



UK-UA Grant Application Form Guidance

1. What the form is for?

The UK-UA grant application form is designed **to make the business case for a grant under the UK-Ukraine Reform Assistance programme (UK-UA)**. It is not designed as the sole document for a grant but it is the essential **project level documentation of approval and record**.

2. What should the form provide?

The completed form should logically and succinctly explain how the proposed project fits within the UK-UA's overarching strategic priorities. The form should explain to potential approvers:

- Why the project is being undertaken
- What it will achieve
- How it will be managed and achieve Value for Money

Prospective implementers are expected to fill out this form, and the accompanying annexes which need to be submitted along with the form.

3. Overview

The UK Government is providing reform assistance to Ukraine to support its economic development and political stability. The intention is to provide assistance to the Government of Ukraine, civil society and the business community to build a democratic and accountable government, and a healthier economy. Between 2014 and 2016, 'UK-UA: Reform Assistance' will support projects which promote one or more of the following four priorities:

- Good governance, accountability and transparency, including tackling corruption
- Implementation of economic reforms
- Protection of the poorest and most vulnerable
- Improved donor coordination

UK-UA: Reform Assistance is being managed by PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (PwC UK) together with PwC Ukraine, in alliance with CASE Ukraine, the Center for Reforms, the

International Centre for Policy Studies and the Kyiv School of Economics. A Programme Management Unit (PMU) has been set up in Kyiv to run the programme.

As part of UK-UA: Reform Assistance, the UK-UA PMU is running a call for grant proposals. Funding between **£100,000 and £200,000** per grant will be awarded through a competitive process to non-state organisations (including both not-for-profit and for-profit organisations as well as consortia of organisations). All grant funds must be spent by the end of March 2016.

4. Application and selection process

The UK-UA grant window essentially has a one-stage application process. Applicants should fill in a grant application form. There may be a further stage of interviews in Kyiv with shortlisted applicants.

Applicants are requested to note the following:

- 1. The UK-UA grant window is a competition and not everyone will be successful.**
We expect that competition for funding will be tough. Please think about your application carefully, take note of the eligibility and selection criteria, and document clearly why your project should receive UK-UA support. Please note that your application will be assessed solely on the information submitted in your form. Therefore, please ensure you fully answer all the questions included in all sections of the form and do not assume that reviewers will use any additional information on your organisation/consortium, or the proposed project.
- 2. Submission of applications.** The period for submission of fully completed applications is between 12-20 January 2015. The absolute deadline is 12pm noon Kyiv time on 20 January 2015. All applications must be submitted by email to: UKReformAssistance@ua.pwc.com. We will acknowledge receipt of your application within three working days.

The application form must be completed using Arial font size 11, in English.
- 3. UK-UA PMU engagement.** The UK-UA PMU will respond to queries and issue appropriate further guidance, which will be made available on the British Embassy Kyiv's webpage. Meetings with the PMU during the application process will not be permitted; however a briefing session for all interested bidders will be held at the British Embassy.

Expected timetable

Application process stage	Indicative timing
Grant window opened	8 December 2014
Briefing session for potential applicants	19 December 2014
Period for submission of forms	12-20 January 2015
Deadline for submission of forms	20 January 2015
Possible interviews in Kyiv; the PMU Fund Manager informs	February 2015

applicants whether their application has been successful or not

Grant agreements with successful applicants finalised

March 2015

5. Eligibility and selection criteria

All applications will be reviewed for eligibility before they are scored in more detail. The eligibility review is a pass/fail test, and covers non-financial and financial considerations. The eligibility criteria for the UK-UA grant window are summarised in the table below, with accompanying explanations.

Eligibility criteria	Comments
Type of applicant	Only non-state organisations, including both not-for-profit and for-profit organisations, may apply.
Extent of financial support	The total financial support approved for any one project is between £100,000 and £200,000.
Financial capacity of the lead organisation	The applicant's average annual turnover/income (over the last 2 years) should exceed the size of the financial support requested by at least 50%.
Fit with UK-UA priorities	Only projects which fit clearly into one or both of the UK-UA's priorities for the grant window will proceed to the scoring stage.
Project timetable	The proposed project must be implemented and all monies disbursed before end of March 2016.
Application form	The applicant must submit a fully completed form by the stipulated deadline, and supply the required accompanying documentation

After an eligibility review, the PMU will score each application, using a set of selection criteria. The UK-UA's selection criteria are shown in the table below, with accompanying explanations.

Table: Selection criteria for UK-UA grant window

Criteria	Weighting	Comments
Organisation track record and capacity to implement the project	10%	How capable is the applicant of implementing this grant? What is the capability of any other partners working with the lead applicant? Has the applicant (both in terms of organisation and individuals) implemented other projects of similar nature? What results has the applicant achieved on other projects?
Fit with Priorities and synergies with other	20%	How well does the project fit with the UK-UA's priorities? Will the project complement existing interventions, rather than overlap with them?

programmes		
Quality of analysis	10%	Does the project demonstrate clear understanding of the situation and the interventions which are most likely to contribute to solutions?
Expected results and impact, including risks	20%	How strong is the evidence that this type of intervention will produce the intended results? What baseline data is available and how accurate is it? Will the project really make a difference? Are the assumptions made in the Theory of Change realistic? Is there an appropriate understanding of risks and of their mitigation?
Value for money	20%	How do the project's costs and the expected results compare with other similar initiatives? What is the level of confidence that this project will deliver VfM in terms of the '3 Es' of, Economy, Efficiency and Effectiveness along the three levels of the results chain – inputs, outputs and outcome? Is any match funding (in cash or in kind) being proposed by the applicant?
Sustainability	20%	How can the impact of the project and/or the project benefits be maintained after UK-UA support ends? Is there a relevant state/other authority supportive of the project, and what evidence is provided of this?

The guidance notes below follow the text of the project form in the order it appears.

Summary

Project title: should be as descriptive as possible within about 10-15 words.

UK-UA objective(s): the project should directly contribute to one of the twostated UK-UA strategic proirities. Some projects will contribute to more than one objective, so more than one box can be ticked.

Implementing partner(s): the organisation/s being funded to carry out the project.

Date submitted: date the project form was completed and sent for approval

Part A: Strategic Case

The Strategic Case is the ‘why’. It sets out the rationale and logic behind for the proposal and how it fits with the wider UK-UA programme. The strategic case should focus on the specific problem to be addressed and the outcome to be achieved, including why we think the proposed implementing partner has comparative advantage in this area.

A.1 Project outcome: there should be only one outcome. This should indicate the anticipated change resulting from the project. The outcome must be specific and measurable. Avoid outcomes that are too high-level to demonstrate progress towards them. For example, instead of ‘*improved human rights in Uzbekistan*’, which is an Impact-level change, ‘*fewer human rights violations at the targeted border crossings between Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan in the Ferghana Valley*’.

A.2 Theory of Change: this section should set out briefly in clear language the logic of the project, explaining how project activities produce outputs which in turn lead to the outcome.

It may be helpful to display each link in the results chain as an ‘if – then’ statement. For example, ‘*if we train community leaders in mediation then community-based negotiations are more likely to be seen as fair. If negotiations are seen as fair, then it is more likely that agreements will be sustained*’. The Theory of Change should clearly state the intended activity – the ‘if’ – and the anticipated change – the ‘then’.

This section in particular should be proportional. While it is helpful to have a Theory of Change even for smaller or straightforward projects, to capture the project’s essential logic, for a small simple project this may only be one or two sentences. Larger, more complex projects may require more depth but should not exceed 300 words.

Useful background on theories of change can be found at:

<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dcdndep/39774573.pdf> (see Annex 6 for useful examples of theories of change)

and <http://bit.ly/1CYxepz>

A.3 Implementing partner(s): provide brief background on the project implementing organisation. Why are they suited to implementing the project? Do they have specific experience or expertise in the field? Have the implementers worked with HMG (Her Majesty’s Government) before? If so, what was their record? Have they worked with other donors? Do they have the resource capacity to implement the project? If relevant what is their local reputation with Government, civil society groups?

Who are the key staff/experts who will implement this project and what is their experience implementing projects of this type? Include their CVs in Annex 1 to your application.

Note that applicants with a limited track record (for example those that are newly formed) will not be at a disadvantage if they can demonstrate that the personnel involved in the project have the skills and experience needed to implement the project successfully. Maximum 400 words.

A.4 Background: any key points you think should be captured but are not set out elsewhere in the form should be included here. It could include the context of previous reform attempts and barriers encountered; future potential issues after the project ends; lessons learned previously. The detail here will also depend on the scale and complexity of the project. Maximum 500 words.

A.5 Co-ordination with others: this section should summarise what efforts have already been undertaken to address the project's theory of change, including by other donors, other stakeholders such as NGOs, and/or by Ukrainian state organisations. Maximum 300 words.

Part B: Appraisal Case

The appraisal case sets out how the project is going to achieve the project purpose, and gives an assessment of the likelihood that it will be achieved. It is central to a judgement of whether the project should be approved. Without a strong appraisal case the project is unlikely to be approved, however developed other aspects might be.

B.1 Outcome: repeated from the Summary.

B.2 Outcome indicators: how you will measure that the outcome has been achieved. This requires a clear **Baseline** to show what the current situation is, an **interim milestone** which the UK-UA PMU can use to check that your project is on track (which will usually be around half-way through the project), the **Target** you are aiming for, the **Source of Information**, who is responsible for collecting it (HMG, implementer or other?)

Example: Project outcome and outcome indicators

Project outcome: to reduce the number of human rights violations at the border crossings between Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan in the Ferghana Valley

Indicator	Baseline	Interim milestone (including date)	Target (including date)	Source of information & who will collect
Complaints about corruption made through existing official channels	No complaints made, due to lack of awareness of official channels in the local community and fear of repercussions	One complaint per month	At least two per month	Local authorities, collected by implementing partners
Opinion of behaviour of border guards improved among target community	75% of respondents believe the Kyrgyz border guards to be 'very prejudiced'	50% of respondents believe the Kyrgyz border guards to be 'very prejudiced'	Reduction in total to 25% by end of project	Surveys carried out by implementers in villages on either side of the border

B.3 Outputs: these are the key deliverables of the project, on which the implementer should be judged. The number of outputs should be proportionate to the size of the project. Please copy and paste extra 'Activity' and 'Indicator' tables for additional outputs if needed or delete unused tables.

Activities: the specific interventions that are going to bring about the outputs – for example, training events which aim to build capacity of the target organisation.

Indicators: the things that you will measure to determine whether your outputs have been achieved. Your indicators will be used in reviews and evaluations to assess implementation, so it is important that they are realistic and measurable, and that either the project lead or the implementer will be in a position to gather the information, both at the outset and at regular intervals.

Indicator: should be quantifiable where appropriate, although this will not always be possible. Carefully chosen qualitative indicators are valid. Indicators should not include the objective in the description.

Example: 'number of Afghan National Police (ANP) completing training' rather than 'increase in number of Afghan National Police completing training'.

Baseline: should give the situation before the intervention.

Example: what percentage of ANP have not had any training.

Interim milestone: should give the anticipated progress around halfway through implementation. *Example: at least 50 ANP officers will have undergone training at this point in the project.*

Target: measurable increase or change against the indicator. *Example: two hundred ANP officers will be trained by the end of the project*

Source of information and who will collect: who will gather the data and from where?

Example: implementers using information from training documentation and government records.

Please note the funded projects will be monitored by the UK-UA PMU. The UK-UA PMU, however, will not be in a position to collect primary data or carry out a formal evaluation. You may need therefore to factor in data collection costs into your budget.

B.4 Risks: Project work is inherently risky, both in terms of the environment and the sort of intervention. So it is important we are serious about assessing, acknowledging and managing risk. We should however not be risk averse – a risky intervention which produces a major change might be one of the most successful UK-UA projects. So if the risks attached to a project are high-impact and high-likelihood, this is not necessarily a reason not to approve the project.

Risks can be defined as the possible negative effect of any areas of uncertainty in the operating context. You should primarily focus on risks to the project outcome from issues beyond your control; rather than risks to the delivery of the outputs that can be mitigated through project design. So, for example, '*failure to identify suitable facilitators to deliver training*'; you are making an assumption that such facilitators exist, and can design the project so as to identify them. But '*media supported by project is taken over by political factions and used to spread propaganda*' is a risk; it is outside our control.

Risks should also include potential political and reputational risks to HMG.

The judgement of the likelihood and impact of a risk is inevitably subjective. So it is important that it is scrutinised and there is agreement that it is realistic. Those approving projects should pay close attention to the risk section and satisfy themselves that it covers all angles.

Risk: identify and describe the most significant risks. Specify what is it a risk to; delivery, for example, or outcome? Or is the risk political – perhaps, for example, that the project, if misunderstood, could damage relationships with the Ukrainian government

Likelihood: is the likelihood of the risk taking place high, medium or low?

Impact: if the risk occurs, what will be the impact on the project's ability to achieve its outcome?

Mitigation: explain what actions are incorporated into the design of the project to lessen the impact of the identified risks. These need to be thought-through: will close monitoring of the operating context or raising an issue with the implementer be sufficient? As part of mitigating risks, do we need to specify decision points or thresholds at which the feasibility of the project needs to be reconsidered?

Owner: who is best placed to judge the level of risk, and to take the appropriate mitigating actions? Implementers, project officers or other HMG staff?

B.5 Sustainability: (maximum 200 words) how will the project ensure that the benefits will be sustained after the project has come to a close? Does the project have a beneficiary who has demonstrated commitment to the project? Not all projects will need to demonstrate direct sustainability but many should be in a position to do so. This is especially important for projects aiming to build institutional capacity, or if the work of the project is going to move to a different funding source.

Part C: Financial Case

The Financial Case covers issues of value for money, sources of funding, how payments are linked to activities and the timetable for payments – especially important for multi-year projects. The activities-based budget should be submitted with the Project Proposal; a project bid without a budget should not be approved. The budget must breakdown the cost of the project by activity, and specify which months these activities are taking place in.

C.1 Total cost: the total cost of the project to UK-UA, including any spending on Monitoring and Evaluation commissioned as part of the project.

C.2 Funding breakdown: Take the total from your activity-based budget (Annex 3). All project budget must be spent by end March 2016, or else returned to the UK-UA PMU. Please note the possibility of an extension until end of July 2016, subject to results achieved in year one.

C.3 Other funding: are other organisations also funding the project? Is the implementing organisation offering any match funding (either cash or in-kind)? If so set out how much broken down by FY. Expand the table as necessary, and offer details of how any in-kind contributions have been calculated

C.4 Value for Money: (maximum 300 words) how will you ensure that the project achieves value for money (VFM)? Please consider the different parts of your simplified results chain (inputs/activities, outputs, outcome), in relation to the the '3 Es' of, Economy, Efficiency and Effectiveness. Please refer to <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dfids-approach-to-value-for-money-vfm> for more detailed guidance

Annex 1: CVs of Key Personnel

Provide CVs of key personnel (no more than five individuals) that will be responsible for managing, implementing and monitoring your project.

Limit CVs to two pages each and include at the start of each CV a very short description of what you are proposing that this individual does in the project.

Annex 2: Project References

Provide three project references that show your most relevant experience using the table provided. Each reference should be maximum 500 words.

Annex 3: Project Budget

The detailed budget should be completed in the budget template provided.

The following considerations should be made when completing the budget:

- The budget should be submitted in GBP Sterling (£). We recommend that you use the Financial Times website to identify exchange rates.
- The budget should be in line with the narrative of your application.

Annex 4: Annual reports

Provide your annual reports for the last two years. If these are not produced, then financial statements should be provided.

Annex 5: Evidence of beneficiary support (optional)

Provide documentary evidence of beneficiary support if available. This is not mandatory.

Notice of future information requirements

If your application is successful, the UK-UA PMU will carry out various checks. The information which will be required by the PMU is likely to include the below list. Please note that this list is not necessarily exhaustive.

The list distinguishes between lead applicant and other 'key partner organisations'. This should not be taken as encouragement to work with partner organisations – we expect that some successful applications will only involve one implementing organisation. However, if your application envisages allocating the work to more than one organisation, we must perform checks on all such organisations.

For the **lead applicant**

Organisation registration numbers for lead and partner organisations

For companies – company registration number

For charities –charity registration number

Any other Government-issued registration number (if relevant and available)

*Key personnel identification**

Full legal name (and aliases)

Date of Birth

Passport number (if applicable)

Passport country of issue (if applicable)

Bank details for lead organisation

Letter of good standing from your bank.

Statement/ Letter of Good Standing from your bank setting out how long the organisation has held the account; indicating if the account is in good standing; to whom the account is registered and its signatories.

Organisation's policy documents

Anti-bribery/ Anti-corruption

Employee manual/ staff training

Quality assurance

Equal opportunities

For all **key partner organisations**

Annual reports/financial statements – last year accounts:

Registration documents, as applicable

For companies – certificate of incorporation

For charities – certificate of registration

Any other Government-issued registration document (if relevant and available)

** Key personnel information will be requested will be used to conduct non-financial due diligence. Typically, an organisation's Board has ultimate responsibility for the conduct of an organisation, and therefore the due diligence assessment focuses on Board members.*

The PMU will undertake public information searches focusing on corruption, bribery, and reputation (e.g. Politically Exposed Persons, sanctions lists, and civil litigation filings). The personal information (i.e. passport details and date of birth) requested will be used to rule out false positives (i.e. two or more individuals sharing the same name).

It should be noted that where individuals are identified as a concern during the due diligence assessment, it may merit further investigation. Only in the most exceptional circumstances would this result in an organisation being excluded from receiving a grant, and this would only happen after discussions and clarifications from the applicant organisation.

The PMU will store the results of the due diligence and related information only as long as necessary to complete these checks, in accordance with relevant data protection legislation.