljeva, Kosjerić, Krupanj, Kula, Lajkovac, Lazarevac, Ljig, Ljubovija, Loznica, Lučani, Mali Zvornik, Mionica, Nova Varoš, Obrenovac, Odžaci, Osečina, Piroć, Požega, Priboj, Prijepolje, Ruma, Šabac, Šid, Sjenica, Sombor, Sremska Mitrovica, Ub, Užice, Valjevo and Vladimirci.

³ Apatin, Bač, Kula, Loznica, Obrenovac, Odžaci, Prijepolje, Ruma, Sremska Mitrovica, Ub, Valjevo (including Vladimirci) and Šid

modernisation of the waste management system will not only affect the livelihood of dump/landfill waste pickers but also of the general group of informal waste pickers. The Programme supported 10 LGs for institutionalisation of waste pickers' livelihoods protection through establishment of Local Coordination Mechanisms as a multisector working body for systemic addressing to waste pickers' needs and provision of integrated support. This body includes representatives of various local institutions such as Centre for Social Welfare, NES, Health Centre, Public Utility Company, even the business sector.

1.2. Background and objectives of the grant/funding

Having in mind that the estimated 35,000 to 50,000 informal waste pickers are economically active in Serbia, as well as that the informal sector is contributing the most to the 80% of the country's total recycling activity, this clearly indicates the need to secure this gains and integrate informal waste pickers into the formal solid waste management system and to support those affected with this EBRD/AFD intervention in livelihood restoration process.⁴

Waste picking provides important opportunities to people who have few or no marketable skills and low-level education, and no alternative sources of income to survive. Also, waste pickers' living conditions remain harsh, and their working conditions continue to be dangerous due to hazardous waste. Given the social, economic, and environmental benefits waste pickers bring, and particularly their contribution to circular economy goals in developing nations, the role of waste pickers has mostly been undervalued on the development agenda.

Many waste pickers are also facing health hazards as their work entails high health risks, including exposure to medical waste. In addition, health risks, but also environmental issues, are also associated with the use of primitive handling methods to extract e-waste components such as power supplies, compressors, processors and capacitors.

It is equally important to be aware of different social consequences for women and entire households engaged in recycling. Oftentimes, men extract waste from the streets or dumpsites, while women, children and the elderly process it before it is sold. Thus, opportunities to improve the life of impacted households should be age and gender sensitive and meet their different needs i.e. not only through better employment opportunities but also through better access to education, social welfare and health services.

With this Call for Proposal (CFP), the Programme will provide support in the implementation of social integrated services with the aim of addressing the needs of local informal waste pickers and their families in order to improve their quality of life, particularly when it comes to their livelihood restoration and better access to public services.

The Overall objective of this CFP is to address social inclusion and reduce poverty among informal waste pickers by enhancing local capacities to provide integrated and sustainable social inclusion policies and practices.

The Specific Objective of this CFP is to enhance the capacity of CSOs in areas such as financial management, advocacy, service delivery, and partnership building to establish or improve integrated social inclusion services, contributing to livelihood restoration as well as ensuring accessibility, quality, and sustainability for informal waste pickers and their families.

⁴ [Inclusion of Waste Collectors into Evolving Waste Management System in Serbia, GIZ, 2018](#)

1.3. Targeted impact of the grant/funding

Planned targeted impact of this CFP is strengthening the overall capacity of CSOs to deliver sustainable and integrated social services while **at least 1000 informal waste pickers and their family members** benefiting from livelihood restoration and better access to social integrated services at the local level.

1.4. Scope of the grant/funding

The Programme will directly support **at least 10 CSOs** to implement projects in delivery of integrated social policies and practices that will address the needs of the local informal waste pickers and their families, while the following **key thematic areas** will be addressed:

1. **Economic empowerment of informal waste pickers** through employment, education and training, with particular focus on women, persons with disabilities, youth and social assistance beneficiaries with the aim of their improved social inclusion;
2. **Improve availability of public services** i.e. equal access to and enhance efficiency, effectiveness and equitable distribution (including health, education and social protection services) to local informal waste pickers;

In both options, the projects are expected to address better social inclusion of informal waste pickers through a social integrated approach which enhances efficiency, effectiveness and equitable distribution of service to local informal waste pickers. The integrated (inter-sectoral) approach should be applied to at least two from the following four thematic areas: employment, social protection, education and health.

Indicative budget for the Call is USD 150,000 while maximum amount of the grant is USD 15,000.

1.5. Target beneficiaries

This CFP is specifically targeting **the informal waste pickers and their family members, with residence on the territory of 42 LGs⁵ covered by the SWP.**

Informal waste picker definition: a person informally engaged in collection and recovery of reusable and recyclable solid waste from the source of waste generation i.e. the streets, bins, landfills and waste disposal facilities who sell it to recyclers directly or through intermediaries to earn their livelihood.

1.6. Eligible activities under grant/funding

The following are eligible activities:

Economic empowerment:

- Support to improve the employability and skills of those not in work and low-skilled through more intensive, flexible and tailor-made approach i.e. on-the-job training
- Engage with employers to encourage them to commit to re-skill, up-skill and recruit from target group

⁵ Apatin, Arilje, Babušnica, Bač, Bajina Bašta, Barajevo, Bela Palanka, Bogatić, Čačak, Čajetina, Dimitrovgrad, Ivanjica, Koceljeva, Kosjerić, Krupanj, Kula, Lajkovac, Lazarevac, Ljig, Ljubovija, Loznica, Lučani, Mali Zvornik, Mionica, Nova Varoš, Obrenovac, Odžaci, Osečina, Piroć, Požega, Prijepolje, Ruma, Šabac, Šid, Sjenica, Sombor, Sremska Mitrovica, Ub, Užice, Valjevo and Vladimirci.

- Formal or non-formal learning through vocationally-orientated training
- Entrepreneurship (social entrepreneurship, cooperatives, entrepreneurship and other business forms) and start-up support
- Other related supportive sub activities, to enable overcoming of identified obstacles and challenges in realisation of education, capacity building and raising employability.

Improved availability to public services:

- Service provision per se, including engagement of supporting staff for efficient implementation of the service
- Service-specific assets/utility items required for provision of services (e.g. furniture, appliances, equipment, tools, assistive technology, etc.), if these are not otherwise available
- Small scale renovation, adaptation or equipping of premises for service provision while the premises must be in the ownership of the lead applicant or partner local institution
- Other activities not listed, which laterally support the improvement of health, educational, social and economic inclusion of the target groups

Promotional activities, including an outreach campaign, are allowable for both thematic areas.

Note: all activities should be implemented on the territory of 42 LGs covered by the SWP.

1.7. Grant/funding available

The overall indicative amount made available under this CFP is up to USD 150,000. The Programme reserves the right not to award all available funds.

Grant/funding amount limit per applicant

The following table indicates the limit of grant/funding allowable per applicant under this CFP.

Currency	Minimum and Maximum Amount	Amount in words
USD	12,000 - 15,000	Twelve thousands - Fifteen thousands

Eligibility of costs: costs that can be included

Only eligible costs can be covered by a grant. The categories of costs that are eligible and non-eligible are indicated below. The budget is both a cost estimate and an overall ceiling for eligible costs.

Eligible direct costs

To be eligible under the CFP, costs must refer only to activities specified in the Section 1.6 Eligible activities under grant/funding.

Eligible costs include:

- Human resources costs i.e. salaries for team members and consultants fees
- Local office and travel costs for the purpose of project implementation

- Equipment and material costs for the active labour measure or service provision
- Other expenses related to active labour measure or service provision i.e. subventions for unemployed and employers, renovation or adaptation of premises for service provision
- Training or service provision costs by contracting training provider or service provider
- Promotional costs

All costs and expenses have to be duly substantiated and incurred after the signing of the Grant Support Agreement.

Ineligible costs

The following costs are not eligible:

- In general, activities that are not contributing to the achievement of the objectives of the CFP
- In-kind contributions
- Bank commission charges (bank fees, opening and servicing bank account, etc.)
- All costs incurred prior to the signing of Grant Support Agreement or accrued after project closure
- Debts and debt service charges (interest)
- Provisions for losses or potential future liabilities
- Costs declared by the Beneficiary(ies) and financed by another project or founding source
- Currency exchange losses
- Procurement of the equipment that is not grounded in the objectives of the CFP and without specific outcome
- Procurement of the used/old equipment
- Credit to third parties, loans and debts
- Auditing costs
- Unforeseen expenses
- Activities that can be more appropriately funded from other funding sources
- Activities where a substantial part of the budget covers recurrent costs and/or personnel costs
- Travel, catering and/or conference services costs not founded in project rationale
- Research or promotional activities with no specific outcomes
- Extensive hardware/software purchases without a true foundation in project rationale
- Extensive costs for promotional activities
- Items from the budget, including office costs, fees or salaries, already funded by other sources (other projects, other organisations – public or civic, etc.)

1.8. Grant/funding duration

The implementation of activities from the projects will last for a **maximum of up to 12 (twelve) months**, and for a **minimum of 10 (ten) months**, from the day the grant contract is signed.

Note: active provision of **active labour measures must last at least 3 (three) months** while the active provision of **social integrated services must last at least 8 (eight) months**.

1.9. Applicant eligibility

Applicant

The following applicants are eligible to apply under this CFP:

- Be a registered citizen's non-for-profit organisation or association (CSOs) **with the seat in one of 110 municipalities within the PRO LGPN Programme Area of Responsibility (AoR)**. Organisations with a seat outside of the PRO LGPN Programme AoR are not eligible for this Call.

Note: project activities should be implemented **only on the territory of 42 municipalities** covered by the SWP, thus in case of different place of Applicant's seat and implementation of activities, the Applicant must prove an organisational and financial capacities to successfully as well as cost-effectively carry on implementation of proposed action

- Only CSOs legally **registered for at least 2 (two) years**.
- For project proposals involving **provision of social protection services for which licence is required**, such a CSO **must be licensed** for provision of the proposed social protection services or **to have at least two years of experience** in provision of such services.
- **The partnership**, formalised through a legally binding agreement, between applicant CSO and local institution i.e. LG, CSW, National Employment Service (NES), school, hospital, etc. **is mandatory** for the application to this Call

The applicant must meet following additional mandatory requirements:

- **Mandatory partnership with local institution(s) relevant for proposed integrated service** i.e. LGs, Centre for Social Work (CSW)⁶ National Employment Service (NES), school, hospital, etc. in a written form (Partnership Agreement), signed by both/all partners, and with a clear division of tasks and responsibilities.

This Call encourages Roma-led CSOs or other CSO with provable track-record from the previous projects addressing improvement of Roma status to apply.

Note: projects on economic empowerment of youth as a target group that would be on the territory of Pirot, Požega and Šabac should plan cooperation/coordination with the SDC funded project "Education to Employment" through its partner organisation in mentioned municipalities.

Number of proposals and grants per applicant

- The applicant may submit only one (1) proposal under this CFP.
- The applicant can be awarded with only one grant under this CFP.

1.10. Content of proposal submissions

Applicants shall include the following:

- **Annex 1: Declarations**
- **Annex 1a: Eligibility Declaration for Partner(s)**
- **Annex 2: Proposal**
- **Annex 3: Financial proposal/Budget**
- **Annex 4: Protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA) implementing partner self-assessment**
- Signed Partnership Agreement on integrated service delivery in Serbian

NOTE: ALL documents must be submitted and all content except partnership agreement should be in English.

Applicants must carefully read and understand the **Requirements** in this CFP and the **Instructions to Applicants** before completing the Proposal and Annexes.

⁶ CSW as a project partner must be mandated for the territory of LG where activities are implemented

1.11. Partial proposals

Partial proposals will not be permitted. Applicants shall submit a proposal for the total scope of the grant/funding and address all of the requirements in this CFP. Evaluation will be based on compliance with the total requirements.

1.12. Sub-granting⁷ and contracting⁸

Sub-granting and contracting are only permitted under this CFP as follows:

Sub-granting	Not permissible
Contracting	Permissible

Solicited contractors

The applicant will act as the lead organisation and, if selected, as the contracting party (the "Grant Beneficiary").

The Grant Beneficiaries have the possibility to award contracts for works, services and/or goods to solicited contractors through procurement procedures provided by the Programme. Contractors are neither partners nor associates, and are subject to the procurement rules in accordance with the PRO LGPN Programme Procurement Manual.

1.13. Proposal currency

The proposal budget shall be prepared in the following currency: U.S. Dollars

1.14. Language of proposals

All proposals, information, documents and correspondence exchanged between UNOPS and the applicant shall be in English.

For a list of documents that can be submitted in Serbian language, please refer to the Section 1.10 Content of proposal submissions.

1.15. Proposal submission

The deadline for the submission of proposals is 28 November 2024.

The Proposal and all accompanying documents must be submitted in the following manner:

- The Proposal must be submitted via email in PDF format (signed, stamped and scanned) and in original editable format. Signed, stamped and scanned versions must contain exactly the same proposal documents as the electronic versions in original editable format. In case of discrepancies, signed, stamped and scanned versions will prevail.

⁷ Sub-grant is when an entity is selected by the implementing partner to implement activities on behalf of the implementing partner and complies with the same principles as outlined in the UNOPS Operational Instruction on [Grant Support](#).

⁸ Contracting is done when an implementing partner procures services, goods or works using the procurement procedures provided by the Programme.

- The applicant must submit the Proposal and all accompanying Annexes in English language, unless specified otherwise within the Section 1.10 Content of proposal submissions.
- The limitations in the length of sections listed in the Proposal Form must be respected. The content of sections exceeding these limitations will not be taken into account. The total email size of the proposal and accompanying annexes should not exceed 15 MB, as that is the maximum allowed email message size by the UNOPS server. If the proposal and accompanying annexes are larger than 15 MB, documents should be sent in a series of emails, with each email not exceeding 15 MB size thresholds. Each email should be numbered in the email subject field (email subject/number).
- Proposals must be submitted to the email address rsoc.applications@unops.org Automatic notification of the delivery would follow upon successful receipt of the email proposal.
- When sending the proposal, the email subject field must contain the reference number of the Call and the title of the Call for Proposals (PRO LGPNI 04-2024 - Informal Waste Pickers Social Inclusion Projects), including also the name of the applicant.
- Requests for clarification should be submitted to the email address rsoc.cfp.clarifications@unops.org
- The deadline for the submission of proposals is 28 November 2024. Any proposal submitted after the deadline will be rejected.
- Refer to Article 10, “Proposal Submission”, of the [Instructions to Applicants](#) for details on the specific requirements for proposal submission.

1.16. Type of legal instrument

The applicable legal instrument is Grant Support Agreement.

1.17. Contact information

All correspondence in relation to this CFP shall be as follows:

- Requests for clarifications - rsoc.cfp.clarifications@unops.org
- Submission of proposal - rsoc.applications@unops.org

1.18. Important dates and deadlines

The following tables provide the key dates and deadlines pertaining to this CFP.

	Date	Time	Time zone
Online info-session	22 October 2024	10:00	Serbia
Online info-session	23 October 2024	10:00	Serbia
Deadline for requesting any clarifications from the Programme	18 November 2024	17:00	Serbia
Deadline for submission of proposal	28 November 2024	24:00	Serbia
Expected agreement start date	4 March 2025		Serbia

1.19. Additional instructions for applicants

Conditions for implementation after the Programme's decision to award a grant

Following the decision to award a grant, the Grant Beneficiary will be offered a contract. By signing the Annex 1: Declarations, the applicant agrees, if awarded a grant, to accept the contractual conditions of the standard grant contract. Each Partner should sign Annex 1a: Eligibility Declaration for Partner(s) related to eligibility and solvency.

The Programme would use grant methodology for implementation of the approved projects.

Financial implementation

A separate sub-account must be opened by the Applicant for the implementation of the project in cooperation with the PRO LGPN Programme team. The sub-account must be exempt from blockade. All payments within the grant contract have to be done from the Applicant's sub-account.

In accordance with the UNOPS Grant policy, no funds shall be paid as profit to the Partner organisation. Consequently:

- Lead Applicant is not permitted to award a service contract to Partner Organisation.
- A Partner organisation is not permitted to submit invoices to the Lead Applicant.

Data Protection

UNOPS shall ensure an appropriate protection of received data subject provided by the Applicant in accordance with the applicable UNOPS Key Privacy Principles (ref. UNOPS Executive Office Directive Ref. EOD.ED.2019.01). Data subjects shall therefore be managed carefully by UNOPS and in a coherent manner across the organisation, particularly ensuring respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms of individuals, in particular the right to privacy.

Visibility

The grantee will be expected to comply with communications and visibility requirements as set by PRO LGPN Programme. The Programme will provide the grantees with adequate guidelines and other information prior to the beginning of the project implementation.

These requirements cover the written and visual identity of PRO LGPN Programme, the donor, and the implementing agency, and they apply to print, electronic and any other material, presentation, banner, invitation, sign, plaque or goods purchased with the funds provided by the donors and managed by the PRO LGPN Programme.

VAT

All expenses (except costs of land-line/mobile telephone, electricity and public heating – if envisaged) planned and presented in the budget must NOT include VAT.

2. REQUIREMENTS

2.1. Approach and methodology

The Applicant must meet the following specific requirements:

A. Mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues

Good Governance

The Applicant must elaborate on how the implementation of the specific action will contribute to improved local governance and enhanced good governance principles of accountability, transparency, participation, non-discrimination and efficiency. Good governance principles and approaches must be embedded in the action methodology. Consistent application of principles of participation and non-discrimination needs to be proven, ensuring that all persons fully practise their human rights and fundamental freedoms without discrimination on any grounds.

Gender Mainstreaming

The non-discriminative and gender balanced approach should be provided throughout the process of design and implementation of the action, enabling equal access of men and women, boys and girls to all project activities and benefits. Gender disaggregated reporting is an integral part of project reporting. The applicants are strongly encouraged by this Programme to include female members, thus respecting the gender equality and anti-discrimination principles.

B. Sustainability

The applicant must describe the main preconditions and assumptions during and after the implementation phase. A detailed risk analysis and possible contingency plans must be developed. This should include at least a list of risks associated with each activity proposed accompanied by relevant mitigation measures. A good risk analysis would include a range of risk types including physical, environmental, political, economic and social risks. The applicant must explain how sustainability will be secured after completion of the action. This can include aspects of necessary measures and strategies built into the action, follow-up activities and ownership by local institutions.

In doing so, a distinction between the following **dimensions of sustainability** must be made:

- Financial sustainability (financing of follow-up activities, sources for covering all future operating and maintenance costs, etc.);
- Institutional level (which structures would allow, and how, the results of the action to continue to be in place after the end of the action? Address issues about the local "ownership" of action outcomes);
- Policy level where applicable (What structural impact will the action have - e.g. will it lead to improved legislation, codes of conduct, methods, etc.).

2.2. Implementation Plan requirements

The applicant is required to submit an **indicative implementation plan** for implementation of the action. Applicants are recommended to base the estimated duration for each activity and total period on the most probable duration and not on the shortest possible duration by taking into consideration all relevant factors that may affect the implementation timetable.

The activities stated in the implementation plan should correspond to the activities described in detail in the Section 1.6 Eligible activities under grant/funding. The implementation plan should be sufficiently detailed to give an overview of the preparation and implementation of each activity. The implementation plan should be drawn up using the format provided in the Proposal.

To ensure that the project timeline is both realistic and feasible, it is important to consider the time required for essential administrative activities, which are integral to the project's success. These activities include, but are not limited to, opening a bank account, vendor registration, and conducting administrative checks.

The aforementioned activities should be considered alongside the operational and implementation activities of the project. It is recommended to allocate a minimum of 30 calendar days to complete these administrative steps. This buffer ensures that any potential delays do not adversely impact the project start date or overall progress. Additionally, flexibility should be built into the project timeline for any unforeseen administrative delays, ensuring the project remains on track.

2.3. Monitoring Plan requirements

Monitoring by the applicant

The applicant is required to develop an **effective and efficient monitoring system** with gender segregated data, according to the proposed activities.

Monitoring by the UNOPS

It is understood that the selected applicants (the Grant Beneficiaries) shall have exclusive control over the administration and implementation of this Agreement and that UNOPS shall not interfere in the exercise of such control. However, both the quality of the Grant Beneficiaries' work and the progress being made toward successfully achieving the goals of such activities shall be subject to review by UNOPS. If at any time UNOPS is not satisfied with the quality of work or the progress being made toward achieving such goals, UNOPS may in its discretion (i) withhold payment of funds until in its opinion the situation has been corrected, or (ii) declare this Agreement terminated by written notice to the Grant Beneficiary; and/or (iii) seek any other remedy as may be necessary. UNOPS' determination as to the quality of work being performed and the progress being made toward such goals shall be final and shall be binding and conclusive for the Grant Beneficiary.

2.4. Budget requirements

The applicant is required to submit a budget using the template provided in Annex 3: Financial proposal/Budget. Special attention should be paid to eligible and ineligible costs, as elaborated in the Section 1.7 under sub-heading Eligibility of costs.

a. Budget Ceiling

The following table indicates the limit (minimum and maximum amount) of grant/funding allowable per applicant under this CFP:

USD	12,000 - 15,000	Twelve thousands - Fifteen thousands
-----	-----------------	--------------------------------------

b. At a minimum, the budgets must include:

- i. An estimate of direct costs, which include all of the expenses that are required for, and can be tracked directly to, the grant/funding accounts. Direct costs must be broken down by expense subcategory and by expense line item.
 - ii. A description of assumptions or justifications underlying the estimates
- c. The costs will be eligible only if these are incurred for the purpose of this grant/funding and within the duration mentioned in the grant support agreement (including any amendments)

3. EVALUATION METHOD AND CRITERIA

Proposals submitted in response to this CFP document shall be evaluated following the cumulative analysis methodology, which consists of the following steps:

- a. **Preliminary screening:** This includes an assessment of whether proposals comply with the formal and eligibility criteria stated in [Table 1: Formal and eligibility criteria](#). All proposals which pass this stage will go through a subsequent evaluation as follows.
- b. **Technical evaluation:** This assesses the technical points achieved by each proposal, as per the maximum obtainable points assigned per criteria group in [Table 2.1: Parts of the technical proposal evaluation](#). Only proposals that meet the minimum threshold indicated in [Table 2: Technical criteria](#) shall be considered substantially compliant at this stage. Evaluation of the technical proposals shall be completed prior to opening the financial proposals.
- c. **Financial evaluation:** Financial proposals will only be opened for proposals that have achieved the minimum threshold in the technical evaluation. Financial proposals shall be checked for any mathematical errors in accordance with Article 15, “Minor Informalities, Errors or Omissions” in the [Instructions to Applicants](#). The total financial proposal points achieved for each proposal are determined in accordance with [Table 3: Financial criteria](#).
- d. **Combined analysis:** This evaluation will be conducted based on a combined analysis, analysing all of the relevant costs, risks and benefits for each proposal. The combined analysis includes the scores from both the technical evaluation, including factors such as risks, sustainability, and others, and the financial evaluation, using a predefined weighting method.

The maximum number of points that an applicant may obtain for its proposal are as follows:

- Technical proposal: 90 points
- Financial proposal: 10 points

The maximum total number of points an applicant may obtain for both the technical and financial proposals is 100. The weighting of the technical and financial proposals will be 90 – 10 (the ratio determined for the technical proposal and the financial proposal).

UNOPS may request clarification or further information in writing from applicants at any point during the evaluation process. In this case, any response from an applicant shall not modify the substance of the proposal, including both the technical and financial aspects of the proposal. UNOPS may use such information to interpret and evaluate the relevant proposal.

UNOPS reserves the right to conduct other forms of verification including site visits. In no way does this presume the positive outcome of the selection process, nor it guarantees that the applicant will be awarded a grant.

Provisional selection:

After the evaluation, a table will be drawn up listing the proposals ranked according to their score and within the limits of the funds available. In addition, a reserve list will be drawn up following the same criteria to be used if more funds should become available during the validity period of the reserve list. The Evaluation Commission submits the evaluation results to the Programme's Steering Committee, which provides its final approval.

Content of the decision

The applicants will be informed in writing of the Programme's decision concerning their application and, if rejected, the reasons for the negative decision. An applicant believing that it has been harmed by an error or irregularity during the award process may lodge a request for obtaining the full narrative evaluation sheet or complaint to the Contracting Authority within eight days upon receipt of the decision.

The evaluation of a proposal by UNOPS shall be carried out against the evaluation criteria described in the following tables.

Grant Awarding

Following the decision to award a grant, the selected applicant will be offered a grant. By signing the Grant Agreement, the selected applicant (who becomes the Grant Beneficiary) agrees to accept the contractual conditions of the standard grant contract.

3.1. Preliminary screening

Table 1 FORMAL AND ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA	
Criteria evaluated on a pass/fail basis during the preliminary screening	Documents to establish compliance with the criteria
1. The applicant is eligible as defined in Article 1, “Applicant Eligibility” in the Instructions to Applicants .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Annex 1: Declarations ● Annex 2: Proposal ● Annex 4: PSEA implementing partner self-assessment
2. The proposal is complete and includes all completed forms and other documentation requested in the Particulars, ‘Content of proposal submissions’ .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All documentation requested in the Particulars, ‘Content of proposal submissions’
3. The applicant accepts the conditions in the template for agreement, as specified in the Particulars, ‘Type of legal instrument’ .	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Annex 1: Declarations
4. The proposal and all mandatory annexes have been submitted timely and in an appropriate format, as specified in the “Proposals submission” section	
5. The applicant has submitted maximum one proposal	
6. The requested grant value is in the range from 12,000 to 15,000 USD as specified in the ‘Grant funding available’ and ‘Budget requirements’ sections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Annex 2: Proposal ● Annex 3: Financial proposal (Budget)
7. The duration of the action is in line with the requirements specified in the ‘Grant/funding duration’ section	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Annex 2: Proposal

If the applicant does not meet any of the formal or eligibility criteria, the proposal may be rejected on that sole basis and will not be evaluated further.

3.2. Technical evaluation

Table 2 TECHNICAL CRITERIA	
Criteria evaluated based on scoring during the technical evaluation	Documents to establish compliance with the criteria
<p>The maximum number of technical points obtainable is detailed in Table 2.1: Parts of the technical proposal evaluation.</p> <p>To be technically compliant, applicants must obtain a minimum threshold of 70% of the total obtainable points.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proposal ● Signed Partnership Agreement in Serbian

Table 2.1 Parts of the technical proposal evaluation		Obtainable points
1.	Applicant's capacity	15
2.	The relevance of the Action	25
3.	Design and Effectiveness of the Action	20
4.	Sustainability and Impact of the Action	30
Total technical proposal points		90

Table 2.1.1 Part 1: Applicant's Capacity			
	Criteria to be evaluated	Documents to establish compliance with the criteria (not exhaustive)	Obtainable points
1.1	<p>Applicant's experience in donor or government funded social inclusion projects in the past five years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No social inclusion projects implemented (0 points) ▪ At least one social inclusion project successfully implemented (1 point) ▪ At least two social inclusion projects successfully implemented (2 points) ▪ At least three social inclusion projects successfully implemented out of which one is funded by the international donor (3 points) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex 2: Proposal 	3
1.2	<p>Does the applicant have specialised expertise to address the issues tackled by the project proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No experience in support to waste pickers or integrated service (0 point) ▪ At least one project related to support to waste pickers' social inclusion (2 point) ▪ At least two projects related to support to waste pickers' social inclusion (additional 2 points) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex 2: Proposal 	4
1.3	<p>Applicant's experience in provision of the proposed integrated service:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The applicant does not have experience in multi-sector approach i.e. integrated service and is applying for its establishment (1 point) ▪ The applicant already has experience in multi-sector approach i.e. provision of integrated service (2 points) ▪ The applicant already provides the integrated service and is applying to enhance the quality of existing one(s) or to expand the number of beneficiaries (3 points) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex 2: Proposal 	3
Total points for Part 1			10

Table 2.1.2 Part 2: The Relevance of the Action

No.	Criteria to be evaluated	Documents to establish compliance with the criteria (not exhaustive)	Obtainable points
2.1	<p>How relevant is the proposal to the objectives and priorities of the CFP? Are the expected results of the action aligned with the objectives and priorities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal does not comply with the priorities and objectives of the CfP (0 points - eliminatory criterion) ▪ The proposal complies with the priorities and objectives of the CfP, demonstrates low results in the majority of defined indicators (1-3 points) ▪ The proposal complies with the priorities and objectives of the CfP, demonstrates average results within the majority of indicators (4-6 points) ▪ The proposal complies with the priorities and objectives of the CfP, demonstrates high results in the majority of defined indicators (7-8 points) ▪ The proposal completely complies with priorities and objectives of the CfP, demonstrates high results in reference to all defined indicators (9-10 points) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex 2: Proposal 	10
2.2	<p>Whether the Applicant based proposal on needs` assessment of informal waste pickers in local communities, conducted by the Applicant or other relevant local actor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal is not based on any relevant needs assessment (0 point) ▪ Proposal based on relevant needs assessment conducted by other institutions or organisations (1 points) ▪ Proposal based on needs assessment conducted by the Applicant (2 points) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex 2: Proposal 	2
2.3	<p>Have beneficiaries` needs been clearly defined and does the proposal address them adequately?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The beneficiaries have not clearly been defined and/or the proposal does not address their needs adequately with appropriate actions (0-2 points) ▪ The beneficiaries and their needs have been clearly defined and the proposal addresses them adequately with appropriate actions tailored to the needs of specific target group(s) (3-4 points) ▪ The beneficiaries and their needs are identified on the basis of qualitative and quantitative analysis and the proposal addresses the identified needs appropriately using a highly relevant methodological approach (5-6 points) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex 2: Proposal 	6
2.4	<p>Does the proposal contain added-value elements related to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex 2: Proposal 	2

	<p>the promotion of gender equality, equal opportunities, rights of minorities, rights of local population, innovation or replication of proven best practices relevant to this type of action?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No added value elements incorporated (0 points) ▪ One added value element incorporated (1 point) ▪ Two or more added value elements incorporated (2 points) 		
2.5.	<p>Have the interventions and obligations of involved local stakeholders been defined and relevant for the proposed action?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ not all relevant stakeholder are included (0-2 points) ▪ all relevant stakeholders are included and their obligations defined (3-5 points) 	• Annex 2: Proposal	5
2.6	<p>Does the Applicant apply the integrated approach in planning and implementation of proposed service?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No (0 point - eliminatory criterion) ▪ Yes (3 points) 	• Annex 2: Proposal	3
2.7.	<p>Does the proposal clearly identify and qualitatively elaborate the good governance objectives and measures that ensure they are met in service delivery?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good governance principles missing or unclear (0 point) ▪ Good governance principles outlined (1 point) ▪ Good governance principles adequately elaborated and included into process of service delivery (2 points) 	• Annex 2: Proposal	2
Total points for Part 2			30

Table 2.1.3 Part 3: Design and Effectiveness of the Action

No.	Criteria to be evaluated	Documents to establish compliance with the criteria (not exhaustive)	Obtainable points
3.1	<p>Is the implementation plan for the action clear and feasible? Is the timeline realistic?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The implementation plan within the proposal not filled in (0 points) ▪ The implementation plan is unclear and/or timelines unrealistic (1-2 point) ▪ The implementation plan is mostly clear and the timeline mostly realistic (3-5 points) ▪ Both the implementation plan and the timeline are clear, feasible and realistic (6-8 points) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex 2: Proposal 	8
3.2	<p>Have risks been identified and assessed, and mitigation measures planned?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal does not identify potential risks (0 points) ▪ Only basic risks and/or mitigation measures identified (1 point) ▪ The risks are well identified and assessed, and mitigation measures envisaged (2 points) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex 2: Proposal 	2
3.3.	<p>Does the proposal include an effective and efficient monitoring system?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal does not envisage monitoring system (0 points) ▪ The proposal defines basic approaches to monitoring (3 point) ▪ The proposal defines effective and efficient monitoring system with gender segregated data (5 points) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex 2: Proposal 	5
3.4.	<p>Does the proposal contain objectively verifiable indicators for the outputs and outcomes?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex 2: Proposal 	5
Total points for Part 3			20

Table 2.1.4 Part 4: Sustainability and Impact of the Action

No.	Criteria to be evaluated	Documents to establish compliance with the criteria (not exhaustive)	Obtainable points
4.1.	<p>Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financially - How will the follow-up activities, operating and maintenance costs and continuation of service be funded after the project? (0-5 points) ▪ Relevance of the provision of service after completion of project - (0 - 2 points) ▪ Policy level - What will be the effect of the project on local regulations, procedures and processes? If policy changes are needed to facilitate sustainability of the project, have advocacy activities been envisaged by the proposal? (0-3 points) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex 2: Proposal 	10
4.2.	<p>Does this project contribute to the enhancement of institutional capacities for providing integrated service and addressing social inclusion of waste pickers issues?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Which institutions/organisations/structures will enhance its capacities and sustain the results of the project upon its completion? (0 - 3 points) ▪ Whether the roles and responsibilities of these bodies are well defined? (0-2 points) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex 2: Proposal 	5
4.3.	<p>Will the project results have a positive impact on its target group(s)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact on target group(s) not demonstrated and questionable: service planned in very limited scope and for small number of beneficiaries (1 point) ▪ Impact on target group(s) limited: provision of service planned in limited scope (2-4 points) ▪ Impact on target group(s) adequate: service provision and intersectoral approach planned adequately (5-7 points) ▪ Impact on target group(s) positive: services very well planned including the scope of beneficiaries (8 - 10 points) ▪ Impact on target group(s) highly positive: holistic approach in planning of services, including the scope of beneficiaries with a positive impact beyond the immediate beneficiaries (maximum 15 points) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex 2: Proposal 	15

Total points for Part 4

30

3.3. Financial evaluation

Table 3 FINANCIAL CRITERIA

Criteria evaluated based on a cumulative analysis methodology during the financial evaluation	Documents to establish compliance with the criteria	Obtainable points
<p>1. Are the activities appropriately reflected in the budget?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Less than half of envisaged activities adequately reflected in the budget (0 points) ▪ At least half of envisaged activities adequately reflected in the budget (1 point) ▪ All activities adequately reflected in the budget (3 points) 	<p>Annex 3: Financial proposal (Budget)</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>2. Is the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results satisfactory?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Costs significantly underestimated; effectiveness of results questionable (0 points) ▪ Cost-effectiveness ratio significantly exceeds the average costs defined within the CfP (1 point) ▪ Ratio between the costs and expected results in the range of average set within the CfP (2 points) ▪ Ratio between the costs and expected results maximally effective (3 points) 	<p>Annex 3: Financial proposal (Budget)</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>3. Co-funding of the local institution partner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-funding of the local institution partner of at least 10% - (2 points) Co-funding of the local institution partner of at least 20% - (4 points) 	<p>Annex 3: Financial proposal (Budget)</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Total financial proposal points</p>	<p>10</p>	

Note: If the total score encompassing technical and financial proposal is less than 70 points, the application will be rejected.