

Reform and Growth Facility for the Western Balkans

Guidance note on double funding

This guidance note addresses the issue of “double funding” between the Reform and Growth Facility (RGF) for the Western Balkans (WB) and other EU funds and/or other donors. Double funding implies that at least one part of financing in the fulfilment of the step is provided in the form of a grant. Therefore, it does not concern cases when all sources of financing involved in the fulfilment of the step are loans.

It explains how the issue can be prevented, identified, and addressed by WB Beneficiaries and the Commission. The aim of this document is to provide to the Beneficiary and the Commission services’ explanations and interpretations of double funding in order to facilitate the implementation of the Reform and Growth Facility for the Western Balkan in compliance with sound financial management principles.

- In general ‘double funding’ refers to a situation where **the same costs for the same activity are funded twice** through the use of EU and/or other donors funds (not compliant to sound financial management principles). In the case of performance-based financing, such as under the Reform and Growth Facility, it can also refer to a situation where complementary **actions funded contribute extensively** to the delivery of the agreed result or **same activities are reported as results under other EU and/or other donors**.
- Under the Reform and Growth Facility for the Western Balkans, the beneficiaries have the **responsibility to prevent double funding** (i.e. declaration of assurance), ideally via a centralised IT system able to spot different funding sources. The Commission and EUDs also take appropriate measures to prevent double funding.
- In practice, this means that there should be no overlapping in final results achieved with funding from either other EU or other donors’ funding unless there is a clear demarcation of results and separation of funds (at final recipients level). It also means that results reported or declared under a different intervention should not be counted again in the review of the fulfilment of a step in the agreed Reform Agendas.

1. General considerations

Both the Commission and the Beneficiary are under an obligation to avoid “double funding” when implementing the RGF. Combining support under the Reform and Growth Facility with financial support from other Union programmes is permitted for under Article 4(3) of the RGF Regulation “provided that such support does not cover the same cost, and that appropriate oversight and budget control is ensured”. This is notably with a view to ensure **complementarity** between funding from IPA III and other sources and that provided under the RGF.

The Commission assessed whether the arrangements put in place by the Beneficiaries to avoid double-funding are satisfactory. Reform Agendas include an explanation of the beneficiary’s system to effectively prevent, detect and correct irregularities and the arrangements to avoid double funding from the Facility and other Union programmes as well as other donors. The Commission assessment of the Reform Agenda covered this aspect.

The concept of “double funding” is not entirely easy to implement in the context of the performance-based nature of the RGF. Article 4(3) of the RGF Regulation introduces a cost-

based approach for the assessment of double funding. However, the RGF is a performance-based instrument under which financing is linked to achieved results, not incurred costs. Disbursements are made based on the satisfactory fulfilment of a set of qualitative and quantitative steps. Payments to the Beneficiaries are therefore **not subject to controls on the costs incurred** to fulfil those steps.

In assessing potential cases of double funding, it is important to respect both the cost-related and performance-related dimensions of the RGF Regulation. Therefore, the Commission and the Beneficiary should not only consider costs incurred when assessing the risk of double funding but also prevent situations when the same result is counted (or reported) twice under different actions.

In this respect, when the Commission is made aware that the beneficiary administration also received support for the same step from another programme (EU or otherwise), it shall establish the extent of contribution by other donor to the achievement of the result and determine the final amount of the disbursement according to the following methodology:

For quantitative steps, the Commission will assess on a case-by-case base, the **extent to which a complementary action contributed to the achievement of a step or what was the degree of overlap between the step in the RA and the result delivered under a complementary action. In its assessment, the Commission will ‘count’ those results which have not already been funded or provided by other programmes and determine the amount to be paid in line with the provisions in the Financing Agreement on partial payments¹.**

For non-quantitative (qualitative) steps, the full delivery of the **step through another programme (EU or otherwise)** shall result in no disbursement. In case that EU or other programmes contribute partially to the delivery of the step, the extent of the contribution needs to be assessed. An “extensive” contribution may also result in no payment and the interpretation as to what would count as ‘extensive’ is illustrated in the examples below (point 3).

For the specific case of **RGF support to investment projects implemented through the WBIF**, Article 19(7) of the RGF Regulation states that such projects may receive funding from two sources so long as this support “provides for additionality and does not cover the same cost”.

Finally, **double funding and synergies/complementarities** with other EU programmes are also addressed **in the annual progress report** from the Commission to the Parliament and Council (as stated in article 25(3) of the RGF Regulation.

2 Control framework to prevent, detect and correct double-funding under the RGF

The RGF Regulation establishes that each Beneficiary should **propose control arrangements to detect and avoid double funding in its Reform Agenda**, with these measures to be evaluated in the Commission’s assessment of the Reform Agenda and should **confirm in the declaration of assurance accompanying payment request** that such

¹ For example, if a step reads as ‘100 computers were provided across schools in Y region’, but the Commission is made aware that 30 computers were donated by another donor, the Commission will count only 70 computers in its final result. This result will amount to 70% compliance rate and in line with the provisions in the Facility Agreement on partial payment, the Commission will propose to pay the partial amount or 50% of the allocated amount to that specific step. Another case would be that the beneficiary delivers 100 computers and another donor will donate 20 computers. In its assessment, the Commission will count 100 computers in its final result and consider that the step has a 100% compliance rate and disburse 100% of the amount allocated for the specific step.

arrangements have been effectively applied. Where steps have received support and funding from other sources, this should be stated, including the corresponding amount².

Based on these provisions, the issue of double funding should be addressed via a series of measures to be taken by **both the WB beneficiary and the Commission** at different moments and according to their responsibility as explained below:

a. Reform Agenda design and assessment (pre-implementation phase)

Beneficiary

The Beneficiary ensures that an effective and efficient internal control system is in place, applying internationally recognised internal control principles. This includes an appropriate system to prevent, detect and address double-funding issues.

The Beneficiary also sets up a system which ensures the collection of, access to, and transfer of data on natural persons and legal entities receiving funding for the implementation of measures under the Facility (Art. 5 of the FA).

The Commission

As part of its assessment of the Reform Agendas, the Commission evaluates each beneficiary's arrangements for ensuring there is no double funding. For all Reform Agendas received, these measures have been judged as satisfactory.

b. Implementation phase

Beneficiary

The Beneficiary takes and implements measures to **detect and prevent double funding** from the Facility and other Union programmes as well as other donors. It shall also **indicate in payment requests** if any quantitative steps or qualitative (non-quantitative) steps have received support and funding, including corresponding amount, from other sources, and **explain the arrangements that have been put in place to avoid double funding**.

In the **declaration of assurance** accompanying payment requests, the National Coordinator confirms that:

- The control systems in place give the necessary assurances that the financing provided has been used in accordance with all applicable rules, in particular on the prevention, detection and correction of fraud, corruption, conflicts of interests and irregularities.
- The arrangements in place give the necessary assurance that the financing provided has not resulted in double funding from the Facility and other Union programmes or instruments, as well as other donors.

If needed, the Commission can support the National Coordinator in gathering information related to funding from other Union programmes and instruments.

The Beneficiary administration also provides a **summary of the audits carried out**, including weaknesses identified and any corrective actions taken.

² Article 23(2)(c) – Protection of the financial interests of the Union (also reflected in Art 9 and Art 14(10) and (12) Facility Agreement)

Commission

In line with article 12.8. of the Facility Agreement, a system audit is taking place not later than 2025 to assess the beneficiary's internal control systems, including its capacity to prevent, detect and correct double funding. If found necessary during the system audit, recommendations will be issued to invite the beneficiary to improve its control system in this respect.

When receiving the request for payment, the EC assesses the fulfilment of the steps based on the information provided by the authorities. In specific cases, the EC may use ex ante controls like verification missions or ex post controls later.

Specifically, the Commission will assess the **extent to which a complementary action contributed to the achievement of a step or the degree of overlap between the step in the RA and the result delivered under a complementary action.**

When the Commission detects such cases of potential double funding it will revert without undue delay to the Beneficiary who may provide additional elements to assist the Commission in its assessment of whether there has been double funding in these cases.

The examples contained in section 3 below aim to provide some illustrative cases of complementary actions that are acceptable. In principle, the beneficiary should retain ownership and ensure the sustainability of the steps implementation.

Through its review of the management declaration and summary of audits, the Commission may request further information and/or undertake on the spot audits should it have doubts about possible double funding risks.

The Commission and Beneficiaries' bodies responsible for managing and auditing the implementation of Union funding should have access to all relevant data, to allow for cross-checking with expenses they intend to declare as eligible for reimbursement by the Union under other funds. The Commission may request such data in the context of its ex-ante controls and audits and recover the respective amount if the irregularity has not been corrected by the Beneficiary administration.

In the absence of a clear differentiation between sectors under RGF and other EU funded Instruments, in particular IPA III, the Commission should proceed with the above methodology for each request for payment provided.

WBIF investments under RGF will be assessed by the WBIF Board vis-à-vis investments financed by IPA III (Article 3.01(c) General Conditions).

- For blending support, which combines loans and grants, the application of these guidelines will not make a distinction between what has been paid for under the loan and what has been paid for under the grant. The overall support under the blending operation is considered as EU complementary support and falls within the scope of these double funding guidelines;
- Therefore, when reviewing the fulfilment of the step, the EC shall not count in the final result under the step the value achieved under a complementary action. The review will consider as final result what has been achieved with national resources or with national loans (- self-standing loans and not part of blending operations);
- An internal mapping exercise of existing complementary EU projects with some degree of contribution to the fulfilment of the RA steps showed that there was limited impact in the overlap of the steps that would result in decreased payments under the RGF (i.e., the actual degree of overlap was estimated as less than 10%, which would allow a full payment of the step if the beneficiaries reach the 90% threshold);

- Regional Energy Efficiency Programme (REEP) projects may involve some degree of overlap with RA steps. It is not possible to anticipate at this stage what would be the actual result of the REEP projects in the fulfilment of various steps. During the implementation stage, the stakeholders should coordinate to ensure a complementary approach to the RA. At the time of the review of the request for payment, the EC will assess the degree and extent of overlap between the RA steps and REEP support.

3. Examples of steps in the reform agenda and complementary funding from other sources and the related double funding assessment:

3.1 Preparation work related to:

a) Drafting of a text.

For example, steps consisting in the drafting / preparation / development of written guidelines / methodology / analysis / report / strategy / action plan / law / bylaws.

Acceptable:	Not acceptable:
EU funded TA providing capacity development in terms of know-how (i.e., best practices, methodological support, etc). Support to the actual drafting may be allowed to some extent (to be certain, it should stay below 50% of the final document)	EU funded TA / EU member states / EU agencies / other donors draft the text for the beneficiary administrations to an extent that they are actually the lead drafter and substitute local authorities / stakeholders.

b) Formal adoption of a law / bylaw / regulation (a legally binding text).

For example, steps that contrary to the previous example go beyond the drafting of documents and mention the adoption / revision / implementation / alignment / amendment / ratification / transposition / bring into compliance with EU standards / entry into force of laws / bylaws / conventions etc. For example: 'PIFC Law is adopted by the Parliament'.

Acceptable:	Not acceptable:
EU funded TA provides capacity development in terms of know how (i.e., guidance on best practices) and/or contributes to the drafting of the text fully or extensively.	<i>Not relevant [all support measures are acceptable].</i> Since no external provider could substitute the authorities in the actual adoption process underpinned by the political act, and which may also involve steps beyond the drafting of a text, like public consultations, impact assessments, adoption by the Parliament, etc) there is no risk of double funding.

3.2 Delivery of goods / products (tangible or observable results of a process, project, or action that represent the immediate deliverables).

For example:

- 4 new regional VET centres refurbished, equipped, and fully functional.

Acceptable:	Not acceptable
partial investments / donations may be provided under EU complementary action /EU MS / EU agencies / other donors/TA to coordinate the refurbishment of the	EU complementary actions deliver the entirety of the refurbishments and/or equipment in 1 or more centres which are reported on by the authorities in the review of the step, hence

centres. Support however should not deliver the actual result expected under the step.	double-counting the result in the context of the step and in the context of complementary support.
--	--

or

- at least 0.8 GW of new renewable energy [solar and wind] capacities installed, in line with the NECP and the targets agreed within the Energy Community.

Acceptable:	Not acceptable
EU funded complementary support provides the know how / design/ training in the management, and maintenance of the RE systems.	RE equipment and installation are acquired and installed under EU complementary actions

or

- Frameworks introduced by NIS2 alignment (CVD framework, crisis management framework), are in place and in use.

Acceptable:	Not acceptable:
EU funded TA supports the authorities to develop the frameworks, providing capacity development, best practices, etc.	EU funded complementary assistance provides the ready-made frameworks.

or

- E-market system is used to award at least 800 Tender procedures in Fiscal Year 2026

Acceptable:	Not acceptable
EU complementary actions support the authorities to design or deliver an e-market system (i.e., best practices, capacity development or training for its usage), but its application and use is ensured by the authorities.	E-market system is delivered by EU funded action and tendering procedure is outsourced to a third party paid under EU complementary assistance.

or

- Establish a comprehensive register of vulnerable consumers / 10 public registers standardised and digitalised by the administration to improve the 'once-only' principle / Digital teaching materials developed and produced for basic subjects and secondary level and shared with all schools.

Acceptable:	Not acceptable (double funding):
Capacity development like exchange of best practices, study visits in partner countries, etc (digital PAR/digitalisation of public schools). Support in the design of the registry/ support in the development of digital teaching materials (the distribution across schools and actual roll out is within the remit of the government).	The delivery of the registry for vulnerable consumers and encoding of data is done by complementary assistance (EU or otherwise) The delivery of the public registries is done/funded by complementary assistance (EU or otherwise). (this is a complete overlap between the step and the deliverable of the external providers).

3.3 Qualitative effects

- Enhance accountability of court presidents and chief prosecutors in the functioning and management of courts and prosecution offices, including by introducing case

processing monitoring, performance analyses of courts and prosecution offices, and reports on budget and staff needs.

Acceptable (no double funding):	Not acceptable:
EU complementary actions deliver trainings to court presidents/prosecutions. EU complementary assistance allows capacity development in the case processes/performance analysis.	NA

or

- Ensure the regular and effective full verification of the assets declarations of judges and prosecutors by the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption, including by crosschecking the information with relevant institutions; amend the Law on disciplinary liability of judges and prosecutors to address the findings of the TAIEX peer review mission, including by introducing a specialized investigation body; improve the recruitment system by strengthening the current mechanisms for background verification of candidates, including by clarifying its scope and procedures.

Acceptable (no double funding):	Not acceptable:
EU complementary actions deliver trainings or organise study visits to relevant staff in the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption or provide capacity development actions to the Agency for the Prevention of Corruption or on other elements mentioned in the step (i.e recruitment system).	NA

or

- Agency of Investments and Export and the Agency for support of the Enterprises established and fully operational³ (the description of the step refers to operationalisation solely as the availability of IT equipment, training etc).

Acceptable (no double funding):	Not acceptable (double funding):
Capacity development/capacity building of the staff like training, study visits, etc	EU complementary assistance provides all the required inputs for the operationalisation of the agency (IT equipment, training)

- 50 employees in the Ministry of Finance will receive training on public investment management

Acceptable (no double funding):	Not acceptable (double funding):
Capacity development 'training of the trainer', study visits as well as EU or other donor paying the fees and /or travel costs of the experts/trainers providing the training	EU complementary assistance or other donors pays for the extensive organisation of the training including paying the trainers, the venue, per diem of attendees, all materials used in the training, etc

³ The actual interpretation will depend on how is 'operational' (or 'established') defined in the RA. If operational is to be understood as a legal and regulatory framework (law, mandate, budget, etc) and physical inputs (building, IT equipment, etc), then complementary assistance could not substitute for the role of the authorities, hence the risk of double funding to an extent that it extensively overlaps with the national administration is small.

or

- Strengthen interconnectivity of civil registry to other government registries (Agency for Business Registration (ABRK), Tax Administration Kosovo, Address System (ARIS).

Acceptable (no double funding):	Not acceptable (double funding):
Capacity development on IT interconnection or design of the process for realising interconnections.	De facto delivery of the IT system operationalising the interconnection (de facto building the registries and interconnections).

4. Recovery of funds

In case double funding occurs, it should be determined under which EU programme or Regulation a recovery should be undertaken.

- (1) When double funding is the result of a grant agreement signed under another Union programme **before** the adoption of the Commission Implementing Decision (CID RGF) adopting the RGF, it is **the RGF funds that should be recovered**, as measures that have been supported by other Union funds should never have been included in the Reform Agenda and this should have been declared during the design and assessment phase.
- (2) When double funding is the result of a grant agreement signed under other Union programme **after** the adoption of the CID RGF, **the amount disbursed by other EU programme should be recovered** by the competent EU body.

Annex I – Fictitious case studies on double funding

Double funding at final recipient level

Case 1: *One of the final recipients (i.e a public school, a SMEs, an individual) receiving funding under a step in the RA also receives financial support from another EU programme or other donor [this means that a final recipient receives two overlapping subsidies for the same action].*

- It is the responsibility of the Beneficiary to detect, correct and recover funds from the final recipients to comply with the RGF Regulation.
- For the Commission, the actual amount that would need to be recovered/offset would however not be linked to costs. In determining the amount to be recovered, the Commission would review the degree of fulfilment of the step concerned and reduce from the total result declared as achieved those cases which benefitted twice from EU funds. The provisions on partial payment as defined in the Facility Agreement will apply.

Double funding at Beneficiary level

Case 2: *The RA envisages the establishment (or the operationalisation)⁴ of a VET center (Recovery Office, etc). The center is established (is operational), the Beneficiary administration, however also obtained other EU funding [other donors] to cover part of the construction costs.*

- The combination of funding should be specified in the description of the implementation of the step to assess the role and potential overlap of different

⁴ For this example, the words ‘establishment’ or ‘operational’ should be understood as the construction or refurbishment of a VET center – what the step actually entails should be understood from the description of the step provided in the Reform Agenda.

contributions (for example: infrastructure (RGF-funded) vs equipment (WB-funded) of a hospital.

- As a performance-based instrument, the amount to be released is fixed in Annex I to the RA and is independent from the actual costs of investments. However, the Beneficiary's and EU's review of the implementation of the step should confirm that the step (in this case the construction of the VET centre is not extensively attributed to an external provider whether the EU or other donors⁵. This attribution is not solely based on costs.

Case 3: *The RA envisages a step regarding digital connectivity upgrades in schools which concretely means 1 000 000 computers delivered in schools. Another EU programme [other donors] has covered financially [or donated] 500 000 computers.*

- The combination of funding/resources should be specified in the description of the implementation of the step to distinguish the different contributions.
- Under this example, there are two possible scenarios: I) are the 500 000 computers additional to the 1 000 000 computers envisaged under the RA step? Or II) are the 500 000 computers to be counted as part of the fulfilment of the RA step?
- Under case I, if the Beneficiary reports a final result of 1 500 000 computers (overachievement), the Commission will consider the 1 000 000 computers delivered by the national administration as relevant to the fulfilment of the step and consider this achievement as fulfilled entirely.
- Under case II, the Beneficiary and the EU should assess the degree of support of other EU [or other donors] provider/programme in achieving the 1 000 000 computers. In this instance, 50% of the fulfilment of the step is attributable to a donor or to another EU programme. If this support is provided under another EU programme, then the Commission would be counting twice a result achieved under different actions. Therefore, in its assessment of the step, the Commission will count only those computers that are delivered by the national administration and apply the partial provisions specified in the Facility Agreement in establishing the degree of achievement (i.e the EC will count 500 000 computers which is a 50% rate of fulfilment of the step that will trigger 50% of the amount allocated for this specific step to be released).

Annex II - Background - WB RGF – provisions on double funding

Regulation references

(37) The Reform Agendas should include an explanation of the beneficiary's system to effectively prevent, detect and correct irregularities, corruption, including high-level corruption, fraud and conflicts of interest, when using the funds provided under the Facility, and the arrangements to avoid double funding from the Facility and other Union programmes as well as other donors.

(59) In accordance with the Financial Regulation, Regulation (EU, Euratom) 883/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council ⁽¹³⁾ and Council Regulations (EC, Euratom) No 2988/95 ⁽¹⁴⁾, (Euratom, EC) No 2185/96 ⁽¹⁵⁾ and (EU) 2017/1939 ⁽¹⁶⁾, the financial interests of the Union are to be protected by means of proportionate measures, including measures relating to the prevention, detection, correction and investigation of irregularities, fraud, corruption, conflicts of interest, double funding, to the recovery of funds lost, wrongly paid or incorrectly used.

⁵ 'Extensively attributed' in this example means that the specific VET center reported on under this specific step has been entirely constructed or fully refurbished by a parallel EU/other donor or has already been referred to as a result in the framework of another EU programme (i.e. a budget support programme who had the building of a VET center as a target and the same VET center is quoted there and in the specific step in this example)

(66) The Commission should provide an annual report to the European Parliament and the Council on progress towards the achievement of the objectives of this Regulation, also addressing synergies and complementarities with other Union programmes, in particular support provided under Regulation (EU) 2021/1529, with a view to avoiding the duplication of assistance and double funding.

Article 4(3) General Principles (also reflected in Art 3(2)(c) and Art 14(10) and (12) Facility Agreement)

3. Support from the Facility shall be additional and complementary to the support provided under other Union programmes and instruments. Activities eligible for funding under this Regulation may receive support from other Union programmes and instruments provided that such support does not cover the same cost and that appropriate oversight and budget control is ensured. The Commission shall ensure complementarities and synergies between the Facility and other Union programmes, with a view to avoiding the duplication of assistance and double funding. There shall be no overlap between support provided under this Regulation and Regulation (EU) 2021/1529.

Article 14(4)(i) – Commission assessment of the Reform Agendas

(i) whether the arrangements proposed by the beneficiary are expected to effectively prevent, detect and correct irregularities, fraud, corruption and conflicts of interest, organised crime and money laundering as well as to effectively investigate and prosecute criminal offences affecting the funds under the Facility, and ensure that there is no double funding from the Facility and other Union programmes, in particular support provided under Regulation (EU) 2021/1529, as well as other donors from the Facility and other Union programmes and also other donors;

Article 19(7) - Implementation of investment projects and programmes under the WBIF

7. Financing under the Facility provided from the loans as referred to in Article 6(5) of this Regulation, shall be made available through the WBIF under the loan agreement between the Commission and the beneficiaries in accordance with Article 17(2) of this Regulation. Combined for all loan agreements, there shall be maximum twelve requests for disbursements per year from the fund managers of the joint fund referred to in Article 12(2) of this Regulation to the Commission⁶. Investment projects and programmes may receive support from two financing sources, as referred to in paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 6 of this Regulation, as well as from other Union programmes and instruments, subject to that such support from different sources, programmes and instruments provides for additionality and does not cover the same cost. For each investment project or programme, the Commission shall provide an assessment to the WBIF Operational Board, including on synergies and complementarities with other Union programmes, in particular support provided under Regulation (EU) 2021/1529, with a view to avoiding the duplication of assistance and double funding.

Article 23(2)(c) – Protection of the financial interests of the Union (also reflected in Art 8 and Art 14(10) and (12) Facility Agreement)

2. The Facility Agreement shall provide for the following obligations of the beneficiary:

(c) to take appropriate measures to prevent, detect and correct fraud, corruption, conflicts of interest and irregularities as well as to investigate and prosecute criminal offences affecting the financial interests of the Union, to detect and avoid double funding and to take legal actions to recover funds that have been misappropriated, including in relation to any measure for the implementation of reforms and investment projects or programmes under the Reform Agendas and to take appropriate measures to treat mutual legal assistance requests by EPPO and Member States' competent authorities concerning criminal offences affecting the funds under the Facility, where applicable and without delay;

⁶ In practice, the share of the loan disbursements allocated to the WBIF will be paid to the Beneficiary, which has the obligation to pay them into the EWBIF in accordance with contribution agreements concluded between the EWBIF and the Beneficiary.

Article 25(3) – Monitoring and reporting

3. The Commission shall provide an annual report to the European Parliament and the Council on progress towards the achievement of the objectives of this Regulation. That annual report shall also address synergies and complementarities of the Facility with other Union programmes, in particular support provided under Regulation (EU) 2021/1529, with a view to avoiding the duplication of assistance and double funding. The annual report shall be complemented by presentations on the state of play of the implementation of the Facility twice per year.

Facility agreement

Article 14 - Rules on the release of funds – para 10

If relevant, the Beneficiary shall indicate in the request for the release of funds if any qualitative and quantitative steps have received support and funding, including corresponding amount, from other Union programmes and instruments or other donor programmes, and explain the arrangements that have been put in place to avoid double funding.

Provisions of the EWBIF General conditions, on the WBIF board assessing the single investments:

Article 3.01 (c)

The Operational Board of the WBIF will select actions eligible for grant support under the WBIF. Following, or, if applicable, contemporaneously with, selection of such actions by the Operational Board of the WBIF, the Assembly of Contributors will decide, in accordance with the decision-making procedures set out in paragraph 3.02 (i) or (j), as applicable, whether the Fund Resources will be used for the financing of any such actions.